



## Durham E-Theses

---

### *The Tradition of restoration: An examination of the Motifs of Israel's re-gathering and the fate of the nations in early Jewish literature and Luke-Acts*

Fuller, Michael E.

#### How to cite:

---

Fuller, Michael E. (2005) *The Tradition of restoration: An examination of the Motifs of Israel's re-gathering and the fate of the nations in early Jewish literature and Luke-Acts*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/2859/>

#### Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

**The Tradition of Restoration:  
An Examination  
of the Motifs of Israel's  
Re-gathering and the Fate of the Nations  
in Early Jewish Literature and  
Luke-Acts**

**Michael E. Fuller**

**A copyright of this thesis rests  
with the author. No quotation  
from it should be published  
without his prior written consent  
and information derived from it  
should be acknowledged.**

**Toward the Fulfillment of the Requirements of the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
The University of Durham, United Kingdom  
Department of Theology**

**2005**



**2 1 JUN 2005**

## **ABSTRACT**

**The Tradition of Restoration: An Examination of the Motifs of Israel's Re-gathering and the Fate of the Nations in Early Jewish Literature and Luke-Acts**

**By Michael E. Fuller**

This thesis identifies and examines the tradition of restoration. Particular attention is given to its expression in—what is identified in the present study—as the exilic model of restoration. This model provided one framework through which Jews in the Greco-Roman period could express their dilemmas as well as their hopes and ideas of the future. This particular expression of Israel's restoration is characterized by the features of: Israel's re-gathering, the fate of the nations/enemies, and the establishment of a new Temple. The present study focuses primarily on the first two features (i.e., the re-gathering of Israel and the fate of Israel's enemies) of the exilic model of restoration. The features are identified in a wide number of early Jewish documents and examined for their interpretation. In Chapter One, we examine and submit to critique the most important scholarly work on the use of the pattern of 'exile and return' in early Jewish ideas of restoration. In Chapter Two (The Re-gathering of Israel), we identify and discuss various early Jewish sources that represent the diverse interpretations given to the motif of Israel's eschatological return. In Chapter Three (The Defeat of Israel's Enemies), we examine a number of early Jewish documents that represent the variety of interpretations and emphases given to the hope for the defeat of Israel's adversaries. In Chapter Four (The Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts), we explore the influence of these early Jewish ideas of restoration on the self-identity and hopes of a formative Christian community.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The present thesis could not have been written without the crucial involvement and support of a number of people. First of all, I must thank my Ph.D. supervisor, Prof. Loren T. Stuckenbruck, who has provided me with guidance and support for which all prospective Ph.D. students hope in their programs. Prof. Stuckenbruck has been both a mentor and a friend. Moreover, he, his spouse (Lois) and children were like an extended family to me and my spouse (Shelia) while we lived in England.

Also appreciation is due to Prof. James D. G. Dunn, for serving as my temporary supervisor while Prof. Stuckenbruck was on Sabbatical leave, and to Prof. C.T.R Hayward, for many stimulating and helpful discussions. I wish also to thank the two examiners of the present thesis, Prof. John Barclay (internal examiner [University of Durham]) and to Dr. Steve Walton (external examiner [London School of Theology]). They provided an invigorating viva and gave me much to consider in my future research.

Other scholars with whom I have had meaningful conversations while at Durham include Doron Mendels, Shemaryahu Talmon, and N.T. Wright. The renowned Durham Theology seminar provided the context for many of these discussions.

I must also thank the secretarial staff of Durham, especially Margaret Parkinson and Anne Parker, who have been so helpful and friendly through the years.

I am grateful for the Overseas Research Scholarship (1997-98; 1998-99) granted by the British Government, which made my study at Durham possible.

My appreciation goes out to Lee University, which has provided me with a wonderful environment to work and great collegiality. A special word of thanks must go to Dr. Paul Conn (President of Lee University), who provided me a faculty post, and who has been so generous with his support of my research. Also, I am grateful to Dr. Carolyn Dirksen (Vice President of Academics) who has helped me in finding space, time, and finances to finish the writing of the thesis. She has been such a friend as well.

My appreciation goes out to a number of friends: Chuck Robertson, Doug Mohrmann, Stephen and Linda Wright, Florian Schwaab, Pierpaolo Andriani, Franek Siedlok, and Marco Conti.

I wish to acknowledge as well my friend and colleagues here at Lee University. Their collegiality and friendship has been vital to the completion of the thesis. Thanks to Brad Frazier, Todd Hibbard, Barbara Searcy, Terry Cross, Dale Coulter, Jean Corey and Edley Moodley.

Three special friends must be singled out:

Mohammed Al-Masri is the friend one needs in far away places. He remains a close comrade, whose friendship is of inestimable value to me. I miss the long nights of conversation, despair, laughter, and Laguvulin. Together, we believed together that 'the end was (always) near.'



Emerson Powery has been a friend for over 17 years. He is more a brother than a friend. I could not have finished the dissertation without his friendship and support. Thanks for sharing your sabbatical in 2003-2004.

Tom Waits is a friend I've never met. However, his lyrics have provided the precise articulation of pain, love, sadness, bliss (and occasional insanity) that accompany the writing of a Ph.D. thesis.

Of course, my family has provided me with an endearing and endless amount of love and support. I have been blessed with the love of: my mother (Pat Fuller) and father (John Fuller), and five siblings (John, Karen, Tonya, Chastity, and Keelan). (No more missed family gatherings!)

Most of all I am indebted to my wife, Shelia. She is my 'all in all.' She has gotten up early with me; she has stayed up late until I got home. She has cried and laughed with me. But most of all, she has continued to believe in me. In tough times, she retained the faith that we could see this thesis through.

And how could I have finished the Ph.D. without my little Abbey, who was born to us in Durham? She has brought so much life and love to our home. Her name will always evoke memories of a place I will recall fondly, Abbey House, Dept. of Theology, University of Durham (*Michaelmas Term, October 2004*).

## **DECLARATION**

**None of the material contained in this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree in this or any other country.**

---

**Michael Fuller**

## **STATEMENT OF COPYRIGHT**

**The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No extensive quotation from it should be published without prior written consent, and information derived from it should be acknowledged.**

## ABBREVIATIONS

Except where noted in the thesis, all abbreviations follow that of: *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Christian Studies*. Edited by Patrick H. Alexander, ed. et al (Peabody, Ma.: Hendrickson, 1999). In the citation of the Dead Sea Scrolls, a number of translations were consulted; these are abbreviated in the thesis, but given here for convenience.

The texts and translations of Florentino García Martínez and Eibert Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 1997-1998) is abbreviated as *DSSSE*.

The translation of Florentino García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English* (2<sup>nd</sup> edit.; Leiden: Brill, 1996) is abbreviated as *DSST*.

The texts and translations of the multi-volume work by James H. Charlesworth, (ed.) *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations* (The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project; Westminster/John Knox: Louisville, 1993-ongoing) are abbreviated as *PDSSP*.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	The Problem .....	3
1.2	Important Studies on the <i>Idea of Exile and Israel's Future Restoration</i> in EJJL.....	6
1.3	Approach and Method.....	14
<b>2</b>	<b>THE RE-GATHERING OF ISRAEL.....</b>	<b>17</b>
2.1	Introduction .....	17
2.2	Israel's Re-gathering in the Sixth Century BCE.....	19
2.2.1	Haggai and Zechariah: Hope for a Greater Restoration .....	20
2.2.2	Ezra-Nehemiah: The Persian Restoration of Israel .....	21
2.3	Israel's Re-gathering(s) after the Sixth Century BCE Restoration.....	29
2.4	The Return of the Diaspora as the End of <i>All Israel's</i> Captivity .....	31
2.4.1	The Book of Tobit: Re-gathering to the Safe Haven of the Land .....	32
2.4.2	Sirach: The Re-gathering to the Land Where Wisdom Dwells.....	39
2.4.3	Second Maccabees 1-2: The Re-gathering as the Completion of Israel's Restoration .....	50
2.5	The Re-gathering of Israel <i>from Israel</i> .....	56
2.5.1	Damascus Document: The True Return from Babylon.....	61
2.5.2	The Animal Apocalypse: The Return from Apocalyptic Exile.....	70
2.5.3	Fourth Ezra: The Return of the Hidden and Righteous Ten Tribes .....	87
2.6	The Diaspora as Holy Land .....	97
2.6.1	Philo of Alexandria: Israel's Re-gathering as a Universal Pilgrimage .....	99
<b>3</b>	<b>THE DEFEAT OF ISRAEL'S ENEMIES.....</b>	<b>118</b>
3.1	Introduction .....	119
3.2	E.P. Sanders' Assessment of the Fate of the Gentiles in EJJL.....	123
3.2.1	The Defeat of the Nations as the Dominant Fate: Issues and Questions.....	128
3.3	The Historic Restoration and Israel's Ongoing Subjugation.....	131
3.4	The Army of Israel and the Defeat of the Enemies in EJJL .....	135
3.4.1	First Maccabees: The Reclamation of the Land from the Gentiles.....	137
3.4.2	Excursus: The Conversion of the Gentiles as a Form of Subjugation.....	145
3.4.3	The War Scroll: The Defeat of Israel's Earthly and Heavenly Enemies.....	150
3.5	Divine Intervention and the Defeat of Israel's Enemies .....	167
3.5.1	Testament of Moses: The Power of Dying and Restoration Beyond the Land .....	172
3.5.2	Josephus: Israel's History of Passivity and Divine Intervention.....	178
3.6	Psalms of Solomon: The Davidic Messiah in Israel's Restoration.....	184
3.6.1	Excursus: The Davidic Messiah .....	192

3.7	<b>The Acceptance of Gentile Rule <i>and</i> Israel's Restoration .....</b>	<b>203</b>
3.7.1	Sibylline Oracles (Book Three): An Egyptian Messiah.....	206

## **4 ISRAEL'S RESTORATION IN LUKE-ACTS .....218**

4.1	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>218</b>
4.2	<b>Between Two Lands: Israel and the Rome .....</b>	<b>219</b>
4.3	<b>Hopes for Restoration (Luke 1-2).....</b>	<b>225</b>
4.4	<b>Israel's Exilic Predicament in Luke-Acts .....</b>	<b>229</b>
4.4.1	Luke's Exilic Vocabulary of Restoration.....	231
4.4.2	Excursus: The Wilderness as Exile in EJJ .....	233
4.4.3	John the Baptist and the Prophetic Judgment: Israel's Exilic Wilderness (Luke 3:1-6) .....	240
4.4.4	The Exilic Wilderness and Israel's (Religious) Leaders (Luke 7:24-35).....	245
4.4.5	Jesus and the Apocalyptic Exile of Israel (Luke 4:1-14) .....	250
4.4.6	Jesus' First Proclamation: The End of Israel's Exile (Luke 4:16-30).....	258
4.5	<b>The Inauguration of Israel's Re-gathering in the Twelve Apostles (Luke 6:12-16).....</b>	<b>262</b>
4.5.1	The Messiah's Characterization of the Kingdom (Luke 6:17-7:1) .....	268
4.5.2	The Pilgrimage toward Jerusalem (Luke 9:51-19:27) .....	271
4.5.3	Israel's New Eschatological Rulers (Luke 22:14-30) .....	273
4.5.4	Excursus: The Motif of the Twelve Tribes and Israel's Re-gathering .....	278
4.5.5	The Re-constitution of the Twelve and Israel's Eschatological Return (Acts 1:15-26).....	280
4.6	<b>Excursus: The Babylonian Exile and the Temple in Luke-Acts .....</b>	<b>288</b>
4.7	<b>The Cycle of Exile and Return Forever Broken.....</b>	<b>290</b>

## **CONCLUSION .....293**

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY .....297**

# 1 Introduction

The aim of the present work is to analyze the variety of interpretations given to the exilic model of restoration in early Jewish literature (EJL) and to explore how these have been picked up or altered in Luke-Acts. Since this constitutes a potentially wide area of study, it is appropriate, in what follows, to delineate the problem more precisely and to justify the approach adopted in this thesis. We begin by reviewing and evaluating the most important scholarly work on the subject of restoration. This is followed by a discussion of “restoration,” and a rationale for the focus and method adopted here.

## 1.1 The Problem

E. P. Sanders observes that “it might be said that ‘Jewish eschatology’ and ‘the restoration of Israel’ are almost synonymous.”<sup>1</sup> The raw features of Jewish eschatology were born out of the barren soil of a national crisis, i.e., the destruction of the land of Israel and the exile of the people. However, while the exile was an *historic* event defined by “death, deportation, destruction, and devastation,” it was also a *theological* event of profound significance that resulted in far-reaching revisions of Israel’s view of God, religion and politics.<sup>2</sup> It was at this time that Israel had to re-think her identity and claim to occupy a privileged status with God. In short, during the aftermath of the exile, Israel had to rethink and revise *Israel*.

---

<sup>1</sup> E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (London: SCM Press, 1985), 97. Since there are eschatological events (e.g., the final judgment, resurrection, heavenly exaltation) that do at times occur outside the framework of restoration theology, Sanders’ statement is not entirely accurate. But in most cases, when Jews thought about their future, they did so within their hopes for Israel’s restoration.

<sup>2</sup> Ralph W. Klein, *Israel in Exile: A Theological Interpretation* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 2.

The exile may have affected only a small percentage of the population,<sup>3</sup> but it would become remembered as *the collective experience of all Jews*.<sup>4</sup> Thus, while the captivity of Israel was a specific event of history, limited in time and scope, it wielded a timeless ideological impact on the Jewish people. This consequence of the Jews' exilic past is both reflected and perpetuated in biblical tradition. For example, during the captivity the key portions of the Hebrew Bible were compiled and edited. Exilic theology thus exerted a heavy influence on Israel's retelling of her history, even shaping the memories of her origins and ancient history. Robert Carroll observes:

The Hebrew Bible is the book of exile. It is constituted in and by narrative and discourses of expulsion, deportation and exile. From Genesis to Chronicles [Hebrew Bible grand narrative], that is, from the stories of the expulsion of Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden to the moment when exiled Israel prepared to expel itself from Babylon to return to Jerusalem to rebuild the Temple, individuals, families, folk and the people of Judah (Jews) existed in situations of varying degrees of deportation awaiting possible return.<sup>5</sup>

While Carroll probably overstates the influence of exilic thought on the entire Hebrew Bible, the importance of the exile is profoundly evident in major sections of the

---

<sup>3</sup> The majority of the exiled Jews belonged to the aristocracy of Israelite society (e.g., Jer 39:1-10; 52:28-30; 2 Kings 24:14-16; Ezra 2:3-67; cf. 2 Kings 25:11-12, which implies the exile of 587 BCE was much more comprehensive). James Purvis (revised by Eric Meyers) estimates that more than 90% remained in the Land, not subjected to exile ("Exile and Return: From the Babylonian Destruction to the Reconstruction of the Jewish State," in Hershel Shanks [ed.], *Ancient Israel: From Abraham to the Roman Destruction of the Temple* [Upper Sadler River, NJ: Prentice, 1999], 202; also see fn 2 [same page]).

<sup>4</sup> The limited scope of the exile was argued long ago (and dismissed by most scholars) by C. C. Torrey (*The Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah* [BZAW 2; Giessen: J. Ricker, 1896]). Recent studies have inquired into the development of the myth of a comprehensive exile within the Bible and the perpetuation of this myth, as fact, by biblical interpreters in the history of scholarship. For instance, see Robert Carroll, "The Myth of the Empty Land," David Jobling and Tina Pippin (eds.), *Ideological Criticism of Biblical Texts* (Semeia 59; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 79-93; Carroll, "Exile! What Exile? Deportation and Discourses of Diaspora," in Lester L. Grabbe (ed.), *Leading Captivity Captive: 'The Exile' as History and Ideology* (JSOTSS 278; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 62-79; Hans M. Barstad, *The Myth of the Empty Land: A Study in the History and Archaeology of Judah during the 'Exilic' Period* (Symbolae osloenses 28; Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1996); Lester L. Grabbe (ed.), *Leading Captivity Captive: 'The Exile' as History and Ideology* (JSOTSS 278; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), esp. 11-19. Although offering valuable insights into the historic exile and return, Grabbe's book also brings into question, as the author himself admits, the occasional suspect assumptions and methods of scholarship in the investigation of biblical history (*Leading Captivity*, 12, fn 2).

<sup>5</sup> Robert P. Carroll, "Deportation and Diasporic Discourses in the Prophetic Literature," in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*, ed., James M. Scott (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 64 (63-85).



biblical narrative. For instance, a *Leitmotif* of the Deuteronomistic history is that Israel's "future" will be one of sin, exile, (repentance) and return (S-E-[R]-R).<sup>6</sup> Even as the children of Israel stand ready to enter and receive the promise of the Land, Moses is made to foresee their expulsion:

I call to heaven and earth to witness against you today that you will soon utterly perish from the land that you are crossing the Jordan to occupy; you will not live long upon it, but will be utterly destroyed. The Lord will scatter you among the peoples; only a few of you will be left among the nations where the Lord will lead you (Deut 4:26-27).<sup>7</sup>

However, in Moses' last speech to the twelve tribes of Israel before his death, he reminds them that the imminent blessing of the Land, to be followed by an exile, will be ultimately realized by a restoration:

Even if you are scattered (פֶּרֶד) to the ends of the heavens, from there the Lord your God will gather (יִקְבֹּץ) you, and from there he will bring you back. The Lord your God will bring you into the land that your ancestors possessed and you will possess it. (30:4).<sup>8</sup>

Jacob Neusner argues that such a retrojection of exilic theology into Israel's sacred history provided an interpretive template through which later writers continued to cope with their misfortunes.<sup>9</sup> In essence, exile and return became "the history of all Judaisms."<sup>10</sup> He writes:

---

<sup>6</sup> This history is contained in Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, 1-2 Samuel and 1-2 Kings. The classic study of this history is contained in Martin Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse, 18 Jahr, Hft. 2; Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1943); idem, *The Deuteronomistic History* (JSOTSup 15; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981). Also see Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972). For a helpful summary of the history of research into the Deuteronomistic history and a discussion on its relationship to the topic of restoration, see J. G. McConville, "Restoration in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic Literature," in Scott (ed.), *Restoration*, 12-40.

<sup>7</sup> Despite the exilic warning, Moses offers hope for future restitution as well. He says that while in captivity, Israel should "seek the Lord your God" (4:29) with the hope that God will "not forget the covenant of your ancestors that he swore to them" (4:31).

<sup>8</sup> My translation.

<sup>9</sup> Jacob Neusner, *Self-fulfilling Prophecy: Exile and the Return of Judaism* (Boston: Beacon, 1987).

<sup>10</sup> Neusner, *Self-fulfilling Prophecy*, 33. Likewise, he notes that "all Judaic systems have recapitulated a single experience: the exile and return suffered by some Jews between 586 and 450 B. C." (1).

Because the Mosaic Torah's interpretation of the diverse experiences of the Israelites after the destruction of the Temple in 586 B.C. invoked the categories of exile and return, so constructing a pattern from the experience of only a minority of the families of the Jews, in the formation of the Pentateuch, the events from 586 to 450 B.C. became for all time the definitive pattern of meaning. Consequently, whether or not the pattern agreed with their actual circumstances, Jews in diverse settings constructed their worlds in accord with that model. They have therefore perpetually rehearsed the human experience created by the original authors of the Torah in the time of Ezra. That pattern accordingly was not merely preserved and perpetuated, but itself precipitated and provoked its own replication in each succeeding age.<sup>11</sup>

Thus, it is clear that the exile left its mark on Jews of the biblical period. However, the question remains: (how) did the pattern of exile and return affect Jews and their writings in Second Temple Judaism? More specifically, how did the *idea of exile* influence the conception of *restoration* for Jews after the 6th century BCE?

## **1.2 Important Studies on the *Idea of Exile and Israel's Future Restoration* in EJJ**

In an essay on "Toward an Understanding of the Messianic Idea in Judaism," published in 1971, Gershom Scholem offered a seminal inquiry into Israel's ideas of the future.<sup>12</sup> Scholem begins his study by characterizing Judaism of the Greco-Roman and Rabbinic periods according to various worldviews. He identifies several streams of Jewish thought: (1) conservative ("directed toward the preservation of that which exist"); (2) restorative ("directed to the return and recreation of a past condition"); and (3) utopian ("aim at a state of things which had never existed").<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Neusner, *Self-fulfilling Prophecy*, 3.

<sup>12</sup> Scholem, in idem (ed.), *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and other Essays on Jewish Spirituality* (New York: Schocken: 1971). Talmon has taken up Scholem's model and developed it in his own assessments of Jewish eschatological ideas. For instance, see Talmon, "Types of Messianic Expectation," 202-26; idem, "Biblical Visions of the Future Ideal Age," in idem (ed.), *Kings, Cult and Calendar*, 140-64.

<sup>13</sup> Scholem, "Messianic Idea," 3. The restorative model is the most relevant model for the present study. However, as discussed later in relation to such early Jewish texts as the *Animal Apocalypse*, the utopian view is not necessarily mutually exclusive from the restorative one. Moreover, Scholem's assumptions about Jewish conservatism is deserving of comment as well. He notes that many Jews adopted a conservative orientation that focused on preserving that which already existed in the

Scholem argues that the restorative model found in early Jewish texts was concerned with the return and re-creation of a past condition that had come to be regarded as ideal. He comments that “hope is turned backwards to the re-establishment of an original state of things and to a ‘life with the ancestors.’”<sup>14</sup> Scholem’s broadly conceived models of Jewish eschatology are helpful in organizing what was a wide array of ideas about the future. However, his descriptions, which are too general, do not do justice to the level of nuance and diversity in relation to Israel’s restoration as attested in EJL.<sup>15</sup> While Scholem is no doubt correct to affirm the importance of certain past events or persons for Israel’s conception of the future, he does not adequately account for the influence of the 6<sup>th</sup> century exile and return on later conceptions of the future. Indeed, as shall be emphasized here, in the period of Early Judaism, the historic return often inspired and/or served as foil for ideas of a future restoration.

An early work that noted the significance of the exilic theology in the writings of Early Judaism and Christianity is the study of Odil Hannes Steck (1967).<sup>16</sup> Steck maintains that this pattern, upon which he further elaborates (see below), provided a

---

respective period (i.e., interpretation of Torah; Temple sacrifice). He maintains that such communities did not engage in future speculations. He concludes that such communities had “no part in the development of Messianism.” However, many interpreters, particularly Jewish scholars, such as Lawrence H. Schiffman (*Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* [New York: Doubleday, 1995]), have noted that many of the Qumran writings combine eschatological concerns with the interpretation of Scripture, both concerns occurring within a single document (e.g., *Community Rule*, 4QMMT; *Damascus Document* and the various Qumran pesharim). These writings demonstrate that various groups could be very interested in matters of Torah, while still retaining fervent eschatological expectations, including the hope for Israel’s restoration.

<sup>14</sup> Scholem, “Messianic Idea,” 3.

<sup>15</sup> Moreover, such writings as the *Animal Apocalypse* and the *Apocalypse of Weeks* describe Israel’s restoration and a new creation within the same eschatological drama. That is, these two scenarios are not necessarily mutually exclusive from one another.

<sup>16</sup> Odil Hannes Steck, *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes in Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum* (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 23; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967). Steck’s study is not concerned with this pattern alone, but with other interests as well (see below). Steck’s early contribution to the study of exilic theology has not been duly noted in scholarship. For instance, N. T. Wright makes only one brief reference to Steck’s book (*The New Testament and the People of God* [London: SPCK, 1992], 270).

template through which Jews of later times interpreted both their trying circumstances and their hopes for the future.<sup>17</sup> While he recognizes the ongoing importance of the sin-exile-return (S-E-R) pattern for Jews, its exploration is not the main focus of his study. He subordinates the issue of Israel's restoration to his main interest in the prevalence of Deuteronomistic theology in early Jewish and New Testament (NT) writings.<sup>18</sup> Therefore, since his focus lies on this broader framework, and not specifically Israel's restoration, Steck's description of the various conceptions of the future in early Jewish or Christian writings is often concerned with other issues. He therefore provides only marginal and generalized commentary on the notion of an extended exile and the features of Israel's future restoration.

Peter Ackroyd, in his monograph on *Exile and Restoration* (1968),<sup>19</sup> examines the exile as an historical event and as an experience interpreted by biblical writers. His final chapter, however, explores "the 'idea' of exile."<sup>20</sup> With respect to post-exilic times, Ackroyd notes the continued significance of exilic thought on Jews and their writings. He observes that Babylon became a term of association with the evil world, foreign empires, and/or a sinful epoch. Exile, in effect, becomes "the symbol for the bondage

---

<sup>17</sup> In addition to his interest in the pattern of S-E-R, Steck notes the attendant features of this Deuteronomistic pattern as: (1) Israel's history of disobedience to God, (2) the sending of God's prophets to call Israel to repentance, (3) Israel's rejection of the prophets, (4) Israel's punishment under the Deuteronomic curses (Deut 27-29), and (5) Israel's restoration as a part of the Deuteronomic blessings (*Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten*). Indeed, as noted below, Steck is particularly interested in the motif of the rejected prophet in his study. Steck sometimes assumes, incorrectly, that one feature of these blessings automatically entails the implicit presence of others, even when not evidenced in the text. Moreover, Steck assumes the predominance of the Deuteronomistic framework and applies this interpretive template too vigorously, at the expense of other concerns of an ancient writer. Also see C. Marvin Pate's discussion of Steck in *Communities of the Last Days: The Dead Sea Scrolls, the New Testament and the Story of Israel* (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity, 2000), 24-27.

<sup>18</sup> Steck's interest does not lie predominately with analyzing Israel's ideas of restoration; he is more interested in elaborating the role of the prophet and his function in calling Israel to repentance within the Deuteronomistic framework.

<sup>19</sup> Peter Ackroyd's study (*Exile and Restoration: A Study of Hebrew Thought of the Sixth Century BC* [London: SCM, 1968]) appeared one year after Steck. Neither scholar refers to the other in their respective works.

<sup>20</sup> Ackroyd, *Exile and Restoration*, 232-47.

from which release is to be found.”<sup>21</sup> Significantly, Ackroyd concludes that “the exile is no longer an historic event to be dated in one period.”<sup>22</sup> He remarks:

[T]he exile came to be seen as of paramount importance, a great divide between the earlier and later stages, but one which it was necessary to traverse if the new age was to be reached. Only those who had gone through the exile--whether actually or spiritually--could be thought of as belonging.<sup>23</sup>

Ackroyd’s assessment of the idea of exile occurs near the conclusion of his work, and provides an important trajectory for further research. He is the first, as far as we can determine, to coin the phrase “idea of exile,” and to emphasize its importance for later communities in Early Judaism and formative Christianity. Ackroyd’s observations about this subject, by his own admission, are tentative, since it is not his aim to provide a full discussion of the implications of an extended, ideological exile *for later conceptions of Israel’s restoration* in the Second Temple period. However, he provides the foundational groundwork on the idea of exile and establishes trajectories for further research on the subject.

Michael A. Knibb, a student of Ackroyd, has conducted a more thorough examination in his article on “The Exile in the Literature of the Intertestamental Period” (1976).<sup>24</sup> Knibb mainly looks at a cross-section of EJJ that re-interprets the seventy-year exile of Jeremiah and the 390-year exile of Ezekiel. Knibb’s study is especially valuable in that he takes up *early Jewish texts*, which refer to other exiles and restorations beyond the 6<sup>th</sup> century. He contends that for many Jewish writers, “Israel remained in a state of exile long after the sixth century, and that the exile would only be

---

<sup>21</sup> Ackroyd, *Exile and Restoration*, 247.

<sup>22</sup> Ackroyd, *Exile and Restoration*, 242.

<sup>23</sup> Ackroyd, *Exile and Restoration*, 243.

<sup>24</sup> Michael Knibb, “The Exile in the Literature of the Intertestamental Period,” *HeyJ* 17 (1976), 253-72.

brought to an end when God intervened in this world in order to establish his rule.”<sup>25</sup> Knibb does not, however, provide a detailed discussion of the restoration (i.e., ‘return’) portion of the exile and return pattern in EJJ. While he observes that Israel continued to hope for a more positive conclusion to their ongoing predicament, Knibb’s interest does not lie in elaborating upon the specific features of restoration and the variety of interpretations given to them. Nonetheless, Knibb provides firm evidence from the careful exegesis of early Jewish sources for Ackroyd’s claim about the importance of exilic theology in the Second Temple period. Knibb’s exploration of the idea of a continual exile in EJJ remains a valuable source to be consulted in the study of the exilic model of restoration, and has too often been under appreciated in scholarship.

E. P. Sanders has emphasized the importance of Israel’s hopes of restoration for the study of early Jewish eschatology (1977; 1985; 1987; 1992).<sup>26</sup> Although he does not specifically address the subject of a *continual exile* as a predominant view taken by many Jews to characterize their ‘contemporary’ situations, Sanders’ discussion of restoration theology (or Israel’s future hopes), nonetheless, depends on the framework of exilic theology. For Sanders, the idea of Israel’s restoration lies at the core of Jewish eschatology.<sup>27</sup> Moreover, Sanders underscores the *nationalistic character* of Jewish

---

<sup>25</sup> Knibb, “The Exile in the Literature,” 271-72. Similarly, Robert P. Carroll observes: “Much of the literature of the Second Temple period recognizes a category of exile after the destruction of Jerusalem in 587/56, but it does not recognize any return in subsequent centuries...Exile becomes a symbol in this literature; a symbol of alienation of the group (or sect) from power in Jerusalem, or one related to messianic expectations which alone would restore people to the land (“Israel, History of [Post-Monarchic Period],” *Anchor Bible Dictionary* [New York: Doubleday, 1992], 3.567-76 [575]). A noteworthy omission in the *ABD* is the absence of a dictionary entry on “Exile.”

<sup>26</sup> E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1977), 147-82, 239-430; idem, *Jesus and Judaism* (London: SCM, 1985), 91-119, 335-40; idem, “Jesus and the Kingdom: The Restoration of Israel and the New People of God,” in idem (ed.), *Jesus, the Gospels, and the Church: Essays in Honor of William R. Farmer* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1987), 225-39; idem, *Judaism: Practice and Belief: 63 BCE—66 CE* (London: SCM, 1992), 279-303.

<sup>27</sup> Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 97.

eschatology and the hope for restoration.<sup>28</sup> Sanders identifies the key components of Israel's theology of restoration as (1) Israel's re-gathering; (2) the subjugation or salvation of the Gentiles; (3) the emergence of a new or exalted Temple; and (4) the inauguration of an age of righteousness or purity.<sup>29</sup>

As a test case for determining the importance of early Jewish ideas of restoration for understanding formative Christianity, Sanders draws from these in his analysis of the historical Jesus. He underscores the importance of restoration theology for understanding the way Jesus identified himself and his activities. Sanders' contribution lies chiefly in elaborating the various ways the Temple was understood in ETL, and how these were taken up by Jesus in defining his mission and eschatological ideas. As noted in this present chapter (below), the hope for a new or exalted Temple is often a key motif of the (exilic) tradition of Israel's restoration.<sup>30</sup> Sanders argues that Jesus drew on ideas about the Temple, particularly, its eschatological replacement, in defining his attitude toward it and expressing his condemnation of Jerusalem's priestly cult.<sup>31</sup> However, while Sanders recognizes the complex interpretations given to the motif of a new Temple,<sup>32</sup> he does not discuss or seem to recognize the same level of complexity that may be given to the other features of restoration as well. Moreover, Sanders' characterization of Israel's restoration as being nationalistic in orientation cannot be sustained as being representative of all Jewish groups of the Second Temple period.

---

<sup>28</sup> Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief*, 279.

<sup>29</sup> Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief*, 289-94. For Sanders' full discussion of Israel's "Hopes for the Future" (Chapter Fourteen), see 279-303.

<sup>30</sup> Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 77-90.

<sup>31</sup> Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 61-76.

<sup>32</sup> Building on the studies of Lloyd Gaston (*No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels* [NovTSup 23; Leiden: Brill, 1970]) and Richard J. McKelvey (*The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969]), Sanders observes the eschatological Temple might be understood in terms of an exalted one, a new or heavenly one, or embodied in a community (i.e., a temple community) (Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 77-90).

While restoration is often conceived of as nationalist and as ultimately an event involving all or most Jews, a number of documents<sup>33</sup> demonstrate that certain groups of Jews often formulated their ideas of restoration expressly against other Jewish adversaries. In such visions of restoration, there is often no expression of reconciliation and/or the hope for inclusion of all Jewish people.<sup>34</sup> Indeed, some of these texts place primary emphasis on the *eradication* of their Jewish opponents. Sanders' work has been of crucial importance for revitalizing scholarly interest in Israel's restoration, especially as it pertains to NT studies. Sanders continues to advocate the value of studying EJJ to *understand Judaism*, but he has also demonstrated the importance of early Jewish writings and their ideas for the investigation of early Christianity. Rather than emphasizing only Christianity's distinctions from Early Judaism, Sanders has sought to demonstrate the profound debt of Christianity on Judaism for fundamental aspects of its self-identity, beliefs, and activities.<sup>35</sup>

N. T. Wright understands exilic theology to be the mother of early Christian origins (1992).<sup>36</sup> While his work is taken up throughout the present study, especially in our analysis of the interpretation of restoration in Luke-Acts, a few words of critique are appropriate in this opening chapter. Wright argues that exilic theology was a pervasive influence on the worldview of most Jews in the Greco-Roman period. Therefore, he

---

<sup>33</sup> E.g., *Psalms of Solomon* 17-18; *Damascus Document*; *War Scroll*; Luke-Acts.

<sup>34</sup> For a critique of Sanders' characterization of Israel's hopes of restoration as being inherently *nationalistic* in scope and content, see the well written critique of Sanders by Mark Adam Elliot in his study, *The Survivors of Israel: A Reconsideration of Pre-Christian Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), esp. 27-56.

<sup>35</sup> Various points of Sanders' arguments concerning Israel's theology of restoration are taken up and assessed in greater detail later in this thesis.

<sup>36</sup> In N. T. Wright's comprehensive study of Christian origins, he gives priority to the framework of exilic theology (including the hope for Israel's restoration) in his analysis of the Christian community (*The New Testament and the People of God* [London: SPCK, 1992; 1997]; all references are to the 1997 edition); the historical Jesus (idem, *Jesus and the Victory of God* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996]); and the resurrected Jesus ("son of God") (idem, *The Resurrection of the Son of God* [Minneapolis: Augsburg, 2003]). The latter work appeared too late to be consulted and dealt with in the present thesis.



argues that the exilic model of restoration provides the best interpretative matrix in which to understand Jesus and the formative Christian movement. In a now well known and frequently rehearsed quote by Wright, he remarks:

The need for this restoration is seen in the common second-temple perception of its own period of history. Most Jews of this period, it seems, would have answered the question 'where are we?' in language which, reduced to its simplest form, meant: we are still in exile.<sup>37</sup>

Wright is correct in noting the significance of the exilic model of restoration in the period of Second Temple Judaism, but he overstates its prevalence, ignoring or downplaying large bodies of Jewish (and Gentile) literary and archaeological data that suggests many Jews understood their context and lives in much more positive terms than exile. While Wright's observations hold true, however, for some communities of Jews, he does not always acknowledge or explore the rich variety of interpretations given to both exile and restoration. Despite these problems and others, Wright's analysis has underscored the importance of the pattern of exile and return for Jews of the Second Temple period, including the formative Christian community. Moreover, his work is invaluable for the wealth of scholarly interest it has generated in mining early Jewish traditions for their ideas of restoration and for determining Christianity's dependence upon them.

More recently, James M. Scott has edited two collections of essays,<sup>38</sup> published in 1997 and 2001 respectively, which examine both ends of the exile and return paradigm. The contributors to these collections, it may be said, at least demonstrate that the notion or idea of exile and return continued to shape Jewish self-understanding throughout the Second Temple period. However, there is little continuity, in terms of

---

<sup>37</sup> Wright, *New Testament*, 268.

<sup>38</sup> James M. Scott (ed.), *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions* (Leiden: Brill, 1997); idem (ed.), *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (Leiden: Brill, 2001).

approach and methodology, among the various studies collected in the two volumes. Moreover, there is little attempt in the later volume on restoration to build upon the previously published studies on the exile. Consequently, while each of the essays is informative individually, the studies, as a whole, are often inconsistent in their approach, choice of criteria for analyzing the topic at hand, and therefore in their assessments. Nonetheless, the various essays marshal together a large number of texts from biblical, early Jewish and NT writings, which demonstrate that long after the events of the 6<sup>th</sup> century restoration, many Jews continued to draw on that historical event (whether positively or negatively) in expressing their ideas of a future restoration in times of duress.<sup>39</sup>

Despite the wide recognition of the importance of exilic theology for shaping Israel's ideas of restoration, and the number of studies which have taken up the topic (above), an in depth study of the exilic model of restoration according to its key features is still lacking in scholarship. The present study aims to identify these texts of restoration and discuss their interpretation in EJJ.

### **1.3 Approach and Method**

The major portion of this study explores the various interpretations given to the exilic model of restoration in EJJ. The final chapter examines the use of this model in Luke-Acts. The exilic tradition of restoration, it is argued, is derived not only from the exilic hopes of the prophets, but from three major features of the 6<sup>th</sup> century restoration: Israel's re-gathering, the new Temple, and (the re-ordering of) relations with the

---

<sup>39</sup>Ackroyd's *Exile and Restoration*, remains a classic study of this subject. Claus Westermann (*Prophetic Oracles of Salvation in the Old Testament* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991] offers a form-critical assessment of various types of expressions for restoration, including exile and return.

nations.<sup>40</sup> While the exilic model of restoration is common in texts of restoration in EJJ, this model, or features thereof (above) receive(s) complex and various interpretations in the documents of Early Judaism and the NT. The interpretations given to the various components of the exilic model have not been sufficiently identified and characterized according to their usage and meaning in the early Jewish documents in which they appear.

In the following two chapters, a number of texts of restoration from EJJ, written primarily between 200 BCE and 100 CE,<sup>41</sup> are identified and discussed. From our examination and study of a wide number of early Jewish documents, we have chosen texts of restoration that represent the diverse views and interpretations of Israel's future hopes that existed in Judaism of the Greco-Roman period. These texts are submitted to an exegetical analysis to determine the interpretation of Israel's restoration in the respective writing in which they appear. Moreover, the relationship of the particular interpretation of restoration or motif thereof in one text is discussed in light of similar or distinctive ideas found elsewhere in EJJ. The analysis of similar or distinctive interpretations across texts provides the basis for us to speak of 'traditions' or complexes of ideas, and their prevalence in Early Judaism. In the examination of the text of restoration in an early Jewish document, particular attention is paid to the identification and discussion of: technical terms or phrases associated with restoration; antecedent (biblical and non-biblical) texts and their (re-)interpretation in EJJ; the recurrence of ideas, images, features and their inter-relationship and interpretation

---

<sup>40</sup> This latter feature is referred to as the 'fate of the nations' in this thesis (see Chapter Three).

<sup>41</sup> The major exception to this timeframe is, of course, the biblical literature written about the historical restoration (i.e., Ezra-Nehemiah; Haggai and Zechariah [1-8]).

within and across documents.<sup>42</sup> In short, the major question that drives the present study is: how is the exile model of restoration interpreted in the writings of Early Judaism and Luke-Acts? The diversity and complexity of the tradition of restoration is thoroughly demonstrated in the analysis below.<sup>43</sup>

A consideration of written sources reveals that the exilic model of restoration consisted of three main motifs: (1) Israel's re-gathering (Chapter Two), (2) the defeat of the nations (Chapter Three), and (3) a new Temple. Of these motifs, the first two shall be treated in detail in the present thesis, while the third – which could constitute a study in itself – is given less thoroughgoing, though necessary, consideration as dictated by the texts being investigated. In the final section (Chapter Four), the writing of Luke-Acts is investigated as a test case for determining one way early Jewish ideas of restoration influenced the emerging self-understanding in a Christian community as it came to terms with traditions about Jesus and his followers.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> That is, in the examination of representative texts, the idea of Israel's restoration is examined within the wider literary goals of the respective document, before attempting to demonstrate its prevalence and importance in the wider stream of Early Judaism.

<sup>43</sup> In the texts of restoration that have been chosen for the present study, at least two of the features, characteristic of the exilic model of restoration (i.e., Israel's re-gathering, new Temple or fate of the nations), appear in the respective document. In most cases, unless a feature of the exilic model of restoration is actually mentioned or alluded to in a particular document, its appearance will not be assumed. In general, the complex of features usually occur within a particular literary unit (i.e., a text of restoration), but occasionally the features of Israel's restoration may be spread across the respective document under investigation. In such cases, this may be random and without consequence, but in other sources, a writer may place special import on one particular component of the restoration over others.

<sup>44</sup> The study of restoration in Luke-Acts and its reliance on early Jewish traditions is exploratory. By placing this Christian writing within the interpretive matrix of EJJ, the degree of indebtedness to Jewish ideas of restoration can be determined and evaluated.

## 2 The Re-gathering of Israel

The aim of the present chapter is to identify and discuss the variety of interpretations given to the motif of *Israel's re-gathering* in EJJ. The treatment of this motif begins with an examination of the 6<sup>th</sup> century restoration, as described (and interpreted) by the biblical authors.<sup>45</sup> The treatment of the biblical or "official" version of Israel's historical restoration is justified since it often informs and influences later conceptions of the tradition of restoration in EJJ. After the analysis of the 6<sup>th</sup> century restoration, we examine the motif of Israel's re-gathering in the literature of Early Judaism. A number of texts of restoration have been chosen that represent the variety of interpretations given to the hope for Israel's future return. While all aspects of Israel's restoration are treated in the analysis of the respective text, primary attention is given to elaborating the interpretation of the *motif of re-gathering*, the focus of the present chapter.

### 2.1 Introduction

E. P. Sanders observes that the expectation of Israel's re-gathering may be "the most ubiquitous hope of all"<sup>46</sup> among Israel's ideas of restoration. The hope for Israel's re-gathering from captivity has its origin in the exilic and post-exilic experiences of

---

<sup>45</sup> E.g., Haggai and Zechariah (1-8); Ezra-Nehemiah.

<sup>46</sup> E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief*, 294. Also see Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 217. While Sanders is correct that the motif of Israel's re-gathering frequently occurs in texts of restoration, Israel's eschatological return is rivalled in terms of frequency of occurrence by the hope for the defeat of Israel's enemies (Chapter Three), another feature of Israel's exilic model of restoration.

Jews in the deportations of the 8<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> century BCE.<sup>47</sup> Against the ominous landscape of destruction and exile,<sup>48</sup> many OT writers penned their hopes for the eventual return of the people of Israel to the Land.<sup>49</sup> In a well-known text from Jeremiah (29:10-14),<sup>50</sup> God promises that after seventy years:

...I will restore (וְשִׁבְתִּי) your fortunes<sup>51</sup> (אֶת־שְׁבִיתְכֶם) and gather (וְקִבַּצְתִּי) you from all the nations and all the places where I have scattered (וְהִדַּחֲתִי) you, says the Lord, and I will bring you back (וְהִשְׁבֹּתִי) to the place from which I sent you away into exile (וְהַגְלִיתִי) (29:14).<sup>52</sup>

Likewise, the prophet Ezekiel envisions the return to the Land. He foresees the re-gathering of the people as the reunion of the southern (Judah) and northern kingdoms (Israel). Ezekiel also establishes a timeline for the duration of the exile(s), but unlike Jeremiah, assigns 390 years for the period of the northern kingdom's captivity (4:5) and forty years to the exile of Judah (4:6). Later, in Ezekiel 40-48, the prophet describes the

---

<sup>47</sup> E.g., 2 Kings 17-18; 24-25; 2 Chr 32; 36; Jer 24-25; 29:1-10; 32:26-35; 39; 52; Ezek 11:14-17; 12; 36:8-12, 24-32.

<sup>48</sup> The most common root used in reference to the exile in the OT is גָּלָה ("to go into exile"; "to emigrate"). The nominal form is גִּלוּת ("exile") (Zobel, *TDOT*, 476-88).

<sup>49</sup> In some OT passages, the re-gathered ones are portrayed as the innumerable masses making their pilgrimage back to their homeland (e.g., Hos 11:10-11; Mic 2:12-13; Isa 43:5-7; 49:12; Ezek 39:25-9). Other biblical sources specify the re-gathering in terms of the twelve tribes (e.g., Deut 30:3; 33-4; Ezekiel 48) or refer to the reunion of the northern (Israel) and southern (Judah) kingdoms (e.g., Hos 1:11; Jer 33: 6-7; 36:3; Ezek 37:15-28). For an extensive inventory and a form-critical treatment of the various passages related to the salvation of Israel, see Claus Westermann, *Oracles of Salvation*. Ackroyd's work (*Exile and Restoration*) remains an important and fundamental study of the 6<sup>th</sup> century period. Also see Konrad Schmid and Odil Hannes Steck, "Restoration Passages in the Prophetic Tradition of the Old Testament," in James M. Scott (ed.), *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 41-81. By examining the various writings of the OT prophets, Schmid and Steck attempt to give a more comprehensive account of the diversity and development of Israel's ideas of restoration.

<sup>50</sup> Also see Jer 25:11; cf. 2 Chr 36:21.

<sup>51</sup> On the translation of the phrase וְשִׁבְתִּי אֶת־שְׁבִיתְכֶם, see the classic studies of Ernst L. Dietrich, *Die endzeitliche Wiederherstellung bei der Propheten* (BZAW 40; Geissen: Töpelmann, 1925) and William L. Holladay, *The Root Šûb in the Old Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1958), respectively. For a more recent examination of the phrase, see John A. Bracke, "Šûb šebût: A Reappraisal," *ZAW* 97 (1985), 233-44. Bracke (*pace* Dietrich) argues that the phrase signifies "a model of restoration, whose primary character is God's reversal of his judgment" (233). The phrase occurs 27 times in the OT.

<sup>52</sup> My translation.

return to the Land, where an expansive Temple dominates the terrain. The returnees are presented as the people of the twelve tribes who are reunited and divided according to their respective territories. These examples from the Hebrew Bible of the envisaged restoration are indicative of the priority placed on the return of the deportees in the future restoration.<sup>53</sup>

## 2.2 Israel's Re-gathering in the Sixth Century BCE

Although the destruction and exile of the northern kingdom and its ten tribes was final and without restitution, ostensibly, the Babylonian exile of the two tribes of the southern kingdom reached its conclusion in the issue of the Edict of Cyrus<sup>54</sup> in 539 BCE.

---

<sup>53</sup> The OT writers differ on what they expect to be the catalyst for the end of the captivity. Some prophets, as in the case of Jeremiah, emphasize that Israel's restoration would occur according to God's predetermined time-table. Similarly, the Chronicler refers to Jeremiah's seventy years, but understands this period in sabbatical theology. For 2 Chronicles, it is the Land itself which requires a period of time for rest and redemption (2 Chr 36:20-21). Later Jewish writings in the Second Temple period, recalculated the seventy years of Jeremiah according to creative mathematical schemes as a means of updating the prophecy and providing validity for the hope that Israel had yet to experience her definitive restoration. Thus the seventy years of exile in Jeremiah become seventy weeks of years (490 years) in Daniel 9:24. The book of Ezekiel offers a competing time frame that did not make as much an impact on early Jewish writings (cf. CD 1) as the seventy years of Jeremiah. As noted above Ezekiel envisions a time scheme of 390 years of the exile for the northern kingdom, while prophesying forty years of captivity for the southern kingdom (Ezek 4:5-6). In most cases, however, the prophets, were not quite so specific. Instead, the end of captivity was usually bound up with future events, e.g., the rise and fall of kingdoms. In other cases, references to the future were made in such phrases as "the day of the Lord" (e.g. Isa 58:13; Jer 46:10; Ezek 13:5; 30:3; Joel 1:15), "in that day/those days" (Isa 20:6; 22:12; 28:5; 52:6; Mic 4:6; 7:11-12) or "in the end of days" (e.g., Dan 2:28; 10:14). Although the occurrence of these phrases often contains the element of judgment, in many cases the idea of salvation or restoration present as well. In other cases, Israel's return depends on the actions of the exiled ones, e.g., repentance, return to purity. Israel's responsibility in determining her own fate is a hallmark of the Deuteronomistic history (Deuteronomy-2 Kings). Written or edited during the exile, the editor retrojects a pattern of Sin-Exile-(Repentance)-Return into Israel's ancient history. As discussed below, after the exile had officially ended, some writings continued to speculate on specific times or events that might precipitate the period of restoration.

<sup>54</sup> See discussion below.

## 2.2.1 Haggai and Zechariah: Hope for a Greater Restoration

In the accounts of the restoration in the prophetic writings of Haggai and Zechariah, which were probably written during the process of the historic restoration, the optimism and hope of the returnees occurs in tandem with criticism and cautious reservation as well. The books of Haggai and Zechariah<sup>55</sup> suggest that some Jews hoped for a greater conclusion to the restoration of Israel experienced under Persia. The expectations are promoted in a positive way by the presence of the two indigenous leaders,<sup>56</sup> the high-priest Jeshua and the royal figure of Zerubbabel, who was of Davidic descent. But a negative stimulation for hopes of restoration is provided by the lack of progress in the rebuilding of the Temple (e.g., Hag 1:3). Apparently, the returnees are devoting more time to rebuilding their own properties than Yahweh's. Although criticism is certainly directed toward the returnees, these two books also reserve strong language for the nations. Nonetheless, it is striking that no explicit criticism is directed specifically toward Persia. In fact, the prophecies of both books are dated explicitly according to the reign of King Darius.<sup>57</sup>

In Haggai, the author bemoans the "condition of the people"<sup>58</sup> and the state of the Temple, but assures the community that the construction will be completed, for God's spirit resides with Israel (Hag 2:3-5; cf. Zech 4:6). Moreover, the writer contends

---

<sup>55</sup> The history of the earliest phase is scant and can only be reconstructed in part. Ezra refers to the first group returning under Sheshbazzar (1:11), a royal figure probably of Davidic descent, but the account of the initial return under him abruptly ends. Cf. however, Ezra 5:14-16 where Sheshbazzar is credited with laying the foundations of the Temple. Also see Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 on the figures of Zerubbabel and Jeshua.

<sup>56</sup> See Haggai 1-2; Zech 3:1-10; 4:6-14; 6:9-15. The exaltation of the two figures may serve as an implicit polemic against the Persian rule, although this is not entirely clear. Both Haggai and Zachariah anticipate the subordination of the nations and the offering of their treasures to Israel (Hag 2:7-8; Zech 6:15).

<sup>57</sup> E.g., Hag 1:1; 2:1, 10; Zech 1:1, 7; 7:1. Similarly, the writer of Luke-Acts pens his story of Israel's restoration by referring to various Roman rulers (e.g., Luke 2:1; 3:1).

<sup>58</sup> Ackroyd, *Exile and Restoration*, 157; also 153-217.



that the low regard for the Temple by some within Israel and the nations at large will result in Yahweh's judgment and bring Israel's restoration to its climax. The Gentiles will then make their pilgrimage to Jerusalem to contribute their treasures and pay homage to Israel's deity (Hag 2:7-9).

The book of Zechariah (chaps 1-8) also voices dissatisfaction with some aspects of the restoration, especially with the rebuilding of the Temple and the incomplete return of the people. Some criticism is directed toward the nations as well (1:15; 2:1-4). Nonetheless, the author rejoices in the presence of Zerubbabel and Jeshua, God's anointed representatives (e.g., 3:8-10; 4:3, 12; 6:13). Zerubbabel's laying of the Temple's foundation is understood as a guarantee of a more comprehensive restoration (Zech 4:9), which will be accomplished "not by might, nor by power," but by the Lord's "spirit" (4:6). There is an imminent expectation that Yahweh is expected to return to complete the Temple himself and usher in a "new age" of restoration.<sup>59</sup> The new epoch will also result both in the judgment of some nations (1:13-15) and turning of others to Israel's God (2:15). The period of restoration therefore is expected to climax in the emergence of a righteous Israel and the pilgrimage of submissive nations gathered around an exalted Temple in recognition to Israel's God (e.g., 2:1-12).

### **2.2.2 Ezra-Nehemiah: The Persian Restoration of Israel**

The most detailed account of the 6<sup>th</sup> century restoration is purportedly described in the writings of Ezra-Nehemiah.<sup>60</sup> Numerous problems in and inconsistencies with the

---

<sup>59</sup> Ackroyd, *Exile and Restoration*, 175-77.

<sup>60</sup> The date of Ezra-Nehemiah is disputed, but probably written in the early to mid part of the fourth century BCE. H.G.M. Williamson (*Ezra Nehemiah*, [WBC 16, Waco, Tx., 1985], xxxvi) dates the work of Ezra-Nehemiah to around 300 BCE, while Clines ("Ezra Nehemiah Esther," NCBC, 13-14) suggests it was written closer to 400 BCE.

account of the restoration the story provides, however, raise serious questions about its accuracy and reliability in describing the return to the Land. Other questions are raised when comparing the account of the restoration in Ezra-Nehemiah with the version of Haggai and Zechariah 1-8, revealing differences not only in substance and detail, but *in their distinct emphases and theological tendencies* as well.<sup>61</sup>

The account of Ezra-Nehemiah provides an overwhelmingly positive endorsement of the sanctioned restoration under Persia. The writer demonstrates little to no concern with the incongruity between (older) prophetic expectations and the more mundane reality that is described.<sup>62</sup> In the opening chapter of Ezra, the author describes the inauguration of Israel's restoration.<sup>63</sup> He narrates the return of the tribes<sup>64</sup> of Judah and Benjamin (and some members of the tribe of Levi) to the Land.<sup>65</sup> The book of Ezra boldly cites the Edict of Cyrus as the pretext for Israel's restoration.<sup>66</sup> In Ezra's version,

---

<sup>61</sup> Perhaps, one of the most notable differences between the accounts of Ezra-Nehemiah and Haggai and Zechariah (1-8) is the degree of importance attributed to the figures of Zerubbabel and Jeshua. In the latter books, the presence of the two figures themselves is a significant event of the restoration, while their role is downplayed in Ezra-Nehemiah.

<sup>62</sup> The lack of any real attention to Israel's future destiny may be partly explained by the generic distinctions between Ezra-Nehemiah and the prophetic writings of Haggai and Zechariah, but other factors, such as the distinct theological and literary agendas of the authors, arising out of different life situations of distinct periods, have exercised their influence as well.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. 2 Chr 36:22-23.

<sup>64</sup> Biblical and early Jewish traditions sometimes differ in regard to which tribes were counted among the twelve (e.g., Gen 49:1-27; Deut 33:5-29) and how these were divided into their respective territories. Sometimes, Levi is not formally counted in the numbering of the twelve since the tribe was not assigned to a particular territory. Thus, Ezra refers to the return of the tribes of Benjamin and Judah and some members of the tribe of Levi. Likewise, Josephus refers to the two tribes of Benjamin and Judah and the Levites (*Ant.* 11.8, 133) and the ten tribes of the northern kingdom (*Ant.* 11.133). Other early Jewish texts refer to the nine and half tribes of the north (e.g., 2 Bar 78:1), reflecting the idea of Joseph's tribe being divided into the half tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh.

<sup>65</sup> As noted above, this positive appraisal may suggest more for author's view in the fourth century BCE than it does for the earlier period in which it purportedly describes.

<sup>66</sup> For the text of the edict, see Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, 315-16; William W. Hallo, *The Context of Scripture: Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World* (vol. 2; Leiden: Brill, 2000). The biblical versions of the edict occur in 2 Chr 36:22-23 and Ezra 1:1-6; 6:1-5. The classic article by Elias Bickerman is still insightful ("The Edict of Cyrus in Ezra 1," in Elias Bickerman, *Studies in Jewish and Christian History* [Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 9; Part 1; Leiden: Brill, 1976], 72-108). Also see the introduction to the text of the Cyrus Cylinder in Hallo, *Context of Scripture*, 2.314.

the Persian king attributes praise to Yahweh for his rise to power.<sup>67</sup> Thus, ironically Israel's God is attributed with bringing Persia<sup>68</sup> to rule over the nations of the world, including Israel.

(Ezra 1:2) Thus says King Cyrus of Persia: The LORD, the God of heaven, has given me all the kingdoms of the earth, and he has charged me to build him a house at Jerusalem in Judah. (3) Any of those among you who are of his people--may their God be with them! --are now permitted to go up to Jerusalem in Judah, and rebuild the house of the LORD, the God of Israel--he is the God who is in Jerusalem (NRSV).<sup>69</sup>

The book of Ezra claims that a large number of Jews enthusiastically made their way back to the homeland, lending weight to the idea, that until this point in time, the Land had remained largely empty of Jews.<sup>70</sup> On the other hand, the author never claims that

---

<sup>67</sup> A number of interesting differences exists between the Edict of Cyrus, as recorded in 2 Chronicles and Ezra and that of the *Cyrus Cylinder*. Although Ezra's version of the edict might suggest that Cyrus was interested only in returning Jews to their homeland, the *Cyrus Cylinder* indicates that Israel's return to her land was part of a more comprehensive policy of return, allowing other peoples conquered and deported by Babylon to return to their territories as well. Moreover, biblical texts claim that Cyrus credited Yahweh with his victory over Babylon whereas in the *Cylinder*, Marduk is given credit. The degree to which the writer of Ezra has edited the official edict is a matter of debate, although the greater balance of scholarship suggests the attribution to Yahweh itself is not necessarily indicative of editorial activity of a Jewish writer. That is, despite the credit attributed to Marduk in the *Cyrus Cylinder*, it is contended by some interpreters that local populations may have received versions that specifically addressed their peoples and their gods. Indeed, the *Cylinder* itself suggests Cyrus' concern to return the (local) gods to their particular territories, albeit to appease the subjected gods and Marduk as well.

<sup>68</sup> According to Isaiah (45:4), Cyrus is not aware that he is the servant of Yahweh; cf. other texts in the OT where writers claim that Cyrus has credited Yahweh with the expansion of his kingdom (2 Chronicles 23; Ezra 1:2). Josephus writes that Cyrus was moved to allow the Jews to return to their homeland upon reading the prophecies about himself in the book of Isaiah (*Ant.* 11.5).

<sup>69</sup> The positive view of the return is also shared by the Chronicler, as would be expected given the probability that they are shaped by a common editor (*pace* Blenkinsopp; *contra* Japhet). Thus whereas 2 Chronicles (36:22-23) ends with the climatic and triumphal citation of the Cyrus decree, the book of Ezra begins with it. In the *Cylinder*, Cyrus declares himself to be "king of the world" (*ANET*, 316). Likewise, in 1 Esdras (2:3), the author claims that Cyrus, the "Lord" and "King" declares that Ἐμὲ ἀνέδειξεν βασιλέα τῆς οἰκουμένης ([occupied] world) ὁ κύριος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ (the Lord of Israel), κύριος ὁ ὑψίστος.

<sup>70</sup> The author claims that 42,360 made the trip to Jerusalem (2:64-5), not including 7,360 male and female slaves and livestock (2:65-67). In *Ant.* 11.18, Josephus numbers the returnees as 42,462; cf. *Ant.* 11.69 where Josephus refers to 48,462 (cf. Ezra 2:64-5). Cf. Sara Japhet, however, who ("Exile and the Restoration in the Book of Chronicles," in Bob Becking and Marjo C. A. Korpel (eds.), *The Crisis of Israelite Religion: Transformation of Religious Tradition in Exilic and Post-Exilic Times* [Leiden: Brill, 1999], 42) argues that the Chronicler rejects the idea of a comprehensive exile. Japhet argues: "'All Israel', in the true meaning of this term for the Chronicler, had never been exiled and never left the land!" (her emphasis.) Consequently, she argues the Chronicler rejects the Ezra-Nehemiah version of a limited restoration. That is, the true restoration for the Chronicler is still a future event. "It will be a

all the deportees to Babylon have returned to the Land. The Diaspora community in Babylon continues to be the primary source from which the returnees look for leaders<sup>71</sup> and the site from which various emigrations originate to populate and rebuild the Land. Bedford writes:

There is no expectation of the end of exile and the return of all Israel to the homeland, nor is there any great consternation expressed at this. Leaders from the diaspora have helped to order correctly the community in the homeland, and that is sufficient in itself.<sup>72</sup>

Thus, the returning Jews have no problem with those who remain in Babylon, but rather with those whom they find in the Land.<sup>73</sup>

The dominant focus of the returnees is the rebuilding of the Temple and the problems encountered in the effort to do so. Israel returns not to re-establish an independent state, but to install a cultic government religiously devoted to God, however, politically loyal to Persia. The Temple's reconstruction is the catalyst for the return and the *modus operandi* for the re-gathered community once they are in the Land (Ezra 1:2-4). As Bickerman observes: "The restoration of the Temple and the repatriation of the Exiles go together."<sup>74</sup> When the initial foundations of the Temple

---

continuation of the monarchal period as it was ideally realized in the time of David and Solomon" (44). While Japhet may be correct in her assessment of the Chronicler's understanding of the exile, the Chronicler's silence about the restoration might equally suggest that he simply accepts the version of the restoration of Ezra-Nehemiah, which, Japhet herself admits, the writer probably knew.

<sup>71</sup> The leadership (e.g., Ezra, Nehemiah) of Israel is (intermittently) sent from foreign territories and does not originate from within the Land.

<sup>72</sup> See Peter Ross Bedford, "Diaspora: Homeland Relations in Ezra-Nehemiah," *VT* 52 (2001), 159. Bedford argues that Ezra-Nehemiah represents the view of a fourth century Jewish community that advocates for an ongoing and mutually important relationship between Jews in the homeland and those in the Babylonian Diaspora (147-65).

<sup>73</sup> See below.

<sup>74</sup> "Edict of Cyrus," in *Studies*, 76. The returnees' focus on the Temple (or Jerusalem) is found in most early Jewish texts of restoration as well, although in contrast to the re-gathered ones of the 6<sup>th</sup> century, rarely are the eschatological re-gathered ones shown to be the builders of the Temple.

were laid, the priests rejoiced: "For he is good, for his kindness is forever unto Israel" (Ezra 3:10-11).<sup>75</sup>

On the other hand, there are a few indications within Ezra-Nehemiah that some aspects of the restoration were not altogether satisfactory. Some members of the older population, who remembered the Solomonic temple, wept at the disparity between it and the present one (Ezra 3:12-13).<sup>76</sup> In Ezra's prayer, on the eve of his reform, he acknowledges that the restoration only involves a portion of the population; many Israelites remained in captivity (Ezra 9:5-15). Ezra refers to the returnees as "slaves (עבדים) (to) this day—(in) the Land that you gave to our fathers...we are slaves" (Neh 9:36).<sup>77</sup>

But at the same time, the returnees in Ezra-Nehemiah are not so much the punished ones of the exile making their way back home, but the saved ones whom God has preserved to carry out the restoration. They are the righteous remnant that God has spared. Although the returnees are a remnant, their task of rebuilding the sacred Temple is carried out on behalf of all Israel. Moreover, the presence of the few within Palestine and their success in erecting the Temple provides hope for a fuller ingathering, albeit under the continual supervision of Persia, who also guards over those in the Diaspora (Ezra 9:8-9). Both Ezra and Nehemiah are sent from Persia to the Land as missionaries or ambassadors of restoration at later stages in the effort.<sup>78</sup> And Ezra leads

---

<sup>75</sup> My translation.

<sup>76</sup> Also see Hag 2:3. Josephus elaborates on the disparity between the present Temple and the former one to a much greater degree than the biblical account (*Ant.* 11.80-83). Furthermore, he develops the contrast between the responses of younger generation and that of the priests and elders, noting that the latter groups wailing increased in terms that were commensurate with the rejoicing of the younger generation. Josephus explains the reason for the wailing in greater detail than the biblical account. The old men cry "because the temple seemed to them inferior to that which had been destroyed" (*Ant.* 11.83).

<sup>77</sup> My translation.

<sup>78</sup> For the sending of Ezra and Nehemiah, see Ezra 7:14 and Neh 2:5-6.

his own group of deportees to the land of Palestine.<sup>79</sup> Rather than seeking the help of the resident population, the returnees continue to look toward Persia and the Diaspora for direction and qualified leadership. Peter Bedford observes:

The upshot of this [the conflict with the “people of the Land”] is that the primary connection of the community of repatriates is to be with their diaspora parent community, not with the any peoples found living in or around Judah. Return to the homeland does not signify the repatriates’ abandonment of or rejection of those remaining in exile (or vice versa), nor do the repatriates accrue a special status, sanctity or authority by virtue of their residence in the homeland. It is not residence in the homeland that grants them or any peoples found living there legitimacy, nor is such residence a competing form of legitimacy. Implicit in this is the notion that the legitimacy of the community of repatriates as a Judean community depends on its continued connection to the Babylonian-Elamite diaspora.<sup>80</sup>

The Babylonian Jews continue to play an integral role in the Second Temple restoration.

The exile not only provides the pool of people from which various returns originate, but becomes the primary source of Jewish leadership on which the returnees depend.

Bedford further observes:

In Ezra-Nehemiah, historiography is the mode chosen to defend the claim that to maintain a legitimate Judean identity the community in the homeland needs to stay connected with those living in the diaspora.<sup>81</sup>

Moreover, the king and foreign power under whom the restoration has been inaugurated oversees the effort from outside the boundaries of the land of Israel. While he is credited with being the royal agent of restoration, he does so only through a Jewish representative. No Persian king is ever described entering the Land even to venerate God or visit the Temple.

Indeed, rather than with outsiders (i.e., Gentiles), the writer claims that most of the difficulties that arose for the returning Jews originated from conflicts with the local population living in the land of Israel and in surrounding territories. This group is

---

<sup>79</sup> See Ezra 7:1-8:22.

<sup>80</sup> Bedford, “Diaspora,” 152-53.

<sup>81</sup> Bedford, “Diaspora,” 163.

referred to *inter alia* as עַם-הָאָרֶץ (“people of the Land”)<sup>82</sup> (e.g., 4:4), apparently that portion of the population not taken into exile. While they desire to assist in the reconstruction, they are prevented from doing so,<sup>83</sup> although the exact reasons are not specified in the biblical text (Ezra 4:3). The “people of Land” are cast in decidedly negative terms, being introduced at the outset of the story as “adversaries” (צָרִים) and are allotted no role in the restoration. In effect, the rebuilding-effort is carried out by *outsiders*, i.e., those Jews who had arrived from Babylon. Ironically, the very people who ostensibly might have preserved the Jewish heritage and traditions in the homeland are now excluded from participating in the restoration precisely *because they have resided there in the Land*.<sup>84</sup> The book of Ezra lays the foundation on which later claims of re-gathering must be based. The exile is presented as the *prerequisite rite of passage* on or through which claims to be legitimate representative of Israel must be based.<sup>85</sup>

Finally, it is noteworthy that the author’s endorsement of the foreign regent *does not* result otherwise in close or intimate ties with Gentiles. Indeed, one of the definitive reforms that Ezra legislates is severe restrictions and penalties on marital relations

---

<sup>82</sup> These inhabitants are also referred to as the “peoples of the Land” (e.g., Ezra 10:2, 11) and the “peoples of the lands” (Ezra 9:1, 2, 11). See Josephus’ anachronistic description of the people as Samaritans (e.g., *Ant.* 11.84, 88, and esp. 11.114-18). Also see Bedford who argues the conflict with the “people of the Land” in Ezra is in fact a later situation (on inter-Jewish conflicts) *read back* into the period of restoration (*Temple Restoration in the Early Archaemenid Judah*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 65 [Leiden: Brill, 2001], 32).

<sup>83</sup> As Blenkinsopp (*Ezra-Nehemiah*, 107) observes, although official policy is cited for denying the local people the right to participate, other (theological) factors, such as fear of contamination from the syncretistic and impure inhabitants was probably a major for their exclusion.

<sup>84</sup> Josephus, however, appears at other points to be more conciliatory in his portrayal of outsiders, even the Samaritans. Perhaps, mindful of his foreign readers, he adds that the Samaritans were invited to worship at the Temple at its completion, an option he contends that is/was available “to all humans” (*Ant.* 11.86-7).

<sup>85</sup> As discussed in the Introduction to the present thesis and elaborated upon below, this requirement does not necessarily entail direct affiliation with the historical exile of Babylon, but rather with its complex of ideas, related terminology, and associations. Of chief importance is usually a claim to have exited the Land.

between Jews and Gentiles and those that are the offspring of such unions.<sup>86</sup> Those Jews who have married foreign women are forced to divorce. Moreover, the violation of the marital decrees becomes a major criterion for expulsion of some people from Israel's leadership, especially the priesthood, thus allowing others to solidify their claims to power.<sup>87</sup> Priests are forever disqualified from service and Gentiles are expelled from the Land. As Blenkinsopp observes, rather than the deportees coming back to an empty Land, the writings of Ezra-Nehemiah give rise to the "myth of the *emptied* land."<sup>88</sup> Strikingly, the book of Ezra ends by listing those who were required to divorce their wives to remain among the people of the restored community. Similarly, Nehemiah closes by underlining the problems of marriages between Jews and foreigners and the divorce-reform that was imposed (Neh 13:3, 23-31). According to books of Ezra and Nehemiah, Israel's restoration has not resulted in her independence from foreign rule or severance from the Diaspora Jewish community. Indeed, these outside sources are seen as vital to the restoration itself. The community of the Land turns its attention to the construction of the Temple, the implementation of the (newly interpreted) Mosaic law code,<sup>89</sup> and completion of its rebuilding program. Despite the fact that the return (1) occurred by the mandate of a foreign empire (Persia), (2) resulted only in a portion of

---

<sup>86</sup> The returnees conflicts with "people of the Land" and the problem of intermarriages with foreigners underscore the common difficulty between Jews in the Diaspora (i.e., Babylon) and the homeland. That is, the repatriates return to find the homeland is also inhabited by foreigners and other threatening parties (Bedford, "Diaspora," 153).

<sup>87</sup> The men are forced to divorce their foreign wives, and in the case of those with priestly lineage, they are required to forfeit their credentials to be priests (Ezra 10:18-44).

<sup>88</sup> Blenkinsopp, "Bible, Archaeology, and Politics," 177 (his emphasis).

<sup>89</sup> Therefore, instead of focusing in a negative way on Israel's ongoing subjection to a foreign power and the lack of full independence in the restoration, other aspects of the exilic model of restoration are emphasized in Ezra-Nehemiah, such as the re-gathering to the Land and the rebuilding of the Temple. While it may be that the writer is simply reticent about voicing claims of the fate of the nations either in terms of a future judgment or salvation, the preponderance of the evidence within Ezra-Nehemiah suggests rather that the author has accepted a plan of restoration that is compatible with foreign domination. As long as Jews are allowed to live in their Land and practice their religion without interference, the author of Ezra-Nehemiah seems to be content with the *status quo*.



the population making the pilgrimage, (3) experienced numerous conflicts and hardships,<sup>90</sup> and (4) at face value seems to be incompatible with the prophetic expectations—of which the author must have surely known—the account of Ezra-Nehemiah presents Israel's restoration under Persia, and ongoing Jewish subservience to a foreign superpower in a remarkably positive manner.

### **2.3 Israel's Re-gathering(s) after the Sixth Century BCE Restoration**

The restoration of the 6<sup>th</sup> century did not result in the cessation of all hopes for a more dramatic climax to Israel's future destiny. Consequently, despite the return of Jews to the homeland under Cyrus, many of the people, both within and without the Land, continued to express their ideas of restoration within Israel's dominant paradigm of salvation: 'exile and return.' That is, after the return under Persia, many Jews, especially during the Greco-Roman period, declared that Israel's definitive return had yet to occur.

E. P. Sanders observes that the expectation of Israel's re-gathering may be "the most ubiquitous hope of all"<sup>91</sup> among Israel's ideas of restoration.<sup>92</sup> Nonetheless, Sanders does not seem to recognize the complexity and diversity of this hope in EJJ.<sup>93</sup> Despite the acknowledgement among scholars of the sustained and frequent expression for Israel's re-gathering in many early Jewish writings, little attention has been given to

---

<sup>90</sup> See below.

<sup>91</sup> E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief*, 294. Also see Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 217.

<sup>92</sup> While Sanders' observation may be correct, the feature of re-gathering is closely rivalled in frequency of occurrence by the feature identified elsewhere in this study as the "fate of the nations."

<sup>93</sup> Sanders' failure to acknowledge the variety of interpretations given to the motif of re-gathering is striking since he is fully cognizant of the various interpretations given to Israel's hope for a new or heavenly Temple, another component within the exilic model of restoration. As Sanders himself briefly observes, the twelve disciples of Jesus are best understood as an interpretive variant of the hope for Israel's re-gathering.

the variety of interpretations it receives. Many important questions about the motif of re-gathering remain unanswered. How is the return interpreted in the respective texts in which it appears? What meaning did the hope of *Israel's* return have for those already within the Land? Who among Israel is included in the re-gathering? Who is excluded? What are the grounds for exclusion or inclusion? The present study explores and characterizes the complex and variegated understandings of re-gathering within the literature of Early Judaism. In the analysis below, we discuss a number of texts of restoration that represent the range of interpretations given to the motif of Israel's future re-gathering. These interpretative possibilities include, but are not limited to: (1) the physical return of the Diaspora, (Tobit 13-14; Sirach 36; 2 Maccabees 1-2); (2) the gathering of a righteous group from (within the land of) Israel (*1 Enoch* 90:6-39 (the *Animal Apocalypse*); *Damascus Document*; *Psalms of Solomon* 17); (3) the gathering of the lost tribes of the northern kingdom (*4 Ezra*); and (4) the spiritualization (allegorizing) of Israel's re-gathering (the writings of Philo). The variety of interpretive possibilities is considerably more complicated than these four divisions. Other intricacies and distinctive emphases are found in the rendering of the motif of re-gathering as well; these are discussed in the analyses of the respective passages. Moreover, some of these interpretations overlap with one another. Indeed, in some cases, a particular text of restoration may offer more than one interpretation of Israel's future return from exile. In the course of the discussion below, these problems and others are discussed.

## 2.4 The Return of the Diaspora as the End of *All Israel's* Captivity

The most frequent interpretation given to the idea of Israel's re-gathering is the hope for the physical return of the Jewish Diaspora.<sup>94</sup> The Edict of Cyrus and the subsequent event of the historic restoration did not result in the return of all Jews to the Land. Many continued to live in their foreign settings, even in Babylon, that geographical site most frequently associated with captivity and the worst of times in the biblical memory. But as will be explored later, the negative characterization of the Diaspora *as exile* must be weighed against other claims of acceptance of and success in foreign lands.<sup>95</sup>

In the minds of many Jews, to live outside the Land constituted an unnatural, even ungodly, state that could only be rectified by returning to the Land. Indeed, the *fact of the Diaspora itself* was a clear enough sign in the minds of some Jewish writers that Israel had yet to experience her definitive restoration. Sanders remarks that "the expectation that the diaspora would be gathered is the most stable and consistent point in Jewish eschatological expectation."<sup>96</sup> That is, the ongoing presence of Jews among the nations posed a serious problem for some writers in the early Jewish period. How

---

<sup>94</sup> By the first century CE, the Jewish population outside the Land was extensive, even outnumbering those within Israel itself (Stern, "Jewish Diaspora," in CRINT 1.1:122, [117-83]). Also see Philo, *Legat.* 214. Israel's presence among the nations has a long history, even prior to the Babylonian exile. Many Jews had been deported to various locales by the Assyrians in the exile of the eighth century BCE. But others Jews had migrated to countries voluntarily at different junctures in Israel's history. This emigration was motivated by a variety of reasons, including inter-Jewish conflicts, economic prospects, and marriage (Stern, "Jewish Diaspora," in CRINT 1.1:117, [117-83]). For a geographical survey of the Diaspora, see Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135)* (Revised edit.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986), 3.1:3-86. Also see John Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE-117 CE)* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996). Barclay's study is particularly helpful in that he attempts to characterize the levels of assimilation Jews may have experienced in their particular Diaspora locations. Moreover, he attempts to make distinctions between the various geographical locales of the Diaspora. That is, Barclay offers a corrective to studies that speak of the Diaspora at large without recognition of the great variety of Diaspora Judaism(s).

<sup>95</sup> The more positive attitude toward the Diaspora and its effect on Israel's understanding of restoration is treated later in this chapter, particularly in regard to the writings of Philo of Alexandria, but also see the treatment of *Sibylline Oracles* (Book 3) in Chapter Three.

<sup>96</sup> Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 217.

could Israel's restoration have occurred when so many of her people have still not returned? Therefore, the hope for Israel's future return continued to be anticipated, even after the 6<sup>th</sup> century.

In this section, three documents (Tobit; Sirach; and Second Maccabees 1-2) are examined which refer to the return in its most literal sense, the physical return of those living outside the Land. The underlying assumption in these passages is that geography *matters*, for it is profoundly theological. Although the foreign context of the Diaspora is understood as a kind of captivity, this captivity is shared in spiritual solidarity by those Jews in the Land.

In some cases, the writings below seem to appeal to the Diaspora communities *to choose* to return, while other passages indicate the eschatological immigration is a *predetermined event* that will happen at the appointed time regardless of any action on Israel's part. While some Jews have found their place in the Land, they await a much more comprehensive re-gathering of those who remain among the nations. The Diaspora is viewed through the lens of exilic theology and can only be reconciled by returning to the land of Israel. Until the return of those outside the homeland, all of Israel, *even those already within the Land*, remains (spiritually) in exile.

#### **2.4.1 The Book of Tobit: Re-gathering to the Safe Haven of the Land**

The book of Tobit<sup>97</sup> expresses the hope for Israel's re-gathering within the genre of a Diaspora novella.<sup>98</sup> A common trait of this genre is to demonstrate how it is

---

<sup>97</sup> Tobit may be dated to the late third or early second century BCE (Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, [CEJL; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003], 51). All quotations from Tobit, unless otherwise noted, are translated from the Sinaiticus version (G<sup>11</sup>) of the Greek text as published in the critical edition by Robert Hanhart (*Tobit* [Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum graecum auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Göttingensis editum 8/5; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983]). For reference to many other versions (i.e., Greek and Latin) of Tobit, see the critical apparatus within Hanhart's edition. For the

possible “to uphold Jewish traditions in a land where governmental hostility to such piety is rampant.”<sup>99</sup> One of the primary aims<sup>100</sup> of Tobit is to instruct Diaspora Jews<sup>101</sup> how to live righteously in their foreign abodes. As Fitzmyer observes

Its didactic purpose is seen in its effort to inculcate righteous conduct, almsgiving, proper burial of the dead, and edifying family life. All of this is the way Jews should learn to live in the diaspora.<sup>102</sup>

A host of problems (i.e., poverty, blindness, demonic possession)<sup>103</sup> plague the various characters in the story. As Amy-Jill Levine notes:

---

Aramaic and Hebrew versions of Tobit, see Magen Broshi, et al., eds., *Qumran Cave 4: XIV, Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (DJD 19; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995). These copies of Tobit from Qumran have been dated palaeographically from 100 BCE to 25 CE.

<sup>98</sup> W.L. Humphreys, “Novella,” in G. W. Coats (ed.), *Saga, Legend, Tale, Novella, Fable: Narrative Forms in the Old Testament Literature* (JSOTSup 35; Sheffield, UK: JSOT, 1985), 82-96; Gowan, “Exile in Jewish Apocalyptic,” 205. Esther and Daniel 1-6 might be included within this genre as well, although there are important distinctions between them and Tobit. First, whereas Esther and Daniel tend to have a favorable view toward some aspects of their foreign context, despite various challenges and dangers, this positive evaluation is missing from Tobit. Both Esther and Daniel play a favorable role in the royal court. Another important distinction, esp. given the interest of the present study, is the general lack of interest in restoration in Esther and most of Daniel 1-6 (cf. 2:44-45). Other scholars assign a different literary status to Tobit. William Soll (“Misfortune and Exile in Tobit: The Juncture of Fairy Tale Source and Deuteronomistic Theology,” *CBQ* 51 [1989], 209-31) and Benedikt Otzen treat the writing as a fairy-tale (*Tobit and Judith* [London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002], 2-3). Fitzmyer simply speaks of it as “a piece of fiction, a Jewish religious romance” (Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 31).

<sup>99</sup> Amy-Jill Levine, “Tobit: Teaching Jews how to Live in the Diaspora,” *BRev* 8 (1992), 44 (42-64). However, Levine fails to consider that “governmental hostility” may not necessarily be the product of a specific historical incident. Rather it may belong to tradition of antagonism between Israel and “the nations.”

<sup>100</sup> Carey A. Moore, (*Tobit: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [New York: Doubleday, 1996], 23-24) understands a similar purpose but argues for an oppressive context behind the document and suggests that the book is intended for both Jews in Palestine and the Diaspora. Other purposes and motifs (e.g., entertainment, value of righteous suffering, protection against demonic forces, etc.) are present as well. See Richard A. Spencer, “The Book of Tobit in Recent Research,” *Current Research: Biblical Studies* 7 (1999), 147-80.

<sup>101</sup> Scholarship remains divided as to the location from whence the writing was composed. For instance, Fitzmyer suggests Palestine (*Tobit*, 54), while Otzen suggest the eastern Diaspora (*Tobit and Judith*, 58). While the writing is best understood as having a Diaspora audience in mind, there is no consensus on which specific location the document was addressed. The setting of Assyria may suggest an Eastern Diaspora origin, but this is not certain.

<sup>102</sup> Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 31-32; Matthias Delcor, “The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Hellenistic Period: Tobit,” in William D. Davies and Louis Finkelstein (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism: The Hellenistic Age*, (vol. 2; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 474 (409-503). For instance, see Tob 1:3-9; 4:1-19; 12:6-10; 14:8-11.

<sup>103</sup> Through the marriage of Tobit’s son Tobias, the author brings together several tales in the book that emphasize righteous activities (e.g., almsgiving, 14:8-11) even in the face of suffering, (e.g., the

In exile, dead bodies lie in the streets and those who bury them are punished; demons fall in love with women and kill their husbands; and righteous action is rewarded with blindness and depression. In the Diaspora, no immediately clear, fixed boundaries for self-definition exist.<sup>104</sup>

If it is correct to understand the literary setting of the Assyrian exile as a symbolic reference to Jews of the Diaspora, the author's assessment of life outside the Land is overwhelmingly negative. Indeed, *Diaspora is exile*. Nonetheless, the book of Tobit demonstrates that faithfulness to God in the Diaspora is possible and may be rewarded by supernatural deliverance,<sup>105</sup> even through the intervention of God's angels (e.g., Raphael). In the narrative, demons are expelled by the righteous and those who are blind are supernaturally delivered. God's intervention in these crises raises the hope for deliverance from the more fundamental problem of the exile.<sup>106</sup> As Moore observes: "If God had done all that for Tobit and his family, how much more, concludes Tobit, will God do for his people and his Holy City?"<sup>107</sup>

---

blindness of Tobit (2:7-10; 3:1-6; 3:16-17) and the killing of seven husbands of Sarah by a demon (3:7-17). Tobit's prayer (3:1-6) characterizes the exile as the place of oppression, death, and reproach; see Sarah's prayer (3:11-15). These stories finally merge together in the narrative through the marriage of Tobit's son, Tobias, to Sarah.

<sup>104</sup> Levine, "Tobit," 48. Similarly, William Soll says that "instances of 'villainy' in Tobit can be seen as acute manifestations of the chronic condition of exile" ("Tobit and Folklore Studies, with Emphasis on Propps' Morphology," in David J. Lull (ed.), *SBL 1988 Seminar Papers* [Atlanta: Scholars, 1988], 51).

<sup>105</sup> George W. E. Nickelsburg rightly observes that, "The belief that God rewards the righteous is basic to the book" ("Stories of Biblical and Early Post-biblical Times," in Michael E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* [Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum; 2.2; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984, 41, [33-87]).

<sup>106</sup> William Soll examines the relationship between the genre of fairy tale and Deuteronomistic theology in Tobit. He observes that the theme of restoration in the final chapters (Tobit 13-14) forms an *inclusio* with chapter 1 (Israel in exile). Soll argues that unit of material is crucial to the narrative and lies outside the fairy tale proper. He argues that "chaps 13-14 are not merely tacked on, but are necessary in view of the way the author has portrayed the initial situation as one of exile." After the resolution of the family's misfortunes at the narrative's end, "the prospect of an end to the exile is held out" ("Misfortune and Exile in Tobit," 230.).

<sup>107</sup> Moore, *Tobit*, 284.

Israel's restoration occurs as the climax and conclusion of the story (Tobit 13 and 14:3-11).<sup>108</sup> The main features of Israel's restoration in Tobit are (1) the return of the exiles (13:13, 13:3-6; 14:5); (2) the rebuilding of an exalted Jerusalem and the Temple (13:7-18, esp. 13:10, 16-18, 14:5);<sup>109</sup> (3) and the submission and pilgrimage of the nations to Jerusalem (13:11; 14:6). Israel's restoration is configured within a Deuteronomistic framework of sin, exile, repentance and return throughout Tobit 13-14.<sup>110</sup> The actions required of Israel, however, are bound up with God's timetable as well.<sup>111</sup>

The account of Israel's restoration is immediately preceded by three major events: (1) Tobias' marriage to Sarah and the expulsion of the demon that had killed her seven previous husbands on her wedding night (8:1-3); (2) the healing of Tobit's blindness; and (3) the revelation of Raphael that he is an angel sent by God to help Tobit and his family (12:6-15). Immediately, following Raphael's ascension (12:20-22), Tobit offers to God a thanksgiving prayer. Rather than focusing on Tobit and his family, the language of the prayer underscores the importance of the events of the narrative for all the people of Israel, especially her restoration (13:1-17). Eileen Schuller argues the

---

<sup>108</sup> Cf. 4:1-21.

<sup>109</sup> The second of these hopes, the glorification of Jerusalem and Temple, receives the greatest attention and emphasis in the restoration account of Tobit.

<sup>110</sup> The prevalence of Deuteronomistic theology in Tobit 12-14 and specific dependence upon Deuteronomy (esp. chapters 30-32) has been noted and discussed by several scholars. See Moore, *Tobit*, 284-85, Alexander A. Di Lella, "The Deuteronomistic Background of the Farewell Discourse in Tob 14:3-11," *CBQ* 41 (1979), 380-89, Soll, "Misfortune," G. Weitzman, "Allusion, Artifice, and Exile in the Hymn of Tobit," *JBL* 115 (1996), 49-61. For the classic treatment of this subject in the biblical writings, see Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972). Di Lella underscores the relationship between Tobit and Deuteronomy by noting that they both share a common goal in the "encouragement of the depressed people and exhortation to remain true to the faith" ("Deuteronomistic Background," 380-81).

<sup>111</sup> See Di Lella, "The Deuteronomistic Background," 380-81. The Deuteronomistic requirements for restoration occur with no apparent tension alongside the author's notice that the prophecies of restoration will be fulfilled at their "appointed times." While the requirement of repentance is much more pronounced in the restoration account of chapter 13 than in 14:3-11, the narrative as a whole emphasizes that the Diaspora community should live righteously in view of the restoration.

closing scenes of the book, especially these dying words of Tobit, shift “the focus of attention beyond this single family” and present “their blessedness as a preview and pledge of the restoration of the whole people.”<sup>112</sup>

Tobit prays that if Jews “acknowledge” or “confess” God before the nations in which they are scattered, “turn to him” wholeheartedly (13:3-6; cf. Deut 6:5), then God “will have mercy unto the nations where you have been scattered” (13:5). While the promise of God’s “mercy” in 13:5<sup>113</sup> almost certainly refers to Israel’s future re-gathering, the return is explicitly noted in 13:13, where it is stated that “all will be re-gathered” (πάντες ἐπισυναχθήσονται) to the glorified Jerusalem (13:9-10, 16-17).<sup>114</sup>

Israel’s future restoration is also referred to within the final testament<sup>115</sup> of Tobit to his sons (14:3-11). After “predicting” a period of exile for “future” generations, Tobit foresees:

But God will have mercy on them again, and return them into the land of Israel; and they will rebuild (οἰκοδομήσουσιν) the house, but not as the first one until the time when the time of the ages is fulfilled. And after these things, they all will return from their exile (ἀρχιμαλωσίας) and rebuild Jerusalem with honor. And the house of God will be rebuilt just as the prophets of Israel spoke concerning it (14:5).

---

<sup>112</sup> Eileen M. Schuller, “Tobit,” in Carol A. Newsom and Sharon H. Ringe (eds.), *Women’s Bible Commentary: Expanded Edition* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1998), 278 (272-78).

<sup>113</sup> The re-gathering of Israel to the Land is mentioned in Tob 13:5 (G<sup>1</sup>): καὶ πάλιν ἐλεήσει καὶ συνάξει ἡμᾶς ἐκ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν οὓς ἐὰν σκορπισθῇτε ἐν αὐτοῖς. Moore favors G<sup>1</sup> without justification (*Tobit*, 275, 279).

<sup>114</sup> Also in Tob 13:10, the writers refers to “all the exiles” who have returned to Jerusalem.

<sup>115</sup> Cf. 4:3-21. As farewell words, the passage take on much weight in the narrative since the dying one, being so close to the world beyond, was thought, in the ancient world, to be privy to special knowledge. Moreover, the testament serves to underscore the integral connection between the ethical mandate of the narrative upon its readers, emphasizing the eschatological (or heavenly) implications that may be at stake. For a discussion of the literary features and theological importance of farewell words in EJT, see (John J. Collins, “Testaments,” in Michael E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT 2.2; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 325-55. Cf. the three (!) farewell discourses of Jesus to his apostles in Luke 22; 24; and Acts 1.



In Tobit's farewell words to his son (Tobias) and grandsons, he refers to both the Assyrian exile—the narrative setting of the story—and the “future” Babylonian captivity. The writer refers to both the desolation of Samaria and Jerusalem, and in particular, the burning of the Jerusalem Temple (14:4). Against this exilic backdrop, two restorations are described, the 6<sup>th</sup> century one and the future one (14:5).<sup>116</sup> The historic restoration is tersely described and given only limited significance. The author briefly mentions the people's repatriation to the Land and their rebuilding of the Temple. The author qualifies the eschatological Temple, by noting that “it will not be like the first one” (καὶ οὐχ ὡς τὸν πρῶτον).<sup>117</sup> Therefore, while the historic Temple is not rejected, as in some early Jewish accounts, it is given limited status as a structure. For the author, the “current” Temple is merely temporal or transitional to the eschatological one to come.<sup>118</sup> Likewise, the writer is not overtly critical of the original returnees, although their involvement in the re-construction of the 6<sup>th</sup> century Temple may be implicitly bound up with the unsatisfactory assessment of the holy place.

In contrast to the restoration of the 6<sup>th</sup> century, the author of Tobit notes that the returnees of the future restoration “will rebuild Jerusalem with honor;” moreover, the construction of the Temple will be “just as the prophets spoke” (14:5). While the historical restoration is presented as inferior to the future one, the actual details of the eschatological restoration are, in fact, closely modeled after the former one. First, the definitive restoration is expressed against the predicament of another occurrence of “exile.” Second, the eschatological returnees, as in the past, are presented as the re-

---

<sup>116</sup> This juxtaposition in Tobit of the 6<sup>th</sup> century return with a future one represents one of the earliest references in EJL that pits the “historic” exile against the eschatological one. Cf., for e.g., *1 Enoch* 89:73-4; 90:28-39; 4Q390, frg. 1.

<sup>117</sup> The writer does not elaborate on this assessment of the sanctuary, but as already noted in the examination of Ezra, and discussed later in regard to EJL, the second Temple and its cult is often the subject of critique and criticism.

<sup>118</sup> Cf. *1 Enoch* 89:73-74.

builders of Jerusalem, and perhaps, the Temple.<sup>119</sup> Third, the Temple itself lies at the center of the restoration and is the locus of the re-gathered ones. A distinctive point, however, is the writer's emphasis on the importance of Jerusalem and the Temple for the world by noting that the nations will make their pilgrimage as well to the Land, presumably after their defeat, an event not realized in the historic restoration. Although the restoration program of the 6<sup>th</sup> century does not include such a pilgrimage or defeat of the Gentiles, Persia is presented as carrying out the plan of the Israelite God. In the eschatological restoration, it is hoped that the nations will cast away their idols and join the Jews in the climatic migration to the Temple to worship God.<sup>120</sup>

The writer underscores the righteous and holy character of the eschatological returnees. Only righteous Jews will be "saved" and invited to inhabit the Land. Other sinful Jews will be eliminated:

All the sons of Israel who are saved (πάντες οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ οἱ σωζόμενοι) in those days, mindful of God in truth, will be gathered together (ἐπισυναχθήσονται). And they will go to Jerusalem and live safely forever in the land of Abraham and it will be given over to them. And those who truly love God will rejoice, but those who commit sin and unrighteousness will vanish from all the Land (14:7).

Therefore, in Tobit 13 and 14, the eschatological restoration is formulated especially around the new Jerusalem and Temple as the eschatological center of the world. Both the righteous Jews of the Diaspora and the Gentiles will make their

---

<sup>119</sup> The author uses the future active indicative, third person plural form of the verb, οἰκοδομέω, to describe the rebuilding of Jerusalem, but uses the future passive, third singular to describe the rebuilding of the Temple, resulting in some ambiguity as to whether the eschatological returnees will rebuild the Temple or whether a divine passive is meant (i.e., suggesting God himself will build the latter). Unfortunately, the key portion of the text was missing from the fragments of Qumran. Apparently, the qualification of the new structure as being "with honor" or "in splendor" is meant as a criticism of the former structure and not the builders per se—although the structure cannot be altogether divorced from its builder(s).

<sup>120</sup> 4Q198 (4QTobit<sup>c</sup> ar), frg. 1.13 reads [וִירְמוֹן כָּל אֱלִילֵיהֶן] ("and they will cast away [their] idol[s]") (14:6). Fitzmyer (*Tobit*, 330) is probably right that it is Gentiles who cast away idols, corresponding closely with G<sup>1</sup> ("burying their idols") and VL ("abandoning their idols"). Unfortunately, there are lacunae at the relevant portion of the Aramaic ms which make it impossible to determine whether the author is describing the actions of Gentiles or Diaspora Jews.

pilgrimage to the place of God's abode.<sup>121</sup> Righteousness will characterize the new era, for sinners—whether Jew or Gentile—will be eliminated or subdued.

As in the restoration accounts of Sirach and 2 Maccabees (below), the Diaspora population in Tobit is presented as essentially being in exile. Therefore, the implicit appeal of the writing is for all Jews to return to the Land, for life among the Gentiles is oppressive and full of dangers. But while among the nations, Jews are implored to be faithful to their heritage and live righteously. Indeed, their faithfulness to God might prove to be the catalyst for the eschatological restoration. The faithful Jews of the Diaspora are led to believe that just as God has intervened on behalf of righteous individuals in the narrative, so at the predetermined time, he will gather the righteous ones back into the Land. At the book's conclusion, Tobias hears of the fall of Assyria (14:15) on his own deathbed, suggesting that the events of the predicted restoration have begun to unfold.<sup>122</sup> The defeat of the nations will launch the return of the Diaspora back into the land of Palestine and provide the major catalyst for the remaining events of restoration.

#### **2.4.2 Sirach: The Re-gathering to the Land Where Wisdom Dwells**

In the book of Sirach<sup>123</sup>(LXX), the hope for Israel's restoration occurs among other topics, such as wisdom, fear of God, the Law, doctrine of God, retribution, prayer,

---

<sup>121</sup> This expansion to include the nations in the re-gathering alongside Israel is met by language that restricts Israel's participation to its righteous members.

<sup>122</sup> The fall of Assyria most likely represents the eventual downfall of the ruling super power of the author's day (i.e., Greece).

<sup>123</sup> Unless otherwise noted, all translations of Sirach are from Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*, (Stuttgart: Biblia-Druck, 1979). Originally written in Hebrew (i.e., *Wisdom of Jesus ben Sira*) in early second century BCE (198-175 BCE), the book was later translated into Greek by ben Sira's grandson at the end of the second century BCE (see the prologue to the Sirach; also see the comments of George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981], 64-

Temple, morality, social justice, and women.<sup>124</sup> The author is particularly concerned with Judaism's place in and contribution to the larger Hellenistic world, particularly on the topic of wisdom. As E. P. Sanders observes, the book of Sirach extols the relationship of Judaism to sapiential learning by "defining the values of a well-established wisdom tradition in terms of the Mosaic covenant: that wisdom which is universally sought is in fact truly represented by and particularized in the Torah given by God through Moses."<sup>125</sup> In addition to wisdom's association with Torah, the author also draws further lines of connection between wisdom and such features of Judaism as the scribe, the high priest, and the Land itself.

The author's attitude toward Hellenistic culture and the wider occupied world is debated by scholars.<sup>126</sup> On the one hand, with few exceptions (e.g., Sirach 36!),<sup>127</sup> there is little overt animosity toward foreigners or places outside the Land. In fact, the author

---

65). The present analysis relies on the Greek text unless otherwise noted. For the Hebrew text(s), see Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Hebrew Text of Sirach: A Text-Critical and Historical Study*. (Studies in Classical Literature 1; The Hague: Mouton, 1966); Yigael Yadin, *The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada with Introduction, Emendations and Commentary* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1965); Pancratius C. Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew : A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts* (VT 68; Leiden: Brill 1998.) For a comparison of the extant Hebrew texts with the Greek, see B. G. Wright, *No Small Difference: Sirach's Relationship to its Hebrew Parent Text* (SBLSCS 26; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989). For a discussion of the recent state of research on either the Greek or Hebrew versions of this work, see Daniel J. Harrington, S. J., "Sirach Research since 1965: Progress and Questions," in John C. Reeves and John Kampen (eds.), *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (JSOTSS 184; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994).

<sup>124</sup> Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella (*The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes* [AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987], 75-92). The hope for Israel's restoration is not included on their list of Sirach's concerns.

<sup>125</sup> E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), 331. What Sanders fails to mention, however, is Sirach's distinctive emphasis on the geographical locale of wisdom: Jerusalem (e.g., Sirach 24).

<sup>126</sup> Martin Hengel argues that the book of Sirach constitutes a scathing critique against certain aspects of Hellenism, even while operating out of certain Hellenistic presuppositions and preferences (Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period* [vols. 1 and 2; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991], esp. 131-53). Hengel speaks of the "apologetic-polemical basis" of Sirach (138). However, elsewhere he refers to Sirach's presuppositions regarding wisdom as being dependant on a Hellenistic (Stoic) framework, though particularized in Jewish terms (*Judaism and Hellenism*, 157-62). Also see Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 56 (59-62).

<sup>127</sup> See the discussion of this passage below.

views foreign contexts as requisite sites of visitation for learning and intellectual development. The author advocates international travel as part of the job description of a good scribe and as a means of acquiring wisdom (34:11). He even proposes service in the court of foreign rulers as being advantageous (39:4). Thus, there is not the emphasis on the inherent danger and hostilities associated with foreign contexts as found in the book of Tobit (above). On the contrary, the author positively supports limited involvement with the nations and itinerant missions abroad to accumulate wisdom.

However, in the author's discourse and hymns on wisdom, ben Sira gives primacy to Judaism and its geographical center, Jerusalem. That is, the author attempts to lay claim for Jews (or Judaism) for that which was claimed by Gentiles to lie with the nations and various foreign locales.<sup>128</sup> Therefore, while on the one hand, Sirach elaborates on the sapiential and other benefits of life outside the Land to his Diaspora compatriots, especially Jewish intellectuals, he emphasizes the ultimate importance of Jerusalem and Judaism (i.e., the Torah) for the acquisition of wisdom. In direct opposition to foreigners and their claims of geographical centers for finding wisdom, the author identifies wisdom with the Jewish people;<sup>129</sup> argues for the sapiential character of the Torah; and emphasizes the geographical priority of Jerusalem as Wisdom's residence.<sup>130</sup>

---

<sup>128</sup> Nonetheless, Doron Mendels argues that the writing's primary audience is Jews, not Greeks. As evidence, Doron Mendels (*The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in Hasmonean Literature Recourse to History in Second Century BC*, *Texte und studien zum antiken Judentum* 15 [Tübingen: Mohr, 1987], 9-17) refers to (1) the original language of the writing being Hebrew; (2) Sirach's exclusive way of treating history from only a Jewish perspective; and (3) the conservative ("canonical") account of famous men from Israel's past (Sirach 44-50). Mendels argument is convincing, although he does not carefully consider the extent to which the original translation and ideas of the Hebrew original might have been affected by the Greek translation.

<sup>129</sup> E.g., Sir 39:1-11 (the scribe); Sirach 50 (high priest).

<sup>130</sup> Therefore, while one hand the author's case for Jerusalem constitutes a critique of Hellenism and its geographical claims, the author participates in Hellenistic assumptions that wisdom is geographically centered. Hayward demonstrates the complexity of the issue, however, by noting that Sirach's interest in wisdom's dwelling place might just as well have originated from such biblical texts as

The importance of wisdom for Sirach can be seen, *inter alia*, in the author's presentation of wisdom as a heavenly being:<sup>131</sup>

(Sir 24:8b) And he (God) said, "Make your dwelling in Jacob, and in Israel receive your inheritance." (10) In the holy tabernacle I ministered before him, and so I was established in Zion. (11) In the beloved city likewise he gave me a resting place, and in Jerusalem was my dominion. (12) So I took root in an honored people, in the portion of the Lord, who is their inheritance (RSV).

According to ben Sira, wisdom has its heavenly representative who once occupied a throne beside God in heaven. She is present from the beginning of creation and, indeed, active in the creative process. In analogy with the scribe himself (i.e. ben Sira) who has traveled the world, but ultimately returned to Jerusalem, so wisdom is portrayed. She leaves her heavenly station (24:3-4), visits all the nations and people (24:6), but ultimately chooses (or is chosen by God) to reside in Jerusalem (24:8-12). Therefore, while not denying the benefits of life outside the Land, at the same time the author argues for Jerusalem's supreme cosmic value for all people, but especially for Jews or Jewish intellectuals.<sup>132</sup> If wisdom has found her dwelling place in Jerusalem, should not all Jews seek her residence in the Land as well?<sup>133</sup>

---

Job 28:12, 20 (cf. Proverbs 8). These texts already raise questions about the place where wisdom may be found. Nonetheless, Hayward observes that Sirach's claim of the priority of Jerusalem must be heard against competing claims in the Hellenistic world (esp. with regard to Greece), which had already staked their claim(s) to the geographical abode of wisdom (C. T. R. Hayward, "Sirach and Wisdom's Dwelling Place," in Stephen C. Barton [ed.], *Where Shall Wisdom be Found: Wisdom in the Bible, the Church and the Contemporary World* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999], 31-46).

<sup>131</sup> Cf. Prov 8:22-31; 1 Bar 3:9-37; Wis 6:12-11:1; *I Enoch* 42.

<sup>132</sup> While on the one hand, the author's promotion of Judaism and the Land may simply serve as a counter claim to Hellenism and Gentiles, and thus may have non-Jewish readers in mind, he may just as well be driven by an internal agenda to appeal to Diaspora Jews to return to Jerusalem, i.e., wisdom's capital.

<sup>133</sup> Mendels (*Land of Israel*, 14-15) contrasts the geographical importance of Jerusalem in Sirach's understanding of wisdom with the writing of 1 Baruch (e.g., 3:37; 4:1-4) in which a related tradition of personified wisdom occurs. However, while 1 Baruch follows Sirach in associating wisdom with the Torah, the author of Baruch emphasizes the association between wisdom and *the people*, not the Land or Temple. While Mendels may be correct in this observation, he does not comment on the conclusion of 1 Baruch, in which the author celebrates the future return of the people to the Land (1 Bar 4:36-7; 5:1-9).

It is within this wider argument for the significance of Israel, especially the Temple as the cultural and sapiential center of the occupied world, that the author stakes out the claim for Israel's restoration. In two places (Sir 36:1-17; 48:10), the writer's critique of the nations spills over into an outright condemnation of the Gentiles. This condemnation leads ben Sira to revive the hope for Israel's restoration. Despite the contributions of the nations to the life of the itinerant scribe, the author underscores the negative side of life of those, particularly the poor, who endure oppressive treatment among the Gentiles. While the harsh criticism of the nations in Sirach 36:1-17 is certainly atypical for the book as a whole,<sup>134</sup> Skehan and Di Lella have demonstrated that the prayer has been thoroughly integrated into its immediate literary context.<sup>135</sup> The prayer for Israel's deliverance is preceded by a fairly lengthy section on ethical conduct, proper worship, especially unacceptable and acceptable sacrifices, and almsgiving to the poor (34:21-35:26). The poor receive special attention (35:11-18) by the author and are extolled as examples of righteousness who are capable of uttering the "prayer of the humble"(35:17). The content of this prayer, with its emphasis on the defeat of the nations and other features of Israel's restoration (Sirach 36), is anticipated in the

---

<sup>134</sup> Some scholars maintain that this chapter is a later addition (e.g., John J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997], 109-110. Collins rejects the prayer as being original to the work since it falls outside the literary and theological agenda elsewhere in Sirach. Moreover, Collins finds no cause in history for such animosity toward the Seleucid ruler, Antiochus III, who ruled over Israel in the time of ben Sira and even assisted in rebuilding the Temple and city in the period of the original author. It may be, however, that Sirach does not intend his reproach of the nations to include the Seleucids, but rather those nations who are hostile toward Jews or even all nations who house Diaspora populations. Analogies can be found in other places in Jewish literature in which a Jewish author is both conciliatory toward the respective power(s) that rule over Israel on one hand and polemical toward the nations on the other. For instance, see the study of Philo later in this chapter as well the analyses of Sibylline Oracles (in Chapter Four) and Luke-Acts (in Chapter Five). For instance, while the Sibyl takes a hard-line against many of the nations, she takes a more positive stance toward Egypt, especially toward the Ptolemaic regime. Thus, in some respects, the traditional formula of 'Israel versus the nations' is now altered to '*Israel (the Jews) and Egypt* versus other nations.' While the book of Acts is very favorable to the nations, particularly Rome, some representatives of Rome (e.g., Pilate) (cf. Acts 4:25-27; Psalm 2:1-2) and much of the leadership of the Jews (i.e., esp. Herod and the priests) are singled out for criticism.

<sup>135</sup> *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 420.

author's preliminary call for judgment and vengeance upon the nations (35:17-19) because of their treatment of the Diaspora. Skehan and Di Lella contend that at this point (35:19), "Ben Sira turns his attention from the individual victims of oppression to the nation Israel, which in that day was under foreign domination."<sup>136</sup> The restoration of Israel (36:1-17) begins with the defeat of the nations. Jesus ben Sira prays:<sup>137</sup>

Have mercy upon us Lord, the God of all, and look upon us, and cause the fear of you to fall upon all the nations. Lift up thy hand against foreign nations and let them see your power (Sir 36:1-3).<sup>138</sup>

Given the author's relatively positive outlook of the nations elsewhere in the document, it may be that the author distinguishes the traveling intellectual, who benefits here and there from the fruits of Hellenism, from those intellectuals who make permanent settlement among Gentiles. But in the literary context of this prayer for Israel's restoration, the author demonstrates a particular concern for poor Jews who are more vulnerable to the nations.<sup>139</sup>

Following the hope for the elimination of the enemy nations and rulers,<sup>140</sup> the writer appeals to God to gather "all the tribes" and to exalt Jerusalem and the Temple (Sir 36:10-17).

---

<sup>136</sup> Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 420. While unrighteous Jews are clearly indicted alongside the nations, Sirach turns his attention to the nations from 35:19-36:1-17.

<sup>137</sup> The call for the nations' defeat dominates the first nine verse of the prayer. At two other points, ben Sira offers prayers as well (26:27-23:1-6; 51 [Heb.]).

<sup>138</sup> The strong polemic against the nations in this chapter stands in stark contrast with the writer's unapologetic endorsement of the benefits of international travel and service to foreign rulers (39:1-4, 10-11). However, Sirach is able to acknowledge the benefits of a larger world as well as articulate its dangers. The anti-Gentile sentiment is present as well in 2 Maccabees (1:28), but is much more pronounced in Sirach 36 (see below).

<sup>139</sup> See the above discussion about Sirach's concern for Jewish intellectuals as well, esp. those who may have begun to favor their foreign abodes too much.

<sup>140</sup> In Sirach 36, there is a particularly strong rebuke against the rulers of nations who think their power is self-derived, and thus not from God. The author prays in Sir 36:9: σύντριψον κεφαλὰς ἀρχόντων ἐχθρῶν λεγόντων οὐκ ἔστιν πλὴν ἡμῶν ("Crush the heads of the rulers of the enemies who say, 'There is no one but ourselves' [RSV; Sir 36:10]). The defeat of the nations will result in their recognition of God as the chief deity (36:5). Also see Sir 36:17.



(Sir 36:10) Gather all the tribes of Jacob and give them an inheritance just as from the beginning (11) O Lord, show mercy to the people, who are called by your name, even Israel, who you named your firstborn. (12) Have pity on your holy city, Jerusalem, the place of your dwelling. (13) Fill Zion with your majesty, and your people<sup>141</sup> with your glory. (14) Bear witness to the ones you created in the beginning, and fulfill the prophecies (given) in your name. (15) Reward those who wait for you, and let your prophets be proven trustworthy. (16) Hear, O Lord, the prayer of your servants, according to the blessing of Aaron concerning your people. (17) And all who are in the earth will know that you are the Lord, the God of the ages.<sup>142</sup>

The return of the tribes to the Land is part of a larger chain of events that belong to the writer's idea of Israel's restoration. These include (1) the defeat of the nations (above), (2) the re-gathering of the Diaspora, and (3) the glorification of the Temple and city, the center and climax of the author's hopes. The full return of Israel is anchored in the predictions of the prophets (36:14, 15).<sup>143</sup> The author's interpretation of the motif of Israel's re-gathering is heavily influenced by the idea of wisdom, particularly as a heavenly being (i.e., Wisdom), dwelling in the Land. Those Jews who seek wisdom among the Gentiles should be aware of her permanent place of residence in

---

<sup>141</sup> The Hebrew and Syriac mss read "Temple."

<sup>142</sup> A similar prayer occurs in what is known as the "Prayer of Jesus, Son of Sirach" or Sira 51. While this prayer is attested in both Greek and Hebrew mss and is considered to be authentic to the work, the portion of the prayer, between 51:12 and 13, that pertains to the re-gathering is not found in the oldest mss of Sirach, but only in ms B. Nonetheless, Skehan and Di Lella argue that it is still old and dates to ca 150 (Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 569; Skehan, *Hebrew Text of Sirach*, 101-5). The text gives weight to the understanding of restoration in terms of re-gathering and temple/city rebuilding:

Sir 51:12 (B) (Hebrew): Give thanks to the redeemer of Israel, for his mercy endures forever; Give thanks to him who gathers the dispersed of Israel (מקבץ נדחי ישראל), for his mercy endures forever; Give thanks to him who rebuilt (rebuilds) his city and his sanctuary; for his mercy endures forever.

In the lines that follow, the writer offers praise for Davidic ruler and the priesthood of Zadok ("sons of Zadok").

<sup>143</sup> The historical association of the tribes to the Land is recalled (35:11), perhaps alluding to an earlier period of Israel's history in which the tribes and territories (i.e., the Land) were identified in terms of one another (e.g., Deuteronomy 33; Ezekiel 40-48). However, the author of Sirach does not envision Israel's restoration as a return to the tribal confederacy. It is more likely that he is simply drawing on the symbolic value of the tribes to the Land in his hope that all the people of Israel (i.e., the Diaspora) will return to the Land. In some writings, the actual tribes are mentioned, making it difficult to discern whether the writer is further emphasizing Israel's relationship to the Land or hoping for an actual restoration of the twelve tribes themselves upon their historic allotments of territories (e.g., *T12P*; *11QT* col. xxiv).

Jerusalem.<sup>144</sup> The author beckons them to return to Jerusalem. Furthermore, and more importantly for the immediate literary context of this text of restoration, ben Sira considers the poor to be in an especially disadvantageous position among Gentiles. He describes the Gentile context of these Diaspora Jews as abusive and full of hardships. Therefore, ben Sira prays for God's judgment on the nations. Following their defeat, the author describes the other features of the exilic model of restoration. He refers to the re-gathering of the Diaspora Jews to the exalted Temple, where they will not only find Wisdom, but God dwelling in the Land.

An understanding of Sirach's view of the future restoration receives further clarification by examining his understanding of the 6<sup>th</sup> century restoration. That is, the writer's understanding of Israel's restoration is intimately related to how he views the past. Israel's history is told through a section of the work known as the "praise of the ancestors" (Sir 44:1-50:24). While Jews living among the nations may consider the heroes of world history to be Gentiles, the author reminds his readers of Jewish contributions to the world. As Hengel observes:

In itself, wisdom may be 'ahistorical', but in the work of Jesus Sirach it is bound up with the history of Israel by its identification with the Torah and through the 'praise of the ancestors' in Sirach 44:1-50:24.<sup>145</sup>

In his rehearsal of the history of Israel's heroes, ben Sira refers to key persons of the historical restoration. While his account of the event is without explicit criticism, the

---

<sup>144</sup> The author clearly indicates that the nations may temporarily and intermittently serve as the locale and source of *wisdom* for the Diaspora Jews and traveling scribe, but in the day of restoration, all Israel will return to the Land to find the definitive locale of Wisdom.

<sup>145</sup> M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 99. Mack compares the list of ancestors to those lists of epic heroes found in Hellenistic literature (Burton L. Mack, *Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic: Ben Sira's Hymn in Praise of the Fathers* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986]; also see Richard J. Coggins, *Sirach* [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998], 78-83, esp. 83). However, as Mendels observes, Sirach is fairly "biblical" in its presentation of its heroes. That is, some Jews of the Diaspora, such as Eupolemus (and perhaps Philo) go way beyond Sirach's claims; thus, Eupolemus co-opts various cultural innovations for the biblical heroes of Israel's past, e.g., Moses is referred to as the "first wise man" and the inventor of the alphabet (*OTP* 2.865, frg. 1, 26).

record of the restoration is given limited acclaim. Sirach's account of the return is encapsulated in his tribute to Zerubbabel, Jeshua, and Nehemiah (49:11-13).<sup>146</sup> Nonetheless, for a writer who esteems the Temple so highly, it is striking that those who were instrumental in its construction and the wider restoration of the 6<sup>th</sup> century receive such brief acclaim. But Sirach plays down their role in order to elevate another figure whom he understands to be true restorer of Israel. That is, the author maintains that the return and restoration under Persia was *not* completed in the 6<sup>th</sup> century. The Temple's completion is carried out by none other than the high priest, Simon II, a contemporary of ben Sira. For it is of Simon II (50:1-21, esp. 1-4)<sup>147</sup>—not Sheshbazzar, Zerubbabel, Ezra (who is omitted altogether) or Nehemiah—that the author remarks:

(Sir 50:1) (The leader of his brothers and the pride of his people)<sup>148</sup> was the high priest, Simon son of Onias, who in his life repaired the house, and in his time fortified the temple. (2) He laid the foundations for the high double walls, the high retaining walls for the temple enclosure. (3) In his days a cistern for water was dug, a reservoir like the sea in circumference. (4) He considered how to save his people from ruin, and fortified the city against a siege. (5) How glorious he was, surrounded by the people, as he came out of house of the curtain (NRSV).

Hayward has demonstrated significant parallels between the writer's description of wisdom (Sirach 24) and of the high priest (Sirach 50).<sup>149</sup> The implication seems to be that just as wisdom cannot be easily separated from Jerusalem and the Temple, neither

---

<sup>146</sup> In a similar way, three figures are also mentioned in *1 Enoch* 89:72, although there unspecified for their identity. Ezra 1 refers to *three tribes* returning to the Land (i.e., the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin and some members of the tribe of Levi.) Also see 1QM, col.i.2, where these *three tribes* are noted in the invasion of the Land. Ezra's absence from the list in Sirach is noteworthy.

<sup>147</sup> Simon is referred to in the past tense and is apparently dead at the time of the writing of this book. Sirach's crediting this high priest with the final phase of the historic restoration seems to be implicitly critical of the version of the restoration given in Ezra-Nehemiah.

<sup>148</sup> This phrase is attested in the Hebrew, but not in the Greek versions of 50:1 (parenthesis are mine).

<sup>149</sup> R. Hayward, "Sacrifice and World Order: Some Observations on Ben Sira's Attitude to the Temple Service," in S. W. Sykes (ed.), *Sacrifice and Redemption: Durham Essays in Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 24-25, (22-34). In particular, see Sir 50:6-24. Hayward also observes how "the scribe" (i.e., ben Sira himself) is associated with wisdom as well. Both the scribe and Wisdom have traveled the world, but ultimately find residence in Jerusalem. Hayward's article is important also in that it demonstrates the prominence of cultic concerns in Sirach alongside ethical and sapiential emphases.

can she be divided apart from her human counterpart, Simon II, or, more generally, the high priest. If the people desire to find Wisdom in its most personified form, there is only one choice for the Diaspora: 'Come home to Jerusalem.' Simon's recent completion of the Temple, the exalted center of God's dwelling, serves as notice to the Diaspora community that Israel's eschatological restoration has been inaugurated and may soon reach its climax in the return of all Jews to Palestine.<sup>150</sup> As Skehan and Di Lella observe, "Ben Sira asks God to complete the restoration of his people to the Promised Land."<sup>151</sup>

One other text related to the future restoration also occurs in the author's account of Israel's ancestors. In this case, the author describes Elijah and his importance for both Israel's past and future (48:10). In this view of restoration, Israel's re-gathering once more comes to the fore. Unlike Sirach 36, where Israel's restoration is achieved directly by God, in this text (Sir 48:10) the author emphasizes the return of Elijah and his role in Israel's restoration. The author notes that Elijah<sup>152</sup> who will return from heaven at the "appointed time (cf. 36:7) to calm the wrath (of God) before fury, to turn the heart of a father to a son *and to reestablish*<sup>153</sup> *the tribes of Jacob*" (καὶ καταστήσαι φυλὰς Ἰακωβ) (48:10).<sup>154</sup>

---

<sup>150</sup> It seems clear that the author does not expect a new or heavenly temple. Rather, the temple has only recently been "completed" and glorified under the high priest Simon II, whom the author considers to be a figure that prefigures an even greater restoration. The author maintains that the return of all Jews to Jerusalem will serve as the catalyst for God's refilling Jerusalem and the temple with even more glory and the praise of all the people (36:13).

<sup>151</sup> Skehan and Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 422. The solidarity of Jews in the Land with those in the Diaspora is also underlined by first person object pronoun in the author's prayer to God to "have mercy on *us*" (36:1) and "all those called by your name" (36:11).

<sup>152</sup> The expectation for the re-gathering of the "tribes of Jacob" occurs in a section of Sirach known as "praise of famous men or heroes" (Sir 44:1-50:24). In Sir 48:1-12a, the writer offers a praise of Elijah. Various events in his life are recalled including his being taken up in a "whirlwind of fire by chariots of fire" (48:9). Strikingly, after his ascension is noted, the writer says that Elijah will come back. See the discussion below.

<sup>153</sup> In Sir 17:17, the writer notes writes that while God "establishes a ruler for every nation, Israel is the Lord's part," a verse which depends on Deut 33:8-9. However, where the Deuteronomic passage

Sirach 48:10 builds upon ideas present in Malachi (3:22-23), a text whose interpretive tradition is important for Luke (and the other Synoptic writers). In Malachi (both MT and LXX), the author anticipates the return of Elijah before “the day of the Lord,” a time of judgment. Elijah is envisioned to be a restorer of familial relationships, “turning the hearts of the fathers to their sons,” a function which Sirach also mentions in his understanding of the prophet. But Sirach expands the role of Elijah from a strictly familial or ethical function to an explicitly nationalistic one that is positively associated with restoration (rather than simply judgment).<sup>155</sup>

Despite the differences between these accounts of Israel’s restoration in the book of Sirach, the various versions underscore the importance of the re-gathering of all

---

emphasizes in somewhat non-polemical terms the establishment of territories according to “the gods” (as opposed to Israel who is Yahweh’s), Sirach’s version emphasizes the rule of the Lord as opposed to human rulers over the nations. His interpretation is especially *a propos* since at the time of the writing Israel does not possess a king per se, but a high priest who rules as God’s agent. Sirach’s use of Deut 33:8-9 also removes any reference to other gods and de-emphasizes the territorial aspect of the OT text. Cf. Deut 33:8-9 [LXX]; Jub 32:31-32 where angels (or spirits) are appointed over the nations, and in the case of Jubilees, for subversive reasons. Also see Sir 46:13 where Samuel is said to have “established” the kingdom.

<sup>154</sup> Other than this reference in Sirach, the tradition of a returning Elijah, which is so important in the Gospels (esp. with reference to John the Baptist), makes little impact in early Jewish writings. The return of Elijah is mentioned in 4Q558, but the poor condition of the fragment makes the context of his appearance difficult to interpret (John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* [New York: Doubleday, 1995], 116). References to “the eighth as an elected one” and “lightening” may imply an eschatological background to the passage, but other portions of the writing seem to be more historically oriented, referring to the reign of Uzziah and to Mt. Horeb (4Q558, frg. 2). (Cf. 4Q246, col. ii.1-2, where the reference to “lightening” is used as a symbol to characterize a kingdom that appears on the eschatological horizon.) Collins argues that the “anointed one” or “Messiah” of 4Q521, whom “heaven and earth will obey” is to be identified as Elijah (*Scepter*, 116-22). 4Q521 depends heavily on Psalm 146 and Isaiah 61 in portraying a figure who performs a list of miraculous deeds, including the freeing of the exiles as well as resurrecting the dead. This last feature is not mentioned in either Psalm 146 or Isaiah 61, but occurs in both 4Q521 and Q (Matt 11:2-5; Luke 7:22).

<sup>155</sup> In Sirach’s version of Israel’s restoration under Elijah, there is no mention of either the Temple or the defeat of the Gentiles. However, such a polemic against the nations may be found in the wider literary context of the description of Elijah. Prior to his description of the *eschatological* Elijah and his role in Israel’s re-gathering, the author describes the *historical* Elijah’s (past) adversarial relationship with kings. Sirach underscores Elijah’s role in the destruction and/or the anointing of kings for judgment (48:6-8). Also, in this section of Sirach, Israel’s historic exile is described. After a short hymn to Elisha (48:12-14), Elijah’s disciple, the exile is mentioned and blamed on the people’s failure to repent, despite the miracles of Elisha: “Despite all this the people did not repent, nor did they forsake their sins, until they were carried off as plunder from their land, and were scattered over all the earth. The people were left very few in number, but with a ruler from the house of David. Some of them did what was right, but others sinned more and more” (48:15-16, NRSV).

Jews to the Land as a key component of the eschatological hopes of ben Sira. Other components include the defeat of the nations and the exaltation of the Temple, the latter event being underway in restorative efforts of the high priest. For this author, there are benefits that lie outside the Land, but these may be overshadowed by the dilemma of undervaluing the center of the world, i.e., Jerusalem and the Land. The basic perspective of Sirach is that until Jews outside Palestine return, even those within Palestine, remain in exile. Therefore, the author hopes for Israel's restoration.

### **2.4.3 Second Maccabees 1-2: The Re-gathering as the Completion of Israel's Restoration**

In 2 Maccabees,<sup>156</sup> the author describes the liberation of Jerusalem and the Land from both Jewish and Gentile enemies. The author views the Land from the vantage point of its geographical and theological center: the Temple. The author does not attempt to develop the political importance of the Land and its priestly rulers in the manner of 1 Maccabees.<sup>157</sup> Rather, the Land is primarily understood as the place of God and the Temple. That is, the Land seems to be given more religious relevance than political import. But nonetheless, the author underscores, God will protect his abode against threats and violence from all adversaries, even the Gentile rulers of the world. The violation of the Temple and threats made against it, by both Jewish and Gentile enemies, provide the negative catalyst for God's intervention on Israel's behalf.<sup>158</sup>

---

<sup>156</sup> This book was written between 104 BCE and 63 BCE. The writing of 2 Maccabees, according to its own introduction, is said to be an abridgment of the five volume work of Jason of Cyrene (2:23), a figure otherwise unknown. The material contained in 2 Macc 1-2:18 originates from two letters that were added to 2 Maccabees at a later point (see below). See Daniel J. Harrington, *Invitation to the Apocrypha* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 137-51.

<sup>157</sup> See the treatment of 1 Maccabees in the following chapter.

<sup>158</sup> In particular, the book places special blame on the role of evil high priests in perpetuating the calamities that occur within the Land.

The chief hero of the narrative is Judas Maccabeus,<sup>159</sup> who wins major victories against various Seleucid rulers and sinful Jews. The writer goes to great length, however, to demonstrate that the real protector of the people of Israel and the holy city is *God and his divine agents* who miraculously intervene at key moments to save Israel.<sup>160</sup> God's intervention results in the restoration of the Temple (10:1-9), and the institution of the feast Hanukkah,<sup>161</sup> a festival whose keeping is a major point of interest for the author. Finally, the author also stresses the divine character of Judas' miraculous triumph over Nicanor<sup>162</sup> near the end of the book (2 Maccabees 14-15), which also is marked by a festival.

The hope for the return of the Diaspora occurs in the second of two letters (1:1-9; 1:10-2:18), which are prefixed to the document of 2 Maccabees.<sup>163</sup> The first letter is addressed from the "Jews in Jerusalem and the land of Judaea" to Jews in Egypt (1:1-9). The second letter is written to Aristobulus,<sup>164</sup> a notable Egyptian Jew of priestly lineage, and to other Egyptian Jews (1:10-2:18).<sup>165</sup> Both letters are unified in their positive view

---

<sup>159</sup> Judas is the primary instrument of God's salvation (2 Macc 10:1-9); there is no mention of a future messiah or Davidic figure. The writer gives full credit to Judas Maccabeus; he barely refers to Jonathan and Simon, the heroes and appointed high priest rulers of 1 Maccabees.

<sup>160</sup> Threats made against the Temple or city, in particular, precipitate divine intervention. For instance, three men who rapidly meet their demise after threat against God or his institutions are Heliodorus (3:1-40), Antiochus IV (9:4-28), and Nicanor (chaps. 14-15).

<sup>161</sup> The restoration of Temple cannot easily be separated from the death of Antiochus IV, which immediately precedes the restoration. After a threat against Jerusalem (9:4), Antiochus is attacked by God and is stricken with severe illnesses. Despite Antiochus' vows to (1) give political freedom to the Jews, (2) declare himself to "become a Jew" and (3) proclaim the Jewish God to the world, he eventually dies (9:5-28).

<sup>162</sup> Nicanor makes his own threat against the Temple (14:33) and finds himself fighting Judas and an army who has been miraculously armed with a heavenly sword. Nicanor's death and the institution of yet another festival (15:28-36; cf. 10:5-8) signify once more God's protection of Israel and Jerusalem. It is with these events that 2 Maccabees concludes.

<sup>163</sup> The first letter dates to 125/4 BCE while the second one dates to ca 100 BCE. See Jonathan A. Goldstein, *II Maccabees* (AB 41A; New York: Doubleday, 1983), 24-27.

<sup>164</sup> Aristobulus is referred to as a teacher of King Ptolemy and the Jews of Egypt (1:10-2:18).

<sup>165</sup> The Jewish community had long roots in Egypt. In fact, two temples have been established there, one at Elephantine in the 5<sup>th</sup> century BCE and another one at Leontopolis in mid second century BCE. The temple in Elephantine had long been destroyed by the time of 2 Maccabees. Some scholars

of the Jerusalem Temple and encouraging the Diaspora Jews to keep the (new) festival of booths<sup>166</sup> (i.e., Hanukkah), a festival celebrating the Maccabean restoration of the Temple.<sup>167</sup> But at three different points in the second letter,<sup>168</sup> the writer expresses a strong preference that God bring the Jews of Egypt back into Israel (2 Macc 1:23-29; 2:7-8; 2:16-18). The first instance occurs in the author's account of the prayer of the high priest Jonathan (1:23-29), following the sixth-century return and Nehemiah's institution of the festival of lights. Jonathan prays:

Gather together our Diaspora (ἐπισυνάγαγε τὴν διασπορὰν ἡμῶν); free the ones who are slaves in the nations. Look upon the despised and detestable and let the nations know that you are our God. Torment the ones who oppress and who are exuberant in arrogance. Plant your people in your holy place, just as Moses said (2 Macc 1:27-29).

---

(e.g., Goldstein, *II Maccabees*, 24-7; 135-88) understand the temple at Leontopolis and Oniad cult to be an important and underlying concern of the letters (and perhaps the whole of 2 Maccabees), implicitly bringing into questioning the Egyptian temple's legitimacy and calling for allegiance to the Jerusalem cultus. Cf. Collins (*Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*, The Biblical Resource Series, [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999], 80-83) who turns the argument on its head. He refers to the absence of references to the Egyptian temple, the favorable portrayal of Onias III (i.e., the Oniad cultus), and the lack of reference to and endorsement of the Maccabean high priesthood. He argues the author of 2 Maccabees may actually support the re-installation of the Oniad priesthood. Collins notes that Leontopolis may have been tolerated because it "was never seriously considered as a rival to that of Jerusalem" (Collins, *Between Athens*, 81). In light of the strong emphasis on the Jerusalem Temple in 2 Maccabees, it is difficult to imagine the writer being neutral regarding the Oniad's affiliation with another temple. Furthermore, the author's favorable view toward Onias III, who was assassinated while in service to the Jerusalem cult does not mean an automatic endorsement of the Oniad descendants now aligned with Leontopolis. C. T. R. Hayward argues, on the basis of his analysis of Josephus' comments on Leontopolis, that the establishment of a cult in this Egyptian locale led some Jews to celebrate this event as the fulfillment of *Israel's* eschatological restoration ("The Jewish Temple at Leontopolis: A Reconsideration, *JJS* 32 [1982], 429-43). Hayward does not comment on 2 Maccabees 1-2. It is also worth noting here that despite the apparent affront that a second Temple in Egypt would seem to pose to the cult in Jerusalem (esp. in the light of the exclusive endorsement of the Deuteronomic law code), there is little explicit criticism of Leontopolis anywhere in EJJL.

<sup>166</sup> The festival is also named in association with the "feast of fire," ostensibly inaugurated at the time of the second Temple restoration under Nehemiah. The point of the writer is that just as the first restoration was accompanied by miraculous events and the institution of a festival, so the restoration under Judas should be remembered, even by those outside the Land (2 Macc 1:18-22).

<sup>167</sup> In this respect, the sentiment of 2 Maccabees (1-2) is analogous to that expressed in the colophon of the Greek translation(s) of Esther, where the author appeals for to its readers to keep the festival of Purim.

<sup>168</sup> Only the second letter refers to the motif of Israel's re-gathering (i.e., the return of the Egyptian Jews). The common appeal to keep the feast of Hanukkah in honor of the Temple's restoration is shared by both letters.



This passage underscores three important points regarding the re-gathering of the Diaspora: (1) Jews who continue to live among the nations are understood to be oppressed people or “slaves.” Consequently, the nations among whom they are scattered will be severely punished.<sup>169</sup> (2) The writer espouses a theological unity or kinship between the Jews of the Land and those in the nations. He refers to “*our* Diaspora.” (3) Lastly, the writer emphasizes the integral relationship of the Jewish people to the holy Land. He does this by utilizing a common metaphor in second Temple Jewish texts that portray Israel as a plant that belongs to the land of Israel.<sup>170</sup>

A few lines further down, the writer provides a larger eschatological framework of Israel’s restoration in which the feature of re-gathering should be inserted and evaluated (2:1-8). In this account, the writer relates a story of the hiding of the tabernacle,<sup>171</sup> ark, and altar of incense by Jeremiah during Israel’s exile.<sup>172</sup> According to this tradition, Jeremiah predicted that God’s reconstitution of the people would trigger a larger eschatological chain of events, including the re-establishment of the tabernacle and the return of the glory of God (2:4-8). In a story that celebrates the liberation of Jerusalem and its Temple from the Seleucids, the author—in this letter to the Egyptian Diaspora—suggests that the Maccabean revolt has initiated Israel’s restoration, but yet

---

<sup>169</sup> It is not clear from the text whether the punishment of the nations will precipitate the re-gathering or occur afterwards. The case for the latter is somewhat stronger in that the nations’ defeat is mentioned after the re-gathering.

<sup>170</sup> Patrick A. Tiller, “The ‘Eternal Planting’ in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *DSD* 4 (1997), 313-35; Shozo Fujita, “The Metaphor of Plant in Jewish Literature of the Intertestamental Period,” *JSJ* 7 (1976), 30-45.

<sup>171</sup> Perhaps, this tradition of the hidden tabernacle might lie behind the words of Stephen (in Luke-Acts) who contrasts the tabernacle with the Temple (Acts 7). Likewise, in Acts 15, a passage that is important for the evaluation of Luke’s idea of restoration (see below), James refers to the raising up of the “tabernacle of David.” Could it be that Luke is revising traditions of the hidden tabernacle to interpret key persons and events of formative Christianity?

<sup>172</sup> Traditions regarding Jeremiah’s preservation of the Temple vessels occur in *Paraleiomena Jeremiu* 3 and Eupolemus (*OTP* 2.871, frg. 4, 39.5). Cf. 2 *Baruch* 6, where angels remove and hide the vessels. This tradition serves as a kind of a guarantee for the Temple’s restoration. The removal of the vessels before the Temple’s destruction stands against claims in Ezra and 2 Chronicles that they were seized by Babylon and later returned by Persia.

some aspects of the eschatological promises await their fulfillment.<sup>173</sup> That is, Israel still awaits the return of all Jews, even those in Egypt, to the Land. This understanding of the letter is supported by its closing verses. The appeal to keep the festival is restated (2:16-17), but the author reminds the Diaspora Jews that God has now “saved all the people...and has restored the inheritance, kingship,<sup>174</sup> priesthood, and purification to all” (2:17).<sup>175</sup> And he hopes that God will soon “gather us from under the heaven in to the holy place” (2:18). Therefore, the author reiterates that the relationship between Jews and Gentiles is inherently dangerous. The unity of the Diaspora with those in the land of Israel is underscored by the author’s use of the first person object pronoun in the phrase, “gather *us*.” The land of Israel is the proper and holy dwelling place of the Jews. The presence of the re-gathering motif in these three passages of 2 Maccabees suggests that the return of the dispersed ones to the land of Israel is a sustained hope for the writer. Their reassembly will be a major and indispensable component of Israel’s restoration, which will also involve the disclosure of the tabernacle and the coming of God’s glory.

In conclusion, the above documents, despite differences in historical context, genre, and reasons for their being written, overlap in their holding on to the hope of Israel’s restoration and a particular conception of the eschatological re-gathering. The

---

<sup>173</sup> This might suggest the reason for the addition of the letters to 2 Maccabees. However, since the letter(s) apparently post-date the rest of 2 Maccabees this point would only be true if the letters were attached to the book at an early date. The relationship of the restored Temple to the hidden tabernacle is unclear. It may be that the writer understands the disclosure of the tabernacle to be somehow related to the (recently) restored Temple or it may stand as a separate event of Israel’s future.

<sup>174</sup> Since restoration of the kingship (or the high priesthood) did not occur in the period of Judas Maccabeus, Jonathan A. Goldstein (“Biblical Promises and 1 Maccabees and 2 Maccabees,” in Jacob Neusner, William Scott Green, and Ernest S. Frerichs, [eds.], *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990], 69-96; esp. 83-84) correctly sees in this designation an allusion to a later period when such a title was attributed to Aristobulus I and Alexander Jannaeus. Does the author of 2 Maccabees attempt to fill in the gaps of Israel’s restoration that he finds in 2 Maccabees? That is, what was begun in Judas Maccabees (i.e., Israel’s restoration [the renewal of the Temple]) anticipates its eschatological conclusion in the period of Aristobulus I or Alexander Jannaeus.

<sup>175</sup> Cf. Moses’ promise in Exodus 19:6 of the attributes: kingdom, priesthood, and purity/consecration.

re-gathering of Israel is understood primarily in terms of the return of the Diaspora. However, until the Diaspora returns, even those Jews in the Land exist in a kind of exilic limbo as well. There are some common assumptions found in these documents about life outside the land of Israel. First, at least for Tobit and 2 Maccabees, Jews who live among Gentiles are understood to be oppressed and enslaved people. While the book of Sirach is usually much more positive about some of the features of life outside the Land (e.g., the accumulation of wisdom), ultimately these same features are used to measure and proclaim the superiority of (life inside) Palestine itself. For these authors, even Sirach, the Diaspora is not simply to be characterized by their existence outside the land of Israel. Indeed, the Diaspora setting is ultimately a kind of exile that envelops all Jews until the eschatological return. It is understood that living among the nations poses a perpetual, precarious threat of sin (e.g., lawlessness, idolatry, impurity). Only the return to the Land and the rest of the people can ensure the dispersed ones' protection and salvation. Since life among the nations is usually viewed in negative terms in this interpretation of Israel's re-gathering, the return to the Land often co-occurs with the hope for the defeat of the Gentiles as well.

Second, there is the presumption that all Jews, both those within the Land and those outside, are one people whose exilic condition is shared.<sup>176</sup> Although all Jews share a common predicament (i.e., exile), they also share a common destiny (i.e., the return to the Land). As long as some Jews remain scattered among the nations, all of Israel stands in need of re-gathering. The rendezvous of the dispersed ones with those in the land of Israel is understood as the eschatological unity or oneness of the Jewish people that is vital to the restoration.

---

<sup>176</sup> That is, Jews within the land of Israel share, spiritually, in the exile of those outside the Land.

A third major emphasis in texts that refer to the re-gathering of the people is placed on the integral bond between the Jews and the Land.<sup>177</sup> The land of Israel is understood as the inheritance of the people, the place of promise, and the locus of God's end-time activity. Lastly, a major goal of all of these writings (above) is to remind the Jewish Diaspora to remain faithful to Judaism and to mind their obligations, variously specified, toward God and other Jews. Indeed, it might be argued that the eschatological return is a subordinate emphasis to the writer's main intention to call the Diaspora into faithfulness and obedience to their religious heritage, even as they live their lives outside Palestine. By maintaining the code of righteousness, Jews can live in hopeful anticipation of their eschatological re-gathering, both a promise and reward that lies in the future. As such, the return of Israel is not so much choice as it is a national destiny enveloping all Jews. Their eventual return is recorded in the prophets and predetermined by God. Therefore, in the age of restoration all Jews will return to the land of their destiny.

## 2.5 The Re-gathering of Israel *from Israel*

In other Early Jewish documents, the motif of re-gathering is revised against an exilic landscape that is defined even more by ideology than the physical presence of Jews among Gentiles. In the understanding of exile above, Jews within the Land could declare their captivity as a profession of solidarity with Diaspora populations. However,

---

<sup>177</sup> On the importance of the Land, or lack thereof, in Early Judaism, see W. D. Davies, *The Gospel and the Land* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974); idem, *The Territorial Dimension of Judaism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982); Doron Mendels, *The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in Hasmonean Literature* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1987); idem, *The Rise and Fall of Jewish Nationalism: Jewish and Christian Ethnicity in Ancient Palestine* (2<sup>nd</sup> edit; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 1992); Betsy Halpern-Amaru, *Rewriting the Bible: Land and Covenant in Post-Biblical Judaism* (Valley Forge, Pa.: Fortress, 1994).

in other texts, the declaration of exile often reflects a conflict or disturbance that Jews within the Land may have had with either Gentiles or Jews *within the land of Israel*.

Therefore, Israel's re-gathering must be assessed against an exilic predicament that is, in many cases, not literal in any real sense. Rather than placing paramount importance on the return of Jews from foreign abodes, Israel's re-gathering may signify the conclusion of a particular conflict within the Land or a turning toward God. Israel's re-gathering therefore may be articulated as an extended process or ongoing 'pilgrimage' that first involves the departure from a sinful state or, perhaps, other sinful Jews. In such cases, the goal of the Land or attaining power within it may be displaced in lieu of *the process* of re-gathering, i.e., on being counted among those who will eventually receive the eschatological promises. That is, Israel's re-gathering is spiritualized to include other ideas than just the notion of a physical pilgrimage from the Gentiles to the Land. The return of the Diaspora may be included in the wider context of the re-gathering, but no longer lies at the center.

In some cases, the idea of re-gathering is almost indistinguishable from repentance or a prescribed range of behaviors, beliefs, or stipulations. When these requirements are taken up—it may be proclaimed that—Israel's re-gathering is underway. As noted in the Introduction (Chapter One) of the present study, N. T. Wright has argued for the paradigm of exile and return as the "controlling story" of Jews in the first century CE. He has underscored the ideological dimension of exile and return. For Wright, the idea of sin and repentance is (almost) interchangeable with exile and return.

[R]eturn from exile, in this period, *meant* 'forgiveness of sins', and vice versa... As long as Israel was still suffering under foreign rule, the 'sins' that had caused the exile had not been 'forgiven.' Forgiveness was concrete, as it would be for someone in prison: a 'pardon' that did not result in actual release would be no pardon at all.<sup>178</sup>

In his (often) synthetic analysis of Early Judaism and its literature, N. T. Wright speaks of a comprehensive and monolithic view of exile and restoration shared by the Jewish people of the Greco-Roman period. He does not adequately explore important distinctions in content and/or emphases of Jews who utilized the raw features of the exilic model of restoration (i.e., new Temple, re-gathering, and fate of the nations), but yet gave these features very different interpretation and/or emphases. Indeed, in most cases, what Wright refers to as "repentance" is more precisely delineated in EYL according to specific and varying requirements, i.e., entailing the adoption of a particular school of Torah interpretation, purity requirements, apocalyptic world-view, and/or allegiance to a specific community or leader. Although such requirement may indeed function as a particular interpretation of Israel's re-gathering, there is usually a physical dimension in which the Land or its power structures (i.e., Temple, Jerusalem) are possessed. Nonetheless, Wright's work has been significant in underscoring the theological significance of the features of restoration theology and their ongoing viability after the 6<sup>th</sup> century restoration for Jews within and outside the Land.

The claim to be the re-gathered ones is often preceded by a narrative of exile or flight from the borders of Palestine. Sometimes the group may claim to be persecuted and forced into captivity or the wilderness. In other cases, claims of persecution or the

---

<sup>178</sup> See Wright, *Jesus*, 577 (his emphasis). Likewise, he writes "[f]orgiveness of sin is another way of saying 'return from exile'" (*Jesus*, 268). Conversely, Wright can speak of Israel's sin *as exile*. He writes: "The exile... was caused by Israel's sin; so now, if the sin has been dealt with and forgiven, the exile must be ending" (*Jesus*, 270). While the context of these quotes occur in Wright's argument of Jesus as the messianic restorer of Israel, the author argues that exilic theology was the pervasive ideology of Jews in the first century CE. Wright has been rightly critiqued for his generalized manner of dealing with Judaism and his lack of precision in dealing with the topic across the spectrum of early Jewish literature.

perception of pervasive sin within Palestine leads to voluntary flights from the Land to preserve righteousness and mark time until the day of restoration. These exiles *en miniature* provide the stage for the climatic conclusion of Israel's return in which the persecuted group is portrayed as the main or even exclusive participants.

It is plausible that after fleeing Palestine, because of conflict with others in the Land, some Jews may have indeed interpreted their situations *ex post facto* as a kind of exile. Conversely, perhaps some Jewish groups, envisioning themselves to be the legitimate representatives of Israel, exited the Land as the understood pre-condition for their triumphal return in the age of restoration. In their self-imposed captivities, they waited and prepared for the eschatological repatriation to Jerusalem.

But the historical reality of these fights or exile is often questionable. As already noted, the claim of exile from the Land may not necessarily reflect a geographical or physical reality at all. Rather, such claims should be heard within Israel's dominant meta-narrative of 'exile and return.' The pattern is used primarily to convey the ideas of distress and hope through geographical segregation and repatriation. That is, a community may utilize the paradigm of exile and return to describe an unsatisfactory predicament and the hope for restoration, *even while already dwelling within the borders of the land of Israel*.<sup>179</sup> The assertion of exile functions as a symbol or literary trope to express woeful dissatisfaction with the *status quo* or specific set of circumstances that may or may not be fully disclosed.<sup>180</sup> Ironically, the return may no longer signify the separation of Jews from Gentiles or foreign territories, but *Jews from*

---

<sup>179</sup> That is, claims of exile are often grounded less on geographical separation from the Land than on theological and/or sociological dissonance with the boundaries of Judea.

<sup>180</sup> Behind the claim of exile may be a situation of social dissonance, disenfranchisement from power or control, and/or (perceived) threat or real persecution.

*Jews* within the territory of Israel. Thus, Israel's re-gathering, in some cases, becomes predominately an inter- or intra- Jewish event.

A particular Jewish group or segment of the population may claim themselves to be the legitimate heirs of Israel, laying claim to the heritage and eschatological promises of the whole. The claim to be the true representatives of Israel may depend on a general claim of righteousness or repentance or be according to a rigid criterion and or rite of passage (e.g., baptism). An early Jewish author or community may mandate a particular line of interpretation to Torah or code of purity. Other claims to be the re-gathered ones are grounded in professions to have (exclusive) access to apocalyptic knowledge, visions, and secrets. Other documents elevate the importance of a leader or leaders to whom the true members of Israel should submit.<sup>181</sup> In claiming to be the nucleus of the end-time participants, some Jews envisioned a climatic end in which they and their brand of Judaism might prevail over the remainder of Israel. That is, the re-gathering of Israel may be portrayed as an extended process occurring over time or in stages. The return of Israel may begin with the emergence or formation of a respective group, whose anticipated arrival into Jerusalem (and into power) remains on the future horizon. In anticipation, such groups of Jews await the fullness of the restoration. In such theological understandings of re-gathering, the return of the Diaspora may still be indicated as well, but as a subsequent and subordinate event to confirm the claim of a righteous few to be the nucleus of the restored people of God.<sup>182</sup>

---

<sup>181</sup> These interpretative options are not mutually exclusive from one another nor does this list exhaust the possible options around which Jews may have rallied and made exclusive claims of inclusion or exclusion.

<sup>182</sup> The return may be marked in stages in which the re-gathering is initiated in the (repentant) claim or formation of one group of Jews, but then followed by a description of a more encompassing migration of the Diaspora who join with the righteous remnant.



### 2.5.1 Damascus Document: The True Return from Babylon

The writing known as the *Damascus Document* (CD)<sup>183</sup> describes Israel's eschatological Israel's re-gathering by claiming that the Babylonian exile has only 'recently' ended in the departure of a remnant group of Jews. That is, the *Damascus Document* offers an alternative version of the return from the Babylon that differs markedly with the official, biblical account of Ezra-Nehemiah.<sup>184</sup> While some early

---

<sup>183</sup> All references to the *Damascus Document* are to the Cairo Damascus Document (CD) unless otherwise noted. The text and translation of the Cairo Damascus Document are taken from Baumgarten and Davis' translation in Charlesworth (ed.), *PDSSP* 2.4-57. Qumran versions of this writing (QD) are referred to where significant variants are found. See Joseph M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4. XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266-273)* (DJD 18; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996). The relationship of the *Damascus Document* to other writings of the Qumran Yahad is currently an unsettled question in scholarship, although a growing consensus understands the document to relate to either the proto- or early history of the group which settled at Qumran. This study treats the claims of the *Damascus Document* on its own terms, not attempting to reconcile its claims with other Qumran writings. For an overview of the various positions on the origin of the *Damascus Document* and its relation to other Qumran scrolls, see John J. Collins, "The Origin of the Qumran Community: A Review of the Evidence," in Maurya P. Horgan and Paul Kobelski (eds.), *To Touch the Text: Biblical and Related Studies in Honor of Joseph A. Fitzmyer*, S. J. (New York: Crossroad, 1989), 159-78; Michael A. Knibb, "The Place of the Damascus Document," in Michael O. Wise et al. (eds.), in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 149-62; Charlotte Hempel, "Community Origins in the Damascus Document in the Light of Recent Scholarship," in Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich (eds.), *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 316-29.

<sup>184</sup> Some scholars, led by Jerome Murphy O'Connor, have argued that the claim to Babylonian origins should be taken seriously and literally. The *Damascus Document*, O'Connor argues, describes a community whose origins lie in Babylon. Only later (ca mid-second century BCE) did the group make its way back to the Land (Jerome Murphy O'Connor, "The Essenes and their History," *RB* 81 [1974], 215-44; idem, "The Damascus Document Revisited," *RB* 92 [1985], 223-46; others who have supported O'Connor's view include Philip R. Davies, "The Birthplace of the Essenes: Where Is 'Damascus,'?" *RevQ* 14 [1990], 503-19 [Davies is either unaware of or ignores Knibb's detailed critique of O'Connor]; (Shanks, "Essene Origins," 79-84). However, Michael Knibb's work on the prominence of exilic theology in the period of Early Judaism poses a weighty challenge to O'Connor and others who seek to validate the claim of the Damascus Document for a real geographical origin in Babylon ("Exile in the Damascus Document," *JSOT* 25 [1983], 99-117; idem, "Exile" in Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [Vol. 1; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000], 276-77). As John Collins observes, Knibb's argument does not require other claims of exile match one another in all details. Rather ["t]he significant parallel is that the condition of exile persists beyond the sixth century" ("The Origin of the Qumran Community: A Review of the Evidence," in Horgan and Kobelski [eds.], *To Touch the Text*, 171; [159-78]). A mediating position is struck by Jonathan Cambell, who argues the second century BCE author of the *Damascus Document* may have drawn from earlier, as well as alternative, memories and traditions of the exile. Cambell argues the ancient author of this Qumran document at least *believed* he was recounting exilic history. Cambell notes the recycling of some aspects of biblical record of the 6<sup>th</sup> century return in the *Damascus Document*. Cambell calls attention to various allusions and references to the account of the restoration in Ezra-Nehemiah ("Essene-Qumran Origins in the Exile: A Scriptural Basis?" *JJS* 46 [1995], 143-56). While not denying the presence of earlier traditions in the *Damascus Document*, the present study sides with the view of Knibb and others that the author's claim of exilic origins is grounded more in theology than historical fact. The

Jewish writings refer to the 6<sup>th</sup> century return, but then follow it with a description of a future and superior restoration, the *Damascus Document* simply replaces the biblical account with its version of exilic history. Indeed, as Talmon argues, the Jewish group described in this Qumran writing “intended to obliterate it [the 6<sup>th</sup> century restoration] entirely from their conception of Israel’s history, and to claim for themselves the distinction of being the first returnees after the destruction.”<sup>185</sup>

The writing opens with an appeal to its readers to heed a warning of impending judgment.<sup>186</sup> The promise of judgment serves as a negative motivation for readers to carefully consider the words of the writing, especially its interpretation of the Torah that is explicated at different points in the document.<sup>187</sup> As evidence of God’s retribution against the unrighteous, the author cites the example of judgment *par excellence*, i.e., the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem and the exile of the people (CD-A i.1-3).<sup>188</sup> The eradication of the unrighteous members of Israel during the exile is matched positively by the preservation of a righteous portion. After tersely recounting the

---

event of the exile, as in other early Jewish writings, serves the aims of a theological program. Like other important episodes of Israel’s history (e.g., the Exodus; the flood), which the writer describes, the author co-opts the exile as the necessary prerequisite for the claim on the full fruits of Israel’s restoration. Thus, even if there is some merit to the author’s claim to Babylonian origin, it is the ideological weight the author gives the event and the status of the group which emerges from captivity that is most crucial to the document.

<sup>185</sup> Shemaryahu Talmon, “Waiting for the Messiah: The Spiritual Universe of the Qumran Covenanters,” in Neusner, Green, and Frerichs (eds.), *Judaisms and their Messiahs*, 116-17. Talmon’s remarks are not directed specifically toward the *Damascus Document*, but are more generally applied to the community at Qumran and its attitude toward the 6<sup>th</sup> century restoration.

<sup>186</sup> This opening chapter belongs to a section of the *Damascus Document* known as the Admonition or Exhortation. This section in the Cairo *Damascus Document* (CD) is found in columns i-viii and xix-xx. One purpose of the writing is to exhort Jews to abide by the interpretation of various laws as set forth in the *Damascus Document*. The law material is found chiefly in columns xv-xvi and ix-xiv. In the Qumran version(s), the material is ordered somewhat differently and there are more laws. (For instance, in the Qumran materials, columns xv-xvi occur before columns viii-ix of CD-A)

<sup>187</sup> For a thorough discussion of the laws of the *Damascus Document*, see Charlotte Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Traditions, and Redaction* (Leiden: Brill, 1998).

<sup>188</sup> Mark Adam Elliott refers to the typological use of the exile and other events of Israel’s history in the *Damascus Document* (*The Survivors of Israel*, 627).

catastrophe of the exile (i.3-4a), the author presents his revision of Israel's return.

Israel's re-gathering begins with the survival or emergence of a righteous community:

(3) For in their treachery in leaving him, he hid his face from Israel and his sanctuary, (4) and gave them up to the sword. But recalling the covenant with the first ones, he left a remnant of (5) Israel (שְׁאִירֵי לְיִשְׂרָאֵל) and did not give them up to destruction. And at the end of (his) wrath, three hundred (6) and ninety years after giving them into the hands of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, (7) he turned his attention to them and caused them to grow out of Israel and Aaron a root of planting (שֹׁרֵשׁ בְּמַעַת), to inherit (8) his land and grow fat in the goodness of his soil.<sup>189</sup>

The importance of the exilic framework for the author in his description of the group's origin and destiny is attested by the numerous references to captivity in the document.<sup>190</sup>

In this opening account of the end of captivity, after 390 years,<sup>191</sup> the remnant of Israel simply celebrates its survival vis-à-vis other members of the people who were eradicated in the "age of wrath." Rather than portraying the exile as place of punishment for all Israel, the author presents it most often as a means by which God cleansed Israel of the unrighteous portion of the population. For instance, later in the document the author argues the long captivity was necessary to eliminate the sinful portion of Israel: "And he despised the generations (in which) they [st]ood and hid his face from the land (...) until their completion. And he knew the years they would stand and the number(s) and details of their times..." (CD-A ii.8-9).<sup>192</sup> The division of Israel,

---

<sup>189</sup> PDSSP 2.13.

<sup>190</sup> See CD i.3-11a; ii.8b-13; iii.12b-iv.12a; v.20-vi.11a. For a proposal of the possible redactional history of these passages, see Charlotte Hempel, "Community Origins in the Damascus Document in the Light of Recent Scholarship," in Donald Parry and Eugene Ulrich (eds.), *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 316-29.

<sup>191</sup> The number of years is derived from Ezek 4:5, and it not meant to be understood literally. Abegg, however, refers to 4Q390 i.7b-10, where desolation of the Land is predicted to occur in the seventh jubilee (343 years), which numerically is fairly close to the number of years (i.e., 390 years) of the *Damascus Document* (Martin G. Abegg, "Exile and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in James M. Scott [ed.], *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions* [Leiden: Brill, 1997], 119-21). Nonetheless, this close correspondence in time seems more accidental than a meaningful calculation.

<sup>192</sup> See PDSSP 2.15. Hempel notes: "This passage forms part of a long predestination section describing the fate of the wicked" ("Community Origins," 322).

and the eradication of the sinful portion is a necessary step in the emergence of the true people of God and Israel's restoration. The author continues: "But amongst all of them (the people of Israel),<sup>193</sup> he (God) raised up for himself renowned ones in order to leave a remnant of survivors for the land and to fill the face of the earth with their descendants" (CD-A ii.11-12). Throughout the writing, the story of Israel's exile is probed, ironically, *for its redemptive value*. That is, the death of many of the people is weighed against its positive result: the survival of the righteous remnant of Israel. The return from captivity is less a story of Israel's separation from the nations as it is a narrative of separation of good Israel from bad Israel.<sup>194</sup>

Nonetheless, the departure from captivity does not lead immediately to the Land. While the emergence of the surviving group is celebrated, the author describes them as groping for twenty years like blind men whose vision is marred by their iniquity (i.7-9). Their initial search then is not so much for the Land as it is for a means to end their spiritual misdirection. The author describes this search as a quest for "(the) Way" (דרך).<sup>195</sup> Thus, the language of travelling or re-gathering is retained, but infused with new meaning, i.e., spiritual direction.

The aimless wandering of the first stage of the return ends as a new epoch of Israel's re-gathering is inaugurated. In this second stage of the re-gathering, the returnees are provided a leader, whom God raises up as a Righteous Teacher (or

---

<sup>193</sup> My translation depends on the convincing argument of Hempel that "amongst all of them" finds its antecedent in the earlier reference to the people and not the years (i.e., *not* "amongst the years" ("Community Origins," 322-23).

<sup>194</sup> That is, in many early Jewish sources, the hope for the elimination of Jewish enemies may rival the hope for the preservation or exaltation of the true community of Israel. Cf. the analysis of *Psalms of Solomon* (esp. chaps 17-18) in the "Fate of Israel's Enemies" (Chapter Three).

<sup>195</sup> Charlesworth's translation recognizes the absolute usage of דרך in reference to Jewish adversaries, who "depart from the Way" (i.13 [*PDSSP* 2.13]). Cf. CD viii.16; xx.23-24. However, unlike 1QS (e.g., viii.14-15), the use of the phrase in the *Damascus Document* does not explicitly depend upon Isaiah 40:3. Cf. the discussion of "the way" in Luke-Acts (Chapter Four).

“teacher of righteousness”) (מורה צדק). His role is to instruct the community “in the way of his [God’s?] heart” (i.11). In another reference to the exilic beginnings of Israel, the re-gathering is interpreted in terms that reveal a clear ideological substructure of Israel’s exile. Apparently, the more specific reasons for the claimed epoch of exile is the interpretation of the Torah on the matters of God’s “holy Sabbaths, and his glorious feasts, his just stipulations and his truthful paths, and the wishes of his will” (CD-A iii.13-15).<sup>196</sup>

Indeed, the ideological contours of Israel’s re-gathering also come into clearer focus as well in this text (CD-A v.20-vi.1-11):

(CD-A v.20) And at the time of the destruction of the land, the trespassers arose and led Israel astray; (21) and the land became desolate, for they spoke deviantly against the ordinances of God (given) through Moses, and also (vi.1) against the anointed holy ones. And they prophesied falsely, so as to cause Israel to turn away from (2) God. And God recalled the covenant with the first ones, and he raised up from Aaron men of discernment (3) wise men; and he allowed them to hear. And they dug the well (of which it is written) “the well was dug by the princes and excavated (4) the nobles of the people, with a ruler.” The “well” is the Torah and those who “dig” it are (5) the penitents of Israel who depart(ed) from the land of Judah and dwell(ed) in the land of Damascus. (6) God called them all “princes,” for they sought him and their honor was not (7) rejected by anyone’s mouth. And the “ruler” is the interpreter of the Torah, of whom (8) Isaiah said, “He takes out a tool for his work.” And the “nobles of the people” are (9) those who come to excavate the well with the statutes which were ordained by the ruler (10) to walk in them in the entire time of evil, and (who) will obtain no others until the rise of the one who will teach righteousness in the end of days.<sup>197</sup>

Unlike the biblical account of the historical restoration, where the end of exile gives way almost immediately to the return to the Land, the story of Israel’s re-gathering in the *Damascus Document* is a more complex and prolonged affair. Israel’s return is an event that has begun, but yet awaits its completion. The intermediary stage to getting to the Land, however, is of crucial importance for the writer’s interpretation of re-gathering as the return of Israel is understood as a process that involves multiple

---

<sup>196</sup> DSSSE 1.555. The author claims his Jewish enemies have fallen into the net of Belial, which is defined as (1) fornication, (2) wealth, and (3) defilement of the Temple (iv.12-18).

<sup>197</sup> PDSSP 2.21-22.

stages. In the first stage, the author underscores the importance of the captivity for eliminating the unrighteous members of Israel, leaving a righteous remnant. This initial stage closes by the author's emphasis on the community liminal status. In the return to the Land, the gathering ones have lost their direction. While no analogous period of blindness is mentioned in the departure from exile in the above account (columns v-vi), the returnees are once more pitted against an opposing portion of Israel. The description of the return is developed once more in correlation with a leading figure, this time referred to as the "interpreter of the Torah" (vi.7). Just as the Teacher of Righteousness directed the returnees to the correct path (i.e., his teaching) to resolve their iniquity, Israel's re-gathering, or at least a stage thereof, is now understood in terms of the returnees' devotion to the Interpreter of the Torah and the interpretation of the Law ('the digging of the well').<sup>198</sup>

Significantly, the re-gathered ones are identified as "the returnees" or "penitents of Israel" (שְׁבִי יִשְׂרָאֵל) (CD-A vi.5).<sup>199</sup> Indeed, the author's choice of this phrase of identification is chosen precisely because of the two-fold association it carries with captivity and penitence<sup>200</sup> (i.e., "the returnees of Israel" or "the penitent ones of Israel"). The double entendre carried in the phrase שְׁבִי יִשְׂרָאֵל serves well the author's use of the exilic model of restoration. While there may be some basis to a migratory exit from the Land, the symbolic *association* is sufficient for the author. As Knibb underscores, the various claims of exile and return in the *Damascus Document* belong to the wider "theological pattern" of usage found in EJS. The primary importance of the claim of

---

<sup>198</sup> Cf. IQS viii.14-15, where the command to 'prepare the way' (Isa 40:3) is explicitly interpreted as "the study of the law."

<sup>199</sup> Also see CD-A iv.2; viii.16 (= CD-B xix.29). Cf. the related phrase שְׁבִי פֶשַׁע (CD-A ii.5 [2x]); and (CD-B xx.17).

<sup>200</sup> Abegg, "Exile and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 112-13.

exile is to justify the claim to be the returnees of Israel, i.e., the people of the eschatological restoration.<sup>201</sup>

The ideological nature of this second stage of re-gathering in the instruction of the Torah and commitment to an esteemed leader does not mean that the goal of the Land has been lost. Nonetheless, the author shifts the focus, at least temporarily, from the *conclusion* of the journey (i.e., the Land) to the journey itself.<sup>202</sup> That is, in distancing Israel's return from its destination, the *process of re-gathering* takes on increased importance, and potentially could become (almost) an end unto itself. This view of re-gathering is especially pertinent to a group which attempts to sustain its eschatological horizon against the ticking of the clock as periods of prolonged waiting set in. Therefore, the focus of the return falls on the preparation for the final stages of Israel's restoration.<sup>203</sup>

The author also uses the exile as a precursor to the eschatological destruction awaiting those who stand in opposition to the author's group. As Schiffman observes:

One of the features of the sectarian ideology of restoration in this and other Qumran documents is the notion that the sectarians will share in the ultimate eschatological restoration, but not their opponents—always seen as evildoers.<sup>204</sup>

Just as the captivity eliminated adversaries in the past, so the coming judgment will eradicate current enemies forever more. Israel's history and eschatology belong together. And Israel's history belongs to the community that stands behind the

---

<sup>201</sup> Knibb, "Exile in the Damascus Document," 111.

<sup>202</sup> The laws of the *Damascus Document* and their interpretation are crucial to understanding the eschatological claims of the writing. Indeed, the author's linking of the interpretation of Torah to Israel's restoration underscores this importance. The goal of the Land lies on the eschatological horizon, but the emphasis of the document underscores the process of getting there, i.e., obeying the Torah.

<sup>203</sup> Perhaps, the spiritualization and extension of the return in the *Damascus Document* is analogous to Luke's revision of eschatology in light of the delay of the parousia.

<sup>204</sup> Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The Concept of Restoration in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in James M. Scott (ed.), *Restoration*, 206 (203-21).

*Damascus Document*. As Elliot notes: “All history [of Israel] is *history of the remnant*, therefore, and the history of the remnant is the only truly significant history.”<sup>205</sup>

In the *Damascus Document* (CD-A vii.14-21; CD-B xix.5-14),<sup>206</sup> the writer reflects on the fate of his group and those (“the princes of Judah”)<sup>207</sup> who have set themselves outside the covenant, by disavowing his group’s interpretation of the Torah (CD-A vii.18-21). This group will meet with certain destruction when the Prince of the Congregation, a royal messianic figure, arrives:

And the star is the Interpreter of the Law (דורש התורה), who will come (or has come)<sup>208</sup> to Damascus, as it is written: (Num 24:17) ‘A star will go out from Jacob and a scepter will arise from Israel.’<sup>209</sup> The “scepter” is the Prince of all of the Congregation, and when he arises, he will destroy all the Sons of Seth. These escaped at the first visitation.

In the passage above, the author underscores the implications for rejecting the teaching of the community and its teacher. According to the writer, Israel’s disobedience in the past led to the previous division and destruction of Israel and Judah (CD-A vii.7-13) in

---

<sup>205</sup> Elliott, *Survivors of Israel*, 627 (his emphasis).

<sup>206</sup> Two recensions of this text are preserved in the *Damascus Document*. However, only fragments which agree with CD-A are attested at Qumran (4Q267, frg. 3, col. iv; 4Q271, frg. 5). The recensions of A and B have many correspondences but differ, *inter alia*, in the OT texts which are cited, as well as the appellations given to the expected figure(s). Thus, rather than the Prince of the Congregation and the Interpreter of the Law, CD-B xix.10 refers to the Messiah of Aaron and Israel who will judge those “who did not remain faithful to the covenant” (13-14). As in CD-A, the disobedient ones are called the “princes of Judah” (xix.15). Michael A Knibb (“The Interpretation of *Damascus Document* VII, 9b-VIII, 2a and XIX, 5b-14,” *RevQ* 15 [1991], 243-51); argues for the priority of CD-B; Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, “The Original Text of CD 7:9-8:2 = 19:5-14,” *HTR* 64 [1971], 379-86 posits that portions of both A and B were contained in an early version of the document; Sidnie A. White (“A Comparison of the ‘A’ and ‘B’ Manuscripts of the Damascus Document,” *RevQ* 48 [1987], 537-53) argues that both A and B were in the original and a scribal error led to the omission of B in A; Collins (*Scepter*, 80-82) maintains that the textual evidence from the scrolls, which supports A must be given priority, but he finds White’s argument persuasive that both A and B were present in an earlier version of the *Damascus Document*.

<sup>207</sup> CD-A viii.3; CD-B xix.15.

<sup>208</sup> The text refers to the “Interpreter” who *הבא* to Damascus. CD-A 6.8 apparently indicates the Interpreter has already come. Scholars are uncertain whether different figures, past and future, are identified by the same epithet or whether this refers to only one (future or past) figure.

<sup>209</sup> Numbers 24:17 (Collins, *Scepter*, 63-4) is also argued to have been important for the messianic conception in the scrolls. While this may be true for other passages in early Jewish literature, its influence has been greatly over-estimated in the scrolls. As demonstrated in the present study, Isaiah 11:1-4 occurs much more often in early Jewish sources that promote the coming of a Davidic messiah.



the historic exile. In constructing this historical backdrop, the writer provides an important interpretative context for the expected figure(s). As the exile eliminated the unrighteous members of Israel in times past, in the future, God will send a royal messiah to eliminate the unrighteous Jews from the membership of the population. As in 4Q174 (*4QFlorilegium*), the messianic figure is accompanied by the “Interpreter of the Law.” The duties of the two figures are closely related but cast in very different terms. The priestly figure will *maintain* Israel’s holiness through his instruction of the Torah,<sup>210</sup> while the Prince of the Congregation *eradicates* the unrighteous ones from Israel who reject that understanding of the Law.<sup>211</sup> Therefore, strikingly, in this text, the messiah’s destruction of the chief adversary is an intra-Jewish activity; the Gentiles are not the primary enemy of Israel. Other Jews are.<sup>212</sup>

Following the elimination of the unrighteous members of Israel, the fullness of Israel’s restoration will be realized. The re-gathering ones will finally reach the climax of their return: entry into the Land and control of the Temple. The sons of Zadok will take charge of the Temple (CD-A iii.21-iv.1-4).<sup>213</sup> The true representatives of Israel will inherit the full glory of an exalted restoration (CD-B xx.32-34):<sup>214</sup>

---

<sup>210</sup> Whereas Amos 9:11 (“the raising of the fallen tabernacle of David”) is used in *4QFlorilegium* to identify the Davidic messiah, in CD-A vii.15-16, it refers to “the Law” which the Congregation has preserved in their flight to Damascus (CD-A vii.13-14; cf. Amos 5:27).

<sup>211</sup> He mediates God’s second visitation (judgment); cf. line 21.

<sup>212</sup> While the text does not provide a full account of Israel’s restoration, the “Prince of the Congregation” is involved in one of its defining features: the elimination of the unrighteous. In other Qumran documents, the Prince of the Congregation is presented as a Davidic or royal figure (e.g., Q174; 4Q161; *11QTemple Scroll*). Also, the eradication of the “princes of Judah” (CD-A viii.3) probably implies that the Prince of the Congregation will assume power in their stead. Moreover, the writer has set the coming of the Prince within the literary and historical context of Israel’s previous destruction by foreign powers (i.e., Babylon). This time God’s own Prince will carry out the judgment duty against the unrighteous members of Israel.

<sup>213</sup> Cf. CD-A iii.11-12 where it states that “all those who have been brought into the covenant shall not enter the temple to kindle his altar in vain” (*DSSSE* 1.559).

<sup>214</sup> These benefits are found in the Land, but those Jews inheriting the features of Israel’s restoration (i.e., entry into the Land; the defeat of their enemies; control over the Temple) are also

[T]hese shall exult and rejoice and their heart will be strong, and they shall prevail (34) over all the sons of the world. And God will atone for them, and they shall see his salvation, for they have taken refuge in his holy name.<sup>215</sup>

Therefore, in the period in which the *Damascus Document* was written, the author claims the end of Israel's captivity. Israel's exile is narrated as one of inter-Jewish division and disagreement. It is analogous, however, to the exile into Babylon under Nebuchadnezzar. While the re-gathering has begun, it has not yet concluded. Israel currently gathers around her Teacher of Righteousness and/or the instruction in the Torah, but she anticipates the moment when God, through the Prince of the Congregation, will eliminate her Jewish (and Gentile) enemies. And finally, in the age of restoration, the re-gathered ones will finally claim the Land, the holy Temple of God, and implement the true interpretation of the Torah.

### 2.5.2 The Animal Apocalypse: The Return from Apocalyptic Exile

In the *Animal Apocalypse* (1 Enoch 85-90), Israel's restoration is described within an apocalyptic vision of world history.<sup>216</sup> While the document is not quite as polemical toward other Jews, as in the *Damascus Document* and such writings as the *Psalms of Solomon*,<sup>217</sup> the author writes on behalf of a Jewish group which defines Israel

---

promised further eschatological rewards that seem to hearken beyond the present life. In CD-A iii.20, the writer characterizes the new period as a kind of Adamic paradise.

<sup>215</sup> DSSSE 1.569.

<sup>216</sup> While written during the early stages of the Maccabean revolution, the writing claims to be the product of ancient times. It purports to be the written account of an ancient dream given to Enoch about Israel and the world's future. In fact, the apocalypse is mostly a highly interpretive retelling of the past (i.e., from creation [based on the Genesis story] to the early period of the Maccabean revolt). The final portion of the document relates to contemporary events of the author and contains a real prediction of what the author hopes to be realized in the near future (90:6-39). The author's interpretation of history is crucial to understanding how he views his present situation as well as his expectations of the future, particularly Israel's restoration. This restoration is understood to be in process at the time of the writer.

<sup>217</sup> For the treatment of this writing, see Chapter Three.

in terms that suggest a delimiting of Israel. That is, the *Animal Apocalypse* seems to understand the true Israel to be embodied in a community of Jews claiming to have been given (apocalyptic) vision of the secrets of God, including Israel's future restoration.

The author's description of the future depends upon the interpretive matrix of exilic theology in which both the nations and heavenly agents hold Israel captive. Consequently, the elimination and/or defeat of both cosmic and earthly enemies plays a central role in the document's description of future Israel re-gathering and the overall plan of restoration (90:6-39).<sup>218</sup>

The nations are described in terms of various beasts, while Israel is represented as sheep.<sup>219</sup> Prior to the Babylonian exile, most of the people of Israel are described in negative terms. The chief sins of the people are identified as the rejection of the prophets<sup>220</sup> and the disregard (or defilement) of Jerusalem and the Temple.<sup>221</sup> Their sins result in the people's blindness, a condition understood in the worst possible terms by the author.<sup>222</sup> At this juncture (i.e., the condemnation of their blindness), just prior to the 6<sup>th</sup> century exile, God departs from them and leaves them in the hands of the Gentiles to be attacked and devoured.<sup>223</sup> Of more importance for the author is his contention that God not only withdraws from Israel, but submits her into the hands of seventy angels

---

<sup>218</sup> All citations of the *Animal Apocalypse* are from the *OTP* 1.63-72 unless otherwise noted.

<sup>219</sup> The twelve tribes (the "twelve sheep") are described immediately after the description of the flood in the description of the ancestry of Noah, which is also understood to be bound up with the history of the nations (89:10-13; cf. Genesis 10).

<sup>220</sup> The prophets are characterized as ones sent to sinful Israel (89:51-54).

<sup>221</sup> The writer contends the people "abandon the house of the Lord and his tower" (89:54). In most instances, the "house" is the symbol for Jerusalem (89:54, 56, 67, 72; 90:28, 29) or the Land (89:40, 50), while the "tower" stands for the Temple (87:3 [heavenly Temple]; 89:50, 54, 56, 67, 73) in the *Animal Apocalypse*.

<sup>222</sup> Cf. *1 Enoch* 89:54; cf. 89:32.

<sup>223</sup> *1 Enoch* 89:55-56, 58.

("shepherds") (89:59), whose *chief duty* is not merely to watch over Israel, but to eradicate the sinful members of the Jewish community. This abandonment of Israel by God into the hands of these seventy agents is understood to be *the turning point* in Israel's history. As Nickelsburg observes, "God has now adopted a new *modus operandi* by distancing himself from the flock."<sup>224</sup> God's absence leaves the door open for destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple and for all that follows in the narrative.

Nonetheless, God's departure does not lead immediately to the destruction and exile. Instead, the writer takes pains to describe the implications of the departure of God in the new epoch of angelic supervision. The angels' care of the sheep is described in stark terms. The main task of the heavenly agents is to destroy Jews designated by God for punishment (89:60). At the outset, however, it is noted that the angels will exceed their duties and slaughter more sheep than instructed.<sup>225</sup> In the description of the excessive nature of the angels' slaughter, the author describes the destruction of Jerusalem ("the house") and the Temple ("the tower") (89:66-67). The narrative sequence of these events may suggest the exilic catastrophe resulted more from the excessive abuse of the cruel angels<sup>226</sup> rather than the instructions of God. While Israel is not presented positively prior to the fall of Israel, after God turns her over to the angels, the focus falls more on their abuse of Israel rather than Israel's sins. That is, Israel's real problems now originate from heaven. Tiller observes: "Just as the tremendous evil and

---

<sup>224</sup> George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1-36; 81-108*, [Mineapolis: Fortress, 2001] 389.

<sup>225</sup> Other angels are appointed as supervisors of the angels to record these misdeeds (89:61-64).

<sup>226</sup> While Israel's blindness results in God's departure from direct supervision, the destruction of Jerusalem and Temple, and particularly the excessive loss of life, are blamed on the angelic agents that God has appointed.

violence that led up to the Deluge was at least in part caused by demonic forces, so the troubles that beset exilic (and postexilic) Israel are caused in part by demonic forces.”<sup>227</sup>

The seventy angels share an intimate relationship with the nations. Sometimes the heavenly agents slaughter the sheep themselves, but often the nations are their chief instruments. The integral connection between the heavenly agents and the nations is apparent in the description of the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple:

And I saw till those shepherds in their appointed time pastured (the sheep) and began killing and destroying many in excess of what they had been commanded; and they abandoned those sheep into the hands of the lions. So the lions and the leopards ate and devoured the majority of those sheep; the wild boars also along with them. Then they burned that tower and plowed the house. So the shepherds and their colleagues handed over those sheep to all the wild beasts so that they might devour them (89:65-68).<sup>228</sup>

The *seventy* heavenly agents are associated with seventy periods (89:68-69), drawing on the number’s traditional association with exile (e.g., Jer 29:10-14),<sup>229</sup> an event which by definition in Israel’s history finds its essential meaning against the landscape of the nations. Whether the number seventy also draws on traditional Jewish *numbering* of the nations (as seventy[-two]) is debated.<sup>230</sup> Nonetheless, the correlation

---

<sup>227</sup> Patrick A. Tiller, “Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch,” *SBL*, [Atlanta: Scholars, 1993] 53.

<sup>228</sup> *OTP* 1.68.

<sup>229</sup> VanderKam notes these angels are connected to the author’s concern for arranging his history into seventy weeks. He refers to a number of exilic and post-exilic sources that demonstrate a fascination with dividing history according to heptads (James VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of the Apocalyptic Tradition* (Washington D.C.: Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 1984).

<sup>230</sup> J. T. Milik (*The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragment of Qumran Cave 4* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976], 254) observes that the writer has found an “original manner” to present the idea of seventy periods by combining it with the tradition of the seventy nations (Genesis 10). Nickelsburg (*1 Enoch* 1, 391) claims that “[t]he number seventy is not drawn from ideas about the angelic patrons of the (seventy) nations.” While Nickelsburg is correct in raising concerns about the specific connotations of seventy to the nations, the author explicitly associates the heavenly agents to the nations in their killing of members of Israel. Another Enochic writing, which may contain earlier traditions that bear on the relationship of the nations to the seventy angels is *3 Enoch*. In this document, Metraton, a heavenly being, is said to have seventy names, corresponding to the seventy nations of the world (3:1). Cf. *3 Enoch* 17:8, where seventy-two nations of the world are identified in relation to seventy-two princes (= angels) (also see 9:3-5). Also see James Scott’s arguments on the use of the tradition of “the table of nations.” He argues that many Jews organized their view of the world, and understanding of the seventy (two) nations, through the lens of Genesis 10 (*Paul and Nations: The Old Testament and Jewish*

of patron angels and the nations, including Israel, is well attested in EJL.<sup>231</sup> Moreover, as noted above, the relationship between the Gentiles and the seventy angels is explicitly demonstrated in their joint participation in killing the people of Israel.<sup>232</sup> If these angels are understood as the patron angels of the nations, the implication is that God not only delivered Israel into the hands of Gentiles, but more significantly, into the hands of the nations' patron angels, (i.e., Gentile or foreign angels [!]).

Other evidence across the narrative, however, suggests the more likely conclusion that the angels should be understood as Israel's own heavenly guardians. Tiller refers to the heavenly shepherds as "the seventy patrons of Israel, each appointed for a particular period of time, both to care for and to punish Israel."<sup>233</sup> But like the Watchers, the seventy supervisors have deviated from their divine assignment. Thus, in correlation with the Watchers, whose sins lead to the first judgment (of the flood) (*1 Enoch* 88-89), the sins of the heavenly supervisors set in motion a string of events that eventually lead to the destruction of Israel, numerous conflicts with Gentiles, and judgment. Indeed, in the eschatological judgment (below), the fate of the Watchers and

---

*Background of Paul's Mission to the Nations with Special Reference to the Destination of the Galatians* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1995)).

<sup>231</sup> Perhaps, the earliest text connecting angels to the nations occurs in Deut 32:8 (LXX), where it is noted that the boundaries of the nations correspond "to the number of the angels of God" (κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ) (LXX). R. H. Charles opines that the identity of the seventy angels is "the most vexed question in Enoch" (*The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1912], 200). He identifies the angels of the *Animal Apocalypse* as the patron angels of the nations (*The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* [Oxford: Oxford University Press], 2:255). Collins accepts this assessment (*The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998], 68-69). In the *Book of Watchers* (*1 Enoch* 10:12), the period of the Watchers' punishment is given as seventy generations. Other texts as well refer to governing angels over the nations (Sir 17:17; Dan 10:13, 20 12:1; 1QM; 11Q13; cf. *Jub* 15:31-32 [!]).

<sup>232</sup> R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, 2.257; Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 68-69.

<sup>233</sup> Tiller, *Commentary*, 54. However, Tiller does not adequately account for the intimate relationship of the angels to the nations; that is, when the heavenly beings punish Israel, they do so very often *through the nations*.

the seventy heavenly supervisors is the same; both are sentenced to a fiery abyss.<sup>234</sup> In portraying Israel's exile as one of primarily heavenly origins and character, the author significantly re-interprets Israel's captivity as an apocalyptic event defined more by heavenly circumstances than earthly ones. That is, foreign captivity is raised to the level of a cosmic event.<sup>235</sup>

A particularly relevant text in assessing the role of the seventy angels in the *Animal Apocalypse* is found in *4QPseudo-Moses Apocryphon* (4Q390). Written as an *ex eventu* prophecy, the writer incorporates the seventy year exile of Jeremiah,<sup>236</sup> but then interprets eschatological history according to a sabbatical scheme of Jubilean years.<sup>237</sup> Unlike the *Animal Apocalypse* (below), the writer of 4Q390 apparently absolves from blame the generation of the historic restoration. He writes that will do evil "apart from those who will be the first to go up from the land of captivity in order to build the temple" (4Q390 frg. 1.5-6 [DSSSE 2.783]). In 4Q390, however, the appointment of the angels over Israel does not seem to have occurred until some time after the 6<sup>th</sup> century restoration. The sins that bring on the angelic appointment and the new round of exile in "the seventh jubilee" are: forgetting the law, the festival, the Sabbath, and the covenant

---

<sup>234</sup> In many ways the magnitude of the seventy angels' sin is on the same level as that of the Watchers (*1 Enoch* 86-88). The story of the Watchers and the seventy angels is analogous in several features. Both are appointed specific duties (i.e., supervisory) toward humanity. Ultimately, both groups of angles fail in their tasks and are largely blamed for the problems that result in Israel. As already noted, the most telling correlation between the Watchers and the seventy angels, however, is that in God's judgment both are singled out for punishment and sentenced to the same abyss (89:24-25).

<sup>235</sup> If the seventy angels are to be understood as the patron heavenly beings of the nations, a dramatic shift in emphasis has been made on the idea that God can use the nations to punish (e.g., Nebuchadnezzar [Jeremiah 25]) or even rule over Israel (e.g., Cyrus [Isa 44:28; 45:1]). That is, God not only uses the nations for such purposes, but also their patron angels. The implication of a cosmic exile at the hands of evil heavenly beings is that Israel's restoration cannot occur through mere human involvement (i.e., the raising of an army for rebellion). Israel requires heavenly or divine intervention to secure her eschatological restoration.

<sup>236</sup> As Michael A. Knibb observes, the author of 4Q390 refers to 70 years, but this time frame is used to "mark the length of something that happened in the pre-exilic period" ("A Note on 4Q372 and 4Q390," in F. García Martínez, A. Hilhorst, and C. J. Labuschagne (eds.), *The Scriptures and the Scrolls* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 174 (164-77).

<sup>237</sup> For the organizing scheme of jubilees and years, see *Jubilees* and *T. Levi* 17 as well.

(frg. 1.8).<sup>238</sup> The defilement of the Temple is added later to this list (frg. 2, col. i.9-10). Like the *Animal Apocalypse*, the author characterizes the final evil epoch of apocalyptic exile as one under the dominion of supervisory angels. The author also associates the appointment of angels with negative connotations for Israel (cf. Jub 15:31-32). The heavenly agents are referred to as “angels of destruction” and “angels of hatred” (frg. 2, col.i.7; frg. 1.11). But nonetheless, God appoints them to punish Israel and to “rule over” (משל) her. Their reign may be further characterized as the “dominion of Belial” (frg. 2, col. i.4). Like the *Animal Apocalypse*, 4Q390 describes “the whole post-exilic period as a time of continuing ‘desolation’—of exile.”<sup>239</sup> Unlike, the *Animal Apocalypse*, however, the supervisory angels are apparently never condemned for excessive punishment. The lacuna, at the end of the document, however, allows us only to speculate on the conclusion of the Jubilean eschatological program. Presumably, the end of the cosmic exile would have given way to Israel’s eschatological restoration and/or a period of new creation.

After establishing the true nature of Israel’s exile as being of divine origin and character, the author of the *Animal Apocalypse* records Israel’s historical restoration (89:72-77):

They again began to rebuild as before; and they raised up that tower which is called the high tower. But they started to place a table before the tower, with all the food which is upon it being polluted and impure. Regarding all these matters, the eyes of sheep became so dim-sighted that they could not see (89:73-74).<sup>240</sup>

The returnees are represented in the arrival of “three of those sheep” who proceed to rebuild “that house which had fallen down” (89:72). The identity of the three sheep is

---

<sup>238</sup> Cf. Jub 1:14 as well as the *Damascus Document*.

<sup>239</sup> Knibb, “A Note on 4Q372 and 4Q390,” 177.

<sup>240</sup> OTP 1.69.



not stated, but the three may represent notable figures of the 6<sup>th</sup> century return (e.g., Joshua, Zerubbabel, and Ezra or Nehemiah).<sup>241</sup> Another possibility, not usually given consideration by scholars, is that the three sheep represent the returning tribes of Judah, Benjamin, and Levi,<sup>242</sup> i.e., the historical returnees of the Babylonian exile.

While the 6<sup>th</sup> century return is acknowledged by the writer and the rebuilding effort is noted in the *Animal Apocalypse*, the restoration effort is ultimately condemned. The Temple sacrifices are unfit and unacceptable to God (89:73), presumably rendering the whole cult, including the Temple, defiled. The returnees are described as being blind (cf. 89:33). More serious, however, is the author's indication that the historic return is carried out under the auspices of the wicked, supervising angels, and not God's direct supervision. Therefore, the epoch of evil continues despite the historic restoration.<sup>243</sup> Regarding the period after the 6<sup>th</sup> century return, Bryan rightly observes that "the divine punishment associated with the exile is not entirely revoked. Israel still remains under the 'care' of the 70 angelic shepherds who represent the Gentile nations."<sup>244</sup> Thus, shortly after the return, Israel is once more submitted to excessive punishment by the angels and Gentiles (89:74). As James VanderKam contends:

---

<sup>241</sup> Alternative candidates for the three returning figures of the *Animal Apocalypse* are Sheshbazzar (Ezra 1:8) or the prophets Haggai or Zechariah. See Ezra-Nehemiah; 2 Macc 1:18; Sir 49:11-13. Also, in 2 *Baruch*, it is claimed that Baruch sends a letter to the Babylonian exile through the hands of three men (2 *Bar* 77:19).

<sup>242</sup> R. H. Charles offers this intriguing suggestion (*Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, 2.90, fn 72). See *T. Jos* 19:3; 1QM col. i; 4Q372. These tribes were associated with the southern kingdom of Judah and are the tribes associated with the 6<sup>th</sup> century returnees in Ezra 1:5 (also see *T. Jos* 19:3 and 1QM, col. i).

<sup>243</sup> The return occurs according to a time frame of God under the supervision of heavenly beings ("shepherds") who are delegated by God to watch over Israel. Thus, the return of Israel is a predetermined event and not due to any action (i.e., repentance) of the returnees.

<sup>244</sup> David J. Bryan, "Exile and Return from Jerusalem," in Christopher Rowland and John Barton (eds.), *Apocalyptic in History and Tradition* (JSPSup 43; Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield 2003), 64.

The time of a Babylonian exile was merely the first part...of a larger and longer-lasting phenomenon—the cruel reign of the seventy shepherds which would continue to the imminent end.<sup>245</sup>

The period after the restoration of the second Temple is described according to the language of exile.<sup>246</sup> Israel is once more dispersed<sup>247</sup> into the exilic wilderness of the Gentiles:

The Lord of the sheep remained silent until all the sheep were dispersed into the woods and got mixed among the wild beasts--and could not be rescued from the hands of the beasts (89:75).<sup>248</sup>

The dispersal into the woods or the wilderness occurs in other early Jewish texts as well (e.g., *Pss. Sol.* 17:16-17).<sup>249</sup> Whether these dispersals constitute real segregations or flights from the Land is uncertain.<sup>250</sup> It seems more likely, in light of the common occurrence of such claims, that references to wilderness flights are simply the symbolic product of an exilic theological framework. In any event, the dispersal into the wilderness is treated as a kind of exile by the author, regardless of whether it relates to a

---

<sup>245</sup> James C. VanderKam, "Exile in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature," in Scott (ed.), *Exile*, 100 (89-109).

<sup>246</sup> F. Gerald Downing observes that the exile after the return is not a continuation, but rather a new epoch of captivity ("Exile in Formative Judaism," in idem, *Making Sense in [and of] the First Christian Century* [JSNTSup 197; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000], 156-57). Downing, however, fixates on the fact that the period after the 6<sup>th</sup> century restoration is not a continuation of exile, but a new round of captivity. He makes this point in his critique of N. T. Wright, in particular, and more generally, in his wider critique against the whole notion of the importance of exilic theology in the Greco-Roman period. However, Downing misconstrues the notion of exilic theology and consequently goes to the other extreme and greatly understates its importance in the period of Early Judaism. Whether the post-6<sup>th</sup> century dispersion is more accurately understood as a second exile or a continuation of an ongoing one is less important to the author of the *Animal Apocalypse* than his overriding claim that Israel's return from Babylon did not result in a fundamental change in Israel's predicament. That is, Israel has not yet experienced her definitive restoration. Although one epoch or period of exile may have ended in the physical return to the Land, the fact that the seventy angels continue their (evil) supervisory role suggests a continuation of the heavenly captivity and/or punishment under which Israel has suffered since just before the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem.

<sup>247</sup> VanderKam observes that the "word *exile* never surfaces in the symbolic narrative of the *Animal Apocalypse*, but the language of dispersion is used and continues to be used after the end of the historical exile. For the author, exile was an ongoing condition that would soon end with the final judgment" ("Exile," 100) (his emphasis).

<sup>248</sup> *OTP* 1.69.

<sup>249</sup> For a treatment of the "wilderness" as a symbol of exile, see the excursus on the wilderness in Chapter Four (The Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts).

<sup>250</sup> Cf. 1 Macc 2:29.

physical reality or symbolic one. In the *Animal Apocalypse*, the wilderness exile is the final epoch of captivity (i.e., an eschatological exile) that now awaits its eschatological resolution in the final restoration of Israel.

The captivity of Israel continues until the birth or emergence of a righteous segment of the population (90:6): "Then, behold lambs were born from those snow-white sheep; and they began to open their eyes and see, and cried aloud to the sheep." The emphasis on the sight of the sheep may be a generalized characterization of some Jews' repentance or their righteous character.<sup>251</sup> But their new sight may also allude to the visionary or apocalyptic claim of the Jewish group whose eschatological worldview is founded on revelation, some of which is no doubt offered in the *Animal Apocalypse*.<sup>252</sup> In any event, the emergence of these visionary sheep represents the inauguration of Israel's restoration, although the heavenly agents continue to supervise Israel. While Israel will only later triumphantly arrive in the new Jerusalem, the emergence of righteous group of Jews (90:6) is a pivotal turning point in the narrative that formally signifies that Israel's re-gathering is now underway.<sup>253</sup>

These seeing lambs witness or prophesy (unsuccessfully) to the other portion of Israel.<sup>254</sup> The division of Israel is the negative counterpart to the positive phase of Israel's re-gathering.<sup>255</sup> Not only do the righteous Jews initially fail to make other Jews

---

<sup>251</sup> Cf. Dan 11:14; CD 1:3-12.

<sup>252</sup> Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 400. Also see the discussion in his "Excursus: Traditions about a Religious Awakening in the Hellenistic Period" (398-400).

<sup>253</sup> As noted in the discussion of Israel's return in the *Animal Apocalypse*, the emergence of a righteous ("seeing") community marks the beginning of Israel's re-gathering. Around this righteous group other returnees, including the Diaspora, will later gather in the pilgrimage to Jerusalem.

<sup>254</sup> The author makes a distinction between those sheep in Israel who begin "to open their eyes and see" and those who are "blind." It is only the seeing part that is able to participate in Israel's restoration. The reference to seeing may allude to the apocalyptic character of the community.

<sup>255</sup> Cf. Tiller who favors a reading of 90:6-7, on the basis of a few Ethiopic manuscripts, that says that the new round of Jewish--Gentiles conflict (below) also involved (or was preceded by) sinful Jews attacking the newly born visionary ones (*Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse*, 351-52).

see, but the blind Jews become even more blind (and deaf!) as a consequence of the effort (90:7-8). Against this righteous group, the angels and Gentiles launch an unparalleled attack of viciousness.<sup>256</sup> Eventually, a leader of the righteous ("seeing") sheep emerges who succeeds in opening the eyes of other Jews (90:9-10). Not only does he succeed in convincing other Jews to see or come around, but he is credited with mounting a military campaign against the Gentiles as well. Therefore, mission and war are closely associated with one another.<sup>257</sup> The revolt, however, is only moderately successful (90:11-12)<sup>258</sup> until God intervenes directly.<sup>259</sup> God's initial triumph over the nations is without human assistance. After bringing a terrifying darkness upon the people, he then strikes the ground with his "rod of wrath," swallowing up a portion of the persecuting Gentiles (90:18). Following this act of divine intervention, Israel is granted the privilege and power to participate in the concluding defeat of the nations.<sup>260</sup> God gives to the righteous ("seeing") members of Israel a "great sword"<sup>261</sup> to execute

---

Although the textual evidence weighs against Tiller's interpretation at this point, the fact that the blind sheep are later sentenced to a fiery abyss underscore the serious indictment of their blindness.

<sup>256</sup> See *1 Enoch* 90:8, 12, 16, 17. Within this renewed period of exile, the reduction of Israel continues, a motif that is present as well in the *Damascus Document*, *2 Baruch*, *4 Ezra*, *Psalms of Solomon*.

<sup>257</sup> However, the mission is to the Jews and the war is aimed toward the nations.

<sup>258</sup> This rebellion of the sheep alludes in part to the events of the Maccabean revolt. The historical retelling of the rebellion in *1 Maccabees*, which extols the role of the Maccabees, stands in contrast with the apocalyptic account of the *Animal Apocalypse*, which places more emphasis on the divine empowerment of the righteous Jews. More significantly, the *Animal Apocalypse* looks for a more definitive conclusion to the events in the land of Israel. Of course, the time lapse between the events and the writing of *1 Maccabees* may have contributed to the interpretation (or de-eschatologization) of the events in mid-second century BCE. A more likely explanation of differences in the accounts probably lies with the respective writers' theological tendencies and the adoption of their distinct genres. That is, the two literary works originated from two different social groups who interpreted the events of the Maccabean period in profoundly different ways.

<sup>259</sup> The persecution intensifies (90:8-14), until God reclaims dominion from the last twelve of the seventy patron angels and intervenes on behalf of the righteous portion of Israel.

<sup>260</sup> The problem of Israel's participation at this juncture, after God's intervention, is raised in the question by Nickelsburg (*1 Enoch* 1, 401): "Why, if God has acted against 'all the beasts' and 'all the birds,' should the sheep be given a sword to kill all the wild beasts?"

<sup>261</sup> Tiller notes that this passage "reflects the common tradition of a magical sword, given by God, which enables the oppressed to defeat the oppressor" (*Animal Apocalypse*, 366). Tiller refers to *1*

their vengeance (90:19). In analogy with the seventy angels of punishment, who had been divinely decreed and empowered to cull Israel (through the nations), so Israel now is equipped and enabled to do her own culling. Since the nations have been acting with divine (angelic) endorsement, it is only when Israel once more becomes empowered by divine agency that she is capable of striking back.<sup>262</sup> It is significant that this occurs by the direct hand of God and not a heavenly subordinate (90:20-39). The righteous ones of Israel defeat the Gentile oppressors and proceed to eradicate them, either by killing them or driving them from the land of Israel (90:19).

In the arrival of a righteous community and their divinely inaugurated rebellion, the incipient period of Israel's restoration is well underway. The emergence of the seeing sheep and their revolt against the Gentiles marks the divide between *ex eventu* prophecy (i.e., history) and real prophecy (i.e., the final and climatic events of Israel's restoration [90:20-39]).<sup>263</sup> Indeed, the distinction between history (the 'already') and

---

*Enoch* 91:12 and 2 Macc 15:12-16, where Onias the high priest appears as a sign of God's support of the Maccabean effort. In the vision Onias refers to Jeremiah as a defender of Jerusalem. Jeremiah then appears in the vision as well and offers Judas a sword from God to use against his enemies:

Jeremiah stretched out his right hand and gave to Judas a golden sword, and as he gave it he addressed him thus: (16) "Take this holy sword, a gift from God, with which you will strike down your adversaries" (2 Macc 15:15-16 [NRSV]).

Another text that seems to be dependent upon the tradition of divine sword appears in the *Apocalypse of Weeks* (91:12): "Then after that there shall occur the second eighth week--the week of righteousness. A sword shall be given to it in order that judgment shall be executed in righteousness on the oppressors, and sinners shall be delivered into the hands of the righteous" (*OTP* 1:73). Other passages as well draw on the metaphor of the sword in the defeat of the nations. The author of the *War Scroll* declares: "The God of Israel has summoned a sword against all the nations, and among the holy ones of his people he will do mightily" (xvi.1). Cf. the enigmatic reference to swords in Luke 22:35-38. Also see Jer 50:35-38.

<sup>262</sup> These events most likely correspond with the Maccabean revolt under Judas Maccabeus (90:9-10). In 2 Maccabees, Judas' victory over Lysias at Beth-zur is credited to divine assistance (11:1-15). If this historical correspondence is correct, the described restoration is a combination of *what has occurred* and *what is hoped for* in the near future. Although it fits the characterization of an "already, not yet" eschatology, the "not yet" portion is not a distant, remote hope, but something expected to reach its climax in the immediate future.

<sup>263</sup> Despite the scope of the time covered and the number of events rehearsed, the primary emphasis of the writing falls on the eschatological restoration.

eschatology (the 'not yet') is lost in the nexus of time that involves the arrival of a righteous Jewish group and its subsequent rebellion against the Gentiles.<sup>264</sup>

In analogy with 1 Maccabees and the *War Scroll*,<sup>265</sup> the *Animal Apocalypse* emphasizes the eradication of the nations from the Land as a key feature of Israel's restoration. Only after they are killed or expelled from the Land does God descend upon his throne to complete his judgment. This phase of judgment focuses on the final eradication and sentencing of the evil heavenly beings, i.e., both the Watchers and the seventy angels (90:20-27). The inter-Jewish polemic of the document is borne out in this phase of the eschatological judgment as well. The evil ("blind") members of Israel are also condemned along with the heavenly beings, although sentenced to different abysses (90:26-27). It is noteworthy, however, that the nations are not mentioned and apparently have no place in the eternal judgment. Evidently, their eradication from the Land is the only "judgment" they experience. The fiery abyss of punishment is reserved for heavenly beings and sinful Jews alone.<sup>266</sup>

After the defeat of the nations and judgment against sinful heavenly beings and Jews, the more positive aspects of Israel's restoration are described. In this final phase of the restoration, the following events occur (1) the earthly Jerusalem ("house") is replaced with a heavenly one;<sup>267</sup> (2) the righteous surviving Jews and the Diaspora Jews

---

<sup>264</sup> That is, in some early Jewish sources, the eschatological period (of restoration) may be thought to be underway in the present, thus negating strict boundaries between the present period and the future.

<sup>265</sup> See the treatment of these documents in Chapter Three.

<sup>266</sup> This may be because the seventy angels, the heavenly powers over the nations, are held accountable instead. Alternatively, the author may conceive of the afterlife (for reward or punishment) to concern heavenly beings and Jews alone (cf. 90:32-33).

<sup>267</sup> See 90:28-9; cf. 90:20; 89:73-7.

are re-gathered to Jerusalem;<sup>268</sup> and (3) the surviving nations are gathered there to submit to Israel and her God (90:33-34, 37).

While the earlier returnees of the second Temple restoration are portrayed primarily as re-builders of the Temple, in the eschatological return the re-gathered ones are not presented as such. The new city is built by God alone and the old (human-built) is removed.<sup>269</sup> The return of the people to the Land is cause for great celebration. Initially, the author underscores the presence of the righteous, "white" sheep, those who had first emerged among Israel, and participated in the defeat of the nations (90:30). The returning Jews of this first stage are exalted as objects of veneration and honor. This group probably corresponds to the visionary community behind the *Animal Apocalypse*. Another marker of their status is that they are joined by Enoch himself (90:31).

Around this nucleus of the re-gathered Israel, a more comprehensive return is described as the passage continues. Even in cases where the primary interpretation of Israel's re-gathering is not understood in terms of the return of the Diaspora (see below),<sup>270</sup> the return of those outside the Land is sometimes still imagined as a later or confirmatory stage of the restoration.<sup>271</sup> Both the Diaspora Jews and those members of

---

<sup>268</sup> Prior to the re-gathering of all Israel is the emergence of a righteous group within Israel (90:6) who are identified as the "seeing" ones as opposed to others who are described as blind or dim-sighted (90:7, 26). Indeed one of the hallmarks of re-gathered Israel (and the nations?) is the "opening of all their eyes" (90:35).

<sup>269</sup> Moreover, it may be significant that the writer does not mention any cultic participation by the new people (or priests), the improper practice of which leads to their rejection and return to "exile" in the earlier account (89:73).

<sup>270</sup> E.g., repentance; the co-opting of Israel's heritage by a smaller group of Jews; see below.

<sup>271</sup> As noted below, in such cases, presumably the return of those in the Diaspora would depend on the returnees meeting the same requirements of the group, whose exile appears to be more ideological than physical. An example can be taken from *Psalms of Solomon* 17, a text treated more fully later in this chapter. In this psalm, the writer understands his community's dilemma and future salvation in terms of exile and return. From the heavy polemic against both Gentiles and other Jews in this psalm (and elsewhere in the psalms), it is clear that the writer defines the legitimate people of Israel to be those Jews whose beliefs and practices match his own. The writer refers to a Jewish group being driven from the

Israel killed (in the recent campaign?) join with the core community in the Land. The author emphatically underscores the comprehensive nature of Israel's re-gathering along with the concomitant emphasis on Israel's new sight:

(1 *Enoch* 90:33) All those [sheep] which have been destroyed and dispersed, and all the beasts of the field and the birds of the sky were gathered together in the house; and the Lord of the sheep rejoiced with great joy because they had all become gentle and returned to his house... (34c) All the sheep were invited to the house but it could not contain them (all). (35) The eyes of all of them were opened, and they saw the beautiful things; not a single one existed among them that could not see. (36) Also I noticed that the house was large, wide, and exceedingly full.

The description of the returnees underlines the magnitude and sheer numbers of Israelites that have come to the restored city (90:29, 35-36).<sup>272</sup> The emphasis on the population of the eschatological returnees contrasts markedly with the low number (i.e., three) associated with the return of the 6<sup>th</sup> century (89:72). The emphasis on the multitude within Israel's borders tells of the author's theology of geography that guides his understanding of the Jewish people; the people belong within the Land.<sup>273</sup> Therefore, in Israel's final restoration, the writer underlines the reversal of fortune for those who were previously captives to the nations. Now the nations have come to Jerusalem and submit to the Israelites (90:30). The author emphasizes, however, the unity and peace

---

Land into "the wilderness" (*Pss. Sol.* 17:16-17) by both foreign and Jewish enemies. It is not clear whether "wilderness" (ἔρημος) is to be taken literally as an expulsion or self-imposed exile, or if it is used metaphorically to refer to the social and theological state of a group which has been made powerless and obscure. In many cases in EJJ, "the wilderness" belongs to the nomenclature of exilic language and thought. The writer of *Psalms of Solomon* 17 envisages a Davidic messiah who would one day re-gather his persecuted community back into the Land (17:21-29), and presumably back into power. The pattern of exile and re-gathering is therefore used to identify both the dilemma and hope of one group of Jews over and against the larger population. But later in the same passage the writer anticipates that the nations will bring those Jews living within foreign territories back to Jerusalem (17:30-31; cf. Isa 55:5). Likewise, a more comprehensive return of the Diaspora is also envisaged in *Psalm of Solomon* 11. In this psalm, there is no explicit reference to a particular community and its crisis. Furthermore, Israel's restoration is expressed almost entirely in terms of a return to the Land. Rather than a messiah clearing the way back to the Land, God himself, in a theophanic visitation, leads the Diaspora of Israel there himself. This return is articulated in the pilgrimage of all Jews--those from the "east," "west," "north," and from "distant islands" (11:2-3; cf. 1 Baruch 5)—to the Land.

<sup>272</sup> The description also serves to emphasize the size of the structure that God has constructed.

<sup>273</sup> Conversely, as already noted, elsewhere in the *Animal Apocalypse*, the (geography of the) nations is used to emphasize danger and cosmic evil.



that characterize the relationship (90:33-4). The most important attribute of the returnees that is noted in the passage is the people's righteousness and their turning from sin. The writer stresses the clear and (apocalyptic) vision of all Israel (90:35), a description which underscores the righteousness of the people in this age, and contrasts markedly with the description of Israel being "blind" at key junctures in her history (89:32, 54, 74; 90:26-27).

The nations join with the re-gathered people in the new Jerusalem. The pilgrimage of the nations is a common motif in the Old Testament and EJJ.<sup>274</sup> As Donaldson observes, the Gentiles' pilgrimage is rarely an isolated event unto itself; rather, it appears most often in texts of restoration.<sup>275</sup> Instead of serving to underscore the Gentiles' "conversion," the nations' migration to Jerusalem conveys their subjection to Israel and her God. Nonetheless, unlike other foreign enemies, these subservient nations are allowed to live and even participate in Israel—as Gentiles.<sup>276</sup>

Only after the pilgrimage of the nations and their complete submission does Israel finally put her sword of vengeance safely away (90:34). Afterwards, the restoration of Israel gives way to a more comprehensive phase of renewal in the final

---

<sup>274</sup> For an inventory of pilgrimage texts, see Terence L. Donaldson, "Proselytes or 'Righteous Gentiles'? The Status of Gentiles in Eschatological Pilgrimage Patterns of Thought" *JSP* 7 (1990), 3-27.

<sup>275</sup> Donaldson argues convincingly against treating most instances of the Gentiles' pilgrimage as denoting the nations' conversion. He argues that "the general tendency" has "been to talk vaguely about the end-time 'conversion' of the Gentiles without giving any consideration to the nature or terms of such conversion" ("Proselytes or 'Righteous Gentiles'?", 10). It is not clear that the envisaged worship of God by the nations is clearly distinct from pilgrimages of political subordination or subservience. Rather, the nations' acknowledgement of God may indicate a more profound level of subordination to both the Jewish people and their deity.

<sup>276</sup> See Donaldson, "Proselytes or 'Righteous Gentiles'?", 26-27. While Donaldson does not discuss the *Animal Apocalypse*, his reticence about characterizing such pilgrimages as acts of conversion is substantiated in this document. The ancient writer clearly distinguishes between the status of the Gentiles at the time of their pilgrimage in Israel's restoration from their status later in the writing in which they undergo a dramatic change, i.e., a metamorphosis. In the period of Israel's restoration, the nations assume a subservient status before God and the Jews. While they worship God, they do so as Gentiles, not as converted Jews.

part of the apocalypse in which ethnic and religious distinctions disappear in a kind of new creation (90:37-39):

Then I saw that a snow-white cow was born, with huge horns; all the beasts of the field and all the birds of the sky feared him and made petition to him all the time. I went on seeing until all their kindred were transformed, and became snow-white cows;<sup>277</sup> and the first among them became something, and that something became a great beast with huge black horns on its head. The Lord of the sheep rejoiced over it and over all the cows. I myself became satiated in their midst. Then I woke up and saw everything.<sup>278</sup>

Differences between Jews and the nations are lost in the rebirth of the people of the world.<sup>279</sup> As Nickelsburg observes: "The distinction between Jew and Gentile is obliterated... Therewith ends the strife between sheep and the beasts and birds of prey. Israel's victimization at the hands of the Gentiles has ceased."<sup>280</sup>

In the age of restoration, according to the *Animal Apocalypse*, the events of the end-time are inaugurated in the emergence of a righteous or visionary portion of Israel. Their next stage of their restoration involves their joining with God to defeat their Gentile enemies. While the emergence of the group constitutes, in effect, the beginning of Israel's re-gathering, it only later ends and climaxes in the heavenly Jerusalem. Prior to the final epoch of Israel's return, there is the judgment of God in which evil heavenly beings and bad Jews are assigned to their respective fiery abysses. Afterwards, the

---

<sup>277</sup> See the description of Adam (85:3) and Noah (89:1, 9).

<sup>278</sup> OTP 1.71.

<sup>279</sup> Despite the so-called universal outlook of the *Animal Apocalypse* in the vision of the cosmic renewal, the writer's places the Jewish God at the center and describes the new humanity in the language used elsewhere in the document to describe the ancient patriarchs of Israel.

<sup>280</sup> See Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 93. Thus, in the *Animal Apocalypse*, Israel's relationship with the nations plays a central role in the envisaged restoration. In the penultimate epoch of history, the nations and evil heavenly beings are shown to be inherently bound up with one another in their imposition of an exile on Israel. Consequently, Israel's exile is re-interpreted in cosmic proportions. Not only do the nations hold Israel captive, but more seriously, evil heavenly beings exercise their control. The importance of the nations in the author's idea of the future is underscored by their role, both negative and positive, in Israel's restoration. Gentiles are dealt with in three primary stages. First, in conjunction with God's judgment against the seventy angelic supervisors, the nations and sinful Jews are defeated and/or driven from the land of Israel. Second, after the eradication of all unrighteous beings, both earthly and heavenly, the surviving Gentiles are gathered in submission to Jews and God to the new and expansive Jerusalem. Finally, following Israel's restoration, the nations are transformed into a common humanity, serving the new Adamic leader and the Jewish God.

earthly Jerusalem is replaced with a heavenly one. Israel's re-gathering is specified not only in the return of the surviving Jews of the Land, but the return of the Diaspora Jews and even the resurrection of the dead. Moreover, the surviving nations are invited to the new Jerusalem as well. In their pilgrimage to the Land, the Gentiles demonstrate their contrition and subservience to God and the Jewish people. Finally, in a scene that may lie outside Israel's restoration-proper (but nonetheless is intrinsically connected), all humanity is reborn and ethnic distinctions are lost. Israel's restoration, however, is understood as the center and seminal event of the future of the world, and the catalyst for the new creation.

### **2.5.3 Fourth Ezra: The Return of the Hidden and Righteous Ten Tribes**

The idea of Israel's re-gathering in *4 Ezra* subscribes to the belief that ten tribes of the Assyrian exile neither were assimilated into their foreign contexts nor became "lost." The author claims that these tribes are not only extant and thriving, but await their eschatological return to the Land.<sup>281</sup> The ten tribes are portrayed as a privileged community that God has maintained in secret so as to replenish, even replace, most of the people of the Land in the time of Israel's restoration.

While the literary setting of the book is the Babylonian exile, the narrative is actually written within the historical context of the Roman destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple (ca 70 CE).<sup>282</sup> The issue of Israel's future restoration rises to the fore amidst the questions of Ezra to an angel regarding God's apparent failure to be faithful to the

---

<sup>281</sup> All quotations from *4 Ezra* are from Bruce M. Metzger's translation in *OTP* 1.516-59, unless otherwise noted.

<sup>282</sup> The exact time that is given is thirty years after the destruction of Jerusalem (*4 Ezra* 3:1-3, 29; 10:19-24). If the thirty years is taken at face value, the time of the writing would be ca 100 CE, a time very close to the writing of Luke-Acts.

Jewish people. As Willett argues, to some degree eschatology is subordinate to theodicy in *4 Ezra*.<sup>283</sup> The author challenges the Deuteronomistic perspective that Israel is getting her just deserts for her sins. The defense of Israel is based primarily on the arguments that: (1) Israel has been incapable of living righteously since the time of Adam's sin, and thus should not be held responsible (e.g., 3:20-27) and that (2) the foreign nation (Babylon = Rome) that Yahweh has used to punish Israel is even more sinful than she is (e.g., 3:28-36).

Through a series of seven visions and divine interpretations,<sup>284</sup> an angel answers Ezra's questions regarding the justness of Israel's demise<sup>285</sup> by pointing to the providence or mysteries of God as well as deferring Ezra's attention to the future rather than the present state of things.<sup>286</sup> In *4 Ezra* 7:16, the angel challenges Ezra: "And why have you not considered in your mind what is to come, rather than what is now present?"<sup>287</sup> Willett correctly observes that "[t]he author's purpose in the first four sections<sup>288</sup> was to establish the validity of the eschatological answer to his problems, without which the eschatological speculations in sections V and VI would be

---

<sup>283</sup> Tom W. Willett, *Eschatology in the Theodicies of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra* (JSPSS 4; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989).

<sup>284</sup> See (1) 3:1-5:20; (2) 5:21-6:34; (3) 6:35-9:25; (4) 9:26-10:59; (5) 11:1-12:51; (6) 13:1-58; (7) 14:1-48 (Metzger, *OTP*, 1.516-59 and Willett, *Eschatology*, 56).

<sup>285</sup> Stone writes: "It is certainly true that 4 Ezra's questions are much more interesting than the answers given by the angel" (Michael Edward Stone, *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on Book of Fourth Ezra*; [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990], 36).

<sup>286</sup> After uncovering the apparent inequity of the Deuteronomistic framework, the author ultimately does not reject it as a partial means to explain the dilemma of Israel. As Willett notes: "Sin is suggested as the reason for the present evil, and future hope is presented as the solution to present iniquities" (*Eschatology*, 71).

<sup>287</sup> Likewise, in regard to the more sinful nations and unrighteous Jews who seem to prosper, Ezra is admonished: "Therefore, do not continue to be curious as to how the ungodly will be punished; but inquire how the righteous will be saved, those to whom the age belongs and for whose sake the age was made" (9:13-16).

<sup>288</sup> The "sections" of which Willett speaks correspond to the seven visions and their interpretations in *4 Ezra* (see above).

meaningless.”<sup>289</sup> In a series of visions the angel discloses to Ezra events that relate to both the restoration of Israel as well as to the final judgment and afterlife.<sup>290</sup> Ezra is shown that Israel’s punishment and suffering is a prerequisite rite of passage to determine who will participate in the restoration of Israel and the world to come (e.g., 7:14). The righteous (i.e., the few) will endure, while the wicked (i.e., the many) will be weeded out in the process.

While the events of Israel’s restoration are scattered throughout these visions, especially visions four through seven, and it is difficult to draw a uniform and orderly account,<sup>291</sup> the major features are (1) the revealing of the true Jerusalem (i.e., an “established city”);<sup>292</sup> (2) the appearance of a Davidic messiah and his destruction of the enemy nation(s) (esp. Rome) and unrighteous ones;<sup>293</sup> (3) the salvation of the righteous remnant;<sup>294</sup> and (4) the re-gathering of the ten tribes (13:12-13, 39-50; 14:33-34). Other events that belong to the future, apparently *after* the restoration of Israel are the final judgment and reward and punishment for the dead (7:26-[44]).<sup>295</sup>

The re-gathering of Israel is understood from the perspective of and emphasis on a surviving remnant of Jews from the Roman invasion of Jerusalem. One of the chief concerns of Ezra is the small number of survivors that now exists. However, the author

---

<sup>289</sup> Willett, *Eschatology*, 74.

<sup>290</sup> The relationship between Israel’s restoration and other eschatological rewards is not always clear since 4 Ezra’s eschatological vision is scattered throughout the book in no clear order.

<sup>291</sup> For instance, 7:26-31 indicates that the hidden Jerusalem will be revealed and then the messiah. No activities of the messiah are given except his death, which precipitates a return to “primordial silence,” the period before (a new) creation. In 13:29-50, the messiah is revealed first and then appears to carve out the mountain Zion (13:6-7), a place apparently synonymous with “the established city.” Thus, Zion is referred to as “the mountain carved out without hands” (13:36; cf. 13:6-7).

<sup>292</sup> 4 Ezra 10:25-8, 42, 44-54; 13:35-6; also 7:26-7.

<sup>293</sup> 4 Ezra 11:45-6; 12:31-5; 13:1-11, 21-38, 51-6; cf. 7:26-30.

<sup>294</sup> 4 Ezra 6:25; 7:27, 45-61; 9:7-8; 12:34; 13:19, 48.

<sup>295</sup> In the initial introduction of the messiah, his role and purpose remain somewhat oblique and undefined. He simply appears, lives four hundred years, and dies. His death along with the rest of humanity, however, ushers in a period of primordial silence that precedes the eschatological age.

interprets the survivors of Israel as *the eschatological core* of Israel around which, a much larger ingathering will take place. After Ezra questions God about the small number of people comprising the Jewish population, God responds by emphasizing that “small” may be understood as “rare” and “precious” (7:58). God remarks:

[F]or I will rejoice over the few who shall be saved, because it is they who have made my glory to prevail now, and through them my name has now been honored. And I will not grieve over the multitude of those who perish; for it is they who are now like a mist, and are similar to a flame and smoke—they are set on fire and burn hotly, and are extinguished (4 Ezra 7:60b-61).

Thus the minority have been divinely preserved, while the majority of Israel has been appointed to destruction. The importance of the remnant community as the eschatological guarantee of larger re-gathering is also seen in second reference to the messiah (11:1-12:1-3).

In the first description of the messiah, he is allocated no real duties. His *appearance*, however, is depicted as a pivotal event of eschatological importance, while the messiah's death signals the division of the present world from the one to come (7:29-30). That is, the messiah is an eschatological boundary marker between epochs. In the second reference to the messiah in 4 Ezra, he is identified as a much anticipated personage of the last days “whom the Most High has kept” (12:32).<sup>296</sup> The messianic figure is primarily portrayed as a warrior who defeats the (foreign) power (Rome) which has laid waste Jerusalem. This victory paves the way for Israel to emerge once more as the world power. The Davidic messiah is portrayed as a war-like deliverer of the *righteous remnant of Israel*. The remnant community function in terms

---

<sup>296</sup> Whether this keeping of the messiah implies a pre-existence of the messiah or simply his election is not clear, although the latter seems preferable in light of the overall picture of the messiah in 4 Ezra.

commensurate with the motif of Israel's re-gathering. That is, the survivors of Israel are presented as the eschatological people of Israel in the future restoration. In the eschatological war, unlike the previous one with Rome, the survivors of Israel, under the direction of the messiah, will miraculously emerge victorious. In a key passage, the messiah, and the remnant, and the saving efficacy of the Land come to the fore:

But he will deliver in mercy the remnant of my people, those who have been saved throughout my borders, and he will make them joyful until the end comes, the day of judgment, of which I spoke to you at the beginning (12:34).

Indeed, throughout most of 4 *Ezra* it is this remnant group of survivors which is central to defining who (true) Israel is and who will inherit the restoration promises of God, even though through much of the narrative, the small number of the population is decried as a reason for disappointment.<sup>297</sup>

In the sixth vision (13:1-58), however, the author underscores the relationship of the Jewish survivors to Israel's eschatological re-gathering and the wider event of her restoration. This account of Israel's restoration occurs in the sixth vision and marks the third description of the leader of Israel's restoration, the Davidic messiah. Throughout the narrative, the author has underscored the small Jewish population as being the true representatives of Israel; moreover, he has downplayed the significance of their small numbers as a measuring stick for God's faithfulness. However, in this final account of the restoration, the author correlates the Jewish remnant with a more comprehensive return of the Jewish population. Rather than interpreting a smaller group as Israel's re-gathered ones (e.g., *Damascus Document*; *Animal Apocalypse*; *Psalms of Solomon*; Luke-Acts) or interpreting the Diaspora as the eschatological returnees (Sirach; 2

---

<sup>297</sup> See Michael E. Stone, *Features of the Eschatology of IV Ezra* (HSS 35; Atlanta: Scholars, 1989), 103-5; 220.

Maccabees 1-2; Tobit), the author describes the return of the ten tribes<sup>298</sup> of the ancient northern kingdom whose return will fulfill the promise of Israel's re-gathering. In the interpretation (13:21-56) of a vision (13:1-13) which Ezra has seen of Israel's restoration, he is told:

(4 *Ezra* 13:39) And as for your seeing him (the messiah) gather to himself another multitude that was peaceable, (40) these are the ten tribes which were led away from their own land into captivity in the days of King Hoshea, whom Shalmaneser the king of Assyria led captive; he took them across the river, and they were taken into another land. (41) But they formed this plan for themselves, that they would leave the multitude of the nations and go to a more distant region, where mankind had never lived, (42) that there they might keep their statutes which they had not kept in their own land. (43) And they went in by the narrow passages of the Euphrates River. (44) For at that time the Most High performed signs for them, and stopped the channels of the river until they had passed over. (45) Through that region there was a long way to go, a journey of a year and a half; and that country is called Arzareth. (46) Then they dwelt there until the last times; and now, when they are about to come again, (47) the Most High will stop the channels of the river again, so that they may be able to pass over. Therefore you saw the multitude gathered together in peace. (48) But those who are left of your people, who are found within my holy borders, shall be saved. (49) Therefore, when he destroys the multitude of the nations that are gathered together, he will defend the people who remain. (50) And then he will show them very many wonders.

Only here in EJJ, as far we can determine, is the return of the *ten tribes* understood literally<sup>299</sup> and distinctly from the Diaspora Jews or other interpretation of the tribes. In 4 *Ezra*, they are presented as an esoteric and righteous population that God had hidden from the nations and preserved in righteousness. The ten tribes are given a

---

<sup>298</sup> For the exile of the northern kingdom of Israel and/or the ten (or nine and half) tribes, see 2 Kings 17:6; 18:11. Cf. 2 Bar 78-87; *Ascen. Isa.* 3:2

<sup>299</sup> As already noted, the book of Tobit takes the Assyrian exile as its literary setting, but does not seem to present these exiles as a real, much less esoteric, population in whom Israel's restoration is invested (in contrast to Judean counterparts in Babylon). In Tobit, the Assyrian exile simply represents the (eastern?) Diaspora. In 4 *Ezra*, it is noted, strikingly, that the ten tribes were unable to keep the Law and retain righteousness in the land of Israel (!), but did do so in this other locale (13:42). There are some similarities (as well as important distinctions) between the ten tribes of 4 *Ezra* and the Rechabites of the pseudopigraphical work, *The History of the Rechabites*. According to Jeremiah 35, in the period of imminent Babylonian destruction and exile (Jeremiah 35) because of Israel's sin, the Rechabites are credited with preserving righteousness and are given the promise of an eternal line of descendants (Jer 35:18-19). In *The History of the Rechabites*, the Rechabites are presented as living righteously as "earthly angels" on an island paradise which models the world to come:

(*HistRech* 11:1) And according to his will God assembled us on this island and did not scatter us upon the whole land; (2) but God placed us on this holy land. And we are without sins and evil and abominable thoughts (*OTP* 2.456).

The Rechabites function as model beings to which humans or Israelites ought to aspire in order to enter paradise. There is no re-gathering to Israel in this document as in 4 *Ezra*, however.



primary place in the conception of Israel's eschatological re-gathering. Unlike Tobit and perhaps, *2 Baruch*, where the Assyrian exile appears to be a cipher for "Diaspora," in *4 Ezra* the ten tribes are presented as a real, albeit esoteric, people, flourishing in isolation from the rest of the world. Several early Jewish writers are aware of a tradition which witnesses to a flourishing multitude across the Euphrates.<sup>300</sup> Not only are they mentioned in *4 Ezra*, but the author accords them primary place in the re-gathering. The ten tribes are initially distinguished from the combatant multitude (enemy nations) that the messiah gathers to destroy.<sup>301</sup> In contrast, the ten tribes are referred to as "peaceable" multitude (13:12), whom the messiah gathers to the land of Israel. Moreover, in contradistinction to the unlawful nations and most Israelites who have been killed or prevented from joining the restoration because of their sins, the ten tribes have lived righteously by the law in all their years of exile. In fact, the writer does not present them as being in exile at all. Unlike the biblical account of the deportation of the northern kingdom (e.g., *2 Kings* 17:21-28), according to *4 Ezra* very soon after their

---

<sup>300</sup> According to Josephus (*Ant.* 11.131-33), Ezra forwarded a copy of the letter-- which released the Jews to return to Jerusalem-- he had received from Xerxes to the Jews in Media. Some of these exiles returned with those in Babylon. Josephus writes: "But the Israelite nation as whole remained in the country (cf. *Ant.* 11.8). In this way has it come about that there are two tribes in Asia and Europe subject to the Romans, while until now there have been ten tribes beyond Euphrates--countless myriads whose number cannot be ascertained (μυρίαδες ἀπειροι καὶ ἀριθμῷ γνωσθῆναι)." However, nowhere does Josephus mention the return of the ten tribes, or their importance to Israel, in terms as found in *4 Ezra* (see also *Ant.* 10.183; 18.310). Charlesworth refers to a tradition contained in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century CE poet Commodian (*Carmen apologeticum* 941-46), which refers to the lost ten (nine-and-a-half) tribes of the Assyrian exile. Cf. as well the *Acts of St. Matthew*. Charlesworth opines that Commodian is drawing from a lost apocryphon that may have been known as *The Lost Tribes* or *The Story Concerning the Nine and a Half Tribes*. While the work by Commodian draws on early Jewish traditions, it has undergone Christian redaction. For instance, Christ descends to be with the nine-and-a-half tribes that are referred to as his elect. Similar to *4 Ezra* this group is invested with salvific value for all of Israel. Quoting Charlesworth's citation or paraphrase: "These true heavenly people fulfill the Law and are hidden beyond the river; they will return in order 'to rescue their captured mother'" (James H. Charlesworth, *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research with a Supplement* (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 7; Ann Arbor: Scholars Press, 1981), 147-49. See also James H. Charlesworth, "The Lost Tribes," in *ABD*, 4.372; A. S. Geyser, "Some Salient New Testament Passages on the Restoration of the Twelve Tribes of Israel," in J. Lambrecht (ed.), *L'Apocalypse johannique et l'Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament* (Leuven: University Press, 1980), 305-10. Cf. references to the ten tribes in *2 Baruch* and the *Testament of Moses* as well.

<sup>301</sup> *4 Ezra* 13:8-11; cf. 13:12-13; 13:31-39; cf. 13:39-50.

exile, the ten tribes escaped from their captors and migrated (in a manner reminiscent of the Mosaic exodus) to a land “where humankind had never lived” (13:41). This dwelling place is established as a parallel or alternative Land to the land of Israel itself. In fact, the land in which the group has been preserved is referred to as Arzareth, probably derived from עֲרֵץ אַחֲרֵת, “another Land.”<sup>302</sup>

Several features of the re-gathering tradition in *4 Ezra* are noteworthy. As in the case of *Psalms of Solomon* 17, a Davidic messiah<sup>303</sup> is credited with the re-gathering of Israel.<sup>304</sup> Perhaps, the most striking function in this account is his re-gathering of the ten lost tribes back into the land (13:40, 46-50). As in the fifth vision of the eagle (11:1-12:51), in *4 Ezra* 13-14:1-9, the messiah, depicted as a man from the sea, is portrayed as a warrior who first defeats the nations. The writer’s depiction of the messiah and his conquest of the nations is dependent upon Isaiah 11. The writer notes that the messiah uses no weaponry to defeat the enemy, but only “fire” from his “mouth” and “flaming breath” from his “lips” (13:9-10). In the interpretation, the Most High explains that the

---

<sup>302</sup> *4 Ezra* 13:45; cf. 7:26. See Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 405. Kraabel’s assessment of post-70 Diaspora literature may bear on the idea of an alternate holy Land. He observes that “after the destruction of the Temple, the vision of Judaism began to turn increasingly eastward, with the growing intellectual power of Jews in Babylonia” and the flourishing of rabbinic Judaism (A.T. Kraabel, “The Roman Diaspora: Six Questionable Assumptions,” *JJS* 32 (1982), 454 (445-64). Although *4 Ezra* would appear to be dated too early to have been influenced by the rabbinic school, the document may represent one of the early impulses to look away from Jerusalem to other communities of Jews for the future hope of Israel. In the absence of the Temple and the presence of a depleted people, the myth of an innumerable population provided hope for the survivors of Israel. As Kraabel observes in another article, in some cases the Diaspora contexts could become “Holy Lands too” (“Unity and Diversity among Diaspora Synagogues,” in Lee I. Irvine (ed.), *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity* [Philadelphia: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1987, 57-58 [49-59]]. In neither of these articles (above), however, does Kraabel comment directly on *4 Ezra*.

<sup>303</sup> Although the future figure is identified as “my Son” (13:32, 37, 52; 14:9), rather than as messiah, from *4 Ezra* 7:28-29 (above) it is clear from his description that the messiah and God’s son are one and the same (Charlesworth, “The Concept of the Messiah,” 205).

<sup>304</sup> In 1QSa (*Rule of the Congregation*) col. ii, the messiah is associated with the twelve tribes. After his entry, the leaders of the twelve tribes of Israel are sat before him (lines 14-15). Likewise, in the *War Scroll*, the messiah (Prince on the Congregation) leads the twelve tribes out to war. These Qumran texts do not relate directly to “re-gathering” per se, but demonstrate a close unity between the tribes and a ruling or warrior-like messiah.

messiah destroyed the nations with “the law” (13:39). His destruction of the nations occurs in conjunction with his gathering and reigning over Israel (13:37-38, 46-50).

The re-gathering of Israel by the messiah also seems to draw from Isaiah 11. For instance in the Isaianic text, the author refers to the return of Israel from Israel and a miraculous exodus and crossing of “the River” (11:11-16). While in many cases the re-gathering motif emphasizes the return of Israel from among the nations, this account says that the ten tribes had long ago segregated themselves from the nations as a means of maintaining righteousness and the keeping the law (13:41-2). Therefore the *multitude* of Israelites who live righteously in “Another land” is contrasted with those *few survivors* who have done so within the borders of the land of Israel (13:48-9; 12:34). Nonetheless, it is the land of Israel to which the tribes return and which functions as the site of the messianic kingdom.<sup>305</sup> They shall join themselves to the remnant of Israel to form the reconstituted people of Israel.

There are some important parallels between at least two of the features of Israel’s restoration according to *4 Ezra*. In the face of Jerusalem’s destruction, Ezra is told that two of the components of restoration are *already* present, but simply wait to be revealed. The destroyed city of Jerusalem is overshadowed by the eschatological city, which is described, in fact, as that which is “already established,” but hidden. Likewise, in light of the angel’s description of sinful Israelites and a dwindling remnant, Ezra is told that there is a multitude of righteous ones who have longed lived in a hidden land beyond the Euphrates.<sup>306</sup> Even the messiah is presented as someone “whom the Most High has kept until the end of days” (12:32), which might suggest his hidden presence as well. The existing presence of an exalted city and a righteous people in the time of

---

<sup>305</sup> Stone, *Features*, 102.

<sup>306</sup> Collins observes that this “legend offers only limited hope for the Jews with whom Ezra was acquainted” (*Apocalyptic Imagination*, 209).

devastation and sinfulness serves to underscore God's control and preservation of Israel in circumstances that strongly suggest otherwise. Israel's restoration is not understood to be a distant string of events disconnected from the present, *but rather the imminent appearing or uncovering of what is already present in Ezra's time.*<sup>307</sup>

In conclusion, the interpretation of the motif of re-gathering in 4 *Ezra* represents an important innovation in the understanding of Israel's eschatological return, but one which does not appear to have widespread support or attestation in Early Judaism. Nonetheless, the document witnesses to the ongoing vitality of Israel's exilic tradition of restoration after the fall of the second Temple. Against this historical context, the document represents a community in crisis who holds out hope that it may find God's mercy and once more be restored. This group of survivors does not interpret itself to be the re-gathered ones as such, but understands itself as the eschatological core around which a greater ingathering of Israel might take place. To fill out its numbers, however, the remnant group does not speak of the return of the Diaspora at large,<sup>308</sup> but rather the re-gathering of the real ten tribes, who have been supernaturally preserved in "Another Land." The hope placed in this esoteric population is perhaps an important tradition-link in the interpretation of Gentiles, in some Christian documents, as the re-gathered ones of Israel.<sup>309</sup> Indeed, the emphasis on these mysterious Jews outside the Land may have provided the basis for a later Christian interpretation of 'Israel's return,' attached to the

---

<sup>307</sup> Therefore, in regard to some aspects of Ezra's eschatology it is not entirely accurate to say that Ezra urges "us to think positively about what is to come, rather than what now is" (Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 209; also, see Willett, *Eschatology*, 72-77).

<sup>308</sup> The lack of reference to the ingathering of the Diaspora appears to be intentional in light of the author's emphasis on the divine preservation of the ten tribes, who despite being outside the Land, were neither among the nations either.

<sup>309</sup> E.g., Romans 9-11; James 1:1.

beginning of 4 Ezra,<sup>310</sup> which allocates the promises of the Jews to the consummate outsiders, i.e., Gentiles:

(4 Ezra 2:10) Thus says the Lord to Ezra: 'Tell my people [the Gentiles] that I will give them the kingdom of Jerusalem, which I was going to give to Israel. (11) Moreover, I will take back to myself their glory, and will give to these others the everlasting habitations, which I had prepared for Israel.

## 2.6 The Diaspora as Holy Land

Many Jews had made their presence known in foreign territories long before the outset of the Greco-Roman period.<sup>311</sup> In fact, more Jews lived outside Israel than within it in this period. How Jews responded or adapted to their Diaspora context(s) and foreign influences (i.e., Hellenism)—whether in the Land or among the nations—has often been a contentious issue in scholarship.<sup>312</sup> Nonetheless, Martin Hengel's seminal work, *Judaism and Hellenism*, long ago established the question was not whether Hellenism exercised an influence on Jews, but to what degree.<sup>313</sup> While several of the

---

<sup>310</sup> 4 Ezra 1-2.

<sup>311</sup> Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 19-81; Joseph Méléze-Modrzejewski, *The Jews of Egypt: From Rameses II to Emperor Hadrian* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995); idem, "How to be a Greek and Yet a Jew in Hellenistic Alexandria," in Shaye J. D. Cohen and Ernest S. Frerichs (eds.), *Diasporas in Antiquity* (BJS 288; Atlanta: Scholars, 1993), 65-91; "The Birth of a Diaspora: The Emergence of a Jewish Self-Definition in Ptolemaic Egypt in the Light of Onomastics," in Cohen and Frerichs (eds.) *Diasporas*, 93-127. A. Kasher, *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985. For the community of mercenaries at Elephantine also see A. E. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1923); B. Porten, *Archives from Elephantine: The Life of an Ancient Jewish Military Colony* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968); B. Porten and A. Yardeni, *Textbook of Ancient Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt* (3 vols.; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1986-92).

<sup>312</sup> Hengel decisively demonstrated that 'ebb and flow' of Hellenism continued to make its impact on Jews and Judaism even within the land of Palestine (*Judaism and Hellenism*).

<sup>313</sup> Based on criteria which he sets forth, Barclay assigns various categories or labels to Jewish authors to represent the level of assimilation the respective writer/writing reflects (*Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, esp. 82-102). Barclay, Kraabel, and other interpreters caution against speaking of a Diaspora at large. Barclay advocates, where possible, great specificity when referring to a Diaspora locale and its population. For instance, Barclay (*Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*) treats various Diaspora centers, such as Egypt, Cyrenaica, Syria, Asia, and Rome. However, insufficient evidence for some of the Diaspora populations impedes a full assessment. Therefore, where possible, we—in the present study—attempt to specify the geographical locale of the writing under analysis. Also see, e.g., A. T. Kraabel, "The Diaspora Synagogue," *ANRW* II 19.1 (1979) 477-510; idem, "Unity and Diversity

early Jewish documents in the present study, portray an adversarial stance toward the nations, other writings are much more accommodating toward Gentiles and life outside the Land. Several scholars, perhaps most notably, A. T. Kraabel, have argued convincingly against the prevailing view that most Jews in the Diaspora considered their existence to be oppressive, even a kind of exile.<sup>314</sup> Kraabel demonstrates that many Jews adapted very well to their foreign settings and did not live “anxious lives in a world which could never be their home.”<sup>315</sup>

Positive accounts of Jewish accommodation to their foreign settings and rulers are frequently found, and sometimes bear on the subject of Jewish eschatology and Israel’s restoration. In regard to the hope for Israel’s restoration, it is safe to say that for some Diaspora populations, after generations of comfortable assimilation into their host countries, a future return to the homeland was not a major issue in their thoughts or theology.<sup>316</sup> In fact, Kraabel suggests that “Exile theology”-- the idea that “displacement from the Homeland (the “Dispersion”) was a punishment from God,” which could only

---

among Diaspora Synagogues,” in Lee I. Levine (ed.), *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1987), 49-59; Cohen and Frerichs, *Diasporas*; Martin Goodman (ed.), *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998).

<sup>314</sup> For instance, Willem Cornelius van Unnik argues that Diaspora even constitutes a worse condition than exile since the former suggests an incoherent scattering and breakdown where all sense of identity is lost, whereas exile allows deported groups to maintain some sense of coherence and national identity (*Das Selbstverständnis der jüdischen Diaspora in der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit* [ed. By Pieter Willem van der Horst; AGJU 17; Leiden: Brill, 1993]).

<sup>315</sup> Kraabel, “The Roman Diaspora,” 449-50.

<sup>316</sup> Josephus notes many Jews from the Babylonian captivity chose to stay in the land of their deportation rather than join their compatriots in rebuilding their homeland. Apparently, some had fared quite well in their foreign abode according to Josephus, and “were unwilling to part with their possessions (κτῆματα)” (*Ant.* 11.8). Of course, Josephus is guided by his own interests as one himself who has benefited from living abroad. But the point is that not all Jews of the Greco-Roman period understood life in foreign lands negatively. Likewise, life in the Babylonian exile may not have been understood as imprisonment by all Jews (cf. Psalm 137). Too often in scholarship, both the exile in Babylon and the return under Persian are portrayed one dimensionally. For instance, see the entry on “Cyrus” by T. Cuyler Young in *ABD* (1.1232 [1231-2]) who compares the Babylonian policies of “ruthless destruction, the deportation of people, and the forced integration of the conquered” with Cyrus’ policy of “respect for locale cultures and traditions.” Cyrus’ policy of return was not motivated by generosity and respect alone, but originated out of a different political policy and strategy for dealing with conquered peoples.

be escaped by a return to Israel--gave way to "Diaspora theology."<sup>317</sup> By this Kraabel means:

These individuals did not understand themselves to be in exile, but rather welcomed and desired immigration as part of a *new*<sup>318</sup> situation that was also under the control of Providence. Just as the rabbis spiritualized the Temple and its cult, so the Diaspora Jews spiritualized the Homeland. Like many immigrants in more recent times, their transplanted religion allowed them to believe that their new homeland was not alien. They had made the main elements of Judaism portable: the Scriptures, the symbols, and the synagogue community itself. *The Diaspora was not Exile; in some sense it became Holy Land, too.*<sup>319</sup>

Kraabel's observation bears important implications for the re-gathering tradition. Although it is possible that this feature of restoration (i.e., Israel's future re-gathering) may have ceased to be meaningful in any literal sense for many Diaspora Jewish populations, Kraabel's statement suggests that it could also be reinterpreted and appropriated in creative and non-literal ways.<sup>320</sup>

### 2.6.1 Philo of Alexandria: Israel's Re-gathering as a Universal Pilgrimage

Philo of Alexander pens his ideas of restoration from the vantage point of a Jew who lived his entire life outside the land of Israel. As Barclay notes, however, Philo should *not* be understood as typical of Jews at large in the Diaspora, but of the elite quarter of "a Jewish philosophical tradition which was deeply engaged with Hellenistic

---

<sup>317</sup> Kraabel, "Unity and Diversity among Diaspora Synagogues," 57. Kraabel's remarks are drawn primarily from archaeological evidence, particularly that of synagogues in the Diaspora. He observes: "The Judaism of the synagogue communities of the Roman Diaspora is best understood, on the basis of the present evidence, as the grafting of a transformed biblical "exile" ideology onto a Greco-Roman form of social organization" (49).

<sup>318</sup> Kraabel's emphasis.

<sup>319</sup> Kraabel, "Unity and Diversity among Diaspora Synagogues," 57-58. The italics of this last sentence are mine.

<sup>320</sup> As already briefly noted earlier, Hayward has argued that the community at Leontopolis may have understood itself to be the re-gathered people of God who have restored "Israel" in their relocation and rebuilding *in the land of Egypt* (Hayward, "The Jewish Temple at Leontopolis," 429-43).

culture.”<sup>321</sup> More specifically, Philo stands within “the intellectual circles of Alexandrian Judaism.”<sup>322</sup>

Philo’s understanding of Israel’s restoration is a matter on which scholars remain sharply divided. Some interpreters have argued that, while Philo submits much of Judaism to his brand of philosophical discourse and allegorical interpretation, this Alexandrian Jew retains a literal or nationalistic understanding of restoration.<sup>323</sup> Other interpreters have contended that Philo’s understanding of restoration is not exempt from the wider philosophical (and allegorical) enterprise of the writer.<sup>324</sup> Some scholars have staked out mediating positions in which it is argued that while Philo retains a literal understanding of restoration, he subordinates it to a cosmic or spiritualized realization of the future that is to come.<sup>325</sup>

The study of Philo’s view of restoration is aided by some preliminary observations. At the outset, it should be noted that Philo devotes little attention to the subject of restoration in his writings. His lack of attention to this matter is noteworthy, especially given his numerous expositions on Scripture, where the subject of Israel’s

---

<sup>321</sup> Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 158. See his full discussion of Philo (158-80). Even when Philo, a Diaspora Jew himself, discusses the Jewish contribution to history, society and culture, he does so within a framework and discourse that belies a deep admiration for Hellenistic life (i.e., politics, history, philosophy) and the value of cosmopolitanism.

<sup>322</sup> Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 159.

<sup>323</sup> Erwin R. Goodenough, *The Politics of Philo Judaeus* (New Haven: Yale, 1938); idem, *Introduction to Philo Judaeus* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962), 52-74; Harry A. Wolfson, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam* (Rev. edit.; 2 vols; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968), 2.322-438, esp. 395-438; Peder Borgen, “‘There Shall Come Forth a Man’: Reflections on Messianic Ideas in Philo,” in James H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 341-61; James M. Scott, “Philo and the Restoration of Israel,” *SBL 1995 Seminar Papers*, 553-75; Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean*, esp. 170-80.

<sup>324</sup> For instance, see the studies of: Richard D. Hecht, “Philo and Messiah,” in Neusner and Green (eds.), *Messiahs*, 139-68; Ellen Birnbaum, *The Place of Judaism in Philo’s Thought*; Halpern Amaru, “Land Theology in Philo and Josephus,” in Lawrence A. Hoffmann (ed.), *The Land of Israel: Jewish Perspectives* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1986), 65-93.

<sup>325</sup> Ray Barraclough, “Philo’s Politics,” in *ANRW* 2.417-553 (esp. 476-86); Collins, *Between Athens*, 131-38.



future often emerges and opportunities for affirmation are present. When Philo encounters such texts of restoration, he employs a variety of strategies. In most cases, he simply passes over the subject entirely. In other cases, he re-writes the biblical account so that it takes on a different interpretation or meaning than a national restoration. Moreover, many opportunities for Philo to comment on the future of Israel/the Jews occur in his discussion of Roman politics. In most cases, Philo rarely takes up the language of restoration, much less the path of Jewish nationalism. Instead, Philo seeks to find reconciliation with Rome on the common ground of the universal ties of humanity (particularly the virtuous portion) and/or Jewish contribution to the wider world. As noted below, Philo argues fervently for Jewish loyalty toward Rome. In other cases, his treatment of Israel's restoration is complex and open to a variety of interpretations.

In our analysis below we argue that any study of Philo's understanding of Israel's future restoration must take into consideration: (1) the author's largely positive assessment of (Jews among) the nations; (2) the relatively positive view of the Roman empire and political leaders; (3) Philo's distinction between "Israel" and "Jews" (or "Hebrews"); (4) Philo's method of interpretation, particularly where it concerns Scripture and/or its ancestral heroes and sacred institutions.

In most cases, Philo describes the Diaspora in positive terms. He refers to the Jews as "the most populous of nations,"<sup>326</sup> overflowing the Land and *benefiting* those countries in which they dwell. Jews living in foreign lands are not captives or slaves who wait anxiously for their return. They are the offspring of ancient settlers, who now refer to their foreign abodes as their fatherland(s). In describing the recent persecution

---

<sup>326</sup> E.g., *Congr.* 3; *Spec.* 1.7.



of Jews in Alexander under the supervision of Flaccus,<sup>327</sup> Philo defends the Jews by referring to their longevity in and loyalty to their homelands outside Palestine. He writes:

For so populous are the Jews that no one country can hold them, and therefore they settle in very many of the most prosperous countries in Europe and Asia both in the islands and on the mainland, and while they hold the Holy City where stands the sacred Temple of the most high God to be their mother city, yet those which are theirs by inheritance from their fathers, grandfathers, and ancestors even farther back, are in each case accounted by them to be their fatherland in which they were born and reared, while to some of them they have come at the time of their foundation as immigrants (ἀποικίαν) to the satisfaction of the founders (*Flacc.* 45-46).<sup>328</sup>

In this account, Philo explains the original basis for Jews leaving Palestine as being due to over population. But their departure from the Land is not bemoaned. The land of Israel is simply understood as the original and revered site from which the Jewish emigration occurred. While Jerusalem continues to be esteemed and venerated as the ancient capital or motherland (μητρόπολις) and Jewish religious center, the countries of the various Diaspora populations are highly valued as well, even being referred to as the πατρίς, the fatherland or homeland.<sup>329</sup> In his characterization of the Jewish migration into the world, Philo never characterizes it as an “exile” and even rarely as a “Diaspora.”<sup>330</sup> Instead, in most instances, Philo refers to the Jews among the

---

<sup>327</sup> For an analysis of the crisis under Flaccus, the Roman prefect over Alexandria, see Barraclough, “Philo’s Politics,” 461-68.

<sup>328</sup> All translations of Philo are from the Loeb Classical Library unless otherwise noted.

<sup>329</sup> Therefore, unlike such writings as Tobit, 2 Maccabees, and Sirach, the Land is understood as the nostalgic place of Jewish origins, the holy place of their God, and as a symbolic locale (below), not the requisite dwelling place of Jews to which they are bound to return. Instead, Philo contends that Jews long ago spread out to foreign territories, which were subsequently adopted as their ancestral homes. Their long-term residence and loyalty to their foreign abodes is a testimony, according to Philo, of Jewish allegiance to Rome. Cf. *Legat.* 281-83 (below).

<sup>330</sup> Philo only refers to διασπορά two times (*Conf.* 197; *Praem.* 115). The verbal form only occurs sixteen times. As with the exile, Philo understands “Diaspora” in negative terms and does not apply it to Jews at large outside the Land. See the discussion below.

nations as the offspring of ancient immigrants who departed Jerusalem long ago to occupy the wider world.<sup>331</sup>

Moreover, Philo casts the ancient departure from the Land as an effort to *colonize* the world. Isaiah Gafni argues that Philo participates in the wider revision of Israel's exilic past, by many Jews of the Diaspora, to interpret their estrangement from Palestine in terms of colonization.<sup>332</sup> That is, many Diaspora Jews, in explaining their presence among the nations, traded the shame of their exilic past for the more glamorous history of colonizing the world. In offering this view of Jewish origins among the nations, Philo may draw on Hellenistic history and "the glorious adventure of Greek colonization that took place at the dawn of the city-state."<sup>333</sup> According to the author, Jews have their place of national origins, which is to be remembered fondly and venerated as the site of God. But the historical *departure* of the Jews from the mother land is a positive and noteworthy event as well.

---

<sup>331</sup> E.g., *Legat.* 281. Scott argues that Philo's view of the world, with Jerusalem as the center, reflects a Jewish cosmology. The basis for this view of the world is found in the table-of-nations tradition, whose origin is found in Genesis 10, but further elaborated in many early Jewish documents. Nonetheless, as Scott acknowledges, no direct references to Genesis 10 occur in the works of Philo ("Philo and the Restoration," 555, 558-59).

<sup>332</sup> Gafni notes the translation of the language and history of exile into that of colonization in the LXX and Josephus as well. In his interpretation of the Diaspora as "colonies," Philo follows the Septuagint's (i.e., his version of the Bible) presentation of Israel's exile as a kind of colonization (Isaiah M. Gafni, *Land Center and Diaspora: Jewish Constructs in Late Antiquity* [JSPSS 21; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997], 19-40). Also see Louis H. Feldman, "The Concept of Exile in Josephus," in Scott (ed.), *Exile*, 146 (145-72). Despite recognizing Philo's mostly positive description of the Diaspora and his rendering of it as a "colonies," Scott unconvincingly argues—largely on the basis of the exilic template found elsewhere in EJL—that Philo views the Jewish emigration as an exile or captivity ("Philo and the Restoration," esp. 562-75).

<sup>333</sup> Scott offers this perspective as an interpretive possibility for the Septuagint (and Philo), but ultimately rejects it. Instead, largely on the basis of external (literary) evidence, where the Diaspora is understood negatively as exile, Scott argues (unconvincingly) that Philo also understands the Jewish Diaspora as a captivity (James M. Scott, "Exile and the Self-Understanding of Diaspora Jews in the Greco-Roman Period," in Scott (ed.), *Exile*, 189 (173-218). But Philo knows very well the vocabulary of exile (e.g., *φυγή*) and is unencumbered in using it when speaking of this terrible fate when necessary. For instance, see his dramatic portrayal of the exile of Flaccus (*Flacc.* 159-60). More dramatically, see *Abr.* 64, where Philo declares that exile is a fate worse than death: "[I]n my opinion, it [exile] is not second to death, if truth gives its verdict, but rather a far heavier punishment, since death ends our troubles, but banishment (*φυγή*) is not the end but the beginning of other new misfortunes..."

The emphasis on Jewish colonization of the world also occurs in a purported letter of Herod Agrippa I written to the Emperor Gaius.<sup>334</sup> In this letter, Herod claims that the Jews are completely loyal toward Rome and Caesar (*Legat.* 280-81). Herod claims, according to Philo, that the Jews are ancient settlers in the Roman empire and that Jerusalem is, in fact, the “mother city” of a large portion of the occupied world:

As for the holy city, I must say what befits me to say. While she, as I have said, is my native city she is also the mother city not of one country Judaea but of most of the others in virtue of the colonies sent out at divers times to the neighboring lands lying far apart (*Legat.* 281).

Herod proceeds to name a plethora of foreign locales in both the western and eastern portions of the occupied world, in which, it is claimed, many Jews founded and staked out long term settlements (*Legat.* 281-84). Whereas in the passage above, Philo claims Jerusalem as the locale of Jewish origins (μητρόπολις), but the world as his homeland (πατρίς), Herod identifies the Land as both his motherland and fatherland. Moreover, Judea is the ancient colonizer of the world. Herod asserts to Emperor Gaius that Rome’s blessing of Jerusalem would yield benefits for “each region of the occupied world.”<sup>335</sup> That is, through the mouthpiece of Herod, Philo declares that if Rome shows goodwill toward the Jews, Emperor Gaius (i.e., Rome) will be praised and esteemed everywhere:

It well befits the magnitude of your great fortune that by benefiting one city you should benefit myriads of others also so that through every part of the world your glory should be celebrated and your praises mingled with thanksgiving resound (*Legat.* 284).

According to Philo, the Jews have long proven themselves in history as peaceful and virtuous citizens of the world. Therefore, Rome can rest assured that the Jews are not

---

<sup>334</sup> *Legat.* 276-329.

<sup>335</sup> *Legat.* 283-84. Scott refers to texts in the writings of Diodorus Siculus in which Egypt makes the propagandistic claim to be ancient colonizer of the world (“Philo and the Restoration,” 557).

only loyal subjects, but a benefit to their foreign contexts in the virtue and wisdom that many of them embody and bring to the wider world.

Thus, Philo very clearly makes the point that the origin of the Jews lies in the history of colonization, not exile. Exile is a completely negative circumstance or fate for Philo that he cannot accept as a description for himself and other Jews outside the Land. Exile is a shameful penal sentence meant for criminals, guilty or displaced people(s). Philo does not understand himself or the Jewish Diaspora in these terms. Philo makes this poignant characterization of exile in his description of the fall of Flaccus.<sup>336</sup> This governing agent of Rome is sentenced to exile,<sup>337</sup> a fate the ruler bemoans as worse than death.<sup>338</sup>

Ellen Birnbaum's monograph on *The Place of Judaism in Philo's Thought*<sup>339</sup> underscores the necessity of observing the distinct meanings of the respective terms "Israel" and "the Jews" (and "the Hebrews") in the writings of Philo. Birnbaum finds that "for Philo, 'Israel's relationship with God is linked to its ability to see Him, whereas the Jews' relationship with God is based upon their belief in Him and worship of Him through observance of the special laws.'"<sup>340</sup> Moreover, these terms, with a single exception,<sup>341</sup> do not occur together within the same writing.<sup>342</sup> She notes that Israel

---

<sup>336</sup> Goodenough, *Politics*, 11. While most of the political writings of Philo are pro-Roman in content and sentiment, there are limitations to this endorsement. As Goodenough observes, Philo's account of the conflict with Flaccus carries "a bold warning" to those who would act "unfavourably with God's chosen people." Those who oppose the Jews will incur the wrath of God.

<sup>337</sup> *Flacc.* 151.

<sup>338</sup> Philo claims that this deposed ruler over Alexandria eventually regrets his actions toward the Jews and even acknowledges the (power of the) Jewish God (*Flacc.* 169-75).

<sup>339</sup> *The Place of Judaism in Philo's Thought: Israel, Jews, and Proselytes* (SPhilo 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).

<sup>340</sup> Birnbaum, *Place of Judaism*, 35.

<sup>341</sup> See *Legat.* 1-7.

<sup>342</sup> Birnbaum, *Place of Judaism*, 44.

appears mostly in the exegetical and expository works of Philo on the Bible.<sup>343</sup> On the other hand, the author refers to the Jews and the Hebrews mostly in his political writings.<sup>344</sup>

Another important observation of Birnbaum in her perceptive study is the distinctive association and distribution of various “collectivities” associated respectively with Israel and the Jews.<sup>345</sup> Birnbaum observes that Israel is usually described as a γένος. While Philo occasionally uses this collectivity to refer to the Jews and the Hebrews as well, he most often refers to them with the collectivities λαός or ἔθνος, terms he never uses in relation to Israel.<sup>346</sup> Birnbaum’s observation regarding these distinctions (i.e., Israel, the Jews, and their respective collectivities) is important for the study of restoration. As demonstrated below, even while Philo holds on to *the restoration of ‘Israel’* (per his definition), he does not envision that event as being the exclusive heritage of *the Jews*.

As is well known, Philo defines Israel, though a (*faux*) etymology, as “the one who sees God.”<sup>347</sup> For example, in *On the Life of Abraham*, he writes:

---

<sup>343</sup> Birnbaum, *Place of Judaism*, 12-13; 221-22.

<sup>344</sup> E.g., *In Flaccum*; *De Legatione ad Gaium*.

<sup>345</sup> Birnbaum, *Place of Judaism*, 44. Also, see Nils A. Dahl, *Das Volk Gottes. Eine Untersuchung zum Kirchenbewusstsein des Urchristentums* (Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1941), 107-14. For a more recent, albeit brief survey and treatment, of the occurrences of Israel, Jew, and Hebrew in Philo and other ancient writings see Graham Harvey, *Uses of the Names Jew, Hebrew, and Israel: The True Israel in Ancient Jewish and Early Christian Literature* (Boston: Brill, 2001), (Jew) 43-46; (Hebrew) 121-23; (Israel) 219-24.

<sup>346</sup> Birnbaum, *Place of Judaism*, 44.

<sup>347</sup> *Spec.* 3.15; *QE* 2.38, 47. Similarly, cf. also references to those who simply “see” (*Opif.* 69-71; *Somn.* 1.64-67; 2.226-27).

Its high position is shewn by the name; for the nation is called in the Hebrew tongue Israel, which, being interpreted, is "He who sees God." Now, the sight of the eyes is the most excellent of all the senses, since by it alone we apprehend the most excellent of existing things, the sun and moon and the whole heaven and world; but the sight of the mind, the dominant element in the soul, surpasses all the other facilities of the mind, and this is wisdom which is the sight of the understanding. But he to whom it is given not only to apprehend by means of knowledge all else that nature has to shew, but also to see the Father and Maker of all, may rest assured that he is advanced to the crowning point of happiness; for nothing is higher than God, and whoso has stretched the eyesight of the soul to reach Him should pray that he may there abide and stand firm... (*Abr.* 57-58).

Philo develops Israel as a philosophical concept or term of identification that is associated with, but no longer understood solely in terms of, the Jew(s). Jacob Neusner correctly argues:

What makes an 'Israel' into 'Israel' for Philo is a set of essentially philosophical considerations, concerning adherence to or perception of God. In the philosophical system of Philo, 'Israel' constitutes a philosophical category, not a social entity in an everyday sense.<sup>348</sup>

Moreover, Philo even claims that such Gentile figures as Balaam could see God, and thus, be counted for membership within Israel.<sup>349</sup> Indeed, Philo's obvious reluctance to use "Israel" in combination with "Jew(s)," or even in the same writings, suggests that the author wishes to keep the two entities apart for the distinct purpose he intends. This purpose includes divesting Israel of strict ethnical associations and broadening its meaning into a term of universal and more profound significance.

However, since Philo takes most of his examples of representative figures of Israel from Jewish figures or ancestors from the Bible (LXX), and, moreover, Israel is a term of obvious importance for Jews and Judaism, this *may suggest* that Jews are *more likely* to attain unto the vision of God.<sup>350</sup> One of Philo's chief representatives of Israel is

---

<sup>348</sup> Jacob Neusner, *Judaism and Its Social Metaphors: Israel in the History of Jewish Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 221.

<sup>349</sup> C. T. R. Hayward, "Balaam's Prophecies as Interpreted by Philo and the Aramaic Targums of the Pentateuch," in P. J. Harland and C. T. R. Hayward (eds.), *New Heaven and New Earth*, 19-36.

<sup>350</sup> Sandmel observes that "Jews rise readily to the vision, and non-Jews only rise sporadically." As examples of people who exemplify this collective or universally attainable idea of Israel, Philo, nonetheless draws exemplar figures from Israel's ancestors (e.g., Moses and Abraham). See S. Sandmel, "Philo Judaeus: An Introduction to the Man, his Writings, and his Significance," in *ANRW* 21.3-46.

the Jewish high priest.<sup>351</sup> As C. T. R. Hayward notes, this figure is a particularly important figure for Philo's (re-)conception of Israel since the high priest so clearly navigates the dimension between earth and heaven.<sup>352</sup> Nonetheless, Philo never expressly limits the vision of God to Jews alone. Hayward correctly assesses the significance of Israel for Philo:

[T]he 'one who sees God' represents for Philo, an individual who has attained the highest measure of mental and spiritual discernment which is possible in this life, and who thereby is worthy to belong to the fellowship of the privileged society which Philo calls τὸ ὁρατικὸν γένος, 'the race, or class which is capable of seeing'.<sup>353</sup>

Hayward's study demonstrates that Israel, not the Jew(s), functions for Philo as a μεθόριος, "a boundary or border between things earthly and heavenly."<sup>354</sup> This characterization is used not only of Israel, but also of other entities that occupy this liminal or medial territory, such as the Logos,<sup>355</sup> (other) heavenly agents, and even the Jewish high priest (above).<sup>356</sup> Philo clearly understands the high priest as a representative figure for all peoples to be distinguishable from other priests of other religions. The high priest of Israel has a more universal purpose (i.e., he intercedes for the whole cosmos rather than particular peoples or nations). However, at other points Philo associates the high priest more closely with the Jews: "The Jewish nation is to the whole inhabited world what the priest is to the State."<sup>357</sup> With this distinction in mind (i.e., between Israel and the Jew), Philo's idea of re-gathering may be more carefully examined.

---

<sup>351</sup> E.g., *Ebr.* 84-87.

<sup>352</sup> "Philo, the Septuagint of Genesis 32:24-32 and the Name 'Israel': Fighting the Passions, Inspiration and the Vision of God," *JJS* 51 (2000), 226 (209-26).

<sup>353</sup> "Philo, the Septuagint of Genesis" 209.

<sup>354</sup> Hayward, "Philo, the Septuagint of Genesis," 214.

<sup>355</sup> E.g., *Her.* 205-06.

<sup>356</sup> *Somn.* 2.187-88; *Ebr.* 84-87.

<sup>357</sup> *Spec.* 2.163, 167.



In *De Praemiis et Poenis*, Philo explores and interprets the various instructions and predictions of Moses.<sup>358</sup> Philo's main interest is in elucidating the rewards and punishment for being obedient or disobedient to the words of Moses—as remembered and interpreted by Philo. On Moses' words regarding the hope for a post-exilic return to the Land, Philo writes:

For even though they dwell in the uttermost parts of the earth (ἐν ἔσχατιᾷ τῆς γῆς), in slavery to those who led them away captive, one signal as it were, one day will bring liberty to all. The conversion in a body to virtue will strike awe into their masters, who will set them free, ashamed to rule over men better than themselves. When they have gained this unexpected liberty, those who but now were scattered in Greece and the outside world over islands and continents will arise and post from every side with one impulse to the one appointed place, guided in their pilgrimage by a divine vision (ὄψις) and superhuman (θειοτέρας) unseen by others but manifest to them as they pass from exile to their home (*Praem.* 164-65).

A number of scholars have interpreted Philo in this passage as expressing the hope for a future national or physical re-gathering the Jews and a restoration of the land of Israel. For instance, James Scott notes that this passage describes “a very concrete, if fantastic, concept of the return.”<sup>359</sup> Moreover, Borgen remarks that the eschatological ideas of this document (*Praem.* 127-72) “support the view that the national and nationalistic motifs...were central to Philo himself.”<sup>360</sup> However, such interpretations of this passage do not properly adhere to the important terminological distinctions between (1) Israel and Jews (and their respective collectivities), (2) the wider literary context of this passage (*Praem.* 164-65), and (3) the carefully worded description of the re-gathering that is given by Philo.

---

<sup>358</sup> The latter portion of the book is based on Philo's reading/reinterpretation of the cursing and blessing of Deut 27:15-30:20. In his rewriting and reinterpretation of these, Philo's places special emphasis on their oracular quality (e.g., *Praem.* 1-2).

<sup>359</sup> Scott, “Philo and the Restoration,” 567. Although Scott refers to the study of Birnbaum (553, fn 3) and appears to recognize the necessity of distinguishing between Israel and the Jews in the writings of Philo, he often fails to do so in his analysis.

<sup>360</sup> Borgen, “There Shall Come Forth a Man,” 360.

In his interpretation of the re-gathering in these words of Moses, Philo never specifically associated this eschatological hope with “the Jews.” Instead, the words of Moses address the fate of all humans, i.e., “the good and bad” (*Praem.* 3). In these words of Moses, Philo finds the counsel of a political leader to “the citizens of his polity” (*Praem.* 4). Philo demonstrates the universal scope of his interpretation of the blessing and curses, early on this writing, in his presentation of Enoch. Enoch is presented as a figure from the Hebrew ancestors, but interpreted by Philo, based on the Greek translation of his name, ἄνθρωπος, as a person representative of all humankind. The appeal of Enoch, for Philo, is that this ancient human passes from earth to heaven, into the very presence of God. Therefore, the true human for Philo is one who, like Enoch, strives to attain unto the vision of God (*Praem.* 14). Just as Philo embraces *all humanity*, he presents God, not as a deity of the Jews, but as the *God of the whole world*.<sup>361</sup>

Moreover, although Philo does not mention the punishment of exile in his retelling of the Mosaic curses, he apparently recalls the curse of Israel’s dispersal in *Praem.* 115-16.<sup>362</sup> However, rather than referring to captivity among the nations or even the blessing of colonization, Philo concludes that Israel must depart from a condition that he refers to as διασποράς ψυχικῆς (“spiritual dispersal”). After departing from the spiritual dispersal, Philo underscores the goal of the returnees is, not the Land, but “wisdom” (*Praem.* 115). That is, the Land, the original goal of the

---

<sup>361</sup> While this theological claim would seem to favor Jews, Philo’s vision of the future is more universally conceived and optimistic in regard to the world responding to God. Indeed, in the context of discussing Deut 30:11-14, Philo defines a “great nation” as one “which has God to listen to its prayers inspired by true religion,” who “draw[s]” nigh when they call upon him with a clean conscience (*Praem.* 84).

<sup>362</sup> It is noteworthy, however, that in Philo’s discussion of the curses, he never refers to the most important of the Deuteronomic curses, the exile. As noted, Philo understands exile as a fate applied only to criminals, a description unfit for Israel, i.e., those who see God.

ancient promise and a key feature of the exilic model of restoration, is spiritualized as symbolic destination.<sup>363</sup> Rather than emphasizing the utopian dimensions and physical borders of the territory, as in some Jewish writings, Philo interprets the Land or its bounty as the virtues (or difficulties) one finds in the pilgrimage to perfection.<sup>364</sup> The physical aspects of the Land are subordinated, or even lost to, what Barclay calls the “territory of virtues.”<sup>365</sup>

Even if there is an element of literalism still retained in the re-gathering of the Land, this aspect is demoted in Philonic theology.<sup>366</sup> This point is made by Ray Barraclough, who recognizes in *Praem.* 169-71, the “most sustained description of the future restoration of Israel.” Yet Barraclough correctly concludes that the “distinct national hope” in Philo is “removed to another plane.”<sup>367</sup> That is, Philo plays with a number of metaphors in his elucidation of the Land, but he is *least interested* in its physical and geographical qualities. Any interest in the idea of a physical return serves his program of elaborating on the ongoing endeavor to acquire virtue and wisdom on

---

<sup>363</sup> Halpern Amaru points out the sometime contradictory view of the Land in Philo. On occasions, it signifies the mysterious and fearful unknown, “an adolescent stage wherein the soul tosses about in its pursuit of wisdom.” But in other accounts, such as *On Rewards and Punishments*, “the Land becomes a metaphor for the source of perfect wisdom and its associated virtues.” Halpern Amaru contends that Philo attempts to reconcile these opposing views of the Land within his elaboration on eschatology (“Land Theology in Philo and Josephus” in Lawrence A. Hoffmann (ed.), *The Land of Israel: Jewish Perspectives* [Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1986], 85 [65-93]).

<sup>364</sup> In addition to allegorizing Moses’ prediction of the exile and return, Philo emphasizes the allegorical or spiritual meaning of the Law in *Rewards and Punishments*. Although in some of Philo’s writings, he affirms the value of the literal observation of the commandments of the Law (e.g., *Migr.* 93), in *On Rewards and Punishments*, Philo usually resorts to his allegorical method of interpretation, stressing the more important spiritual value of the Torah. Thus, in this writing, the Law is understood as the guide or means by which a γένος may find its way to God. The various stipulations of the Law help cultivate the vision (e.g., *Praem.* 83-84; cf. Deut 4:5-7).

<sup>365</sup> Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 171.

<sup>366</sup> As Betsy Halpern Amaru argues, “Philo’s method involves more and less allegory, never the total absence of it” (“Land Theology,” 67). She also correctly notes that to describe something as “allegorical” is not explanatory in itself. It is “the nature and significance of that allegorization” of restoration, as with other components of Philo’s thought, that still must be assessed (68).

<sup>367</sup> Barraclough, “Philo’s Politics,” 480. He also adds that while Philo seems to hold the political and spiritual elements together, “in the wider compass of his writings the historical denouement is more on the fringe than at the centre of his interest.”

the journey to God. The physical return to the Land is merely an inferior analogy to a greater re-gathering. He writes:

[J]ust as God with a single call may easily gather together from the ends of the earth to any place that He wills the exiles dwelling in the "ends of the earth," so too the mind which has strayed everywhere in prolonged vagrancy, maltreated by pleasure and lust, the mistresses it honored so unduly, may well be brought back (*Praem.* 115-17).

That is, the scattered ones of Israel are interpreted by Philo to be the divided "mind" and goal of humanity which has so far failed, in the detour to various "vices," to converge on the single vision of God. In the eschatological future, however, Philo anticipates the reunion of the virtuous "mind(s)" to the Land, which metaphorically represents the goal of virtuous humanity. Similarly, for Philo the true "city of God" is not the Jerusalem that resides in Palestine, but the spiritual pilgrimage and abode found in the life of contemplation and peace (*Somn.* 2.250).<sup>368</sup>

Although Philo seems momentarily to turn his attention to those who are really displaced outside the homeland(s), albeit ethnically unspecified, even mentioning specific places (e.g., Greece), Philo uses the geography of Israel symbolically, to underscore the spiritual goal and union of those guided by "a supernatural vision" (*Praem.* 164-65). The ultimate goal is referred to as the one "appointed place." Furthermore, the people are characterized, not as Jews, but as ones who have experienced the "conversion to a body of virtue," no longer slaves to inferior peoples who presume to be their masters. As Halpern Amaru argues:

Philo "uses the 'ingathering of exiles' in order to express the ever-available opportunity for a return to wisdom and knowledge of God. The 'land' language seems to serve far more as a metaphor for that return than for a physical recovery of real estate."<sup>369</sup>

---

<sup>368</sup> Gafni, *Land, Center and Diaspora*, 29. While Gafni correctly assesses Philo's spiritualization of exile, he erroneously argues that Philo held on to a literal idea of Israel's re-gathering.

<sup>369</sup> Halpern Amaru, "Land Theology in Philo," 85. Similarly, Barraclough notes that "this seemingly distinct national hope is largely removed to another place by Philo, because the treatise ends by applying this promise [of restoration] to the promise of the budding of the soul to its full virtue" ("Philo's Politics," 480). Barraclough also refers to the viewpoint of Yehoshua Amir: "No doubt the popular source from which Philo drew identified the place of ingathering as the Holy Land, and the

After this description of the return to the holy place, Philo closes out his discussion by returning to his exposition on the soul and virtue (*Praem.* 171-72). Thus, Philo adopts the notions of the re-gathering of the Jews into his larger and more important discourse on the perfecting of virtue and wisdom and ultimate union with God. The climax is not the Land, but a climatic return of all virtuous people to God.

This re-centering of Jewish eschatology from the Land to a more spiritual quest and destination is also apparent in *Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres* (293). This writing contains a rare occurrence of “restoration” (ἀποκατάστασις) in the writings of Philo, occurring only twice in all of his writings.<sup>370</sup> Its appearance in this document and bearing on Philo’s idea of Israel’s restoration has often been overlooked by interpreters.

The document is devoted almost entirely to Gen 15:2-18, a biblical passage concerning the promise of God to Abraham. In the course of discussing this Genesis 15, Philo arrives at a section where Abraham is given notice of Israel’s future exile and return. The passage occurs in Gen 15:13-14:

(Gen 15:13) Then the LORD said to Abram, “Know of a surety that your descendants will be sojourners in a land that is not theirs, and will be slaves there, and they will be oppressed for four hundred years; (14) but I will bring judgment on the nation which they serve, and afterward they shall come out with great possessions (RSV).”

In his recitation and interpretation, Philo once more takes up the issue of Israel’s re-gathering to the Land:

These words are meant not only to state the date at which they should inhabit the holy land, but to bring before us the thought of the complete restoration of the soul. It (the restoration) may be said to come in the fourth generation (*Her.* 293).

---

obscuring of its territorial identity is part of Philo’s other-worldliness” (“The Messianic Idea in Hellenistic Judaism [English translation by Chanah Arnon of the Hebrew original, in Machanayan [CXIV; Shevat, 1970], 54-67).

<sup>370</sup> *Her.* 293. The term also occurs in *Decal.* 164, but is not related to Israel’s restoration.

The notion of exile or being outside the Land is understood as the transitional status of those who have begun the accumulation of virtue and wisdom as they walk the path to perfection and God. Philo understands the “fourth generation” in terms that are analogous to the migratory stages of the soul, spoken of elsewhere in his writings.<sup>371</sup> The Land is understood as the symbolic goal, whose features represent the various virtues and rewards, of the vision of and/or pilgrimage toward God.

Philo also revises the Abrahamic covenant in terms less associated with the Land and more in terms of the people and their path toward perfection. For instance, in *Who is the Heir?*, Philo substitutes for the covenant of the Land the “inheritance” of wisdom.<sup>372</sup> Gafni notes as well that in the call of Abraham, Philo places more emphasis on the aspect of the patriarch’s *departure and journey* rather than the biblical goal of the Land.<sup>373</sup> In explaining Genesis 15:18 and the covenant of the Land, Philo notes:

(*Her.* 313-14) What land does he mean, but that which was mentioned before to which he now refers, the land whose fruit is the sure and steadfast apprehension of the wisdom of God, by which through His dividing powers he separates all things and keeps untouched by evil those that are good, as it is meet they should be kept for those who are born to life imperishable.

That is, while Philo retains the term and importance of “covenant” in his writings, and may even use it in combination with Jews, the covenant is primarily with all virtuous people and the goal of the Land gives way to the vision of God and/or accumulation of wisdom.<sup>374</sup> Therefore, while it cannot be said definitively that Philo forfeits the idea of a real return to the Land, as Halpern-Amaru states “the allegorical treatment of the text...overwhelms the literal.”<sup>375</sup> The traditional Jewish symbols of the Land, covenant,

---

<sup>371</sup> E.g., *De Migratione Abrahami*; *De Abrahamo*.

<sup>372</sup> *Her.* 98.

<sup>373</sup> Gafni, *Land, Center and Diaspora*, 22; *Abr.* 63-64.

<sup>374</sup> Halpern Amaru, “Land Theology in Philo,” 85.

<sup>375</sup> Halpern Amaru, “Land Theology in Philo,” 87, fn 10.

and even the Jews are interpreted by Philo as typologies or inferior symbols of a superior, spiritual reality available for all humanity.

Thus, perhaps, in this view of restoration, Philo has found interpretation of Israel's promises that is compatible with present Roman domination. The climax of Israel's future restoration is devoid of nationalistic features and political antagonism. As E. P. Sanders concludes: "Philo's heart did not lie in the awaiting day of national revival, but in teaching men to follow the 'royal road.'"<sup>376</sup>

Philo's reinterpretation of re-gathering opens it to a more universal hope for all (virtuous) humanity. The Jews, because of their heritage and belief in God, may have some advantage in participating in the eschatological restoration, but Philo does not limit the restoration to them. That is, the tradition of Israel's restoration has been expanded to include the possibility of Gentiles participating as well. As Barclay observes: "[I]n Philonic allegory there is neither Jew nor Greek."<sup>377</sup> Therefore, while Philo preserves the Land as an ideal and the symbolic locus of Israel's eschatological re-gathering, the nations are holy lands as well. But the true return of Israel is not so much a physical re-gathering of Jews to physical lands, whether it be Rome or the land of Israel. Rather, Israel's re-gathering will come to fruition in the unified focus and pilgrimage of humanity toward God.

---

<sup>376</sup> Sanders, "The Covenant as a Soteriological Category and the Nature of Salvation in Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism," in Robert Hammerton-Kelley (ed.), *Jews, Greeks, and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 35.

<sup>377</sup> *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 171. Barclay observes the complex interplay between universalism and (Jewish) particularism in the writings of Philo. At points Barclay seems to suggest a priority on the universal aspects of Philo's thought (e.g., "Philo's philosophy always leads away from Jewish particularity" [172]), but his final assessment suggests Philo continued to be particularistic in much of his thought. He writes that Philo "ultimately turned that synthesis [of universalism and Jewish particularism] to the advantage and defense of the Jewish community" (180). However, Barclay's conclusion is unsatisfactory in that it fails to recognize Philo's deft interpretation of "Jew(s)" vis-à-vis "Israel." Moreover, and more important, Philo allows his Diaspora context (i.e., Alexandrian philosophy) to determine his understanding of Judaism, including matters of ultimate importance for Jews, such as the hope for Israel's restoration. Indeed, Philo's writings reveal the occasional limitations of the categories Barclay assigns to writers/writings to indicate the level of assimilation of Jews to foreign contexts and ideas.

In conclusion, it has been demonstrated that the motif of Israel's future re-gathering was open to diverse and complex interpretations. In some cases, the return of the Diaspora remained central to the hope for the future ingathering. While this aspect of Israel's return therefore retained a literal and physical view of the event, the theological dimension of captivity may carry over to those in the Land as well. As long as some Jews remained outside of Palestine, all the people of Israel existed in a kind of exile.

In other sources, the motif of re-gathering is used to describe the resolution of crises within the Land. Written against a claim of persecution and/or flight (i.e., to the wilderness), the motif of re-gathering is used to envisage one group of Jews rising to dominance over other Jewish enemies, and perhaps Gentiles as well. In some cases, an author may claim his or her group to be the true returnees from Babylon, denying the historic return as legitimate or omitting it from the historical record altogether. In some Jewish sources, especially apocalyptic writings, an author may claim Israel's true exile to result from evil heavenly powers. Therefore, divine intervention is mandated in the epoch of restoration. Given the frequency of such claims of exile and the pervasive influence of exilic theology in Early Judaism, the physical reality of these flights or exiles is often questionable, leaving open the possibility that Israel's eschatological re-gathering may be understood as an inter-Jewish affair that largely finds fulfillment within the Land.

In the case of *4 Ezra*, the hope for Israel re-gathering is understood to lie with the return of the long lost ten tribes of the northern kingdom. Although these tribes have lived outside the Land, they are not considered to the Diaspora Jews (i.e., Jews who have lived among the nations). Instead, the ten tribes have been secretly stored and kept righteous awaiting their return to and reunion with the remnant community in the Land.



Lastly, we have noted that Philo submits the motif of Israel's re-gathering to a largely symbolic level of interpretation. The goal of the physical Land is no longer of *ultimate* value; instead Philo envisages the eschatological pilgrimage of virtuous humanity on a course that concludes with a rendezvous and union with God.

### 3 The Defeat of Israel's Enemies

In this chapter, we explore the fate of Israel's enemies in the future restoration as attested in EJJ. Israel's understanding of the fate of her *adversaries*, in the period of Greco-Roman history, represents a broadening of an idea normally expressed in view of *the Gentiles* through much of biblical and Jewish history in the ancient period. Therefore, it is appropriate that we devote sustained attention to the destiny of the nations—Israel's ancient enemies—in our analysis of the exilic tradition of restoration. However, in a number of early Jewish texts, as demonstrated below, the circle of Israel's enemies is enlarged in the tradition of restoration to include not only Gentiles, but *Jewish rivals* and *evil heavenly powers* as well. Texts that represent these various interpretations of Israel's enemies are identified and presented in this chapter. Moreover, attention is also given to *the means* by which the defeat of Israel's enemies was expected to occur (i.e., through an Israelite army and/or through divine intervention). How a particular Jewish group envisioned its enemies to meet their 'end' has important implications on how that group may have identified itself and acted in the 'present.' Within our analysis of the future defeat of Israel's enemies, we also examine various early Jewish documents that describe a Davidic messiah—an eschatological agent that figures prominently in Luke-Acts—acting to bring about Israel's restoration. Lastly, we explore interpretations of the nations' defeat in which Israel endorses and adopts one Gentile power or king as its agent of restoration in the defeat of other nations considered to be enemies.

### 3.1 Introduction

In Otto Plöger's brief, but landmark study, *Theocracy and Eschatology*, he writes:

For it is only where the fate of the Gentile world is not dismissed as of no concern that the question of the future relationship of the theocracy [of Israel] to the Gentile world arises and opens the eyes to eschatological expectation, just as, *vice versa*, an eschatological viewpoint cannot disregard the question of the future destiny of the Gentiles.<sup>378</sup>

Plöger's study underscores the fundamental relationship of (late) biblical eschatology to the tradition(s) of Israel's restoration. When Israel envisioned her future, she could not do so without thinking of her enemies. For much of the history, when Israel thought of her adversaries, they were understood almost exclusively in terms of the Gentiles. As N. T. Wright succinctly observes: "[T]he fate of the nations was inexorably and irreversibly bound up with that of Israel."<sup>379</sup>

The destruction of Jerusalem, the Temple, and the exile of the people occurred at the hands of Babylon and left an indelible mark on Israel's memory of the ancient past and on Jewish hopes of the future. In the immediate aftermath of this 6<sup>th</sup> century catastrophe, Israel imagined her future return to sovereignty and the fate of the nations most often in terms of their defeat and/or subjugation.<sup>380</sup> However, as with all aspects of Israel's hopes of restoration, the place of the nations in Israel's future was subject to revision and reinterpretation after the historic return from captivity. Babylon's defeat, however, was not the result of Israel's rise to power, but the ascension and domination of another foreign empire (i.e., Persia) in the Ancient Near East. Ironically, Persia was

---

<sup>378</sup> *Theocracy and Eschatology* (Richmond: John Knox, 1968), 39-40. Plöger's study originally was published in German: *Theokratie und Eschatologie* (Neukirchen: Neukirchner Verlag, 1959). All references in the present study are to the English translation.

<sup>379</sup> Wright, *New Testament*, 268.

<sup>380</sup> See below.

understood as God's agent of Israel's restoration.<sup>381</sup> In the ensuing years of the Greco-Roman period, Jewish relationships with foreign powers continued to exercise a formative influence on the shaping of the ideas of restoration. Of particular importance became the issue of the Gentiles' role in that future event.

Israel's expectations of the nations in her restoration are indicative of the complexity of a long relationship with Gentiles in the Ancient and Hellenized Near East.<sup>382</sup> Numerous passages in the OT and EJJ present a cosmological outlook of the world whose occupants are divided in strict oppositional terms between "the nations" (גוֹיִם [MT]; ἔθνη [LXX])<sup>383</sup> and Israel.<sup>384</sup> Despite the complexity and often contrary

---

<sup>381</sup> As noted in the previous chapter and discussed further below, Israel's return under a Gentile regime empire exercised a great deal of influence on the tradition of restoration and resulted in significant revisions of it in some branches of Judaism.

<sup>382</sup> Norman K Gottwald, *All the Kingdoms of the Earth: Israelite Prophecy and International Relations in the Ancient Near East* (New York: Harper & Row, 1964); Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973); Menahem Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* (3 vols; Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1974-84); Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*; Duane L. Christensen, "Nations," in *ABD*, 4.1035-49; Louis H. Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993); Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*; Martin Goodman (ed.), *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998); Erich Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998); Collins, *Between Athens*; esp. 1-26; 261-72.

<sup>383</sup> Similarly, גוֹיִם/ἔθνη ("peoples") is used to identify the nations as well.

<sup>384</sup> Collins notes: "From an early time, this experience was generalized, so that psalmists and prophets could identify the enemies of Israel not just as Babylon or Syria, but as 'the nations.' The inherently antagonistic relations between Israel and the nations is reflected in Psalm 2, which Collins quotes: 'Why do the nations conspire and the peoples plot in vain? The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord and His anointed' (*Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 92). (Cf. Acts 4:25-27 where this psalm is used in reference to Herod and Pilate.) Morton Smith refers to the "pejorative" use of nations by Jews in the Greco-Roman period ("The Gentiles in Judaism: 125 BCE-CE 66," in Horbury, Davies, and Sturdy, [eds.], *CHJ*, vol. 3: *The Early Roman Period*, [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999], 192). The population of the ancient world was, according to most Jews, divided between "the Jewish people and the 'nations of the world'" or "the Jew and the idolater" (*EncJud* 7.410). Schiffman attempts to explain this negative characterization of the nations from the experience of Jews at the hands of Gentiles: "Throughout the ages, most Jews have in large measure defined themselves over against non-Jewish majorities. More often than not, those majorities have been hostile to Jews, thus compelling Jews to erect barriers in order to define themselves and maintain their group identity" (*Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 371, [371-84]). Racial and ethnic stereotypes were propagated against the Jews as well. For instance, see Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*; E. Gabba, "The Growth of Anti-Judaism or the Greek Attitude towards Jews," in Davies and Finkelstein (eds.), *CHJ* (2.614-56); John Collins, "Gentile Perceptions of Judaism," in *Between Athens*, 6-13; P. Schäfer, *Judeophobia* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997). Whereas the nations are

evidence<sup>385</sup> to adversarial relationships between Jews and Gentiles, the various expressions of both Israel's past (origins) and especially her future (destiny) most often depends upon a polemical view of the nations.<sup>386</sup>

Israel's *Heilsgeschichte* is formulated around claims of distinction from and privilege over the nations, evidenced most often in memories of past triumphs or visions of future victories over foreign powers and their gods.<sup>387</sup> According to the biblical writers, God chose Israel among the nations and has consistently delivered her from them. For instance, in the tradition of incomparability,<sup>388</sup> many writers reflect on the unique aspects of Israel and God in opposition to other nations and their gods.

---

generically condemned as sinful, idolatrous, or immoral, Jews are most often inveighed against for their lack of social engagement with Gentiles (i.e., Jewish misanthropy) or for the superstitious nature and strangeness of their religion (e.g., circumcision, the rejection of the cult of gods and the lack of visible representation of their own God [i.e., atheism]).

<sup>385</sup> It was only after the reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah in the Second Temple period that "a sharp distinction and a barrier of separation was erected between the Jew and the gentile" (*EncJud* 7.410). Thus, in the patriarchal and monarchal period, Abraham, the father of Israel, is portrayed himself to be a man of Ur, a Mesopotamian (a non-Jew; Gen 11:26-28). Joseph serves in the court of pharaoh and even takes an Egyptian for his wife (Gen 41:46-49). Likewise, Moses himself takes a Gentile (Midianite) wife. In 1 Kings 3-11 portrays Solomon to be a monarch whom the biblical writers celebrate for raising Israel's status among the nations. He marries the daughters of foreign kings, including the daughter of Pharaoh, king of Egypt (1 Kings 3); enlists foreign laborers and building materials for the Temple from Hiram king of Tyre (1 Kings 5); and is visited by foreign dignitaries (e.g., queen of Sheba) (1 Kings 10). Following the exile, some passages in OT documents (and non-biblical ones) from the Persian and Hellenistic periods cast relationships with the Gentiles favorably as well. The books of Ezra-Nehemiah, Esther, and Daniel 1-6 depict various Jews, despite occasional hardships, serving foreign kings either in their courts or accepting administrative appointments in the Land. Second Isaiah assigns the highest level of praise to the Persian king Cyrus (e.g., Isa 45:1) who restores Israel to the Land. The book of Jonah represents the view that nations might be spared God's judgment by repenting and acknowledging him. As discussed below, the attitude toward Gentiles varies widely in the period of Early Judaism by Jews of the Land and particularly by those of the Diaspora.

<sup>386</sup> Tessa Rajak argues: "For the Jews of the Second Temple period, the Greek-Jewish polarity was, in fact, a central part of the way they constructed their own identity. They needed to see the Greeks as different from themselves in particular aspects" ("The Location of Cultures in Second Temple Palestine: The Evidence of Josephus," in Richard Bauckham [ed.], *Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting* [vol. 4; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993], 8 [1-14]).

<sup>387</sup> E.g., the defeat of Pharaoh and the exodus from Egypt; the occupation of Canaan; the expansion and unification of the empire under David and Solomon. In the exilic and post-exilic periods, the past triumphs over the nations serve as precedents for the definitive victory in the future.

<sup>388</sup> E.g., Exodus 9:14; 15:11; 19:4-6; Deut 3:24; 4:34; 2 Sam 7:22-24; 1 Kings 8:23; Micah 7:18-20; Jer 10:1-16; Psalm 86:8; 35:10; 113:5. Only a few examples of the interpretive variations of this tradition are included here. As far as this study can determine, a full account of its tradition-history remains to be done. For a discussion of some important aspects of this tradition and its appearance in various biblical passages, see Walter Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997), 139-44.

Following the deliverance from Egypt, God is confessed as the Divine Warrior who unlike any other ANE god has conquered other nations to create a nation, i.e., Israel, for himself (e.g., Ex 15:11). In Deuteronomy, as Israel stands on the boundary of her Land, Moses reflects on the uniqueness of God in terms of the deity's redemption of the Jewish people. He asks, "Has any god ever attempted to go and take a nation (גוי) for himself from the midst of another nation (גוי)...?"<sup>389</sup> The same tradition, with a more balanced emphasis on the distinction of both God *and Israel*, is used to underscore the Davidic claim to the throne (2 Sam 7:23-34). After confessing God's distinct standing among other gods, David prays:

2 Sam 7:23) Who is like your people, like Israel? Is there another nation on earth whose God went to redeem it as a people, and to make a name for himself, doing great and awesome things for them, by driving out before his people nations and their gods? (24) And you established your people Israel for yourself to be your people forever; and you, O Lord, became their God (NRSV).

A few hundred years later the tradition of incomparability is picked up again in the *War Scroll*, a text found at Qumran.<sup>390</sup> The nations (and other enemies) provide the foil once more, but rather than finding Israel and God's peculiarity in terms of his redemption of Israel from the Gentiles, the author emphasizes Israel's exclusive claim to the (apocalyptic) knowledge of Torah and other heavenly secrets:

1QM x.8 Who is like you, God, in the hea[ven]s or on the earth...(9) and who (is) like your nation, Israel, whom you chose from among all the nations of the earth (10) a nation of holy ones of the covenant, learned in the law, wise in knowledge, [...] hearers of the glorious voice, seers of (11) the holy angels, with opened ears, hearing profound things?<sup>391</sup>

Therefore, for the writer of the *War Scroll*, the definitive event of salvation history no longer lies in the past defeat of the nations in Israel's exodus and with her origins, but in

---

<sup>389</sup> Deut 4:34.

<sup>390</sup> For further discussion of this passage, see the treatment of the *War Scroll* below.

<sup>391</sup> DSSSE, 131. In contrast, the nations and Jewish enemies are privy only to mundane knowledge from below and other false forms which stem from their alliance with the sons of darkness.

the present with her exclusive access to the mysteries of God. But among the secrets disclosed in the main body of the document is the *future* victory over all Israel's enemies, both earthly and heavenly.

### 3.2 E.P. Sanders' Assessment of the Fate of the Gentiles in EJJ

In his assessment of Israel's future hopes in the period of Second Temple Judaism, E. P. Sanders argues that "[t]here was a wide variety in views about what would happen to the Gentiles."<sup>392</sup> According to Sanders, Israel's ideas of the nations' destiny are complex and involve such different outcomes as destruction, subjugation, or conversion. His treatment of the nations is typical of a wide number of scholarly assessments of how Jews imagined their future with the Gentiles. The fate of the nations is often viewed solely in terms of final results (e.g., destruction, subjugation and/or salvation) without sufficient attention given to the complex of other ideas, emphases, and relationships in Israel's restoration.<sup>393</sup> Moreover, the scholarly presentation of these outcomes often conveys a simplistic and more balanced distribution of the various

---

<sup>392</sup> Sanders, *Judaism*, 295. For his discussion of Israel's future hopes, see 279-303 and his discussion of "The Gentiles" of *Jesus and Judaism* (Chapter Seven, 212-21).

<sup>393</sup> Sanders' discussion is driven by his over zealous critique of Joachim Jeremias (*Jesus' Promise to the Nations: The Franz Delitzsch Lectures for 1953* (Naperville, IL, 1958) and John Riches (*Jesus and the Transformation of Judaism* [New York: Seabury, 1982]), who argued erroneously that a major distinction between Jesus and his Jewish contemporaries was the former's more universal, loving view toward Gentiles. However, in his attempt to "undermine the uniformity and clarity of Jeremias' presentation" (215), which juxtaposed Jesus' positive understanding of the nations against that of his Jewish contemporaries (and post-biblical Judaism), Sanders himself errs, overstating the positive representations of Gentiles in texts of restoration. Sanders' own characterizations of the Gentiles' fate identifies their future in mostly negative terms: (1) "The wealth of the Gentiles will flow in Jerusalem;" (2) "The kings of the Gentiles will bow down, and the Gentile nations will serve Israel;" (3) Israel will be a light to the nations; her salvation will forth to the ends of the earth;" (4) "The Gentiles will be destroyed;" (5) "[P]redictions of vengeance and the defeat of the nations;" and (6) "Foreigners will survive but will not dwell with Israel." Based on these outcomes and the texts which Sanders cites, it is difficult to find much support for his conclusion that "the above lists also show that in post-biblical literature Jewish attitudes towards Gentiles are not all negative" (214-15). While this study affirms Sanders' argument that Jewish attitudes toward the Gentiles in the Greco-Roman period are complex, the complexity, especially regarding positive depictions of Gentiles in Israel's future, is not validated by the evidence that Sanders cites.

scenarios than actually exists. For instance, a serious deficiency of Sanders' treatment of the fate of the nations is his failure to note that every instance of Gentiles' salvation that he cites from EJJ also refers to the defeat (or subjugation) of the nations in the immediate or wider literary context of the respective passage.<sup>394</sup> While a number of early Jewish writings often mention the Gentiles' defeat without referring to their salvation, the converse is rarely true. The salvation of the Gentiles is almost never described outside a context that does not describe the defeat or subjugation of (some) foreign powers as well.<sup>395</sup>

Although Sanders correctly affirms the widespread evidence of positive relations between many Jews and Gentiles in the daily or present order of the Greco-

---

<sup>394</sup> Sanders, *Judaism*, 290-91, 295. While all of the primary texts from EJJ that he cites also refer to the expectation of the defeat of the nations', Sanders' presentation of the data leaves the impression that hopes for the nations' defeat and/or salvation were distinct occurrences, mutually exclusive from one another. Furthermore, since he cites an equal number of texts for each representation of Jewish expectations, Sanders gives the (false) impression that there was a balance between the various views. (In their assessments of writings that refer to both the defeat and salvation of the nations, it is not uncommon for scholars to consider the former scenario to lie outside the restoration-proper.) Sanders divides Israel's hope for the future into two primary blocks: negative (*Judaism*, 280-89) and positive hopes (*Judaism*, 289-303). However, in the positive texts Sanders lists, he confuses the presentation by including references to the negative hopes as well. By "negative hopes," Sanders primarily discusses Israel's hopes for the defeat of the nations. However, in his discussion of the positive aspects, he refers to Israel's re-gathering, the new Temple, and the defeat of the nations. Moreover, at one point in his discussion, he places texts representing the idea of a future war, which inevitably contain a more negative view of the nations' fate, outside the frame of restoration proper. However, later in his discussion of Israel's ideas of the future, he includes these Jewish passages (*Judaism*, 291-92). The consequence of placing the defeat of the nations outside the paradigm of restoration is that the proper interpretive context for understanding the Gentiles' salvation is lost. Thus, scenarios of the Gentiles' salvation, which sometimes follow a description of the nations' defeat, become isolated and may appear to be more positive (i.e., universal in orientation) than what they really are. Furthermore, even in cases where the salvation of the nations is described, this event is portrayed from a 'Judaic-centric' point of view. Usually, Israel's God is acknowledged; the Land and Temple are the locus and goal of the nations' pilgrimage; and the Jewish people are presented as the ethical and moral representatives for the Gentiles.

<sup>395</sup> The retention of the negative outcome of the Gentiles' fate alongside more positive claims in EJJ is critical and cannot be overlooked in examining the precise meaning and implications for the nations' salvation in both EJJ and its interpretation in such Christian writings as Luke-Acts. The partitioning off of texts of salvation from a literary context that also refers to the same or other nations being (first) defeated distorts the interpretation of the former, raising the question of accuracy and helpfulness in scholarly claims of a diversity in Judaism regarding Jews' ideas on the fate of Gentiles in their future. This more complex scenario of defeat and (then) salvation is certainly more positive than other documents that anticipate only the nations' destruction or subjugation. But since the more positive outcome, when it appears, almost always follows a prior claim of the nations' defeat, the characterization of "salvation" loses its primary interpretive context. The very notion of salvation must be carefully explored and weighed according its indebtedness to the motif of defeat and other aspects of restoration in a respective text.



Roman period, he is unable to demonstrate how these good interactions and experiences transferred into positive assessments of the Gentiles' ultimate fate in Israel's future restoration. He dismisses the importance of Josephus in assessing this issue on the grounds that the historian's loyalties toward Rome make him inherently untrustworthy on such a question. Likewise, Sanders considers the Qumran evidence (*en bloc*)<sup>396</sup> as atypical of early Jewish thought on the nations.<sup>397</sup> He contends that since the Qumran writings—as well as many other Jewish documents written in the Greco-Roman period—were penned in a period of foreign domination, they contain negative sentiments that would, otherwise, not be present. That is, Sanders contends these hostile contexts resulted in attitudes that do not adequately or genuinely reflect how Jews really thought about the Gentiles' fate. He questions “whether or not Jews who expected eschatological victory, could, during a time of actual subjugation, envisage the conversion of their oppressors.”<sup>398</sup> Therefore, Sanders searches for a Jewish voice on the Gentiles uncolored by the lens of Roman occupation or immune to the (perceived) hardships of some Jews living as a minority community among Gentiles. In his quest to uncover the latent presence of what —he supposes— must have lurked in the imagination of large numbers of Jews, Sanders struggles to find the corroborating

---

<sup>396</sup> Sanders does not properly specify which Qumran writings he has considered in making this evaluation.

<sup>397</sup> As one point of evidence for the atypical nature of the Qumran writings, and thus their unreliability in assessing mainstream Jewish thought, Sanders notes the scant references to the re-gathering of the Diaspora, “the most stable and consistent point in Jewish eschatological expectation” (Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 217). While Sanders allows for considerable diversity in the expression of Jewish ideas of Temple (i.e., new, heavenly, its embodiment in a community), he assigns rigid interpretations to other portions of Israel's tradition of restoration. As the previous chapter underscores, the return of the Diaspora is only one variation of the motif of re-gathering. Sanders fails to observe that the motif of Israel's re-gathering may be understood is a less than literal fulfillment (see Chapter Three of present study). Such reinterpretations of Israel's re-gathering, as already noted as well, do not rule out the prospect that an author might still anticipate a larger ingathering to the remnant community at some point in the future (1QM col.ii.2-3; 1QSa col.i). Thus, while the return of the Diaspora is important to the understanding of re-gathering, contrary to Sanders' claim, it does not provide the proper criterion to determine what is typical or atypical.

<sup>398</sup> Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 216.

evidence. Since Sanders dismisses the view of the nations' defeat attested in Second Temple Jewish writings as unrepresentative of Judaism, he is left with scant and questionable literary evidence from which to draw. He appeals to the documents of rabbinic Judaism penned, in the post-70 CE era, as a reliable witness to how Jews in the pre-70 Judaism would have thought—if conflicts with foreigners had not clouded the eschatological horizon.<sup>399</sup> Ironically, even while devaluing the witness of the majority of Jewish writings of the Greco-Roman period, Sanders promotes the atypical views and actions of a minority Jewish (Christian) sect, which sought to convert Gentiles, as representative of Early Judaism.<sup>400</sup> As Barclay writes, however, Paul was “[a]n anomalous Diaspora Jew.”<sup>401</sup> And despite Paul's frequent appeal to Jewish heritage and ideas to shape his theological program, Barclay argues “[t]he majority of his Gentile

---

<sup>399</sup> As is well known, Sanders has demonstrated quite convincingly that the dominant scholarly reconstruction of Judaism and Christianity perpetuated by many 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century interpreters anachronistically mirrored the Lutheranism (= Christianity [i.e., faith]) vis-à-vis Catholicism (= Judaism [i.e., works]) debate. Thus, in the study of the present topic, Sanders seems driven to prove that the scholarly assessment of Jews on the subject of the nations has been distorted by this same bias. However, in his quest to discover this misconception of the Jews in scholarly research, ironically Sanders himself skews the evidence to fit a typical Lutheran or “Christian” conception. That is, Sanders favors the “Christian” idea of conversion rather than what might be described as a “Jewish” idea of political liberation. Sanders assumes the former is a more desirable attitude and never questions why conversion of the oppressor should be construed more positively by interpreters than the thoughts of real liberation by an oppressed community. Therefore, Sanders implicitly subordinates political or national liberation (referring to such hopes as “misanthropic”) to spiritual redemption. Furthermore, he never questions whether missionary efforts themselves, just as more rebellious sentiments and activities, might constitute an accommodation to foreign oppression as well. That is, rather than imagining Jewish dominance over the nations, Jewish hopes for power may have been revised to underscore God's heavenly rule rather than Israel's. As we demonstrate below, conversion could be understood as a kind of subjugation. Indeed, Rome may have begun to understand the power of religious devotion in lieu of brute military strength. See N. T. Wright's essay on the expansion of the imperial cult (“Paul's Gospel and Caesar's Empire,” *CTI Reflections* 2 [1999], 42-65). Ultimately, both the hope for defeat and salvation arose out of the soil of foreign domination and/or occupation; neither represents the pristine, politically unaffected outlook of a Judaism uncolored by foreign domination.

<sup>400</sup> As the studies of Scot McKnight (*A Light among the Gentiles: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991]) and Martin Goodman (*Mission and Conversion: Proselytizing in the Religious History of the Roman Period* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1994]) have underscored, the systematic effort to convert other peoples to a different religion is largely without precedent in ancient pagan religions and non-Christian Jewish writings.

<sup>401</sup> Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 381. Also see Barclay's fuller discussion (381-95).

converts, and most subsequent readers of his letters, could see their distance from, not their common destiny with, Jews."<sup>402</sup>

Sanders' attempt to locate a more balanced assessment of the place of Gentiles in Jewish eschatology is to be commended, but is ultimately misguided and flawed in its conclusions. Sanders' redemption of many aspects of Early Judaism from a skewed history of interpretation has been accepted by the majority of scholars and is not disputed here. But his evaluation of the early Jewish evidence as containing a more complex, even positive, affirmation of the nations in Israel's eschatology is not supported by the evidence or arguments Sanders provides. While many Jews dealt with Gentiles in a positive manner in their daily interactions, this engagement did not often result in the manifest hope for the nations' positive participation in Israel's future. The preponderance of the eschatological evidence from EJL suggests a striking discontinuity between how Jews may have related to Gentiles on a daily basis as opposed to how Jews thought about the participation of the nations in Israel's future restoration.<sup>403</sup> Moreover, foreign occupation and subjugation was the soil from which Jewish ideas of the fate of the nations arose, and when Jews thought of the place of Gentiles in the future world, they envisioned most often their defeat.

Nonetheless, the present chapter underscores the complexity of the motif of the nations' fate and even identifies various positive renderings of the Gentiles' fate, but not

---

<sup>402</sup> See Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 395.

<sup>403</sup> The low number of texts envisioning a positive role for the nations, completely absent of any negative sentiment or notions of subjugation, may be due in part to the fact that Israel's eschatology is expressed most often in texts of restoration, where antipathy toward the enemy is to be expected. Therefore, it is plausible that those who enjoyed positive relations with the nations on a daily basis were less likely to envision ideas of restoration to begin with. This study does not dispute the well-documented fact that many Jews thought positively of Gentiles and interacted with them on many positive and complex levels, both in the Land and in the Diaspora. But against Sanders and others, the evidence does not support the contention that these affirming ideas automatically transferred into positive Jewish ideas of the nations in Israel's future. In the attempt to protect Judaism from charges of misanthropy to Gentiles, especially in comparison with Christianity, Sanders inadvertently misconstrues the evidence himself.

as Sanders has construed them.<sup>404</sup> The more positive portrayals of the nations usually involves Jews honing down their level of antipathy toward the nations and/or selectively identifying some Gentiles as enemies and destined for defeat, while ignoring other nations. In other cases, surviving nations are granted the privilege of submitting to the Jews and their God. More surprising, although less frequently attested, are those texts in which Israel endorses a Gentile power or king to defeat other foreign empires and oversee Israel's future restoration.

### 3.2.1 The Defeat of the Nations as the Dominant Fate: Issues and Questions

Therefore, this study of the fate of Israel's enemies examines the most common version of this motif at the center of many early Jewish texts of restoration, i.e., *the defeat* of the nations and other enemies.<sup>405</sup> This expectation, however, is far from simplistic or predictable in its appearance in EJJ. The various representative texts (below) of how Israel imagined the fate of her enemies demonstrate considerable complexity and diversity in terms of this motif's complex of features, relationships, and interpretations. The various expressions of the enemies' defeat extend beyond possible outcomes of defeat, salvation, subjugation, or conversion. A number of questions might

---

<sup>404</sup> See the discussion of the *Sibylline Oracles* (Book Three) later in this chapter.

<sup>405</sup> It is not uncommon to find Israel's hope of the future couched entirely in the negative (e.g., Dan 7:26-27; *T. Sim* 6:2-4), specifying only the expectation of the defeat of Israel's enemies or the elimination of (the) unrighteous(ness). The hope for the elimination of the enemy or enemies may be founded on the OT idea of the Day of the Lord (e.g., Isa 13:6, 9; Joel 1:15; 2:1; Zeph 1:14) in which the judgment of God on Israel's adversaries is implied to be a day of reversal of Israel's misfortunes. Admittedly, it is difficult to characterize these negative expressions as accounts of "restoration," since what is positively restored is not articulated--although it can sometimes be inferred from wider literary context. These terse and singular expressions of hope for the Gentiles' defeat demonstrate the core value attached to this motif, and precisely why the negative aspect of the nations' fate should not be separated from the more positive aspects of Israel's restoration. In eliminating this component, the essence of Israel's restoration—her rise above the nations and the ability to live in peace—is often lost. Furthermore, the very basis and catalyst for the more positive aspects of restoration (i.e., the re-gathering, the rebuilding of the Temple, and the salvation of the nations) leaves these without an important interpretive key.

be asked of how Israel adapted the motif of the Gentiles' defeat. First, how was the defeat of the Gentiles expected to occur (e.g., a Jewish war against the nations; divine intervention; the arrival of a Davidic messiah; the intervention of a foreign king on Jews' behalf)?<sup>406</sup> Second, who exactly is the enemy to be defeated (i.e., all the nations; those who occupy or border her territories; or one particular enemy)?<sup>407</sup> Similarly, how is Israel's understanding of the defeat of the Gentiles revised to name other enemies or forces of opposition (e.g., bad Jews, heavenly agents, or abstraction like wickedness and evil)? Third, how does the defeat of the nations relate to geography and territorial aims (i.e., the retaking of the Land; sovereignty over the world; relationship of heaven to earth)? Fourth, how does the defeat of the nations relate to more positive portrayals (i.e., salvation) of the Gentiles? Fifth, how does the nations' defeat relate to other aspects of Israel's restoration and to the wider eschatological goals of the respective writing?<sup>408</sup> As

---

<sup>406</sup> One of the most important issues in the defeat of the nations was the question of how this might be achieved. Some texts of restoration allocate the prerogative of intervention to God or his heavenly agents alone. In other cases, an end-time war is anticipated in which the people of Israel would join with God in the triumph over the nations. Such distinctions perhaps affect how Jews would have perceived their role, relations and ways of organizing themselves around Gentiles in day to day life preceding the age of restoration.

<sup>407</sup> What this study has generally characterized as the defeat of the nations is often more nuanced and specific. Many early Jewish writings demonstrate Israel's ability to discriminate between the nations, often affirming one foreign power in her future, while damning another or even resorting to a stock condemnation of the nations at large.

<sup>408</sup> The early Jewish writings in this chapter are not systematically submitted to each of these questions. Nor do these questions alone guide the analysis. Rather, they are heuristically posed here to indicate the range of complexities and issues to which the defeat of the nations is bound. For instance, in writings an author may adopt a different tradition of restoration that may be characterized as utopian or envisioning a new creation. Such expectations are exceedingly complex and may very well conceal other realities related to Israel's restoration. For instance, in texts in which a new creation occurs, the new order is usually not a neutral conception of humanity, but often depends on Jewish: history (i.e., Genesis 1-2); religious devotion (to the Israelite God) and practices (e.g., purity, priority of Torah). That is, the "new" humanity often looks very Jewish. Moreover, some scholars have argued that ideas of new creation of heaven and earth should not be too quickly divorced from those whose focus is more on the Land and Temple. A number of early Jewish texts suggests that images of creation and paradise were often used metaphorically or symbolically to speak of the Temple or Jerusalem, the center or navel of the earth and/or the climax of creation (e.g., Sirach 24; *I Enoch* 25). Other writings may find the solution to the problem of the nations in a heavenly escape from them. For other writers, Israel's restoration and future encounter with the nations is retained, but is shown to be an incremental (and subordinate) step to a more comprehensive restoration or "afterlife." In regard to the latter, expectations of immortality, resurrection or heavenly exaltation may altogether displace Israel's hopes for restoration, including the idea of altering her relationship with the nations.

these questions imply, the defeat of the nations involves a number of features that cannot be easily synthesized. Moreover, the ideas of the future often bear directly on the present world of the community or writer in question. That is, a community's eschatology may influence the way Jews organized themselves socially, politically, and religiously in the present world.

In the examination of the motif of defeat, a number of early Jewish writings are analyzed that represent the complexity of Jewish hopes regarding the nations' defeat and/or subjugation. In particular, the *War Scroll* is given sustained treatment since it represents the most elaborate and detailed account of Israel's eschatological triumph. But the *War Scroll* is *not* presented in this study as being representative of all Jewish views on the future defeat of the nations. Moreover, 1QM is not understood in this thesis to be the climax of a single and linear line of development of Jewish ideas on the subject. Indeed, in many respects, the *War Scroll* is quite atypical of other accounts in its hyper detailed description of the conflict, the role of human participants, and the emphasis on the liturgical and cultic character of the final military campaign. Despite these anomalies, the document's intensive attention to various features of the eschatological war involves a wide array of motifs and ideas found elsewhere, either in isolation or in various combinations, in EJJ. Therefore, the motif of the fate of the nations in 1QM provides a convenient point of departure for this motif in other early Jewish accounts although this document does not determine the full inventory of topics and questions to be discussed.

This chapter also offers a detailed assessment of the portrayal of the Davidic messiah in EJJ. While the Davidic messiah does not appear in most accounts of Israel's restoration and triumph over the nations, where he does appear in particular writings, he is almost always shown to be inextricably involved in the defeat of Israel's enemies.

Moreover, since a Davidic messiah is central to the story of Luke-Acts,<sup>409</sup> a Christian writing examined in Chapter 4, the analysis of the messiah in EJL will provide the basis for assessing Luke's reliance on and/or revisions of early Jewish messianic ideas.

### 3.3 The Historic Restoration and Israel's Ongoing Subjugation

In 587 BCE, Israel's worst fears were realized. Despite the covenantal promises of David and the divine protection of the Land that the Temple had been thought to guarantee, the hated enemy of Babylon invaded and destroyed Jerusalem and the sacred dwelling of her God. More scandalous was the claim that Babylon was the instrument of divine punishment against Israel. From the catastrophe, Israel's various visions of restoration were first formulated.

In the exile, Israel continued to consider the fate of the nations in respect to her present dilemma. Many passages in the OT indicate that Jews expected their return to the Land to coincide with the defeat of the nations.<sup>410</sup> For instance, in Isaiah 11:11-16, God gathers Israel to defeat the enemy nations<sup>411</sup> and even divides a passage of water as she returns to the Land. Jeremiah prophesied that Israel's seventy years of exile would conclude with the defeat of Babylon.<sup>412</sup> According to Ezekiel, God would initiate Israel's restoration with the defeat of a number of Gentile powers (25-32; 35-36). The

---

<sup>409</sup> See Chapter Four.

<sup>410</sup> In some cases, the defeat of the nations is envisioned to be a prior event to the return of Israel; in other accounts, the triumph over the Gentiles is a secondary occurrence.

<sup>411</sup> On arguments for the dating of this passage and whether the various nations and events correspond with the Assyrian period or are figurative types used by a later post-exilic author; see T. A. Boogaart, *Reflections on Restoration: A Study of Prophecies in Micah and Isaiah about the Restoration of Northern Israel* (Groningen: Rijksuniversiteit te Groningen, 1981), 119-38.

<sup>412</sup> Jeremiah 25:11-14; cf. 29:10.

war climaxes with the defeat of Gog from the land of Magog (38-39),<sup>413</sup> a symbolic reference to the nations of the world.<sup>414</sup> As Ralph Klein notes, "The destruction of the nations is the beginning of Israel's salvation. No longer will the nations hurt Israel."<sup>415</sup> Israel's victory over the Gentiles paves the way for a comprehensive re-gathering of the twelve tribes around a new and expansive Temple (39:25-29; 40-48). In other texts, the writer expects the complete subjection of the nations, represented in their pilgrimage to the Land to honor the Jewish people and their God:

Micah 4:1 In days to come the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established as the highest of the mountains, and shall be raised up above the hills. Peoples shall stream to it, (2) and many nations shall come and say: "Come, let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob; that he may teach us his ways and that we may walk in his paths." For out of Zion shall go forth instruction, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem.<sup>416</sup>

These texts and many others from the OT indicate that the biblical writers could not articulate a vision of restoration without imagining the defeat or subjugation of the nations.<sup>417</sup>

---

<sup>413</sup> While it is common to treat only Ezekiel 40-48 as Israel's plan of restoration (e.g., Jon D. Levenson (*Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40-48* [Harvard Semitic Monograph Series 10; Missoula, Montana: Scholars, 1976]), the defeat of the nations, especially over Gog and Magog, cannot be separated from the larger drama of salvation. Levenson argues that Ezekiel's focus on the cult and God is part of a more comprehensive effort to de-politicize and de-nationalize ideas of the restored kingdom (111, 129, 161-63). In his words it is "a kingdom without politics" (111). Levenson is able to reach this conclusion, however, by excluding the defeat of the nations from his analysis of Israel's restoration. Of course, war over one's enemies is filled with nationalistic implications. Moreover, the vast expansion of territorial boundaries of the twelve tribes (Israel) constitutes a theological *and political* concern for Land since territory cannot be so easily divorced from politics and nationalism. Levenson is correct, however, that after this stage (e.g., the eradication of the nations) of the restoration, Israel is focused on the cult and not on politics *per se*.

<sup>414</sup> The defeat of Gog from the land of Magog apparently has no historical correspondence in the period of Ezekiel. The author draws symbolically on Gog from the table of nations (Genesis 10). Other ancient Gentile powers from the table of nations are named in Ezekiel as well (e.g., Meshach, Tubal, Cush, Put, Gomer, Togarmah, and Tarshish [Ezekiel 37-38]) to represent the nations *en bloc* over whom God will give Israel a comprehensive victory (Scott, *Paul and the Nations*, 10-11).

<sup>415</sup> *Israel in Exile*, 81.

<sup>416</sup> For OT references to the pilgrimage of the nations, see Joachim Jeremias, *Jesus' Promise*, 55-62. For the appropriateness of this expectation in EJJ, see Terence L. Donaldson, "Proselytes or 'Righteous Gentiles'? The Status of Gentiles in Eschatological Pilgrimage Patterns of Thought," *JSP* 7 (1990), 3-27. Also see T. A. Boogaart, *Reflections on Restoration*. Cf. Isa 2:2-3.

<sup>417</sup> A number of foreign enemies are designated for destruction, e.g., Isa 10:12; 11; 13-23; 24-27; 30:27-33; 34-35; 60:12; 66; Joel 2:18-20; 3; Zech 9; 10; 12:1-9; 14; Mic 4:13; 5:5-9; Obadiah 15-21; Mal



Despite the various prophecies and expectations, however, Israel's re-gathering to the Land was neither precipitated by nor did it result in the imminent defeat of the nations. Instead, by permission of and in submission to Persia, another foreign power, Israel<sup>418</sup> returned to the Land. Israel's repatriation under a foreign power, despite exilic prophecies and hopes that promised otherwise, exercised a tremendous influence on her conception of restoration and understanding of the nations. There is some evidence in Haggai and Zechariah (1-8) that some Jews understood the restoration under a foreign regime for the limited event that it was. Until the Temple was fully completed and Israel governed over the nations,<sup>419</sup> some Jews within Israel continued to hope for a definitive epoch of liberation.

---

4:1-6; Jeremiah 46-51; Ezekiel 25-32; 35-36; 38-39; Psalm 137. For a discussion of God's judgment on the nations, as reflected in these passages and others, see Claus Westermann, *Prophetic Oracles of Salvation in the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991); Ackroyd, *Exile and Restoration*, 218-28. Using a rigid application of form-criticism, Westermann assigns the hope for the destruction of the nations to a small window of time and texts, whereas the hope for salvation knows no such limitations: "Oracles of judgment are limited to one part of the history of Israel, but the oracles of salvation are found throughout that history" (13; also 195-223). However, Westermann is able to maintain this thesis by treating evidence (those texts which combine the element of judgment with salvation) that challenges his thesis as "glosses" or late interpolations (e.g., 203-04). More troubling is the indication that some of his conclusions have been reached by erroneous presumptions that draw from a particular Christian reading that understands Judaism's climax in Christianity. For instance, Westermann assumes that judgment and salvation as respective fate(s) for the nations are mutually exclusive from one another. Moreover, he argues that the desire for revenge or judgment on the nations stems from an early period of Israel's history that has given way in time to a less violent and more universal mode of salvation. Westermann understands the climax of salvation to be the arrival of Jesus himself (223). Westermann contends that texts that depict salvation in terms of the eradication of an enemy reveal that some within have not come to terms with Israel's own sin and responsibility for the destruction of Jerusalem. As such, these texts that combine salvation and judgment originate from "nationalistic and militaristic circles" and are not really prophetic, but imitations of prophecy. Indeed, Westermann associates these writers with "false prophets" (222).

<sup>418</sup> That many Jews could accept foreign rule in a positive way is affirmed by those who acknowledged Persia as the instrument of Israel's restoration. Moreover, the fact that many Jews chose to stay in their foreign abodes suggests that the opportunity to return did not always meet with an automatic departure for the Land. Other factors came into play as well.

<sup>419</sup> But even these hopes might need to be carefully assessed, for much of the criticism and prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah are aimed at internal issues (and other Jews). And while the prophets foresee judgment against the nations, ironically, the oracles are "dated" according to Persian rulers, who themselves are nowhere specifically criticized in the two books.

Overall, however, the biblical record is almost mute in its dissatisfaction with the restoration under Cyrus. There is no explicit criticism of him<sup>420</sup> and only marginal negativity directed towards Persia in the OT.<sup>421</sup> Indeed, as noted in the previous chapter, Cyrus and other Persian kings are associated with the return and restoration in an overwhelmingly positive way.<sup>422</sup> Attributes formerly associated with Israel's kings, particularly the Davidic lineage, are transferred to Cyrus in the writings of Second Isaiah.<sup>423</sup> This author refers to him as the "shepherd" of Yahweh (44:28) and even "his anointed" (45:1). Therefore, despite being under foreign domination, Israel's return to Jerusalem is carried out with much Jewish approval and even rejoicing. The biblical writers claim that God has appointed Persia<sup>424</sup> to oversee Israel's restoration and to rule over the world. Consequently, the biblical view of the second Temple restoration indicates a radical shift in theological perspective. Not only may a foreign power be the instrument of Yahweh's punishment of his own nation, but a Gentile ruler may be the agent of his "restoration" as well.

---

<sup>420</sup> Although not a criticism as such, it is striking that in Daniel's three references to Cyrus (1:21; 6:28; 10:1), the author never mentions the return from exile (cf. 9:35; 10:13, 20; 11:2). However, the author's description of the 6<sup>th</sup> century return and restoration clearly subordinates it to a future restoration (9:24-27). The low evaluation of the second Temple (restoration) is present in Daniel (chaps. 7-12), but stems from events in ca 160s BCE under the Seleucids.

<sup>421</sup> Davies observes that while the Hebrew Bible is filled with criticism and oracles directed toward the nations and their gods there is a dearth of polemics regarding Persia, her kings, and the god Mazda (Philip R. Davies, "The Biblical and Qumranic Concept of War," in James H. Charlesworth, *The Hebrew Bible and Qumran* [ed.], [N. Richland Hills, TX: BIBAL Press, 2000], 289, fn 5).

<sup>422</sup> E.g., 2 Chr 36:22-3; Ezra 1-2; 5:13-17; 6:3, 14; Isa 44:28; 45:1.

<sup>423</sup> This has led some scholars to conclude that the writers known as Second Isaiah has accepted Cyrus as the legitimate heir to the Davidic promises.

<sup>424</sup> According to Isa 45:4, Cyrus is not aware that he is the servant of Yahweh; cf. elsewhere where OT writers claim that Cyrus has credited Yahweh with the expansion of his kingdom (2 Chronicles 23; Ezra 1:2). Josephus writes that Cyrus was moved to allow the Jews to return to their homeland upon reading the prophecies about himself in the book of Isaiah (*Ant.* 11.5).

### 3.4 The Army of Israel and the Defeat of the Enemies in EJL

By the advent of Hellenistic age, when Greece took its turn at the helm of power, Israel had already endured over two hundred years of subservience to the Persian empire. Even though there is ample evidence of many Jews living in harmony with the Gentile people, many Jews in the Second Temple period continued to define themselves and their future destiny against the nations. John Collins observes: "One of the recurring features of the 'end of days' is the expectation of a final war between Israel and the Gentiles."<sup>425</sup> While "war" is too narrow a description to encompass the variety of possibilities<sup>426</sup> that Jews imagined in defeating their foreign enemies, Collins is generally correct that many writers continued to embrace the idea of an eventual triumph over the nations.

As noted in the study of the motif of Israel's re-gathering, the defeat of the nations is often the catalyst for the release of the captives and central to a writer's concept of restoration. Some allusion to the motif of the nation's defeat usually occurs even in writings that are more conciliatory to the Gentiles. For instance, in the book of Sirach, in which the writer makes many positive overtures toward the nations, the author adopts a surprisingly hostile posture when his attention is directed toward the Land and the hope of Israel's restoration.<sup>427</sup> As the author has presented Jerusalem and the Temple as the center of the world—the dwelling place of Wisdom and the high priest—the prayer of Sirach 36 endorses the ultimate defeat of the nations as means by

---

<sup>425</sup> Collins, *Apocalypticism and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 91.

<sup>426</sup> As discussed below, Jews imagined a variety of options of how they might emerge victorious over their enemies. Some expected God (Sirach 36; *Tobit* 14) or his heavenly agents (Daniel 7; *1QMelchizedek*) to act alone and directly against Israel's enemies; others anticipated Israel's participation (with divine assistance) in the overthrowing of the nations (*Animal Apocalypse* 90:18-19; *War Scroll*).

<sup>427</sup> Sir 36:2, 8, 12.

which the Diaspora will return to the Land and Jerusalem will be recognized as the center of the world.

Likewise, in 2 Maccabees, even while the author petitions Jews outside the Land to be faithful and to incorporate the newly inaugurated festival of Hanukkah, he prays for all Jews to be re-gathered to the Land (1:27-29; 2:17-18). Those who live among the nations are referred to as “slaves” (1:27). Moreover, the letters of appeal (2 Maccabees 1:1-2:18) are attached to a larger story which celebrates the Maccabean redemption of the Temple from Gentiles and Jewish enemies. In the restoration account of Tobit 13-14, the author envisions the pilgrimage of the nations to Jerusalem to worship Israel’s God. While the pilgrimage of the Gentiles is certainly more positive than a vision of eradication or defeat, their salvation is almost certainly understood as a form of subjugation and religious dominance.<sup>428</sup> After all, the major story line of the book of Tobit challenges Jews to be faithful to their religious heritage (e.g., to pay alms; to bury the dead) despite their foreign contexts and the dangers therein. Moreover, in the testament of Tobit to his sons, he “foretells” the defeat of Nineveh and Babylon (14:4). At the book’s conclusion, Tobias hears of Nineveh’s fall (14:15).<sup>429</sup> Therefore, the destruction of the nations forms an *inclusio* around the more positive elements of Israel’s restoration. The Gentiles’ defeat provides an important interpretive key to all aspects of Israel’s restoration, including the hope for the pilgrimage and so-called salvation of the nations. In the historical fall of Nineveh and Babylon, albeit disguised as prophecy, the author of Tobit finds symbols of hope for the fall of present foreign

---

<sup>428</sup> I.e., the Gentiles surrender their gods for Israel’s God.

<sup>429</sup> As noted in our introductory remarks on the book of Tobit, the writing is penned long after the fall of Assyria. The fall of Nineveh is symbolic of the anticipatory fall of the nations at large or, perhaps, the ruling super power of the author’s day.

oppressors. Likewise, in many other early Jewish accounts, the defeat of the nations and Jewish enemies is a prominent feature of the future restoration.

### 3.4.1 First Maccabees: The Reclamation of the Land from the Gentiles

Although, as we have noted, there is little extant evidence of a negative attitude toward Persia, in the mid-160s BCE, the actions of Antiochus IV and the ensuing Maccabean revolution resulted in a fundamental turn in Israel's ideas of the nations, precipitating revised and new expectation of the future restoration. The story of 1 Maccabees<sup>430</sup> chronicles the Jewish revolution against the nations and results in the reclamation of the Land and the installation of the Hasmonean high priesthood. As an "apologetic historiography,"<sup>431</sup> the narrative of 1 Maccabees strongly defends the right of Jews to take up arms<sup>432</sup> against all enemies who threaten the Land and its people. For the author of 1 Maccabees, Israel's restoration is demonstrated in the return of the persecuted, righteous Jews (i.e., the Maccabeans and their supporters) to the Land, the cleansing of the Temple, the expulsion of all Gentiles, and the installation of the

---

<sup>430</sup> The book of 1 Maccabees concludes with a summary account of John Hyrcanus, high priest from 134-104 BCE. It has been proposed that a Hebrew version (now non-extant) may have been written during the last part of his tenure or shortly afterward in the first century BCE. The Greek translation was probably completed in the late first century BCE or early first century CE (J. Goldstein, *1 Maccabees* [AB 41; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976]); John R. Bartlett, *1 Maccabees* [Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; Sheffield: Sheffield, 1998], 16-20; Daniel J. Harrington, *Invitation to the Apocrypha* (Grand Rapids; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1999), 123.

<sup>431</sup> For a discussion of this genre, see Gregory Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephus, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum 64; Leiden: Brill, 1992).

<sup>432</sup> As noted in the next section, a military response cannot be taken for granted since competing theologies in Early Judaism called for passive resistance and waiting on God or divine intervention. In some cases, this attitude to war gave rise to a theology of martyrdom which favored dying for Israel/Judaism rather than killing for it. See Isaiah M. Gafni, "Josephus and 1 Maccabees," in Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata, (eds.), *Josephus, the Bible, and History* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989), 124-25 (116-31).

Maccabeans to the high priesthood.<sup>433</sup> The author develops his idea of restoration within a theological understanding of geography that places paramount importance on the centrality of Jerusalem and its importance for the ruling nations of the occupied world.<sup>434</sup>

The story of Israel's restoration in 1 Maccabees is inseparable from the author's promotion of the Maccabean rulers as the only legitimate agents of that liberation and legitimate heirs to the priesthood and leadership over the Land.<sup>435</sup> When other Jews attempt to lead military campaigns against the enemy (5:55-62), they fail because *only the Maccabeans* have been ordained by God to lead Israel.<sup>436</sup> Unlike 2 Maccabees which tells only of Judas' role in the restoration, 1 Maccabees underscores the installation of a Hasmonean priestly dynasty. The author begins with the story of the righteous patriarch, Mattathias (1 Macc 2:1-70), under whom the rebellion begins. The story of Judas describes Jerusalem's liberator in great detail (3:1-9:22). Furthermore, and with great significance as well, the author pens the story of the priestly lineage of Jonathan (9:23-12:48), Simon (13:1-16:17), and John Hyrcanus (16:23-24). The priesthood of the Maccabeans receives special significance under Simon, who as the successor to Jonathan, confirms the Maccabean priestly lineage. Moreover, Simon leads

---

<sup>433</sup> The return of the Diaspora is briefly mentioned (10:33), but is not central to the author's understanding of Israel's re-gathering. Instead, the author emphasizes the triumphal return of the Maccabeans and their followers. Significantly, the author indicates they exit the city for the wilderness (e.g., 2:31) in order to preserve righteousness and the covenant with God.

<sup>434</sup> Cf. the geographical plan of the apostolic mission in Acts (e.g., 1:8).

<sup>435</sup> The promotion of the Hasmonean claim to the high priesthood is a major interest of 1 Maccabees, an aim not shared with 2 Maccabees (Attridge, "Jewish Historiography," in Kraft and Nickelsburg (eds.), *Early Judaism*, 316-23).

<sup>436</sup> Two commanders (Joseph of Zechariah and Azariah) of the Jewish armed resistance attempt to lead an attack against the Gentiles to gain notoriety, but are defeated with 2000 other followers. Of their defeat the author notes that "they were not of the lineage of those men through whom salvation was given by their hand to Israel" (5:62 [RSV])

Israel to political independence and gains the titles of military commander and ruler as well (below).

The catalyst for the story of restoration in 1 Maccabees begins with the author noting the arrival of the new and evil regent ("sinful root") in the world, i.e., Antiochus IV (1:10). In the ominous introduction to Antiochus, the writer also tells of the efforts of some Jews to throw off the covenant of Israel with God in exchange for one with the nations (1:11-15):

In those days, lawless sons came out from Israel and persuaded many saying: "Let us go and make a covenant with the nations (διαθώμεθα διαθήκην μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν) around us, because since we separated from them many bad things have happened to us."<sup>437</sup>

Despite (or perhaps because of)<sup>438</sup> the conciliatory efforts of these Jews toward the nations, Israel is invaded by Antiochus IV. The invasion of the Land is part of a larger effort of the Seleucid ruler to expand his kingdom. Immediately following his defeat of Egypt, Palestine becomes his target (1:20-40). The Temple is desecrated (1:21-23,54) and the Jewish religion itself is abrogated (1:41-50). The invasion of Jerusalem and desecration of the Temple is described in language that draws from the vocabulary of exilic theology. Following the defilement of the Temple, it is referred to as a wilderness or desolation (ἐρημός) (1:39; 3:45). Even the Temple and the holy vessels are described in terms normally used to refer to the exiled people of Israel: τὰ σκεύη τῆς δόξης αὐτῆς αἰχμάλωτα ἀπήχθη (2:9).<sup>439</sup>

In response to the invasion of the nations, Mattathias leads a rebellion. Mattathias' motivation for leading the military campaign also originates from his zeal to

---

<sup>437</sup> My translation.

<sup>438</sup> The invasion is not explicitly connected, by the author, to the efforts of the Hellenizing Jews, but the close narrative sequence of the two events may suggest that the actions of Jewish rogues led to the invasion. This Deuteronomistic perspective of punishment seems to be largely missing from the wider narrative of 1 Maccabees.

<sup>439</sup> Similarly, the author says the Temple "has become a slave" (ἐγένετο εἰς δούλην) (2:11).

honor the covenant with God and his absolute refusal to make any covenant with the nations that call for the Law's abrogation.<sup>440</sup> Prior to leading a military campaign, the Maccabeans and their followers initially exit the Land: fleeing its borders: "Then many of those seeking righteousness went down to dwell into the wilderness" (2:29).<sup>441</sup> As noted in the previous chapter, such an exit from the Land, whether figurative or real is often claim in the various versions of the exilic model of restoration. As noted in the treatment of the *Animal Apocalypse* (above) and *Psalms of Solomon* (e.g., 17:17) (below) and discussed in Chapter Four ("Restoration in Luke-Acts"), the "wilderness" is often a term laden with exilic connotations,<sup>442</sup> providing various groups with a locale, whether real or fictional, from which Israel's re-gathering may occur.

The author of 1 Maccabees understands Israel's enemies to be both the nations and sinful Jews.<sup>443</sup> That is, Israel is defined against the nations, but a further distinction is made between the righteous and sinful portions of Israel. Indeed, the contributing role of Hellenizing Jews in the desecration of the Temple and the invasion of Antiochus was influential in the revision of Israel's understanding of her enemies.<sup>444</sup>

The Gentiles, however, continue to be understood as the primary enemy to be defeated. Although one particular foreign power is responsible for the invasion of

---

<sup>440</sup> 1 Macc 2:19-20,24-30.

<sup>441</sup> Cf. 5:24 where Judas Maccabeus and his band seek refuge in the wilderness of the Jordan.

<sup>442</sup> For references to "wilderness" in EJJ that carry exilic symbolism, see the discussion of the wilderness in the treatment of the *Animal Apocalypse* in Chapter Three and the discussion of John the Baptist and Jesus in Chapter Four ("The Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts").

<sup>443</sup> In comparison, however, with 2 Maccabees, 1 Maccabees places much more emphasis on the responsibility of the nations for the predicament in Jerusalem. The author of 2 Maccabees does not exclude the evil actions of Antiochus IV and the nations from blame, but places the burden of responsibility on evil Jews, especially the high priests following the assassination of the Onias III.

<sup>444</sup> Daniel R. Schwartz contrasts the hostile perspective of 1 Maccabees, a Palestinian document with the more conciliatory attitude toward Gentiles in 2 Maccabees, a Diaspora writing ("Diasporan Historiography of the Second Temple Period," in Aharon Oppenheimer [ed., with the help of Elisabeth Müller-Lückner], *Jüdische Geschichte in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit, Weg der Forschung: Vom alten zum neuen Schürer* [München: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1999], 29-40.



Jerusalem and the defilement of the Temple, the author generically condemns all “the nations” (2:12).<sup>445</sup> At his death, Mattathias recalls famous figures from Israel’s history (2:51-60)<sup>446</sup> whose righteousness was manifested in their “zeal for the Law” and resulted in great victories of divine deliverance. His final charge to Judas and his other sons before his death is: “Pay back the nations in full and hold to the commandments of the Law” (2:68). At the death of Mattathias, his sons take up the military assault to liberate Jerusalem and extend Judaism’s influence among the nations. Despite the overwhelming odds and being out-numbered (4:1-35), Judas and his army emerge victorious and recapture Jerusalem (4:36-40).

The restoration of the Temple is portrayed as a moment of pivotal importance in the narrative (4:36-61). The author claims that its liberation occurred exactly on the (third year) anniversary of its profanation (4:54).<sup>447</sup> The renewal of the Temple is marked with the institution of the feast of Hanukkah, a festival whose keeping is emphasized in 2 Maccabees as well. The retaking of Jerusalem is understood to be the decisive blow against the nations and the catalyst for military victories outside Jerusalem and wider territorial and political gains. The reclamation of Jerusalem is followed by the author’s narrative of expanding military triumphs and territorial claims. A strong theology of the Land underlies the military expansion of Jewish autonomy over such bordering areas as Judea, Galilee and Gilead, Samaria and other nearby

---

<sup>445</sup> The word ἔθνος appears 82 times in 1 Maccabees, in most cases, in a pejorative sense. In 2 Maccabees, which is more conciliatory to the Gentiles, the term appears only 25 times. According to the author of 1 Maccabees, Israel’s history is not one of salvation, but rather a history of oppression by the Gentiles (2:10).

<sup>446</sup> There are some surprising inclusions as well as striking omissions (e.g., Moses, Aaron) from this list.

<sup>447</sup> Cf. 2 Macc 1-2; 10:5; Dan 7:25.

territories.<sup>448</sup> For the author, the seizure of these territories is not so much an occupation as it is a reclamation of the Land, i.e., that which already belonged to Israel. This perspective is given voice in the narrative by Simon, the Maccabean successor to Judas and Jonathan. In response to the demands of Antiochus VII to return various conquered territories or pay tribute (15:33-34), Simon claims:

We have neither taken foreign land nor seized foreign property, but only the inheritance of our fathers, which at one time had been unjustly taken by our enemies. (34) Now that we have the opportunity, we are firmly holding the inheritance of our fathers.

The writer possesses a strong theology of the Land that disallows any Gentiles from residing in its boundaries; under the rule of the Maccabees, all Gentiles are eradicated from the sacred borders.<sup>449</sup>

Despite the fact that Israel's war is restricted to Palestine and adjacent territories, the impact of Israel's restoration and the installation of Maccabean rule is expressed in geographical claims that extend unto the far corners of the world. One of the key phrases the writer uses to underscore the scope of world domination and influence is the phrase "until the end (or extremities) of the earth," a phrase of importance, as well, for the author understanding of the mission of the twelve Apostles in Acts. In the introduction to 1 Maccabees, the author refers to Alexander the Great, who advanced unto the "extremities of the earth" (ἄκρων τῆς γῆς), defeating the world of nations (1:3). Later, in noting the rise of Rome and her emergence as a world

---

<sup>448</sup> E.g., 1 Maccabees 5; 10:38; 11:28, 34. Isaiah Gafni, "The Historical Background," in Michael Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings, of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* [Philadelphia: Van Gorcum, 1984], 11 [1-31]).

<sup>449</sup> 1 Macc 3:8; 10:12-13; 11:66; 13:43-48; 14:7-13,36. For instance, it is claimed that during the tenure of the high-priest, Simon, the remainder of any Hellenizing Jews and Gentiles were placed "outside their country" (14:36). Conversely, for all Jews to be counted as the people of God, they are required to possess the sign of God's covenant, i.e., circumcision. In describing the early stages of the rebellion under Mattathias, the author notes that while purging the Land of Jewish and Gentile enemies, the Maccabees also circumcised boys without the circumcision (2:46). Presumably, these are Jewish boys who had not been circumcised by their Hellenizing Jewish parents (1 Macc 1:41-53, esp. 1:48).

power, the writer notes that she is challenged by many nations and kings “from the extremity of the earth” (8:4). It is therefore striking and noteworthy that the author of 1 Maccabees places Judas *on the same level* as the ruling superpowers of the world. Judas’ liberation of Jerusalem, the center of the world, results in the claim that he is one who is “renowned unto the end of the earth” (ἔως ἑσχατοῦ γῆς) (3:9).<sup>450</sup>

Simon is celebrated for his reclamation of Israel’s ancestral lands and his import in the occupied world. Besides being high priest, he also becomes the military commander and ruler over Israel (13:41-42; 14:41, 47). He gains Israel’s full political independence. Simon is extolled in a poem as one who presides over a peaceful epoch and expansive kingdom.<sup>451</sup> The author draws on the exilic model of restoration in his portrayal of Simon. The high priestly ruler is credited *inter alia* with re-gathering<sup>452</sup> the captives back into the Land (14:7), increasing Israel’s borders to the sea (14:5-7), and further glorifying the Temple (14:15). Although the author cannot claim that Simon has conquered the nations for Israel, he strongly underscores Simon’s international importance and influence over the Gentiles. The author extols Israel’s ruler as one whose “name of glory was renowned to the extremity of the earth” (ἔως ἄκρου γῆς) (14:10).<sup>453</sup>

While the author of 1 Maccabees is intolerant of Gentiles within the Land, he recognizes their presence in the world and the necessity of Israel to negotiate with them

---

<sup>450</sup> While Isaiah Gafni correctly observes that it is “not until Jonathan secures the high priesthood that Israel is able “to establish control over portions of Palestine beyond the borders of Judaea,” the author portrays the liberator of Jerusalem (i.e., Judas) as the who has cleared the way for the expansion of Israel’s influence in the world. Israel is portrayed on the same level of a world power as Greece and Rome. (Gafni, “The Historical Background,” in Stone [ed.], CRINT 2.11).

<sup>451</sup> In 1 Macc 14:4-15, the author provides a poem in which Simōn is celebrated in almost utopian sentiment.

<sup>452</sup> Cf. 1 Macc 2:6-13 (above), where the author portrays the Temple and her vessels as the captives of the exile.

<sup>453</sup> Cf. Acts 1:8; 13:47.

for her own good. Therefore, the expulsion of all Gentiles from the Land is emphasized as well as Israel's freedom from the nations' dominion. But at the same time, he presents the Maccabeans as shrewd politicians, forging tactical, political and international alliances with foreign powers.<sup>454</sup> However, the author does not question the right of foreign powers to grant or confirm the high priesthood.<sup>455</sup> While at the story's conclusion, Israel has not emerged as the dominant power over the nations, the people have: (1) returned to and gained control over their own Land; (2) restored their Temple and extended its borders; and (3) defeated and purged all Gentiles from the territory of Israel.<sup>456</sup> Moreover, Israel has become a power to be reckoned with in the world again. The author does not claim Israel's restoration under the Maccabeans to be the fulfillment of *all* prophetic hopes. But neither does he find fault with it or look anxiously for something greater. Indeed, in the period of the Maccabees, Israel has thrown off the mantle of foreign domination and has emerged as an independent nation under her own ruler. The Maccabeans have ushered in the penultimate epoch of history, which will last until "forever until a faithful prophet arises" (14:46).<sup>457</sup>

---

<sup>454</sup> While he is correct in observing that 1 Maccabees is more antagonistic toward the nations than 2 Maccabees, Schwartz's characterization of portrayal of the Gentiles leans too far in one direction. For instance, Schwartz contends that in 1 Maccabees (1:1-10) "all Gentile kings are simply wicked" must be balanced against other places in the writing that reflect a less hostile view of the nations, particularly those that treat Israel well and respect her territorial borders ("Diasporan Historiography," 29). After all, the Hasmoneans ultimately accept their appointment to be high priests (and rulers) from a foreign power (e.g., 10:18-21) and send emissaries to Egypt (13:34-40) and Rome to conduct negotiations (e.g., 12:1-23).

<sup>455</sup> 1 Macc 10:18-20; 11:23-27; 13:42; 14:41-43.

<sup>456</sup> Israel has climbed from a decidedly subjugated position to be a more autonomous nation (e.g., 13:31-53), ruled by zealous warriors whom God has made high priests and rulers.

<sup>457</sup> Following Simon's appointment as commanders and ethnarch (as well as high priest), the author notes that he will serve *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἕως τοῦ ἀναστῆναι προφήτην πιστόν*.

Following the restoration of the Temple, the desecrated stones are buried "until a prophet arises" to instruct Israel how to properly dispose of them (4:46). The use of the phrase does not seem to indicate an immediate expectation, but rather a deferred one. Indeed, in the case of its use with Simon, its usage is meant to underscore the longevity of the Maccabean period of rule. Thus, the phrase might be better indicated in the paraphrased translation: "Simon should be their leader and high priest forever, until the distant and far-away arrival of the faithful prophet" (14:41).

### 3.4.2 Excursus: The Conversion of the Gentiles as a Form of Subjugation

According to 1 Maccabees, the war against the Seleucids and Hellenized Jews has resulted in all enemies being eradicated from the Land, either by expulsion or death. Josephus, however, refers to another practice of subjugation practised in lieu of these two options: the forced circumcision<sup>458</sup> of Gentiles who remained within Israel's borders. Josephus claims that various Maccabean rulers—John Hyrcanus,<sup>459</sup> Aristobulus, and probably Alexander Jannaeus—engaged in a systematic effort to circumcise (i.e., convert) those Gentiles<sup>460</sup> not killed or driven from territories captured in their military campaigns:

[A]fter subduing all the Idumaeans, [John Hyrcanus] permitted them to remain in their country so long as they had themselves circumcised and were willing to observe the laws of the Jews. And so, out of attachment to the land of their fathers, they submitted to circumcision and to making their manner of life conform in all other respects to that of the Jews. And from that time on they have continued to live as Jews (*Ant.* 13.257-58)

As Collins notes, these efforts to convert Gentiles constitute the “only evidence for an organized Jewish proselytizing campaign” in pre-Christian Judaism.<sup>461</sup> The conversion of the foreign inhabitants is not motivated by a concern for the welfare or salvation of the Gentiles nor is it ascribed any special, much less eschatological, importance in Josephus' account. The proselytizing actions of the Maccabeans are presented simply as a feature of their wider program to subjugate Gentiles within territories claimed by Israel.<sup>462</sup> Both 1 Maccabees and Josephus suggest that the

---

<sup>458</sup> In the discussion of the Maccabean's defeat of the nations and Hellenizing Jews, it was noted that part of the campaign also involved the circumcision of the children of these rogue Jews (e.g., 1 Macc 2:42).

<sup>459</sup> According to Josephus, beginning with the rule of John Hyrcanus, who is briefly introduced near the conclusion of 1 Maccabees, conversion became an option in lieu of death or expulsion. In other accounts of the Maccabeans, Josephus does not mention the practice of converting the inhabitants and no where else in EJJ, as far as this study can determine, is this activity of the Maccabeans explicitly mentioned, although as noted below, other early Jewish accounts may allude to this practice. On the other hand, cf. the account of 2 Maccabees where that author suggests that some of these foreign inhabitants, deemed friendly toward Jews, were allowed to remain unmolested in the Land (2 Macc 10:10-12, 29-31).

<sup>460</sup> See *Ant.* 13.257-58 (John Hyrcanus and the Idumeans); 13.319 (Aristobulus and Itureans) 13.395-97 (Alexander Jannaeus). It is noteworthy the circumcision is forced upon two Gentile groups understood in early Jewish traditions to be distantly related to the Israelite, not “pure” Gentiles. The Idumeans are understood to be descendants of Esau, while the Itureans' origin is traced to Ishmael. Cf., however, Josephus' account of Alexander Jannaeus who may have required all conquered Gentiles to observe Jewish customs, although it is not clear if mandatory circumcision is entailed. After providing a long list of territories and cities that the Maccabeans had claimed by the period Alexander (13.395-97), Josephus observes that city of Pella has to be destroyed because the inhabitants would not “adopt the national customs of the Jews” (*Ant.* 13.397).

<sup>461</sup> Collins, *Between Athens*, 262.

<sup>462</sup> Martin Goodman makes the corollary that “[s]ince it possible that Jews thus sometimes insisted on conversion when they had the power to enforce their will, it has been suggested that they used persuasion when that was the only weapon available to them” (*Mission and Conversion*, 65). However, while Goodman can cite individual and sporadic cases of Jewish conversion of Gentiles by persuasion

Maccabeans acted with a theology of the Land that required its sole occupants to be Jews.<sup>463</sup> This theology required the death, expulsion, or conversion of the Gentiles.<sup>464</sup>

Another document that may have been written within the context of Maccabean efforts to eradicate or convert Gentiles is the document known as the *Epic of Theodotus*.<sup>465</sup> The writing is ostensibly a retelling of the rape of Dinah by the Shechemites and their massacre by Levi and Simeon (Genesis 34). In the biblical version, after Dinah is raped, the Shechemites are asked to submit to circumcision for marital purposes and as a requirement for the reconciliation and integration of two peoples whose borders are close (i.e., the Jews and the Shechemites). In the *Epic of Theodotus*, the author describes circumcision more precisely in terms of conversion, an event that perhaps would have made the death of the Shechemites unnecessary. The author notes: "Jacob said that he would not give her [Dinah] until all the inhabitants of Shechem were circumcised and became Jews."<sup>466</sup> In the biblical version, the vengeful actions of Levi and Simeon are carried out *after* the circumcision of the Shechemites. Consequently, both of the tribal heads are viewed negatively by the biblical author and condemned. Unlike the biblical version, however, in the *Epic of Theodotus*, the

---

(e.g., Izates of Adiabene [*Ant.* 20.34-45]), there are no written accounts in non-Christian Judaism in which Jews engage in systematic efforts to persuade groups of Gentiles to convert. Perhaps, the book of Jonah is relevant to the discussion as well, although Goodman does not mention it in his book. While it is not clear whether the repentance of the people of Nineveh constitutes conversion per se, at least in the mind of the Jewish writer the Gentiles' response is sufficient to halt God's judgment. In terms therefore somewhat analogous to Josephus' description of the options extended by Maccabeans to Gentiles, the nations are given the choice of death or recognition of the Jewish God. Nonetheless, the requirements for deferring the Maccabean punishment (i.e., circumcision) differs markedly from the requirement of repentance elicited from Jonah.

<sup>463</sup> Mendels observes other responses to the Maccabean conquest of the Land and the continual presence of Gentiles with Israel's borders. Rather than claiming the conversion of the Gentiles (e.g., Josephus) or envisioning complete eradication (e.g., 1QM), other Jewish writers claim kinship with such people like the Idumaeans. Mendels writes: "Dreams of conquest and subjugation of other peoples were very popular in Hellenistic literature, as were those of assimilating the enemy. In many instances, the current [second century BCE] attitude of Israel to the nations was retrojected into the past, where a rapport and even a kinship between the Jews and the ancestors of these same nations was presented" (*Rise and Fall*, 97). Such claims of kinship were necessary to "to justify the judaizing of Idumaeans" by Hyrcanus (98). Specifically, Mendels refers to the book of *Jubilees* as an example of one writer's concern to ground the foreign peoples in Israel's history (97-98). Perhaps, however, Josephus' claims of Maccabean conversions of Gentiles might be viewed as alternative to the revisionist genealogies found in other early Jewish writings.

<sup>464</sup> For comprehensive treatments of Jewish proselytizing efforts in the Second Temple period, see the studies of McKnight (*A Light among the Gentiles*) and Martin Goodman (*Mission and Conversion*). Both scholars conclude there is little evidence for systematic efforts to convert Gentiles in pre-Christian Judaism. Louis Feldman attempts a rebuttal based on highly questionable circumstantial evidence (e.g., ancient population figures of Jews); his interpretation of the evidence and counter-theories in favor of Jewish missionary activity is unconvincing (*Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993], 288-341).

<sup>465</sup> See OTP 2.785-93. The document dates from the second century BCE to the first century CE. This section of the writing is partly preserved in the writings of Alexander Polyhistor under the title "Concerning the Jews." Alexander's own quotations of the Theodotus are mostly found in the writings of Eusebius (*Praeparatio Evangelica*).

<sup>466</sup> *Theodotus*, frg. 5. See John J. Collins, "The Epic of Theodotos and the Hellenism of the Hasmoneans," *HTR* 73 (1980), 93-104 and Collins, *Between Athens*, 57-60. It is not clear, however, whether the phrase "they became Jews" belongs to Theodotos or the later sources in which the fragments of this document are found.

circumcision of the Shechemites remains merely a proposal never carried out. Instead, Hamor (the Shechemite) goes back to his people to announce the agreement of circumcision (frg. 6), but Levi and Simeon launch their attack before anyone is circumcised. However, since no actual circumcision is described in the *Epic of Theodotus*, no condemnation is recorded in the document. Instead, Levi and Simeon are portrayed as military heroes, claiming the killing of the Shechemites is even the fulfillment of biblical prophecy.<sup>467</sup> While the *Epic of Theodotus* is part of a wider literary revision of the biblical account to clear the record of the priestly patriarch, Levi, the story also underscores a strong theology of the Land that maintains Gentiles found within the sacred boundaries should be killed, expelled, or converted. Since the circumcision of the Shechemites would have indicated their subjection and nullified their need to be killed, the author excludes this portion of the biblical account. That is, the bloodlust of Dinah's brothers ultimately results in the Shechemites' death rather than their conversion.

Other early Jewish accounts also present the circumcision or conversion of Gentiles as a form of subjugation, required of those who would dwell in the land of Israel. The narrative of Judith purports to describe a planned attack on Jerusalem shortly after the 6<sup>th</sup> century return.<sup>468</sup> The story portrays the success of Jewish resistance against the nations, particularly in the actions of the heroine Judith. The story draws together the defeat of the Gentiles in defending the Land and the conversion of a Gentile ruler, portrayed as one who recognizes the special status of the Jews and their God.<sup>469</sup> At the heart of the narrative is the dramatic account of Judith's seduction and assassination of Holofernes (13:1-8), a general in Nebuchadnezzar's army (2:4-13). Judith's killing of Holofernes constitutes an endorsement of violence against those Gentiles who would threaten the Land or religion of Judaism. Achior, the leader of the Ammonites (5:5), one of the ancient occupants associated with Canaan,<sup>470</sup> hears of the assassination of

---

<sup>467</sup> See frg. 6 (OTP 2.793). A text from Gen 15:18-21 is cited that states that the descendants of Abraham will possess "ten peoples" of whom the Shechemites, in the *Epic of Theodotus*, are interpreted to have belonged. Likewise, the book of *Jubilees* does not mention the circumcision of the Shechemites, instead portraying their massacre in a wholly positive way (*Jubilees* 30). Cf. the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* where the author presents the killing and even Jacob's anger, but then continues to endorse the actions of Simeon and especially Levi in the strongest possible terms. Before the massacre, Levi is described as ascending to the heavens, even to the throne of God (2:5-5:1-2). Afterwards, an angel equips Levi with a heavenly sword to carry out the massacre (5:3-7). Moreover, the author underscores the wickedness of the Shechemites by saying that they wanted to rape Sarah and Rebecca as well (*T. Levi* 6). After the massacre, Levi is endorsed by heaven for the priesthood. Heavenly agents dress him in the priestly garments (*T. Levi* 8). In the early Jewish period the Shechemites became identified as ancestors of the Samaritans. The scandal of Israel's priestly patriarch being cursed and the affiliation of the Shechemites with the Samaritans provided the motivation and raw material for the various revisions of the biblical account.

<sup>468</sup> The author of the story has confused many aspects of the biblical history of exile and return, referring anachronistically to Nebuchadnezzar's planned invasion of Jerusalem after the 6<sup>th</sup> century return. Furthermore, he is incorrectly identified as the king of the Assyrians (4:1-3).

<sup>469</sup> Cf. Judith 5:5-22, where Achior rehearses the salvation history of the Jews as a warning to the invading foreign power. Achior tells of Israel's pilgrimage and occupation of a variety of countries around the Land before the permanent settlement in Palestine. Achior warns the Assyrians that God fights for Israel unless Israel has sinned. Therefore, it is imperative to determine if there is iniquity among the Jews before attempting to invade them. See the section on "Divine Intervention" later in this chapter.

<sup>470</sup> It is noteworthy that Achior is identified as the leader of Ammonites, one of the historic nations associated with the territories and people around the Land. Other Gentiles in close proximity to the Land (e.g., Moabites) are named as well (5:2-3). It may be that story originates from Hasmonean

Holofernes and understands it as a great military victory. For him, the defeat of this Gentile warrior is in fact a testimony of God's victory over the nations. In response to this event, Achior "believed firmly in God, was circumcised, and added to the house of Israel" (14:10).<sup>471</sup> Therefore, the author suggests the conversion of the Gentiles, particularly those living on Israel's borders, is a more desirable option than the certain death of any who would threaten the Jews of the Land.

The writing of 2 Maccabees also describes a proposed conversion of a powerful Gentile ruler. In the narrative of military conflict, the story of Antiochus IV's offer to convert finds its proper interpretive context. In this account, God afflicts Antiochus IV with a bodily ailment after the Seleucid king plans to invade and destroy Jerusalem.<sup>472</sup> As a result of his ailment, Antiochus IV makes a series of vows to God. Antiochus promises to: (1) make full citizens of the Jews; (2) restore the Temple treasures; (3) become a Jew (Ἰουδαῖον ἔσεσθαι) (9:13-16); and (4) "visit every occupied place to proclaim the power of God" (9:17). The king apparently either does not act upon his vow to convert or it is not recognized by God. Shortly after the vow, the king dies. Nonetheless, the king's offer to convert probably suggests a desire of Jews that other Gentile rulers might recognize the Jewish God and Jewish people or face the consequences of defeat, either at the hands of the Jewish army or God.

Other early Jewish writings, particularly those whose literary context is the Diaspora or captivity, also reflect the desire for Gentile rulers to acknowledge the Jewish God. These accounts differ significantly from the ones above in that the (theology of) the Land is greatly diminished or missing altogether. Furthermore, in most cases, the authors hope more broadly for the monarch's recognition of God, no longer specifying such actions in terms of conversion or circumcision. The recognition of God by these kings is considered sufficient and a kind of subjugation to the Jewish deity and his rule (i.e., the kingdom of God). The assumption in such writings seems to be that God rules the world, rather than (just) the Land, and it is therefore desirable for the kings of the world to recognize the Jewish deity and honor Jewish subjects throughout the empire.<sup>473</sup>

The book of Esther purports to tell the story of a Jewish woman who rises to the position of Queen of Persia (2:17). The novella pivots on the king's legislation to approve genocide against the Jews,<sup>474</sup> not knowing that his own wife, Esther, is in fact a Jew. On the one hand, the book of Esther demonstrates remarkable concessions made to Gentiles (e.g., marrying a foreign king). While Esther's story seems to advocate more openness to Gentiles than other early Jewish stories on the theme of the Jew in the

---

efforts of eradication and forced conversion. In any event, it is another early Jewish (e.g., *War Scroll* [e.g., col. i]) writing that demonstrates a special interest in the fate of those Gentiles around the borders of Palestine or within the Land itself.

<sup>471</sup> Therefore, rather than focusing on the conversion of the populace, the story of Judith emphasizes the repentant actions of a Gentile ruler or leader. See the discussion and references of John Collins, "'The King has Become a Jew': The Perspective on the Gentile World in Bel and the Snake," in idem (ed.), *Seers, Sibyls, and Sage in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 167-77.

<sup>472</sup> 2 Macc 9:5-13. Cf. 1 Macc 6:1-16, where the illness is said to follow the desecration of the Temple.

<sup>473</sup> On the other hand, the deferral to God's rule may indicate an acceptance of the longevity and inevitability of foreign rule.

<sup>474</sup> E.g., Esther 3:12-13. The story presents the Jews as being hated and despised for the religious claims and loyalty to the Torah rather than the Persian king (e.g., 3:8).



king's court,<sup>475</sup> there is also a measure of antagonism as well. The book advocates strongly for the Gentiles to provide protection for Jews who live among the nations. This right is claimed to originate from the highest levels of the Persian empire. The king himself ultimately acknowledges God and issues an edict to the occupied world that Jews are permitted to kill Gentiles when attacked (8:5-12). Consequently, because of the power and influence of Jews into the far corner of the globe, Gentiles throughout the world ("from India to Ethiopia") become fearful of Jewish reprisals and seek conversion: "Many of the peoples of the country became Jews (מִתְיִהְדִּים)" (8:17).<sup>476</sup> In the LXX, the "becoming a Jew" receives explication. In the translation, the writer adds: "Many of these Gentiles were circumcised and became Jews (ἰουδαίζον) because of fear of the Jews" (8:17).<sup>477</sup> In analogy with the accounts above, circumcision or conversion is viewed as a former of subjugation and alternative to physical harm. Unlike the accounts, however, conversion becomes a means by which Gentiles might demonstrate their recognition of the authority of God and Jews in foreign contexts. There is, however, no emphasis on the Land whatsoever.

Other early Jewish writings follow Esther in articulating a desire for foreign kings to recognize God. However, in these cases, it is not clear if this recognition of God constitutes a *conversion* per se. In Daniel 4:31-33,<sup>478</sup> Daniel tells Nebuchadnezzar that the king will soon undergo a period of illness. At the end this period, Daniel tells the monarch that he will recognize God as the one who appoints kings to rule.<sup>479</sup> Consequently, the foreign king prays to God and recognizes his dominion (4:34). In the story of Bel and the Dragon, Daniel is pitted in a kind of contest against Babylonian priests and their idolatrous worship. After Daniel uncovers their ruse (i.e., the priests' consumption of foods claimed to have been eaten by the god Bel [1-22]), the foreign king gives Daniel permission to kill a dragon or serpent worshipped by the people (23-27). The king's endorsement of Daniel's attack against the Gentiles' idol leads the people to profess (or accuse): Ἰουδαῖος γέγονεν ὁ βασιλεύς.<sup>480</sup> Thus, unlike

<sup>475</sup> Lawrence M. Wills, *The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King* (HDR 26; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990).

<sup>476</sup> The translations of the RSV("declared themselves to Jews") and NSRV("professed themselves to be Jews") suggest the Gentiles may have pretended to convert to Judaism rather than being genuinely converted.

<sup>477</sup> In another Greek manuscript (Alpha text [AT]) of Esther, it is Jews themselves who are circumcised. Apparently, now that it is safe to be Jewish in the post-Haman period, the editor claims that Jews once again practiced circumcision. For a treatment of the Hebrew and various Greek versions of Esther 8:1-17 (AT 7:14-41), see Kristin De Troyer, *The End of the Alpha Text of Esther: Translation and Narrative Technique in MT 8:1-17, LXX 8:1-17, and AT 7:14-41* (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 46; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1997), esp. 166-68; 267-69; 337-40. Cf. Jud 14:10, where Ananias the Ammonite converts to Judaism through circumcision after seeing the head of Holofernes, and being convinced of the might of Israel and her God.

<sup>478</sup> In the collection of stories that make up Daniel 1-6, the dominant emphasis falls on the success of Jews in foreign lands or kings' court. In particular, it is shown to be highly desirable for foreign kings to recognize the Jewish God as the one who has appointed them their kingdoms. Therefore, these regents should acknowledge him and show favor to Jews in the Land. These Jews (i.e., Daniel) are shown to have arisen to great acclaim in the court due to their wisdom and piety.

<sup>479</sup> An antecedent tradition of this text was found at Qumran in a writing known as *4QPrayer of Nabonidus*. Instead of Nebuchadnezzar, this Qumran writing refers to the lesser renowned Nabonidus. Moreover, instead of Daniel, an unnamed Jewish holy man intervenes on the king's behalf.

<sup>480</sup> Both the OG and Theodotion texts contain this assessment of the king.

Daniel 4, the author of *Bel and the Dragon* hopes for more than a Gentile king who recognizes God as the sovereign power behind the kingdom; he hopes the foreign regent might take a strong stand against idolatry.

All of these stories witness to, with varying degrees of emphasis, an association between conversion or the acknowledgement of God and the idea of subjugation.<sup>481</sup> In some accounts, such as the writings of Josephus, 2 Maccabees, Judith and *Epic of Theodotus*, the conversion of the nations is directly correlated with Land theology and the suppression of Gentiles in Palestine or adjacent territories claimed by the Jews. Moreover, the Gentiles' subjection to the Jews is inseparable from their subjection to their God. In the case of Esther, Daniel 4, and *Bel and the Dragon*, the foreign regent's acknowledgement of God is not associated with the Land or conquered territory at all. In the book of Esther, a Jewish woman has ascended to a position of high influence in foreign kingdom. Despite the hostilities of this context, the foreign king eventually recognizes the Jewish God and empowers Jews to defend themselves against Gentile aggression. As a result, according to the LXX version of this story, some Gentiles were circumcised and became Jews. Therefore, rather than Jews being fearful in foreign lands among Gentiles, the nations should be afraid of God and consider becoming Jews. In Daniel 4 and *Bel and the Dragon*, the focus is entirely on the foreign king under whom the Jewish prophet happily serves. Both stories claim that the Jewish God has appointed the foreign king over the world. Therefore, the king ought to acknowledge God and show favor to the Jews, particularly those in foreign contexts. The wish for the Gentile king to honor God may extend to all Gentiles, but the focus on the regent, the one with the power, seems very deliberate. In a period in which Jews in the Land or Diaspora are ruled by foreign monarchs, many Jews understand that the best they can hope for is that the monarch will at least treat them well, but ultimately, honor God as the one who establishes kingdoms and takes them down. If Jews cannot rule over the nations, at least they can claim their God to rule over foreign kings and the world. Therefore, it would behoove the regents of the world to recognize the Jewish God.

### 3.4.3 The War Scroll: The Defeat of Israel's Earthly and Heavenly Enemies

The most comprehensive account of a final triumph over the nations in EJJ is found in the *War Scroll* (1QM), a document from Qumran.<sup>482</sup> In many respects, 1QM is

---

<sup>481</sup> N. T. Wright observes how even the nations, particularly Rome, may have begun to understand the subjugationist power of imposing the imperial cult on conquered peoples. As Wright asks "Who needs armies when they have worship?" ("Paul's Gospel and Caesar's Empire," *CTI Reflections* 2 (1999), 42-65.

<sup>482</sup> The relationship of this writing to the Qumran community itself (i.e., the Yahad), however, remains a point of debate in current scholarship. Some of the difficulty in assessing the relationship between the Qumran community and 1QM stems from the document's complex, compositional history, attested in part by related fragments of the *War Scroll* found in Cave 4. While some scholars have posited a literary unity to 1QM (e.g., Yigael Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962] and Jean Carmignac, *La Règle de la Guerre: Des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres: Texte, Restauré, Traduit, Commenté* [Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1958]), most scholars have concluded the document has undergone significant editorial activity (e.g., J.

the apocalyptic counterpart of 1 Maccabees.<sup>483</sup> 1 Maccabees promotes the role of a priestly family in achieving Israel's victory of major Gentile enemies and increasing Israel's importance in the world. The *War Scroll* extols the role of a priestly entourage that leads Israel into an apocalyptic war in which the Jews fight alongside heavenly forces against earthly enemies (Gentiles and Jewish adversaries) and their heavenly counterparts. Israel's restoration constitutes a definitive victory, which affects all nations of the world and the very fabric of the cosmos.<sup>484</sup>

---

van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre* [Leiden: Brill, 1959]; Philip R. Davies, *IQM, the War Scroll from Qumran* [Rome: Biblical Institute, 1969], 1-23; Jurgen Becker, *Das Heil Gottes, Heils- und Sündenbegriffe in den Qumrantexten und im Neuen Testament* [SUNT 5; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964, 43-50; Charlesworth (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume 2 Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents* [PDSSP 2; Louisville: John Knox, 1995], 80-203; esp. 83-84). For the critical edition of the *War Scroll* and related fragments, see Duhaime's translation in PDSSP 2. He omits, however, reference to some fragments from Cave 4, most significantly 4Q285, apparently related to the *War Scroll* (Martin Abegg, "Messianic Hope and 4Q285: A Reassessment," *JBL* 113 [1994], 81-91). While *yahad* is used in a technical sense to refer to the "Community" in some key Qumran writings (e.g., 1QS), it is not used in this way in IQM (i.11; ii.9; vii.6; x.6; xii.4; xiii.12). Other phrases and terminology (e.g., "the sons of light," "sons of darkness" "Prince of the Congregation"), however, found in IQM are also found in writings normally thought to have originated with the Qumran Community. Some of these complexities may be explained by the *War Scroll*'s editorial history and changes made by various redactors. Some scholars place the IQM in the early or proto- stages of the Community's history (e.g., Devorah Dimant, "Qumran Sectarian Literature," in Michael E. Stone [ed.] CRINT 2.517 [483-550]). Other interpreters argue that (a form of) the document was inherited by the Community and then edited (Davies, *IQM*; Duhaime, PDSSP 2; Harmut Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998] 102-04). Davies understands col. i to reflect views of the Qumran community or group as opposed to other parts (e.g., cols. ii-ix) of the writing which are more national or pan-Israelite (IQM, 115). It might be noted as well, in terms of identifying this document specifically with "the Essenes," that Philo contended the group was a pacifist one, opposed to taking up instruments of war (*Quod Omnis Probus Liber sit* 78; ref. in Duhaime, "War Scroll," 85). Indeed, in most Qumran documents associated with the Yahad, the Community depicts its salvation as dependent upon the intervention of God and his heavenly agents rather than an army.

<sup>483</sup> James VanderKam and Peter Flint write: "There are many similarities between the military features of the *War Rule* and those of 1-2 Maccabees (*The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, and Christianity* [San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2002, 365]). The comparison of the *War Scroll* and 1 Maccabees does not entail the former document serves as an endorsement of Maccabean rule. On the contrary, it is likely the Maccabeans would be viewed as enemies.

<sup>484</sup> See below.

The *War Scroll* was written as a “rule” (סדר)<sup>485</sup> to provide detailed<sup>486</sup> instructions on the preparation and engagement for the end-time war.<sup>487</sup> The document’s purpose is both to reveal the outcome of the expected conflict between Israel and the enemy as well as to dictate *how* the Jewish community should participate in it. Collins observes that the *War Scroll* “spell[s] out an active role for human participants in far greater detail”<sup>488</sup> than other (apocalyptic) texts. Part of the reason for the elaborate attention to all aspects of the war is that it is viewed as a *cultic* and cosmic event of extreme importance. Every concern and precaution must be addressed to ensure God and heaven’s full endorsement.<sup>489</sup>

### 3.4.3.1 The Eschatological Israel of the Final War

In the *War Scroll*, references to Israel often appear unrestricted and unqualified,<sup>490</sup> thus suggesting all Israel is meant. Nonetheless, there is evidence in 1QM that the author understands Israel to be more restricted or divided than the usage of pan-Israelite language might imply. Some Jews are distinguished with such references as the “violators of the covenant” (מרשיעי ברית) (i.2; cf. Dan 11:30 ), “the wicked

---

<sup>485</sup> 1QM i.1; other “rules” include the *Community Rule* (1QS); *Messianic Rule* (1QSa); *Damascus Covenant*, and perhaps the *Temple Scroll*. See the discussion of “Rules” in New Schürer 3.1: 381-420.

<sup>486</sup> In this respect, 1QM is analogous to such writings as *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (cf. 4Q403 cols. i-ii; 1QM ii-ix ), which describes in great detail (or legislates) all aspects of the heavenly Temple service and the heavenly participants in the cult.

<sup>487</sup> Yadin discusses correspondences between the military tactics of 1QM with Jewish ones from the ancient, biblical, and early Jewish periods (e.g., Maccabean), as well as with Greco-Roman strategies and weaponry (*The Scroll of the War*, 18-197).

<sup>488</sup> Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 94.

<sup>489</sup> Harmut Stegemann observes that “[f]rom the viewpoint of its foundational ideas, the War Scroll portrays more a cultic event than an actual war” (*Library of Qumran*, 102).

<sup>490</sup> E.g. 1QM ii-ix; x.9-10; xiii.7.

congregation" (xv.9), and "enemies" (e.g., x.4,8; xviii.12).<sup>491</sup> Righteous Jews are referred to, for instance, as the "sons of his covenant" (בְּנֵי בְרִיתוֹ) (xvii.8), "the poor ones" (xvi.9, 13), and "the remnant" (xiii.8; xiv.8-9).<sup>492</sup> Such references might be understood as contradictory to these more encompassing or nationalistic ones, and as evidence of the (inconsistent) editing of the *War Scroll*,<sup>493</sup> but at least two other options are possible as well. Collins argues that the pan-Israelite texts should be interpreted within the eschatological outlook of the writer who hopes that the rest of Israel will join with the more restricted community prior to the final war.<sup>494</sup> That is, the Jewish group behind 1QM hopes for a larger ingathering of members in the future.<sup>495</sup>

Collins may be correct. But as noted in the discussion of the re-gathering motif in the previous chapter, various groups in EJJ, including the Qumran community, often employ the language, history, and legacy of Israel. The use of pan-Israelite language does not necessarily entail a nationalistic or comprehensive view of restoration. As noted in the study of several early Jewish documents (e.g., *Animal Apocalypse*, the *Damascus Document*, *Psalms of Solomon* and *4 Ezra*) in the present study, an author

---

<sup>491</sup> These references, especially the latter two, may encompass Gentiles as well. While inter-Jewish conflicts and tendencies are emphasized to the degree found in such writings as the *Damascus Document* and the *Psalms of Solomon*, there is enough evidence for Jewish divisions in 1QM to confirm they are a factor in the mind of the author.

<sup>492</sup> Collins notes the absence of references to "the remnant" in a parallel passage to xix.8-9 in 4Q491 (*Apocalypticism*, 108).

<sup>493</sup> This argument is intimately related to similar arguments regarding 1QM's relationship to the Qumran community (see above). Some scholars have suggested that this evidence indicates a tension between a pan-Israel idea and a more restricted one in the writing of 1QM. While Duhaime notes in one place that the document applies to "Israel as a whole" (*PDSSP*, 84), at other points he refers to the "reduction" of Israel which may have arisen through "sectarian appropriation of earlier material" (86). Therefore, it is not clear that designations to "Israel," her promises, or the people necessarily carry a more nationalistic or inclusive understanding of Israel beyond the more restricted one which the author describes. As Davies himself observes elsewhere, albeit perhaps too strongly: "One suspects that 'all Israel' never did exist except as an idea, and that continuity was with this 'Israel' was always claimed by one or other groups" (Davies, "Biblical and Qumranic Concept of War," 299).

<sup>494</sup> Collins, *Apocalypticism*, 108. In support of this understanding, he points to 1QSa (*Messianic Rule*), which appears to be written for all Israel and not just a particular community.

<sup>495</sup> Cf., for e.g., 4QMMT; 4Q169, frg. 3-4, iii.5.

may develop the idea of Israel's re-gathering around a core group who is later joined by the others (i.e., the Diaspora or the ten tribes) as a kind of final stamp of confirmation on the smaller group's claim to be Israel. But this falls short of a nationalistic conception of restoration. Thus, the co-opting of pan-Israelite language by a righteous segment of the population may entail, but does not require, a larger ingathering. While the claim of a Jewish group to possess the heritage of all Israel may indicate a kind of evangelical hope for new converts, the usage of "Israel" may rather serve to distinguish (even divide) a smaller community of Jews from the rest of Israel or another rival group.<sup>496</sup> The destiny of such Jewish adversaries is not usually one of restoration, but judgment.<sup>497</sup> The reduction of true Israel concomitantly enlarges<sup>498</sup> the group(s)

---

<sup>496</sup> On the relation of the *War Scroll*, see the introduction to the document above. While the *War Scroll's* relationship with the *Qumran* community is questionable, the document does contain ideas and vocabulary that may suggest the document originated from a group or community that was not representative of most of Jews. For instance, its apocalyptic perspective is not one that corresponds with common or mainstream Judaism as we know from the wider body of early Jewish writings. Certainly, the prominent role that Jews are assigned alongside heavenly agents belies its interest in a more restricted version of Israel than might be first apparent. Moreover, as already noted, the author refers to some who have violated the covenant.

<sup>497</sup> While the writer of 1QM can refer to the covenant that God made with "our fathers," "the preservation" of that covenant is entrusted to the "the remnant," whom God has "counted" in "the lot of light" (ובגורל אור) (xiii.7-10). Although it should be underscored that community language is sparse in 1QM, especially in comparison with other Qumran writings, the writer does identify some Jews as being outside the covenant, and therefore outside the people of Israel. It is with this more restricted understanding of Israel that more general references in the *War Scroll* should be interpreted, at least according to the final editor. That is, if one wishes to inherit Israel's promises, the only way to do so is align oneself with a particular Jewish group who claims to represent Israel. Such texts and traditions stand in opposition to more nationalistic or covenantal conceptions of Israel, which ultimately include all Israel within a salvation framework. For Sanders, the covenantal understanding of salvation was the dominant paradigm in the first century CE (e.g., *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*). However, Sanders does not give sufficient value to those texts in EJL that indicate strong divisions within Judaism which include Jewish hopes for the judgment and damnation of other Jews (e.g., 1QS col.i.15-26; 1 *Enoch* 90:26-7.)

<sup>498</sup> While Schiffman (*Reclaiming*, 371) is correct in observing that Jewish infighting did not result in the blurring of (ethnic?) distinctions between Jews and Gentiles, it is noteworthy that some of the charges traditionally made of Gentiles are now made of Jews. For instance, marital, dietary and purity restrictions were especially important for many Jews in regulating interactions with Gentiles in the Second Temple period. While these were often interpreted as mandating some degree of segregation between Jews and Gentiles, they became issues cited for inter-Jewish divisions (e.g., 4QMMT). Perhaps, most importantly for this study, the same fate assigned Gentiles in the earliest traditions of restoration (i.e., destruction) is expanded to include Jewish adversaries in some documents. Rather than a problem with nations per se, some Jews considered other Jews, particularly those in charge of the Temple, cult and interpretation of the Torah to be their chief enemy. Given this changing of the guard (of the enemy), Israel's restoration could be understood in some quarters of Judaism more in inter-Jewish terms or on a local politico-religious level rather than the comprehensive victory of the nations of the world. Indeed, in

designated for destruction. The traditional hope for the destruction of the (enemy) nations is enlarged to include Jewish adversaries as well. Indeed, in the case of 1QM, the eschatological war and anticipated victory is understood as a vindication or supreme litmus test of competing claims to be Israel.

### 3.4.3.2 The Nations

Despite the variety of enemies named in the *War Scroll*, the destruction of the nations continues to be of major significance to the writing. They themselves are identified in a variety of ways as well. In the opening lines of column i of the *War Scroll* (also see xi.6; xviii.2; cf. also ii.10-13.), some nations are depicted as Israel's traditional foes of the ancient past (e.g., Edom, Moab, Ammon, Philistia, and Asshur, i.1-2).<sup>499</sup> The use of these ancient designations is most likely meant to identify those Gentiles who lived on the borders of the Land or in adjacent territories. The focus on these enemies perhaps reflects the sensitivities to Gentiles in or near Palestine at the time of or shortly after the Maccabean revolt. In other places in early Jewish literature these old enemies are similarly recycled as symbolic representations of the nations closest to Israel. These Gentile powers are usually envisaged to receive the first blow in the envisioned war.<sup>500</sup>

---

the case of the *Damascus Document*, the fate of Jewish rivals seems to have overtaken the fate of the nations as the enemy of primary importance. Cf. Luke's notion of Israel's enemy in Luke-Acts (Chapter Four).

<sup>499</sup> On the ancient occupation of the Land and the defeat of these and other enemies, see Joshua 12; 13; 15; 24; and Judges (esp. chap. 11). Also, these ancient enemies continued to resonate with later biblical authors (2 Sam 8:12; 1 Chr 18:11; Isa 11:14-16; Jer 25:21; Dan 11:41-42).

<sup>500</sup> See 4QFlor frgs. 1-3, col. i.3-4 and esp. Dan 11:40-45. Other writings such as *Jubilees*, *Pseudo-Philo*, and the *T12P* (esp. *T. Simeon*.6) often-utilize the names of Israel's ancient enemies as symbolic designations for Israel's current enemies among the Gentile powers, especially those within or around her borders. In many cases, these accounts thinly disguise Israel's hopes for the defeat of the Gentiles in later periods. It is also possible that the writer of 1QM is interpreting Isa 11:14-16 where these traditional enemies are named and anticipated to be conquered in the future restoration of Israel. In

A frequent name for the most important of the enemy nations in 1QM is the Kittim.<sup>501</sup> While there is some debate about which foreign power(s) underlie(s) this designation in 1QM—the most likely candidates being Greece or Rome—the Kittim<sup>502</sup> is presented as Israel's arch-enemy or the dominant foreign power whose defeat signals the climax of the war. Lastly, on many occasions the nations are simply referred to generically as the עמים,<sup>503</sup> גוים,<sup>504</sup> or אויב.<sup>505</sup>

As noted in the introduction to this chapter, many of the writings from the OT and EJL explore Israel's identity and fate in contrast to the nations by proclaiming the incomparability of God and/or Israel to the nations and their gods. In contrast to Biblical traditions, the use of the tradition shifts the weight of the emphasis on Israel's distinctiveness rather than God's. The claims of 1QM must also be heard, however, as part of inter-Jewish polemic in which one group claims precedence over another to be the true representatives of Israel. The author of the *War Scroll* claims this distinction for

---

Daniel 11, the writer refers to the Antiochine persecution and the Seleucid king's alliance with those who have "violated the covenant" (11:30). In Dan 11:40-45, the writer also refers to a battle between the kings of the north and the south which involves Edom, Moab, and the Ammonites and Egypt. In 1QM, it is Israel that invades these countries on the path to her eschatological victory. For various views on the influence of Daniel on 1QM, see John J. Collins, "The Mythology of the Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll: A Point of Transition in Jewish Apocalyptic," *VT* 25 (1975), 596-612; "Dualism and Eschatology in 1QM: A Reply to P. R. Davies," *VT* 29 (1979), 212-16; Philip R. Davies, "Dualism and Eschatology in the Qumran War Scroll," *VT* 28 (1978), 28-36; Philip R. Davies, "Dualism and Eschatology in 1QM: A Rejoinder," *VT* 30 (1980), 93-97.

<sup>501</sup> E.g., 1QM i.2,4,6,9,12; xi.11; xv.2; xvi.3,5,6,8, 9; xvii.12,14,15; vxiii.2,4; xix.10, 13. Also see 4Q285 frags. 4-5. The large number of references to the Kittim in 1QM cols. xiv.16-xix.13 motivated Yadin to refer to this section of 1QM as "the Kittim series." He compares this section to others in which Israel's opposition is identified with different, more general terms (*Scroll of the War*, 10-13).

<sup>502</sup> For a survey of terms used in the OT, 1QM and other early Jewish writings, see Hanan Eshel, "The Kittim in the War Scroll and in the Pesharim," in David Goodblatt, Avital Pinnick, and Daniel Schwartz (eds.), *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 27-31 January, 1999* (STDJ XXXVII; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 29-44. Eshel observes the association of the Kittim with the Hellenistic kingdom(s) in some (early) Qumran writings, but with Rome in other later ones.

<sup>503</sup> The plural form (עמים) is used with foreign nations in 1QM i.3; x.9,14; xi.14; while the singular עם is used with Israel (i.12; iii.13; ix.1; x.9,10; xii.1,5,15; xiii.7,9; xiv.12; xvi.9; xvii.14; xviii.7).

<sup>504</sup> E.g., 1QM xi.9,15; xii.11,14; xv.1,2; xvi.1; xix.6,10; cf. ii.7.

<sup>505</sup> E.g., 1QM vi.2; xii.7,11; ix.6,12; x.2,8; xi.7,8,13; xii.11.



his group to lie in the realm of apocalyptic secrets and claims to knowledge and righteousness. In making this claim, the author first appeals to the ancestors of Israel as sources of authority for the smaller group's claim(s).

In the hymnal portion of the *War Scroll*, God's saving actions on behalf of Moses and David are recalled (e.g. x.6-8; x.8-10; xi.1-7). These words in 1QM are a composite rendering of lines from the prayers of Moses in Ex 15:11 and of David in 2 Sam 7:22-24.<sup>506</sup> Moreover, this text from 1QM explores Israel's distinction from the nations in terms of her heavenly attributes, while underscoring Israel's close status with God and heavenly beings. The emphasis is made in the structure of the passage itself where the same question of incomparability is asked of both God and Israel. Reflecting on Moses' words regarding God's deliverance from enemies (x.6-8), the writer dwells on the uniqueness of both God and Israel, rhetorically asking: "Who is like you, God of Israel....and who is like your people, Israel" (x.8)? Although the writer of 1QM initially explores Israel's uniqueness in terms of God's selection of her "from all the peoples of the earth" (1QM x.9; 2 Sam 7:23), he proceeds to refer to qualities of the community that assign to it a quasi-heavenly status. The community is described as being the "holy ones of the covenant, learned in the law, wise in knowledge."<sup>507</sup> That such knowledge is not to be understood as ordinary and/or originating from study alone is emphasized in the adjoining claim that *this Israel* is privy, like the angels, to apocalyptic secrets of the universe (x.10-18). This special knowledge includes the seeing and hearing of angels as well as cosmological and calendrical matters.

David's reference to God's covenant to build him an eternal house of descendants may have been understood as a revelation of sorts (2 Sam 7:27:

---

<sup>506</sup> Although Yadin notes the correspondence with Exodus 15, he overlooks the influence of 2 Samuel 7 (*Scroll of the War*, 305).

<sup>507</sup> DSSSE 1.129.

גליתָה אֶת־אָזְן; lit. “you opened the ears”) and may have prompted the writer of 1QM to associate the community’s covenant with God as the basis for its claim to be privy, in the manner of heavenly beings, to the secrets of God (cf. the similar phrase מִגּוּלֵי אוֹזֶן). The main secret, however, that is disclosed in 1QM is the imminent triumph of Israel over the nations and all other enemies. The idea of Israel’s army joining with God draws from a variety of sources. The Maccabean revolution contributed to the idea that Israel could once more form a formidable army. Other writings draw on memories of notable conquests in Israel’s history, such as the invasion of the Land under Joshua or the expansion of her territory under David and Solomon. Several writers draw on a selected memory of Israel’s history of her miraculous origins and covenants in which God selected and redeemed the Jewish people.<sup>508</sup>

### 3.4.3.3 The Heavenly Combatants

The author of the *War Scroll* declares that Israel will not fight the battle alone, but would be joined by heavenly agents and even God.<sup>509</sup> In fact, the presence of “holy angels” among the combatants is the very reason given for the prohibition of certain

---

<sup>508</sup> Other documents from Qumran also demonstrate the continual importance of claiming relationship to Israel’s ancestors and covenantal promises for later communities. The promises of Israel’s future are for those Jews who share her history. The author of *1QFestival Prayers* (1Q34 + 1Q34bis) understands the “renewal of the covenant” with his community in terms of Israel’s covenantal beginnings, recalling how God established “a people” (עַם) “for holiness from all the peoples” (הַעַמִּים) (frg. 3, col. ii.6). Also see *4QFestival Prayers* (4Q509 + 4Q505). The writer anticipates the eradication of all Israel’s enemies (1Q34, frg. 4, col. i.6) and the re-gathering of Israel to the Land (1Q34, frgs. 1-2; 4Q509 + 4Q505, frg. 3, col. i). Likewise, the author of *4QWords of the Luminaries* (4Q504) recalls the past covenants with Israel through the figures of Moses (frgs. 1-2, col. iii) and David (frgs. 1-2, col. iv). Although the author acknowledges that God has used the nations to punish Israel (4Q504, frgs. 1-2, col. v), he now hopes for a reversal in which the nations would be subjugated and bring their riches into Zion (4Q504, frgs. 1-2, col. iv).

<sup>509</sup> E.g., 1QM xii.7-8; xiii.10; xvii.6-8. As discussed below, God joins the eschatological fray at the war’s conclusion (i.14-17; xi.17).

people (e.g., women, boys, disabled) from the camps or battlefield (vii.4-7). As Yadin writes:

The members of the sect must prepare for this war not only by perfect conduct but also in their organization, which must befit the 'hosts of God'. This is why a *serekh* is needed; this is given in the scroll.<sup>510</sup>

The relationship between these two realms (the community and heavenly beings) is very complex. The community believed itself to participate on some level in the lives of the angels or heavenly beings,<sup>511</sup> therefore, sharing in some aspects of the future, exalted (i.e., angelic) life even in the present. But this interaction with heaven and the angelic world is limited in the earthly realm. The *War Scroll* anticipates a climax to history in which the Jewish community would reap the eschatological reward of transformation and full access to the heavenly world.

---

<sup>510</sup> Yadin, *Scroll of the War*, 15. He elaborates: "Its purpose was to supply an urgent and immediate need, a guide for the problems of the long predicted war, which according to the sect would take place in the near future" (15; also 4). Similarly, Collins posits: "Its purpose is not to disclose what will happen, as is usually the case in an apocalypse, but to prescribe the appropriate actions in the light of what is known to be at hand" (*Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 93).

<sup>511</sup> More recently, Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis argues against the prevailing scholarly characterization of Qumran theology as dualistic. He prefers to speak of the "synchronisation of heavenly and earthly worlds in such a way that the righteous are both the effective agents of God's action and his presence, thereby becoming theomorphic or angelic" (*All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* [Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah XLII; Leiden: Brill, 2002], 395). Thus, Fletcher-Louis contends there are no clear-cut ontological differences between humans (i.e., the community of the *War Scroll*) and heavenly beings (see esp. 395-480). Likewise, he contends there is "much less evidence for a strongly spatial dualism, between heaven above and earth below" (397). Fletcher-Louis, however, goes too far in his attempt to blur all distinctions between the community of IQM (and other Qumran documents) and that of heavenly beings, or between that of heaven and earth. Although the community of IQM does claim to share an element of heavenly status, other evidence suggests the community members realized their limited participation in the heavenly realm. Thus, ultimately, the community stands in need of heavenly intervention from the angel Michael (xvii.7-9) and/or God (xviii.1-3). IQM xvii.1-9 is especially poignant as it anticipates the intervention of Michael, while encouraging the community ("sons of the covenant") to persevere until the time when the "mysteries" of their lives will be revealed and the final tests are complete. Moreover, the writer of the *War Scroll* clearly anticipates a day of greater exaltation and transformation at the moment of triumph. In a number of places, there are clear distinctions between the holy people of Israel and heavenly beings (e.g., IQM xiii.9-10). Therefore, Fletcher-Louis' argument for a lack of distinction between heavenly and earthly entities cannot be sustained. Nonetheless, his study demonstrates that strict characterizations of dualism may need to be modified or more carefully nuanced in some cases. Also see Crispin Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* (WUNT 2.94; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1998). (Cf. 4Q491.)

The *War Scroll* evidences a phenomenon found elsewhere in EJJ in which the playing field for the end-time war is enlarged to include heavenly combatants. While in some cases, heavenly rivals are envisaged to fight alone without human interaction, in other cases, such as the *Animal Apocalypse* and the *War Scroll*, humans wage war alongside such heavenly powers. In some cases, heavenly beings are strictly aligned with specific nations. But in writings like the *War Scroll*, the heavenly agents are not assigned to particular nations, but to all the nations *en bloc* and Jewish adversaries as well. These evil heavenly beings are understood to preside over an age of evil. The final war between Israel and the nations in 1QM is envisioned on a comprehensive and cosmic scale, involving the human actors, good and evil heavenly agents and even God himself.<sup>512</sup> In dualistic terms these combatants<sup>513</sup> are identified as the “sons of light” and the “sons of darkness.”<sup>514</sup>

---

<sup>512</sup> The inclusion of heavenly combatants into the war does not diminish the importance of the earthly combatants. In 1QM as in other early Jewish accounts the synchronization of the heaven and the earth is the basis for demands or regulations involving the people of Israel. It is noteworthy, however, to point out that while the sons of darkness may include both Jew and Gentile and (evil) heavenly forces, the sons of light are restricted to righteous Jews and heavenly beings; Gentiles are disqualified.

<sup>513</sup> The dualism of Qumran is not completely balanced between the powers of good and evil. That is, humans and angels have their good and evil counterparts, but God has no adversary of equal status, but rather is the decisive actor in an otherwise balanced match of good and evil.

<sup>514</sup> E.g., 1QM i.1-1, 3, 9, 10, 11, 13, 16; iii.6, 9; iv.2; xvi.11. The dualistic characterization of the combatants incorporates not only the human participants—Israel, Jewish enemies, and the nations—involved in the conflict but the respective heavenly powers who support each party as well. The sons of light also may be identified with the sons of Levi, Judah and Benjamin (i.2), the “exiles of the desert,” (i.2), and the [Son]s of Righteousness (i.8). The Sons of Darkness are analogous with “the army of Belial” (i.1), “lot of Belial” (i.5), the “troop of Edom, Moab, the sons of Ammon (i.1) and Philistia” (i.2), and the Kittim (i.1, 4, 6) and “those who violate the covenant” (i.2). Other terms or phrases are used as well to distinguish heavenly agents in the conflict. Israel’s spiritual allies are referred to by such names as holy ones (e.g., xii.7, 8) and angels (xii.4, 8), spirits (x.12), spirits of truth, (xiii.10), and gods (xvii.7). Occasionally, a specific angel is identified as the Prince of light (xiii.10), “majestic angel” (xvii.6), or Michael (xvii.6, 7). The names of the angels Michael, Sariel, Gabriel, and Raphael are written on the shields of the towers as well (1QM ix.15-16), perhaps suggesting their presence. In other Qumran writings, Michael (or Melchizedek) is given special acclaim as Israel’s chief angel or at least the one who fights for her (11Q13). Most importantly, God himself intervenes and fights for Israel. On the side of the nations are heavenly powers identified as “spirits of his (Belial’s) lot” (xiii.2, 4), “fallen spirits” (xi.10), “wicked spirits” (xv.14), and “prince of the dominion of evil” (xvii.5). The chief of these spirits is Belial (i.1, 5, 13, 15(?), iv.2; xi.8; xiii.2, 4; xvi.11[?]; xviii.1, 3). As with Michael, Belial is noted in many other Qumran documents as the chief power of the enemy, whether Jewish or Gentile.

### 3.4.3.4 The Eschatological Re-gathering and the Final War

The cosmic battle between Israel and her enemies is told in great detail over the course of the whole document of the *War Scroll*. However, in the most complete (and final) form of the *War Scroll*, attested by 1QM,<sup>515</sup> the opening column serves as both an introduction to and summary of the eschatological war. As already demonstrated, the opening lines situate Israel's war against the nations within an apocalyptic framework whose denouement is at hand:<sup>516</sup>

The first battle of the Sons of Light shall be launched against the lot of the Sons of Darkness, against the army of Belial, against the troops of Edom, Moab, the sons of Ammon (2) and [...] Philistia, and against the troops of Kittim of Asshur, these being helped by those who violate the covenant. The sons of Levi, sons of Judah, and the sons of Benjamin, the exiles of the wilderness, shall wage war against them (3) [...] according to all their troops, when the exiles, the Sons of Light, return from the wilderness of the peoples to encamp in the wilderness of Jerusalem.<sup>517</sup>

The forty year<sup>518</sup> conflict takes place in three stages: (1) The conquest of the Land and the enemies who have occupied it and the evil powers which preside over them; (2) the defeat of the Kittim of Egypt; and (3) the defeat of the remainder of the nations.

Israel begins the war with an assault on those enemies close to the Land. In this stage her traditional Gentile foes and Jewish enemies ("those who violate the covenant") are defeated. The goal of Israel's stage of assault is to retake Jerusalem from

---

<sup>515</sup> While Yadin (*The Scroll of the War*) and Carmagnac (*La Règle de la Guerre: Des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres: Texte, Restauré, Traduit, Commenté* [Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1958]) propose a literary unity of 1QM, most scholars have posited a complex editorial history of the *War Scroll*: "1QM represents the most complete extant copy of the War Scroll and is probably a witness to the final form of its literary growth" (PDSSP 2.80).

<sup>516</sup> Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 7; Davies, *1QM*, 113-24, esp. 113; Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 94.

<sup>517</sup> PDSSP 2.97.

<sup>518</sup> While no timetable is given in 1QM col. i, ii.7 refers to the remaining thirty-three years of the war, implying the first stage of the war in the invasions of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Kittim extended seven years. These seven years may correspond to the seven encounters between the sons of light and darkness in the final stage of the battle.

enemy control. The invasion is led by the sons of Levi, Judah, and Benjamin.<sup>519</sup> Davies notes the curiosity of the reference to these three since elsewhere in the document the writer refers to the twelve tribes (ii.1, 2; iii.14; v.1, 2).<sup>520</sup> He suggests that the reference to the three tribes might suggest that the opening stages of the battle will be fought by a few tribes, which will be joined, in the later stages of the war, by the remaining "lost tribes of Israel."<sup>521</sup> Although such a usage of the motif of the twelve tribes does not entail 1QM is envisioning the return of the literal ten tribes of the Assyrian exile, as Davies suggests, he has observed an important feature of the *War Scroll* that has not been sufficiently noted in scholarship. That is, the time of Israel's eschatological victory over her enemies is *also the time of her final ingathering*. In this interpretation of the motif of Israel's re-gathering, the eschatological return to the Land is understood as *a gathering for war* on the return back to the Land.

In the first stage, the three chief tribes of Israel, the ones associated with the historic exile and return, lead the attack.<sup>522</sup> As noted, the author may understand the

---

<sup>519</sup> The author's idea of Israel's re-gathering also draws from OT portrayals of the spying out (Numbers 1-10) and invasion of the Land, as recorded in the book of Joshua.

<sup>520</sup> Davies, *1QM*, 114. Since Davies' work is devoted to recovered the editorial history of 1QM it is unclear why he does not treat the concern for three tribes in col. i as opposed to twelve in cols. ii-v as simply a matter related to different authorships, especially since he spends a great deal of time arguing for literary connection between col. i and cols. xv-xix, where no reference to the twelve or three occurs. Other interpretative options have been offered as well. Milik sees an allusion to the other tribes already in column i in the reference to sons of light "from the wilderness of the nations." He posits that these tribes are from the "camps in the land of Damascus and in the Diaspora generally." (J. T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* [Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, 1959], 122).

<sup>521</sup> Davies, *1QM*, 114. This interpretation seems unlikely. Nowhere in 1QM (or elsewhere in the scrolls as far as I can determine) is there a concern for a literal reunion of the northern tribes with the southern ones.

<sup>522</sup> Cf. Shlomo Pines, who argues that a full stop should occur after Benjamin with the implication that those who have violated the covenant are "these three tribes who returned from the Babylonian captivity," who constitute leadership or "polity of Jerusalem" ("Notes on the Twelve Tribes in Qumran, Early Christianity and Jewish Tradition," in Ithamar Gruenwald, Shaul Shaked, and Gedaliahu G. Stroumsa [eds.], *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity: Presented to David Flusser on the Occasion of his Seventh-Fifth Birthday* [Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1992], 152, [151-54]). Conversely, Pines suggests the "exiled of the desert" are "identified as the twelve tribes." While possible, Pines' interpretation is complicated by the fact that 1QM accepts positively the idea of the twelve tribes, which would presumably include the three that are named in col. i. Pines is forced to suggest, therefore, that the rejection of the three tribes extends only to the polity or rule

initial invasion (or re-gathering) to be led by the three leading tribes, who will be joined by the rest of Israel in the later stages of the war. Alternatively, the three leading tribes may be representative of an all-out assault by the tribes.<sup>523</sup> The largely symbolic value of the twelve tribes for indicating Israel's eschatological return is underscored by the writer's *naming* only three leading tribes (e.g., Levi, Judah, and Benjamin), while simply referring to the number "twelve" elsewhere in speaking of the tribes.<sup>524</sup>

The final war is portrayed as being a conflict of the ages. While the Land lies at the center and is the key to the battle, all humanity and heavenly beings find a stake in the war. As 1QM i.10-11 anticipates:

On this (day) they shall clash in a great carnage; the congregation of divine beings and the assembly of men, the Sons of Light and the lot of darkness, shall fight each other to (disclose?) the might of God, with the uproar of a large multitude and the war cry of divine beings and men, on the day of calamity.<sup>525</sup>

Following victories over Jerusalem and the Land, and the renewal of the Temple (ii.1-6), the next front of the eschatological war is opened with the Kittim in Egypt and the kings of the North. Jerusalem, however, *continues to serve as the base* from which further military campaigns are launched.<sup>526</sup> The capture of Jerusalem and fall of the

---

associated with these tribes and not the tribes themselves. Moreover, Pines does not take into account the positive references about some of these tribes elsewhere in 1QM and other Qumran writings. Nowhere else are these three condemned in the scrolls. Ephraim and Manasseh are associated with the enemy in some texts.

<sup>523</sup> Moreover, in 1QM ii.10, the writer indicates that the remainder of the war will be fought in divisions, implying the first stage was fought altogether. Column ii opens in Jerusalem, referring to the special relationship of the twelve tribes to Jerusalem and the gates of the Temple, a relationship underscored in other Qumran writings as well, a point made in other Qumran documents as well.

<sup>524</sup> It is likely that these are named because of their importance to Israel's history, especially 6<sup>th</sup> century exile and restoration. Ezra mentions only these tribes in the return (1:5). Cf. 1 Esd 2:8 and *Ant.* 11.8. 11QT col. xix, col. xxiii (11Q20 col. vi) refers to the full number of twelve tribes, but begins with these three in the same order as 1QM; 4Q372 (*4QApocryphon of Joseph*), frg. 1.5 refers to the exile of Joseph into Egypt; the three tribes of Levi, Judah, and Benjamin are mentioned in the exact order of 1QM.

<sup>525</sup> PDSSP 2.97.

<sup>526</sup> E.g., 1QM vii.3-5; 4QM<sup>a</sup> frg. 16.4). Cf. the centrality of Jerusalem for the missionary campaign to the nations in 1 Maccabees and Luke-Acts as well.

Kittim is a decisive turning point in the war and is celebrated as the pivotal point of the campaign.<sup>527</sup> Although many more years of war are expected, these battles are treated more as the recovery of lost territory than important new conquests. The capture of Jerusalem is the decisive blow, guaranteeing the inevitability of the final triumph over the world. The reclamation of Jerusalem and the defeat of the Kittim, the chief superpower, is understood as a “time of salvation (עת ישועה) for the nation of God and period of rule for all the men of his lot” (i.5).

The retaking of the Land and Jerusalem, and by implication, the purifying of the Temple cult, is interpreted as having cosmic and transformative implications (i.8-9):

And [the sons of righteous]ess<sup>528</sup> shall shine to all the ends of the earth (קצוות תבל), shining continuously until the end of all the periods of darkness; and in the time of God, his exalted greatness will shine for all the appointed times, for peace, and blessing, and joy, and length of days for all the sons of light.<sup>529</sup>

As the decisive blows are given against the nations and heavenly evil powers, the author claims a radical, new creation is effected in the world. For the author, the consequence of Israel’s liberation is an atoning effect that sweeps over the all creation.<sup>530</sup> That is,

---

<sup>527</sup> Following the defeat of the enemies within the Land and the Kittim, Israel’s military campaign is directed at such foes as the sons of Shem, Ham, and Japheth, names that correspond with the ancestry of the (seventy) nations, (cf. Genesis 10; cf. 15:18). Although 1QM ii.6-7 indicates there are thirty-three years remaining in the war, the recapturing of Jerusalem ensures the final triumph.

<sup>528</sup> Yadin, (*Scroll of the War*, 258) reconstructs [“Knowledge and] justice” based on similar combinations of terms (e.g., 1QM xvii.5-6).

<sup>529</sup> My translation based on *DSSSE*, 113. While 1QM i.1-9 suggest a fairly decisive, even easy victory, lines 9b-17 suggest the contest between the sons of light and sons of darkness is much more balanced. For after six battles, in which three are won by the sons of light and three by the sons of darkness, God himself must intervene to provide the ultimate victory (i.14-16): “And in the seventh lot, God’s great hand will subdue (15) [Belial, and a]ll the angels of his dominion and all the men of [his lot]” (*DSSS*, 95-96). Collins understands the seven lots of the war to refer not to the final stage, but to the whole of the war (*Apocalypticism*, 94.)

<sup>530</sup> E.g., *DSSSE*, 2.1081; cf. *T. Lev* 18:1-5, 9; *Tob* 13:11; 1QS iii.13-26; xi.2-9. The cultic or atoning implications of Israel’s restoration on the world is found elsewhere in *EJL* as well. For instance, in 4Q541 (4QapocrLev<sup>b</sup> frg. 9, col. i.1-7), the writer describes the exaltation of Levi in terms that magnify his power and redemptive implications for the world:

(4Q541 i.2)... And he will atone for all the children of his generation, and he will be sent to all the children of (3) his [people]. His word is like the word of the heavens, and his teaching,



what is often imagined only for Israel—the purging of the Land—is envisioned for all the created order. The atonement of all creation, however, originates from seminal event of *Israel's restoration* (i.e., that which occurs in the Land). Although, the renewal of the cosmos represents a stage beyond Israel's redemption, the two events are bound so closely together in 1QM, they cannot be easily separated. The atonement of the world reflects Israel's concern for her future self-preservation rather than a sympathetic view of the nations. Israel can only live safely within her borders when the nations of the world have either been destroyed or made completely submissive.<sup>531</sup>

While the retaking of Jerusalem is pivotal, the conflict grows in intensity as the final period of the war concludes. According to the writer, on the day of decision, each side of the conflict wins three battles each, suggesting not only a certain equality of prowess among the earthly combatants, but of the heavenly beings as well. At this juncture, God intervenes directly in the seventh lot, delivering the final victory (i.14; xviii.1-3, 11-13).

The program of restoration in the *War Scroll* places paramount importance on the eradication of Israel's enemies. While on the positive side, Israel's restoration is the time of the eschatological gathering of the twelve tribes to the Land, the return, in 1QM, is presented as first being an occasion for war. Although Israel is gathered for her salvation, there is also an "assembly of people or nations for destruction without

---

according to the will of God. His eternal sun will shine (4) and its fire will burn in all the ends of the earth; above the darkness it will shine. Then, darkness will vanish (5) [fr]om the earth, and gloom from the dry land.

The conclusion of this fragment (lines 5b-7) ends with a prophecy of Levi (or the Levitical cult) being rejected and an ensuing age of evil. It is not clear from the passage whether this means that an evil age will follow the glorious one of Levi or whether the author has now shifted his focus back on to the period prior to the installation of the glorious, high priest (above).

<sup>531</sup> While the author's description of the end-time war is best interpreted within an apocalyptic framework and understood as reflecting a genuine belief in heavenly powers and transformative endings in the world, the close association between Israel's military triumphs and cosmic consequences may also be a kind of code language for describing Israel's political and religious dominance over the nations and lands of the world.

remnant" (xiv.5). Thus, the *War Scroll* clearly indicates that the salvation of Israel cannot be understood apart from the defeat of the nations: "For God's lot there will be an everlasting redemption and destruction for all the wicked nations" (xv.1-2).<sup>532</sup> Although some texts suggest a comprehensive annihilation of the nations, other passages suggest that their defeat will be followed by the subjugation of the surviving foreign powers. These nations will make the requisite pilgrimage to Jerusalem to indicate their subservience. A poem celebrating this humbling and humiliating pilgrimage of the Gentiles to Jerusalem occurs at two points in 1QM, underscoring the importance of Israel's earthly enemies (i.e., the nations), even while the author has emphasized the cosmic dimensions of the war. Moreover, the passage emphasizes that Israel's exaltation depends concomitantly upon the nations' humiliation:

1QM xii.10 ...Arise, mighty one! Take your captives, glorious man. Seize (11) your plunder, (you) who do worthily! Put your hand upon the neck of your enemies and your foot upon the piles of the slain! Smite the nations, your foes, and let your sword (12) devour the guilty flesh. Fill your land (with) glory and your inheritance (with) blessing; a multitude of cattle in your fields, silver, gold, and precious (13) stones in your palaces. Zion, rejoice greatly! Shine forth in jubilation, Jerusalem! Be glad all you, cities of Judah! Open (14) [your] gate[s] continually, that through them may be brought the wealth of the nations! Their king shall serve you; all your oppressors shall bow down before you and (15) [lick] the dust [from your feet. Daughter]s of my people, shout with a voice of jubilation! Deck yourselves with glorious ornaments! Have dominion over [the ki]n[gdoms...] (16) [...]Israel shall reign forever.<sup>533</sup>

Early Jewish documents such as the *Animal Apocalypse*, 1 Maccabees, and the *War Scroll* represent the view, found in many other early Jewish sources as well, that Israel will play an important role in defeating the nations in winning her (eschatological) restoration. The *War Scroll* and the *Animal Apocalypse*<sup>534</sup> emphasize, however, that Israel will be divinely supported in her miraculous victory, while 1 Maccabees claims God's favor and exclusive endorsement in leading a rebellion, but

---

<sup>532</sup> DSSST 135.

<sup>533</sup> The poem also appears in xix.1-8.

<sup>534</sup> For the analysis of the *Animal Apocalypse*, see the previous chapter (Chapter Three).

stops far short of portraying a comic war. In these writings, the enemies are defined primarily as the nations, but Jewish adversaries are identified as well. Moreover, in some accounts, the enemy is portrayed to be comprised of, or empowered by, heavenly agents. In those accounts in which the enemy is portrayed as both human and demonic, Israel stands in need of her own heavenly support and usually receives it through God or heavenly mediators. Therefore, Israel's triumph over the eschatological enemies may involve not only the ruling superpower of the day, but the patron angels of the Gentiles or evil cosmic forces. The geography of the war usually proceeds from Jerusalem to the nations. But in some cases, the geographical scope of the eschatological battle may stretch not only from the Land to the nations, but from earth unto heaven.

### 3.5 Divine Intervention and the Defeat of Israel's Enemies

All of the documents, thus far treated in this chapter, envisage some level of human participation in the defeat of the enemy or enemies in Israel's (future) restoration. Moreover, in the future restoration according to the *Animal Apocalypse*,<sup>535</sup> Israel was envisaged as well to play a role in the defeat of the nations. Although not so much a factor in the defeat of the enemy in 1 Maccabees, these documents also emphasized, to varying degrees, levels of divine support in gaining the eschatological victory. Other early Jewish sources limit their description of human participation in the defeat of the enemy to a central or leading figure, such as a Davidic messiah (e.g., *Pss.*

---

<sup>535</sup> As noted in Chapter Two, the *Animal Apocalypse* describes the rise of a righteous community who is empowered by God to victory. Only afterwards does God establish his throne on earth to issue judgments of fiery punishment against evil heavenly agents and Jewish rivals (90:20). The appearance of the throne marks the decisive end of the conflict and initiates God's judgment on the culprits who are subsequently sentenced to fiery punishment, paving the way for the more positive aspects of Israel's restoration.

*Sol.* 17).<sup>536</sup> But other documents place little or no stock in Jews fighting to secure their restoration. As Marinus de Jonge argues:

God is free to achieve his end in the ways He chooses. He may use no human intermediaries, but only heavenly ones; He may also bring about the radical change in the circumstances of Israel and the world without any instrument at all. Indeed, some Jewish authors intentionally downplay, and in some cases, even oppose any human participation in the defeat of the enemy.<sup>537</sup>

Daniel 7-12, written during the period of the Antiochine persecution and Maccabean rebellion, attributes little credit to or hope in human combatants securing Israel's restoration in the conflict with the nations.<sup>538</sup> For the most part, the Danielic author simply omits all references to the role of the Jewish army (i.e., the Maccabeans). At one point, however, he apparently acknowledges the Maccabeans, but immediately qualifies their participation as merely "a little help" (עֶזֶר בְּעֵט) (11:34). Daniel understands the decisive end of Israel's predicament to rest *exclusively* on the divine intervention of God and his heavenly agents. In Daniel 7, the victory is tersely articulated as a divine judgment rendered by God, who sits upon a throne of judgment (7:9-10).<sup>539</sup> His verdict is mediated by a being described as "one like a son of man" (7:13-14), a heavenly agent who receives the kingdom on Israel's behalf.

---

<sup>536</sup> The *Psalms of Solomon* and other early Jewish documents in refers to a Davidic messiah are treated later in this chapter. However, we have already noted the Davidic messiah's importance in the *Damascus Document* and 4 *Ezra*.

<sup>537</sup> Marinus de Jonge, "The Role of Intermediaries in God's Final Intervention in the Future according to the Qumran Scrolls," in O. Michel, et al (eds), *Studies on the Jewish Background of the New Testament* (Assen: Van Gorum, 1969), 63.

<sup>538</sup> Although the defeat of the nations and the renewal of the Temple are clear emphases of the writer's understanding of restoration, the feature of the peoples' re-gathering does not explicitly occur in Daniel 7-12. Instead, the author speaks of a (holy) people (e.g., 7:27; 12:1,7) and a sapiential-apocalyptic community (11:35).

<sup>539</sup> Some early Jewish passages portray God emerging in a theophanic visitation and/or upon throne(s) of judgment. For instance, in *The Book of Watchers* (1 *Enoch* 1-36), the writer opens with an account of God's theophanic visitation to earth (1:1-9). This pericope does not explicitly refer to Israel (or her restoration). While God's coming is associated with universal or cosmic implications, the choice of Mt. Sinai—the place of the Mosaic covenant—as the launch-pad of God's judgment certainly suggest important implications for Israel (cf. 10:18). The full focus of 1 *Enoch* 1 is on the elimination of the nations and/or the wicked, a staple feature of texts of restoration. Nonetheless, it is very difficult to know

Other descriptions of Israel's liberation in Daniel emphasize the role of divine intervention as well. At other points in Daniel, the author portrays or interprets Israel's current conflict with the nations to be the direct result of a heavenly war involving the patron angels of the nations. However, Daniel is told by an angel that Israel has her own angelic deliverer, who ultimately will defeat the other heavenly agents and usher in Israel's restoration (e.g., 8:25; 10:13, 20; 12:1).<sup>540</sup> Thus, the cosmic dimensions of the war, at least for the Danielic writer, render the taking up of arms to be of little or no importance. Therefore, the writer only stresses the role of God and heavenly agents in executing Israel's eschatological deliverance.

The writing known as *Pseudo-Philo* advocates strongly for Jews to place their hopes in divine intervention rather than other options available to them. Written against the tumultuous events of the Roman occupation of the mid first century CE, the author promotes the period of the Judges as analogous to his own. The author offers a creative retelling or interpretation of the book that highlights his concerns. As Doron Mendels convincingly argues, the book opposes military rebellion against Rome, being especially critical toward the messianic pretenders who would illegitimately lead such restorative efforts. Instead, the writer implies that Israel should wait patiently for the

---

the positive content of the writer's ideas of restoration in this text, although from the wider literary context of the story and the historic backdrop of the narrative (the impending flood), restoration is conceived of as a kind of new creation. These texts often casts "restoration" or Israel's hopes entirely in the negative, focusing exclusively on the destruction of the enemies and providing little if any idea of what Israel's expects beyond the Gentiles' defeat. Occasionally, however, as in the case of *1 Enoch* 1 the events are very closely related to the hope for a new creation. Although the use of the new creation motif may lie outside the restoration of Israel tradition and even be a critique of it, as observed from the *Animal Apocalypse*, this is not necessarily so. The emphasis on the defeat of the nations with little detail to the more positive aspects of the restoration underscores the importance attached to the defeat of the enemy in Israel's hopes of restoration. A number of biblical texts place God's revenge against the nations as front and center of the hopes of the future. Some of these biblical passages draw on the biblical tradition of the "Day of the Lord," where Israel's restoration is portrayed almost exclusively in terms of judgment on the nations (e.g., Isa 13:6, 9; Ezek 13:5; Joel 1:15; 2:1, 11; 3:4; 4:14; Amos 5:18-20 [3x]; Obad 15; Zeph 1:7, 14; Mal 3:23. See K. J. Cathcart's discussion of "Day of Yahweh," in *ABD*, 2:84-85). Some of these texts (e.g., Amos 5:18-20) indicate that Yahweh's vengeance may be directed toward unrighteous Jews as well.

<sup>540</sup> At the heart of the author's understanding of restoration is the renewal of the Temple cult in the imminent future (e.g., 8:13-14).

rightful heir to the throne of David.<sup>541</sup> Until God chooses to intervene in such a manner, the book advocates (1) passivity and religious devotion; (2) strong local leadership; and (3) reliance on God. While the author advocates Israel's passivity throughout the book, his retelling of the exodus from Egypt is particularly noteworthy and striking, differing markedly with the biblical account of the event. In the author's description of the risky exit from Egypt, *Pseudo-Philo* inserts a response from the various tribes to the impending danger. Some of the tribes suggest suicide (10:3); others advocate Israel's surrender and servitude to the nations (10:3b); and the four leading tribes (Levi, Judah, Joseph, and Benjamin) advise fighting back (10:3c). The author's view is conveyed in the response of Moses who rejects all of the options of the tribes, and instead, cries out for God to intervene on Israel's behalf. Mendels observes that through the voice of Moses "our author expresses his practical message for the present time: do not fight the oppressor; God will, provided you believe in him."<sup>542</sup> Moreover, like the writings of Josephus and the *Testament of Moses*,<sup>543</sup> both of which are treated below, *Pseudo-Philo* contends that the people's suffering and dying is heroic and sometimes even redemptive. By resisting, waiting, and dying righteously, Israel may play a role in precipitating God's intervention in bringing about her restoration and other eschatological benefits (i.e., heavenly exaltation).<sup>544</sup>

---

<sup>541</sup> "Pseudo-Philo's Biblical Antiquities, the Fourth Philosophy, and the Political Messianism of the First Century C.E.," in Charlesworth (ed.), *Messiah*, 261-75. While *Pseudo-Philo* reiterates the claim of the book of Judges that Israel's problems are due to the lack of national leadership, he also underscores the perils of false and bad leaders, both local and national. His story ends his story with the death of Saul, who is "portrayed as a king who appeared 'before his time' (Mendels, *Rise and Fall*, 229-30). Although he introduces David and the idea of his kingship, its history is not told. Instead, the author leaves the impression that the true period of Davidic rule lies not in the past with David, but in the (indefinite) future with his heir (e.g., 62:9). Moreover, there are a number of explicit anti-kingship passages (e.g., *Ps-Philo* 56:2; 58:4; 59:1-5). See the discussion of the Davidic messiah below.

<sup>542</sup> Mendels, "Pseudo-Philo's Biblical Antiquities," 271.

<sup>543</sup> For the views of Josephus and the *Testament of Moses* on divine intervention, see below.

<sup>544</sup> E.g., *Ps-Philo* 39-40; 43:5-8; 64:9.

While the author embraces the idea of divine intervention, the outcome of God's retribution is less clear. The narrative setting of much of the story is the Land and covenant, but the borders of Palestine ultimately do not define the parameters of the author's eschatology.<sup>545</sup> The covenant is understood in terms of God's commitment to and reward of the people. While the promise of the Land is still bound up with the covenant and the people, the holy territory of Israel is no longer at the center. The eschatological reward of covenant reaches through, *but beyond*, the land of Israel. Instead, the fulfillment of the covenant is articulated in terms of a new creation<sup>546</sup> in which the righteous people are rewarded with eternal life with the ancestors "in the immortal dwelling place that is not subject to time" (19:12).<sup>547</sup> Since the writing is penned within an historical context in which some of the people of Israel have politicized the Land and Temple, placing the sacred territory and institutions at risk, the hope of divine intervention is the last hope. Therefore, the author attempts to convince Israel of God's exclusive right to intervention and of a destiny that lies beyond the territory of Palestine.<sup>548</sup> When God intervenes, the author envisages the borders of the Land giving way to a more comprehensive domain over which the Jewish deity will rule over.

---

<sup>545</sup> See the introduction of "Pseudo-Philo," in *OTP* 2.300-01, where the editor remarks that *Pseudo-Philo* "does not cast his eschatology in political terms, nor does he show interest in the future Messiah" (301). For the author's interpretation of Israel's covenant, see Betsey Halpern-Amaru, "The Historical Covenant of *Pseudo-Philo*," in idem (ed.), *Rewriting*, 69-94.

<sup>546</sup> E.g., 3:10.

<sup>547</sup> *OTP* 2.328. The author leaves open the possibility of a restoration to the Land, but the content of this future hope is unclear (19:13).

<sup>548</sup> Mendels, "Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities*," 272-75. Although there is no imminent hope for a Davidic messiah, the narrative leaves open the possibility that his genuine appearance, unlike that of messianic pretenders and other rebels (of the author period), would be an acceptable indication of God's intervening activity. But as Mendels observes, while "the author emphasizes the future ascendancy of the House of David, ...the time has not yet come" (269). However, given the author's focus on heavenly geography and eternal life, the messiah's role in such an eschatological order is not altogether clear. The vague hope for such a figure is primarily one of rhetorical or symbolic value. That is, unlike the contemporary pretenders of the author's period, the real messiah will stand clearly as God's agent.

The reliance on divine intervention for Israel's future restoration occurs across a wide number of documents in EJL. In the discussion below, the *Testament of Moses* is examined for its view of the future defeat of Israel's enemies. Although the event of Israel's restoration does not function as the climax of the author's understanding of the future, the restoration of Israel, particularly, the defeat of the nations and other enemies, sets in motion a string of eschatological events which conclude beyond the geography of the Land to the boundaries of heaven itself. Other writings, particularly some passages written by Josephus, although lacking in the hope for Israel's restoration, are included in the present discussion to provide insight into how ideas of divine intervention relate to such ideas or activities as war, passivity, martyrdom, and Israel's conception of her role in the world of nations.

### 3.5.1 Testament of Moses: The Power of Dying and Restoration Beyond the Land

The *Testament of Moses*<sup>549</sup> proposes to be the final words of Moses to Joshua just before the latter's conquest of the nations.<sup>550</sup> Joshua is told that while he will be

---

<sup>549</sup> The date of the *Testament of Moses* is disputed. George W. Nickelsburg ("An Antiochan Date for the Testament of Moses," in George W. E. Nickelsburg (ed.), *Studies on the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers* [SBLSCS 4; Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973 ], 33-37) and J. Licht ("Taxo, or the Apocalyptic Doctrine of Vengeance," *JJS* 12 [1961], 95-103) both posit a date in the mid-second century BCE. Therefore, they conclude that the transparent references to Herod and Varus in *T. Moses* 6 are later interpolations. Collins ("The Date and the Provenance of the Testament of the Testament of Moses," in Nickelsburg [ed.] *Studies on the Testament of Moses*, 15-32), Johannes Tromp (*Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary* [Leiden: Brill, 1993], 116-17) and Norbert Johannes Hofmann (*Die Assumptio Mosis: Studien zur Rezeption massguiltiger Ueberlieferung*; Supplements to the Study for the Study of Judaism 67; Leiden: Brill, 2000, 27-30) date the writing to the early first century CE, although they recognize the presence and re-use of older traditions. The *terminus a quo* is to be found in Varus' attack on the Jews in 4 BCE (see 6:8-9), while the *terminus ad quem* would be the destruction of the second Temple, apparently not mentioned in the writing. All translations are those of J. Priest in *OTP* 1.919-34 unless otherwise noted.

<sup>550</sup> Much of the *Testament of Moses* is a rewritten and highly interpretive history of the events found in Deuteronomy 31-34 (D. J. Harrington, "Interpreting Israel's History: The Testament of Moses as a Rewriting of Deut 31-34," in Nickelsburg (ed.), *Studies on the Testament of Moses*, 59-68.



successful in conquering and dividing the Land, because of the sins of the two southern tribes (i.e., idolatry), the “future” city and Temple will be destroyed by a king from the east and the people will be exiled (3:1-3). According to the writer, the destruction and exile is God’s punishment for Israel’s sins and is to last seventy-seven years (3:14), an interpretative play on the seventy years of Jeremiah.<sup>551</sup> The restoration of the second Temple is referred to in Moses’ words to Joshua:

(*T. Moses* 4:5) Then God will remember them because of the covenant which he made with their fathers and he will openly show his compassion. (6) And in those times he will inspire a king to have pity on them and send them home to their own land. (7) Then some parts of the tribes will arise and come to their appointed place, and they will strongly build its walls. (8) Now, the two tribes will remain steadfast in their former faith, sorrowful and sighing because they will not be able to offer sacrifices to the Lord of their fathers. (9) But the ten tribes will grow and spread out among the nations during the time of their captivity.<sup>552</sup>

The historic restoration is understood to be unsatisfactory and unfulfilling in its conclusion. The main problem centers on the cult and the inability to offer sacrifices to God (4:8).<sup>553</sup> Tromp argues convincingly that the two tribes who are devoted to the Temple are portrayed positively, but are contrasted by the author with other Jews of the return who devote themselves to building the walls of Jerusalem. The writer understands in their actions a misplaced priority on rebuilding Jerusalem into a fortress or political nation.<sup>554</sup> That is, the author wishes to present Jerusalem as a religious center that was displaced in the historic restoration by political or nationalistic goals. The first impulse of the returnees should have been to rebuild or renew the Temple and cult, not the rebuilding of Israel into a political or military regime. Furthermore, the two tribes of Jews (of both good and sinful people) within the Land are contrasted with the ten

---

<sup>551</sup> The reason for additional seven years is not clear; the best explanation may lie simply in the symbolic importance of the number seven itself, i.e., “the factor of complete” (Tromp, *Assumption of Moses*,) 174.

<sup>552</sup> *OTP* 1.929.

<sup>553</sup> On the impurity of the Temple sacrifice, see *1 Enoch (AnApoc)* 90:73 and 4Q390.

<sup>554</sup> Tromp, *Assumption of Moses*, 180-81. Cf. *T. Moses* 2:7.

tribes who "grow and spread out among the nations during the time of their captivity" (4:9).<sup>555</sup>

This critique of the sinful Jews and the Diaspora is immediately followed in the narrative by a period of woes or tribulation.<sup>556</sup> In this epoch, conditions regarding the people of Israel and the state of the Temple worsen. While initially the tribes of Israel are not able to sacrifice, the religious practices which they do engage in are characterized as idolatrous:

(*T. Moses* 5:3) Consequently, the word was fulfilled that they will avoid justice and approach iniquity; and they will pollute the house of their worship with the custom of the nations; and they will play the harlot after foreign gods.<sup>557</sup>

This epoch of evil and sin results in the invasion of the Gentiles, giving way to the occupation of a foreign king from the West who (1) conquers Israel; (2) sets fire to the Temple; and (3) takes Israel into captivity (6:8-9). That is, the author describes the predicament of Israel according to the language of exilic theology.

The antipathy between Israel and the nations climaxes in the remaining chapters of the book. The final king who torments Israel is referred to as a "king of kings of the earth" who will bring upon Israel more suffering than has been experienced since "creation" (8:1).<sup>558</sup> Many of the evil king's misdeeds are described as religious crimes. He forces the Jews to: recant their faith in Yahweh; reverse their circumcisions; and

---

<sup>555</sup> Other documents (*4 Ezra*; *2 Baruch*) as well explore Israel's destiny in terms of ancient tribal divisions and their respective exiles. The meaning of this contrast between the two and ten tribes in the *Testament of Moses* is uncertain. Some scholars see in the characterization a positive evaluation of the ten tribes flourishing among the nations as opposed to the two tribes and difficulties in the Land. Such an interpretation seems unlikely in light of the lack of a positive evaluation of the life outside Palestine elsewhere in the *Testament of Moses*. Tromp suggests the periphrastic translation: "they [the ten tribes] will more and more (crescent) be absorbed among the nations" (Tromp, *Assumption of Moses*, 183).

<sup>556</sup> See Dale C. Allison, *The End of Ages Has Come: An Early Interpretation of the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985).

<sup>557</sup> See *T. Moses* 5:1-6.

<sup>558</sup> Tromp (*Assumption of Moses*, 217) notes that the description of the final king as one of universal significance stands in marked contrast with other (previous) kings in the document who are described as being from the east (3:1) or the west (6:8).

enter into the holy of holies to blaspheme God.<sup>559</sup> In the final phase of this evil epoch, the *Testament of Moses* shifts its focus from the Jewish people at large to an enigmatic figure named Taxo, who apparently represents and embodies righteous Israel.<sup>560</sup> Rather than give over to the sins of the people or submit to the torture of the enemy in an unprepared state, Taxo and his seven sons enter a cave to prepare themselves for a righteous death.<sup>561</sup> In contrast to those of Israel who have fallen thus far, the author emphasizes the innocence and utter lack of reason for the death of Taxo. Rather than signaling defeat, the death of Taxo and his family provides the catalyst for God's intervention and Israel's final triumph. After describing the plan to fast and die their righteous death, Taxo claims: "For if we do this, and do die, our blood will be avenged before the Lord" (9:7). As Licht observes the death of Taxo and his family is presented as an atoning death meant to motivate God to "exercise His vengeance."<sup>562</sup> Immediately, after this saying, the author describes the intervention of God and the defeat of the nations and their cosmic agent:

---

<sup>559</sup> This eschatological evil king is modeled after the notorious Antiochus IV.

<sup>560</sup> Taxo takes his seven sons to a cave to die. As J. Priest notes, refuge in the caves was common in times of travail (e.g., 1 Macc 1:53; 2:32; 2 Macc 6:11; 10:6). He also refers to the presence of the Jewish community at Qumran, which may have taken up residence in the surrounding caves. Priest refers as well to Josephus' account of a man who found refuge in a cave with his wife and seven sons in the period of the Roman invasion. While there, the man slew his entire family and himself, finding this manner of death more honorable than submission to the enemy (*Ant.* 14.5).

<sup>561</sup> The author stresses their preparation for death through fasting and their desire not to transgress the Law (9:5-6). While it is not clear from the text whether he kills himself or is killed by the wicked foreign king, it is clear that his death is deemed as the turning point for God to enter the picture. A number of texts demonstrate that dying can be as significant as killing in bringing about the triumph of God over the nations. That is, Israel's participation with God in overcoming the Gentiles is maintained but developed in dramatically different terms. A theology of martyrdom and divine wrath also plays a principle role in 2 Maccabees. (See the death of the seven sons and their mother in 2 Maccabees 7.) While 1 Maccabees emphasizes the role of the Maccabeans and their righteous army in securing victory and their priestly mandate, 2 Maccabees emphasizes the military exploits of Judas, the role of heavenly intervention, and the deaths of righteous Jews in invoking God's righteous indignation. Their deaths are understood in 2 Maccabees as a major force in precipitating God's direct intervention. Therefore, in 2 Maccabees, the victory of Judas and the Israelite revolt is understood to be more due to heavenly intervention than Israelite military prowess.

<sup>562</sup> Licht, "Taxo," 98.

(*T. Moses* 10:1) Then his (God's) kingdom will appear throughout his creation. The devil will have an end. Yea, sorrow will be led away with him. (2) Then will be filled the hands of the messenger, who is in the highest place appointed. Yea, he will at once avenge them of their enemies.

The description of the end of the Gentiles and other enemies is tersely stated in apocalyptic fashion, describing the appearance of God's kingdom and its implementation over the whole world. The death of one righteous family has resulted in the comprehensive inauguration of God's reign on earth.<sup>563</sup> The writer notes that the coming judgment will "work vengeance upon the nations, Yea, all their idols will be destroyed" (10:7).<sup>564</sup> The nations, however, are understood to have their own heavenly support; the appearance of the kingdom of God marks *the end of the devil* as well as the Gentiles (10:1). Thus, the judgment of God entails both the elimination of the devil and the nations, intimately tying the two together.<sup>565</sup>

It is not completely clear that the inauguration of the kingdom of God is to be equated with Israel's restoration. Following the elimination of the Gentiles and the reordering of the world, the writer exults (10:8-10):

(*T. Moses* 10:8) Then you will be happy, O Israel! And you will mount up above the necks and the wings of an eagle. Yea, all things will be fulfilled.<sup>566</sup> (9) And God will raise you to the heights. Yea, he will fix you firmly in the heaven of the stars, in the place of their habitations. And you will behold from on high. Yea, you will see your enemies on the earth.

In a period of distress, the author contends that Israel's suffering carries redemptive value; the death of the righteous ones may motivate God's intervention.

---

<sup>563</sup> The lack of details regarding the defeat of the nations underscores the suddenness and mystery of God's intervention.

<sup>564</sup> The eradication of the enemies of Israel probably encompasses both sinful Jews and the nations, but the greater emphasis of the narrative, especially the immediate literary context, falls on the latter.

<sup>565</sup> As noted above, the intimate association of the nations to patron angels (or the devil) is a common assumption of many early Jewish authors. Cf. the discussion of the devil and the nations in Luke-Acts as well (e.g., 4:5-6) (below).

<sup>566</sup> Priest observes that the phrase "all things will be fulfilled" could also be translated "will be brought to an end."

This intervention results not on changes that affect Israel's standing in the present world, but in the one beyond. The elimination of the nations and the Devil (i.e., the Gentiles' cosmic counterpart) results in the heavenly exaltation of Israel. That is, God's intervention results not only in the defeat of earthly enemies, but heavenly ones as well. Moreover, the restoration of Israel results in heavenly exaltation. The climax of Israel's history no longer occurs in the Land, but in heaven.<sup>567</sup> This revision of Israel's ideas of restoration suggests a certain devaluing of the land of Israel in lieu of heavenly territory and its occupation. Nonetheless, the ascension to heaven following the elimination of the enemy from the Land (and the Devil) underscores the inextricable association of Israel's restoration to heaven. Israel's restoration, or more precisely, the defeat of the enemies (both earthly and heavenly) is the catalyst which precipitates the eschatological exaltation.

A major focus of the narrative has been to underscore God's covenantal devotion to the people of Israel and her Land, especially in times of crisis. Even the final surviving verses of the book suggest that Israel's re-gathering to the Land retained its importance for the author. Moses tells Joshua in (12:11-13):

(*T. Moses* 12:11) They (unrighteous Israel), indeed will be punished by the nations with many tortures. (12) But it is not possible for the nations to drive them out or extinguish them completely. (13) For God, who has foreseen all things in the world, will go forth, and his covenant which was established, and by the oath which ... (MS ends).<sup>568</sup>

---

<sup>567</sup> As Halpern-Amaru observes, Israel's ascension to the stars provides the heavenly vantage point from which to "view God's avenging destruction of her enemies on earth" (*Rewriting*, 66). Although we accept a literal understanding of the language of heavenly exaltation in the Testament of Moses, other interpretative options are available as well and have been suggested. For instance, the language of heavenly exaltation may be meant as (1) a metaphor for Israel's restoration; (2) a replacement of the Land promise; or (3) alternatively, as a hope beyond it. As noted in the wider discussion, the third option seems preferable to the other choices. However, we might add that while the hope of heaven lies beyond the border of Palestine, heaven is shown to share intimate connections with the Land. Thus, the heaven and earth (or the Land) are not so easily divorced from one another in every case.

<sup>568</sup> OTP 1.934.

Halpern-Amaru rightly argues: "The Land promise is not lost. Rather its primary place in the covenant has been superseded by the immediate issue at hand: the survival of the people of Israel, the promised seed of the patriarchs."<sup>569</sup> The *Testament of Moses* demonstrates the redemptive value of the martyrs for these survivors. The author contends that the deaths of the righteous Jews are not meaningless; on the contrary, he asserts they carry redemptive value that should not be underestimated. In the near future, God will intervene on Israel's behalf and eradicate her enemies, sanctify her Land, and exalt the people of Israel to the stars of heaven. Therefore, rather than being disconnected from time and space, the present period is integrally connected to the future. Moreover, the borders of the Land are closely tied to the borders of heaven. When Israel's restoration occurs, the full benefits of the eschaton, including heavenly exaltation, will come to fruition as well.

### 3.5.2 Josephus: Israel's History of Passivity and Divine Intervention

One of the strongest advocates for the idea of divine intervention is found in Josephus. He makes the case for divine intervention in his account of the fall of Israel to the Romans. While there is little evidence that Josephus continues to hope for Israel's restoration after the fall of the second Temple—but much evidence to the contrary—the ancient writer offers the most detailed explanation and defense of a theology of divine intervention.

In making his case, Josephus draws heavily on and selectively from biblical traditions that underscore the role of divine activity on Israel's behalf. In *War* 5.375-94, Josephus recounts his appeal<sup>570</sup> to his Jewish comrades in Jerusalem to surrender to the

---

<sup>569</sup> *Rewriting*, 67.

<sup>570</sup> All translations from *War* are from the Loeb translation(s). On the appeal to surrender, also see *War* 5.362-420; 6.96-112.

Romans.<sup>571</sup> One of his arguments against Israel's rebellion is his contention that in Jewish history God has *never* required an army or war to accomplish his aims. That is, when God has fought for Israel, the Jewish deity was the exclusive combatant, never requiring any human assistance.<sup>572</sup>

In short, there is no instance of our forefathers having triumphed by arms or failed of success without them when they committed their cause to God: if they sat still they conquered, as it pleased their Judge, if they fought they were invariably defeated.<sup>573</sup>

In making the case that Israel should await divine intervention, Josephus appeals to Israel's *Heilsgeschichte*, but it is a very selective retelling of that history. He cites only cases of divine intervention in which Israel or her leaders play no direct or military role in securing their redemption. Initially, Josephus supports his argument with positive evidence of God's acting on Israel's behalf.<sup>574</sup> Most of these relate to God's slaying of the enemy himself and Israel's righteous passivity. A common refrain is that Israel did not take up arms to secure her salvation.<sup>575</sup> As examples of divine intervention, Josephus refers to God's deliverance of Sara from a Gentile king, the Exodus from Egypt, the liberation of the ark from the Philistines, and the massacre of Sennacherib's<sup>576</sup> army, and the restoration of the second Temple under Persia.

Preceding his account of the Exodus he first expands on the biblical account of Sarah being taken from Abraham by an Egyptian pharaoh.<sup>576</sup> Josephus emphasizes that

---

<sup>571</sup> Josephus notes that the Greek account is a translation of a version which was sent to Jews of the Diaspora. The Greek translation is apparently meant both for Gentiles and (Hellenized) Jews. The earlier version is thought to have been an Aramaic one.

<sup>572</sup> A similar point is made, apparently with some regret, by Ezra in refusing Persia's offer of a military entourage for his group on their return to Jerusalem (Ezra 8:21-3).

<sup>573</sup> *War* 5.390-91.

<sup>574</sup> *War* 5.379-90.

<sup>575</sup> According to Josephus' account, Israel's greatest triumphs occurred when she did *not* take up arms (*War* 5.380, 386, 387-88, 390).

<sup>576</sup> *War* 5.379-82; Gen 12:10-20; cf. Genesis 20. Josephus's account differs in emphasis and details from the biblical account and other versions (e.g., *Genesis Apocryphon*).

Abraham relied on God as the protector of Sarah, even though the patriarch has a vast army, a feature of Abraham not found in the biblical tradition (*War* 5.380). Rather than fight, Abraham *prayed* toward the Land, the eventual goal of the people.<sup>577</sup> Sarah's dilemma ends when God intervenes, tormenting the king with visions until he fled, leaving behind "silver and gold" for Israel (*War* 5.381-82). Josephus concludes his case for Israel's passivity and reliance on divine intervention by referring to the 6<sup>th</sup> century return under Cyrus. His recitation assumes a positive view of the Second Temple restoration, and emphasizes that Israel patiently endured the exile until God liberated her through Cyrus, a foreign king. According to Josephus, God used Cyrus to end Israel's captivity and "re-established the temple-worship of their Ally."<sup>578</sup>

After citing the positive evidence for Israel's passivity, Josephus refers to the negative evidence<sup>579</sup> in which Israel took up arms without God's authorization and suffered great losses. The author conveniently strikes from the record all cases where God and Israel, in fact, did war together. There is no reference to the invasion of Canaan in the period of Joshua and the judges, the battles of David, or the Maccabean revolution. Instead, Josephus blames the destruction of Jerusalem in the fifth century on Zedekiah's rebellion. He refers to Antiochus IV's desecration of the Temple in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE, but blames it on Jewish warmongers. In his account of Antiochus' persecution, he never mentions the armed and successful Hasmonean uprising that followed.<sup>580</sup> Lastly, Josephus refers to internal conflicts between Jews *within Israel*,

---

<sup>577</sup> Josephus notes that Abraham prayed toward "the place which you have now desecrated" (my translation).

<sup>578</sup> *War* 5.389.

<sup>579</sup> *War* 5.391-98 (401).

<sup>580</sup> *Ant.* 12.246-56. Josephus casts Antiochus IV as the aggressor and positively presents the Maccabean rebellion (also see *Ant.* 12.299-312; 313-26). However, as Isaiah M. Gafni argues, Josephus' rewriting of 1 Maccabees emphasizes the value of dying or martyrdom (cf. 2 Maccabees) to a greater extent than the author of 1 Maccabees ("Josephus and 1 Maccabees," 124-25).



which brought Rome into the Land in the first place. Josephus especially condemns Israel's failed leaders of the past whom he compares with the current leadership, which has brought on the invasion of the Romans.<sup>581</sup> The chief cause for the destruction of Jerusalem is the Jews' taking up of arms, an offense to God's divine prerogative and Israel's mandate to be a religious people rather than a militant nation. Josephus contends that Israel's holy status forbids her to war and instead requires her to devote herself to cultic devotion. Josephus claims:

Thus invariably have arms been refused to our nation, and warfare has been the sure signal for defeat. For it is, I suppose, the duty of the occupants of holy ground (χωρίον ἁγίον) to leave everything to the arbitrament of God and scorn the aid of human hands, can they but conciliate the Arbiter above.<sup>582</sup>

It is striking to observe that while Josephus' positive examples of God's intervention on Israel's behalf take him only through the 6<sup>th</sup> century, and end with God's deliverance of Israel by a foreign power, his negative evidence takes him from the 6<sup>th</sup> century to the present moment (ca 1<sup>st</sup> century CE) of the (sinful) Jewish rebellion. Since God, according to Josephus, does not employ an army and has always been faithful to avenge Israel, the author asks:

[W]ould you make war on the Romans with arms and might of hand? What other foe have we conquered thus, and when did God who created, fail to avenge, the Jews, if they were wronged?<sup>583</sup>

The best hope for the Jews, according to Josephus is to devote themselves to their holy places and accept Rome as God's choice. If Israel accepts the legitimacy of Rome as God's nation and rejects the unlawful Jewish leaders, there is still hope:

---

<sup>581</sup> Strikingly, Josephus contrasts Israel's leaders with Titus (= Rome) whom God has visibly endorsed, even with miracles. He notes that springs of Siloam which had virtually dried up are now flowing again in abundance since Titus' arrival (*War* 5:410).

<sup>582</sup> *War* 5.399-401.

<sup>583</sup> *War* 5.376-77.

Yet a way of salvation (σωτηρίας ὁδός) is still left you, if you will; and the Deity is easily reconciled to such as confess and repent. Oh! iron hearted men, fling away your weapons, take compassion on your country even now tottering to its fall, turn round and behold the beauty of what you are betraying: what a city! what a temple! what countless nations' gifts!<sup>584</sup>

Therefore, Josephus endorses the idea that Israel's best line of action lies (or would have been) in a passive response to such nations as Rome and leave the assignment and overthrow of kingdoms to God. In the meanwhile, Israel, Josephus contends, should devote herself to God (and his Temple) and accept Rome as the nation through whom God has chosen to rule at the present time. Indeed, as Josephus tells it, Israel's taking up of arms was not only useless, but deemed by God as the decisive transgression that resulted in God's wrath, i.e., the invasion of Rome.

Since this understanding of divine intervention is espoused by one who became a collaborator with Rome, Josephus' views on this subject might be considered suspect by interpreters (i.e., both then and now). Indeed, whether he is reciting biblical history or the events of the Roman invasion, Josephus' record of events must be carefully weighed for his theological tendencies and interpretative activities. But Josephus' portrayal of Israel as a religious, rather than a political, people who should rely on divine intervention rather than armed resistance finds support elsewhere in EJJL as well, as already noted, and therefore cannot be discounted automatically.

In conclusion, these various early Jewish documents provide evidence that many Jews placed as much theological weight on *the means* by which the restoration of Israel might occur as on event of restoration itself. The author of 2 Maccabees emphasizes to a much higher degree than 1 Maccabees the role of divine intervention in securing Israel's restoration. Moreover, the author of Daniel 7-12 places almost the full weight of Israel's hopes on the heavenly support of God and other divine agents. The

---

<sup>584</sup> War 5.415-17.

focus on heavenly agents as mediators of Israel's liberation is supported by numerous Qumran documents as well.<sup>585</sup> The implications for a community's complete reliance on heaven in achieving Israel's restoration vary. But in some cases, such as 2 Maccabees and the *Testament of Moses*, the significance of Israel's passivity was elaborated particularly in tales of martyrdom, which were understood as that which might provoke God to act on Israel's behalf. These authors contended that *dying* may be more powerful a response to the oppression of enemies than *killing* them. The pious deaths of the righteous will result eventually in invoking divine wrath against Israel's adversaries and Israel's restoration.<sup>586</sup>

Other writings, however, do not explicitly prohibit Israel's armed role in the restoration; they simply downplay it or do not mention it all. Instead, various writings may simply describe heavenly agents acting alone to defeat the enemies of Israel and bring about her eschatological restoration. In other cases, various early Jewish writers express a hope that often seems to mediate between ideas of Israel's armed resistance and accounts of divine intervention. In some cases, various Jewish writers envisage the arrival of a Davidic messiah who will defeat the various enemies of Israel and lead her in the eschatological restoration.

---

<sup>585</sup> The author of 11Q13 (*11QMelchizedek*) not only portrays Israel's liberation as coming exclusively from divine intervention, but he portrays the enemy almost exclusively in heavenly terms as well (e.g., 11Q13 col. ii.11-13), rarely referring to human participants at all. The author anticipates the arrival of an anointed prophet to announce the inauguration of the eschatological war in which the angel Melchizedek will destroy Belial and his spirits.

<sup>586</sup> Israel's restoration is the climax of the eschatological time-table in some early Jewish accounts, but in others, her liberation paves the way for a more universal climax in a new creation and/or rewards that lie in heaven.

### 3.6 Psalms of Solomon: The Davidic Messiah in Israel's Restoration

The future restoration in the *Psalms of Solomon* is articulated against a predicament in which sinful Jews have brought on the desecration of the Temple and the invasion of a foreign power. This dilemma is expressed in the language of exilic theology. According to the author, in this period of sinful Jews and invading Gentiles, the righteous portion of Israel is driven from the Land into an exilic wilderness:

Those who loved the assemblies of the devout fled from them as sparrows fled from the nest. (They became) refugees in the wilderness to save their lives from evil. The life of even one who was saved from them was precious in the eyes of the exiles. They were scattered over the whole earth by (these) lawless ones (17:16-17).<sup>587</sup>

The author writes on behalf of a righteous group of Jews who understand (true) Israel's fate to lie with them. The author envisions the arrival of a Davidic messiah to cleanse the Land of all enemy inhabitants and lead Israel in her restoration.<sup>588</sup>

The Davidic messiah (17:21-46; 18:5-8) in the *Psalms of Solomon* is a *locus classicus* for the study of such a figure in the period of Early Judaism.<sup>589</sup> The expectation of the messiah is motivated in a positive way by the recollections of God's

---

<sup>587</sup> All translations are from the *OTP*.

<sup>588</sup> The hope for restoration occurs in other places in the writings, but the Davidic messiah is mentioned only in the closing chapters of the document (i.e., chaps. 17 and 18). Other psalms that pertain to Israel's restoration do not mention the messiah (e.g., 8:27-30; 11:1-10). The absence of a messiah in other psalms of restoration may be due to a number of factors. It may be explained within the document's complex compositional history, in which various views were incorporated and inconsistently redacted in the final version of the *Psalms of Solomon*. But it is also possible to understand the appearance of the messiah in these two final psalms as due to the literary aims of an author (or editor) who has arranged the material to end with an eschatological climax that reveals the hope for a Davidic messiah in Israel's restoration (P. N. Franklyn, "The Cultic and Pious Climax of Eschatology in the Psalms of Solomon," *JSJ* 18 [1987], 1-17).

<sup>589</sup> The *Psalms of Solomon* are belatedly and pseudepigraphically attributed to Solomon. These attributions were likely added later to the particular psalms. Most scholars think the writing was originally penned in Hebrew, although there is no extant evidence for a Hebrew original. The most important versions of the writing exist in Greek and Syriac. See Robert R. Hann, *The Manuscript History of the Psalms of Solomon* (SBLSCS 13; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1982); Joseph L. Trafton, *The Syriac Version of the Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Evaluation* (SBLSCS 11; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 5-20; 217-18. The document dates from the middle part of first century BCE. *Psalms of Solomon* 2, 8, 17 make clear allusions to the events that involved Aristobulus II and Hyrcanus II and the invasion of Pompey (e.g., *Pss. Sol.* 2:2; 8:16-28). *Pss. Sol.* 2:26 refers to Pompey's death, which occurred in 48 BCE. See Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 195-98, 203-212.

promise of eternal kingship to David (17:4). But the promise is recalled within a context of dire circumstances which resulted in illegitimate usurpation of the Davidic throne (17:5c-6) by another Jewish ruler. The author prays: "See Lord, and raise up for them their king, (the) son of David, in the time which you know, O God, to rule over (βασιλεῦσαι) your servant, Israel" (*Pss. Sol.* 17:21). The messiah's kingship<sup>590</sup> is developed between the opposing poles of the kingship of God and the rule of the corrupt Jewish regime (17:5-20) and that of the foreign conqueror.<sup>591</sup> The kingship of God is intrinsically tied to that of his anointed regent.<sup>592</sup> As God is called "king" (17:1, 34, 46), so is the earthly ruler (17:4, 21, 32, 42).<sup>593</sup> In applying the same title to both God and the messiah, the writer blurs clear, categorical distinctions between the figures.<sup>594</sup> While the messianic king is certainly subordinate to God the king, it is not the writer's aim to downplay the significance of the earthly regent. Rather, the main point is that, unlike Israel's corrupt rulers and foreign powers, the future Davidic regent has

---

<sup>590</sup> The focus on kingship in *Psalms of Solomon* 17 is underlined by the vocabulary found therein: nine of the fifteen occurrences of βασιλεὺς (*Pss. Sol.* 17:1(2x), 4, 20, 21, 32 (2x), 34, 42, 46; cf. 2:30(2x), 32; 5:11, 19) in the *psalms* are here; three of the four references to βασιλεία (*Pss. Sol.* 17:3; 5:18)/βασιλείον (*Pss. Sol.* 17:4, 6) are in this chapter, and βασιλεύω is found only in 17:21.

<sup>591</sup> *Psalms of Solomon* 17 begins and ends with a declaration of the Lord as the eternal king (Βασιλεὺς) (17:1, 46, also 17:34), while the Jewish ruling body (βασιλείον) is denounced as sinful and illegitimate (17:5-6, 20b). The Gentile ruler is described as lawless (17:11) as well as the Jewish king (17:20). Immediately prefacing the writer's cry for a new king (17:21) is the charge in 17:20: ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐν παρανομίᾳ ("The king was lawless").

<sup>592</sup> If the absolute reading of "lord" is to be retained in regard to the messianic figure, this would be another shared appellation between the king and deity; see *Pss. Sol.* 17:1, 4, 21: God as Lord; 17:32d: king as lord.

<sup>593</sup> Moreover, both the deity-king (i.e. God) and the future king are said to rule eternally (17:1, 46; 17:4).

<sup>594</sup> This does not mean that the royal figure is portrayed as supernatural or a deity per se. As in other kingships in the ancient and Hellenized near east, the king was closely associated with the patron deity. The OT reflects this as well (e.g., Psalms 2:6-7 and 2 Samuel 7). Later in *Psalms of Solomon* 17, the author characterizes the words of the king ὡς λόγοι ἁγίων ἐν μέσῳ λαῶν ἡγιασμένων (*Pss. Sol.* 17:43c), alluding possibly to the messiah's quasi-heavenly status.

been anointed *by God* to restore Israel and will manifest and inaugurate the deity's rule.<sup>595</sup>

In view of some early Jewish writings that portray Israel fighting alongside God to secure her restoration, and others, which envisage exclusively, divine intervention, the role of the Davidic messiah serves as an important mediating tradition between the two expectations. That is, while he is clearly human, the Davidic messiah is often portrayed in EJJ as acting alone on Israel's behalf as God's unique agent of liberation. The corollary language used of the messiah and God serves the interest of the writer to portray the Davidic ruler as God's agent, who alone among the Israelites, has been given the divine prerogative to wage war. Thus, in contradistinction to evil Jewish and Roman leaders, the author's prayer on behalf of righteous Jews is: καὶ βασιλεὺς αὐτῶν χριστὸς κύριος<sup>596</sup> ("And their king [will be] the Lord messiah").<sup>597</sup>

Unusual to most restoration passages in early Jewish literature, the messiah in the *Psalms of Solomon* is depicted as the sole agent of all aspects of Israel's re-establishment. He alone procures the kingdom (17:21-32) and then reigns over it (17:32-44). The chief aim of the Israel's reconstitution is to bring the Land and the people into *a state of holiness*. For the author, this means nothing short of all of Israel's enemies, both Jewish and Gentile, being eradicated from the border of Palestine. All the

---

<sup>595</sup> Nickelsburg notes: "As God's vicar and agent on earth, the king shares in, or embodies, divine qualities" (*Jewish Literature*, 1981, 208).

<sup>596</sup> The reading of "the Lord messiah" is disputed. Although both the Syriac (msyh' mrn') and the Greek support it, largely on the basis of 18:7 (χριστοῦ κυρίου: [the] Lord's anointed) and the belief that χριστὸς κύριος reflects the Hebrew *Vorlage*: מָלֶכְךָ יְיָ, the emendation χριστὸς κύριος is suggested. See Trafton, *Syriac Version of the Psalms of Solomon*, 177.

<sup>597</sup> The figure is specifically referred to as messiah in 17:32; 18:5, 8. *Pss. Sol.* 17:32 forms an *inclusio* with 17:21, serving as a restatement of the messiah's kingship and the kingdom which he will established 17:21-32: "And he will be a righteous king, and there will be no unrighteousness in his days in their midst because all of them will be holy and their king will be the Lord's messiah" (17:32).

components of the restoration—(1) eradication of Gentiles and sinners from the Land,<sup>598</sup> (2) re-gathering of the tribes, (3) submission of the nations, and (4) the cleansing of Jerusalem and exaltation of the Temple—are integrally related to this objective and carried out by the messianic king.<sup>599</sup>

The writer's insistence on the messiah's absolute reliance upon God is a leitmotif in the *Psalms of Solomon* of 17 and 18. He is God's representative on earth, and uniquely assigned to intervene on Israel's behalf. The divine endorsement of the messiah depends heavily upon Isaiah 11:1-4:

(Isa 11:1) A shoot shall go out from the stump of Jesse, and a sprout shall spring from his roots. (2) And the Spirit of God shall rest upon him (and) the Spirit of wisdom and understanding (and) the Spirit of counsel and strength (and) the Spirit of knowledge and the fear of God. (3) And he shall delight in the fear of God. And he shall not judge by the sight of his eyes or decide by the hearing of his ears, (4) but shall judge the poor with righteousness and shall decide with equity the afflicted of the earth. He shall strike the earth with the rod of his mouth and with the breath of his lips he shall kill the wicked.<sup>600</sup>

In the initial purging of Gentiles and Jewish sinners from the land of Israel, the messiah is portrayed as being “undergirded” by God with “strength,” “wisdom” and “righteousness” (*Pss. Sol.* 17:22-23; cf. Isa 11:2). The messiah eradicates the unrighteous nations “with an iron rod” (17:24a; cf. Isa 11:4c)<sup>601</sup> and “the word of his

---

<sup>598</sup> One point that is worth emphasizing is that rarely is the messianic figure portrayed in EYL as being accompanied by an army. However, in some documents (e.g., *T12P*; *4QFlorilegium*), the Davidic messiah is accompanied by a priestly agents and/or heavenly assistants.

<sup>599</sup> The messiah inaugurates the restoration as a warrior-king who eradicates all sinners and the gentiles (17:22-5) from Jerusalem. The elimination of the “unrighteous” ones (17:22) from the land is matched positively by his re-gathering of the tribes, “a holy people” (17:26a, 43bc, 44c). The tribes are to be distributed upon the ethnically cleansed land (17:28b) according to their (ancient) tribal allotments (17:28a). The future regent will return Jerusalem to its ancient state of holiness (17:30b) (καὶ καθαριεῖ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐν ἁγιασμῷ ὡς καὶ τὸ ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς). Ruled over by a righteous, Davidic king, who has cleaned the city from gentiles and sinners, and filled her with righteous Jews, Jerusalem will become the “glorious” capital of the world. The nations that ruled over Israel will become submissive to her (17:30a). In their pilgrimage to acknowledge Israel and the Jewish deity’s supremacy, the Gentiles will return the Diaspora Jews to behold the city of God (17:31).

<sup>600</sup> My translation based on RSV.

<sup>601</sup> Cf. Psalm 2:9.

mouth" (17:24b; cf. Isa 11:4c [LXX]).<sup>602</sup> In the description of the messianic reign, (17:32-44), the royal figure again "strikes the earth with the word of his mouth," this time as an indication of "mercy" and "blessing" to the submissive Gentiles and righteous people (17:35a; cf. 17:24b; Isa 11:4c [LXX]). It probably also denotes the ongoing cleansing which is the chief characteristic of the messiah's rule, since the implications of sin and unrighteous are Israel's desecration and destruction. Unlike other kings who rule by their own military and political might, the writer is careful to stress that the Davidic king's power originates from God. Drawing from Isaiah 11, the writer claims that God will make the king "powerful in the holy Spirit and wise in the counsel of understanding with strength and righteousness" (17:37; Isa 11:2). The reign of messiah is characterized in similar terms in chapter 18, drawing once more on Isaiah 11 to underscore the point that the messiah's anointing is to be understood not only in terms of his power to eradicate the nations, but in the wisdom of the Spirit and righteous rule over the nation of Israel and a conquered world.

(Pss. Sol. 18:7) μακάριοι οἱ γενόμενοι ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ἰδεῖν τὰ ἀγαθὰ κυρίου, ἃ ποιήσει γενεᾷ τῇ ἐρχομένῃ (8) ὑπὸ ῥάβδον παιδείας χριστοῦ κυρίου ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐν σοφίᾳ πνεύματος καὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἰσχύος (9) κατευθῆναι ἄνδρα ἐν ἔργοις δικαιοσύνης φόβῳ θεοῦ

(18:7) Blessed are the ones who are there in those days to see the good things of God, which he will do in the time which comes, (8) by the rod of discipline of the messiah (or anointed) Lord (who will abide) in (the) fear of his God, in wisdom of (the) Spirit, and of righteousness and strength (9) to lead (the) people by (the) fear of God in works of righteousness (Pss. Sol. 18:7-9).<sup>603</sup>

---

<sup>602</sup> From his attributes of "strength," "wisdom" and "righteousness" (17:22) six infinitival phrases (17:22-4) underscore the destructive power of the warrior-king in the initial holy war: θραύσαι ("to shatter"); καθαρίσαι ("to cleanse"); ἐξῶσαι ("to expel"); ἐκτρίψαι ("to root out"); συντρίψαι ("to crush"); ὀλεθρεῦσαι ("to destroy"). There is, however, no mention of the Spirit in this section, a point which is critical to Isaiah 11. The fact that the destruction of the enemies occurs through the "word of his mouth" (17:24) does not lessen the violent portrayal of the king's activities in 17:22-5. It simply stresses the fact that he is uniquely enabled by God to render destruction.

<sup>603</sup> For "in the fear of his God, in the wisdom of the Spirit and of righteousness and strength"; cf. Pss. Sol. 18:7; Isa 11:2-3; for "will lead the people by (the) fear of God in works of righteousness and the fear of God" (Pss. Sol. 18:8; Isa 11:2-3).



Immediately, following the elimination of Gentile and Jewish enemies from the Land (17:21-25), the re-gathering of a "holy people"<sup>604</sup> takes place (17:26-28).<sup>605</sup>

(*Pss. Sol.* 17:26) And he [the messiah] will gather (συνάξει) a holy people whom he will lead in righteousness, and he will judge (κρινεῖ) the holy tribes by the Lord his God. (27) And he will not allow unrighteousness to lodge in their midst any longer, and any one who knows wickedness will not live among them. For he will know them, that all of them are sons of their God. (28) And he will divide them in their tribes upon the land and neither the alien nor foreigner will dwell with them any more.

The return of Israel is articulated into two main stages. The first stage of re-gathering apparently involves those driven (from power) into "the wilderness" (17:16-17).<sup>606</sup> The messiah himself will re-gather this portion of Israel, which represents the core of the ingathered people, and the community behind the document (17:28). The tribes are to be distributed upon the ethnically cleansed Land (17:28b) according to their (ancient) tribal allotments (17:28a). The writer apparently thus maintains that the core of the tribes is already (partially) present within the Land or in its environs. The righteous Jews who have been persecuted and disempowered lay claim for themselves to be the essential core of the re-gathered people of Israel. That is, the messiah's re-gathering of the people and their division into tribes upon the Land (17:26-29)<sup>607</sup> occurs *before* the return of the Diaspora, those living outside the Land and subjugated to the nations

---

<sup>604</sup> See 17:26a, 43bc, 44c.

<sup>605</sup> The elimination of the "unrighteous" ones (17:22) from the land is matched positively by his re-gathering of those Jews who have taken flight from the Land. Cf. *Pss. Sol.* 9:1-3 which gives the reason for Israel's dispersion into every nation. The reconstitution of the tribes is also mentioned in two other places in the *Psalms of Solomon*. In *Pss. Sol.* 8:27-32 the re-gathering of the "dispersed of Israel" signifies the end of the Jews' punishment under the oppression of the nations. In *Pss. Sol.* 11:1-9 the dispersed Jews return from the "east, west, and north" to Jerusalem; the writer expects it to be a miraculous event led by God himself.

<sup>606</sup> Whether the writer intends this to be understood metaphorically (as a condition of dissonance or persecution) or the literal condition of ones driven from Jerusalem is not altogether certain. The use of wilderness as a metaphor or synonym for exile is common in the literature of Early Judaism and is used in Luke-Acts as well.

<sup>607</sup> The division into tribes is motivated by the concern for segregation from foreigners (17:28).

(17:31).<sup>608</sup> It is striking that while the messiah gathers those who have been recently driven from Jerusalem,<sup>609</sup> he apparently does not gather those who have been exiled among the nations. The messiah stays put within the borders of Palestine, while the nations return the Diaspora Jews (17:30b-31; cf. Isa 55:5). Thus, the author applies the paradigm of exile and return to describe both the crisis and its future resolution.

*Psalms of Solomon* 17:32 marks the beginning of the next section (17:32-44), which fills in the final events of the restoration of Israel after the defeat of the enemies and the re-gathering of the righteous community of Jews to the Land. In this section, the author is particularly interested in describing the nature of the messiah's reign in the age of peace.<sup>610</sup> While the restoration process initially involves some degree of violence in the overthrow of the ruling powers and the expulsion of foreigners from the land (17:22-25),<sup>611</sup> the reign itself is characterized by peace (i.e., a strong anti-war sentiment) and holiness. The king will not rely on weaponry or violence in his domain over Israel and the nations.<sup>612</sup> Rather he will rely upon God.<sup>613</sup> He is portrayed as a righteous, sage-

---

<sup>608</sup> The nations, that have ruled over Israel, will become submissive to her (17:30a) In their pilgrimages to acknowledge Israel and the Jewish deity, the Gentiles will return the Diaspora Jews to behold the city of God (17:31). The return of those Jews outside the Land is perhaps the only component of the restoration that is not carried out directly by the messiah; he stays within the land.

<sup>609</sup> As already noted, God is envisioned as the one who re-gathers Israel in *Pss. Sol.* 8:27-32 and 11:1-9; no messiah is mentioned. The similar accounts of the re-gathering in 1 Baruch 5:1-4 and *Psalms of Solomon* 11 suggest one of the documents may be dependant upon the other or a mutual reliance upon a common tradition. The exile and return, however, functions differently in each book. In 1 Baruch, the return is presented as the re-gathering of Israel from Babylon; in the *Psalms of Solomon* 11, no precise historical setting is given. Rather, the hymn celebrates the return of all Israel from various directions of the world. In light of the author's view of Israel's re-gathering in *Psalms of Solomon* 17, perhaps the idea of the return in chap. 11 is to be understood in terms of the Diaspora and/or the group which has fled into the wilderness.

<sup>610</sup> *Psalms of Solomon* 17:32 forms an *inclusio* with 17:21, serving as a restatement of the messiah's kingship and the kingdom that he will establish: "And he will be a righteous king, and there will be no unrighteousness in his days in their midst because all of them will be holy and their king will be the Lord's messiah" (17:32).

<sup>611</sup> But he does so without weaponry (*Pss. Sol.* 17:24b).

<sup>612</sup> The kingship of the messiah will be in opposition to the foreign powers who have "laid waste the land of Israel" (17:11-20; 2:1-29; 8:1-22).

<sup>613</sup> Cf. the description of the Gentile ruler, Pompey, in *Pss. Sol.* 2:28-29.

king, with special emphasis upon his word and blessing in maintaining the purity of the restored Israel.<sup>614</sup>

This portrayal of the Davidic king—as one who was chosen by God and empowered by him alone through the holy Spirit and wisdom—is the fundamental basis for the writer’s primary claim that the expected Davidic ruler is, in fact, the Lord messiah. While on the one hand the messiah’s arrival is understood according to the timetable of God, the author also underscores Israel’s part in preparing or hastening the messiah’s arrival: “May God cleanse Israel for a day of mercy with blessing for the appointed day when his messiah will reign” (*Pss. Sol.* 18:5).

In *Psalms of Solomon* (17-18), the author’s understanding of the future restoration is inextricably bound up with the appearance of a Davidic messiah. The psalmist makes several crucial claims about the future king and Israel’s restoration: (1) The Davidic messiah will be a “Son of David,” the long awaited heir of God’s promises to David. (2) The messiah’s first order of priority is to eradicate all Gentiles and Jewish sinners from the land of Israel. (3) He will gather the persecuted righteous ones and the Diaspora in the Land around the exalted Temple. (4) He will return Palestine to an ancient state of holiness and oversee the maintenance of righteousness among the people.<sup>615</sup> (5) After his ascension to power, the Davidic figure will rule in peace and righteousness, no longer reliant upon military strength, but wisdom and the power of the Spirit.

---

<sup>614</sup> This emphasis runs throughout 17:33-44.

<sup>615</sup> The future regent will return Jerusalem to its ancient state of holiness (*Pss. Sol.* 17:30b): καὶ καθαρῇ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐν ἁγιασμῷ ὡς καὶ τὸ ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς.

### 3.6.1 Excursus: The Davidic Messiah

In the period of Early Judaism, “there existed no continuous, widespread, or dominant expectation of a davidic messiah.”<sup>616</sup> Moreover, even in most texts of restoration, there is no mention of a Davidic messiah.<sup>617</sup> However, when such a figure is

---

<sup>616</sup> Kenneth E. Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism: Its History and Significance for Messianism* (SBLEJL 7; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 270. In the history of scholarship, the study of (the) messiah in early Jewish literature has often been hampered by unclear criteria and methodological approaches. Thus, it is appropriate to begin this investigation into the Davidic messiah with some brief remarks regarding methodology and terminology. In the past some scholars (e.g., Joseph Klausner, *The Messianic Idea in Israel*, [London: Allen and Unwin, 1956], 9; Sigmund Mowinkel, *He That Cometh: The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and Later Judaism* [Nashville: Abingdon, 1956]; Scholem, *Messianic Idea; “Messianism,”* in *History of the Jewish People* 2.489-555) have used “messianic” to characterize eschatological texts or ideas, even when no messiah or other future redeemer is mentioned in a text. It is important to note, however, that the presence of משיח or χριστός (“messiah,” “anointed [one]”) alone does not signify an eschatological redeemer. In early Jewish literature משיח or χριστός is most often used to denote someone or something as “anointed” without any hint of future or ultimate importance (e.g., Dan 9:25-26; Damascus Document [CD-A] 2.12-13; 5.21-6.1; 1QM ii.7-8; 4Q375 col. i.9). 4Q287 (4QBerakoth<sup>b</sup>) and 4QD<sup>e</sup>, frg. 9, col. ii.14 probably refer to slander or rebellion against the prophets, although the writer may have in mind “anointed” prophets/visionaries within the Qumran community and not within the OT. The “anointed one” in Dan 9:25 probably refers to the governor Zerubbabel or the high priest Joshua of the 6<sup>th</sup> century restoration, although Cyrus may be intended. The anointed one who is “cut off” in 9:26 is usually interpreted as the murdered high priest Onias III of the mid-second century BCE (2 Macc 4:33-35). See J. J. M. Roberts, “The Old Testament’s Contribution to Messianic Expectations,” in Charlesworth (ed.), *The Messiah*, 40-41. For a discussion of Onias III’s murder, see Victor Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (New York: Atheneum, 1970), 172. The reference to “anointed” in 4Q376 col. i.2 is not messianic, but col. iii.1-3 does mention the Prince of the Congregation, a messianic figure in other Qumran scrolls. 1QM ix.8 speaks of the danger of the priests profaning their “priestly anointing” with the dead and the blood on the battlefield. 4Q521 frg. 8.9 refers to “all his anointed ones” in the context which has priestly connotations: ... וכל כלי קודשן [... (4Q521 frg. 8.9). No reference to a Davidic messiah occurs in the Apocrypha (cf. 1 Macc 2:57; Sir 47:22). Other references to anointed one(s) occur in Qumran documents too badly damaged to determine the precise meaning of the text in question (e.g., 4Q274, frg. 4.1; 4Q381; 4Q377). In the present study, we have chosen not to capitalize messiah, since to do so might suggest a dominant or singular (and thus tendentious) conception and usage of “messiah” in the literature of Early Judaism.

<sup>617</sup> A number of recent studies have called for a more careful appropriation and qualification of the designations “messiah” or “messianic” in the examination of EJL. The works of Neusner, Green, and Frerichs (eds.), *Judaisms and their Messiahs* and Charlesworth (ed.), *Messiah* underscore the complexity of messianism in the Greco-Roman period and called for greater nuance and precision in scholarly discussions about the subject. (Charlesworth’s volume originated from papers given in 1987 at *The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins*.) The epithet of messiah could be applied to Davidic or royal figures as well as priestly, prophetic, and perhaps angelic figures. Since “messiah” is such an “amorphous and fluid” term (James H. Charlesworth, “From Messianology to Christology: Problems and Prospects,” in Charlesworth, [ed.], *Messiah*, 10), this may explain why references to messiah(s) or anointed figure(s) usually appear with attributives, in genitival phrases, construct states, or in conjunction with other titles and appellations. Even when משיח appears in the absolute and clearly designates an eschatological figure, such as in the DSS, the *Psalms of Solomon* and the NT, the term appears alongside associate titles or alternative identifications. William Scott Green argues that “[t]he New Testament’s gingerly application of multiple titles suggests a crisis of classification, the dilemma of a signified without a signifier” (“Introduction: Messiah in Judaism: Rethinking the Question,” in Neusner, Green, and Frerichs, [eds.], *Judaisms and their Messiahs*, 4). However, as argued in this study, the diverse use of “messiah,” in both ‘routine’ and eschatological contexts, probably makes further qualification necessary, even in early Jewish literature. John J. Collins’

envisaged, it is usually within the wider tradition of Israel's future restoration. In his appearance in such accounts, the messiah's role in the restoration is most often devoted to defeating Israel's enemies. Wright correctly observes that "[t]he main task of the Messiah, over and over again, is the liberation of Israel, and her reinstatement as the true people of the creator god. This will often involve military action."<sup>618</sup>

This study examines messianic or redeemer figures who are, most often, specifically qualified as Davidic.<sup>619</sup> Moreover, particular attention is paid to those references<sup>620</sup> that characterize the future *Davidic* king explicitly as *messiah* (משיח or χριστός).<sup>621</sup>

The identification of a particular eschatological figure as a Davidic messiah in the Qumran scrolls<sup>622</sup> sometimes depends on the correlation of several (related) terms and references from the various writings.<sup>623</sup> Nonetheless, a careful assessment of the importance of such a figure is necessary since the great majority of the Qumran documents are not fixated on eschatology or the coming of the messiah. Instead, the dominant focus in many Qumran writings often lies elsewhere.<sup>624</sup>

---

landmark study of the "messiah" noted the rise of Davidic messianism in some quarters of Early Judaism at various points in the Greco-Roman period. Collins also has substantiated the diversity of messianic figures. Collins has proposed various criteria as well for qualifying and distinguishing between messianic figures (*Scepter*, 11-19, 60).

<sup>618</sup> Wright, *New Testament*, 320. For the fuller discussion, see 319-20.

<sup>619</sup> Since we have already treated the messiah in the *Psalms of Solomon* and *4 Ezra* elsewhere in the thesis, they are not treated in detail in this section. However, insights from the analysis of these documents are brought into the discussion, where relevant.

<sup>620</sup> Some references to a future royal king, not treated here, are either not explicitly identified either as "messiah" or qualified as "Davidic" (e.g., *2 Baruch*, the *Similitudes* [*1 Enoch* 36-71]; *3 Enoch*). Other occurrences are in documents that are either of a late date and/or have undergone intensive Christian redaction (e.g., *Apocalypse of Zephaniah*, *Apocalypse of Elijah*, *Apocalypse of Sedrach*, *Ascension of Isaiah*, *Odes of Solomon*). The pseudepigraphical writings of *2 Baruch*, *4 Ezra*, *1 Enoch* 37-71 [the *Similitudes*], probably date from the mid to late first century C.E. and are of much value in evaluating the (re)formulations of messianic expectations which occurred in the wake of the Jerusalem's destruction, a key event in the formative milieu of Christianity's conception of Jesus. While these texts post date the second Temple, they contain traditions about the messiah that are earlier.

<sup>621</sup> In the case of the Qumran materials, other appellations or terms that occasionally appear in conjunction with "messiah" in the corpus of genetically or Community related writings are briefly examined as well.

<sup>622</sup> The reason for the sustained attention to the Qumran literature is the frequency of references to the messiah that occur here. But the emphasis on these references for the present study should not lead to the corollary that most writings in the Qumran corpus were fixated on messianism or eschatology. Most writings have interests that lie elsewhere, such as in the interpretation of Torah.

<sup>623</sup> For Collins' assessment of the coordinating terms that relate to a Davidic figure, see his *Scepter*, 11-19, 56-73. The occurrence of an epithet or title used to explicitly identify a Davidic messiah provides basis for the analysis of the same epithet in another Qumran writing as Davidic, even when this qualification of "messiah" is not expressly found. These references are therefore more suspect and treated with greater caution.

<sup>624</sup> E.g., the study of Torah, Temple devotion, maintenance of purity. However, as already noted in the review of Scholem in the introduction of this present chapter, an interest in more mundane or practical matters is not incompatible with an interest in eschatology by any means.

Moreover, the Davidic messiah may appear alongside other eschatological agents (i.e., a priestly messiah; heavenly mediator) in the envisaged restoration.<sup>625</sup> In such cases, the writer may spell out a hierarchy that actually subordinates the messiah to another eschatological figure. Therefore, in cases, where more than one eschatological figure is anticipated, it is imperative to carefully delineate the duties of each respective figure. As with the *War Scroll*, where humans participated with heavenly agents, so the Davidic figure may appear with angelic support as well.<sup>626</sup> As noted in the examination of the messiah in the *Psalms of Solomon*, God is still understood to be the ultimate agent of Israel's liberation, although the messiah is given high acclaim as well.<sup>627</sup> The hope placed in a variety of redeemer figures is not peculiar to the Qumran writings or one particular community. A number of documents from EJL place the hope Israel's salvation in a number of mediating agents alongside the future Davidic ruler.

It is often lost in the discussion of Davidic messianism at Qumran that only one (extant) text among the scrolls identifies a future *Davidic* king *explicitly* as (the) משיח. 4Q252 (4QCommentary on Genesis<sup>a</sup>)<sup>628</sup> col. v.1-4 reads:

[ל]וא יסור שליט משבט יהודה בהיות לישראל ממשל  
 [ל]וא ינכרת יושב כסא לדויד כי המחקה היא ברית המלכות  
 [ו]אל[פי] ישראל המה הדגלים vacant עד בוא משיח הצדק צמח  
 דויד כי לו ולזרעו נתנה ברית מלכות עמו עד דורות עולם

(1) A ruler (שליט) shall [no]t depart from the tribe (שבט) of Judah. When there is for Israel dominion (ממשל), (2) [there will not c]ease someone who sits on the throne of David. For 'the staff' (המחקה) is the covenant of the kingdom (ברית המלכות), (3) [and the thousa]nds of Israel, these are 'the feet' (or divisions). Until the messiah of righteousness (משיח הצדק) comes, the Branch of (4) David (דויד). For to him and to his descendants the covenant of the kingdom of his people has been given until eternal generations.

As the title of this source suggests, it is from a larger work (4Q252-254) that contains pesharim<sup>629</sup> or interpretations of various sections of Genesis, particularly those pertaining to various ancestors of Israel. The passage above comes from a section of that work which apparently interpreted portions<sup>630</sup> of Jacob's dying testament (Gen 49:1-33) to his twelve sons (= the twelve tribes of Israel). This particular passage concerns Gen 49:10, Jacob's testament to Judah:

<sup>625</sup> Thus, the expectation that God or a heavenly agent will intervene does not necessarily preclude the presence of a Davidic or other human assistance in Israel's liberation.

<sup>626</sup> In such cases, the Davidic figure might be imagined less a liberator than a ruler.

<sup>627</sup> That is, in many cases, the messiah is the instrument of *God's* or *heavenly* wrath on earth. Likewise, he may be portrayed as the earthly viceroy of the heavenly king (i.e., God).

<sup>628</sup> George C. Brooke, et al, *Qumran Cave 4: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD 17; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 185-207.

<sup>629</sup> The classification of this work as peshar is debated. See Ida Fröhlich, "Themes, Structure and Genre of Peshar Genesis," *JQR* 85 (1994), 81-99.

<sup>630</sup> The commentary on the tribes may have been selective. Only portions of Jacob's testament to Reuben, the firstborn son (4Q252, col. iv.3-7), Judah (col. v), and possibly Naphtali (col. vi) are extant in 4QpGen.

The scepter (שֶׁבֶט) shall not depart from Judah, nor the staff (מַחֲקֶה) from between his feet (רַגְלָיו), until he to whom it belongs.<sup>631</sup> And to him shall be the obedience of the peoples (Gen 49:10).

The writer reads Gen 49:10 in conjunction with Jer 33:15-17, which refers to “the Branch of righteousness” (cf. 4Q252, lines 3-4) and one who “will not cease for David...sitting on the throne of the house of Israel” (cf. 4Q252, line 2). The “scepter,” “the coming one,” “the righteous Branch,” and “the enthroned one” are all connected to the hope for a Davidic ruler in 4Q252. The promise of a future Davidic king is a crucial component of the writer’s messianic conception and is the basis for his belief in Israel’s restoration. The advent of the messiah is expected to occur in tandem with Israel’s dominion (מַמְשָׁל). The most important point regarding the messiah is simply his taking the throne and inaugurating his reign. The advent of the messiah’s rule is understood to signal automatically the end of the nations’ rule over earth. This point is made as well in a document known as *4QWords of the Luminaries*<sup>a</sup> (frgs. 1-2, col. v.1-15). In that document, the author prays for and anticipates the coming of a Davidic king, although he is not specified as “messiah.”<sup>632</sup> Nonetheless, the lack of the term is incidental since the author clearly understands the Davidic ruler as an eschatological agent. Upon the messiah’s enthronement, the writer anticipates the subjugation of the nations and the paying of their tribute in honor of God, the Jewish people, and the Land.

In addition to his Davidic lineage, in 4Q252, the messiah is identified closely in terms of “righteousness” (מִשִּׁיחַ הַצֶּדֶק), which suggest that like the *Psalms of Solomon* 17-18, the establishment and maintenance of righteousness may be a dominant feature of the messiah’s reign over Israel.<sup>633</sup> This aspect is also evident in line 5 which mention that “he will [ ....] observe the Torah with the men of the Community.”

Specific and elaborate details of the messiah’s role and duties in Israel’s restoration are minimal in 4Q252. It is plausible that in 4Q252, the writer simply presents the messiah’s enthronement as the climatic finale of Israel’s restoration, rather than as the *instrument* of it. However, if George J. Brooke is correct in reading **הַרְגָלִים** (“divisions”)<sup>634</sup> rather than **הַרְגָלִים** (“feet”)<sup>635</sup> in line 3, this might imply a more specific role for the messiah in Israel’s dominion. In most cases in the Qumran scrolls, particularly in the 1QM (*War Scroll*),<sup>636</sup> **הַרְגָלִים** is used to refer to the divisions of infantry battalions or standards of the tribes of war. The association of this term with the Davidic king might suggest a militant-messiah who would lead an eschatological

---

<sup>631</sup> For interpretations and proposed emendations of שִׁלָּה see BDB, 1010, col. 1. Possibly the text refers to “tribute” (NRSV) to be paid to the king by the nations or to the coming of Shiloh. The writer of 4Q252 has obviously understood the reference messianically.

<sup>632</sup> The Davidic ruler is referred to as “shepherd, a prince over your people” (4Q504, frgs. 1-2, col. iv.7) (DSSSE 2.1015).

<sup>633</sup> A small fragment of 1Q30 mentions a “holy messiah.” The text is too broken to determine its proper reference and interpretation.

<sup>634</sup> Brooke (*Parabiblical*, 205) says a computer enhancement makes the dalet “certain.”

<sup>635</sup> Cf. Gen 49:10

<sup>636</sup> 1QM i.14; iii.6; iv.10; v.5; xii.17; 11QT xxi.5. Cf. 4Q405 (e.g., frgs. 20-22), which refers to the divisions of various gods or heavenly beings around God’s throne.

assault. This picture is consistent with some depictions of the Davidic messiah in early Jewish literature.<sup>637</sup>

In 4Q252 Israel's restoration has special significance to the members of the Qumran community. The reference to "the thousands" (line 3) identifies the ones in Israel over whom the messiah will rule. While, the phrase ("the thousands") may emphasize the magnitude of the kingdom,<sup>638</sup> it is more likely that it designates those within the Qumran group. Line 5-6 refer to the "men of the Community" (אנשי היחד) and the כנסת אנשי ("the assembly of the men of..."). Both אנשי היחד and כנסת אנשי are *termini technici* in the scrolls and refer to the membership and hierarchy of the group. Moreover, in other places in several of the Qumran scrolls, the epithet "the thousands" is used to denote a layer of the community's membership as well.<sup>639</sup> Therefore, this suggests that 4Q252 claims that the Qumran group is the true heir of Israel's restoration.<sup>640</sup> That restoration, according to the author of 4Q252, will include: (1) a Davidic king,<sup>641</sup> (2) the defeat of the nations and Israel's dominion, and (3) the proper observation of Torah.

The identification of a future messiah as the "Branch of David" is found in three other places in the Qumran scrolls: 4Q161 (*4QIsaiah Pesher*<sup>a</sup>), 4Q285 (*4QWar Scroll*<sup>b</sup>), and 4Q174 (*4QFlorilegium*). *4QFlorilegium*<sup>642</sup> (frgs. 1-3, col.i.1-19) is a composition which interprets various OT texts in view of "the end of days" (אחרית הימים) (lines 2, 12, 15).<sup>643</sup> Lines 10-13 concern the David messiah:

---

<sup>637</sup> E.g., *Psalms of Solomon* 17-18; 4Q161; 4Q285.

<sup>638</sup> See Dan 7:10.

<sup>639</sup> 1QS*a* (*The Rule of the Congregation*), col. i.6-14 pertains to the initiation process of new inductees into the Community. Lines 13-14 report that when a member is thirty years old he can take his place "among the leaders of the thousands of Israel" (ברואשי אלפי ישראל). More interesting, in light of the presence of the messiah in 4Q252 is col. ii.14-15 of 1QS*a*, where the writer designates the table positions of the "leaders [of thousands of Israel]" when the messiah comes (cf. 4Q252, col. v.3-4). Lastly, 11QT (*Temple Scroll*) col. xix.16 stipulates the sacrifices and offering which the "leaders of the thousands of Israel" should give. In all cases, as far we can determine, where אלפ occurs in a plural construct state, it is preceded by "leaders" in the construct state as well, and always refers explicitly to the DSS Community. The reconstructed רואשי אלפי in line 3 might well be emended to רואשי אלפי. For the relationship of the Temple Scroll to the Community and to Qumran scrolls, see Stegemann, *Library of Qumran*, 96; Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll: The Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1985).

<sup>640</sup> These lines (5-6) may be a commentary on the last portion of Gen 49:10: "...to whom it belongs. And to him shall be the obedience of the peoples."

<sup>641</sup> The writer of 4Q252 does not understand the promise to pertain to a single royal figure who will live forever, but rather one who will be the first in the eternal line ("his descendants") of Davidic kings. Nonetheless, the advent of the first messianic king is seen as the decisive and pivotal point of the restoration or dominion of Israel.

<sup>642</sup> For the official reconstruction and official of the Hebrew text, see John M. Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4: I (4Q158-4Q186)* (DJD 5; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 53-57. For the Hebrew text and translation, we have cited from that of *DSS* unless otherwise noted.

<sup>643</sup> For the "end of days," see Annette Steudel, "אחרית הימים in the Texts from Qumran," *RevQ* 16 (1993), 225-46.



(10) And (2 Sam 7:12-14) 'YHWH de[clares] to you that he will build for you a house. And I will raise up your seed after you and establish the throne of his kingdom 11) [forev]er. I will be a father to him and he will be a son to me.' He is the 'Branch of David' (צמח דוד) who will arise with the Interpreter of the Law (דורש התורה) who (12) [will rise up] in Zi[on in] the last days (בא[הרית הימים]), as it is written: (Amos 9:11) 'I will raise up the tabernacle of David (סוכת דוד) which has fallen.' This (refers to) 'the tabernacle of (13) David' which has fallen,' who will arise to save Israel (להושיע את ישראל).

The reference to a Davidic ruler occurs within a large block of material (4Q174, frgs. 1-3, col.i.1-13) that pertains to the interpretation of 2 Sam 7:10-14. Of special interest to the writer in this section of *Florilegium* are the multiple meanings of "house" (בית) (2 Sam 7:11, 13). Interpreters have observed multiple interpretation of the house according to various temples in the text. Some scholars argue for two,<sup>644</sup> while others understand references to three temples in *4QFlorilegium*:<sup>645</sup> (1) the eschatological sanctuary that Yahweh will build "in the end of days" (lines 2-3), (2) the first sanctuary which was destroyed (lines 5-6), and (3) the "sanctuary of man" (line 6b).<sup>646</sup> The "house" of the messiah in line 10, however, is a continuation on this theme in *Florilegium*.<sup>647</sup> In this section the author mentions some important components of Israel's restoration. These include God's building of the eschatological, eternal Temple (lines 1-3) (cf. Ex 15:17-18), the prohibition of Israel's enemies, foreigners, bastards, and proselytes (lines 3-4) from entering the Temple, the emergence of a holy people— a "Temple of man" (מקדש אדם) (line 6)—and the arrival of the Davidic and priestly figures.<sup>648</sup>

The Davidic messiah is said to be the "house"<sup>649</sup> and the "son"<sup>650</sup> of 2 Samuel 7:13-14. He is referred to as "the Branch of David"<sup>651</sup> and will "arrive with the

<sup>644</sup> Michael O. Wise, "4QFlorilegium and the Temple of Adam," *RevQ* 15 (1991), 103-32.

<sup>645</sup> This is the majority viewpoint, as represented by George J. Brooke (*Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* [JSOTSS 29; Sheffield: JSOT, 1985], 193); Devorah Dimant, ("Qumran Sectarian Literature," in Stone, *Jewish Writings* 518-21.); Collins, (*Scepter*, 106-9); and Gerbern S. Oegema, (*The Anointed and His People: Messianic Expectations from Maccabees to Bar Kochba* [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press], 120-21).

<sup>646</sup> It is possible that the "sanctuary of man" (מקדש אדם) is to be equated with the eschatological temple that God will build with his own hands. But it is more likely that the writer refers to three, perhaps four temples or houses: the eschatological sanctuary, the sanctuary of the Community, the former sanctuary, (and the house of David, the messiah). For a thorough discussion of this passage, see Brooke, *Exegesis*, 178-92.

<sup>647</sup> While lines 10-13 are usually treated separately from lines 1-9, these lines form a literary unity based on the writer's interpretation of 2 Samuel 7:10-14 and his sustained interest in "house" (lines 2, 3, 10). Brooke (*Exegesis*, 178) rightly observes that "[t]he intention of 4QFlor...is to say that God has established both houses, the sanctuary and the shoot of David." Nonetheless, Brooke treats lines 10-13 apart from lines 1-9. Dimant ("Sectarian Literature," 521) notes that lines 10-13 "should be seen as a continuation of the first part." The space at the end of line 13 also suggests that this is a cohesive block of material.

<sup>648</sup> Although the priestly messiah ("the Interpreter of the Law") is not dealt with in this paper, throughout the scrolls, the priest(s), when mentioned, assumes an equal or superior position. See George J. Brooke, "The Messiah of Aaron in the Damascus Document," *RevQ* 15 (1991), 215-30; Collins, *Scepter*, 74-115.

<sup>649</sup> See lines 2-3; 2 Sam 7:10-11; Exodus 15:17-18.

<sup>650</sup> Although the writer does not press the point, the royal figure is identified as a "son" of God in *4QFlorilegium*. This relationship is already in 2 Samuel 7 (between God and David), but 4Q174 provides

Interpreter of the Law in Zi[on in] the end of days.” The writer’s interpretation of the “Branch of David” draws upon Amos 9:11, which foretells the “raising of the tabernacle of David that has fallen.”<sup>652</sup> The Davidic messiah’s fundamental duty is put in succinct terms: **יַעֲמֹד לְהוֹשִׁיעַ אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל** (“he will arise to save Israel”). Although the importance of the priestly figure cannot be denied in the scrolls, it is noteworthy that only the Davidic king is portrayed in *Florilegium* as the restorer or savior of Israel. The messianic salvation of Israel is not elaborated, but in light of the preceding lines (4-9), his eschatological activities may concern the elimination of Israel’s enemies and other unrighteous peoples from Zion in preparation for the establishment of the eschatological Temple.

One other point is noteworthy, however, in the discussion of the messiah or the anointed in *4QFlorilegium*. In frg. 1, col. i.17-19, the author refers to his community, “the sons of Zadok” (also “council of the community”) who are under attack by their Jewish enemies and the Gentiles. The author understands his community to be the eschatological Israel based on his claim that they alone properly follow the Mosaic law (frg. 1, col. ii.1-2). Moreover, the writer underscores the apocalyptic nature of the conflict by referring to the role of Belial, an evil heavenly agent of the enemy, in this period.<sup>653</sup> In underscoring eschatological conflict, the author quotes Psalm 2:1:

Why do the nations conspire, and the peoples plot in vain? (2) The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the LORD and his anointed?<sup>654</sup>

While the portion of the line containing the interpretation of the passage is fragmented at certain points, it seems to indicate that the author does *not* interpret the reference to “the anointed” as the Davidic messiah (or Branch of David). Instead, the author understands “the anointed” in terms *an anointed community*, who is referred to the persecuted “elect ones of Israel in the last days” (**בְּחִירֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים**). That is, the *anointed community*, i.e., the true Israel, will be delivered by the *anointed Branch of David* when he arises. Therefore, in this passage the basic features of the exilic model of restoration are evident: the formation or re-gathering of the true Israel; the hope for a new or eschatological Temple; and the defeat of the enemies (Jewish rivals, nations, and Belial).

The document known as *4QIsaiah Pesher*<sup>a</sup> (4Q161) describes the restoration of Israel under the leadership of a Davidic messiah. In frgs. 2-6, col. ii.1-25, the author refers to a surviving remnant of Israel who makes their eschatological pilgrimage back from the wilderness exile (line 14) to the Land. The re-gathering of Israel is also a time of battle to defeat the enemy. In 4Q161 (frgs. 8-10, col.iii.1-25), the author provides a detailed account of the eschatological battle.<sup>655</sup> Isaiah 11<sup>656</sup> is the author’s biblical point

firm evidence that in the pre-Christian period, this title was associated by some Jews with a future, royal, Davidic figure.

<sup>651</sup> See Jer 33:15; 4Q252.

<sup>652</sup> Cf. the *Damascus Document* (CD-A vii.14-21), where “the tabernacle of David” is interpreted to be the “books of the Law.”

<sup>653</sup> See 4Q174; frg. 1, col. i.8-9 (3x); frg. 1, col. ii.1-2; frg. 4, lines 1-6.

<sup>654</sup> RSV translation.

<sup>655</sup> See the earlier discussion of 1QM and the excursus on the wilderness in the next chapter.

of departure for his assessment of the Davidic conqueror. The Spirit-endowed figure from Jesse (lines 11-16; Isa 11:1-4) is understood by the writer of 4Q161 to be ["Branch] of David<sup>657</sup> who will arise in the en[d of days]" (line 17).<sup>658</sup> Apparently the various attributes of the Spirit in Isaiah 11 (lines 11-13) are understood by the writer to be God's empowerment or "support" of the messiah (ואל יסומכנו).<sup>659</sup> The messiah is depicted as a warrior who conquers and judges all of Israel's enemies (lines 18, 20).<sup>660</sup> The royal messiah will be "enthroned," "crowned," and dressed in royal "vestments" (lines 19). He will rule (ימשול) over Israel and the nations; however, he will do so in consultation with the priests of the Community (lines 22-24).

A similar but much more fragmented account of a Davidic ruler is given in 4Q285 (*4QWar Scroll*).<sup>661</sup> The messianic king is identified once more as the "Branch of David" (frg. 5.1-2) as well as the "Prince of the Congregation" (frg. 4.1, 6; frg. 5.4). As in the *Isaiah Pesher*, he is the leader of an eschatological battle against the "Kittim" (= Rome) (frg. 4.1-9). In fact, 4Q285, frg. 5.1-6 draws explicitly from Isa 10:34-11:1(-4?), which, as shown above, influences the conception of the messiah elsewhere in early Jewish literature. In the conclusion of the war in 4Q285, the messiah is depicted as killing an important figure (cf. Isa 11:4), probably the enemy leader, and destroying the "Kittim" (frg. 5.4-5).<sup>662</sup> Line 5 also indicates that the Davidic figure will be accompanied by a priest, as noted also in 4Q174 and the 4Q161.

The connection of the "Branch of David" with the "Prince of the Congregation" (נשיא העדה)<sup>663</sup> in 4Q161 and 4Q285 leads to yet more DS texts that bear on the study

<sup>656</sup> The author interprets various lines in Isaiah 10:33-34-11:1-5 as related to eschatological period of Israel's restoration. This passage, particularly Isaiah 11:1-5, as noted in the discussion of the messiah in *Psalms of Solomon* is often the locus of messianic exegesis in EJJL.

<sup>657</sup> In *4QIsaiah Pesher*<sup>a</sup> (frgs. 2-6, ii.15) he is also referred to as the "Prince of the Congregation" (see 4Q285 below).

<sup>658</sup> Trans. based on Allegro, *Cave 4*, 14.

<sup>659</sup> Line 11 reads "God will strengthen him by וררה[...]," possibly a reference to the Torah (Allegro, *Cave 4*, 14).

<sup>660</sup> In line 20 the enemy is called Magog. Earlier in 4Q161 (lines 3-9), the opponent is identified as the Kittim (= Rome); in 4Q162 the writer also speaks of "the Congregation of the men of Scoffing who are in Jerusalem" (Allegro, *Cave 4*, 16.)

<sup>661</sup> In 1QM (*War Scroll*) very little is said about the role of the Prince of the Congregation. He is mentioned only in col. v, where it is said that upon his sh[ield], "they shall write his name [and] the name of Israel and Levi and Aaron and the names of the twelve tribes of Israel according to their generations (2) and the names of the twelve commanders ("princes") of their tribes (PDSSP 2.107). Cf. 1QM 3.12, where the banner of the whole congregation contains the names of Israel and Aaron and the twelve tribes. The literary relationship of 4QM and 1QM remains unclear, although they share many textual correspondences with one another. See Martin Abegg, "Messianic Hope and 4Q285: A Reassessment," *JBL* 113 (1994), 81-91.

<sup>662</sup> This text first gained notoriety as the "Slain/Pierced Messiah text." While it is possible in Hebrew to understand the messiah as the subject or the object of the killing, the grammar favors a reading the messiah as the subject. Moreover, since Isaiah speaks of a descendant of Jesse killing (enemies) with his breath, 4Q161, frg. 5.3-5, it is likely the messiah is the envisaged one who is killing the opposing ruler. For the arguments for either interpretation, see Collins, *Scepter*, 58-60.

<sup>663</sup> Cf. Ezek 34:24; 37:25.

of a Davidic messiah.<sup>664</sup> In *1QRule of Blessings* (1Q28b), the writer records the “blessing of the Instructor” (משכיל), a priestly figure,<sup>665</sup> over the “Prince of the Congregation” (נשיא העדה) (col. v.20-29).<sup>666</sup> While the end of the first line of the blessing is unreadable, the Prince is situated within “the covenant of the Community.” The Instructor prays that God will use the Prince “to establish (להקים)<sup>667</sup> the kingdom (מלכות) of his people for eve[r...].” (line 21). The technical language<sup>668</sup> contained in these two lines suggests that the Community understands itself to be the recipients of “the kingdom.” Israel and the Community are bound up together in the group’s theology.

Once again Isaiah 11:1-4<sup>669</sup> exercises a profound influence on the depiction of the messiah (lines 24-29). Armed only with the “scepter of his mouth” and “breath of his lips,” the Prince “destroys the “land” (or “earth”) and “kills the wicked” (lines 24-25; Isa 11:4). His attributes of “eternal strength,” “the Spirit [...] of knowledge” and the “fear of God” (line 25; Isa 11:2-3) demonstrate that he is the divinely, sanctioned agent of restoration. It is God who establishes the messiah as the world power over other rulers (מושלים) and subjugates the nations to him: [“and all the na[tions] shall serve you” (lines 27-28). Therefore, the primary locus of attention in 1Q28b, col. v is the messianic, Prince of the Congregation.<sup>670</sup> He is cast as a figure of Israel’s, or the kingdom’s, re-establishment. Enabled by the Spirit and strength of God, the messiah’s reconstitution of the kingdom is portrayed singularly as the defeat and subjugation of foreign powers. His victory is assured through the Community’s covenant with God (lines 21).

These passages (above) from the Qumran scrolls<sup>671</sup> contain the most assured and important references to a future Davidic figure, who may be called a messiah, although as noted, only rarely is he explicitly identified as a משיח. There are, however, several other explicit occurrences of “messiah” that may relate to a future, Davidic figure,

<sup>664</sup> It is important to note, however, that thus far in this study of the DSS, “messiah” has explicitly appeared only once in conjunction with a Davidic figure (4Q252).

<sup>665</sup> As noted earlier, the royal figure is often accompanied by (a) priestly one(s); the ruler is usually cast in a subordinate position, as here. This subordination is usually more prominent in cultic matters of Torah interpretation or purity requirements (etc.) The Instructor is probably to be equated with the Interpreter of the Law (and the messiah of Aaron), although it is possible there may have been multiple priestly figures of high authority among the Community’s hierarchy.

<sup>666</sup> In 1Q28b, col. 1.1, “the Instructor” blesses the whole Congregation. In 3.33 “the blessing of the Instructor” is for the Sons of Zadok.

<sup>667</sup> See line 23: “establish a covenant” (“Blessings (1QSb),” in *PDSSP* 1.129, fns. 33 and 35).

<sup>668</sup> As noted from 4Q252 the “the Community” is sometimes a technical term for the group at Qumran; furthermore, “covenant” in this context also is technical language and probably refers to the formal membership agreement as contained in such documents as 1QS (the *Community Rule*). 4Q252 refers to “the covenant of the kingdom.”

<sup>669</sup> The importance of Isaiah 11 for the messianic conception(s) in early Jewish literature cannot be underestimated. In the study thus far of the Davidic messiah in early Jewish literature, Isaiah 11 was seen to be influential in the conception of the messiah in *Psalms of Solomon*, 4Q161, 4Q285, and 1Q28b.

<sup>670</sup> The exaltation of the messianic king is alluded to in line 23, where it is stated that he “will be raised to an everlasting height” and made like a “mighty tower.”

<sup>671</sup> For more on the messiah in the *Damascus Document*, see the treatment of that writing in Chapter Two.

although firm terminological grounds are lacking. These passages, therefore, are only briefly identified and discussed (below).

The first line of 1QSa (*Rule of the Congregation*) establishes the purpose of the document as: "[T]he rule for all the Congregation (עדת) in the end of days" (1QSa, col.i.1). The subsequent lines provide detailed stipulations for the Congregation to follow in matters of order and protocol for the various levels of membership and the hierarchy in this eschatological period. Col. ii.11-22 concerns "the feast<sup>672</sup> for the Council of the Community when [God] leads forth<sup>673</sup> the messiah (to be) with them (lines 11-12)." While the text implies a great deal of importance to the arrival of the messiah—the meeting is qualified in light of his advent (line 12)—apparently the royal messiah's<sup>674</sup> entry and seating at the meeting/dining table is preceded by the chief priest and other priestly figures (lines 12b-14). It is noteworthy that after the messiah's entry, the leaders of the twelve tribes of Israel are sat before him (lines 14-15). There are lacunae at key junctures in the text, but after the prayer of a priestly figure, the messiah himself "stretches out his hand" (to bless) and partake of the bread (lines 18-20). Afterwards the other members of the Congregation participate in order of importance (lines 21-22). It is difficult to assess the messiah in this text since the writer provides few details. It is noteworthy that this is the only place (line 12) where משיח occurs in the absolute without any qualifiers whatsoever; the eschatological ruler is simply "the messiah" (המשיח).<sup>675</sup> The opening line of 1QSa places the gathering of the group and the messiah in an eschatological context ("the end of days"), a period normally understood to be characterized by both incipient salvation and conflict. The messiah is clearly an important figure. This is demonstrated in his order of entrance before the Congregation and the author's focus on him. But nonetheless, the messiah is subordinate to the priest(s), at least in certain matters. The messiah himself exhibits some priestly characteristics in his (apparent) "stretching of the hand toward the bread."

Other places in the scrolls refer to the messiah(s) of Aaron and Israel.<sup>676</sup> In the *Community Rule* (1QS ix.9), the two messiahs are expected to be accompanied by a future prophet as well:

They shall be judged by the first judgments in which the men of the Community began to be instructed, until the coming of the prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Levi (1QS ix.10-11).<sup>677</sup>

This is the only undisputed incidence of the phrase "messiahs of Aaron and Israel" (משיחי אהרן וישראל) in the plural, although most scholars understand the other

---

<sup>672</sup> מועד probably should be translated "assembly," although the gathering includes a feast.

<sup>673</sup> Geza Vermes (ed.), (*The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* [5th edit; London: Penguin, 1997], 159) says that יוליד ("begets") "seems to be confirmed by computer image enhancement." The translation in this study follows Charlesworth proposes יוליד (*PDSSP* 2.115-16).

<sup>674</sup> He is not mentioned in 1QSa, except at the meal.

<sup>675</sup> In lines 14 and 20 he is the "Messiah of Israel."

<sup>676</sup> E.g., 1QS xix.9; CD-A xii.23-xiii.1; xiv.18-19; CD-B xix.10-11; xix.33-xx.1. Charlesworth observes that these references to the messiah(s) in 1QS and CD provide little information regarding the function of the messiah of Aaron and Levi ("From Messianology," in *The Messiah*, 27.)

<sup>677</sup> *PDSSP* 1.41.

instances of the “messiah of Aaron and Israel” to be a distributive singular construct form, and therefore also plural.<sup>678</sup> In 1QS ix.9, CD-A xii.23-13:1, and xiv.18-19, the arrival of the messiah(s) is expected to signal a change in the Community’s government and keeping of their covenantal laws. The messiah(s) will assume leadership and oversee the code of righteousness. Thus, in CD-A xiv.18-19, the writer maintains that certain requirements must be kept by Israel until the messiah of Aaron and Israel comes. At which point, “he [the messiah] shall atone for their sins.” (It is noteworthy to point out here that the messiah seems to be spoken of in the singular.) Line 20 is fragmented but refers to punishments as well. The messiah is anticipated to be a priestly personage who will impose either penalty or forgiveness, as the case may warrant. The author of the *Damascus Document* (CD-B xix.10-11 and xix.33-xx.1) expects, however, the messiah(s) to procure judgment on the community’s enemies and apostates.

In conclusion, although in early Jewish literature a number of messianic and other eschatological agents of redemption are found, the present study has demonstrated that some writers and their communities attached great significance to the hope for a messiah from the lineage of David. These passages manifest considerable variety in their portrayal of the long awaited Davidic messiah, but also demonstrate some overlap in details as well. Some documents (e.g., *Psalms of Solomon*; 4 *Ezra* 13-14:1-9)<sup>679</sup> provide detailed accounts of the person and duties of the messiah from David, emphasizing his role as the warrior who ascends to the throne and re-gathers Israel, although even here there are important re-gathers differences in detail and emphasis. The promise to David (e.g., 2 Samuel 7), in many early Jewish writings, is seen as the guarantee of the Davidic ruler’s future coming. His appearance will mark a decisive shift in the ages and rise of Israel as the supreme power. Some documents emphasize the messiah’s enthronement<sup>680</sup> and his inauguration of the Davidic line of kings. But by far, the depiction of the Davidic messiah that is most prevalent is that he will be Israel’s liberator, forcefully eradicating all her enemies from the Land. In many cases, the enemies of Israel are the traditional ones, i.e., the nations. But in other cases, the circle of enemies is enlarged to include sinful Jews and cosmic powers as well. In the presentation of the Davidic messiah, Isaiah 11:1-4 emerges as the most important OT text that informs the description of the expected ruler in early Jewish literature. It is striking that in several of the messianic passages, the biblical text of Isaiah 11 is cited and used to interpret the envisaged Davidic king. Why this OT passage had such an impact on the conception of the Davidic ruler among so many early Jewish writings is not altogether clear. It might be surmised that the appeal of the passage was based in part on the figure being shown to be anointed with the Spirit of God, suggesting his divine agency, an important attribute to possess for one assigned to defeat Israel’s enemies and the administrate God’s heavenly rule over the Land and the world. The Isaianic passage and its pneumatic emphasis might have been attractive in light of the understanding that Israel’s enemies ruled unjustly and sinfully by the power or spirit of their own cosmic agent (i.e., Satan or Belial). As God’s appointee, the Davidic messiah is expected to be empowered by the heavenly Spirit to destroy all Israel’s enemies, and

---

<sup>678</sup> Martin Abegg, (“The Messiah at Qumran: Are We Still Seeing Double?,” *DSD* 2 [1995], 125-44, esp. 129-31) disputes this claim.

<sup>679</sup> For a treatment of the messiah in 4 *Ezra*, see the analysis of this document in Chapter Two.

<sup>680</sup> See esp. *Psalms of Solomon*; 4*QCommentary on Genesis*<sup>a</sup>; 4*QWords of the Luminaries*<sup>a</sup>.

to rule wisely as God's regent on earth.<sup>681</sup> Within the wider matrix of Early Judaism, Israel's hopes for restoration could be placed in God alone or a number of other messianic or eschatological figures. The expectation of a Davidic ruler is a relatively uncommon feature found in the exilic model of restoration. But in some quarters of Judaism, the hope for Davidic messiah was of vital importance; his arrival would constitute the definitive signal that the age of Israel's restoration had commenced.

### 3.7 The Acceptance of Gentile Rule *and* Israel's Restoration

Shaye Cohen argues that, "the basic political stance of Jews of both the land of Israel and the diaspora was not rebellion but accommodation. The Jews must support the state until God sees fit to redeem them."<sup>682</sup> While some Jews continued to anticipate a future restoration in which Israel would emerge independent from or dominant over the Gentiles, other Jews did not, and had accepted the fact of a perennially ruling Gentile kingdom.<sup>683</sup> The thought of Israel's restoration was often non-existent for many Jews, or at least did not factor very prominently in their thoughts and how they lived their lives. Instead, the dominant world view of many Jews was that God (now) ruled the world through Gentile kingdoms or kings that he appointed. God's (heavenly) kingdom stretches over all the worldly powers. But his kingdom or rule on earth was administered by foreign regimes that God appointed for intermittent periods of rule.<sup>684</sup>

---

<sup>681</sup> After the defeat of the enemies, the messiah would administer his rule by the wisdom of God. As we have already noted, particularly in the discussion of Sirach, sapiential claims regarding various geographical locales and figures were very important in the Greco-Roman period. Thus, this sapiential attribute of the enigmatic figure of Isaiah 11 would be appealing as well.

<sup>682</sup> Shaye J. D. Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah* (Library of Early Christianity 7; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987), 34. Cohen suggests this political viewpoint originated with Jeremiah in his idea that the triumph of Babylon was not due to Israel's sin but God "who controls the destiny of nations and empires" (28).

<sup>683</sup> As Barclay notes, many Jews fully assimilated into their Diaspora contexts (*Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, esp. 104-06; also see his remarks on "Cultural Convergence [Chapter Six, 125-80]). Those integrated so fully into their foreign environments were not so likely to have harbored hopes of restoration.

<sup>684</sup> Collins, "Nebuchadnezzar and the Kingdom of God: Deferred Eschatology in the Jewish Diaspora," in idem, *Seers, Sibyls, and Sages*, 131 (131-37).

Some Jews hoped that foreign monarchs might at least acknowledge the Jewish God and accept this deity as the one who had established their kingships. One of the lessons of stories like Esther, Daniel 1-6, and Bel and the Dragon is that “even Gentile kings must worship the God of heaven, who is the God of Israel, if their sovereignty is to endure.”<sup>685</sup> But other early Jewish writers suggest that the rise and fall of kingdoms is dictated according to the pre-determined plan of God, each kingdom allocated a set period of rule before “the kingdom”<sup>686</sup> passed on to another empire. As Daniel the prophet prays before interpreting the dream of Nebuchadnezzar and informing him of the temporal extent of his kingdom (2:36-45):

Dan 2:20) ...Blessed be the name of God for ever and ever, who possesses wisdom and power. (21) He changes times and seasons; he removes kings and sets up kings...<sup>687</sup>

Writing well after the 6<sup>th</sup> century restoration, and despite referring to Cyrus,<sup>688</sup> the author of Daniel 1-6 never mentions the historic restoration. While exhibiting some concern for the hardships of Jews among some Gentiles, foreign monarchs are portrayed relatively positively, often affirming the Jewish God. Although God is understood as the ultimate sovereign, only rarely in the first half of Daniel is the earthly rule of Gentile kings challenged. In Daniel 2, the prophet anticipates the eventual inauguration of God’s direct and eternal rule on earth, after the passing of four other divine kingdoms. While God’s kingdom certainly stands in contrast to the foreign kingdoms of the world, it may be that the kingdom of Israel is to be included in the contrast as well.<sup>689</sup> That is, in Daniel 2, the eschatological kingdom of God is never

---

<sup>685</sup> Collins, “The King has Become a Jew,” in idem (ed.), *Seers, Sibyls, and Sages*, 171.

<sup>686</sup> Collins, “Nebuchadnezzar,” 131.

<sup>687</sup> My translation.

<sup>688</sup> Dan 1:21; 6:29; cf. 10:1. Also see 9:25.

<sup>689</sup> Of course, the description may be a largely, symbolic and propagandistic view of Israel’s kingdom as opposes to those of the nations.



directly interpreted in terms of the nation of Israel or the Jewish people.<sup>690</sup> The kingdom is elaborated for its eternal character, supernatural elements, and, indeed, lack of human or earthly mediation.<sup>691</sup> That is, it is not clear whether the writer endorses the notion of Israel's restoration as such. Until the age of God's direct rule, the author of Daniel 1-6 accepts the inevitability of foreign empires and even places his God's endorsement upon their administration. Therefore, God's sovereignty and Gentile domination over the world are not viewed as mutually exclusive realities, a fact heavily contested, however, by Daniel 7-12.

The favorable acceptance of Gentile rulership by Jews did not always result in their discarding of the tradition of restoration.<sup>692</sup> Strikingly, in a few cases, there is evidence that some Jews revised the future restoration in such a manner to incorporate a positive role for a favorable Gentile ruler or kingdom. Thus, in some revisions, the hope for freedom from foreign subjugation—the foundation of the earliest expressions of biblical restoration—may not only be omitted, but revised to envision the exaltation of a Gentile nation or ruler who would oversee Israel's restoration. These revisions are configured in such a way to be compatible with the endorsement of the respective, foreign superpower. Of course, this “new” interpretation of Israel's restoration is in reality the revival of a very old idea. After all, the 6th century restoration was found compatible with foreign domination under Cyrus and Persia.

---

<sup>690</sup> In fact, the writer suggest God's rule will be mediated by no people:

ומלכותה לעם אחרן לא תשתבק

<sup>691</sup> While the defeat or subordination of the nations is therefore implied, there is no reference to the other features of the exilic model of restoration (i.e., the new or heavenly Temple and the re-gathering).

<sup>692</sup> Even Philo, whom Barclay includes in his chapter on “cultural convergence” (*Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 158-80) retains some of the central ideas of restoration, but shapes them in ways—not fully recognized by Barclay—that reflect these integrationist tendencies (see below).

### 3.7.1 Sibylline Oracles (Book Three): An Egyptian Messiah

The Jewish author of the *Sibylline Oracles* (Book 3) (*Sib. Or. 3*)<sup>693</sup> adopts the identity of a famous pagan prophetess<sup>694</sup> from antiquity to deliver the propagandistic message<sup>695</sup> of the superiority of the Jewish God, the morality of the Jewish people, and (or but) the rule of an Egyptian king. While the document adopts a hard-line policy against many of the nations, especially Rome,<sup>696</sup> the Egyptian kingdom is treated more favorably. The writing is penned on behalf of a Jewish community who wishes to

---

<sup>693</sup> All references to the *Sibylline Oracles* are from Book 3 unless otherwise noted. All citations are taken from Collins' translation in the *OTP* (1.362-80). Also see his introductory notes on the whole collection (317-24) and Book 3 (355-61).

<sup>694</sup> Oracles attributed to the "Sibyl" are attested as far back as the 6<sup>th</sup> century BCE. While documents written in her name seem to have originated from the eastern part of the occupied world (i.e., Asia Minor), the prophetess was associated with oracles in the western world as well. See the introduction of John J. Collins' important monograph, *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism* (SBLDS 13; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974), 1-33. The author pens the writing under the pseudonym of "Sibyl," a pseudonym commonly adopted in the ancient world to express the concerns and predictions of various communities in different periods of the ancient world. In the case of *Sib. Or. 3*, she is identified at one point as the daughter of Circe and Gnostos (3.815). Collins notes that "Circe was the magic-working goddess who changed Odysseus' men into swine." Gnostos is of unknown origin (*OTP* 1.380, fn g4). The author has the Sibyl challenge other cultural claims that she has descended from Erythrae (3.13-14). The Sibyl is also identified as the daughter-in-law of Noah, the biblical patriarch of the Deluge (3.823-27). By adopting the role of Sibyl—a prophetess of world acclaim and identifying her as the daughter of the Greek gods as well as Noah, a biblical figure who possesses "a universal heritage" in his own right (i.e., the survivor of the first judgment and father of the nations [Genesis 10])—the author adapts the heroine into a figure who can speak for and to both Jew and Gentile (Erich S. Gruen, "Jews, Greeks, and Romans in the Third Sibylline Oracle," in Goodman [ed.], *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World*, 36). Likewise, Doron Mendels observes that the ancient ancestors of Israel are presented as "universal figures." He writes that in this collection of oracles (book three), the Land is significantly downplayed as political or national entity and birthright. Mendels notes that "it is emphasized that the first ancestors were universal figures to whom the world was promised, rather than just the Land" (e.g., 3.220-64) (*Rise and Fall*, 255). Barclay only observes the familial association with Noah (*Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 218).

<sup>695</sup> As Collins observes the characterization of this document as "political propaganda" does ultimately rests on whether the writing was meant for a Gentile or Jewish audience. As Collins remarks: "Propaganda typically bolsters the security of the propagandist group by addressing the world around it, whether or not that world is prepared to listen" (idem, "The Sibyl and the Potter: Political Propaganda in Ptolemaic Egypt," in idem, *Seers, Sibyls, and Sage*, 199-210; idem, *Between Athens*, 16). For an early, but significant, seminal essay on apologetic or propagandistic writings, see Victor Tcherikover, "Jewish Apologetic Literature Reconsidered," *Eos* 48 (1956), 169-93. One of the main points that Tcherikover makes, against the scholarly consensus of the time, is that apologetic literature is not necessarily or even mostly for outsider groups, but may be directed internally, i.e., to other Jews.

<sup>696</sup> The singling out of Rome for special treatment qualifies the document, at least in part, as an example of anti-Roman propaganda that circulated both in the Hellenistic Near East and West during the period of Roman expansion in the early to mid second century BCE.

convey its support of one Gentile power over and against other nations, especially Rome.<sup>697</sup>

The document claims to be a series of divinely inspired predictions, but, in fact, many of the "predicted" events have already occurred at the time in which the author writes.<sup>698</sup> The recasting of past events as prophecies is found in other Jewish prophetic and apocalyptic writings,<sup>699</sup> as has been previously noted in this study. These *ex eventu* prophecies are used to convince the intended audience of, *inter alia*, a document's ancient origins,<sup>700</sup> the legitimacy of the real prophecies, and the divine basis or authority for its claims. These factors underlie the implicit message of the Sibyl that her words should be heeded.

Jews or Judaism is presented as central to the unfolding events of world history. Jews are presented as the most righteous population among the nations, and therefore,

---

<sup>697</sup> *Sib. Or.* 3.155-61, 193, 318, 608, 652-56. Several passages in the writing suggest the provenance of the writing is Egypt. But the author does not adopt the philosophical framework of allegorization to interpret either the biblical text or the socio-political events of the world. Instead, the writing is penned as a series of oracles, laying its claim to be inspired speech. The endorsement of Egypt by the Jewish writer does not entail by any means the acceptance of all things Egyptian or Gentile. Indeed, a recurring theme of the book is the superiority of the Jewish God and Jewish ethics and morality. Moreover, the book launches a strong assault against idolatry. However, these pro-Jewish features must be balanced against other factors that such suggest a high level of accommodation to the writer's Diaspora context (i.e., Egypt), not least of which is the use of the prophetess Sibyl to convey the author's message. Furthermore, as the present section argues, the author lends its support to the regent of Egypt. Therefore, although certain features of the writing may be strongly opposed toward Hellenism or elements of the wider Gentile context, we cannot accept Barclay's classification of this writing as belonging fully to those corpus of documents reflecting "cultural antagonism" (Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 181-228; esp. 216-28).

<sup>698</sup> Since the *ex eventu* prophecies are rarely detached retellings of history, but highly interpretative accounts, they often share an integral relationship with the present reality and visions of the future in the prophecies of the Sibyl. While the oracles in this the third book were written over a lengthy period, perhaps, over 150 years, the core of the collection was probably penned in the middle part of the second century BCE (Collins, "Sibyl and the Potter," 201; Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 223).

<sup>699</sup> Cf. also the use of such prophecies in non-Jewish writings, such as the *Potter's Oracle*. See John Collins, "The Sibyl and the Potter: Political Propaganda in Ptolemaic Egypt," in idem (ed.), *Seers, Sibyls, and Sages*, 199-210)

<sup>700</sup> I.e., the prophecies are claimed to have originated from primordial times.

are to be emulated in their virtues.<sup>701</sup> The Jewish God is presented as the chief deity, and therefore, as the one whom the world should venerate above all.<sup>702</sup> The Temple is allocated primacy as the locale at which to worship God. But strikingly, the Sibyl suggests an *Egyptian* king has been appointed as God's earthly regent over the world, and moreover, his reign will inaugurate the eschatological age in which the Temple of Israel will emerge as the religious center of the world.

The main body of the document (*Sib. Or.* 3) is comprised of five oracles: ([1] 3.97-161; [2] 3.162-95; [3] 3.196-294; [4] 3.545-656; and [5] 3.657-808).<sup>703</sup> In the first oracle, the author establishes the ancient character of the document and the origin of the problem at hand, i.e., idolatry, immorality, and esp. the warring of the nations. The author explains the ancient origins of the nations' conflict in the construction and destruction of the tower of Babel (3.97-105). God's judgment on the tower and the people results in the creation of the nations or kingdoms of the world. Their creation is assessed in negative terms by the writer: "[T]he whole earth of humans was filled with fragmenting kingdoms" (3.107). From this event sprung the ensuing history ("future") of conflict and war. According to the writer, the establishment of the world's kingdoms marked the end and anti-climax of the "the tenth generation" of "humankind" (3.108-09).<sup>704</sup> While the first oracle does not refer to Israel's restoration, it is important in that

---

<sup>701</sup> E.g., 3.219-64.

<sup>702</sup> See 3.624-34; 3.716-18. John Collins notes: "If there is a central theme in these oracles, it is to call to the Greek world to honor the Most High God and offer sacrifices in his temple" ("Sibyl and the Potter," 201).

<sup>703</sup> The scholarly consensus assigns the opening verses of the book (3.1-96) to a separate work (see Collins, *OTP* 1.359-60), a position adopted in this study as well.

<sup>704</sup> The importance of Egypt, a kingdom that rises to the fore later in the document for the author (see below), may be evident in the final part of the oracle that closes with the author naming the kingdoms appointed to rule the world (3.156-61). Nine nations are named, but Egypt is mentioned twice. Rome is the final nation to be named. If a tenth and final nation is expected to supplant Rome, readers may be expected to infer the third rise of Egypt, or more precisely, the kingdom of God, but administered through Egypt on earth.

the prophecy introduces the problem of world kingdoms, and shows them to be the source of conflict from an early point in history. Therefore, this early description of the origin of the kingdoms “provides a context for the oracles about the end-time that are in the rest of the book.”<sup>705</sup> That is, the defining aspect of the new age is the end of war and the peaceful co-existence of all peoples.

One of the more striking, and perhaps, controversial arguments of John J. Collins in his 1972 Harvard dissertation<sup>706</sup> is his contention that one of the aims of the *Sibylline Oracles* (Book 3) is to promote the reign of an Egyptian king, whom the Sibyl prophesies will be the overseer of Israel’s future restoration.<sup>707</sup> Regarding the various oracles concerning the eschatological Egyptian king, Collins writes: “They bear witness to an era of Jewish success in Egypt, when it was possible to envision a glorious restoration of the Jerusalem temple under Ptolemaic patronage.”<sup>708</sup>

The prominence of Egypt and her messianic king first come to the fore in the second oracle. The Sibyl identifies the addressees of her words as the nations of the world (3.162-64). Near the beginning of the oracle (3.166), the author asks: “How many kingdoms of men will be raised up?” (3.166). While the first kingdom named is the *Israel* (i.e., kingdom of Solomon) (3.167), the final one is *Egypt* (3.191-95). The author’s choice of these two kingdoms as the inner and outer frames of the kingdoms of the world is significant and reflects the author’s positive view not only toward Israel, but Egypt as well. The Sibyl elaborates on the benefits of an Egyptian empire *for Jews*

---

<sup>705</sup> OTP 1.354.

<sup>706</sup> Collins, *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism* (written under John Strugnell). All references in the present thesis are taken from the published version of Collins’ dissertation (Collins, *Sibylline Oracles*).

<sup>707</sup> Also, see the other studies of Collins in which he has continued both to affirm this argument (idem, “The Development of the Sibylline Tradition,” *ANRW* II:20.1 [1987], 421-59; John J. Collins, *Between Athens*, 83-97; idem, “The Sibyl and the Potter: Political Propaganda in Ptolemaic Egypt,” in idem, (ed.) *Seers, Sibyls, and Sage in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* [Leiden: Brill, 2001], 199-210).

<sup>708</sup> John Collins, “Sibyl and the Potter,” 209.

his description of the eschatological Egyptian king.<sup>709</sup> The coming kingdom of the Egyptian monarch stands in marked contrast to the evil kingdom it displaces:

(*Sib. Or.* 3.191) It [a wicked Gentile nation]<sup>710</sup> will stir up hatred. Every kind of deceit will be found among them (192) until the seventh reign, when (193) a king of Egypt, who will be of the Greeks by race, will rule. (194) And then the people of the great God will again be strong (195) who will be guides in life for all mortals.<sup>711</sup>

The description of the seventh king and the Egyptian empire is very brief. In the immediate literary context of the description, the weight of emphasis falls on the wickedness of the previous Gentile kingdom that the Egyptian one replaces. In fact, only four lines are devoted to describing the rise of the kingdom of Egypt and its positive implications for the Jews, while seventeen lines of the writing are given to the evil, foreign empire in the preceding lines.<sup>712</sup> The emergence of the Egyptian king is the decisive boundary marker between an evil age and the new eschatological age of peace.<sup>713</sup> Collins argues that “[o]ne of the major concerns of *Sib. III* can thus be described as royal eschatology—the expectation of radical and decisive change to be

---

<sup>709</sup> Also see 3.318, 608; cf. 3.652-56. On the precise identification with various Egyptian kings, see Collins, *Sibylline Oracles*, 30-33.

<sup>710</sup> E.g., Rome.

<sup>711</sup> *OTP* 1.366.

<sup>712</sup> The line count is based on the English translation of the *OTP* (1.366) and thus is of only approximate value. Nonetheless, there is clearly much more said about the wicked Gentile power (3.175-91) than Egypt (3.192-95).

<sup>713</sup> Such terse expressions of royal eschatology (“the expectation of radical and decisive change to be brought about by a king or kingdom,” Collins, *Sibylline Oracles*, 35), where the hope for the messiah is followed with few details about the exact nature of his reign are found in other documents of EJJ literature as well. For instance, in 1QS (ix.10-11), the author refers to the regulations by which a community of Jews should live “until the prophet comes, and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel.” No immediate elaboration on the meaning of the messiah is offered in the context of this messianic reference in 1QS. In EJJ, the inauguration of Israel’s restoration is occasionally connected to the emergence of a king or messiah. While an evil Gentile king may sometimes serve as the negative catalyst for the new epoch, other texts hope for the rise of a righteous Jewish king or liberator (i.e., a royal messiah). For instance, as discussed above, the author of the *Psalms of Solomon* 17-18, places paramount importance on the arrival of the Davidic messiah. Other early Jewish writers may provide few details of the restoration, but tersely note that arrival of a figure or figures will inaugurate the new age. Rather than an eschatological king, some documents prefer to speak of the arrival of a long awaited kingdom. Daniel and other writers adopt the four kingdom motif and adapt it according to a Jewish conception in which either Israel or her God is expected to come to power.

brought by a king or kingdom.”<sup>714</sup> Although the passage does not explicitly refer to the restoration of Israel, the Egyptian king’s ascension to power is described in terms of its significance for the Jewish people. Under the monarch from Egypt, the Sibyl notes that Jews will be affluent, serving as the religious and ethical leaders of the peoples of the world (3.194-95). That is, the fate of the Jews and the seventh king are bound up together in a clearly positive manner. Therefore, the reference to the seventh Egyptian king does more than merely date the eschatological age and the rise to prominence of the Jews. As Collins remarks, “the fact that the reign of the seventh king marks the beginning of the eschatological age strongly suggests that he is in some sense the cause of it.”<sup>715</sup>

In the second occurrence of the seventh king of Egypt (3.318), his appearance is briefly elaborated in terms of its significance for Egypt; neither the Jews nor the land of Israel is mentioned.<sup>716</sup> In the third and last explicit reference to the arrival of the seventh king of Egypt, the description of his reign is brief, but suggests positive implications for Jews (3.601-09). While this passage, like the one above, does not refer to the restoration of Israel, the author does associate the emergence of an eschatological *Gentile ruler* (!) with the cessation of idolatry,<sup>717</sup> a prohibition that reflects the religious views and desires of Jews for the nations. Moreover, the eradication of idolatrous practices strongly suggests the more positive side of that hope that the seventh king of Egypt, and

---

<sup>714</sup> Collins, *Sibylline Oracles*, 35.

<sup>715</sup> Collins, *Sibylline Oracles*, 43.

<sup>716</sup> Out of large number of “woes” issued against many nations (3.295-349), Egypt’s curse is the only one predicted to end in a positive way.

<sup>717</sup> The condemnation of idolatry is a Leitmotif of the writing (e.g., *Sib. Or.* 3.586-89; 604-07).

perhaps, all the peoples of the occupied world, will embrace the Jewish religion and worship God.<sup>718</sup>

The most importance reference to the eschatological Egyptian monarch brings Israel's restoration into the complex of future events which his appearance will inaugurate. In this instance, the Egyptian ruler is not referred to as the seventh king, but rather as a "king from the sun":

(*Sib. Or.* 3.652) And then God will send a King from the sun (653) who will stop the entire earth from evil war, (654) killing some, imposing oaths of loyalty on others; (655) and he will not do all these things by his private plans but in obedience to the noble teachings of the great God.

Some scholars have argued that this king should *not* be understood in analogy with other references to the seventh king, but as a Jewish messiah or king.<sup>719</sup> However, a Jewish identification of the figure seems unlikely. No where else in this document are there references to a future Jewish king. Furthermore, all other references to an eschatological king in the *Sibylline Oracles* (Book 3) are those which refer clearly to the seventh king *of Egypt*. In these references, the Egyptian monarch is portrayed positively and as a figure of pivotal importance for the world—even for the Jews. Therefore, the reference to the "king from the sun" is best interpreted as an Egyptian monarch as well. Moreover, as Collins has noted, in the *Potter's Oracle*, an Egyptian document, an eschatological Egyptian king is also referred to as a "king from the sun."<sup>720</sup> Thus, the weight of the evidence suggests that the "king from the sun" is Egyptian.

As with the first reference to the seventh king of Egypt (*Sib. Or.* 3.191-95) who follows an evil empire, so the "king from the sun" follows a period ruled over by wicked Gentile kings. The appearance of the Egyptian ruler and his kingdom marks an

---

<sup>718</sup> In *Sib. Or.* 3.624-25, the (rare) expression in EJJ for the nations to repent and convert occurs: "But you, devious mortal, do not tarry in hesitation but turn back, converted, and propitiate God."

<sup>719</sup> E.g., Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 223-24.

<sup>720</sup> Collins, "Sibyl and the Potter."



end to the evil Gentile kingdoms and the inauguration of an epoch of peace (3.653; cf. 3.118).<sup>721</sup> But whereas the earlier oracles associate the rule of the seventh king with positive consequences for the Jews, such as the expansion of their affluence in the world (3.193-94) or the end of idolatry (3.605-9), this instance of the Egyptian messiah is interpreted within the exilic model of restoration. That is, the inauguration of the Egyptian ruler's kingdom is viewed not only for its significance for the occupied world, but for Israel's restoration as well.<sup>722</sup> After describing the king's defeat and subordination of the evil Gentile powers, the author emphasizes that the Egyptian king will not govern by his own plans, but by God's instructions, probably implying not only God's guidance for polity, but religious teaching (i.e., Torah) as well (3.655-56).<sup>723</sup> Immediately after this qualification of the foreign monarch, the author shifts his focus to the Land and Israel's restoration:

(*Sib. Or.* 3.657) The Temple of the great God (will be) laden with very beautiful wealth, (658) gold, silver, and purple ornament, (659) and earth (will be) productive and sea full (660) of good things.

While this period of peace is followed by another brief period of wickedness and conflict (3.660-68), God is expected to intervene in judgment and complete the restoration (3.669-70).<sup>724</sup> In this phase of the restoration all sinful nations are either eliminated or brought around to worship God. The exalted Temple receives the primary attention of the author in understanding Israel's restoration. Its essential features are a world at peace (under an Egyptian king) and a world whose one god is God, whose cult

---

<sup>721</sup> The epoch of peace is often a defining characteristic of the eschatological age in early Jewish accounts (e.g., *Pss. Sol.* 17:32-44).

<sup>722</sup> See *Sib. Or.* 3.657-731, but, esp. 3.657-68, 702-31.

<sup>723</sup> In *Sib. Or.* 3.624-34, the Sibyl, in a rare early Jewish proselytizing passage, calls on the nations to submit, convert, and worship the Jewish God; in order to avoid the imminent judgment. After this appeal, the writer tells of the evil nations (635-51), before describing the arrival of the penitent, Egyptian ruler (652-56).

<sup>724</sup> Cf. *4 Ezra* where the messianic period is followed by the divine intervention of God.

end to the evil Gentile kingdoms and the inauguration of an epoch of peace (3.653; cf. 3.118).<sup>721</sup> But whereas the earlier oracles associate the rule of the seventh king with positive consequences for the Jews, such as the expansion of their affluence in the world (3.193-94) or the end of idolatry (3.605-9), this instance of the Egyptian messiah is interpreted within the exilic model of restoration. That is, the inauguration of the Egyptian ruler's kingdom is viewed not only for its significance for the occupied world, but for Israel's restoration as well.<sup>722</sup> After describing the king's defeat and subordination of the evil Gentile powers, the author emphasizes that the Egyptian king will not govern by his own plans, but by God's instructions, probably implying not only God's guidance for polity, but religious teaching (i.e., Torah) as well (3.655-56).<sup>723</sup> Immediately after this qualification of the foreign monarch, the author shifts his focus to the Land and Israel's restoration:

(*Sib. Or.* 3.657) The Temple of the great God (will be) laden with very beautiful wealth, (658) gold, silver, and purple ornament, (659) and earth (will be) productive and sea full (660) of good things.

While this period of peace is followed by another brief period of wickedness and conflict (3.660-68), God is expected to intervene in judgment and complete the restoration (3.669-70).<sup>724</sup> In this phase of the restoration all sinful nations are either eliminated or brought around to worship God. The exalted Temple receives the primary attention of the author in understanding Israel's restoration. Its essential features are a world at peace (under an Egyptian king) and a world whose one god is God, whose cult

---

<sup>721</sup> The epoch of peace is often a defining characteristic of the eschatological age in early Jewish accounts (e.g., *Pss. Sol.* 17:32-44).

<sup>722</sup> See *Sib. Or.* 3.657-731, but, esp. 3.657-68, 702-31.

<sup>723</sup> In *Sib. Or.* 3.624-34, the Sibyl, in a rare early Jewish proselytizing passage, calls on the nations to submit, convert, and worship the Jewish God, in order to avoid the imminent judgment. After this appeal, the writer tells of the evil nations (635-51), before describing the arrival of the penitent, Egyptian ruler (652-56).

<sup>724</sup> Cf. *4 Ezra* where the messianic period is followed by the divine intervention of God.

lies in Jerusalem. All Jews are anticipated to gather around the Temple in the age of peace in which God presides:

(*Sib. Or.* 3.702) But the sons of the great God will all live peacefully around the Temple, rejoicing in these things which the Creator, just judge and sole ruler, will give... (707) They will be free from war in towns and country. (708) No hand of evil war, but rather the Immortal himself (709) and the hand of the Holy One will be fighting for them.

While the Egyptian monarch fades from view after the opening stages of Israel's restoration, it is clear he plays an important role in inaugurating the eschatological epoch. Following the defeat of the enemy Gentile powers, the writer shifts his focus to aspects of the restoration that are more religiously oriented, hence the lack of reference to the Egyptian monarch. Instead, the author describes the exaltation of the Temple, the re-gathering of Israel, and the conversion of the remaining nations. The Land and the holy Temple become the exclusive focus of the writer. The Temple is understood to be the sole center of worship for the world, and the Law, the rule for all humanity:

(*Sib. Or.* 3.715) They [the Gentiles] will bring forth from their mouths a delightful utterance in hymns, (716) "Come, let us all fall on the ground and entreat (717) the immortal king, the great eternal God. (718) Let us send to the Temple, since he alone is sovereign (719) and let us all ponder the Law of the Most High God, (720) who is most righteous of all throughout the earth.

One final passage from the *Sibylline Oracles* (Book 3) is noteworthy for the author's view of the future and the endorsement of a foreign regent as the overseer of Israel's restoration. In the Sibyl's third oracle (3.196-294), the author provides a description of the ancient world in which the world will be filled with sin, war, and idolatry (3.196-212). The anti-climax of this period is the destruction of Solomon's Temple (3.213-17). This account is followed by a lengthy ode of praise regarding the Jewish people (3.218-64), who are portrayed as the ideal population on the earth, excelling in virtues and religious practices. However, according to the writer, even the Jews must answer for their sins; he proceeds to record the exile of Israel (3.265-81).

Israel is promised that after seventy years, she will be restored to the Land:

And then the heavenly God will send a king  
 and will judge each man in blood and the gleam of fire.  
 There is a certain royal tribe whose race will never stumble.  
 This too, as time pursues its cyclic course,  
 will reign, and it will begin to raise up a new temple of God.  
 All the kings of the Persians will bring to their aid gold and bronze and much-wrought iron. For  
 God himself will give a holy dream by night  
 and then indeed the temple will be as it was before (*Sib. Or.* 3.280-94).

While the above “prophecy” describes the restoration of the second Temple, rather than the eschatological restoration, the author finds in this past event a *typos* for Israel’s future redemption. As Barclay points out:

While this last passage (282-94) clearly has in mind the post-exilic restoration, it is the sort of prophetic oracle which takes on fuller meaning in its eschatological context. The future glory of Israel is assured: her moral and religious superiority distinguish her as the one nation exempt from the disastrous fate awaiting the other kingdoms of the world.<sup>725</sup>

Although Barclay correctly observes the important eschatological implications of the author’s interpretation of the historic restoration for the future one, surprisingly he overlooks the fact that “the future glory of Israel” in the world takes place *under the auspices of a foreign king*. Cyrus is described as the monarch that “God will send” (3.286). Therefore, just as Cyrus was instrumental in Israel’s past restoration,<sup>726</sup> so an Egyptian king will arise to inaugurate the eschatological restoration of Israel. That is, the historic restoration serves as a model for how the author understands the future redemption of Israel.

In conclusion, the author emphasizes that the Jewish God is in fact the God of all nations. Moreover, the Sibyl stresses that the kings of the world, including the monarch of Egypt, will submit to God and Judaism in the eschatological epoch. The evil

---

<sup>725</sup> Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 220. Although as Collins notes, the explicit relationship to the author’s revisionist history of the Persian restoration and eschatological perspective remains “tentative,” the passage may “suggests that the Jewish-state-and its temple will be established through the mediation of a Gentile monarch like Cyrus” (Collins, *Between Athens*, 92).

<sup>726</sup> The Sibyl indicates that Cyrus was motivated to restore the Temple by a divine dream, revising biblical history in revealing his desire that the current or future Gentile ruler would acknowledge God as well. As noted earlier, Josephus writes that Cyrus was motivated to restore the Temple after reading the book of Isaiah (*Ant.* 11.5).

nations will be defeated and all idolatry will be eradicated. But even as the *Jewish God* is envisaged as being worshipped by all the nations, the author underscores that God has appointed an eschatological *Egyptian king* to administer the kingdom of God on earth, and to oversee Israel's restoration. In this view of Israel's restoration, the Temple is portrayed as the cultic center of the world, and the Torah as the universal law code. In the present period of the author, the world is full of war and idolatry, climaxing in the ever-threatening Roman empire. But when the eschatological Ptolemaic king arises, he will defeat the enemy nations and usher in an age of universal peace. The king from the sun will be hailed by both Gentiles and Jews as the "savior figure or Messiah" over the world, even over the land of Israel.<sup>727</sup>

All of these early Jewish sources in the present chapter indicate that Israel continued to include in her hopes of a future restoration the vision of the defeat of her arch-enemy or enemies. In many cases, the Gentiles retain their position as Israel's major adversary. But in other cases, an author may include with Israel's enemies a particular Jewish group. That is, Israel's restoration may involve not only the defeat of the Gentiles, but Jewish adversaries as well. Moreover, in a number of early Jewish documents, heavenly enemies are imagined as well, requiring the services of heaven to defeat such foes.

Indeed, a major issue that arises in early Jewish sources of restoration is the means by which the enemy is to be defeated. In some cases, an author describes Israel's participation in an eschatological war, fighting with God's endorsement. But in other sources, an author looks only to heaven for divine intervention. In these (latter) cases, an author may even forbid the participation of Israel to fight in their liberation,

---

<sup>727</sup> OTP 1.356. Furthermore, Collins writes that "[a] work that hails a Ptolemaic king as a savior figure must be presumed to have at least in part a propagandistic purpose. The work might at least hope to ingratiate the royal house and show that Jews and gentiles would share a common hope" (OTP 1.356).

interpreting the raising of arms as (theologically) at odds with the Jewish people's religious duties and God's divine prerogative. Given this belief, an author may counsel his or her readers to accept a righteousness death (i.e., martyrdom), thereby invoking God to intervene on Israel's behalf in divine wrath and judgment on the enemy.

Perhaps, a mediating tradition in the history of ideas between heavenly intervention and human participation in the defeat of the enemy is the hope for a Davidic messiah. Although clearly a human figure in all early Jewish (non-Christian) sources that can be dated before 70 CE, the Davidic messiah is usually envisaged as a military liberator acting to procure Israel's restoration. Often the messiah is described as acting alone in Israel's restoration. He is often described as acting in the power and wisdom of the Spirit (cf. Isaiah 11).

Finally, we have noted that many Jews seem to have accepted the inevitability of Gentile rule. In such cases, the tradition of restoration may become largely dormant and even forgotten. In other instances, perhaps, Israel's future redemption was remembered as a kind of fantastic or distant hope. But some Jews, such as the writer of the *Sibylline Oracles* (Book 3), may have retained the tradition of restoration as a vital part of his or her religious outlook, but revised it to include a Gentile king as the hero of the future restoration.

Therefore, the exilic model of restoration continued to be a vital tradition in many expressions of Early Judaism. The diverse interpretations given to the motifs of Israel's re-gathering and the defeat of the nations, however, demonstrate that these features of the exilic model of restoration were open to a variety of understandings by Jews in the Greco-Roman period. These interpretations of the exilic model of restoration in EJJ provide an important lens to examine the understanding of Israel's tradition of restoration in formative Christian communities.

## 4 Israel's Restoration in Luke-Acts

In this chapter, we examine the interpretation of the exilic model of Israel's restoration in Luke-Acts. The primary question to be answered in this examination is: (How) has Luke<sup>728</sup> taken-up and revised early Jewish ideas of restoration, especially, the hope for Israel's re-gathering,<sup>729</sup> in the interpretation of Jesus, the Twelve, and the emerging Christian community of the author's period?

### 4.1 Introduction

The examination of the (exilic) tradition of restoration in EJJ provides a new trajectory into the study of Israel's fate in Luke-Acts. While the importance of Israel's restoration has often been noted to be a major concern of the Lukan narrative, only rarely have scholars attempted to examine the author's use of this motif within the wider interpretative matrix of early Jewish tradition(s).

In a story where Israel's future is a common and explicit point of interest, and the features of the exilic model of restoration occur, the question of whether Luke has a 'restoration of Israel theology' can at the outset be tentatively answered in the affirmative.<sup>730</sup> While significant in itself, the recognition of these features constitutes only the first step. Although the basic paradigm of the exilic model of restoration is fairly stock—thus making such a model recognizable—its interpretation, as has been

---

<sup>728</sup> "Luke" is used as a convenient term of reference for the author of Luke-Acts and does not suggest any historical correspondence with an actual author by that name.

<sup>729</sup> The fate of Israel's enemies is treated in less detail than the motif of Israel's re-gathering due to the limitations of treating Luke-Acts in a single chapter.

<sup>730</sup> Therefore, any study which attempts to examine Luke's understanding of Israel's restoration without taking into account the nomenclature of restoration to which the features of re-gathering and the fate of the nations belong runs the risk of error.

demonstrated in the previous chapters, is a more complex issue to resolve. As it has been observed in the preceding chapters, the features of restoration we have examined in detail (i.e., Israel's re-gathering and the defeat of her enemies) are subjected to a variety of interpretations in Early Judaism. Therefore, the more pressing question is not whether Luke has a theology of restoration or not, but how he interprets it. By drawing on insights from the previous discussion of restoration in Early Judaism, this chapter explores Luke's: (1) idea of exile, the predicament from which restoration is needed, (2) understanding of the Twelve, and (3) view of the nations, especially Rome. While a comprehensive study of each of these features is not possible in a single chapter, a preliminary characterization of their role in Luke's understanding of restoration is offered and trajectories for further research are suggested.

## 4.2 Between Two Lands: Israel and the Rome

The writing of Luke-Acts embodies the complex fusion of cultural indebtedness that was exhibited among many subjected and minority communities in the Roman empire.<sup>731</sup> The narrative's *Jewish*<sup>732</sup> elements are firmly embedded in the larger matrix of its *Hellenistic* world.<sup>733</sup> Regardless of the author's ethnicity and religious background,

---

<sup>731</sup> The difficulty in assigning strict cultural and geographical identities to such authors as Luke is demonstrated in the six volume series edited by Bruce Winter (*The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting*. 6 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993-96). Three of the volumes investigate Acts according to specific geographical/contextual orientations, e.g., Greco-Roman, Palestinian, and Diaspora settings.

<sup>732</sup> This is not to suggest that Luke was a Jew. Luke was probably a Gentile, but even so, as the narrative of Luke-Acts evidences, the author is keenly interested in grounding the history of Jesus and the formative Christian community in the history and religion of, respectively, Israel and Judaism. Not only is he interested, but Luke appears to be quite knowledgeable of the (biblical) history of Israel.

<sup>733</sup> No longer, however, is it acceptable in scholarship to distinguish so cleanly between that which is Jewish and that which is Greek, even within the confines of first century Palestine. As Martin Hengel's seminal study underscores: "Hellenism, then, must be treated as a complex phenomenon which cannot be limited to purely political, socio-economic, cultural or religious aspects, but embraces them all" (*Judaism and Hellenism*, 3). Likewise, Tessa Rajak observes, Judaism and Hellenism were not "two incompatible, fixed systems, standing center stage in opposition to one another" ("The Location of



the story of Luke-Acts takes place between or within the “two worlds” of Israel and Rome. The writer pens the story of Jesus, a Jewish messiah, in the Greek language,<sup>734</sup> the *lingua franca* of the Roman (western)<sup>735</sup> world. The author situates the characters and events of his story of Israel in relation to the reigns of various Roman emperors.<sup>736</sup> Furthermore, he is able to name local rulers appointed over Palestine and governing officials elsewhere in the empire.<sup>737</sup> Lastly, Luke demonstrates an interest in other territories of the Roman empire, especially in the book of Acts. Indeed, while the narrative begins in the land of Israel it ends in Rome,<sup>738</sup> the capital of the occupied world.

But it is from the vantage point of Israel—her religious heritage, future hopes, and the activities of Jesus and the Twelve within the Land—that Luke takes his interest in the occupied world. The key events of the narrative are most often interpreted within a particular understanding of *Jewish* history. As Wainwright observes, “Even if he [Luke] was not a Jew, it is obvious that he was powerfully influenced by Judaism.”<sup>739</sup> It

---

Cultures in Second Temple Palestine: The Evidence of Josephus,” in Richard Bauckham [ed.], *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting, Volume 4* [Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1995], 4). However, Rajak observes that nonetheless “the question of who is a Jew and who a Gentile” is a matter of great significance in the Lukan narrative (2). She observes the numerous stereotypes of ethnic groups (such as Jews and Greeks) in the literature of the Greco-Roman period.

<sup>734</sup> A number of studies have examined the narrative of Luke-Acts in relation to (non-Jewish) Hellenistic literature. For instance, see Loveday Alexander, *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Content in Luke 1.1-4 and Acts 1.1* (SNTSMS 78; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993; David P. Moessner (ed.), *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke Narrative Claim upon Israel's Legacy* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press, 1999). The latter volume is especially significant and contains a number of studies that elaborate on correspondences between Luke-Acts and Greco-Roman history and literature. More recently, see Marianne Palmer Bonz, *The Past as Legacy: Luke-Acts and Ancient Epic* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000).

<sup>735</sup> In the eastern portion of the empire, including Palestine, Aramaic continued to function as the *lingua franca* for many populations.

<sup>736</sup> Luke 2:1; 3:1; Acts 25:10.

<sup>737</sup> E.g., Luke 1:5; 3:1-2; Acts 23:26; Acts 24-27.

<sup>738</sup> Acts 28:16-30.

<sup>739</sup> See Arthur W. Wainwright, “Luke and the Restoration of the Kingdom to Israel,” *ET* 89 (1977-1978), 78 (76-79). Similarly, Tiede asks: “Is this a Gentile author and community now reaching back to lay claim to Israel's heritage, or a Jewish-Christian movement staking out the ground of ‘true

may also be said that if Luke was not from Israel he is very much aware that Israel's promises are inextricably bound in some sense to the Land and to the Jewish people.<sup>740</sup> Most importantly, Luke's description of Israel's restoration depends upon the pattern of exile and return, the dominant meta-narrative of Jewish history.

Luke's history concerns Jesus, Israel's eschatological messiah of restoration. According to Luke, Jesus is a Jew whose life, death, resurrection, and post-resurrection meeting(s) take place within the land of Israel. Jesus is presented as Israel's messiah, whose coming has been anticipated since the time of David, the most famous king of Israelite history. The author makes extensive use of the Jewish Scripture<sup>741</sup> in elucidating the importance of events that take place within and without the Land. Indeed, Nils A. Dahl observes that Luke's literary style and technique reveals a "conscious intention...to write history in biblical style or, rather, to write the continuation of the biblical history."<sup>742</sup> Luke not only cites and interprets the sacred text, but employs it in complex and sophisticated ways. Various stories within the OT are used as subtexts or intertextual skeletons to underlie portions of Luke-Acts.<sup>743</sup>

---

Israel,' or a mixed community of Jewish and Gentile-Christians responding to a persistently powerful minority of strictly observant Jewish Christians" (David Tiede, "'Glory to thy People Israel': Luke-Acts and the Jews," in Joseph B. Tyson (ed.), *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives* [Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988] 32-33)?

<sup>740</sup> For instance, see the various essays in Moessner (ed.), *Luke and the Heritage of Israel*.

<sup>741</sup> A number of studies have examined Luke's use of Scripture. See esp. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993).

<sup>742</sup> N. A. Dahl, "The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts," in L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn, (eds.), *Studies in Luke-Acts* (London: SPCK, 1968), 152-53 (139-58). Dahl notes that Luke accomplishes this not only in imitating the style of biblical narrative, but in the recollection of ancient figures from Israel's past such as Abraham, Moses, and David (139). It is not clear whether Dahl means to say that Luke intends his writing to be accepted as Scripture, as William Kurz argues (*Reading Luke-Acts: The Dynamics of Biblical Narrative* [Louisville, Ky: John Knox, 1993], 6, 10-11). As Emerson Powery rightfully observes Luke's imitation of biblical narrative does not mean the author intends for its "content" (his emphasis) to be understood as Scripture (*Jesus Reads Scripture: The Function of Jesus' Use of Scripture in the Synoptic Gospels* [Leiden: Brill, 2003], 195-96, fn 17).

<sup>743</sup> Emerson Powery observes, "[t]he speeches in the first two chapters resonate with scripture, signaling to the reader the continuation of the actions of God with the coming of John the Baptist and Jesus" (*Jesus Reads Scripture*, 195-96). For instance, John the Baptist is portrayed according to the figure

Moreover, Israel's ancestry informs Luke's genealogy<sup>744</sup> of Jesus (Luke 3:23-38), identifying him with famous Jewish patriarchs. These heroes of Jewish history are remembered throughout Luke-Acts. Thus, Israel's past is not only reinterpreted in Luke's narrative in light of current events, but history functions to interpret the present period of Jesus and the Christian community as well. While the narrative concludes in "another land," Luke understands the events that occur in Rome in light of Israel's history and hopes (e.g., Acts 28:20).

In recounting Israel's history within the Greco-Roman context, however, Luke's story of Israel demonstrates the period of his narrative, and the one in which he lives, to be of pivotal or eschatological importance.<sup>745</sup> For instance, the writer utilizes

---

of Elijah (Luke 1:13-17). And Mary's speech (1:46-55) draws on Hannah's prayer (1 Sam 2:1-10). Wright argues that the story of Jesus and John is a loose retelling of the story of Samuel (= John the Baptist) and David (= Jesus) (*New Testament*, 378-84). David P. Moessner argues that major portions of Deuteronomy serve as the narrative substructure to Luke's presentation of Jesus (as a prophet-like Moses) in the travelogue of Luke 9:51-19:44 (*Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989]). More recently, David W. Pao contends for the pervasive influence of the book of Isaiah on Luke's narrative, especially Acts. Pao tries to show how various characters in the narrative act to fulfill the "Isaianic program" or "Isaianic New Exodus" (*Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000], esp. 17-19). Rather than any single one of these OT stories being the crucial hermeneutical key to all of Luke-Acts, it is more likely that Luke has drawn on a large number of scriptural episodes to connect his story of Jesus and the Christian community to the story of Israel.

<sup>744</sup> The presentation of Jesus' relationship to his father Joseph is carefully phrased in Luke 3:23. Luke's interest in portraying Jesus to be of supernatural origins, i.e. a son of God, stands in tension with his concomitant interest to depict Jesus as an Israelite with the correct lineage.

<sup>745</sup> As noted in the discussion of Early Judaism, eschatology has been variously defined in the history of scholarship. While given more specificity in this chapter, "eschatology" is used here to mean a turning point or climax of history, not its end. Conzelmann, of course, fueled a generation of scholarship (or two!) on the issue of Luke's eschatology (*Der Mitte de Zeit*, (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1953); all references are to the English translation *The Theology of Luke* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982). As the German title more accurately reflects, Conzelmann argues that Luke's response to the problem of eschatology (the delay of the *parousia*) was to conceive of history as dividing into three epochs: the period of Israel, the period of Jesus, and the period of the Church, the last relating to Luke's era. (Conzelmann's book therefore was named after the period of Jesus, which received the author's primary consideration. This factor alone greatly affected Conzelmann's understanding of Luke's theology since little regard is paid to Acts. Cf., however, Conzelmann, *Acts*.) While it is beyond the scope of the present thesis to recite and critique the post-Conzelmann assessment of Luke's eschatological perspective, the intrinsic relationship of eschatology to Israel's restoration requires some discussion. Conzelmann is correct in that some of Luke's (re)writing (e.g., the destruction of Jerusalem [Mark 13:14-27; cf. Luke 21:20-28] and the fact of Acts itself) bears the mark of someone attempting to lessen eschatological expectation. But many of the changes and additions that Luke makes are better understood as an effort to revise Israel's hopes in light of new interpretations and experiences of the Christian community. In agreement with the general thesis of John T. Carroll (*Response to the End of History: Eschatology and*

“fulfillment language”<sup>746</sup> in indicating the urgency of the present time. It is a period in which heavenly figures, including God, interrupt time and space to make critical proclamations,<sup>747</sup> especially about Jesus and the climax of Israel’s history.<sup>748</sup> Within the narrative, Jesus and his followers announce the imminent arrival of the kingdom of God.<sup>749</sup> For Luke, the kingdom of God has immense implications for Israel’s restoration (e.g., Luke 12:32; 16:16; Acts 1:1-6).<sup>750</sup> As Carroll observes, “[t]he Lukan presentation of the kingdom is inextricably bound to the motif of Israel.”<sup>751</sup> Even after Jesus departs,<sup>752</sup> Luke continues to understand the priority of the “present” period for

---

*Situation in Luke-Acts* [SBLDS 92; Atlanta: Scholars, 1988), one of Luke’s main aims is simply to bring eschatology up-to-date rather than lessen it per se. Luke’s understanding of the end-time must be balanced alongside other issues in the narrative (e.g., the Church’s relationship to Rome; property and the poor; the division of Jews in response to the Gospel.) Lastly, Luke’s eschatology must be judged in part on its own terms and emphases. As Anders E. Nielsen observes, Luke’s eschatology cannot be properly assessed by the criterion of imminence alone. Luke is interested in the exhortative and ethical implications of eschatology as well its immanent and transcendent dimensions (*Until it is Fulfilled: Lukan Eschatology according to Luke 22 and Acts 20* [Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck 2000]). The present study argues that Israel’s restoration lies at the center of Luke’s eschatology. Therefore, Nielson’s study is ultimately flawed in his rejection of Israel’s restoration as something which Luke supports. Nielson rejects a positive understanding of Israel in Luke-Acts largely on the basis of his assumption that Israel’s restoration is to be understood solely in terms of Jewish nationalism or ethnocentrism. Nielson maintains that Luke’s theology is “inclusive” and “universal” as opposed to the exclusive and nationalistic features inherent to Israel’s restoration (e.g., *Until it is Fulfilled*, 100-01). Nielson’s apparent unfamiliarity with the variety of early Jewish traditions of restoration hinder his assessment of this theme in Luke-Acts.

<sup>746</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer (*Gospel According to Luke I-IX* [AB 28; New York: Doubleday, 1970], 292-93) points to the occurrence of πληρόω (e.g., Luke 1:20; 4:21; 9:31(?); 9:51(?); 21:24; 22:16; 24:44; Acts 1:16; 3:18; 13:27, 33) and πληρωμι (e.g., Luke 21:22; Acts 13:33). As William Kurz observes, the events that are fulfilled are those of Scripture, but also of prophecies given by characters in Luke’s narrative itself (“Promise and Fulfillment in Hellenistic Jewish Narratives and in Luke and Acts,” in David P. Moessner [ed], *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke’s Narrative Claim upon Israel’s Legacy* [Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity, 1999], 148). Furthermore, Kurz observes some events are fulfilled outside the narrative of Luke-Acts, (e.g., the destruction of Jerusalem, Luke 13:34-35; 19:41-44). Presumably, the fulfillment of such prophecies would provide the hope for those still not realized, i.e., the *parousia* and the arrival of the kingdom of God.

<sup>747</sup> Luke 3:21-22; 9:35.

<sup>748</sup> E.g., Luke 1:11-20, 26-38; 2:8-14; Acts 1:10-11.

<sup>749</sup> E.g., Luke 4:43; 9:1-2; 10:9; 17:21; Acts 28:31.

<sup>750</sup> As discussed later in the chapter, while the kingdom of God is not the same as Israel’s restoration, it cannot be separated from it either. The kingdom of God begins with God’s reign over Israel in Luke-Acts, and is mediated through her over the nations.

<sup>751</sup> *Response to the End of History*, 84.

<sup>752</sup> Indeed, as a direct result of Jesus’ ascension, the Twelve and others receive the Spirit which is characterized as the climatic event of the last days. We return to Luke’s understanding of the Pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit later in this chapter.

*eschatological history*. That is, Luke describes an epoch in which to divide history apart from eschatology would be, as I. Howard Marshall observes, “a false dichotomy.”<sup>753</sup> Of noted importance in the narrative is the pouring out of the Spirit, an event interpreted to be an indication of “the last days” (Acts 2:17). While the final period is significant for the entire occupied world—as Jesus’ commission to the Apostles indicates (Acts 1:8), and Luke’s description of the mission in other lands (esp. Acts 8:4-24), and the ending in Rome underscores—Luke understands that which has happened in the Land to be catalytic to all events which take place outside of it. As Luke’s description of events leads away from the land of Israel, events in far away places continue to be understood in relation to the hope of the “twelve tribes” (Acts 26:7; cf. 28:20).<sup>754</sup>

The priority of Israel is a presupposition of the author and thus serves as the beginning point of his narrative and grounds all his theological claims. But the fundamental question(s) remain: how is Israel’s restoration *interpreted*? Luke’s obstacles in telling Israel’s story are plenty. The narrative is written in the “recent” aftermath of Israel’s destruction.<sup>755</sup> In this context, a message of Israel’s restoration might be welcomed by some Jews, but with skepticism and fear by others. Moreover, Rome is the sovereign power of the world; earlier Jewish ideas and actions of restoration had been crushed. How would Luke’s message be received by Roman ears? Does Luke’s narrative constitute a challenge to Rome or does it represent a (harmless) accommodation? Even if Luke is proposing an apolitical or spiritualized version of restoration, (how) would this be received and understood by his readers, both Jewish

---

<sup>753</sup> Marshall (*Luke: Historian and Theologian* [Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 1970], 107; also see 107-11) makes this observation in his critique of Hans Conzelmann.

<sup>754</sup> Israel’s restoration is not the sum of all Luke’s eschatology, but neither can one speak of Luke’s eschatological scheme without paying heed to the motif of Israel’s role in it (Luke 16:16; Acts 2:17).

<sup>755</sup> Fitzmyer dates the composition of Luke-Acts to 80-85 CE (Fitzmyer, *Gospel According to Luke*, 57 [see also 53-57]).

and Gentile?<sup>756</sup> Lastly, the message of Jesus' messianic identity and restoration has not been recognized by a large portion of the Jewish constituency in the period in which the author writes. Is this a factor for Luke's concern in addressing the topic of restoration? Would Luke's explanation of Israel's restoration be credible for Jewish readers? Is so, what does this say about the religious or social orientation of such Jews? In examining Luke's narrative through the interpretive lens of early Jewish traditions, the resolution to (some of) these questions is offered and/or trajectory for further investigation is suggested.

### 4.3 Hopes for Restoration (Luke 1-2)

From the beginning of Luke's narrative, there is ample evidence to suggest that Israel's restoration will be a central motif of his concern.<sup>757</sup> Luke, however, carefully words Israel's hopes in these introductory chapters in terms that allow him to shape and revise the understanding of restoration over the course of his two-part narrative. John is associated with the returning Elijah and predicted to "(re)turn many of the sons of Israel to the Lord their God" (Luke 1:16). John's role is understood in terms of the preparation

---

<sup>756</sup> Also one might ask what this implies about the identity of Luke's readers.

<sup>757</sup> As Paul S. Minear observes, "it is only by ignoring the birth narratives" that Hans Conzelmann can argue that Israel's importance belongs to a previous epoch which has since been superseded by the age(s) of Jesus and the Church ("Luke's Use of the Birth Stories," in Keck and Martyn [eds.], *Studies in Luke-Acts*, 121 [111-30].) Cf. Conzelmann, *Theology*, e.g., 16-17. Also see W. Barnes Tatum's study ("The Epoch of Israel: Luke I-II and the Theological Plan of Luke-Acts," *NTS* 12 [1966-67], 184-95), who attempts to integrate Luke 1-2 into Conzelmann's thesis. Thus for Tatum, these early chapters of Luke do not indicate the inherent importance of Israel for Luke-Acts, but merely reflect "the period of preparation" (his italics) (193) for Luke's real interest, the epoch of Jesus and the Church (193). From the onset of Luke's narrative, (Luke 1-2), Jesus' life and bond with Jerusalem and the Jewish people is emphasized. Prophetic events are focused on Israel and the Jewish people. Seven of the twelve references to Israel in the Gospel are found here (1:16, 54, 68, 80; 2:25, 32, 34; the other five occur in 4:25, 27; 7:9; 22:30; 24:2). Although the nations are mentioned in this section as well (e.g., 2:29-32), unlike references to Israel, they never appear in isolation, but are connected to Israel's narrative. In Luke 2:41-52, the boy-Jesus remains in the Temple after his family's departure. After finding him, Mary voices her and Joseph's ("your father's") concern. But Jesus refers to his sonship to God ("Father"), and identifies Jerusalem as [his?] natural dwelling place (2:48-50).

necessary for the coming of a Davidic king (1:69, 76-77). The angel Gabriel reveals to Mary that she will miraculously give birth to an heir of David, who will take his throne, and “rule over the house of Jacob,” while expanding the boundaries of the Davidic kingdom (1:33). While little commentary is offered on the nature of Jesus’ enthronement in Luke 1-2, the messiah’s ascension to the throne (e.g., Acts 2:32-36), as Luke will indicate later, will not be according to most Israelites’ expectation or in a manner that immediately upsets the earthly regime of Rome.

Moreover, in her prayer of thanksgiving (Luke 1:46-55), Mary describes Jesus as the fulfillment of the promises to Israel and the patriarchs, including Abraham himself (1:54-55).<sup>758</sup> The promise to Abraham, however, is carefully described in terms of *descendants*, and nothing is said regarding the eternal inheritance of the Land (cf. Acts 3:25-26),<sup>759</sup> the central feature of the biblical version of the Abrahamic covenant (e.g., Gen 17:8).

At the birth of John, Zechariah describes Jesus as one who would bring “salvation from our enemies” and deliverance “from the hand of all who hate us” (1:71, 73). While “salvation” and “redemption” could suggest Israel’s independence and political sovereignty over her foes, Luke methodically de-militarizes the language of deliverance over the course of his narrative in the work of Jesus and the Twelve. That is, in these opening chapters, the adversaries of Israel remain unspecified in Luke 1-2 as well as Israel’s exact means of deliverance from them. While later Luke does identify

---

<sup>758</sup> In similar fashion, the covenant with Abraham is characterized in generalized terms as deliverance from “our enemies” (1:73), avoiding reference to the Land. In Acts 7:5, Stephen argues that while Abraham was promised the Land, and even Abraham traveled throughout its borders, God οὐκ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ κληρονομίαν ἐν αὐτῇ οὐδὲ βῆμα ποδός. Also see Acts 3:25.

<sup>759</sup> For other references to Abraham in Luke-Acts, see the discussion of Luke’s portrayal of Abraham in Nils A. Dahl, “The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts,” in Keck and Martyn, *Studies in Luke-Acts*, 139-58. Dahl rightly observes that “Luke does not claim that the church has replaced Israel as the people of God, nor does he call Gentile believers Abraham’s children” (151). But later he blurs this important observation in his remark that “the Gentile church is now the legitimate continuation” of Israel’s ancestry (153).

Rome among Israel's enemies (Luke 19:43), he enlarges the circle to include demonic powers (Luke 10:19; Acts 13:10) and portions of the Jewish population itself (Luke 19:27).<sup>760</sup> Throughout the first two chapters, Jesus is presented as the Davidic redeemer of Israel (1:32, 69; 2:11). The Davidic messiah is often portrayed in EJL as a *military* liberator; Luke embraces this basic idea as well in his presentation of Jesus in Luke 1-2. But as the narrative proceeds, the author will redirect and redefine Jesus' liberation of Israel in terms other than a violent, military attack.<sup>761</sup>

Finally, just before Luke presents John and Jesus' public appearance to Israel, two other characters underline the motif of Israel's restoration. Both Simeon and Anna are shown to be characters of high religious piety with strong attachment to the cult. Upon seeing Jesus, the priestly Simeon anticipates "the consolation of Israel" (2:25).<sup>762</sup> Lastly, the prophetess Anna sees in Jesus the redemption of Jerusalem (2:38). Neither character elaborates on the meaning of these proclamations. The statements are left open for Luke to elucidate over the course of his story. Therefore, while Luke speaks very definitely of Israel's restoration in the opening chapters of his narrative, expresses it through Jewish characters, and directs it toward Israel, his carefully worded description of Israel's redemption admits more than one interpretation.<sup>763</sup>

---

<sup>760</sup> Moreover, the Lukan Jesus advises his followers of a different tactic toward enemies. Rather than rise up against the opposition, he counsels his followers to love their adversaries (Luke 6:22-33).

<sup>761</sup> Mark L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* (JSNTSS 110; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995). Strauss argues that "Luke places the fulfillment of the promise to David at the heart of promise-fulfillment scheme" (97). However, the Davidic Messiah (of EJL and Luke-Acts) cannot be isolated apart from his expected work: the restoration of Israel. Luke must still demonstrate how Jesus accomplished this task.

<sup>762</sup> While the various expressions of restoration in Luke 1-2 are overwhelmingly positive, the first hint of trouble occurs in Simeon's remarks; in his prophecy to Mary, he forecasts that Jesus is "appointed for the falling and rising of many in Israel, and for a sign to be opposed" (Luke 2:34).

<sup>763</sup> Perhaps, given the lack of consensus on the interpretation of Israel's restoration, it could be surmised that Luke was not very successful in achieving his literary goals, at least for modern readers (!).



Rome among Israel's enemies (Luke 19:43), he enlarges the circle to include demonic powers (Luke 10:19; Acts 13:10) and portions of the Jewish population itself (Luke 19:27).<sup>760</sup> Throughout the first two chapters, Jesus is presented as the Davidic redeemer of Israel (1:32, 69; 2:11). The Davidic messiah is often portrayed in EJL as a *military* liberator; Luke embraces this basic idea as well in his presentation of Jesus in Luke 1-2. But as the narrative proceeds, the author will redirect and redefine Jesus' liberation of Israel in terms other than a violent, military attack.<sup>761</sup>

Finally, just before Luke presents John and Jesus' public appearance to Israel, two other characters underline the motif of Israel's restoration. Both Simeon and Anna are shown to be characters of high religious piety with strong attachment to the cult. Upon seeing Jesus, the priestly Simeon anticipates "the consolation of Israel" (2:25).<sup>762</sup> Lastly, the prophetess Anna sees in Jesus the redemption of Jerusalem (2:38). Neither character elaborates on the meaning of these proclamations. The statements are left open for Luke to elucidate over the course of his story. Therefore, while Luke speaks very definitely of Israel's restoration in the opening chapters of his narrative, expresses it through Jewish characters, and directs it toward Israel, his carefully worded description of Israel's redemption admits more than one interpretation.<sup>763</sup>

---

<sup>760</sup> Moreover, the Lukan Jesus advises his followers of a different tactic toward enemies. Rather than rise up against the opposition, he counsels his followers to love their adversaries (Luke 6:22-33).

<sup>761</sup> Mark L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* (JSNTSS 110; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995). Strauss argues that "Luke places the fulfillment of the promise to David at the heart of promise-fulfillment scheme" (97). However, the Davidic Messiah (of EJL and Luke-Acts) cannot be isolated apart from his expected work: the restoration of Israel. Luke must still demonstrate how Jesus accomplished this task.

<sup>762</sup> While the various expressions of restoration in Luke 1-2 are overwhelmingly positive, the first hint of trouble occurs in Simeon's remarks; in his prophecy to Mary, he forecasts that Jesus is "appointed for the falling and rising of many in Israel, and for a sign to be opposed" (Luke 2:34).

<sup>763</sup> Perhaps, given the lack of consensus on the interpretation of Israel's restoration, it could be surmised that Luke was not very successful in achieving his literary goals, at least for modern readers (!).

A common error of scholars is to *read into* the language of these early chapters (and elsewhere in Luke-Acts, e.g., Acts 1:6) a nationalistic<sup>764</sup> agenda that has failed or been deferred to the future (because of Jewish rejection).<sup>765</sup> Other interpreters, who understand these expectation(s) of restoration as referring to Israel's acceptance of Jesus as messiah (i.e., restoration = repentance), argue that the Jewish mission has largely failed over the course of the narrative. Consequently, it is erroneously contended by some interpreters that either Israel's restoration (i.e., repentance) is to be realized in the future or that the Gentiles have taken over Israel's legacy. While it is true that the various expressions of Israel's restoration in these early chapters might be read as entailing Israel's national restoration and/or an inevitable success in recruiting wide-scale Jewish acceptance of Jesus, the story of Israel's restoration *begins, not ends*, in Luke 1-2. That is, the author introduces the generalized conception of Israel's

---

<sup>764</sup> For instance, some scholars understand the motif of restoration to be nationalistic or political by definition, unaware of the complexity of other interpretations or nuances in Israel's hopes. Therefore, since Luke raises the idea of restoration in Luke 1-2 (and does not obviously reject it or "spiritualize" it in these opening chapters), some interpreters argue that there will be a restoration in the Land in the future. See Wainwright, "Luke and the Restoration," 76-79; Franz Mussner, *Tractate on the Jews: The Significance of Judaism for Christian Faith* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 38; J. Bradley Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple and the New Age in Luke-Acts* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1988); Larry Helyer, "Luke and the Restoration of Israel," *JETS* 36 (1993), 317-29.

<sup>765</sup> For instance, David P. Moessner argues that not all the characters in Luke 1-2 represent the author's point of view, but are used to articulate ideas of restoration which Luke wishes to correct. Since Moessner understands restoration only in narrow terms (i.e., a wide scale positive Jewish response, nationalism or political independence), he concludes that some people (e.g., Zechariah, Mary [!]) that predict Israel's redemption in these opening chapters are unreliable characters and not dependable voices for evaluating the point of view of the author. Moessner argues that other characters in Luke 1-2 (Simeon and Anna) speak for Luke ("The Ironic Fulfillment of Israel's Glory," in Tyson (ed.), *Luke-Acts: Eight Critical Perspectives* [Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988], 39 [35-50]). Cf. Robert C. Tannehill ("Israel in Luke-Acts: A Tragic Story," *JBL* 104 [1985], 73 [69-85]), who correctly observes that all of the people in Luke 1-2 are presented by Luke as "models of faith" whose very words are replete with "reminders of scripture." However, Tannehill himself errs in concluding that Luke's story is one of failure and tragedy for the Jewish people. Thus, both Moessner and Tannehill, in imposing one particular model of restoration on Luke-Acts, with the major criterion being the wide scale Jewish acceptance or rejection of Jesus (and/or the Apostles and Paul) do not recognize that Luke may be drawing from other models of restoration in EJL in his revision of Israel's liberation. Furthermore, expectations of Israel's restoration, as noted from many early Jewish texts, are not mutually exclusive from descriptions of divisions within the Jewish community. Indeed, they often serve as a negative catalyst for the expression of hopes for restoration (e.g., *Damascus Document*; *4QMMT*; *Psalms of Solomon*). Thus, among the characters who foresee Israel's restoration in Luke 1-2, there are other characters who envisage trouble and division as well. In Simeon's prophecy to Mary he forecasts that Jesus is "appointed for the falling and rising of many in Israel, and for a sign to be opposed" (Luke 2:34).

restoration in the beginning of his narrative so that he can elucidate its meaning over the course of Luke-Acts.

#### 4.4 Israel's Exilic Predicament in Luke-Acts

N. T. Wright observes that “[l]ike so many Jews (and presumably well-taught proselytes) of the period, Luke believed that prior to Jesus, Israel’s story had yet to reach its climax. The exile was not over; redemption had yet to appear.”<sup>766</sup> Wright, as we have noted, understands “exile” to be the defining matrix in which all Jews find themselves in the first century.<sup>767</sup> But he does little to differentiate the various ways this may have been understood by Jews in the Greco-Roman period. Likewise, Wright does not seem to realize that Jews may have thought about their restoration differently as well. Wright appears to assume one particular model existed, i.e., a political or national restoration, which would be *obvious* to all Jews.

---

<sup>766</sup> Wright, *New Testament*, 381. For his discussion of Luke-Acts, see esp. 373-84.

<sup>767</sup> As Dunn observes, Wright’s frequent use of exile to describe the predicament of Jesus (and NT authors) is disproportionate to the “lack of direct reference” to captivity in the writings themselves (James D. G. Dunn, review of N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, *JTS* 49 [1998], 732 [727-34]. Consequently, Dunn rejects Wright’s argument for the prevailing view of exile for NT writers. While Dunn’s critique is specifically directed toward Wright’s use of exile to characterize the “Jesus tradition” lack, his critique is equally valid for Wright’s treatment of exile in Luke-Acts. For Wright assumes the exilic paradigm for Luke-Acts, but never bases its presence on exegesis. Dunn is correct in reprimanding Wright’s liberal and often unqualified use of the exilic framework and calling for more rigorous methodological controls. However, Dunn seems to assign Wright a more narrow usage of exilic theology than Wright means. While it is unfortunate that Wright himself too often uses the term “exile” to describe how most Jews would have described their predicament in the 1<sup>st</sup> century, in many instances it is clear he employs it simply to mean Israel’s unrealized promises or hopes. Indeed, Dunn himself goes too far in the other direction in dismissing the importance of exilic theology for a good number of early Jewish and NT writers. Dunn invokes a narrow lexical criterion—the presence or absence of the term exile or rigid literary patterns (e.g., the S-E-R pattern of the T12P), and incorrectly dismisses the ideological import of exilic theology for communities within the Land. Dunn fails to appreciate the complex and diverse use of the motif in the literature of Early Judaism and, as demonstrated in this study, early Christian literature, such as Luke-Acts.

Most Jews of this period, it seems, would have answered the question 'where are we?' in language which, reduced to its simplest form, meant: we are in exile. They believed that, in all senses which mattered, Israel's exile was still in progress. Although she had come back from Babylon, the glorious message of the prophets remained unfulfilled. Israel still remained in thrall to foreigners; worse, Israel's god had not returned to Zion.<sup>768</sup>

Wright's treatment of Luke's understanding of Israel's future restoration is done largely through the interpretative lens of Josephus.<sup>769</sup> Wright never examines the specific exilic and restoration vocabulary and/or ideas of Luke in his interpretation of Israel's future hopes. Instead, Wright places almost the full weight of Luke's plan of restoration on the messiah Jesus and the ending of Luke's narrative in Rome. Wright never explores Luke's indebtedness to other features of the exilic model of restoration, such as the motif of Israel's re-gathering (and the twelve Apostles) or the fate of Israel's enemies (and Luke's interest in the Gentiles).<sup>770</sup>

Moreover, Wright fails to explain how Luke's understanding of restoration adequately meets the expectations of Jews that Wright himself has painstakingly described. That is, Wright makes the sweeping generalization (above) that no Jew in the Second Temple period could have accepted the idea that Israel had really been restored in view of the present reality vis-à-vis OT prophets' predictions of the future of an exalted freedom from foreign rule, the return of the Diaspora, a glorious new Temple, and the theophanic reign of God. If the present world of Judaism did not meet with prophetic expectation, how would various claims in the NT (either by Jesus or the early community) that Israel's restoration is underway—for which Wright argues—be any more acceptable? Conversely, if the Christian community could declare that Israel's restoration was underway in the person and work of Jesus and his activities—in the face

---

<sup>768</sup> Wright, *New Testament*, 268-69.

<sup>769</sup> Wright, *New Testament*, 373-84.

<sup>770</sup> Surprisingly, Wright never examines the role of the Twelve in Luke's narrative.

of the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple—with no obvious relief from Rome’s continual domination over the Land in sight—could not other Jews have accepted the earlier state of affairs (i.e., the second Temple) as satisfactory, even as indications of Israel’s restoration? Wright does not afford non-Christian Jews this privilege. Moreover, if the present study is correct, Luke must make an even greater leap than Jews in the Second Temple period, who could at least have pointed to their presence in the Land and to the standing of Jerusalem and the Temple as evidence of restoration. That is, *the author of Luke-Acts pens his story of Israel’s reconstitution in a time when the Land lies in ruins.*<sup>771</sup>

#### 4.4.1 Luke’s Exilic Vocabulary of Restoration

Luke’s understanding of Israel’s re-gathering in the formation of the *twelve* Apostles<sup>772</sup> presupposes a situation of exile afflicting Israel, as discussed below. But at a number of other locations in Luke-Acts, the author discloses an explicit and variegated vocabulary of exilic theology that guides his understanding of Jesus, the Twelve, and the wider program of Israel’s restoration. A brief survey of the evidence for Luke’s indebtedness to the matrix of exilic thought provides the basis for the more detailed discussion of his idea of restoration that follows.

In Jesus’ initial speech to Israel at Nazareth (Luke 4:14-30), he introduces himself *inter alia* as the messiah who has come to “release” the “captives”

---

<sup>771</sup> Other features of Luke’s understanding of Israel’s restoration—such as his promotion of a messiah who sits on a heavenly throne and not on one in Jerusalem—, which Wright himself endorses, stand as a sharp counter to what might be acceptable as a feature of restoration to Jews of the first century CE. The analogy which Wright draws between Luke-Acts and the writings of Josephus carries important implications which are explored in the examination of Israel’s restoration in Acts.

<sup>772</sup> For the Apostles’ association with the twelve tribes of Israel, see Luke 22:28-30, and the discussion below.

(αἰχμάλωτος)<sup>773</sup> from their exile (4:18). In Luke 13:24-28, Jesus refers to some Jews being excluded from Israel, while others will return from “the east and west, from the north and south,” i.e., from exile, to take their place in the kingdom (13:29). In Luke 21:20-24, the Lukan Jesus foresees the Roman invasion and destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE. His description echoes the language used to describe the aftermath of the Babylonian exile. In describing the “coming” catastrophe, only Luke among the Synoptics describes the event in terms of Sin-Exile (-Return).<sup>774</sup> Jesus warns the people of Israel that αἰχμαλωτισθήσονται<sup>775</sup> εἰς τὰ ἔθνη πάντα (“they will be taken captive into all the nations”). Furthermore, even among the twelve Apostles, Luke describes an exile *en miniature* when Judas strays from the number before Israel’s re-gathering is finalized (Luke 22:3-5, 47-48; Acts 1:18).<sup>776</sup> Finally, Stephen explicitly refers to the Babylonian exile (Acts 7:42-43), ‘the mother of all exiles,’ in his defense against charges he has slandered the current Temple and Law. His explanation of the 6<sup>th</sup> century catastrophe as due to Israel’s idolatrous history, spanning the giving of the Law at Sinai to the construction of—and perhaps, implicating—the Temple, is highly relevant for Luke’s understanding of restoration.<sup>777</sup> After Stephen’s murder, the author notes that all the Jews of Jerusalem who had accepted Jesus as messiah were “scattered”

---

<sup>773</sup> The reference to αἰχμάλωτος is found in Jesus’ quotation of Isa 61:1 (LXX), a passage which Jesus cites to identify himself and his mission (Luke 4:16-19). The proclamation of Jesus at Nazareth is discussed in more detail later in this chapter. αἰχμάλωτος is found only here in the NT. Cf. Barn 14:9, which also quotes Isa 61:1.

<sup>774</sup> Cf. Mark 13:14-20; Matt 24:15-22.

<sup>775</sup> This verb occurs only here in the Gospels. Cf. Rom 7:23; 2 Cor 10:5; and 2 Tim 3:6.

<sup>776</sup> Consequently, Judas’ home or position is pronounced an ἔρημος (Acts 1:20), before the Apostles elect a twelfth member to complete Israel once more. For ἔρημος and its relation to Luke’s exilic thought, see the discussion below.

<sup>777</sup> Luke’s account of Stephen is treated in more detail later in this chapter.

(διασπείρω)<sup>778</sup> outside the Land, *except the Twelve*, who remain in Jerusalem (Acts 8:1). Behind's Luke's frequent use of exilic vocabulary and ideas is the vivid memory of Rome's recent invasion of Jerusalem and the destruction of the second Temple.

#### 4.4.2 Excursus: The Wilderness as Exile in EJJ

Luke's most important means of describing Israel's continual exile is his characterization of Israel as a "wilderness" (ἐρημος). The initial characterization of Israel's dilemma occurs in the Baptist's citation of Isaiah 40:3-5 in his opening address to all Israel (Luke 3:4-6). As with Mark and Matthew, Luke uses the passage from Isaiah to establish the context in which John makes his appearance before Israel, but Luke uses the Isaianic passage to describe the exilic context that envelopes all Israel.

Since Isaiah 40:3(-5) accompanies the introduction of the Baptist in the tradition Luke receives, most interpreters have given his use of it minimal attention. Those who have treated it have most often understood it in light of the wider Synoptic concern to depict John the Baptist as (a kind of) Elijah.<sup>779</sup> Other scholars have explain the function of the wilderness motif in Luke-Acts within Luke's interest in portraying Jesus as a prophet-like Moses who leads Israel, the wilderness-like generation,<sup>780</sup> on a new exodus.<sup>781</sup>

David Pao<sup>782</sup> understands the Isaianic exodus (40:3-5) to be programmatic for Luke-Acts. Pao, however, focuses his interpretation on the *departure* from the wilderness, rather the *wilderness* itself. He argues that Luke's interpretation of the Jesus' new exodus in Luke-Acts is derived from (Second) Isaiah, not the Deuteronomic version.<sup>783</sup> Pao correctly observes the association of wilderness with exile in Isaiah and, by extension, in Luke-Acts as well. He argues that Luke's use of Isaiah 40:3-5 should

---

<sup>778</sup> Also see Acts 8:4 and 11:19 for the only other occurrences of this verb in the NT. For διασπορά, see John 7:35; James 1:1; 1 Pet 1:1.

<sup>779</sup> Unlike Matthew (11:14; 17:11-13), who explicitly identifies John as Elijah, Luke associates John with some of the preparatory work of Elijah. Moreover, while both Matthew (17:11) and Mark (9:12) credit Elijah (or John the Baptist) with aspects of "restoring" (ἀποκαθίστημι) Israel, in Luke-Acts, only Jesus is associated with some aspects of Elijah's duties, never restoration (Acts 1:6; cf. 3:21). The redactional activity of Luke in shifting the work of restoration from John to Jesus is overlooked by Richard Bauckham, who characterizes John as: "The Elijah-Like Restorer" ("The Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts," in Scott (ed.), *Restoration*, 446).

<sup>780</sup> E.g., Exodus 15:22-17:15; Num 10:33-22:1; 33:1-49; Deut 1:19-3:29; Psalms 78; 105; 106.

<sup>781</sup> E.g., J. Manek, "The New Exodus in the Books of Luke," *NovT* 2 (1957), 8 (8-23); C. F. Evans, "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel," in D. E. Nineham (ed.), *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot* (Oxford: Basil, 1955), 37-53; esp. Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet*, 45-79; idem, "Jesus and the Wilderness Generation: The Death of the Prophet like Moses according to Luke," in *SBL Seminar Papers* (Vol. 21; Scholars Press, 1982), 319-40; John Drury, *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel: A Study in Early Christian Historiography* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1976), 138-64; Willard M. Swartley, *Israel's Scripture Traditions and the Synoptic Gospels: Story Shaping Story* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994), 126-45.

<sup>782</sup> Pao, *Acts*, esp. 54-69.

<sup>783</sup> Cf. Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet*.

be understood within a more comprehensive effort by the author to implement a program of restoration, which Pao refers to as “the Isaianic new exodus.”<sup>784</sup> In a brief survey of EJ texts that refer to Isaiah 40:3-5,<sup>785</sup> Pao underscores the eschatological usage of the passage in the history of tradition. He concludes that readers would have understood Luke’s story of Jesus within this interpretive frame. While Pao deals briefly with the Gospel, most of his attention is devoted to exploring Isaianic motifs in Acts. Pao investigates the recurrence of key terms and phrases from Isaiah 40:3-5—such as “salvation” and “the way”<sup>786</sup> in underscoring the programmatic value of the Isaianic text. However, he does not explore the interpretation of Isaiah’s wilderness in Luke-Acts.<sup>787</sup> This is surprising given Pao’s assessment that Isa 40:3-5 “defines how the rest of the narrative of Luke-Acts should be understood since it provides the definition of the nature of Luke’s history.”<sup>788</sup>

The wilderness motif is used in a variety of contexts in early Jewish and biblical literature (both the OT and NT).<sup>789</sup> In the original literary setting of Isaiah (40:3), the wilderness functions as a metaphor for Israel’s exile, and the place where God will appear in restoring the Jewish people to the Land (cf. Isaiah 39). As we have already noted briefly in the treatment of the wilderness in various restoration texts, the wilderness is often used as a kind of captivity from which Israel’s eschatological return takes place. In a commentary on Psalm 37:18, concerning the heritage of the righteous, the author of *4QpPsalm*<sup>a</sup> (4Q171) understands the verse’s fulfillment in “the returnees of the wilderness (שְׂכֵי הַמִּדְבָּר), who will live for a thousand generations, in salva[tio]n. And for them there be will all the inheritance of Adam and or their descendants until eternity.”<sup>790</sup> Likewise, in 1QM (*War Scroll*),<sup>791</sup> the writer refers to

<sup>784</sup> Pao, *Acts*, esp. 93-110.

<sup>785</sup> Pao, *Acts*, 41-45; 66-69. Beyond this, Pao does very little with early Jewish texts.

<sup>786</sup> Pao, *Acts*, 37-69. His insights into the Luke’s use of “the way” in Acts are helpful and are treated below.

<sup>787</sup> In an excursus, Pao only devotes a few pages about the theological concept of exile and the contribution of N. T. Wright (*Acts*, 143-46), whose view Pao endorses. However, Pao does not elaborate on how Wright’s understanding is to be integrated with his own.

<sup>788</sup> Pao, *Acts*, 38. Pao also refers to the Isaianic passage as “the hermeneutical key for the Lukan program.” His remarks here are much more optimistic than his introductory claims where he observes that the Isaianic program in Luke’s Gospel “plays much less of a role” (13).

<sup>789</sup> E.g., Ulrich W. Mauser, *Christ in the Wilderness: The Wilderness Theme in the Second Gospel and its Basis in the Biblical Tradition* (SBT 39; London SCM, 1963); Shemaryahu Talmon, “The ‘Desert Motif’ in the Bible and in Qumran Literature,” in A. Altmann (ed.), *Biblical Motifs* (Texts and Studies 3; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966), 31-63; K. R. Snodgrass, “Streams of Tradition Emerging from Isaiah 40:1-5 and their Adaptation in the New Testament,” *JSNT* 8 (1980), 24-45; George J. Brooke, “Isaiah 40:3 and the Wilderness Community,” in George J. Brooke (ed.), *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Paris 1992* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 117-32. Also see Richard A. Horsley, *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs: Popular Movements in the Time of Jesus* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988). Horsley observes that the wilderness is sometimes the preferred location from which bandits and would-be deliverers would launch their campaigns (cf. Matthew 24:26).

<sup>790</sup> *War Scroll* iii.1-2 (Trans based on DSSSE, 345). See the treatment of the *War Scroll* in Chapter Three.

<sup>791</sup> The text of *4QpIsaiah*<sup>a</sup> (4Q161) interprets various portions of Isaiah (10:20-11:1-15). Although the text is fragmented at key points, it seems to indicate that in a battle during the “last days,” the remnant of Israel and/or the Prince of the Congregation “returns from the wilderness of the nat[ion]s”



Israel as the (גולת המדבר) “exiles of the wilderness” (i.2). He anticipates the group’s return “from the wilderness of the peoples” (ממדבר העמים) to the “wilderness of Jerusalem” (במדבר יושלים) (i.3).<sup>792</sup> That is, the writer refers to a comprehensive exile that embraces both the nations and Jerusalem. Until the true Israel is re-gathered to the Land, Jerusalem’s status is considered to be no different than the nations.<sup>793</sup>

In Philo, the wilderness is presented as the place of seclusion and preparation for Israel, i.e., the one(s) who see(s) God.<sup>794</sup> In *On the Life of Abraham*, the departure into a (metaphorical) wilderness represents the final stage of migration from the “senses” to the “knowledge of God.” To enter the wilderness is explained as the willingness to abandon the familiar and mundane territory of most mortals’ existence. The wilderness is the final point from which one enters the Land, which is also understood in mostly metaphorical terms as the perfection of virtue and wisdom and union with God.<sup>795</sup>

In other texts, the righteous are forced to flee to or voluntarily enter the wilderness as a place of refuge in times of trouble.<sup>796</sup> But even in these passages, the wilderness is treated in exilic terms as a place of temporary abode, until God gathers the people back into the Land. In the *Psalms of Solomon*, the writer portrays his community as one which has taken flight to the wilderness, (17:16-17).<sup>797</sup> But its exile there is merely a prelude to their anticipated return to the Land (17:26-29), followed by a more comprehensive re-gathering (17:31) under the Davidic messiah. In the *Animal*

to the land of Israel (frgs. 2-6, col. ii) (*DSSSE*, 314-15). The precise subject cannot be determined from these verses, but cf. 4Q163 (frgs. 4-6, col. ii) which portrays the Babylonian captivity in terms of a remnant community who anticipates its return to the land of Israel. Israel (or, perhaps, her messiah) is compared to a plant or shoot who will grow in the land in contrast with the Kittim and Jewish enemies, who are compared with trees to be chopped down (4Q161, frgs. 8-10, iii.1-25; cf. Luke 3). The Prince of the Congregation (a Davidic figure) is associated strongly with Moses and language from the exodus (4Q161, frgs. 8-10, col. iii).

<sup>792</sup> Also see 4Q169 (frgs. 3+4, col. i.1) where the phrase “a place of residence for the wicked ones of the nations” most likely refers to Jerusalem (col. i.2). The literary context seems to associate Jerusalem’s condition with the occupation of both foreign and Jewish rivals.

<sup>793</sup> This characterization of Israel is partly based on Israel’s subjection to foreign powers (e.g., IQM i.1-2, 12; ii.11-14), but also on the occupation of Jerusalem by Jewish rogues or “violators of the covenant” (i.2). The description of Israel’s wilderness condition may also express its metaphorical desolation. The author of *4QApocryphal Lamentations A* ostensibly describes the aftermath of the Babylonian invasion. He describes Jerusalem as desolate and “like a wilderness” (כמדבר) (4Q179 frg. 1, col. i.1-10). Although it cannot be certain, perhaps the writer describes Jerusalem in this manner to reflect its current theological condition as it stands in the time of the writer, i.e., a city and Temple defiled in the hands of the unrighteous priests. In Luke 21:20, Luke describes the Roman devastation of Jerusalem in similar terms as an ἐρήμωσις, a term closely related to “wilderness” (cf. Mark 13:14; Matt 24:15; Dan 9:27; 11:31; 12:11). In his description of the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple in 70 CE, Josephus describes it as if never had been inhabited (*War* 7.3; cf. 7.375-76).

<sup>794</sup> *Abr.* 85; *Her.* 288.

<sup>795</sup> Philo varies his description of this path to perfection. But as noted in the analysis of Philo in Chapter Three of the present study, the Land may signify the climatic goal of attaining knowledge of God, wisdom, and virtue (*Abr.* 84-85; *Migr.* 28-29; *Her.* 293; *Praem.* 115-17; 164-65).

<sup>796</sup> In both 1 and 2 Maccabees, the Maccabeans and their sympathizers flee to the wilderness for safety and preparation for war (1 Macc 2:27-31; 5:24-28; 9:33; 62; 2 Macc 5:27). In the case of Judas, however, the retreat to the wilderness is a penultimate exile that leads to the triumphant return and restoration of Jerusalem (1 Macc 4:36-61; 2 Macc 10:1-8).

<sup>797</sup> Cf. IQH col. xii.8-9.

*Apocalypse*, after the restoration of the second Temple, Israel is driven into the wilderness of the Gentiles and evil heavenly agents in the final period before her eschatological restoration.

Of most importance for the discussion of the motif of wilderness in EJL is the interpretation of Isaiah 40:3(-5), the passage which Luke himself uses. George Brooke observes that this Isaianic passage is often used in early Jewish writings to describe "eschatological circumstances in which the glory of the Lord will be revealed."<sup>798</sup> In particular, the theophanic disruptions of geography in Isaiah 40:4 are often used to emphasize the immediacy of God's judgment and the elimination of the unrighteous.<sup>799</sup>

In some EJ texts, however, Isaiah 40:3(-5) is interpreted more specifically in relation to Israel's *return from exile* in the eschatological restoration. The writing of *4QTanhumim* (4Q176)<sup>800</sup> takes as its literary backdrop the Babylonian destruction and exile of Israel. The document's actual *Sitz im Leben* is uncertain, but the author is clearly discontent with his contemporary situation. He especially bemoans the condition of Jerusalem and the Temple, even referring to the "corpses of your (Israel's) priests" (frgs. 1-2, col. i.3).<sup>801</sup> The author interprets and cites a number of texts from Second Isaiah to support his understanding of the present predicament and its resolution. After indicating that Israel has suffered enough for her sins, the writer quotes Isaiah 40:1-5 in anticipation of God's restoration of Israel,<sup>802</sup> clearly suggesting that Israel's exile and devastation might be referred to as a "wilderness." Although the hope of re-gathering is strongly implied in Isaiah 40:3-5 (cf. 40:11), it is not explicitly mentioned in the Isaianic text itself. However, *4QTanhumim* brings other texts from Isaiah to bear on Isaiah 40:3-5 to indicate that Israel's return (from the wilderness) is clearly in view. The author refers to those "[from the end]s of the [ea]rth" and "from faraway lands" (frgs. 1-2, col. i.9-10), phrases that occur elsewhere<sup>803</sup> in Isaiah in relation to the return from captivity. The return from the exilic wilderness is not the sum of the eschatology of 4Q176, for the writer also anticipates the heavenly exaltation of the righteous returnees.<sup>804</sup> Nonetheless, the wider literary context places paramount importance on Israel's restoration as the catalytic event that concludes with the community's transformation into heavenly beings.

In 1 Baruch, the author adopts the Babylonian exile as his literary setting. In fact, the writing was written at a much later time period. Jerusalem, who is personified

---

<sup>798</sup> Brooke, "Isaiah 40:3," 130.

<sup>799</sup> In these texts (*1 Enoch* 1:6; 53:7; *T. Mos* 10:4) there is no mention of the wilderness (Isa 40:3), although the wider literary context of *T. Moses* refers to exile(s) (3:1-14) of the twelve tribes (2:1-9), and the 6<sup>th</sup> century return (4:1-9). But chaps 5-9 refer to a future exile and oppression by the nations. Also it is worth noting, that the punishment of evil heavenly beings (as the ultimate source of Israel's troubles) is emphasized in the Enochic passages (above) and *T. Moses* 10.

<sup>800</sup> Our discussion of 4Q176 draws from the text and translation of in *DSSSE* (357-61).

<sup>801</sup> Cf. frgs. 16 + 17 + 18 + 22 + 23 + 53, line 1.

<sup>802</sup> Isaiah 40:1-5 is quoted in 4Q176 frgs. 1-2, col. i.4-8.

<sup>803</sup> Both Isaiah 43 and 49 also allude to the geographical changes that God will make "in the wilderness" (Isa 40:3; 43:19; cf. 49:11). But Isaiah 43 and 49 associate these changes explicitly to the return of the exiles who are characterized as those "from faraway" (43:6; 49:1, 12) and "from the ends of the earth" (43:6; 49:6 [nations]). Therefore, it is likely that the author of 4Q176 has grouped these passages together on the basis of common phraseology and thematic material. Cf. Isa 40:28 where God is identified as the "creator of the ends of the earth."

<sup>804</sup> Frgs. 16, 17, 18, 22, 23, 33, 51, 53; also see frgs. 8-11, lines 15-17.

at one place in the narrative, refers to herself as an ἔρημος (4:19), awaiting her exilic children's return (4:36; 5:1-9). In the re-gathering to the Land, Isaiah 40:4 is utilized by the author. God orders the way cleared—the mountains leveled and the valleys filled (Bar 5:7; Isa 40:4)—to provide an easy and safe passage to Jerusalem.<sup>805</sup> Likewise, *Psalms of Solomon* 11, a psalm that either relies on 1 Baruch 4-5 or tradition common to both,<sup>806</sup> also portrays God's clearing out the wilderness as preparation for the return to the Land (11:4). Moreover, in *Psalms of Solomon* 8:14-17, Isa 40:3-4 is also used to denounce the actions of sinful Jews<sup>807</sup> "who prepared the way" for the nations (probably Pompey<sup>808</sup> and the Romans)—rather than God<sup>809</sup> or his messiah<sup>810</sup> to enter Jerusalem (8:14-17). Rather than finding a peaceful resolution, and far from Israel's salvation, their invitation to the Gentiles resulted in the capture and the defilement of the Temple and city and to another bout of captivity. The psalm ends with a condemnation of the nations and the writer asking God to return the righteous "dispersed of Israel" (8:28) back into the Land (8:23-34).

The document known as the *Community Rule* (1QS) also refers to this passage from Isaiah (40:3) in describing the origin of a Jewish group that distinguishes itself from the rest of (sinful) Israel:

(1QS viii.12) And when these have become /a community/ in Israel (13) in compliance with these arrangements/ they are to be segregated from within the dwelling of the men of sin to walk to the desert in order to open there His path. (14) As it is written: 'In the desert, prepare the way of \*\*\*\*, straighten in the steppe a roadway for our God. (15) This is the study of the law wh[i]ch he commanded through the hand of Moses, in order to act in compliance with all that has been revealed from age to age, (16) and according to what the prophets have revealed through his holy spirit.<sup>811</sup>

Although this passage may relate to the founding of the community in the wilderness at Qumran, Golb correctly argues that Isaiah (40:3) is not explicitly interpreted in the *Community Rule* to explain the geographical location of a group of

<sup>805</sup> Of particular emphasis in the passage is the return of God's "glory" (5:7, 9; cf. Isa 40:5) to the city, perhaps suggesting his leading the way.

<sup>806</sup> On the complex relationship between 1 Baruch 4-5 and *Psalms of Solomon* 11 see Wright, *OTP*, 2.647-48 and Nickelsburg (*Jewish Literature*, 113).

<sup>807</sup> The Jewish leadership that is criticized in this psalm is generally thought to have been John Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, both of whom sought Pompey's support. See Josephus, *Ant.* 14.41-79. Josephus also holds these two men responsible for Israel's subjection and loss of "freedom" to Rome "freedom" (*Ant.* 14.77), i.e., just the opposite of the expectation of Isaiah 40:3-5. The use of Isa 40:3 might not be altogether satirical. That is, the psalmist may understand Rome to be an agent of salvation for his group's return to power. Inadvertently, the opposition invited God's instrument of punishment into their very presence (de Jonge, "Expectations," 97). The punitive function of Rome against Jewish enemies could be viewed as a penultimate step to the return and restoration of all Israel.

<sup>808</sup> This psalm is an important link in the history of traditions for Isa 40:3-5 being interpreted in light of a coming king, in this case Pompey. For as the psalmist later indicates (*Pss. Sol.* 17:21-46; 18:6-9), God will utilize a Davidic king to lead Israel back into the Land. In similar terms, Luke uses the Isaianic passage to introduce the eschatological figure of John, who anticipates the messiah Jesus.

<sup>809</sup> *Pss. Sol.* 11.

<sup>810</sup> *Pss. Sol.* 17-18. (Isaiah 40:3-5 does not occur in the writer's presentation of the messianic restoration of Israel in these chapters.)

<sup>811</sup> *DSSSE* 1.89. Cf. 1QS ix.19-20 in which the proper interpretation of Torah is bound up with submission to the proper teaching/Teacher as well.

Jews.<sup>812</sup> Instead, the phrase “to make a way in the wilderness” is interpreted as a “metaphor referring to the expounding of Torah.”<sup>813</sup> Golb observes:

They [the words of Isaiah 40:3] are treated as a verbal illusion to Torah study, the words of holy writ appearing as a wilderness of seemingly impenetrable ideas and commandments, needing to be cleared of their outward, superficial meaning by deep and intensive study, so that, wherever a group of ten members of the Unity are living, the true way to the Lord can be discovered.<sup>814</sup>

George Brooke, however, drawing on external evidence (i.e., other Qumran references as well as the fact of a Qumran settlement) and other information from within 1QS, argues that Isaiah 40:3 is interpreted to describe both the geographical locale of a Jewish group as well as its exegesis of Torah.<sup>815</sup> If Brooke is correct, the author of the *Community Rule* ties *theology and geography together* in his interpretation of Scripture.<sup>816</sup> But the theological dimension overshadows the physical by far. Israel’s wilderness of sin is defined in 1QS as an evil age or epoch that is ruled by Belial (e.g., cols. i.18, 23-24; ii.19). The wilderness is also characterized by the erroneous interpretation of Torah. In her correct interpretation of Scripture Israel has emerged from theological wilderness, but still awaits her triumphal entry into the Land.

The Community of 1QS indicates that their separation from the unrighteous ones has simultaneously resulted in the emergence of a group that holds exclusive rights to the heritage of Israel, and even now has begun to enjoy them in part. Even though the Community *may* reside outside the Land or the environs of Jerusalem, to some degree, the eschatological return of Israel has already begun in the formation of a righteous Jewish group. The group’s wilderness-exile is never understood to be permanent. On the contrary, the segregation from other unrighteous Jews is understood to have a “soteriological” function. Thus, while in the wilderness—separated from the impurity

---

<sup>812</sup> Golb’s interpretation of this passage forms part of his well-known argument against the scholarly consensus that the ruins of Qumran are those of an ancient (apocalyptic/scrabal) community, i.e., the Essenes. See Norman Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?: The Search for the Secret of Qumran* (New York: Scribner, 1995), 73-75. Also see Norman Golb, “The Problem of Origin and Identification of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 124 (1980), 1-24.

<sup>813</sup> Golb, *Who Wrote*, 75.

<sup>814</sup> Golb, *Who Wrote*, 74.

<sup>815</sup> See esp. his discussion of בָּדַל in 1QS and other Qumran documents, “Isaiah 40:3,” 120-21. Other evidence which may stand in Brooke’s favor is found in the Cave 4 fragments of the *Community Rule*. Apparently, the Isaianic citation does not occur in 4QS<sup>d</sup> (4Q258), frg. 2 (see the discussion of the Cave 4 manuscripts in Charlesworth (ed.), *PDSSP* 1.53-56). Although 4QS<sup>d</sup> follows 1QS fairly closely in many respects (cf. 1QS viii.6-21), and apparently refers to the Community’s departing into the wilderness (line 7, although by a conjectured reconstruction), the second half of the line immediately refers to “[the study of the Tora]h which he commanded,” as the interpretation for going into the wilderness. In contrast, 1QS cites Isa 40:3 immediately after referring to the Community’s exit, and prior to the interpretation of the text as the study of the Law. Nonetheless, if Qimron and Charlesworth’s reconstruction of the first part of line 7 is correct—“[to depart into the wilderness to prepare the Way of truth]”—(*PDSSP* 1.77), Cave 4 lends strong support to the argument that experience (a real physical segregation) may have preceded the search for biblical support (i.e., 1QS; Isaiah 40:3) to justify or explain the Community’s existence in the wilderness (cf. 4Q258, frg. 3, col.ii.4-5 as well). Brooke does not refer to 4QS<sup>d</sup> in his argument for theological interpretation of Isaiah 40:3.

<sup>816</sup> For this point and references to other secondary literature on the use of Isaiah 40:3 in 1QS, see Brooke, “Isaiah 40:3,” 117-32.

and sins of the unrighteous ones—the righteous Community hopes “to atone for the Land” (1QS viii.6, 10).<sup>817</sup> The atonement of the Land implies that the Community anticipates an eventual re-gathering to Israel.<sup>818</sup> The restoration of Israel does not comprise all of the eschatological hopes of the Community. For beyond Israel lies the hope for the exalted life and location of heavenly beings (1QS iv.6-8; 19-23; col. xi.4-9). Nonetheless, the return to Jerusalem and the Land is understood to be the penultimate and catalytic link in a chain of eschatological events.

Moreover, Luke’s introduction of John and especially Jesus as leaders of Israel’s restoration is done with a full awareness of other Jewish figures who have instigated failed efforts of restoration in the period preceding the fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE. Several of these Jewish revolutionaries or messianic pretenders were associated as well with the same geographical area in which John and Jesus emerge.<sup>819</sup> Josephus associates the wilderness and the area of the Jordan with other efforts of restoration that failed prior to the fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE. In his rehearsal of the Jewish sedition that preceded Roman invasion, Josephus refers on one occasion to an Egyptian false prophet (ὁ Αἰγύπτιος ψευδοπρόφητης) who instigated trouble. In describing the failed effort of rebellion, Josephus notes that the Egyptian led the group “from the wilderness to the mount called (the Mount of) Olives.”<sup>820</sup> He also refers to Theudas—whom Luke<sup>821</sup> knows as well—who leads a crowd of Jews down to the Jordan river in a (failed) effort to duplicate the Mosaic exodus (*Ant.* 20.97-99). The implication seems to be that through this miraculous act, the people of Israel can assured of God’s endorsement and divine intervention on their behalf. No miraculous division of the Jordan occurs and, instead, Josephus writes that the leader was decapitated. In Acts, Luke indicates that Jesus and his followers were considered in the same vein as these failed revolutionaries of restoration (Acts 5:35-37; 21:38). Luke even acknowledges the wilderness connection of the Egyptian and mistaken assumption that Paul may be him (!).<sup>822</sup> The wilderness beginnings of other (failed) movements of restoration underscore the correlation of wilderness to Luke’s interpretation of Israel’s restoration in Luke-Acts, and the role that the author understands John and Jesus to have in it.

---

<sup>817</sup> Many portions of 1QS (esp. cols. viii.1-13; ix.3-11) ascribe a strong cultic (Temple) identity to the Community.

<sup>818</sup> The Community’s numerical identity with Israel may be indicated in the composition of the council of “twelve men” and “three priests” (1QS viii.1). Admittedly, 1QS does not contain an exilic account of restoration per se. The focus of the document is on the liminal or preparatory stage of the Community for the eschatological promises, but the future restoration of Israel is couched

<sup>819</sup> Josephus assigns the figure Judas to Galilee, Theudas to the Jordan, and the Egyptian to the wilderness.

<sup>820</sup> My translation. Cf. Josephus’ account of the Egyptian in *Ant.* 10.169-72.

<sup>821</sup> Cf. Acts 5:36. Luke also refers to Judas the Galilean, a figure that Josephus describes as a revolutionary as well (*War* 2.118). Josephus refers to him as the founder of the fourth philosophy (*Ant.* 18.23-25). His sons become ringleaders in the rebellion against Rome as well (*War* 2.433).

<sup>822</sup> Due to a Jewish uprising over Paul’s supposed bringing of a Gentile into the wrong area of the Temple, a Roman tribune asked him if he was “the Egyptian” who had led “four thousand” into “the wilderness” (Acts 21:38).

#### 4.4.3 John the Baptist and the Prophetic Judgment: Israel's Exilic Wilderness (Luke 3:1-6)

The exilic connotations of the wilderness are an important interpretive key to understanding how Luke presents the appearance of John and Jesus to Israel; they are the key figures affecting Israel's restoration. Moreover, their arrival is also framed within the wider historical context of the Roman empire (Luke 3:1-2).<sup>823</sup> Luke refers to the political leadership of the world,<sup>824</sup> from the emperor of Rome himself to the hierarchy of Jerusalem's own high-priesthood. It is notable that among such powerful and anointed figures, especially the high priest(s) mentioned just prior to the Baptist's introduction, Luke observes that it was *to John* that the "word of God came" (3:2).<sup>825</sup>

---

<sup>823</sup> Luke's introduction of John the Baptist, the one who introduces Israel's eschatological king, reflects the complexity of Luke's loyalties and sympathies. As Henry Cadbury long ago pointed out, Luke's report of John's birth in respect to world and local rulers is similar to other Hellenistic historians (e.g., Thucydides), and constitutes a technical or formal means of dating (*The Making of Luke-Acts* [London: SPCK, 1958], 204-09). Cadbury observes that the last phrase ("the word of the Lord came to") of Luke's chronology also appears in biblical accounts of the prophets (e.g., Jer 1:1-3 LXX), in which the prophet or prophecy may be dated according to the periods of particular rulers or regimes. More appropriate for Luke, however, are Haggai and Zechariah, which Cadbury does not mention. For these latter two prophets date their prophecies somewhat comfortably to the reigns of foreign rulers (Hag 1:1; 2:1, 20; Zech 1:1, 7; 7:1). Moreover, in analogy with Luke, in these two prophets, the burden of their prophetic criticism falls on Israel (or parties therein) and not Persia (cf. however Hag 2:6-9; Zech 1:15). Donald L. Jones offers a helpful survey of Luke's chronological references, but his over willingness to accept Luke's dates and version of events (e.g., the census of Quirinius) over other historical sources is tendentious at certain points ("Luke's Unique Interest in Historical Chronology," in *SBL Seminar Papers 1989*, 378-87). George B. Caird's observation—"Among the NT writers only Luke had any interest in relating Christian history to world history" ("The Chronology of the NT," in G.A. Buttrick (ed.), *The Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible* [New York: Abingdon, 1962], 599)—is too unqualified of a statement, ignoring other NT writings (e.g., Revelation), which also stake out political interests in the world. But among the Gospels, Luke alone so explicitly articulates the relationship of Israel to Rome under Jesus the messiah.

<sup>824</sup> Joel Green observes, "from the opening verse [1:5a] of the Gospel, we are aware that Luke is concerned with *the political world and the balance of power* in Greco-Roman Palestine" (his emphasis) (*The Theology of the Gospel of Luke* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995], 7). While Green is correct in observing Luke's interest in the wider world, the program of restoration in Luke-Acts is considerably more complex than the wish for "the cessation of foreign-occupancy and subjection" (8).

<sup>825</sup> This formula "the word of God came to ---" is a phrase that is frequently used to identify prophecies and/or prophets in the OT, e.g., Jer 1:2, 4, 11; Ezek 1:3; Joel 1:1; and esp. Hag 1:1; 2:1; Zech 1:1, 7. On the importance of "the word of God" in Luke-Acts, see David Pao, *Acts*, 48-50; 147-80. Pao, however, overstates the importance of the motif and its status in his assessment that "the word of God should be understood as the main character in the narrative of Acts" (49).

The arrival of John and his message of "a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins" (Luke 3:3) is described as the (incipient) fulfillment of Isaiah 40:3-5:

The voice of one crying in the wilderness; prepare the way of Lord, make his paths straight. Every valley shall be filled, and every mountain and hill shall be brought low, and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough ways shall be made smooth; and all flesh shall see the salvation of God (3:4-6).

With the other Gospels,<sup>826</sup> Luke associates Isaiah 40:3 and the wilderness<sup>827</sup> with John the Baptist. The Isaianic text is initially used to introduce a figure in the area of the Jordan, proclaiming a message of Israel's wilderness condition and calling for repentance. The message of John is expressed against the eschatological backdrop of God's imminent judgment and the salvation.<sup>828</sup> Luke's use of Isaiah 40:3, therefore,

---

<sup>826</sup> See Mark 1:2-6; Matt 3:1-6; John 1:19-23. Unlike Mark, who dramatically opens his narrative with the quotation of Isaiah 40:3 (and Mal 3:1) in the appearance of John the Baptist, Luke's quote of Isaiah 40:3-5 has been preceded by a painstakingly developed introduction of John and Jesus (Luke 1-2) that clearly indicates their fundamental importance for Israel, before they ever arrive on the public scene. Isaiah 40:3 has been alluded to in Luke 1:17 and 1:76, but the full quotation of the Isaianic pericope and the public arrival of the Baptist inaugurates the preparatory period of Israel's restoration. Mark and Matthew's use of Isaiah 40:3 must also be measured against the use of the Isaianic text in early Jewish traditions, but there is evidence that Luke develops key ideas and motifs from this OT passage in ways that surpass his Synoptic rivals, as is demonstrated in the present study.

<sup>827</sup> The word "wilderness" (ἐρημος) occurs ten times in Luke (1:80; 3:2, 4; 4:1, 42; 5:16; 7:24; 8:29; 9:12; 15:4) and ten times in Acts (7:30, 36, 38, 42, 44; 8:26; 13:18; 21:38). The wilderness is used by Luke in a variety of ways, not always connoting exile per se. In some cases it is a place of solitude for Jesus to pray alone (e.g., Luke 5:16) or the meeting place where Jesus ministered to the people (e.g., Luke 4:42; 9:12). In Acts 8:29 it is the place where the demon(s) Legion drives a man (cf. Acts 4:1-2). In Acts it is used to refer to Moses and wilderness generation—not without exilic overtones, however (e.g., 7:30, 36, 38, 42, 44; 13:18). It is also used of another failed liberator (i.e., "the Egyptian") who led people out to the wilderness (Acts 21:38). See the discussion of this last reference in the present chapter.

<sup>828</sup> The greater emphasis of the literary context of Luke 3:3-17 falls on the judgment of God, but unlike Mark (and Matthew) Luke includes other concerns as well. He extends the quote of Isaiah 40:3 (LXX) down to verse 5, thus including Isaiah's description of the impact of God's arrival on the earth (i.e., the geographical changes). Furthermore, Luke lengthens the quotation of Isaiah 40 so as to end on a more positive note than Mark and Matthew by including verse 5: "all flesh will see the salvation of God" (Luke 3:6). The salvation of God is a motif found elsewhere in Luke-Acts, e.g., Luke 2:30; 19:10; Acts 2:21; 28:28. Luke does not follow Mark in integrating Malachi 3:1 into the opening announcement of John, preferring to wait until later in his narrative (Luke 7:27). Luke emphasizes throughout his narrative that Israel's promises do not in fact belong to all Israel or to even that segment of the population who might presume to claim to them for their own (i.e., the righteous, the Pharisees, the priesthood). See, for example, Luke 7:29-30; 19:11-28; Acts 3:23. While Luke continues to define Israel according to the Jewish people, Jewish ancestry does not guarantee one a place within the future restoration. In Luke 3:8, John rejects the idea that Israel's salvation belongs to all Jews simply because of their Abrahamic heritage. The author uses the metaphor of a forest being thinned out to make his point. Israel is compared to a forest which shall be cleared of those trees that do not produce fruit (3:9). Some within Israel are compared to wheat to be "gathered," others to chaff to be burned. As noted earlier, the formation of a

corresponds to its general application in eschatological settings in early Jewish writings (above), but is developed within the author's unique emphasis on Jesus and his community of followers.

Luke's use of Isaiah 40:3 corresponds with the LXX (and Mark) in that the phrase "in the wilderness" designates the location of the voice<sup>829</sup> rather than the locus of God's coming, as in the MT. But Luke is not bound by the grammar of the citation. A closer look at the literary context of Luke 3 and other places within the narrative of Luke-Acts, suggests that the Isaianic passage does more than identify geography and preaching of John. Luke invests heavily in the symbolic importance of "the wilderness," finding in it an apt metaphor for Israel's exilic condition.<sup>830</sup> For Luke, the epoch<sup>831</sup> of the Baptist is a preparatory rite for participation in Israel's restoration. John's function in the wilderness of the Jordan is to provide Israel with her *necessary exit* from the Land (or the environs of Jerusalem)<sup>832</sup> and to confront the Jewish nation with the comprehensive condition of sin (= exile) in the face of God's imminent judgment and salvation. Only those who accept John's indictment and submit to his baptism of

---

righteous community within Israel is often depicted in EJL with the imagery of vegetation, most often in reference to a "shoot" or "sprout." In a Qumran peshar on Isaiah 10:19 (4Q163, frgs. 4-6, col. i.1-4), the exile is understood as means by which God limits the people of Israel to a remnant. The righteous remnant of Israel is described metaphorically as a shrinking forest.

<sup>829</sup> John is understood to be prophetic fulfillment of the messenger, i.e., "the voice," of Isa 40:3, while Jesus—not God—is the one for whom "the way" is prepared. In Luke 7:27 (cf. Mark 1:2), Luke uses Mal 3:1 to implicitly identify Jesus with "the Lord" (of Isa 40:3), a word Luke uses elsewhere for both God and Jesus, not necessarily equating the two, but certainly attributing to Jesus a title of importance. Cf. Luke's allusion to Isaiah 40:3 in Luke 1:17 and 1:76. In a number of early Jewish texts, God and his royal representatives are closely identified and share titles with one another (e.g., 4Q521; *Pss. Sol.* 17).

<sup>830</sup> Therefore, in Luke's Gospel, the wilderness is not so much the geographical locale of the Baptist's crying voice (Isa 40:3 LXX), but the exilic condition of Israel from which she needs salvation.

<sup>831</sup> Other references, as argued below, to the Baptist or his period often seem to carry the same exilic connotations even when the "wilderness" itself is not explicitly mentioned (Luke 7:29-30; 16:16-17; Acts 1:22).

<sup>832</sup> While technically the area of the Jordan may lie within the formal boundaries of the Land, in analogy with ideas from the Qumran community, the barren territory of the Jordan and the segregation from the heart of the Land (i.e., Jerusalem and Temple) could serve as a symbolic exit.



repentance are prepared for the more positive aspects of restoration, which Jesus, Israel's messiah, will formally inaugurate.<sup>833</sup>

Perhaps, because of the negative associations with *Israel's* wilderness (as opposed to John's), and because of the author's desire to identify it with Israel's theological plight, he avoids referring to *the location* of John's preaching as the wilderness. Instead, Luke describes John as departing his respective, physical wilderness to proclaim Israel's theological wilderness. Luke writes that after "the word of the Lord" came to John "in the wilderness," he went into the "region around the Jordan" (Luke 3:2-3; cf. Matt 3:1; Mark 1:4). Moreover, in Luke's earlier description of the birth of the Baptist, it is not the Baptist's entrance into, but rather his exit from the wilderness that is anticipated.<sup>834</sup> The author notes that John was "in the wilderness until the day he appeared to Israel" (1:80).<sup>835</sup> While Luke certainly understands the area of the Jordan as a wilderness terrain (Luke 7:24), he attempts to make a categorical distinction between John and the people of Israel, i.e., the ones to whom the Baptist preaches. Whereas John's wilderness is a physical locale of preparation and waiting, Israel's wilderness is a theological one of sin and exile. By omitting Mark's references to the physical wilderness of the Baptist,<sup>836</sup> Luke eliminates the possibility that the quotation of Isaiah 40:3-5 is to be understood in terms of geography alone. Instead the

---

<sup>833</sup> As discussed below, Luke places paramount importance in the encounter with the Baptist. For submission to John's baptism constitutes Israel's *ipso facto* recognition of an ongoing, theological exile. The response to John becomes the prerequisite for the initial phase of re-gathering which Jesus himself will initiate and seal.

<sup>834</sup> François. Bovon, *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 2002), 121; cf. Fitzmyer (*Gospel According to Luke*, 449-76) who makes no comment on the theological or geographical significance of Luke's editing of the wilderness scene.

<sup>835</sup> Only in Luke 1:80 does Luke use the unusual plural for wilderness: ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις.

<sup>836</sup> Mark 1:4; cf. Matt 3:1.

proclamation of an Isaianic wilderness stands naked as a stunning indictment of Israel's exilic problem of sin, from which the Jews must repent if they are to be re-gathered.<sup>837</sup>

Luke attaches great importance to the meeting with the Baptist and the opening charge that Israel's predicament is one of wilderness-exile. Unlike Mark and Matthew,<sup>838</sup> Luke depicts *all the people of Israel*, regardless of region, entering the wilderness and hearing John's call to repentance.<sup>839</sup> Indeed, in Luke 3:21 and 7:29, the author declares that "all the people" were baptized. The comprehensive nature of the work of the Baptist receives further affirmation in the speech of Paul to the Jews in Pisidia (Acts 13:13-41). In rehearsing the history of Jesus, Paul begins by telling the history of Israel (13:16-25). At the pivotal turning between the ancient past (David) and Jesus, Paul speaks of the Baptist who proclaimed "a baptism of repentance" παντὶ τῷ λαῷ Ἰσραήλ ("to all the people of Israel")<sup>840</sup> before the arrival of messiah Jesus.

In terms analogous with the view of an ongoing exile in EJJ—where claims of restoration are often first grounded in claims of captivity—Luke understands the

---

<sup>837</sup> Therefore, the quote cannot be understood only on the basis of the Baptist's physical locale or as the location of God and/or his messiah's coming. Indeed, as demonstrated below Luke also hesitates to even place Jesus in the same wilderness as Israel (or John), choosing instead to associate the messiah with the cosmic wilderness of the Devil.

<sup>838</sup> In Luke 3, the author refers to ones who came out to John as "the crowds" (3:7, 10) and "the people" (3:15, 18, 21). Only later (e.g., Luke 7:29; Acts 13:24) does Luke describe the comprehensive nature and the full implications of the period of the Baptist. Both Mark (1:5) and Matthew (3:5) specify the region of Judaea and the people of Jerusalem as those baptized by John.

<sup>839</sup> The mission to "all the people" of Israel is a *Leitmotif* of Luke-Acts. The phrase "all the people" occurs ten times in Luke-Acts (Luke 2:10; 3:21; 8:47; 9:13; 20:45; 24:19; cf. 2:31 "all the peoples"; Acts 4:10; 5:34; 10:41; 13:24). Perhaps, more significantly is the fact that the phrase does not appear at all in the other Gospels. Luke alone portrays the period of the Baptist in such comprehensive terms.

<sup>840</sup> Marius Reiser contrasts the Baptist's emphasis on judgment and the separation of the unrighteous from the righteous within Israel with Jesus' ministry to all Israel, especially the unrighteous. As we demonstrated here, Reiser's distinction between John and Jesus on the criterion of audience cannot be maintained in Luke (*Jesus and Judgment: The Eschatological Proclamation in its Jewish Context* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997], 313); (German edit; *Die Gerichtspredigt Jesu: Eine Untersuchung zur eschatologischen Verkündigung Jesu und ihrem frühjüdischen Hintergrund* [Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, Neue Folge, Band 23; Münster: Aschendorff, 1990]).

wilderness and period of the Baptist. As Colin Brown observes, John's baptism is not so much a rite of purification, but a symbol of the exile from where Israel initiates her exodus.<sup>841</sup> Unlike the author of 1QS, however, Isaiah 40:3 is not used "to justify the establishment of an actual wilderness community."<sup>842</sup> Instead, the Isaianic passage is used to explain Israel's pilgrimage to the Jordanian wilderness to hear John's call to (a baptism of) repentance in light of the Baptist's charge that all Israel inhabits an exilic predicament of sin. Only by responding appropriating can Israel escape the imminent eschatological judgment of God and find salvation.<sup>843</sup>

#### 4.4.4 The Exilic Wilderness and Israel's (Religious) Leaders (Luke 7:24-35)

The exit from Israel into the wilderness is an eschatological boundary at which Israel begins to divide into repentant and unrepentant Israel.<sup>844</sup> Although Luke underscores that all Israel enters the geographical abode of wilderness, and hears John's judgment of Israel's exilic-wilderness condition, only "the people of Israel" submit to John's baptism and are thus prepared to participate in the messiah's formal program of

---

<sup>841</sup> Colin Brown, "What was John the Baptist Doing," *BBR* 7 (1997), 37-50. Brown argues for the importance of the Jordan River for Luke because of its associations with Elijah.

<sup>842</sup> Joan E. Taylor, *The Immerser: John the Baptist within Second Temple Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 29. While John does not advocate a permanent wilderness settlement, the physical encounter with John in the wilderness bears important communal consequences in Luke-Acts.

<sup>843</sup> In this sense, Luke takes his part in the wider conversation of Early Judaism about a more exalted epoch of restoration than experienced in the Second Temple period. Moreover, his casting of the Baptist's wilderness preaching and Jesus' introduction (i.e., his entry into the apocalyptic wilderness) (below) suggest that Luke will interpret Israel's restoration in terms of exile and return. The exit from the Land may be portrayed—whether literally or figuratively—as a flight for physical safety (*Pss. Sol.* 17:17-18; *Animal Apocalypse* 89:75), a self-imposed segregation for purity and Torah (1QS; 4QMMT 92), or even captivity in Babylon (1 Baruch; CD col. i.5-8; iv.1-4). In the case of Luke-Acts, all of Israel exits the environs of Jerusalem to the wilderness of the Jordan to be confronted with John's indictment of their exilic-wilderness condition in order that they might make preparation for their eschatological return.

<sup>844</sup> Cf. Simeon's prophecy to Mary in Luke 2:34-35.

re-gathering and restoration.<sup>845</sup> For Luke, “the people” constitute a group to be distinguished from other groups, particularly ones associated with Israel’s religious leadership, e.g., Pharisees, lawyers, priests. While Luke later provides all Israel with other opportunities for repentance after Pentecost (Acts 2:14-7:60), the rejection of John’s message is particularly severe for Israel’s religious leadership<sup>846</sup> and entails permanent consequences for their status *as leaders* in the epoch of Israel’s restoration. In Luke 7:24-35, Jesus reflects upon John’s status and function.<sup>847</sup> According to Jesus, John and his wilderness proclamation bear directly on the identity of eschatological Israel. In contrast to “all the people, even the tax collectors,” Luke concludes that the Pharisees and lawyers have forfeited, *as a group*,<sup>848</sup> their religious authority because of their refusal to repent and submit to John’s baptism (7:29-30).<sup>849</sup>

---

<sup>845</sup> While submission to John’s baptism is not to be equated with the re-gathering per se, those who have repented stand ready to join Jesus in the return. Furthermore, those who have rejected John’s call to repentance have disqualified themselves from Jesus’ effort to restore Israel until after Pentecost. The defection of Judas—who presumably would have been baptized (Acts)—illustrates that baptism alone is not to be equated with Israel’s full re-gathering. Also see Acts 18:24-28 and 19:1-7, which demonstrate the inadequacy of John’s baptism alone. Its preparatory character for “the Way” (18:25, 26; cf. Isa 40:3) of Jesus is emphasized.

<sup>846</sup> In this passage (Luke 7:24-35), Jesus speaks only of the disqualification of the scribes and Pharisees, but later other groups, especially the priesthood, including the high-priest himself, will oppose Jesus and thus meet with the same fate as well (e.g., Luke 20:1-8, 19; 22:2, 4; 23:10).

<sup>847</sup> Jesus’ elaboration on the role of John follows John’s own inquiry, through his disciples, into Jesus’ identity (7:18-23). John and Jesus belong to the same epoch of time, but John’s role is to prepare the people, that is, call them into knowledge of their exile and to repentance in order for Jesus to re-gather and restore them. The time of the Baptist is limited, and John himself is subordinate to Jesus, but Luke understands the relationship of the two figures to be more complex than simply the issue of subordination. Instead, Luke underscore the distinctive, but inter-related duties and roles of John and Jesus in an epoch of eschatological importance (see Luke 16:16).

<sup>848</sup> Luke’s portrayal of the Pharisees is not altogether one-sided. Although they are described unsympathetically in some places in the narrative (e.g., Luke 5:33-9; 8:36-50; 11:37-53; 23:6, 9; Acts 15:5) in other locations, particularly in Acts (5:33-3; 23:6-10), they are presented more favorably. Nonetheless, on the basis of Luke 7:29-30, and the divided response of the Pharisees, they are prevented from functioning as Israel’s religious representatives. Moreover, Luke’s promotion of Jesus and the Twelve as Israel’s leaders suggests the ultimate voice of religious authority lies in other hands. On the other hand, Luke’s depiction of the lawyers (οἱ νομικοί) (the interpreters of Torah) is always negative (Luke 7:30; 10:25; 11:45-52; 14:3). Apparently, “the lawyers” and “the scribes” (οἱ γραμματεῖς) refer to the same group (Luke 11:53; Acts 23:9).

<sup>849</sup> Although Luke is dependent upon Q (cf. Matt 11:7-19) for much of 7:24-35, the verses 29-30 belong to Luke. Cf. Matt 21:23-32, however, where Jesus first responds with a question about John’s authority to the chief priests and elders’ inquiry into Jesus’ own authority. After their non-committal

Accordingly, the writer maintains that in the preparatory period of the Baptist, the initial “division of Israel”<sup>850</sup> occurred between the populace and some of its leadership.<sup>851</sup> On one level, Luke’s bifurcation or division of Israel into these two groups (i.e., the people and the religious hierarchy) fits his wider program of favoring the weak and the marginalized (i.e., the poor, women) over the powerful.<sup>852</sup> For instance, in a later passage (Luke 15:1-2), Luke refers again to the division of Israel, but this time in terms that more clearly underscore his critique of the power structure of the social and religious systems of Israel. In this case, he contrasts the response of the “tax collectors<sup>853</sup> and sinners” (= people; cf. 7:29) with the “Pharisees and the scribes” (Luke 15:1-2).<sup>854</sup>

But the elevation of the “people of Israel” over the current religious leadership is presented, *not as a presupposition* of the author, but as reflecting *the consequence* of a response to an *eschatological event*: the acceptance or rejection of John’s judgment of exilic existence. Unlike Matthew, who introduces the Pharisees and Sadducees as being already under special condemnation from the outset of (Matt 3:7), Luke shows all of

---

response, he tells a parable that highlights the inclusion of the tax collectors and the prostitutes into the kingdom of God on the basis of their faithful response to the Baptist as opposed to the religious authorities. Conzelmann understands Luke 7:29-30 to be a continuation of the words of Jesus (*Theology*, 21), but these verses 29-30 are better understood as a commentary by Luke (Nolland, *Luke* 1.342; Bovon, *Luke* 1.284, fn 51).

<sup>850</sup> Bovon, *Luke* 1.284-85.

<sup>851</sup> Conzelmann, *Theology*, 21. Whereas Matthew (= Q) singles out the religious leaders (Pharisees and Sadducees) of Israel for judgment from the beginning (3:7), in Luke, the Baptist charges “the crowds”—inclusive of the people and the leaders of Israel—that all Israel is under the judgment of God (Luke 3:7). Therefore, Luke’s narrative does not suggest the rejection of Israel’s religious authorities was predetermined, but rather the results of their own actions.

<sup>852</sup> See Chapter Seven (“The Poor and the Rich”) of the insightful monograph by Philip F. Esler (*Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987], 164-200).

<sup>853</sup> Therefore, the reference to the tax collectors (Luke 7:29) is not a “second thought” (Eduard Schweizer, *The Good News according to Luke* [Atlanta: John Knox, 1984], 136), but an attempt to define the lowly composition of “all the people.”

<sup>854</sup> Luke follows 15:1-2 with a series of parables, beginning with the search for one sheep as opposed to the ninety-nine left in the wilderness—a symbol we have underscored as having exilic value for Luke—demonstrates the ironic composition of the re-gathered Israel. Cf. Wright’s discussion (*Jesus*, 533, 565), which has little to say about 15:3-7, but instead places the greater emphasis on the parable of the lost son in 15:11-32 (Wright, *Jesus*, 125-44).

Israel being under judgment (Luke 3:7). But while the people submit to John's baptism in Luke, the religious leaders reject John's prophetic judgment of Israel's wilderness exile, thereby making themselves ineligible for the eschatological restoration that the messiah will initiate.<sup>855</sup> That is, the encounter with John in the wilderness is the first hurdle that Israel must clear in preparation for her exit from exile. As Jesus reports after the period of the Baptist (Luke 7), the people have responded appropriately and stand ready to be included in the return, but the religious leadership has been disqualified from participating in the restoration. For Luke, the decisive factor in determining who will inherit the *eschatological future* lies in the response to the *eschatological past* event of John's call to repentance.<sup>856</sup> This eschatological significance of the period of John is underscored later as well in Jesus' response to the criticism of the Pharisees (Luke 16:16): "The Law and the Prophets were until John (μέχρι Ιωάννου); since then the message of the kingdom is proclaimed, and everyone enters it violently."<sup>857</sup>

Finally, we might note two other events in Luke-Acts that underscore the programmatic value of Isaiah 40:3-5 (i.e., the period of John) and the idea of Israel's wilderness exile. Unlike Israel's "former" leadership (the Pharisees and lawyers), who failed to properly enter the wilderness of John, Luke later implies that the Twelve, the

---

<sup>855</sup> Luke's emphasis on ethics, morality, and the privilege of the poor stand the risk of being misconstrued in his narrative, if not viewed under the more encompassing umbrella of his eschatology and the peoples' response to the figures of John and Jesus. While it is popular in current scholarship to refer to Luke's emphasis on social justice and ethics, the eschatological dimension of these requirements cannot be overlooked. That is, Luke's ethical program is bound up with eschatology, particular in Israel's response to the two eschatological figures of John and Jesus. Indeed, Luke's history testifies to the false dichotomy that is sometimes made in scholarship between eschatology and ethics. The co-existence of both ethics and eschatology are found in others early Jewish writings as well (e.g., *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*; *Epistle of Enoch*, *Damascus Document*).

<sup>856</sup> This characterization is not meant to draw a sharp divide between the eschatological past and future, but on the contrary, to underline their unity for Luke.

<sup>857</sup> My translation.

core and leaders of the re-gathered Israel,<sup>858</sup> had made the requisite exit from the Land into the exilic wilderness of the Baptist, and responded appropriately. After the ascension of Jesus, the Apostles gather to reconstitute the Twelve to replace one of their membership (i.e., Judas) (Acts 1:15-26).<sup>859</sup> Peter maintains that the candidate must be a man who has accompanied the group from “the beginning, the baptism of John” until the ascension (1:22). That is, to be counted among the re-gathered ones, the new member of the Twelve must have first identified himself with Israel’s exile by visiting John in the wilderness.

One other point also confirms the exilic connotations of John’s appearance and importance of Isaiah 40:3-5 for Luke-Acts. Just as Luke uses “the wilderness” of the Isaianic passage to underscore Israel’s exilic status, he appropriates “the way,” a phrase found in the same passage, to identify the re-gathered ones of Israel (i.e., the formative Christian community).<sup>860</sup> If it is appropriate to read this communal interpretation of “the Way” in Acts back into the early chapters of Luke (i.e., John’s preaching in the Jordan),<sup>861</sup> the Baptist’s eschatological proclamation to Israel might be periphrastically translated as follows:

In the wilderness-exile of Israel, I have come to prepare ‘a Way’—a righteous portion of the people—to be re-gathered by the messiah Jesus in this eschatological epoch of Israel’s restoration (Luke 3:4).

---

<sup>858</sup> See the discussion of the Twelve in the next section.

<sup>859</sup> This passage is fundamental to Luke’s idea of Israel’s re-gathering and is discussed in more detail later in the chapter.

<sup>860</sup> Acts 9:2; 19:9, 23; 22:4, 14, 22.

<sup>861</sup> Schuyler Brown argues that Luke employs “the way” for a variety of uses and meanings over the course of Luke’s two-part narrative. For instance, “the way,” according to Brown, not only has relevance for the Christian community, but also for “Jesus’ way” (i.e., to the cross; to heaven in his ascension) (*Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke* [Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969], 131-45).

#### 4.4.5 Jesus and the Apocalyptic Exile of Israel (Luke 4:1-14)

The theme of wilderness also guides Luke's description of Jesus, leading up to the messiah's first public appearance before Israel at Nazareth. Just as John and Israel make a mandatory exit from the Land (into their respective wilderness exiles), Luke describes Jesus making his required visit to the wilderness as well (Luke 4:1). Luke emphasizes, however, that Jesus enters a different kind of wilderness from that of either John or the rest of Israel.<sup>862</sup> In distinction to John who departs (1) a physical wilderness of preparation to confront Israel with (2) her sinful wilderness, Jesus was "led by the Spirit" in (3) an apocalyptic wilderness to meet the Devil (4:1).<sup>863</sup> The author uses the cosmic conflict between Jesus and the Devil in the wilderness to lay bare the demonic substructure underlying Israel's exilic condition.<sup>864</sup>

---

<sup>862</sup> Luke downplays not only the place, but obscures Jesus' meeting with John and his role in Jesus' baptism. That is, neither the wilderness setting nor the Baptist himself is mentioned in Jesus' baptism. Moreover, immediately prior to Jesus' baptism (!), John is imprisoned by Herod (3:19-20). Despite the Baptist's anticipation of the messiah's coming (3:15-18), Luke records nothing of significance in their encounter with one another nor does he indicate that John even recognized Jesus from "all the people" (3:21) that he had baptized. It is possible to interpret John's later inquiry into the (eschatological) identity of Jesus (Luke 7:19) as further evidence of the uneventful character of their first meeting. Luke 7 seems to suggest that only later does John seek to identify Jesus with "the one to come," but even in there, the questions of John's disciples to Jesus bear the mark of uncertainty. Indeed, according to Luke, God's pronouncement of Jesus as "son" occurred after Jesus had prayed, perhaps referring to an event subsequent to his baptism. In any event, the prayer of Jesus stands alongside—perhaps even over—the baptism as the occasion for God's announcement. As Sharon Ringe observes, "Luke minimizes the place of the actual baptism and emphasizes the consequences of Jesus' prayer in the events that follow (3:21)" (*Luke* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995], 54). However, as argued here, Luke's redaction of Jesus' baptism does not originate so much from an effort to subordinate the Baptist as it does from his effort to distinguish the roles and duties of each eschatological figure in Israel's restoration.

<sup>863</sup> Whereas John leaves the wilderness to go to the Jordan (3:2-3), Jesus departs from the Jordan to go into the wilderness (4:1).

<sup>864</sup> This encounter between Jesus and devil bears similarity with apocalyptic tours (of heaven and the earth) that occur in some early Jewish writings. But rather than a good heavenly agent serving as Jesus' tour guide, the messiah is transported by an evil heavenly figure. Cf. the angelic transportation of Enoch in the *Book of Watchers* (1 Enoch 17-36) and the *Astronomical Apocalypse* (1 Enoch 72-82), where he is guided by various angels and shown various secrets related to the cosmos. In early Jewish revelations or tours such as these serve a variety of purposes, such as providing authoritative (divine) approval for a particular figure, teaching or practice (e.g., calendar, eschatological time-table; rite of purity) or disapproval. Only the most righteous are privileged to ascend or made privy to the cosmological secrets. Thus in this account Jesus is initially led (ἄγω) into the wilderness by (a) holy Spirit (4:1), but then turned over to the Devil who "tests" him and, twice, transports Jesus, finally concluding in Jerusalem. Similarly in 2 *Baruch* (Syriac), it is the Spirit which transports Baruch to the



The meeting between Jesus and the Devil also underscores the heavenly status of Jesus and the cosmic dimension of his work on Israel's behalf. As noted above, Jesus himself is not only clearly identified as an ancestor and liberator of Israel in Luke-Acts (e.g., Luke 1:32-34), but is also depicted to be the offspring of God himself (Luke 1:34-35). In Luke 1-2 (and elsewhere in Luke-Acts), the author shows himself to be reliant upon early Jewish ideas of the Davidic messiah in his characterization of Jesus.<sup>865</sup> But Luke also improvises the concept of this figure, by assigning the messianic office of Jesus a heavenly pedigree that exceeds all other Jewish sources.<sup>866</sup> Prior to the encounter with the Devil, Luke continues to present Jesus as God's anointed representative of Israel. Thus, while Jesus undergoes his baptism in solidarity with repentant Israel,<sup>867</sup> he is distinguished (from other Jews) by God's declaration that he is none other than

---

"wall of Jerusalem" (6.3). Of course, Jesus' post-resurrection ascension is given prime status by Luke (e.g., Acts 1:9-10). Cf. Acts 8:26; 13:2; and 16:7, where the Spirit transports various men to certain places by the Holy Spirit. On apocalyptic tours, see Martha Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

<sup>865</sup> For more on Jesus as Davidic messiah, see below as well.

<sup>866</sup> Luke's emphasis on the heavenly status of Jesus, leading up to his wilderness encounter with the Devil, and in their encounter, does not preclude the author's concomitant effort to demonstrate Jesus' relationship with Israel and her ancestry as well. As the previous discussion of Luke 1-2 has already explored, and the present discussion continues to emphasize, Jesus is Israel's (i.e., a Davidic) messiah, a figure who is inherently invested with nationalistic meaning in EJL. Moreover, as we also noted in the discussion of the Davidic messiah in EJL (Chapter Three), the figure may even be referred to as a son of God. The title "son of God" carries Davidic associations as well (Luke 1:32). Cf. Luke 20:41-44 where the author brings (the nature of) the messiah's sonship to David into question, implying that David would never refer to a (mere?) son as Lord. As the supernatural conception of Jesus underscore, David is not genetically related to Jesus as all, but is associated with his lineage nonetheless. Luke further emphasizes the supernatural aspects of the epithet by having God declare Jesus as "son" at his baptism, when the Holy Spirit "bodily" comes upon him. Likewise, in the Transfiguration (Luke 9:28-36), Jesus' glory is emphasized along with his sonship to God (9:31, 32, 35). Luke's climatic conclusion to Jesus' heavenly status occurs after the death and resurrection, when Jesus ascends to heaven and takes a throne alongside God (see below). In describing Jesus' ascension into heaven, Luke goes one step further than either Mark or Matthew. While OT texts such as 2 Sam 2:14 provides the biblical basis for the idea of the Davidic heir being called a son of God, the title itself is found sparingly in EJL (e.g., 4 Ezra 7:28; 13:32 ["my son"; 12:31]; 4Q174 frags. 1-3, i.10-13; cf. 4Q246 col. ii.1, where the identity of the son of God figure is debated.). Moreover, in the Greco-Roman period, Gentile rulers (i.e., Roman emperors) might claim for themselves divine status. Luke's presentation of Jesus being actually conceived by God—with no real earthly father—and dueling with the Devil (who engages Jesus as son of God) is a considerable step beyond sonship status of Davidic messiahs in EJL. One other account that possibly rivals the messiah of Luke-Acts is the exalted Davidic figure of the *Similitudes of Enoch*.

<sup>867</sup> Luke 3:21.

(literally) God's son (Luke 3:21-22). Only at this point, immediately after the baptism and God's proclamation of Jesus as his son, does Luke provide Jesus' genealogy.<sup>868</sup> The genealogy of Jesus highlights the messiah's important Israelite ancestry, but concludes with one final emphasis on his heavenly status.<sup>869</sup> Luke concludes the genealogy with Adam, an ancestor who shares with Jesus the exclusive privilege of being a "son of God" as well. Luke's emphasis on Jesus' divine origins continues to be stressed in the encounter with the Devil, an evil heavenly figure in his own right, who challenges Jesus' identity as "son of God" in two of the three tests.<sup>870</sup>

Luke's claims of Jesus' heavenly status, as actually being conceived by God, rivals or exceeds that claimed of heavenly agents or angels in EJL. As already noted, heavenly figures commonly play an important role in Israel's hopes of restoration. In early Jewish sources, Israel's conflict with the nations is often mirrored in the heavens,

---

<sup>868</sup> Unlike Matthew who places Jesus' genealogy at the beginning of his narrative and prior to the birth of Jesus (1:1-17), Luke inserts the genealogy of Jesus after his baptism. While the Spirit is involved in the conception of Jesus, the baptism itself is portrayed almost as another birthing story as such that underscore Jesus' divine status. The Spirit comes upon Jesus "in bodily form," and God declares to him that he is his "son in whom [he] is well pleased" (3:22). Furthermore, whereas Matthew highlights Jesus' ancestral origins in David and Abraham, Luke refers to these figures as well, but traces Jesus' ancestry all the way back to Adam. Luke's interest in going back to Adam is not so much for the universal implications (i.e., the mission to the nations) of the first human, but rather Adam's quasi-supernatural status as well. That is, like Jesus, Adam also had no earthly father, only God himself. The association with Adam may inform Luke's telling of the Devil's temptation of Jesus, an episode that could resonate with Adam's own temptation by the serpent in Paradise (cf. Luke 23:43).

<sup>869</sup> Nowhere, however, is a heavenly agent clearly referred to as messiah. The angelic figure of 11Q13 may be an exception, but the fragmented condition of the key lines may that determination questionable; cf. 4Q521 as well (Collins, *Apocalypticism*, 72). The *Similitudes of Enoch* refers to an exalted figure by various names, including Son of Man, the Elect One, and messiah (e.g., *1 Enoch* 48:10). It is beyond the scope of the present chapter to explore the complex issues involved in the Luke's use of angelic categories in his presentation of Jesus as Israel's messiah of restoration. A number of studies have addressed the topic as part of a wider investigation into the angels, angelic categories, monotheism, and the worship of Jesus in antiquity. Some studies have focused particularly on Luke-Acts; for instance, see Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*. The latter study, however, argues for much higher degree of fluidity between heaven and earth and angels and humans than the scholarly consensus has accepted. Fletcher-Louis unconvincingly concludes that there were no clear criteria accepted by Jews (and other peoples) to distinguish between angels and humans in the first century. See the more careful study of Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *Angel Veneration and Christology: A Study in Early Judaism and in the Christology of the Apocalypse of John* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1995).

<sup>870</sup> The first and third test begins with "If you are the Son of God..." (4:3, 9).

where divine beings have aligned themselves with various nations.<sup>871</sup> Israel's conflicts on earth are often shown to be the result of aggression between heavenly powers. In the case of Dan 10:20, Israel's angels are shown to be fighting the heavenly agent ("prince") of Persia, even while anticipating the next war with the angel over Greece.

Other sources in EJL, as noted in the analysis of the *War Scroll*,<sup>872</sup> portray the respective heavenly agents in more comprehensive terms than rather aligning them to particular nations. Heavenly powers, as we have noted, may be described dualistically as divine beings of good and evil or light and darkness.<sup>873</sup> Thus, an evil heavenly agent may be envisaged not only to represent the Gentiles, but sinful Jews as well. In such schemes, Israel's earthly enemies and crises have their ultimate origins in heaven. Therefore, their ultimate resolution is sought in heaven.

For instance, the *Community Rule* indicates that its members have been initiated into the Community during the "dominion of Belial"<sup>874</sup> (1QS col. i.16-20). Indeed, part of the argument of the writer is that the formation of his group serves as a turning point in the age of evil, the Community serving as a beachhead of righteousness against the onslaught of evil and sin.<sup>875</sup> The *Damascus Document* refers to the exilic

---

<sup>871</sup> E.g., Daniel 7-12 (esp. 12:1); *T. Dan* 5:4; 6:5-7.

<sup>872</sup> See Chapter Three.

<sup>873</sup> E.g., *11QMelchizedek*; 1QS iii.13-iv.26.

<sup>874</sup> For בלעל, see 1QS i.24; ii.19.

<sup>875</sup> In other early Jewish writings, particularly those who take the primordial (esp. Enochic and Noachic) period as their narrative settings, bad heavenly powers (e.g., the Watchers, Giants or named heavenly beings thereof) are associated with the origin of evil and/or the reason for the Flood, i.e., the first judgment. By implication and extension, these cosmic forces are understood to be the real source of Israel's problem in the contemporary scene behind the respective writing. Some of the early Jewish sources explicitly associate these heavenly beings with the ongoing presence of evil spirits in the world (*1 Enoch* 15:8-10; *Jub* 10:7-14). Michael E. Stone argues that the Community at Qumran accepts the conception of evil as articulated in such "primordial" documents as its own "axis of history" from which all else proceeds ("The Axis of History at Qumran," in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature 12-14 January, 1997* [Leiden: Brill, 1999], 133-49). Contra Collins, *Apocalypticism*, 35-51.

period of Israel's captivity as "the period of wrath" (i.6). But the evil epoch has been ruptured by the emergence of a righteous people (a true Israel) who departed "Babylon," inaugurating the first stage in Israel's restoration. In the interim period between the exodus from Babylon and its eventual re-gathering to the Land, the author refers to the ongoing attacks of Belial (col. iv.12-13) and his dominion over other Jews (cols. iv.15-18; xii.2). In the *War Scroll* and *4QCatena A*, Belial is said to be the oppressive power who oversees Israel's exile. Therefore, the defeat of Belial is a *de facto* guarantee of Israel's defeat over other human enemies (1QM iv.15-16). Likewise in the *Testament of Dan*, the writer envisages an offspring of Judah (and Levi) waging war again Belial (5:10).<sup>876</sup> The eventual victory over this cosmic agent is anticipated to result in Israel's restoration, its climax being the eradication of evil, the return of the captives, and a new Jerusalem (5:11-12).

The Devil, of course, is clearly a heavenly figure; he is portrayed in the strongest possible adversarial terms in Luke-Acts. In contrast to most early Jewish depictions of heavenly conflict as a kind of military combat, Jesus' confrontation with the Devil is characterized as a series of "tests." Strikingly, rather than engaging each other in a cosmic battle, the two heavenly beings engage one another in a war of words involving the interpretation of Scripture. More specifically, the tests of the Devil involve assumptions regarding the identity of Jesus as son of God and the words of Scripture regarding Jesus.<sup>877</sup> In contradistinction to the other Gospels, Jesus' first words as an adult<sup>878</sup> are not directed at John the Baptist, Israel or the Twelve, but the Devil.<sup>879</sup> On the

---

<sup>876</sup> Cf. the reference to Satan in *T. Dan* 5:6 who is referred to as the "prince" over the tribe of Dan. Satan is associated with all kinds of sins.

<sup>877</sup> Powery observes that Jesus' first words in the public phase of Jesus' ministry "in Luke's Gospel are words from scripture" (*Jesus Reads Scripture*, 200).

<sup>878</sup> Cf. Luke 3:49.

<sup>879</sup> Cf. Mark 1:14-15; Matt 3:15.

one hand, it appears each of the three tests takes place at three distinct locales: the wilderness, a heavenly perch from which to view the nations, and the pinnacle of the Temple in Jerusalem.<sup>880</sup> But as the point of entry for Jesus' conflict with the Devil, the wilderness is probably understood more comprehensively by Luke to envelope the world of nations and the nation of Israel as well, including the holy Temple. That is, Luke's version of Jesus' encounter with the Devil in the wilderness serves as an apocalyptic microcosm of Israel's exilic situation.<sup>881</sup>

Just as Jesus is shown, by Luke over the course of his narrative, to have primary significance for Israel, but to be meaningful for the world of nations as well, the Devil is shown to be a heavenly agent who serves as the evil heavenly counter part to both the nations and the sinful portion of Israel. Paul can describe his mission to the nations in terms of bringing the Gentiles "from darkness into light" and "from the *power of Satan* to God" (Acts 26:17-18). The comprehensive nature of the Devil's rule comes to its clearest expression, however, in this apocalyptic encounter with Jesus in the wilderness. The Devil presents himself to Jesus as the one who presides over "all the kingdoms of the world" (πάσας τὰς βασιλείας τῆς οἰκουμένης [Luke 4:5-7]). Luke has previously presented Rome as the earthly administrator and ruler over the οἰκουμένη (Luke 2:1; cf. 3:1) in the literary context of describing *Jesus'* birth. Therefore, Luke instills into the conflict between Jesus and the Devil strong political overtones. That is, Luke represents an intimate association between Rome/the nations and the Devil. Moreover, in a story concerned with the restoration of Israel, the Devil's offer of world domination, and Jesus' rejection of it, may contain an implicit critique of particular

---

<sup>880</sup> Fitzmyer, *Gospel According to Luke*: 1:507.

<sup>881</sup> Bovon, *Luke* 1.139. Bovon observes that Luke does this so as to emphasize "the salvation-historical significance" of Jesus rather than his "political authority," which would have been "awkward for Luke" (139).

ideas of restoration that involve nationalism and world domination. Although, Jesus rejects the “test,” or the means (i.e., worshipping the Devil) to the end (i.e., sovereignty over the world), he does not directly challenge the Devil’s claim to be the *de facto* ruler over the nations. Instead, Jesus addresses the Devil’s interpretation of Scripture and the means—worship of the Devil—to achieve that end.

Strikingly, Luke associates the Devil most intimately with Israel herself.<sup>882</sup> The Devil’s agents are shown to possess Jewish individuals and/or cause them illnesses.<sup>883</sup> It may be that these individual cases are meant as personal microcosms of a condition inflicting Israel as a whole.<sup>884</sup> Conversely, it may be that Luke uses demonic possessions as part of a wider effort to reduce Jesus’ role as a political messiah by simultaneously deflating Satan’s national or political associations as well. But Luke also employs the heavenly powers to underscore their associations with Israel’s religious leadership.<sup>885</sup> Strikingly, Luke indicates that the chief priests and the scribes, Israel’s ostensible religious leaders, aim to kill Israel’s messiah. More noteworthy, however, is what occurs after their conspiracy is made known. Immediately following Luke’s announcement of their plan to assassinate Jesus (Luke 22:2), the author describes Satan entering into Judas (22:3), one of the new eschatological leaders of Israel, who then seeks out the priests himself to negotiate the terms of the attack (22:4-

---

<sup>882</sup> Along with his healings, Jesus’ casting out demons is remembered in Peter’s testimony to Cornelius as definitive acts that Jesus performed in Israel, and demonstrated that Jesus was anointed with the Holy Spirit and that God was with him (Acts 10:38).

<sup>883</sup> E.g., Luke 4:33-35, 40-41; 8:26-39. While the Devil continues to be a presence in the narrative in Acts (e.g., 5:3), it is noteworthy that the community of Jesus’ followers never engage in exorcisms following their leader’s death, resurrection and ascension. Cf. Jesus’-empowerment of the Twelve to cast out demons in Luke 9:1.

<sup>884</sup> That is, their spiritual ailment (i.e., demonic possessions) may be symptomatic of their political state. Cf. the words of Jesus to Herod (Luke 13:32).

<sup>885</sup> That is, in some cases, the ones who are victimized by demons are not the real focus of Luke, but serve his larger program to undermine Israel’s religious leaders and their conflict with Jesus.

6). Thus, Satan is shown to be the heavenly counterpart of Israel's disqualified leaders making a fresh attack on one of the Twelve.

The association of the Satanic exilic wilderness with Israel forms the climax of the Devil's temptation of Jesus. Indeed, just as the wilderness is seen to include the nations, which are offered to Jesus, the wilderness is understood to encompass Jerusalem and the Temple itself, the site of the final test in Luke's version of wilderness conflict. In the last test, the Devil takes Jesus to the Temple itself and (ironically) challenges him to provoke angelic intervention on his behalf by tempting Jesus to kill himself (4:9-11). The successful refusal of Jesus to meet any of the Devil's demands finally results in the Devil's exit from Jesus' presence. As the narrative proceeds, however, Luke demonstrate how the hungry are to be fed; who is to worshipped and who rules the world;<sup>886</sup> and the kind of death that Jesus will die to provoke divine intervention (Luke 21:35-36; Acts 17:31).

Jesus' entry into the apocalyptic wilderness has demonstrated the complexity and severity of Israel's situation. After successfully enduring the "temptations" of Israel's exile,<sup>887</sup> Luke notes that Jesus "returned" in the "power of the Spirit to *Galilee*" (Luke 4:14). Therefore, Luke seems to indicate that Jesus' later pilgrimage to

---

<sup>886</sup> One other point relates as well to the kind of role that the Devil plays in Israel's exilic wilderness may be taken from Acts 13:6-12, a passage that once more evokes the language of Isaiah 40:3, which has been argued here to be programmatic for Luke's idea of exile and restoration. As in the wilderness conflict in Luke 4, this story from Acts also underscores Satan to be an evil counterpart of Jesus. In the Diaspora mission, Paul encounters a magician who attempts to impede the progress of his preaching. For Luke, this opposition constitutes the same kind of association that was made between those who conspired together with Satan to kill Jesus. In playing on the words of Isa 40:3, Paul denounces the magician in terms that once more underscore the affinity between the Devil and wilderness: "You son of the devil, you enemy of all righteousness, full of all deceit and villainy, will you not stop making crooked the straight paths of the Lord?" See Acts 13:10 (NRSV).

<sup>887</sup> The Devil is said to depart from Jesus ἄχρι καί ποῦ (4:13). He ("Satan") re-emerges during the Passion "to enter" Judas (22:3) and to afflict Peter (22:31). Luke uses both "Devil" (Acts 10:38) and Satan (Luke 11:18; 13:16) to refer to the power (or being) behind sicknesses and demonic possessions. Paul refers to his mission as "turning the nations from "darkness to light" and "from the power of Satan to God" (Acts 26:18). Also see Luke 10:17-18, where following the return of "the seventy" and their report to Jesus that "even the demons submit to us in your name," Jesus remarks: "I saw Satan falling from heaven as lightning."

Jerusalem with the Twelve has already been preceded with a brief visit there, courtesy of the Devil's apocalyptic tour. Unlike Mark and Matthew, "Jesus' travels," at the outset of his ministry, do not begin in Galilee but, as Conzelmann observes, "in Jerusalem."<sup>888</sup> Indeed, the proleptic victory of Jesus over the Devil, and Jesus' return from the apocalyptic wilderness of Jerusalem makes a way for the later journey that the messiah will make with the Twelve before his death. In the next pilgrimage to Jerusalem (9:51-19:28), Jesus will again face the Devil, this time in a climatic encounter that will conclude with the temporary failure of the re-gathering of the Twelve (Luke 22:3).<sup>889</sup> More importantly, the Devil will conspire with one of the Twelve and Israel's religious leadership to kill the messiah in Jerusalem. However, as noted below, although the messiah will die, his righteous death will result in a chain of events that ironically will achieve the eschatological victory over the Devil and all Israel's earthly enemies. Rather than Jesus' death being his end, and the end of Israel's hopes for restoration, Luke describes the enthronement of Israel's messiah to a position above both Rome and Jerusalem (see below).

#### **4.4.6 Jesus' First Proclamation: The End of Israel's Exile (Luke 4:16-30)**

The preceding analysis of the exilic association of the wilderness receives its clearest confirmation in Jesus' sermon at Nazareth. After his triumphal return from the apocalyptic exile with the Devil, Jesus is described as full of the power of the Spirit. It is noteworthy that his first address to Israel announces the (proleptic) end of Israel's captivity (4:16-19 [27]):

---

<sup>888</sup> Conzelmann, *Theology*, 27.

<sup>889</sup> In that occasion, the Devil will not tempt Jesus into risking his life, but rather manipulate the authorities and one of the Twelve into killing him.



(Luke 4:18) The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty those who are oppressed, (19) to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord.<sup>890</sup>

In these words of Jesus, Luke's revision of Israel's restoration hopes begins to take on more specificity. Only in Luke does Jesus proclaim himself to be the messiah or anointed one at the outset of his public life. Moreover, he describes his messianic role and duties by appealing to Isaiah 61. His choice of *this exile-restoration text* from Isaiah provides the author with a conceptual frame to elucidate an important dimension of Jesus' restoration of Israel that takes into account his work of proclamation and healing.<sup>891</sup> Essential to ending Israel's captivity will be Jesus' proclamation and activities on behalf of the oppressed in which Jesus redefines who among Israel will be given priority in the return from exile.<sup>892</sup> Indeed, the bulk of Jesus' work is devoted to helping those in need and challenging the religious establishment's conception and practice of certain aspects of Judaism, i.e., the concept of righteous and purity as well as eschatological beliefs. Not only does Jesus' quotation of Isaiah 61 end precisely at the point where God's vengeance on the nations is mentioned,<sup>893</sup> but the subsequent remarks of Jesus indicate that God (and his prophets) have never been absolutely

---

<sup>890</sup> Is this a criticism of the Land itself and the framework exilic theology or a particular theology which restricts God only to the Land and to one segment of the Jewish people? A similar point seems to be made in the sermon by Stephen in Acts that takes to task the notion that God is restricted to the Temple, at best, or has never dwelt there, at worst. See below.

<sup>891</sup> The programmatic force of this sermon is acknowledged by many scholars. For instance, see Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 60-82; 103-04; Green, *Theology of the Gospel of Luke*, 76-84; Christopher J. Schrenk, "The Nazareth Pericope: Luke 4:16-30 in Recent Study," in F. Neirynck (ed.), *L'Evangile de Luc: The Gospel of Luke* (BETL 32; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 399.

<sup>892</sup> For Luke's Jubilean theology and his exegetical strategy in Luke 4, see James A. Sanders, "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4," in Evans and Sanders (eds.), *Luke and Scripture*, 46-83.

<sup>893</sup> While arguments from silence are often tenuous, the fact that Luke follows the quotation of Isaiah 61 by pressing the point that Elijah and Elisha both ministered to Gentiles even when there were Jews in need suggest the omission may have indeed been intentional.

restricted to the Land and Jewish people.<sup>894</sup> Luke does not mean that God's promises of restoration have shifted to the Gentiles; instead, Luke seems to indicate that Israel's restoration does not by definition entail the destruction of the nations. On the contrary, they may be shown favor as well.

But the proper interpretation of Luke 4 and this passage from Isaiah must also take into account the initial triumph that Jesus has scored over his apocalyptic foe and the theme of the wilderness as an exilic concept. In *11QMelchizedek* (11Q13), the author also gives priority to Isaiah 61 (and other OT passages) in envisioning Israel's release from exile and her apocalyptic restoration.<sup>895</sup> In 11Q13, Israel's restoration is portrayed as resting on the outcome of a cosmic triumph of Melchizedek, Israel's heavenly agent, over Belial, the evil heavenly agent over the nations and sinful Jews. This victory will unleash Israel from her cosmic captivity and result in her restoration to the Land.

In Acts, Luke will elucidate the messiah's more comprehensive cosmic triumph in the climatic exaltation of Jesus, but in his address at Nazareth, an important initial victory over the Devil in the apocalyptic wilderness is reported and its implications anticipated. Moreover, the Isaianic text provides the proper hermeneutical frame from which to view the restorative activities of preaching, healing, and exorcisms that Jesus will perform prior to his death and dramatic resurrection and ascension. Indeed, even the resurrection is brought into the spectrum of messianic events in a later reference to Isaiah 61.

---

<sup>894</sup> The emphasis on the return from exile is underscored in this quotation of Isaiah 61:1-2 by including a line as well from Isaiah 58:6, that pertains to the "liberty of the oppressed" a second text related to exilic theology. Craig A. Evans argues that Jesus' reading from Isaiah is met with favor until the sermon on Elijah and Elisha's ministry among the nations ("The Function of the Elijah/Elisha Narratives in Luke's Ethic of Election," in Evans and Sanders [eds.], *Luke and Scripture*, 70-83).

<sup>895</sup> Following Adam S. van der Woude, James A. Sanders argues that Isaiah 61 function as the base text around which other OT citations are collected and interpreted ("From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4, in Evans and Sanders (eds.), *Luke and Scripture*, 55-57.

The importance of Isaiah in shaping Luke's theology of restoration is affirmed later (chap. 7), where once more the author alludes to Isaiah 61.<sup>896</sup> In this instance, however, Luke adds the resurrection of the dead to the list of activities which Jesus is performing.<sup>897</sup> That Jesus' activities, however, were not necessarily associated with some people's ideas of restoration and the messiah might be inferred from the question of John the Baptist (Luke 7:18-23). Luke uses this question from John's disciples to address (present and potential) criticism of Jesus' identity and activities, as they relate to Israel's restoration. Jesus responds to the messengers from John by grounding his identity and actions in Isaiah 61.<sup>898</sup> In Luke 7 he does not mention the end of the exile. Instead, Jesus responds to the question of 'whether he is the one?' by referring to his healings of the blind, the lame, the lepers, and the deaf, the preaching to the poor, *and the raising of the dead*. The resurrection of Jesus from the dead later in the narrative underscores, in particular, its importance for Luke's reinterpretation of Israel's exilic model of restoration. Not only does his resurrection and ascension provide the basis for Jesus' messianic exaltation and pouring of the Spirit upon the Twelve and other others (see below), but the resurrection of the people is sometime spoken of in terms analogous to language normally reserved for Israel's redemption or restoration in Luke-

---

<sup>896</sup> Cf. Luke 4:18-19; 7:18-23;

<sup>897</sup> As other scholars have noted, the resurrection of the dead is not mentioned in Isaiah 61. Strikingly, a text from Qumran, 4Q521, whose first lines refers to a "messiah," also refers to Isaiah 61, and, includes among, the messianic (or God's) works, the resurrection of the dead as well. Joseph Fitzmyer, "Jewish Christianity in Acts in Light of the Qumran Scrolls," in Keck and Martyn (eds.), *Studies in Luke-Acts*, 233-57; J. Tabor and M. O. Wise, "4Q521 'On Resurrection,' and the Synoptic Gospel Tradition," *JSP* 10 (1992), 149-62; David Flusser, "The Magnificat, the Benedictus, and the War Scroll," in *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988), 12649; Timothy H. Lim, "11QMelch, Luke 4 and the Dying Messiah," *JJS* 43 (1992), 90-92; George J. Brooke, "Luke-Acts and the Qumran Scroll: The Case of 4QMMT," in Christopher M. Tuckett (ed.), *Luke's Literary Achievement: Collected Essays* (JSNTSS 116; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 72-90. Willem-Jan de Wit, *Expectations and the Expected One: 4Q521 and the Light it Sheds on the New Testament* (Doctoraalscriptie, Universiteit Utrecht, 2000).

<sup>898</sup> Luke 4:16-19; Isa 61:1-2; 58:6. Both references to the Isaianic passage follow the questioning of Jesus' identity. As we have noted, Jesus' citation of Isaiah 61 at Nazareth, after the meeting with the Devil who questions the messiah's divine identity (Luke 4:16-19). The second reference to Isaiah 61 also occurs in response to questions regarding Jesus' identity, this time by John the Baptist (Luke 7:17-23).

Acts. Thus, Paul claims he is on trial for *the hope of "the twelve tribes" for their resurrection* (e.g., Acts 26:6-7).

#### **4.5 The Inauguration of Israel's Re-gathering in the Twelve Apostles (Luke 6:12-16)**

Whereas some passages, especially within Luke 1-2,<sup>899</sup> appear to anticipate all Israel's restoration without qualification, the analysis thus far has indicated that in Luke's interpretation, the future restoration does not in fact belong to all, but only to those Jews who meet the appropriate qualifications (i.e., submission to John's baptism, acceptance of Jesus as messiah, obedience to his socio-ethical program of instruction, and, as we argue below, reception of the eschatological outpouring of the holy Spirit.) Although the redefinition and culling of Israel might therefore suggest that the re-gathering has been underway since the period of John,<sup>900</sup> Luke describes the formal inauguration of the eschatological return in Jesus' selection of the Twelve:

And it happened in those days that he (Jesus) went out to the mountain to pray. And he passed the night in prayer to God. And when day came he called out to his disciples, he chose from them twelve whom he named apostles (Luke 6:12-13).

Luke not only affirms the importance of the twelve disciples, which he inherits from Mark and the wider Christian tradition, but develops their role within the exilic model of restoration. Jesus' selection of the Twelve is best interpreted in light of other early Jewish claims that Israel's exile did not end in the 6<sup>th</sup> century, but continues unto the present. While Jesus has proclaimed the end of Israel's exile at Nazareth (Luke 4), in

---

<sup>899</sup> See Luke 1:54-55; 67-79; 2:29-32; cf., however, Luke 1:16; and esp. 1:34-35 where limitations are already implied.

<sup>900</sup> As noted, being an Israelite itself does not suffice. John says if that were the case, God could raise up sons of Abraham from stones (Luke 3:8-9). Those who do not repent are not counted within Israel and face the impending judgment of God (3:9). Cf. Acts 3:22-23.

the selection of the Twelve he formally initiates Israel's eschatological return by making use of the number 'twelve.' E. P. Sanders contends:

[I]t is necessarily true that the expectation of the reassembly of Israel was so widespread, and the memory of the twelve tribes so acute, that 'twelve' would necessarily mean 'restoration.'<sup>901</sup>

Therefore, Luke is not describing a new institution in the life of the people of Israel, but the eschatological climax of an ancient hope. As Gerhard Lohfink observes in his monograph, *Die Sammlung Israels*, Luke's use and interpretation of the Twelve is the clearest indication that the author is *not* describing the formation of *the Church* (i.e., a new institution), but rather the restoration of *Israel*.<sup>902</sup>

In distinction to either Mark<sup>903</sup> or Matthew,<sup>904</sup> Luke's primary interpretative frame for understanding the Twelve is the exilic model of restoration. The selection of

---

<sup>901</sup> Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 98.

<sup>902</sup> An often undervalued study of the restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts is Gerhard Lohfink's *Die Sammlung Israels: Eine Untersuchung zur lukanischen Ekklesiologie* (München: Kösel-Verlag, 1975). While the present thesis confirms several of Lohfink's conclusions, he incorrectly determines that it is the disciples in Luke-Acts, not the Twelve, that are ultimately important for Luke's understanding of Israel's eschatological re-gathering. Lohfink understands the Twelve to represent leadership of the true Israel, while the disciples are the "Kern des wahren Israels" (*Sammlung Israels*, 94; also see 63-83). Our analysis finds it is the Twelve that function as *the core and the leadership* of the re-gathered people of God. Their appointment as Israel's new leaders occurs in Luke 22:28-30. Elsewhere, Lohfink argues: "On the whole, the institution of the Twelve is one of the clearest points of reference for Jesus' determined turning toward Israel. Jesus tried to gather the people of God; he sought the restoration of the lost and scattered Israel" (*Jesus and Community: The Social Dimensions of Christian Faith* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984], 11).

<sup>903</sup> In Mark, Luke finds his primary source for the formation of the Twelve (3:13-19). In Mark's account, Jesus "made" (ποιέω) the Twelve out of larger group (3:14). But in Mark the formation of the Twelve is followed by two ἵνα clauses of purpose which indicate that the group was formed "so that they might be with him and that he might send to preach and to have authority to cast out demons" (3:13-15). Thus while it is clear enough from these verses that the Twelve were made for the expressed purpose of being sent (ἀποστέλλω) to do the very things Jesus is doing, it is less clear what the writer means by the phrase "so that they might be with him." The literary context of the passage suggests the Twelve are defined primarily against the crowd (ὄχλος) or multitude (πλῆθος) that is following him. The verses (3:7-12) that immediately precede the selection of the Twelve indicate Jesus' popularity in Galilee has resulted in a "great multitude" (3:7) "crushing in on him" (3:9). Jesus' fame is the result of his healings and exorcisms (3:12). In the verses that immediately follow the choosing of the Twelve (3:19b-35), Jesus returns home. But Mark once more stresses the great crowds that followed him there as well (3:20). He also indicates the presence of opposition from scribes who argue his exorcisms of demons are done by the authority of other demonic powers. His own family demonstrates concern for his sanity, prompting Jesus to redefine family in terms of those who do the "will of God" (3:35). Therefore, in Mark the Twelve are formed explicitly to assist Jesus with the crowds of people; that is, they are for him assistants or protégés whom he "might send to proclaim and to have authority," and especially "to cast out of demons." But the

the Twelve is initiated by Jesus (Luke 6:12-13), whom Luke presents, as we have shown, as a (heavenly) Davidic Messiah. The hope for Israel's reunion in the *twelve tribes* is one variation of the re-gathering motif that has been explored in the treatment of EYL. Luke's use of the motif of the twelve tribes in identifying the twelve Apostles<sup>905</sup> corresponds with those early Jewish texts that foretell Israel's eschatological re-gathering in terms of her ancient, tribal identity. The formation of the twelve Apostles in Luke is immediately preceded by Jesus' going to a mountain to pray (6:12).<sup>906</sup> Before important events, Luke often depicts Jesus in prayer.<sup>907</sup> Therefore, Luke indicates that the decision of Jesus to reassemble Israel *originated from God*.<sup>908</sup> The author indicates that the Twelve were selected from a larger group of disciples (μαθητῆς) (6:12-13).<sup>909</sup> Unlike the interpretation of the motif of twelve tribes in some early Jewish texts, where

---

author also implicitly suggests that the phrase "so that they might be with him" is to be understood also in context of the pressing crowds, opposition, and doubting family. From the masses of people, Jesus creates a smaller group of association, a replacement family of sorts (3:31-5), the Twelve. (Cf. Mark 5:18 where the demon-possessed man of the Gerasenes requests "to be with him [Jesus]," the only other occurrence of this phrase in Mark). Jesus prohibits the man from "being with him," perhaps indicating the unique privilege of the Twelve in Mark.) Ultimately, however, at the climax of Mark's Gospel, even the Twelve flee from Jesus, suggesting that even the ones "made" to be with him left the messiah at the definitive hour.

<sup>904</sup> In Matthew, Jesus simply calls out "his Twelve disciples" and provides them with the authority to cast out evil spirits and to heal (Matt 10:1-4). That is, Matthew does not really emphasize the *formation* of the group per se. Instead, the Twelve carry an instrumental function in Matthew. The literary context of the calling of the Twelve suggests that the group is to be understood in view of the great need of Israel and the lack of fellow workers. Preceding the calling of the Twelve, Matthew refers to Jesus' ministry to the cities and crowds, but in distinction to Mark, emphasizes his compassion on the crowd's great need and helplessness. Just before Jesus chooses the Twelve to deliver and heal, he requests that the disciples pray for more workers. Following the selection of the Twelve, Matthew notes that the Twelve are the ones Jesus "sent out" to proclaim and to heal (10:5-15), although no report of their sending is actually provided (cf. Luke 9). Matthew is especially concerned to stress that the mission and duties of the Twelve are to "the lost house of Israel" (10:6). In fact, before telling them where to go he restricts where they are *not* to travel, neither to the Gentiles or Samaritans (10:5). Ultimately, because they have forsaken everything, the Twelve are told they will sit upon the twelve thrones over Israel in the new world or new creation (see Luke 22:28-30 [below]).

<sup>905</sup> E.g., Luke 22:28-30. The nature of this relationship is elucidated below.

<sup>906</sup> In Mark 3:13, Jesus goes to the mountain, but does not pray.

<sup>907</sup> E.g., Luke 3:21; 6:12; 9:28; 11:1.

<sup>908</sup> In Acts 10:41 Peter refers to the limited appearances of Jesus to those who were "chosen by God..." (προκεχειροτονημένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ), which would include the Twelve.

<sup>909</sup> Cf. Mark's account (3:13), where it might be understood that Jesus chose the Twelve from a selected people ("those whom he wanted") of the crowd that flocked about him.

the number is used to describe the return of the Diaspora to those in the Land (e.g., 2 *Baruch*) or the reunion of the ten 'lost' tribes with the two in the Land (e.g., 4 *Ezra*),<sup>910</sup> Luke interprets the motif in association with twelve core followers of Jesus who are *already within the borders of the land of Israel*.<sup>911</sup> The inauguration of Israel's return is presented as an *inter- or intra-Jewish event*. Jesus gathers a group of Jews from the wider Jewish community of Palestine to form, as Andrew Clark remarks, "[t]he nucleus of a restored Israel."<sup>912</sup>

Where Mark and Matthew justify the creation of the Twelve for instrumental purposes (i.e., to carry out certain duties), Luke provides no explicit, initial rationale for the Twelve at the time of their selection. Their formation connotes a more absolute value for Luke; God has authorized the new assembly of Israel through the messiah. According to Luke, Jesus named them "Apostles." While this designation is rare in Mark (6:30) and Matthew (10:2), it is a Lukan favorite<sup>913</sup> and is used by the author, with only two exceptions,<sup>914</sup> for the Twelve. For Luke, their being "sent ones" is not the primary point, for the Twelve are rarely "sent" or venture outside the Land.<sup>915</sup> That is, for Luke, "Apostle" is a technical term associated with the authoritative status of the

---

<sup>910</sup> For texts that explicitly refer to the reunion of the twelve tribes, see, e.g., 4 *Ezra* 13:12-13, 39-50; cf. 2 *Bar* 30:19; 78:1-7. For the return of simply the "tribes" (with the number 'twelve' or otherwise, unspecified), see, e.g., Sir 36:13; 48:10; *Pss. Sol.* 17.

<sup>911</sup> The implications of the Twelve, the fullness of Israel, being selected from within the Land has important implications then for Luke view of the Diaspora later in Acts. See the discussion below.

<sup>912</sup> Andrew C. Clark, "The Role of the Apostles," in I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson (eds.), *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 173 (169-90).

<sup>913</sup> It occurs six times in Luke (6:13; 9:10; 11:49; 17:75; 22:14; 24:10) and twenty-eight times in Acts (1:2; 1:26; 2:37; 2:42, 43; 4:33, 35, 36, 37; 5:2, 12, 18, 29, 40; 6:6; 8:1, 14, 18; 9:27; 11:1; 14:4, 14; 15:2, 4, 6, 22, 23; 16:4).

<sup>914</sup> Cf. Acts 14:4, 14.

<sup>915</sup> See Luke 9:1-6, 10-11; cf. Luke 24:47-48 and Acts 1:8. No form of the word "send" occurs. Instead, their role as "witnesses" is emphasized.

Twelve, who constitute the original nucleus and leadership of the eschatological Israel.<sup>916</sup>

The wider literary context contributes to understanding Luke's conception of the Twelve and their relationship to the re-gathering of Israel. Just prior to their selection, Luke emphasizes Jesus' growing conflict with Israel, especially with portions of the Jewish leadership. As already noted, in Jesus' first proclamation to Israel, he is rejected by the people of Nazareth, and they try to kill him *at the outset* of messianic restoration (4:29). In Luke 5, Jesus encounters more hostilities. Following his healing of a paralyzed man and his forgiveness of the man's sins (5:17-20), he is accused of blasphemy by the scribes and Pharisees (5:21). Afterwards (5:29-32), he is criticized by the Pharisees for eating and drinking with sinners and tax-collectors (5:30), one of the very groups from whom Jesus had just chosen a disciple (5:27-8). Lastly, just before Jesus selects the Twelve, the Pharisees accuse Jesus, in two successive instances (6:1-5; 6:6-11) of breaking the Sabbath. This final incident is a decisive turning point. Luke indicates that the scribes and Pharisees are there "to find an accusation against him" (6:7 [NRSV]). Preceding his healing of a man's withered hand, Jesus offers a strong rebuke of those Jewish leaders (6:9), and then heals the man (6:10). This healing precipitates the opponents' plotting of "what to do" with Jesus (6:11).<sup>917</sup> Luke describes the healing of the man's withered hand in language (ἀποκαθίστημι) used elsewhere

---

<sup>916</sup> Lohfink, *Sammlung Israels*; Jacob Jervell, *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972), 75-112. In this section, he provides a brief survey of the interpretation(s) of the twelve apostles through the late 1960s. Jervell's coverage of secondary literature emphasizes those interpreters who disconnected the Twelve from Israel or understood the Apostles' relationship to Israel in Luke-Acts as a relic of the Church's Jewish origins, and thus no longer important in Luke's time.

<sup>917</sup> Luke softens Mark's version which indicates that the healing was a catalyst for their (the Pharisees and the Herodians') plot to "destroy" (ἀπολλύμι) him (3:6).



only of Israel's restoration (Acts 1:6; cf. Acts 3:21 [ἀποκατάστασις]).<sup>918</sup> In the face of Israel's divided response, and open hostility from the religious leaders, it may be that Luke describes the "restoration" of the hand (6:1-11) to symbolize the formal beginning of Israel's restoration that is inaugurated in the re-gathering of the Twelve (6:12-16).

Therefore, rather than portraying the selection of the Twelve as instrumental to (Jesus') activities or sending,<sup>919</sup> Luke seems to aim at something more absolute in their identity. In a context in which Jesus encounters mounting opposition from *within the Jewish community regarding his identity and religious practices*, Jesus is authorized by God to initiate the re-gathering of Israel.<sup>920</sup> Luke underscores this point by following the

---

<sup>918</sup> Both Mark and Matthew also use this verb (ἀποκαθίστημι; ἀποκαθιστάνω) to describe the healing of the man's hand (Mark 3:5; Matt 12:13). Although Luke appears to be following the Markan account, in Matthew it is striking that the miracle precedes a quotation from Isaiah which emphasizes the Messiah's ("servant's") proclamation of hope to the Gentiles (12:15-21). Mark uses the verb elsewhere to describe another healing of Jesus (8:25). Moreover, the word occurs in Mark and Matthew (Mark 9:12; 17:11) in texts describing expectations of Elijah. In Acts 1:6 the word is used in the Apostles' questions about when Jesus might "restore the kingdom to Israel." A nominal form (ἀποκατάστασις) is also used in Acts 3:21 of the restoration.

<sup>919</sup> Luke associates the Twelve explicitly with "sending" only in one instance (Luke 9:1-6, 10-11). In the sending of the Twelve, their authority to heal, deliver, and proclaim the kingdom of God is emphasized. Moreover, they are apparently sent *en masse* as the Twelve to "villages." Strikingly, Luke also refers to another group of seventy(-two) who go out as well (10:1-20). In his characterization of the seventy(-two), Luke indicates that they, unlike the Twelve, were formed for the expressed purpose of *being sent* to "every city and place" where (Jesus) "intended to go." While the Twelve are sent out as well, it is not the reason stated for their formation or departure. Unlike the Twelve, who appear to be sent out together, the seventy(-two) disciples are sent out *by pairs*. Nonetheless, they seem to have greater success than the Twelve; it is to the seventy(-two) that Jesus announces his vision of Satan's fall (10:18). They are rewarded with "authority" on their return. Text critical evidence is divided for either reading seventy or seventy-two disciples (Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition* (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1975), 150-51). The editor refers to the popularity of the number seventy in the Old Testament and relatively scarcity of references to seventy-two. If seventy-two disciples is original, the most likely explanation seems to be that it is also based on the Twelve (6x12), as perhaps the 120 followers (12x10) are in Acts 2. Although the *Letter of Aristeas* does not refer to Israel's restoration, the document refers to the existence of members of the twelve tribes residing in Jerusalem (*LetAris* 39-40, 47-51). From these twelve tribes, six members of each tribes are chosen to participate in the translation of the Hebrew Bible into Greek. While on their "translation mission," they impress the king with their wisdom. (It is interesting to note that in Josephus' version of this story, he also alternates between referring to seventy and seventy-two translators). Moreover, both numbers are found in EJL as representing the numbering of the nations in Jewish thought. In Genesis 10 (MT), seventy nations are apparently named; however, two additional nations are named in the LXX version (i.e., seventy-two) of this biblical text. See Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 150.

<sup>920</sup> As James Dunn notes: "[T]he twelve were seen as the focal point of the reconstituted people of Israel, representative of the re-gathered twelve tribes" (*The Partings of the Way: Between Christianity*

assembly of the Twelve with Jesus' first and longest speech to the new community in his Sermon on the Plain (6:17-7:1).

#### 4.5.1 The Messiah's Characterization of the Kingdom (Luke 6:17-7:1)

Jesus offers his conception of the eschatological Israel to both the gathering people and the Jewish masses in Luke 6:20-49.<sup>921</sup> Before Jesus delivers his most prominent speech and teaching to Israel, the messiah first initiates Israel's re-gathering on the mountain.<sup>922</sup> Afterwards, the messiah descends from the mountain *with the Twelve*. Jesus then delivers his keynote address to the Twelve (6:17), the disciples (6:17, 20) and the people<sup>923</sup> (6:17; 7:1).<sup>924</sup> In Luke's re-composition of Jesus' constitutional speech, he ensures the presence of Israel's core constituency (the Twelve) among the disciples, but indicates, by noting the presence of the other groups, that

---

*and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity* [London: SCM, 1996], 115). Dunn observes this regarding the tradition as preserved in Q, but seems to confirm it for Luke as well.

<sup>921</sup> For detailed discussions of the sermon as it appears in Matthew and Luke, respectively, see W. D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (BJS 186; Atlanta: Scholars, 1989); Hans Dieter Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Mount, including the Sermon on the Plain (Matthew 5:3-7:27 and Luke 6:20-49)* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995).

<sup>922</sup> Matthew also emphasizes the importance of these words (5:1-7:29) by constructing it as the first speech of Jesus (cf. Luke 4); it is directed, however, only toward the disciples whom are taken up to the mountain *away* from the crowds (Matt 5:1; cf. Matt 8:1). In Matthew, Jesus has not yet formed the Twelve.

<sup>923</sup> As N. A. Dahl writes: "In the Lukan writings Ἰσραήλ remains the name of Israelite people, and ἔθνη means always non-Israelites and never non-Christian Gentiles only. With the two exceptions Acts xv.14 and xiii.10 the word λαός is in use limited to Israel" ("A People for His Name," *NTS* 4 [1957-1958], 324). The primary issue lies on how much weight to assign these two exceptions.

<sup>924</sup> Although Luke designates three distinct groups as being present, he is not proposing a formal organizational plan for the renewed community, as proffered in such documents as 1QS. Although the Twelve are indeed (later) appointed to lead Israel in Luke 22:28-30, Luke's main point here in this passage is to provide concrete evidence for the Twelve's formation just prior to Jesus' most sustained instruction and explanation of the kingdom of God.

Israel's restoration is not intended for an isolated, esoteric group. The restoration is open to all the people of Israel.<sup>925</sup>

The instructions to Israel begin with the topic of the kingdom of God. Although the kingdom of Israel and kingdom of God are not the same for Luke, he indicates that they cannot be too easily separated. For Luke, the "dissociation of 'the reign of God' and its proclamation from 'the restoration of Israel' is *a priori* implausible."<sup>926</sup> The relationship of the kingdom of God to Israel's restoration is elucidated in this speech. The first item (and the second)<sup>927</sup> (6:20-21) addressed by Jesus may recall the conflict with the Devil in his apocalyptic exile (4:1-13): "Blessed are the poor"<sup>928</sup> for yours is the kingdom of God" (6:20). If an allusion to the exilic temptation is meant, Luke clarifies who the true appointer of kingdoms is: *Jesus (or God), not the Devil*. Furthermore, it is not the kingdom of the nations to be desired, but the kingdom of God. In these words (6:20-7:1), the kingdom of God is fused with ethical and socio-political content, with a special emphasis on the poor and powerless. Luke's concern for the underclass and activities of the people is not disconnected from eschatology.<sup>929</sup>

Jesus' teaching of the kingdom serves to critique the relationship between Jews and the various constituencies (i.e., esp. the religious establishment) within the Jewish community as well as Jewish perceptions of and relations with Rome. That is, the

---

<sup>925</sup> Presumably, the participation in this phase of Israel's re-gathering would require one had already repented and made preparation in the period of the Baptist (see above).

<sup>926</sup> Ben F. Meyer, *The Aims of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1979), 129-30. More recent scholars who have noted an interdependent relationship of the kingdom of God to the restoration of Israel in studies of the historical Jesus are Sanders ("Jesus and the Kingdom," 225-39) and N. T. Wright (*Jesus and the Victory*).

<sup>927</sup> The second "blessing" of Jesus relates to the feeding of the "hungry" (Luke 6:21; cf. 4:3-4; 9:12-17).

<sup>928</sup> The poor is sometimes used an epithet for Israel or Jewish communities within Israel (e.g., *Psalms of Solomon*).

<sup>929</sup> The social, religious and ethical instructions or requirements included in the Sermon on the Plain do not substitute for the kingdom, but identify the kingdom's character and quality as well stipulate the criteria for those of Israel who would participate in it.

initiation of Israel's re-gathering and his teaching on the kingdom, which Jesus has just commenced, is not meant to be interpreted by those there as an instigation of rebellion. Instead Jesus advises Israel: "Love your enemies (ἐχθρός) and do good to those who hate you" (6:27, 35).<sup>930</sup> As Borg comments:

It had an inescapable and identifiable political implication: the non-Jewish enemy was, above all, Rome. To say "Love your enemy" would have meant, "Love the Romans; do not join the resistance movement," whatever implications it might also have had.<sup>931</sup>

These words, however, must also be seen within the context of inter-Jewish conflicts and disputes, which dominate the surface of Luke's narrative, both in the Gospel, but in Acts as well.<sup>932</sup> As we have underscored in the treatment of the tradition of restoration in Early Judaism (Chapters 2 and 3), inter-Jewish polemics often play a key role in Jewish eschatology. Therefore, Luke is capable of referring to all people, whether Jewish or Roman, who oppose the kingdom as "enemies."<sup>933</sup>

Jesus' elaboration on the establishment of the kingdom of God without violence from the community may not be interpreted as suggesting that Israel must accept her enemies—whether Roman or Jewish—for all time, with no hope of change.<sup>934</sup> Luke may simply be delegating which activities are reserved for God (i.e., vindication) and which

---

<sup>930</sup> Several verses of this sermon could be understood as relating to relations with Rome or to other Jews (Luke 6:27-9, 32-3, 35-6).

<sup>931</sup> Marcus J. Borg, *Conflict, Holiness, and Politics in the Teaching of Jesus* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1998), 142.

<sup>932</sup> Certainly, the wider literary context of this passage has pointed to tensions within Israel between Jews regarding Jesus and his disciples, regarding Jewish or religious issues, i.e., socializing with sinners and violation of purity and Sabbath requirement (Luke 4:29-30; 5:17-6:1-11).

<sup>933</sup> Therefore Borg goes too far in claiming that "enemy" "must mean non-Israelite, not the personal enemy within Israel" (*Conflict, Holiness, and Politics*, 143). For even as Borg himself acknowledges elsewhere, some of Jesus' conflicts with Jewish rivals, such as his table-fellowship with tax-collectors, not only has implications for purity issues but for the tacit support of Rome (100).

<sup>934</sup> See Ernst Bammel, *Jesus and the Politics of his Day* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985); Marcus J. Borg, *Conflict and Holiness and Politics*. On non-eschatological issues important to Jesus and the Christian community, see Tom Holmén who among other issues discusses the importance of outcasts, purity, and Israel's relationship to enemies and neighbors (*Jesus and Jewish Thinking: Covenant Thinking* [Biblical Interpretation Series 55; Leiden: Brill, 2001]).

are Israel's (i.e., passivity and religious devotion). That is, Luke understands Rome's ultimate displacement to lie, not in Israel's hands, but in God's.<sup>935</sup> If Luke's words can be read this way, the author's theology of divine intervention resonates with those early Jewish authors who defer the judgment of Israel's enemies to God alone, not the people of Israel.<sup>936</sup> Until God chooses to intervene, Israel's responsibility is to: pay alms (Tobit); to study the Torah and observe the instructions of the Teacher of Righteousness (*Damascus Document*); submit to suffering and martyrdom (*T. Moses* 9-10); repent, submit to baptism, and swear allegiance to the messiah Jesus (Luke-Acts).<sup>937</sup> For Luke, the true members of Israel will submit to the messiah's ethical and religious code of conduct and receive the baptism of the Spirit, thus demonstrating in the present (in part) what is anticipated (in full) in the future.<sup>938</sup>

#### 4.5.2 The Pilgrimage toward Jerusalem (Luke 9:51-19:27)

After Luke indicates that Jesus has reassembled Israel in the selection of the Twelve, the author develops the heart of his narrative into a pilgrimage whose destination is Jerusalem. That is, Luke shapes the whole central section of his Gospel (9:51-19:27) as a *return of Jesus and the Twelve to Jerusalem*. As we have noted, in the study of EJJ, Jerusalem or the Temple often functions as a more specific goal of the return rather than simply the Land. Luke's composition of the central portion of the narrative into a pilgrimage-story underscores the goal and significance of the

---

<sup>935</sup> E.g., Luke 21:24, 27-28.

<sup>936</sup> As Luke clearly indicates in a number of texts, the Son of Man's return will entail a violent end for some.

<sup>937</sup> E.g., proclamation of the Jesus and the imminent kingdom of God; healing; casting out demons; surrender of property; caring for the poor and the underclass (Luke-Acts).

<sup>938</sup> Ultimately, however, these principles that Jesus teaches to Israel are not the full realization of the kingdom of God.

destination (i.e., Jerusalem), but also elevates the importance of the *process* of return in its own right.<sup>939</sup> For only those who complete the return—as Luke defines it—can count themselves among the re-gathered people of Israel.

It is noteworthy that just prior to the turn toward Jerusalem: the Twelve have demonstrate their capacity to operate in the power of their king (9:1-10); the Twelve affirm their recognition of Jesus as messiah (Luke 9:20); Jesus announces his impending death and betrayal (9:22, 43-45);<sup>940</sup> and Jesus provides an “apocalypse of his glory” to (three of) the Twelve (9:28-36) in which his exit from Jerusalem is brought to the fore. In this apocalypse, Jesus is intimately associated with important ancestral figures from Israel’s past, Moses and Elijah, an indication of Jesus’ importance, but also for Luke, an indication that the appearance of Jesus the messiah marks a special epoch of time as well, i.e., the eschatological period of Israel’s restoration.<sup>941</sup> Only in Luke is it mentioned that the three conversed about “his exodus,” which he was about to fulfill in Jerusalem (Luke 9:31). Therefore, *the return* of the Twelve will mark *the departure* of the messiah. Luke indicates the final countdown has begun (9:51). It is time for Jesus (and the Twelve) to go into Jerusalem.

As Jesus and the Twelve turn toward Jerusalem, Luke attempts to clarify his distinctive interpretation of Israel’s restoration. Luke clarifies that the arrival and assembly in Jerusalem, prior to the messiah’s death, was never meant to culminate in

---

<sup>939</sup> Therefore for Luke it cannot be said that he has constructed “an extended introduction to the Passion.” The earlier part of his narrative takes on new significance.

<sup>940</sup> In contrast to Mark (8:32-33) and Matthew (16:21-23), Peter’s messianic proclamation is allowed to stand unmolested; Peter is not subsequently rebuked as “Satan.”

<sup>941</sup> That is, Moses and Elijah embody the previous age of the Law and the Prophets (Luke 16:16), while Jesus marks the arrival of the Kingdom of God (cf. Luke 24:44). This scenario also serves to clarify that Jesus’ association with these figures does not mean he is to be identified as one of them.

the immediate appearance of God's kingdom (19:11).<sup>942</sup> Luke attempts to address expectations (or traditions) that the messiah's entrance into Jerusalem would precipitate the immediate restoration of Israel. Instead, Luke uses the eschatological pilgrimage to Jerusalem, as Frank Matera notes, to underscore the messiah's growing "conflict with Israel."<sup>943</sup> The restoration of Israel is still in view, but lies beyond the arrival into Jerusalem. Rather, Israel's restoration must await the messiah's arrival and enthronement *in heaven*. From there, the Spirit of restoration will fall on the Twelve, who will implement God's kingdom over the world.

#### 4.5.3 Israel's New Eschatological Rulers (Luke 22:14-30)

Immediately prior to the messiah and the Twelve's entrance into Jerusalem (19:28), Jesus strongly criticizes those within Israel that reject him, threatening them with future destruction (19:12-27; also 20:16). On the road into Jerusalem, Jesus is explicitly proclaimed "king,"<sup>944</sup> not by "the many" (Mark 11:8) or "the crowds" (Matt 21:9), but by ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν, i.e., the newly re-gathered ones of Israel (Luke 19:37). The reception of Jesus as king by the disciples stands in marked contrast to the reception he is given by the religious leadership (i.e., the Pharisees),<sup>945</sup>

---

<sup>942</sup> This comment occurs after the characterization of a tax-collector as a "Son of Abraham" (19:9) and immediately before a parable which emphasizes the new rulers' rise to power. The story anticipates Jesus' departure and the appointment of the Twelve to positions of power.

<sup>943</sup> Frank J. Matera, "Jesus' Journey to Jerusalem (Luke 9.51-19.46): A Conflict with Israel," *JSNT* 51 (1993), 57-77. At the heart of the conflict that Jesus has with Israel are the issues of "the kingdom of God, the need for repentance, the correct use of possessions, and ritual purity" (76).

<sup>944</sup> Both Mark and Matthew hint at Jesus' royal status, but are much more reticent about identifying Jesus in absolute terms as the king (cf. Mark 11:9-10; Matt 21:9).

<sup>945</sup> Following this scene (of final rejection), the Pharisees are not mentioned again in Luke's Gospel.

which rejects Jesus' royal status (19:37-39).<sup>946</sup> Moreover, the greater part of Jerusalem apparently rejects the messiah as well. Consequently, Jesus weeps over Jerusalem for not recognizing (*en bloc*) him as messiah. Rather than bringing God's salvation to this portion of Israel, the messiah pronounces judgment upon the city. Luke's readers will understand in this prediction of judgment the invasion of Rome and Jerusalem's destruction (19:41-44; 21:5-24, 25-36).<sup>947</sup>

While in Jerusalem, Jesus continues his assault on the different constituencies that comprise Israel's religious leadership, particularly the priesthood and scribes (20:1-19, 45-47). The nations, however, are portrayed as both adversaries as well as the instrument of God's judgment against the sinful portion of Israel and Jerusalem (21:12, 24). While in Jerusalem, even the core of the new Israel (i.e., the Twelve) undergoes a major crisis. One member of the Twelve is warned by Jesus that he will come under attack by Satan, but will survive (22:31). More seriously, Judas, another one of the Twelve, comes under the control of Satan, who "enters" (εἰσερχομαι) him. Strikingly, immediately after Satan enters Judas—one of the core members of the eschatological Israel—this Apostle joins with Israel's rejected leadership (e.g., chief priests) to conspire to kill the messiah (22:3-6).<sup>948</sup> Thus, the status of Israel's leadership,

---

<sup>946</sup> Only in Luke do the Pharisees caution Jesus to "rebuke" his "disciples" for their proclamation (Luke 19:39-40; cf. Matt 21:14-16).

<sup>947</sup> Horsley follows Tannehill in understanding Jerusalem's rejection of Jesus as Israel's "tragic" loss of restoration (Richard A. Horsley, "The Kingdom of God and the Renewal of Israel: Synoptic Gospels, Jesus Movements, and Apocalypticism," in John J. Collins (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism: Volume 1: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity* (New York: Continuum, 2000), 339-40 (303-44). By focusing on the motif of Israel's rejection, and by not taking Acts 1-3 into account, Horsley misunderstands Luke's handling of the tradition. While Tannehill considers the evidence from Acts, he too understands the rejection of Jesus and the Pauline mission as a tragic failure of Jesus' restoration program for Israel. Horsley suggests that it has passed on to the Gentiles.

<sup>948</sup> One of Luke's most dramatic and ironic twists in Israel's return to Jerusalem is the location of Jesus' death (Luke 23), or in Lukan terms, his departure. Although Luke understands Jesus' death as part of the plan of God (e.g., Acts 4:28) (John T. Squires, *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts* [SNTSMS 76; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993]), it does not prevent Luke from charging the Jewish leadership with Jesus' killing, a leitmotif in Acts. In contrast, Luke is much more lenient to the Romans



both old and new, occupies the primary focus of Luke in his description of the messiah's final days on earth in the city of Jerusalem.

Within this context of extreme hostility and demonic assault,<sup>949</sup> Luke shapes Jesus' final meal with the Twelve into a testamentary discourse. One of the key features of farewell addresses is the appointment and well-being of successors.<sup>950</sup> Therefore, in Jerusalem, the ancient seat of Israelite power and the expected capital of the eschatological kingdom, Jesus appoints the core membership of the newly re-gathered Israel as the eschatological "judges." Even while recognizing that one of the group will betray him (22:21-23), the messiah authorizes the Twelve to preside over the twelve tribes of Israel (22:28-30):

And you are the ones who have continued with me in my tests. And I "covenant" with you just as my Father "covenanted" with me, a kingdom, that you might eat and drink upon my table in my kingdom. And you yourselves will sit upon thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

Unlike Matthew who construes the appointment of the Twelve as Israel's judges to be a future vocation in an epoch of "new creation,"<sup>951</sup> Luke describes their appointment as

---

(e.g., 20:20-26). Although condemning Jesus to death, three times Pilate declares Jesus to be innocent (23:4, 14, 22), a verdict confirmed by a Roman centurion's verdict as well (Luke 23:47).<sup>948</sup> In contrast, Luke depicts the chief priest, the (religious) leaders, and the (elders of the) people demanding Jesus' death (23:1, 10, 13, 23). Nonetheless, Luke does not let the Romans completely off the hook (e.g., Luke 21:24; Acts 4:24-28).

<sup>949</sup> In his words to the Twelve, Jesus indicates their prominence is due, in part, to their taking a willing role in his *πειρασμός* ("testing"), a term/activity Luke very closely associates with Satan's brand of torment. Cf. the testing of Jesus in his encounter with the Devil in the messiah's entrance into the apocalyptic wilderness of Israel (Luke 4). See the discussion above. In his farewell remarks to the Twelve, Jesus cautions the Apostles not to come (again?) into the time of testing (Luke 22:40, 46).

<sup>950</sup> William S. Kurz observes that "[m]ost farewell addresses focus especially on those leaders who will succeed the dying founder, emphasizing their special roles and tasks with respect to the rest of the community. Luke 22 is no exception to this. The Lukan farewell address places special focus on the twelve apostles as successors to Jesus" ("Luke 22" [Chapter 2] in *Farewell Addresses in the New Testament* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1990), 61 [52-70]). For a discussion of the testamentary genre, see Anita Bingham Kolenkow, "The Literary Genre 'Testament,'" in Robert A. Kraft and George W. E. Nickelsburg (eds.), *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1986), 259-67; John J. Collins, "The Testamentary Literature," in Kraft and Nickelsburg, *Early Judaism*, 268-85.

<sup>951</sup> Luke combines material related to theme of inter-disciple strife (Mark 10:42-44) with a text from Q about the appointment of the Twelve to thrones over Israel (Matt 19:28; cf. Matt 20:20-28). In Matthew, the appointment of the Twelve occurs in Judea (Matt 19:1), but prior to their entering Jerusalem (Matt 21:10). The throne saying occurs in a conversation that Jesus is having with a larger group of

carrying both a present and future orientation. Using the present tense, Luke indicates that Jesus “bequeaths” (διατίθημι) “a kingdom” on the Twelve (Luke 20:29).<sup>952</sup> In this instance, the kingdom is clearly bound up with Israel,<sup>953</sup> for what follows is the Twelve’s appointment to the thrones of judgment over Israel.<sup>954</sup> In Acts, especially chaps. 1-15, Luke continues to underscore the importance of the Twelve as Israel’s eschatological leaders *in the present period of Israel*, particularly in their union on the day of Pentecost (see below). But the Twelve’s eschatological function is not completely fulfilled within the history of the present age. In analogy with the messiah, who presided over God’s incipient kingdom while on earth, but was exalted to a heavenly throne (Acts 2:32-36), so lies the future of the Twelve as well.<sup>955</sup>

In a several early Jewish texts, the leaders of the twelve tribes are envisaged to be in close association with Israel’s (future) king. In some cases, they act as

---

disciples, a group that includes the Twelve, but is not limited to them. Moreover, their appointment is precipitated by Peter’s inquiry into the Twelve’s reward for leaving everything to follow the messiah. (Cf. the inquiry of the mother of the sons of Zebedee on their behalf for higher positions of leadership than the other ten disciples. [Matt 20:20-28]). In Matthew, the appointment of the Twelve to the twelve thrones is clearly future oriented; Jesus specifies their appointment will occur in the new creation (παλιγγενεσία). Moreover, their “sitting” on the thrones is placed in the future tense.

<sup>952</sup> Cf. Luke 12:32.

<sup>953</sup> This relationship was asserted as well in the Twelve’s initial gathering in Luke 6 and Jesus’ sermon on the kingdom of God. It was noted briefly as well in the discussion of Luke 19, the parable of the young man who goes away to secure his kingdom. Likewise, in Acts 1, it is the Apostles (Israel’s judges) asking about the restoration of the kingship to Israel in a literary context in which Jesus is first discussing the kingdom of God. See Horsley, “The Kingdom of God,” 303-44. Horsley’s article focuses mostly on Q, offering only about two full pages of discussion of Luke (339-41). Horsley argues the twelve apostles “are to be establishing justice for or delivering the twelve tribes of Israel.” In parallel with *Psalms of Solomon* 17:28-32 and the IQS 8:1-4, he argues that in Q the renewal of Israel takes place in the “revitalization of the village communities, the fundamental social form in which Israel was constituted” (321).

<sup>954</sup> Moreover, Luke underscores the integral unity between Jesus and the Twelve. In solidarity with the suffering of the messiah, the Twelve have stood with Jesus (Luke 22:28). The kingdom which he appoints to them is the same one his father (i.e., God) has conferred on him (22:29).

<sup>955</sup> Craig A. Evans correctly recognizes the future dimension of the Apostles’ thrones of judgment, but does so at the expense of the present eschatological dimension of their role in Luke-Acts (“The Twelve Thrones of Israel: Scripture and Politics in Luke 22:24-30,” in Evans and Sanders (eds.), *Luke and Scripture*, 154-70). Also see Evans for an inventory of references to heavenly thrones in EJJL.

representatives of the twelve tribes.<sup>956</sup> In other cases, they are portrayed more specifically as the military leaders of Israel, serving the messiah in his liberation of Israel. As we have noted, the Twelve's appointment over Israel results in part from the disqualification of various representatives of Israel's religious leadership (i.e., scribes, Pharisees, priests), which Luke has taken pains to underscore.<sup>957</sup> Moreover, the servant-like rule of the Twelve is explicitly juxtaposed with the domineering rule of Gentile leaders (Luke 22:24-27). Finally, Jesus, Israel's heavenly king, will himself soon depart from earth, resulting in the need for earthly viceroys to lead Israel in the final stages of the eschatological epoch of restoration. Although, as Luke will indicate later, Jesus will carry on as Israel's leader after his death, he will do so from the vantage point of a heavenly throne, thus relying on the Twelve to mediate his rule over Israel. Therefore, the importance of the Twelve as Israel's eschatological leaders comes to the fore in the messiah's dying testament. The Twelve are required to be present, not only at the eschatological outpouring of the holy Spirit, but to preside over and proclaim the newly restored Israel, and to await their ultimate ascension to the twelve heavenly thrones alongside the messiah.<sup>958</sup>

---

<sup>956</sup> According to Eupolemus before David died, he handed over the power to Solomon in the presence of the twelve rulers of the tribes (*Eup* 30:8) (*OTP* 1.33)

<sup>957</sup> Jacob Jervell's work on the Twelve in Luke-Acts is particularly important. He argues that the Twelve serve as the replacement for Israel's rejected leaders. The Twelve's eschatological role is essentially fulfilled in their number and in their role as witnesses. Jervell argues they are expendable after bringing Israel's witness to the nations (e.g., Acts 15) *Luke and the People of God*, 75-113. Jervell assigns little importance to the Twelve in Luke's understanding of the future.

<sup>958</sup> Luke T. Johnson argues for an idiomatic meaning of 'waiting on tables' in Luke-Acts. Johnson contends that the phrase or activity of 'waiting on tables' is to be understood in terms of possessing authority. He observes: "The authority of the Twelve over Israel is to be expressed in their διακονεῖν τραπέζαις (Acts 6:2)" (*The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts* [SBLDS 39; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977], 167). Moreover, Johnson adds: "The authority of the Twelve possesses a certain paradoxical character. It is the full prophetic power of Jesus for judgment, but it is expressed through the mundane symbol of handling the community of goods, 'waiting on tables'" (167). Johnson, however, fails to note the future role of the Twelve in the judgment.

#### 4.5.4 Excursus: The Motif of the Twelve Tribes and Israel's Re-gathering

A number of early Jewish sources, some of which were examined in the previous chapters, make use of Israel's historical identity as the people of the twelve tribes for understanding her eschatological re-gathering. In the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (T12P), the most important function of the twelve tribes, except for perhaps, the priority on the leadership of the two tribes of Judah and Levi, is the *constitutive value placed on the number "twelve"* for signaling Israel's eschatological re-gathering. That is, Israel's historic and eschatological identity is described in terms of her being the people of the *twelve tribes*, both past and future. In a number of passages within the T12P, the author refers to an eschatological re-gathering from exile.<sup>959</sup> The return is most often dealt with in a series of sin-exile-(return) (S-E-R) passages that occur throughout the testaments.<sup>960</sup> Unfortunately, as Hollander and de Jonge observe many of these texts have undergone extensive Christian redaction. Importantly, throughout the T12P the hope for Israel's restoration is closely tied to the ethical and moral instruction given to each of the twelve sons.

Each of the twelve patriarchs provides final instructions to and predictions for their respective sons (i.e., the twelve tribes of Israel/future generations of Israel).<sup>961</sup> Each son is depicted as being a microcosm of Israel, who is usually predicted to follow a cycle of sin, exile, (repentance) and return,<sup>962</sup> sometimes more than once. Thus, the fate of all Israel is intrinsically connected to the self-preservation and restitution of each of the twelve tribes. While the writer acknowledges the tribes' future sin(s) and dispersal, Israel's final restoration climaxes in the end-time re-gathering of the twelve tribes.<sup>963</sup>

The leadership of the various Jewish groups in EJJ is often drawn from the main tribes of Levi and Judah, but others, such as Benjamin or Joseph, may be given priority as well. Several documents from Qumran attest to the belief that Jewish writers understood the *reassembly of the twelve tribes* to have been inaugurated in the

---

<sup>959</sup> As the present study demonstrates, however, the re-gathering of Israel is envisaged in a number of ways. Therefore, each of the S-E-R passages in the T12P must be examined for its particular interpretation.

<sup>960</sup> E.g., T. Levi 10; 14; 16; 17; T. Jud 23; T. Iss 6; T. Zeb 9:5-9; T. Dan 5:4-13; T. Naph 4:1-3; 4:4-5; T. Asher 7:2-4, 5-7 (etc). Although many portions of the *Testaments* have undergone extensive Christian redaction or interpolation the references are still valuable as corroborative evidence that the future return continued to inform both early Jewish and Christian interpretations of restoration. For a discussion of the S-E-R passages, see H. W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary* (SVTP 8; Leiden: Brill, 1985); Jürgen Becker, *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Zwölf Patriarchen* (Leiden: Brill, 1970).

<sup>961</sup> Hollander and de Jonge (*The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 53-56) treat the T12P as a Christian work. Although various passages in the work have been heavily redacted or interpolated, other scholars are more optimistic about recovering the Jewish core (Becker, *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen* [Leiden: Brill, 1970]. The presence of portions of Aramaic Levi (1Q21, 4Q213, 4Q 214, 4Q540), T. Naphtali (4Q215), T. Joseph (4Q539), and perhaps Judah (3Q7; cf. 4Q538) at Qumran, suggests that either early versions of, or key sources for, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* were Jewish.

<sup>962</sup> T. Naph 6:1-9; 8:1-3; T. Ben 9:1-5; 10:3-11; T. Jud 23-25:1-5; T. Gad 8:1-2; T. Zeb 9:5-8; T. Asher 7:1-7; T. Jos 19:11-12; T. Lev 14-18:1-14.

<sup>963</sup> The two tribes of Levi and Judah, Israel's expected priestly and royal rulers, are particularly important to the future reconstitution.

appointment of tribal rulers within the group's hierarchy. The positions of the twelve tribal rulers among the ruling elite of the Community are confirmed as well in other manuscripts of the DSS, although their posts are subordinate to the priest(s) and royal messiah.<sup>964</sup> However, as noted from 4Q252 the Davidic messiah himself is associated with the tribe of Judah and the priests are from the stock of Levi. In 1QM (*War Scroll*), the author describes Israel in terms of the twelve tribes. As noted in the discussion of that document, the occasion for the eschatological war also serves as the pretext for Israel's eschatological re-gathering. At the outbreak of the end-time war against the foreign and Jewish powers, the writer says: "the sons of Levi, the sons of Judah, and the sons of Benjamin, the exiled of the desert, will wage war against them."<sup>965</sup> Indeed in the *War Scroll* the primary task of the rulers of the twelve tribes is to lead Israel into the eschatological battle against all enemies. The identity of the community behind 1QM as the people of the twelve tribes constitutes a comprehensive claim to the *heritage and promise* of Israel's full re-gathering, although, as we have noted, the eschatological fulfillment of Israel's promises within this smaller group may *prefigure* a larger ingathering of the tribes of Israel in the last days (cf. 4QpNah, frgs. 3-4, col. iii.3-7).

In some Qumran writings, each of the leaders of the tribes will lead thousands into battle (1QM 4; cf. 11QT19 [*Temple Scroll*], col. lvii.1-7). The banner of war over the people will contain the name of Israel and Aaron and the names of the twelve tribes along with their genealogies (1QM iii.13-15). The messiah himself ("the Prince of the Congregation") will rule over or through the chiefs of the tribes. On his banner is written the names of the twelve tribes and their leaders (1QM v.1-3). Also as noted above, in the *Rule of the Congregation* (1QS<sup>a</sup> ii.14-15), the rulers of the tribes sit before the messiah. In the *Temple Scroll* (11QT xix.2-12), the first act of the new king is to appoint the leaders of the twelve tribes who will organize and rule twelve thousand men of war. Their primary task is to protect the king from physical and spiritual harm and to guard Israel.

In several cases, the leaders of the twelve tribes are described in special relationship to the Temple or Jerusalem. For instance, 4QIsaiah Peshet<sup>d</sup> (4Q164) offers an interpretation of Isaiah (Isa) 54:11b-12, where the Isaianic author envisages the new Jerusalem made of jewels. The author of 4Q164 interprets the precious stones of the Temple-city in terms of the Community (cf. 4QFlorilegium) (lines 1-2). Apparently, it is the "gates of jewels" of Isa 54:12 that are interpreted to be the leaders of the twelve tribes of Israel (line 7):<sup>966</sup>

---

<sup>964</sup> In 1QS<sup>a</sup> (*The Rule of the Congregation*) the leaders [of the twelve tribes] are briefly noted (1.29; 2.15). They rank behind the priests and the "messiah of Israel" in the eschatological assembly (1.1). They are seated before the messiah according to their tribal ranking. The twelve leaders of the tribes are also mentioned in 1QM 2.3 (*War Scroll*); they are subordinate to the Prince of the Congregation and to the priests of Israel.

<sup>965</sup> See also 1QM 3.14-15. Cf. 4Q372, frg. 1 and 4Q371, frgs. 1,8, and 11; the sons of Joseph are set in opposition to the sons of Levi, Judah, and Benjamin.

<sup>966</sup> See Revelation 21.

appointment of tribal rulers within the group's hierarchy. The positions of the twelve tribal rulers among the ruling elite of the Community are confirmed as well in other manuscripts of the DSS, although their posts are subordinate to the priest(s) and royal messiah.<sup>964</sup> However, as noted from 4Q252 the Davidic messiah himself is associated with the tribe of Judah and the priests are from the stock of Levi. In 1QM (*War Scroll*), the author describes Israel in terms of the twelve tribes. As noted in the discussion of that document, the occasion for the eschatological war also serves as the pretext for Israel's eschatological re-gathering. At the outbreak of the end-time war against the foreign and Jewish powers, the writer says: "the sons of Levi, the sons of Judah, and the sons of Benjamin, the exiled of the desert, will wage war against them."<sup>965</sup> Indeed in the *War Scroll* the primary task of the rulers of the twelve tribes is to lead Israel into the eschatological battle against all enemies. The identity of the community behind 1QM as the people of the twelve tribes constitutes a comprehensive claim to the heritage and promise of Israel's full re-gathering, although, as we have noted, the eschatological fulfillment of Israel's promises within this smaller group may prefigure a larger ingathering of the tribes of Israel in the last days (cf. 4QpNah, frgs. 3-4, col. iii.3-7).

In some Qumran writings, each of the leaders of the tribes will lead thousands into battle (1QM 4; cf. 11QT19 [*Temple Scroll*], col. lvii.1-7). The banner of war over the people will contain the name of Israel and Aaron and the names of the twelve tribes along with their genealogies (1QM iii.13-15). The messiah himself ("the Prince of the Congregation") will rule over or through the chiefs of the tribes. On his banner is written the names of the twelve tribes and their leaders (1QM v.1-3). Also as noted above, in the *Rule of the Congregation* (1QS<sup>a</sup> ii.14-15), the rulers of the tribes sit before the messiah. In the *Temple Scroll* (11QT xix.2-12), the first act of the new king is to appoint the leaders of the twelve tribes who will organize and rule twelve thousand men of war. Their primary task is to protect the king from physical and spiritual harm and to guard Israel.

In several cases, the leaders of the twelve tribes are described in special relationship to the Temple or Jerusalem. For instance, 4QIsaiah Pesher<sup>d</sup> (4Q164) offers an interpretation of Isaiah (Isa) 54:11b-12, where the Isaianic author envisages the new Jerusalem made of jewels. The author of 4Q164 interprets the precious stones of the Temple-city in terms of the Community (cf. 4QFlorilegium) (lines 1-2). Apparently, it is the "gates of jewels" of Isa 54:12 that are interpreted to be the leaders of the twelve tribes of Israel (line 7):<sup>966</sup>

---

<sup>964</sup> In 1QS<sup>a</sup> (*The Rule of the Congregation*) the leaders [of the twelve tribes] are briefly noted (1.29; 2.15). They rank behind the priests and the "messiah of Israel" in the eschatological assembly (1.1). They are seated before the messiah according to their tribal ranking. The twelve leaders of the tribes are also mentioned in 1QM 2.3 (*War Scroll*); they are subordinate to the Prince of the Congregation and to the priests of Israel.

<sup>965</sup> See also 1QM 3.14-15. Cf. 4Q372, frg. 1 and 4Q371, frgs. 1,8, and 11; the sons of Joseph are set in opposition to the sons of Levi, Judah, and Benjamin.

<sup>966</sup> See Revelation 21.

(1)....]all Israel sought thee according to thy word. 'And I shall lay your foundations in lapis (or sapphires) [...Its interpretation is (2) th[at they have founded the Council of the Community (עצת היחוד), [the] priests and the peo[ple...]] (3) a congregation of his elect, like a stone of lapis lazuli among the stones [...'And I will make as agate] (4) all thy pinnacles.' Its interpretation concerns the twelve [...] (5) giving light in accordance with the Urim and Thummim [...] (6) that are lacking from them, like the sun in all its light. And ['...]' (7) Its interpretation concerns the heads of the tribes of Israel (ראשי שבטי ישראל) at the [end of days...] (8) his lot, the offices of [...]<sup>967</sup>

Also, in 1QM ii.3, the twelve leaders of the tribes take their battle stations at the *gates of the Temple* (cf. 4Q164 line 7; Isa 54:12). The close affinity of the twelve tribes to the land of Israel, especially the Temple or Jerusalem, has been noted above and is attested in other texts among the DSS. While 4Q164 defines the new Jerusalem figuratively in relation to the twelve tribes (i.e., a Jewish community), other early Jewish sources portray the tribes or tribal leaders as making their abodes or taking their stations around Jerusalem/Temple. Thus, in the future Temple of the *Temple Scroll*, the Temple-city *gates* are assigned according to the twelve tribes (11QT col. 44; cf. Ezekiel 47-48). The *Temple Scroll* also assumes the future re-gathering of the twelve tribes and stipulates the regulations and order of their offerings according to their hierarchy (cols. 23-25). Likewise, in the *New Jerusalem Scroll*<sup>968</sup> the large dimensions of the future city are established according to the twelve tribal allotments, underscoring the intrinsic relationship of the tribes to the city (and Temple) (4Q554). Significantly the Temple-city of the tribes of Israel will be free from the presence of all Gentiles and other hosts of impurity and unrighteousness (*4QFlorilegium*; 4Q554, frg. 2, iii.14-21).<sup>969</sup>

This survey of various early Jewish sources demonstrates the ongoing importance of the idea of the twelve tribes as being important for various interpretations of Israel's re-gathering, particularly in those schemes which draw on the numerical significance of the tribes (i.e., twelve) for organizing (and/or imagining) the leadership of the eschatological Israel in relationship to Jerusalem and/or the Temple.

#### 4.5.5 The Re-constitution of the Twelve and Israel's Eschatological Return (Acts 1:15-26)

Luke continues to focus on the Apostles (i.e., momentarily, the Eleven) in Jerusalem as he describes the eschatological climax of Israel's re-gathering and restoration. Whereas Galilee is the anticipated location of Jesus' appearance before the

<sup>967</sup> Translation based on Allegro, *Cave 4*, 28.

<sup>968</sup> See 1Q32; 2Q24; 4Q554-55; 5Q15; 11Q18. The large number of manuscripts of this scroll attests to the importance of this document at Qumran, and correspondingly, to the idea of a future temple for the Community. Cf. the remarks on *4QFlorilegium* in Chapter Three regarding the claim of a Jewish community to represent in its membership a kind of eschatological Temple.

<sup>969</sup> This text is highly fragmented but probably foretells the defeat and annexation of all of the territories around the land of Israel and the defeat of her traditional enemies (line 18: "Edom, Moab, Ammon,...Babel").

Apostles in Mark (16:7), and is the explicit locale of their meeting with Jesus in Matthew (28:7, 10, 16), Luke alone describes *Jerusalem* as the post-resurrection meeting place of the messiah and the Twelve (Luke 24:33-36). Unlike Luke's sources, the author's program of restoration requires Jerusalem to be the eschatological, geographical center of the events he describes. Luke cannot have the decisive moment of Israel's restoration take place in Galilee,<sup>970</sup> a place of little importance for Israel's history or future hopes. *In Jerusalem*: the messiah must meet with the core of the re-gathered community; the messiah must make his exit to heaven; the Twelve must be re-constituted; and the Spirit must fall. Thus, Jesus orders the Twelve to wait in Jerusalem for the promise and power of the holy Spirit (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:12).<sup>971</sup>

In Acts 1-2, Luke *completes* his description of Israel's eschatological restoration. In the events that occur in Jerusalem (or above it), Luke describes both the fulfillment of Israel's re-gathering and the messiah's pre-emptive strike against all the enemies of Israel. Just as Luke 1-2 raised the subject of Israel's restoration to the fore, the opening of Acts, particularly the dialogue between Jesus and the Twelve (the Eleven), demonstrates that, despite the death and wider rejection of the messiah, Israel's eschatological re-establishment remains undeterred (Acts 1:1-8).<sup>972</sup> According to Luke (*and only Luke*), after Jesus is resurrected, he meets with the Apostles *for forty days, instructing them about "the kingdom"* (Acts 1:3). The relationship of the kingdom (and the coming of the holy Spirit) to the hope for Israel's restoration receives explicit

---

<sup>970</sup> For the author, Galilee's relevance lies in the past. Christopher M. Tuckett observes that, "a prophecy of a future event in Galilee [Mk 16.7] becomes a statement about Jesus' past teachings in Galilee" (24:6) (*Luke* [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997], 57-58).

<sup>971</sup> At the Gospel's end, the Apostles remain in Jerusalem, "continually in the Temple praising God" (24:53). Luke continues to de-emphasize Galilee, even in Acts. Galilee is omitted from the list of places the Apostles are to be witnesses. On the (in)significance of Galilee for Luke see Davies, *Gospel and the Land*, 264-65.

<sup>972</sup> Luke 24:21 (!), 44-49.



confirmation in the Apostles' question, *their final words* to Jesus prior to his departure: "Will you in this time restore the kingdom to Israel" (Acts 1:6b)? Although the response of Jesus is somewhat elusive, he does not deny the validity of the question. Instead, the messiah clarifies that the *timing of the restoration* belongs to the realm of heavenly knowledge.

In the events subsequent to the Apostles' interest in Israel's restoration, however, Luke clearly indicates that the final stages of Israel's restoration are reaching their climax. These events may be briefly summarized as follows. First, in response to the Apostles' question about Israel's restoration, Jesus refers to the coming of the holy Spirit (1:4-5, 8). The coming of the holy Spirit upon Israel has been anticipated since the beginning of the narrative, and served John's introduction of Jesus (Luke 1:16; Acts 1:5).<sup>973</sup> As we have indicated, Luke understands the period and wilderness of John as a judgment of Israel's exilic wilderness, which Jews must accept to be counted among the re-gathered ones. The prophecy of the Spirit is thus inextricably bound up with the positive end of the pattern of exile and return, i.e., Israel's restoration. Moreover, the promise, which was initially prophesied *to all Israel* in Luke 3 is now narrowed to the messiah's promise to the Twelve (Acts 1).

Second, immediately after Jesus' ascension (1:9-11) and immediately prior to the pouring out of the Spirit (2:1-13), the Apostles (the Eleven) return to Jerusalem and re-constitute the Twelve (1:15-26).<sup>974</sup> As we have already noted, Luke's emphasis on the

---

<sup>973</sup> Only Luke among the Synoptics describes the fulfillment of John's prophecy about Jesus baptizing with the Spirit.

<sup>974</sup> Jervell argues that, for Luke, the "number twelve as applied to the apostolic circle is essential..." (Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 83). For instance, Jervell points to the description of Judas in Luke 22:3 (cf. Mark 14:10 and Matt 26:14: "one of the twelve") as being "of the *number* (ἀριθμός) twelve," and Acts 1:17: "For he was numbered (καταριθμέω) among us." Likewise, Luke uses a verb (συγκαταψηφίζομαι) that underscores the numerical significance of Matthias, the apostolic replacement of Judas (84). According to Jervell these passages "are conclusive evidence that it is the very number twelve that is constitutive" (85). Jervell argues that the reason this number of Apostles

Twelve is, in effect, a concern for Israel's restoration.<sup>975</sup> The rupture in the Twelve is therefore a serious dilemma for Israel. That is, the return to Jerusalem of the re-gathered people is not complete, despite the pilgrimage of the Apostles to Jerusalem and the resurrection of the messiah. In a sense, the loss of Judas, one of the re-gathered Twelve, results in another phase of exile that must be rectified.<sup>976</sup>

The dilemma of the Apostles is expressed in exilic terms. According to Peter, Judas' defection and death has resulted in his "place" being declared "*a wilderness*" (Acts 1:20).<sup>977</sup> Strikingly, Luke chooses to describe the consequence of Judas' break with the Twelve by employing his metaphor of choice for speaking of Israel's exile

---

is essential for Luke is that they are intrinsically linked to Israel, who by Luke's definition, is a nation of twelve tribes (85). Jervell supports this by pointing to such texts as Luke 22:30, where the Apostles are appointed to be judges over the twelve tribes. (Jervell argues that Luke does not mention "twelve" thrones because of Judas' at the farewell discourse and his subsequent disqualification.) Furthermore in Acts 26:7, Israel is described as the "twelve tribes" (τὸ δωδεκάφυλον). Lastly, Jervell demonstrates that in comparison with Mark and Matthew, Luke understands the Apostles "to be chosen by God himself" (Luke 6:12-13; cf Mark 3:13-19; Luke 11:49; Acts 1:2; Acts 1:15-26; Acts 10:41) (86-7). According to Jervell these texts underscore that the Twelve Apostles--even Judas' replacement-- are divinely appointed, and that "the choosing of the Twelve goes back further than Jesus" (88).

<sup>975</sup> As Rengstorff noted in his classic article on the election of the twelfth apostle, the author's telling of the election of Matthias serves his larger interest to affirm the importance of *Israel*, both in Luke's narrative and in the period in which the author writes (Karl Heinrich Rengstorff, "The Election of Matthias: Acts 1:15 ff." in William Klassen and Graydon F. Snyder [eds.], *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation* [New York: Harper, 1962], 178-92).

<sup>976</sup> Jervell's argument on the eschatological importance of the Twelve for Israel's restoration depends heavily on Luke's description of the replacement of Judas (Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 83-89). Jervell convincingly demonstrates the numerical or absolute importance of "Twelve" for Luke-Acts. Moreover, elaborates on the importance of the Twelve for a particular phase of the Christian community's history. According to Jervell, Luke underscores the fact that the Apostles' main task is to witness to the resurrection. Secondly there must be Twelve -- "at least during a certain period of history" (82). The Twelve must be present sustained before Pentecost and up unto the conversion of the first Gentile. Afterwards, they may fade from history. Thus, after the James, another Apostle (12:2), there is no interest in replacing him. While we agree with Jervell for the need to replace Judas prior to Pentecost, we disagree with the Twelve's relevance extending to the conversion of the first Gentile. Otherwise, Jervell remarks are astute that the Twelve "are set apart wherever the resurrection, the Messiah of Israel, or the redemption of God's people are (*sic*) discussed" (81).

<sup>977</sup> Sanders writes: "Luke's story of the election of a new twelfth member" is one of several attempts to avoid "the embarrassment which the betrayal created" (Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 102). There is no evidence, however, in Luke's construction of this event of any level of embarrassment in his relating of the event of the reconstitution of the twelve. Indeed the re-election of the twelve is used by Luke to underscore the motif and even the climatic moment of Israel's re-gathering which occurs immediately before the pouring out of the Holy Spirit.

(i.e., "the wilderness").<sup>978</sup> In rectifying the wilderness exile of the newly re-gathered ones, Peter establishes the criteria for the qualified candidate to join the Eleven in Israel's climatic moment of return. He maintains that the twelfth Apostle must be a man who has accompanied the group from "the beginning, the baptism of John" until the ascension (1:22). As we have underscored throughout the present chapter, the period and wilderness of the Baptist symbolizes the exile that Israel must acknowledge in order to participate in the messianic return. This point is underscored once more in Peter's recitation of the criteria for the joining the Twelve. While most commentators understand these two episodes to constitute the inner and outer frame of Jesus' career, this explanation is only partly correct and offers little understanding into *why* the candidate must have been present from such an early period. Peter very specifically defines the Twelve's task to be *witnesses of the resurrection* (1:22; cf. 1:8), not the life of Jesus. Since the Twelve's vocation does not depend on their being there at the beginning, the period of the Baptist is presented as a rite of passage that closely parallels similar claims about the exile from whence the true Israel must emerge.<sup>979</sup> That is, Luke understands the person and period of the Baptist as an eschatological turning point that determines who can be counted for consideration in Jesus' re-gathering of Israel. Rebecca Denova correctly observes: "Once the restoration is complete with the election of Mattathias, the programmatic story of Pentecost can be told."<sup>980</sup>

Third, the pouring of the Spirit (Acts 2:1-13) upon the Twelve is bound up with the messiah's enthronement, an event, by definition, bound up with Israel's restoration. As we have noted above, the pouring out of the Spirit has been underscored as having

---

<sup>978</sup> See the discussion of the wilderness and its exilic connotations in EJL and Luke-Acts in the early part of the present chapter.

<sup>979</sup> Cf. Luke 7:29-30 above.

<sup>980</sup> Rebecca I. Denova, *The Things Accomplished Among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke-Acts* (JSNTSS 141; Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 169.

primary importance for Israel's restoration. Luke now attempts to explain the relevance of this event (2:14-36). According to Luke, the outpouring of the Spirit is *the event* of "the last days." As both Annette Steudel<sup>981</sup> and John J. Collins<sup>982</sup> have demonstrated from their study of this motif in EJJ, the end of days is most often described as a *time of testing* as well as a *time of incipient salvation or restoration* for Israel. Luke draws on this understanding, but revises it in light of a heavenly messiah who pours out the Spirit on the Twelve and other followers, who subsequently find themselves, as did their messiah, in conflict with both (non-Christian) Jews and Rome.

As Max Turner<sup>983</sup> underscores, Israel's re-gathering and restoration reaches its eschatological climax in Jesus' ascension and exaltation to the heavenly throne alongside God (2:29-36).<sup>984</sup> Jesus' unjust death has resulted in his divine vindication,<sup>985</sup> culminating in his resurrection and heavenly enthronement. However, Luke indicates the messiah's exaltation also has resulted in the concomitant exaltation of the eschatological Israel. Israel's exaltation is manifested in the outpouring of the Spirit

---

<sup>981</sup> "אחרית הימים in the Texts from Qumran," *RevQ* 62 (1993), 225-44.

<sup>982</sup> "The Expectation of the End in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Craig A. Evans and Peter W. Flynt (eds.), *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 74-90).

<sup>983</sup> Max Turner, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 267-317, 428-31. We cannot accept, however, Turner's interpretation of the event of Pentecost as essentially a critique of Sinai and the covenant. Nor do we accept Turner's interpretation of the event as being related to the renewal of prophecy within the community. A number of other interpreters have rightly noted the importance of the outpouring of the Spirit for Luke's notion of Israel's restoration. Eric Franklin (*Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1975], 95-99) observes the importance of Pentecost for Israel's restoration on a more restricted basis as well (i.e., through the Twelve). Also, see Denova, *Things Accomplished Among Us*, 169-75.

<sup>984</sup> While interpreters are correct in understanding the pouring out of the Spirit as the defining and climatic claim about Jesus' messiahship in the Lukan narrative (Odette Mainville, *L'Esprit dans l'Oeuvre de Luc* [Montreal: Fides, 1991]; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 260-61), Luke's christology is subsumed under his larger interest in the restoration of Israel (Franklin, *Christ the Lord*; 95-99; Turner, "The 'Spirit of Prophecy' as the Power of Israel's Restoration and Witness," in Marshall and Peterson [eds.], *Witness*, 343-45).

<sup>985</sup> As has long been noted, Luke does not understand the significance of Jesus' death in terms of its redemptive value, but as the pretext for the messiah's vindication and exaltation to a heavenly throne. See, for example, I. Howard Marshall, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 61-62.

upon the Twelve and other followers of Jesus in Jerusalem.<sup>986</sup> At the core of the re-gathered community is the Twelve, but Luke indicates they have been accompanied by 120 other Jews as well. Moreover, Luke claims that many from the Diaspora, particularly the eastern portion of the world, were there to witness the initial event as well as participate in it (Acts 2:37-41).<sup>987</sup>

Finally, Luke anticipates the wider implications of Israel's restoration for her enemies in the messiah's kingship in heaven. Although the messianic ascension has resulted in the eschatological climax of Israel's re-gathering, Luke indicates that the heavenly kingship of Jesus has dealt a mortal blow to all Israel's enemies, both Jews and Gentiles.<sup>988</sup> The heavenly messiah has placed all adversaries under his feet as a "footstool."<sup>989</sup> Although the emphasis of Peter in the quotation of Psalm 110 falls on the heavenly exaltation of the messiah, the more comprehensive implications of messiah's enthronement for the world is entailed, which Luke will (later) describe in greater detail as the consequences of what has been instigated in the Land overflow into the nations as

---

<sup>986</sup> The Spirit is the definitive mark of Jesus' messianic identification, (Luke 3:21; 4:18-19), his enthronement (Acts 2:32-36), and the seal of his promise to Israel and for Israel (Luke 2:15-17). The eschatological Israel (the Twelve and those gathered around them) awaits and receives the divine seal of its restoration and solidarity with the heavenly messiah on the day of Pentecost.

<sup>987</sup> Although Luke's use of the motif of the Twelve, a number associated with the fullness of Israel's ingathering, precludes the necessity of the Diaspora's physical return (*contra* Richard Bauckham, "The Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts," in Scott [ed], *Restoration*, 469-77 [435-87]), he pays homage to the Diasporic interpretation of the re-gathering motif by including a large gathering of Jews from various locales at the time of the Spirit's outpouring. At the time of Jesus' selection the Twelve, they are already within the Land of Israel. None of the Twelve is identified as a Diaspora Jew or from foreign territories (Luke 6; Acts 2). The importance of this point cannot be under estimated. Since the twelve Apostles already represent the proleptic fulfillment of a re-gathered people, ultimately Luke's idea of Israel's re-assembly does not require any response from Jews outside the Land. Nonetheless, Luke gathers around the Twelve, not only the 120, but other followers from the Land as well as many Jews from the Diaspora. The mission spreads outside the Land, but encompasses not only the Gentiles, but on Diaspora Jews as well (Acts 8-28). However, the focus on people outside the Land does entail a loss of interest on Jerusalem (see below).

<sup>988</sup> In a later episode (Acts 4:23-30), after Peter and John (i.e., two of the Twelve), are released from imprisonment, instigated by the Jewish high priests and elders, Luke explains the conflict by referring to Psalm 2:1-2. In the interpretation that follows, the "kings of the earth" and "rulers" (i.e., Israel's enemies) are understood as Herod and Pilate (4:25-27).

<sup>989</sup> Acts 2:34-35; Luke 20:43; cf. Acts 7:49.

well. Although the implications of Israel's restoration for the nations find primary expression in the second half of Acts, this concern is anticipated not only here in Peter's speech, but in Jesus' pre-ascension words to the Twelve as well. Prior to his departure for heaven and Israel's exaltation, Jesus explains to the Apostles the significance of his imminent heavenly enthronement (i.e., their reception of the Spirit) in terms of their authority to announce Jesus' heavenly, messianic reign in "Jerusalem, Judaea, Samaria, and the ends of earth" (Acts 1:8).

Therefore, the Twelve have fulfilled their eschatological duty in returning from the wilderness-exile of Israel to Israel (i.e., Jerusalem) to receive the Spirit of the messiah upon them. Although Jerusalem heads the lists of geographical locales<sup>990</sup> where they are told to be "witnesses" (Luke 24:47; Acts 1:8), the Twelve remain bound to Jerusalem. As a group, they are never portrayed by Luke as leaving the city (see the excursus below).<sup>991</sup> The Apostles' eschatological role is primarily fulfilled in the reconstitution of their number (i.e., the Twelve) at the time of the messiah's enthronement, so as they might receive the outpouring of the Spirit. Moreover, their duty is to proclaim and explain to (sinful) Israel about the eschatological restoration that has occurred (Acts 1-2; 3-8:1). Lastly, the Twelve play a vital role in introducing the reign of Christ to the nations and oversee important aspects of the wider mission to the occupied world.<sup>992</sup>

---

<sup>990</sup> The other places that are named are Judea, Samaria, and "the ends of the earth."

<sup>991</sup> In Acts 8:14-25, Peter and John venture up to Samaria to pray for the Spirit upon believers, but once this is done they return to Jerusalem. Likewise, Peter is credited with the conversion and baptism of the Spirit of Cornelius, the first Gentile convert (Acts 10), but then afterwards, he returns immediately to Jerusalem (Acts 11:2).

<sup>992</sup> Luke's geography has been understood to mirror his theology. Some have argued that what begins in the land of Israel (Luke) ends in the nations (Acts); what begins with Judaism ends with (Gentile) Christianity. J. C. O'Neill also speaks for a number of interpreters who understand in Luke's geography a theological break with Judaism. He argues that "Luke's thesis is that the Gospel is free to travel to the ends of the earth only when it is free from the false form which the Jewish religion has taken" (O'Neill, *The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting*. [2<sup>nd</sup>. edit.; London: SPCK, 1970], 75).

## 4.6 Excursus: The Babylonian Exile and the Temple in Luke-Acts

As with other early Jewish or NT<sup>993</sup> accounts of restoration in which references to the Babylon's destruction of Israel occur,<sup>994</sup> Luke's reference to Israel's 6<sup>th</sup> century exile is informative for understanding his interpretation of Israel's plight and restoration. Since Luke is writing in the aftermath of Rome's invasion and destruction of Jerusalem,<sup>995</sup> it is possible to understand these remarks in Acts 7, at least in part,<sup>996</sup> within the collection of responses in EJJ and the NT to this catastrophe.<sup>997</sup> As such the words of Stephen may reflect an attempt to explain the significance of the Temple's

---

More recently, Jack T. Sanders understands Paul's final words in Rome (Acts 28:26-7; Isaiah 6:9-10) to be a rejection "not only to Jews in Rome but to all Jews" (Sanders, *Jews in Luke-Acts*, 298). Other interpreters contend that whatever interest in Israel or Judaism that is present in Luke is ultimately a transitory phase that may be considered ultimately unimportant for the period in which Luke and his community now find themselves. Conzelmann affirms this view in discussing incipient Christianity's *seemingly* close ties to Israel and to Judaism:

It marks a new stage in historical understanding when one becomes aware of the peculiar character of the period of origin, for only then does the writing of Church history become possible. The separate phenomena can now be grasped as a whole: the change from the Jewish Church to the Gentile Church, the expansion from Israel into the world, the liberation from the Law (Conzelmann, *Theology*, 211; also see 18-94).

As is well known, Conzelmann (*Theology*) argues that Luke has consigned Israel to the initial epoch of salvation history which has since given way to the periods of Jesus and the Church (e.g., 16, 22-26; 112-36; 185-234). Such analyses (above) do not give sufficient weight to Luke's revision of Jewish traditions of restoration in light of his claim that Israel's messiah rules the world from a heavenly throne.

<sup>993</sup> The Gospel of Matthew explicitly frames the arrival of Jesus the messiah against the Babylonian exile. The writer introduces Jesus within a genealogy arranged according to three groups of fourteen generations. The genealogy stresses the importance of David to Israel's history and the end of Israel's exile in the arrival of Jesus and his kingdom: "[A]nd from the deportation to Babylon to the messiah, fourteen generations" (1:17c).

<sup>994</sup> As noted above the second Temple restoration is reflected positively or at least without critique in many early Jewish writings (e.g., *Letter of Aristeas*; 1 Maccabees; Sirach; cf. Sirach 36; 48). In other sources, however, it is considered inferior or secondary to what is expected to come (e.g., Tobit 13-14; 4Q390; 11Q<sup>Temp</sup> Scroll; 4Q<sup>Florilegium</sup>). Some writers reject it outright (e.g., *Animal Apocalypse*; 4 Ezra; 2 Baruch), while other writers simply exclude the 6th century return and Temple from history (e.g., *Jubilees*; *Apocalypse of Weeks*).

<sup>995</sup> E.g., Luke 19:41-44; 23:27-31 and esp. 21:20-24.

<sup>996</sup> Of course, the devaluation of the Temple in Acts 7 does not depend on its destruction. As already noted in the discussion of EJJ, a variety of writers, contemporary with the existence of the second Temple, find reasons to criticize it. Alternatively, some Diaspora communities—perhaps due to their geographical distance to Jerusalem and absence from the Temple or allegiance to other Temples (e.g., Elephantine)—may have developed less attachment to the Temple in Jerusalem.

<sup>997</sup> Michael E. Stone, "Reactions to Destructions of the Second Temple," *JSJ* 12 (1981), 195-204; Robert Kirschner, "Apocalyptic and Rabbinic Response to the Destruction of 70," *HTR* 78 (1985), 27-46; Martin Goodman, "Diaspora Reactions to the Destruction of the Temple," in James D. G. Dunn (ed.), *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135. The Second Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium on Earliest Christianity and Judaism Durham, September, 1989* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999); Helmut Schwier, *Tempel und Tempelzerstörung: Untersuchungen zu den theologischen und ideologischen Faktoren im ersten jüdisch-römischen Krieg (66-74 n. Chr.)* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989); Craig A. Evans, "Predictions of the Destruction of the Herodian Temple in the Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Scrolls, and Related Texts," *JSP* 10 (1992), 89-147.

destruction as well as to affirm God's presence in the absence of Judaism's sacred center.

The reference to the Babylonian exile (Acts 7:42-43) occurs within Stephen's defense against (false) accusations that he had slandered the Law and the Temple (Acts 6:11-14).<sup>998</sup> Most of Stephen's speech is in fact a selected rehearsal of Israel's history (7:2-54) that emphasizes the history of (1) Israel's rejection of God's representatives and (2) the presence of God outside the Land and Temple.<sup>999</sup> It is in the remembrance of Moses at Sinai and the episode of the golden calf (7:38-41) that Stephen refers to Israel's historic exile into Babylon (7:42-43).<sup>1000</sup> According to Luke's version of Israelite history, the Babylonian exile did not originate from the political events of the 6<sup>th</sup> century BCE, but from a much earlier event in Israel's history,<sup>1001</sup> the making of the golden calf. Thus, according to Luke, even before Israel enters the Land for the first time, she had already been sentenced to captivity.<sup>1002</sup>

Stephen does not refer to the historic restoration (or the second Temple) in his speech, which might be telling in itself. Instead his condemnation of Israel's idolatry at Sinai leads him to denounce Israel's next great sin of idolatry, *the Temple itself* (!)<sup>1003</sup> Therefore, not only was "the whole sweep of Israel's time within the promised land"<sup>1004</sup> a period under condemnation for idolatry, but the first Temple was the punctuating mark on her idolatrous history.<sup>1005</sup> Inasmuch as the first Temple is rejected as an idol

---

<sup>998</sup> In Mark (14:58; cf. Matt 26:59-61), part of the conspiracy against Jesus involves a false accusation that the messiah is going to destroy the Temple. Luke omits this accusation from the Passion scenario. Strikingly, however, he relocates and re-interprets the accusation as one made against Stephen, of whom it is claimed, is preaching a false eschatology about the Temple. That is, Stephen is accused of speaking against the Law and prophesying that Jesus will return (from the dead/heaven) to destroy the Temple (Acts 6:13-14).

<sup>999</sup> Dunn, *Partings of the Ways*, 65.

<sup>1000</sup> The reference to the Babylonian exile occurs within Stephen's quote of Amos 5:25-27. Luke, however, has apparently substituted "Babylon" for "Damascus," which is indicated in both the MT and the LXX. As a part of Davies' argument that references to Damascus in the Damascus Document are in fact veiled references to Babylon, he refers to Acts 7:23 as evidence of the larger "exegetical tradition" that understood Amos 5:27 in this capacity (Philip R. Davies, "The Birthplace of the Essenes: Where is 'Damascus'?" *RevQ* 56 (1990), 511 (503-19).

<sup>1001</sup> Cf. 2 Kings 21:9-15 where the exile is blamed on the sins of King Manasseh.

<sup>1002</sup> Cf. Barnabas 4:7-9 where the author observes the covenant of Moses was broken by God himself on Sinai in order to make way for the "covenant of Jesus."

<sup>1003</sup> As both Marcel Simon ("Saint Stephen and the Jerusalem Temple, *JEH* 2 [1951], 133 [127-42]) and Dunn (*Partings of the Ways*, 66-67) correctly observe, the Temple's (7:48) human and idolatrous origins are described in analogy with the golden calf (7:41) as the work of "human hands," a common LXX means of describing idols (e.g., Deut 4:28). Contra Dennis D. Sylva, "The Meaning and Function of Acts 7:46-50," *JBL* 106 (1987), 261-75; John J. Kilgallen, "The Function of Stephen's Speech (Acts 7,2-53)," *Biblica* 70 (1989), 173-93.

<sup>1004</sup> Dunn, *Partings of the Ways*, 66.

<sup>1005</sup> Charles Gibling (*The Destruction of Jerusalem according to Luke's Gospel: A Historical-Typological Moral* [Rome: Biblical Institute, 1985], 108-112; Francis Weinert, "Luke, Stephen, and the Temple in Luke-Acts, *BTB* 17 [1987], 88-90) argues against the normative value of Acts 7 for understanding Luke's attitude toward the Temple. Moreover, he argues for a more nuanced interpretation of Stephen's remarks. He suggests that Luke is favorable to the Temple as a place of tradition, piety, teaching, and prayer, but in Acts 7, the author is reacting against a strict localization of God to the Temple, making it indispensable to (the worship of) God. Other interpreters have argued that Stephen's perspective reflects that of some Hellenized Jews, not Luke per se. However, there is nothing in the



and illegitimate structure—as opposed to the heavenly inspired (and itinerant) Tent of Witness—it is hardly likely that 6<sup>th</sup> century restoration and the second Temple, could be accepted in terms of Israel’s ultimate restoration. Indeed, it might follow by analogy that just as the construction of the idolatrous golden calf and first Temple were part of the idolatrous history that led to Israel’s destruction and exile, the construction of the second Temple—rather than a feature of restoration—ironically marked a continuation (or new epoch) of “exile.” The period has climaxed in the rejection of Israel’s messiah and the invasion of Rome.<sup>1006</sup>

Therefore, it is fair to say that Israel’s hope for restoration had yet to reach its fulfillment, until the period of Jesus. Against the exilic landscape, Luke presents his version of Israel’s restoration that is centered around a heavenly messiah who has poured out the Spirit upon the re-gathered Israel, so that the kingdom of Israel’s heavenly king might be proclaimed to the end of the earth, bringing all nations into subjection to him.

#### 4.7 The Cycle of Exile and Return Forever Broken

Following the killing of Stephen (7:54-60) and the Jewish leadership’s persecution against “the assembly” (ἐκκλησία) in Jerusalem, Luke writes:

[T]hey (the Jerusalem assembly) were all scattered (διασπείρω) about the country of Judea and Samaria, except the Apostles” (πλὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων) (8:1).<sup>1007</sup>

Therefore, while most of the re-gathered ones are once more driven from the Land<sup>1008</sup> the Twelve, the symbolic core and leadership of the re-gathered Israel, remain in Jerusalem. Their presence signifies the climatic break of the pattern of sin-exile-return that has defined Israel’s history. Israel’s restoration can no longer be undone, for it is secured by the heavenly messiah who mediates his rule over the world through the re-

---

immediate literary context to suggest the author’s dissent. In fact, the words of the Lukan Paul in Acts 17:24, which also deny God’s presence in human-made temples, make it even more likely that Stephen speaks to some degree *for Luke* in Acts 7. Although Luke portrays the second Temple positively, in its associations with Jesus and the formative Christian community (throughout most of Luke-Acts), nowhere does the author indicate that a new Temple will be a feature of Israel’s eschatological restoration.

<sup>1006</sup> In Luke 19:41-44, the Roman invasion is understood as a judgment against Jerusalem for rejecting Jesus.

<sup>1007</sup> The Twelve remain intact until Acts 12:2, where James (“the brother of John”) is killed, but this time, the number is not re-constituted.

<sup>1008</sup> The direction of the (divinely sanctioned [?]) dispersal ultimately results in the mission to Judea, Samaria, and Rome.

gathered people of God. Those who accept his rule will find their salvation, but those who reject it will find judgment.

In conclusion, it is clear that Israel's restoration lies at the center of Luke's eschatology. More than any other Gospel writer, the author attempts to interpret Jesus, the Twelve, and the formative Christian community within the framework of the exilic model of restoration. Although Luke's understanding of Israel's restoration involves the Land as the geographical locus of this eschatological restoration, the author does not portray the Land, as some early Jewish writers do, as a nationalistic or political center. Moreover, Luke indicates little interest in developing a Temple-centered<sup>1009</sup> understanding of restoration. Rather, Luke describes Israel's restoration as occurring through the agency of a heavenly Davidic messiah, who re-gathers and restores Jewish Israel in the number and activities of twelve key followers, who proceed to give witness to the rest of Israel of the messiah's reign. They will also preside over those who announce the messiah's rule to the Jewish Diaspora and to all the nations.

The climax of Israel's restoration occurs in the Davidic messiah, who is vindicated in his enthronement in heaven. As a result, he pours out the Spirit upon the re-gathered Israel in order for them to mediate on earth his heavenly rule. From heaven, Israel's messiah rules the world. The role of the restored Israel is to proclaim and interpret the significance of the messianic exaltation as the inauguration of Israel's (spiritual) rule over the occupied world. From this end-time event, inaugurated within Palestine, Luke describes the expansion of the messiah's (and Israel's) spiritual rule over the world of nations. That is, the geographical development of Luke-Acts from

---

<sup>1009</sup> *Contra* Chance, *Jerusalem*, 5-33, 115-38. Chance treats Luke's understanding of Jerusalem and Temple through the interpretative lens of early Jewish traditions of restoration. Chance finds that many early Jewish traditions anticipate a new Jerusalem/Temple. However, Chance errs in requiring Luke to conform to these expectations. He argues that Luke probably expected a new Temple as well. Chance does not consider how Luke may have drawn on these traditions of a new Temple, but revised them to meet the requirements of his own eschatological program.

Jerusalem to Rome (i.e., "the end of the earth") does not signify the rejection of Israel,<sup>1010</sup> but rather the expansion of the rule of the messiah, Israel's king, over the wider occupied world. At the end of the narrative, Luke demonstrates that the kingdom is being proclaimed in Rome. The implication of the dramatic conclusion is that even the ruling superpower of the world now stands ready to be put in subjection to Israel's messiah (Acts 28:28-31).

Finally, the restoration of Israel provides the catalyst for events that lie beyond the geography of the Land and even the nations. Luke anticipates the restoration of all things (Acts 3:19-21) and the inclusive participation of all peoples in the more comprehensive epoch of salvation, which includes Israel's restoration, but also the inclusion of Gentiles into the assembly of God. Moreover, Israel's restoration promotes the imminent return of the messiah, the resurrection of the dead, and future life in Paradise (or heaven). However, the availability and proclamation of such eschatological rewards beyond the present life originate out of the eschatological event *par excellence* that has occurred in the Land: the restoration of Israel (Acts 26:7).

---

<sup>1010</sup> The Twelve oversee the mission to the Gentiles, which Luke conceives of as being the expansion of the messiah's kingdom over the wider occupied world. The nations, however, are not counted within Israel. Although they recognize the messiah, they are saved as, and remain as, *Gentiles* (*contra* Lohfink, *Sammlung Israels*).

## Conclusion

This study has identified and elucidated two important motifs of the exilic tradition(s) of restoration in EJJ: the re-gathering of Israel and the fate of the nations. Furthermore, the present investigation has determined that the author of Luke-Acts is indebted to early Jewish ideas of Israel's restoration in articulating the importance of Jesus, the Twelve, and the self-definition of the community which stands behind Luke's narrative.

In EJJ, we identified and explored two of the key components of the exilic model of restoration: Israel's re-gathering and the fate of the nations. By examining a number of representative texts from early Jewish sources, we demonstrated the complexity and diversity of the interpretations given to these motifs.

The re-gathering of Israel is an essential feature of Israel's eschatological restoration. In some documents (Tobit; 2 Maccabees; Sirach), the return of Israel is interpreted literally to mean the return of the Diaspora (i.e., those living outside the Land). This population's existence among the nations—whether voluntarily or involuntarily—according to many texts, constitutes an unholy, unnatural state (i.e., exile) that could only be rectified by returning to the Land. Although the return of the Diaspora is the most literal of the interpretations given to the motif of Israel's re-gathering in EJJ, even in this interpretation, the ideological dimension of exile often comes into view as well. That is, many of the writings attest to the sentiment that as long as Jews remain outside the land of Israel (i.e., in exile), all Jews, even those within Palestine, remain in captivity as well.

In other writings (*Damascus Document*; *Animal Apocalypse*; *Psalms of Solomon*), the motif of Israel's re-gathering is used to refer to (the hope for the)

emergence of a righteous Israel or particular group within the wider Jewish population. That is, Israel's re-gathering may primarily be interpreted as an inter-Jewish or inter-territorial (i.e., within Israel) activity. As such, the return of the exiles may function *inter alia* as a cipher for repentance, adherence to a particular interpretation of Torah, claims of apocalyptic or esoteric knowledge, and/or allegiance to a respective leader or teacher. The motif of Israel's re-gathering therefore may be utilized to distinguish one group of Jews (i.e., true Israel) from another (i.e., apostate Israel). Other important emphases rise to the fore as well. In some cases, a writer may choose the ancient geographical backdrop of Babylon as the exilic setting from which to describe Israel's return. In other cases, an exit to the wilderness is suffice to claim Israel has made her mandatory departure from the Land, and thus stands ready to be re-gathered by God.

Another interpretation of the motif of Israel's return is seen in the re-gathering of the twelve tribes. We have noted the importance and diverse interpretations of the motif of the twelve tribes in the wider hope for Israel's re-gathering. In some cases, the motif of the twelve tribes may be used as a generalized expression of Israel's re-gathering (e.g., *T12P*). In other cases, it may signify the reunion of the Diaspora (= ten tribes) with the people of the Land (= two tribes) (e.g., *2 Baruch*). However, in the case of *4 Ezra*, it was noted that the author invests much hope in the reality of ten righteous tribes who have been preserved in an esoteric location outside the Land. One day, the author hopes, they will return in great numbers to the homeland.

Lastly, there are some interpretations of the re-gathering which are difficult to characterize, but seem to spiritualize the Land or demote its significance in some sense. For instance, on most occasions, Philo seems to allegorize the Land into a symbol meaning the perfection of "wisdom" or the vision of God in the wider pilgrimage of righteous humanity toward God. In other cases, it appears Philo retains the Land and

the re-gathering ones as real, physical entities, but subordinates their value to a more important spiritual pilgrimage and destination that lie(s) ahead.

The fate of Israel's enemies also lies at the core of the exilic model of restoration. This motif involves a number of features and emphases as well. In 1 Maccabees, Israel's participation was shown to be instrumental in fighting for her liberation. The restoration of Israel was localized to the Land, but understood to have far reaching implications in the wider world. The focus on borders of Palestine is found in the *War Scroll* as well. Moreover, Israel is portrayed once more fighting alongside God to secure her redemption. But the *War Scroll* describes the eschatological conflict in comprehensive terms as involving the nations, evil Jews, and heavenly powers.

The cosmic dimension of Israel's predicament may lead some early Jewish writers to contend that Israel's salvation depends largely or exclusively on divine intervention. The emphasis on divine support is found in 1QM and the *Animal Apocalypse*, but other documents such as the *Testament of Moses* locate all hope in heaven. Some descriptions of the Davidic messiah seem to mediate between the hope of Israel's involvement and God's intervention. The author of the *Psalms of Solomon* (chaps. 17-18) describes a messiah acting as God's agent to liberate Israel from her enemies and inaugurate her restoration. Lastly, it was noted that some Jews (e.g., the author of *Sibylline Oracles* Book 3), particularly those within the Diaspora, may have incorporated the nations (or Gentiles) as positive agents within the exilic model of restoration.

In Luke-Acts, the author places paramount importance on the motif of re-gathering in his interpretation the tradition of Israel's restoration. At the center of the writer's understanding of Israel's re-gathering is the twelve Apostles and the heavenly Davidic messiah. In developing the importance of the Twelve, Luke defines the epoch

of the Baptist within the matrix of exilic theology. The re-gathered Israel must emerge from the wilderness of John.

The twelve Apostles are the core and the leadership of the eschatological Israel. While Jesus appoints the Twelve to leading posts in the kingdom, he carefully delimits their power in a manner that contrasts with political examples, especially as exemplified by the nations (i.e., Roman). As a result, the restored kingdom of Israel and especially its leadership are defined in terms of service and loyalty to a heavenly messiah, a brand of restoration that seems (at least temporarily) able to accommodate the *status quo* under Rome—until the return of the messiah.

Luke explains the Twelve's reception of the Spirit as the consequence of Jesus' enthronement in heaven. The messiah now rules over Israel and the wider occupied world. For Luke, this event is the definitive mark of Israel's restoration and an indication of the "last days." The exaltation of the messiah results in the exaltation of the Israel. The primary role of the Twelve *is to be the Twelve* at the time of the enthroned messiah's outpouring of the Spirit. Afterwards, the Twelve's duty is to proclaim this event's significance to the rest of (Jewish) Israel: Israel has been restored. When persecution breaks out in Jerusalem, most of the re-gathered ones of Israel are scattered. But the fate of the Twelve is no longer to be that of exile. They remain bound to the Land; the pattern of exile and return has been forever broken.

## Bibliography

- Abegg, Martin G. "Exile and the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 111-25 in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*. Edited by James M. Scott. Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplemental Series 56. Leiden, Brill: 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Messianic Hope and 4Q285: A Reassessment." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 113 (1994): 81-91.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Messiah at Qumran: Are We Still Seeing Double?" *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995): 125-44.
- Ackroyd, Peter. *Exile and Restoration: A Study of Hebrew Thought of the Sixth Century BC*. London: SCM, 1968.
- Alexander, Loveday. *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Content in Luke 1.1-4 and Acts 1.1*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 78. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Allegro, John M., ed. *Qumran Cave 4: I (4Q158-4Q186)*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 5. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
- Allison, Dale C. *The End of the Ages Has Come: An Early Interpretation of the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- Amaru, Betsy Halpern. "Land Theology in Philo and Josephus." Pages 65-93 in *The Land of Israel: Jewish Perspectives*. Edited by Lawrence A. Hoffmann. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1986.
- Attridge, Harold W. "Jewish Historiography." Pages 316-23 in *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters*. Edited by R. A. Kraft and G. W. E. Nickelsburg. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- Bachmann, Michael. *Jerusalem und der Tempel: Die geographisch-theologischen Elemente in der lukanischen Sicht des jüdischen Kultzentrums*. Stuttgart: Verlag Kohlhammer, 1980.
- Bammel, Ernst. *Jesus and the Politics of his Day*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Barracrough, Ray. "Philo's Politics. Roman Rule and Hellenistic Judaism." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*. 21.1:417-553. Part 2, *Principat*, 21.1. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. New York: de Gruyter, 1984.



- Barclay, John M. G. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE –117 CE)*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.
- Barrett, C. K. *The Acts of the Apostles*. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994-1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Luke the Historian in Recent Study*. London: Epworth, 1961.
- Barstad, Hans M. *The Myth of the Empty Land: A Study in the History and Archaeology of Judah during the 'Exilic' Period*. Symbolae osloenses 28. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1996.
- Bartlett, John R. *1 Maccabees*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Barton, Stephen C., ed. *Where Shall Wisdom be Found: Wisdom in the Bible, the Church and the Contemporary World*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999.
- Bauernfeind, Otto. "Tradition und Komposition in dem Apokatastasispruch Apostelgeschichte 3,20 f." Pages 13-23 in *Abraham unser Vater*. Edited by Otto Betz, Martin Hengel, and Peter Schmidt. Leiden: Brill, 1963.
- Bauckham, Richard, ed. *The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting*. Vol. 4 of *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting*. Edited by Bruce W. Winter. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts." Pages 435-87 in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*. Edited by James M. Scott. Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement Series 72. Boston: Brill, 2001.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M., ed. *Qumran Cave 4. XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266-273)*. DJD 18; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- Becker, Jürgen. *Das Heil Gottes, Heils- und Sündenbegriffe in den Qumrantexten und im Neuen Testament*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen*. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- Becking Bob and Marjo C. A. Korpel, eds. *The Crisis of Israelite Religion: Transformation of Religious Tradition in Exilic and Post-Exilic Times*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Bedford, Peter Ross. "Diaspora: Homeland Relations in Ezra-Nehemiah," *Vetus Testamentum* 52 (2001): (147-65).
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Temple Restoration in the Early Archaemenid Judah*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 65. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Beentjes, Pancratius C. *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts*. Vetus Testamentum Supplements 68. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

- Betz, Hans Dieter. *The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, including the Sermon on the Plain (Matthew 5:3-7:27 and Luke 6:20-49)*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
- Bickerman, Elias. "The Edict of Cyrus in Ezra 1." Pages 72-108 in *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*. Edited by in Elias Bickerman. *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums* 9. Part 1. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- Birnbaum, Ellen. *The Place of Judaism in Philo's Thought: Israel, Jews, and Proselytes*. *Studia philonica* 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. "Bible, Archaeology, and Politics; or The Empty Land Revisited." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 27 (2002): 169-87.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Ezra-Nehemiah: A Commentary*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988.
- Bogaert, Pierre. *Apocalypse de Baruch, Introduction, Traduction du Syriaque et Commentaire*. 2 vols. Sources Chrétiennes 144-45. Paris: Cerf, 1969.
- Bonz, Marianne Palmer. *The Past as Legacy: Luke-Acts and Ancient Epic*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000.
- Boogaart, Thomas A. *Reflections on Restoration: A Study of Prophecies in Micah and Isaiah about the Restoration of Northern Israel*. Groningen: Rijksuniversiteit te Groningen, 1981.
- Borg, Marcus J. *Conflict, Holiness, and Politics in the Teaching of Jesus*. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1998.
- Borgen, Peder. "'There Shall Come Forth a Man': Reflections on Messianic Ideas in Philo." Pages 341-61 in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Bovon, François. "Israel, die Kirche und die Völker im lukanischen Doppelwerk." *TL* 108 (1983): 403-14.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50*. Translated by Christine Thomas. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Luke the Theologian: Thirty-three Years of Research (1950-1983)*. Translated by Ken McKinney. Allison Park, Pa.: Pickwick Publications, 1987.
- Bracke, John A. "Šûb šebût: A Reappraisal," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 97 (1985): 233-44.
- Brawley, Robert L. *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 33. Atlanta: Scholars, 1987.
- Brooke, George J., et al., eds. *Qumran Cave 4:XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*. DJD XXII. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 29. Sheffield: JSOT, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Isaiah 40:3 and the Wilderness Community." Pages 117-32 in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Paris 1992*. Edited by George J. Brooke. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Luke-Acts and the Qumran Scroll: The Case of 4QMMT." Pages 72-90 in *Luke's Literary Achievement: Collected Essays*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Messiah of Aaron in the Damascus Document." *Revue de Qumran* 15 (1991): 215-30.
- Broshi, Magen et al., ed. *Qumran Cave 4: XIV, Parabiblical Texts, Part 2*. DJD XIX. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.
- Brown, Colin. "What was John the Baptist Doing?" *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 7 (1997): 37-50.
- Brown, Schuyler. *Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969.
- Bruce, F. F. "Eschatology in Acts." Pages 51-63 in *Eschatology and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of George Raymond Beasley-Murray*. Edited by W. Hulitt Gloer. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1988.
- Brueggemann, Walter. *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997.
- Bryan, David J. "Exile and Return from Jerusalem." Pages 60-80 in *Apocalyptic in History and Tradition*. Edited by Christopher Rowland and John Barton. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 43. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003.
- Cadbury, Henry. "Acts and Eschatology." Pages 300-21 in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*. Edited by W. D. Davies and Charles Harold Dodd. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Making of Luke-Acts*. London: SPCK, 1958.
- Caird, George B. "The Chronology of the NT." Pages 599-607 in vol. 1 of *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by G. A. Buttrick. 4 vols. New York: Abingdon, 1962.
- Campbell, Jonathan. "Essene-Qumran Origins in the Exile: A Scriptural Basis?" *Journal of Jewish Studies* 46 (1995): 143-56.
- Carmignac, Jean. *La Règle de la Guerre: Des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres: Texte, Restauré, Traduit, Commenté*. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1958.

- Carroll, John T. *Response to the End of History: Eschatology and Situation in Luke-Acts*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 92. Atlanta: Scholars, 1988.
- Carroll, Robert P. "Deportation and Diasporic Discourses in the Prophetic Literature." Pages 63-85 in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*. Edited by James M. Scott. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Exile! What Exile? Deportation and Discourses of Diaspora." Pages 62-79 in *Leading Captivity Captive: 'The Exile' as History and Ideology*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 278. Edited by Lester L. Grabbe. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Myth of the Empty Land." Pages 79-93 in *Ideological Criticism of Biblical Texts*. Semeia 59. Edited by David Jobling and Tina Pippin. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Israel, History of [Post-Monarchic Period]." Pages 567-76 in vol. 3 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday 1992.
- Cathcart, K. J. "Day of Yahweh." Pages 84-85 in vol. 2 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Chance, J. Bradley. *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts*. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1988.
- Charles, R. H. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1913.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1912.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1908.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1908.
- Charlesworth, James H. "The Concept of the Messiah in the Pseudepigrapha." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*. 19.1.88-218. Part 2, *Principat*, 19.1. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume 2 Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*. Princeton Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume 1 Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Princeton Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1994.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "From Messianology to Christology: Problems and Prospects." Pages 3-35 in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Lost Tribes." Page 372 of vol. 4 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *The Hebrew Bible and Qumran. The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Vol. 1. N. Richland Hills, Tex.: BIBAL Press, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983-1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Pseudepigraphica and Modern Research with a Supplement. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 7*. Ann Arbor: Scholars Press, 1981.
- Christensen, Duane L. "Nations." Pages 1035-49 in vol. 4 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Clark, Andrew C. "The Role of the Apostles." Pages 169-90 in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Clines, David J. *Ezra Nehemiah, Esther*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.
- Coats, G. W., ed. *Saga, Legend, Tale, Novella, Fable: Narrative Forms in the Old Testament Literature*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 35. Sheffield: JSOT, 1985.
- Coggins, Richard J. *Sirach*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Cohen, Shaye J. D. *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*. Library of Early Christianity. Vol. 7. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987.
- Cohen, Shaye and Ernest Frerichs. *Diasporas in Antiquity*. Brown Judaic Studies 288. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.
- Collins, John J. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. 2d. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*. The Biblical Resource Series. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Date and the Provenance of the Testament of the Testament of Moses." Pages 15-32 in *Studies on the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers*. Edited by G.W.E. Nickelsburg. Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 4. Cambridge, Mass., 1973.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Development of the Sibylline Tradition." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*. 20.1.421-59. Part 2, *Principat*, 19.1. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1987.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Dualism and Eschatology in 1QM: A Reply to P. R. Davies." *Vetus Testamentum* 29 (1979): 212-16.

\_\_\_\_\_, ed. *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism: Volume 1: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*. New York: Continuum, 2000.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Epic of Theodotos and the Hellenism of the Hasmoneans." *Harvard Theological Review* 73 (1980): 93-104.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Expectation of the End in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 74-90 in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and Peter W. Flynt. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997.

\_\_\_\_\_. "'The King has Become a Jew': The Perspective on the Gentile World in Bel and the Snake." Pages 167-77 in *Seers, Sibyls, and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*. Edited by John J. Collins. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Messianism in the Maccabean Period." Pages 97-109 in *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. Edited by Jacob Neusner, William Scott Green and Ernest S. Frerichs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll: A Point of Transition in Jewish Apocalyptic." *Vetus Testamentum* 25 (1975): 596-612.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Nebuchadnezzar and the Kingdom of God: Deferred Eschatology in the Jewish Diaspora." Pages 131-37 in *Seers, Sibyls, and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*. Edited by John J. Collins. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Origin of the Qumran Community: A Review of the Evidence." Pages 159-78 in *To Touch the Text: Biblical and Related Studies in Honor of Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S. J.* Edited by Maurya P. Horgan and Paul Kobelski. New York: Crossroad, 1989.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*. New York: Doubleday, 1995.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Sibyl and the Potter: Political Propaganda in Ptolemaic Egypt." Pages 199-210 in *Seers, Sibyls, and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*. Edited By John J. Collins. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 13. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Testamentary Literature." Pages 268-85 in *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters*. Edited by Robert A. Kraft and George W. E. Nickelsburg. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Testaments." Pages 325-55 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*. Section 2.2. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Colson, Francis H. and George H. Whitaker, eds. *Philo*. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press, 1929-1962.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Der Mitte de Zeit*. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1953.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Theology of St. Luke*. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Luke's Place in the Development of Early Christianity." Pages 298-316 in *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. London: SPCK, 1968.
- Cook, Michael. "The Mission of the Jews in Acts: Unraveling Luke's 'Myth of the Myriads'." Pages 102-123 in *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives*. Edited by Joseph B. Tyson. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988.
- Cowley, A. E. *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B. C.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1923.
- Cross, Frank Moore. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Cullman, Oscar. *Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History*. Translated by F. Filson. Rev. ed. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964.
- Dahl, Nils A. *Das Volk Gottes. Eine Untersuchung zum Kirchenbewusstsein des Urchristentums*. Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1941.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A People for his Name." *New Testament Studies* 6 (1957-1958): 319-27.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts." Pages 139-58 in *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. London: SPCK, 1968.
- Davies, Philip R. *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran*. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1969.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Birthplace of the Essenes: 'Where Is "Damascus?"'" *Revue de Qumran* 14 (1990): 503-19.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Dualism and Eschatology in 1QM: A Rejoinder." *Vetus Testamentum* 30 (1980): 93-97.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Dualism and Eschatology in the Qumran War Scroll." *Vetus Testamentum* 28 (1978): 28-36.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Biblical and the Qumranic Concept of War." Pages 275-305 in *The Hebrew Bible and Qumran*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. N. Richland, Tex.: BIBAL Press, 2000.
- Davies, William D. and Louis Finkelstein, eds. *The Cambridge History of Judaism: The Hellenistic Age*. Volume 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*. Brown Judaic Studies 186. Atlanta: Scholars, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Territorial Dimension of Judaism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.
- de Jonge, Marinus. "The Expectation of the Future in the Psalms of Solomon." *Neotestamentica* 23 (1989): 93-117.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Collected Essays of Marinus de Jonge*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 63. Leiden: Brill, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Role of Intermediaries in God's Final Intervention in the Future according to the Qumran Scrolls." Pages 44-63 in *Studies on the Jewish Background of the New Testament*. Edited by O. Michel, et al., eds. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1969.
- de Wit, Willem-Jan. *Expectations and the Expected One: 4Q521 and the Light it Sheds on the New Testament*. Doctoraalscriptie, Universiteit Utrecht, 2000.
- Delcor, Matthias. "The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Hellenistic Period: Tobit." Pages 409-503 in *The Cambridge History of Judaism: The Hellenistic Age*. Edited by William D. Davies and Louis Finkelstein. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Denova, Rebecca I. *The Things Accomplished Among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke-Acts*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 141. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Dibelius, Martin. *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*. Edited by Heinrich Greeven. London: SCM, 1956.



Di Lella, Alexander A. "The Deuteronomistic Background of the Farewell Discourse in Tob 14:3-11." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 41 (1979): 380-89.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Hebrew Text of Sirach: A Text-Critical and Historical Study*. Studies in Classical Literature 1. The Hague: Mouton, 1966.

Dietrich, Ernst L. שׁוֹב שְׁבוּת *Die endzeitliche Wiederherstellung bei der Propheten Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 40. Geissen: Töpelmann, 1925.

Dimant, Devorah. "Qumran Sectarian Literature." Pages 483-550 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period. Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum. Section 2.2. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

Donaldson, Terrence A. "Proselytes or 'Righteous Gentiles'? The Status of Gentiles in Eschatological Pilgrimage Patterns of Thought." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 7 (1990): 3-27.

Downing, F. Gerald. "Exile in Formative Judaism." Pages 148-68 in *Making Sense in [and off] the First Christian Century*. Edited by F. Gerald Downing. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 197. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

\_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Making Sense in [and off] the First Christian Century*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 197. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Drury, John. *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel: A Study in Early Christian Historiography*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1976.

Dunn, James D. G. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Epworth Commentaries. Peterborough: Epworth, 1996.

\_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135. The Second Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium on Earliest Christianity and Judaism Durham, September, 1989*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Partings of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity*. London: SCM, 1996.

\_\_\_\_\_. Review of N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, *Journal of Theological Studies* 49 (1998): 727-34.

Edwards, D. "Luke's Unique Interest in Historical Chronology." Pages 378-87 in *Society of Biblical Literature 1989 Seminar Papers*. Atlanta: Scholars, 1989.

Elliot, Mark Adam. *The Survivors of Israel: A Reconsideration of Pre-Christian Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

- Eltester, Walther. "Israel im lukanischen Werk und die Nazarethperiokope." Pages 76-147 in *Jesus in Nazareth*. Edited by Walther Eltester. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 40. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972.
- Eshel, Hanan. "The Kittim in the War Scroll and in the Pesharim." Pages 29-44 in *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 37. Edited by David Goodblatt, Avital Pinnick and Daniel Schwartz. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Esler, Philip Francis. *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Evans, C. F. "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel." Pages 37-53 in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.
- Evans, Craig. "Jesus and the Continuing Exile of Israel." Pages 77-100 in *Jesus and the Restoration of Israel: A Critical Assessment of N.T. Wright's Jesus and the Victory of God*. Edited by Carey C. Newman. Downers Grove, Ill.: Intervarsity, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Predictions of the Destruction of the Herodian Temple in the Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Scrolls, and Related Texts." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 10 (1992): 89-147.
- Evans, Craig A. and James A. Sanders., eds. *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- Feldman, Louis H. "The Concept of Exile in Josephus." Pages 145-72 in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*. Edited by James. M. Scott. Journal of Judaism Supplement 56. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Feldman Louis H. and Gohei Hata, eds. *Josephus, the Bible, and History*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_, eds. *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Anchor Bible 31. New York: Doubleday, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Jewish Christianity in Acts in Light of the Qumran Scrolls." Pages 139-58 in *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. London: SPCK, 1968.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Luke the Theologian: Aspects of his Teaching*. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel According to Luke, I–IX*. Anchor Bible 28. New York: Doubleday, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel According to Luke, X–XXIV*. Anchor Bible 28a. New York: Doubleday, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Tobit*. Commentary on Early Jewish Literature. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003.
- Flender, Helmut. *St. Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History*. London: SPCK, 1967.
- Fletcher-Louis. *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 42. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. 2.94. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1998.
- Flusser, David. "The Magnificat, the Benedictus, and the War Scroll." Pages 126-49 in *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity*. Edited by David Flusser. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988.
- Franklin, Eric. *Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts*. London: SPCK, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Luke: Interpreter of Paul, Critical of Matthew*. Journal for the Society of the New Testament Supplement Series 92. Sheffield: JSOT, 1994.
- Franklyn, P. R. "The Cultic and Pious Climax of Eschatology in the Psalms of Solomon." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods* 18 (1987): 1-17.
- Fröhlich, Ida. "Themes, Structure, and Genre of Pesher Genesis." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 85 (1994): 81-99.
- Fujita, Shozo. "The Metaphor of Plant in Jewish Literature of the Intertestamental Period." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods* 7 (1976): 30-45.
- Fusco, Vittorio. "Luke-Acts and the Future of Israel." *Novum Testamentum* 38 (1996): 1-17.
- Gabba, Emilio. "The Growth of Anti-Judaism or the Greek Attitude towards Jews." Pages 614-56 in *The Cambridge History of Judaism: The Hellenistic Age*. Volume 2. Edited by W. D. Davies and Louis Finkelstein. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Gafni, Isaiah M. "The Historical Background." Pages 1-31 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum. Section 2.2. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Josephus and 1 Maccabees." Pages 116-31 in *Josephus, the Bible, and History*. Edited by Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Land Center and Diaspora: Jewish Constructs in Late Antiquity*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 21. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- García Martínez, Florentino, ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English*. 2d. ed. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- García Martínez, Florentino and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997-98.
- Gaston, Lloyd. *No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem*. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- George, Augustin. "Israël dans L'Oeuvre de Luc." *Revue Biblique* 75 (1968): 481-525
- Geyser, A. S. "Some Salient New Testament Passages on the Restoration of the Twelve Tribes of Israel." Pages 305-10 in *L'Apocalypse johannique et l'Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament*. Edited by J. Lambrecht. Leuven: University Press, 1980.
- Giblin, Charles. *The Destruction of Jerusalem according to Luke's Gospel: A Historical-Typological Moral*. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1985.
- Gnilka, J. *Die Verstockung Israels. Isaias 6, 9-10 in der Theologie der Synoptiker*. Munich: Kösel, 1961.
- Golb, Norman. *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls? The Search for the Secret of Qumran*. New York: Scribner, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Problem of Origin and Identification of the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 124 (1980): 1-24.
- Goldstein, Jonathan A. "Biblical Promises and 1 Maccabees and 2 Maccabees." Pages 69-96 in *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. Edited by Jacob Neusner, William Scott Green, and Ernest S. Frerichs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *I Maccabees*. Anchor Bible 41. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *II Maccabees*. Anchor Bible 41a. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983.
- Goodblatt, David, Avital Pinnick, and Daniel Schwartz, eds. *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea*

*Scrolls and Associated Literature*, 27-31 January, 1999. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah XXXVII. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Goodenough, Erwin R. *Introduction to Philo Judaeus*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Politics of Philo Judaeus*. New Haven: Yale, 1938.

Goodman, Martin. "Diaspora Reactions to the Destruction of the Temple." Pages 27-38 in *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135. The Second Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium on Earliest Christianity and Judaism Durham, September, 1989*. Edited by James D. G. Dunn. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

\_\_\_\_\_. ed. *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Mission and Conversion: Proselytizing in the Religious History of the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.

Goranson, Stephen. "Others and Intra-Jewish Polemic as Reflected in Qumran Texts." Pages 534-51 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. 2 vols. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Gottwald, Norman K. *All the Kingdoms of the Earth: Israelite Prophecy and International Relations in the Ancient Near East*. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.

Gowan, Donald E. "The Exile in Jewish Apocalyptic." Pages 205-223 in *Scripture in History and Theology*. Edited by Arthur L. Merrill and Thomas W. Overholt. Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1977.

Grabbe, Lester L., ed. *Leading Captivity Captive: 'The Exile' as History and Ideology*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 278. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Green, Joel B. *The Gospel of Luke*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Theology of the Gospel of Luke*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Green, William Scott. "Introduction: Messiah in Judaism: Rethinking the Question." Pages 1-13 in *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. Edited by Jacob Neusner, William Scott Green, and Ernest S. Frerichs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Griffen, Patrick J. "The Theology and Function of Prayer in the Book of Tobit." Ph. D. diss., Catholic University of America, 1984.

Gruen, Erich. *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Jews, Greeks, and Romans in the Third Sibylline Oracle." Pages 15-36 in *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World*. Edited by Martin Goodman. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.

- Gruenwald, Ithamar, Shaul Shaked, and Gedaliahu G. Stroumsa, eds. *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity: Presented to David Flusser on the Occasion of his Seventh-Fifth Birthday*. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1992.
- Haenchen, Ernst. "Judentum und Christentum in der Apostelgeschichte." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 54 (1963): 155-87.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Book of Acts as Source Material for the History of Early Christianity." Pages 258-78 in *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. London: SPCK, 1968.
- Hallo, William W. *The Context of Scripture: Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World Vol. 2*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Halpern-Amaru, Betsy. *Rewriting the Bible: Land and Covenant in Post-Biblical Judaism*. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1994.
- Hamm, M. Dennis. "The Freeing of the Bent Woman and the Restoration of Israel: Luke 13.10-17 as Narrative Theology." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 31 (1987): 23-44.
- Hammerton-Kelley, Robert, ed. *Jews, Greeks, and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity*. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- Hanhart, Robert. *Tobit*. Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum graecum auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Göttingensis editum 8/5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983.
- Hann, Robert R. *The Manuscript History of the Psalms of Solomon*. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 13. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1982.
- Harland, P. J. and C. T. R. Hayward, eds. *New Heaven and New Earth: Prophecy and the Millenium: Essays in Honour of Anthony Gelston*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Harrington, D. J. "Interpreting Israel's History: The Testament of Moses as a Rewriting of Deut 31-34." Pages 59-68 in *Studies on the Testament of Moses*. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 4. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1973.
- Harrington, Daniel J. *Invitation to the Apocrypha*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sirach Research since 1965: Progress and Questions." Pages 164-76 in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 184. Edited by John C. Reeves and John Kampen. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Harvey, Graham. *The True Israel: Uses of the Names Jew, Hebrew and Israel in Ancient Jewish and Early Christian Literature*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Hayward, C. T. R. "Balaam's Prophecies as Interpreted by Philo and the Aramaic Targums of the Pentateuch." Pages 19-36 in *New Heaven and New Earth: Prophecy and the Millenium: Essays in Honour of Anthony Gelston*. Edited by P. J. Harland and C. T. R. Hayward. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Jewish Temple at Leontopolis: A Reconsideration," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 32 (1982): 429-43.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Philo, the Septuagint of Genesis 32:24-32 and the Name 'Israel': Fighting the Passions, Inspiration and the Vision of God." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 51 (2000): 209-26.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Sacrifice and World Order: Some Observations on Ben Sira's Attitude to the Temple Service." Pages 22-34 in *Sacrifice and Redemption: Durham Essays in Theology*. Edited by S. W. Sykes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Sirach and Wisdom's Dwelling Place." Pages 31-46 in *Where Shall Wisdom be Found: Wisdom in the Bible, the Church and the Contemporary World*. Edited by Stephen C. Barton. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999.

Hecht, Richard D. "Philo and Messiah." Pages 139-68 in *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. Edited by Jacob Neusner, William Scott Green, and Ernest S. Frerichs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Helyer, Larry R. "Luke and the Restoration of Israel." *Journal of Evangelical Theological Society* 36 (1993): 317-29.

Hempel, Charlotte. "Community Origins in the Damascus Document in the Light of Recent Scholarship." Pages 316-29 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Traditions, and Redaction*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. 2 vols. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

Himmelfarb, Martha. *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Hoffmann Lawrence A., ed. *The Land of Israel: Jewish Perspectives*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1986.

Hofmann, Norbert Johannes. *Die Assumptio Mosis: Studien zur Rezeption massgültiger Überlieferung*. Supplements to the Journal Study for the Study of Judaism 67. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

- Holladay, William L. *The Root Šûbh in the Old Testament*. Leiden: Brill, 1958.
- Hollander, H. W. and M. de Jonge. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Holmen, Tom. *Jesus and Jewish Thinking: Covenant Thinking*. Biblical Interpretation Series 55. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Horbury, William, and W. D. Davies, John Sturdy, eds. *Cambridge History of Judaism: The Early Roman Period*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Horgan Maurya P. and Paul Kobelski, eds. *To Touch the Text: Biblical and Related Studies in Honor of Joseph A. Fitzmyer*, S. J. New York: Crossroad, 1989.
- Horsley, Richard A. *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs: Popular Movements in the Time of Jesus*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Kingdom of God and the Renewal of Israel: Synoptic Gospels, Jesus Movements, and Apocalypticism." Pages 303-44 in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism: Volume 1: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by John J. Collins. New York: Continuum, 2000.
- Humphreys, W.L. "Novella." Pages 82-96 in *Saga, Legend, Tale, Novella, Fable: Narrative Forms in the Old Testament Literature*. Edited by G. W. Coats. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 35. Sheffield: JSOT, 1985.
- Japhet, Sara. "Exile and the Restoration in the Book of Chronicles." Pages 33-44 in *The Crisis of Israelite Religion: Transformation of Religious Tradition in Exilic and Post-Exilic Times*. Edited by Bob Becking and Marjo C. A. Korpel. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *Jesus' Promise to the Nations: The Franze Delitzsch Lectures for 1953*. Naperville, Ill.: Allenson, 1958.
- Jervell, Jacob. "The Church of Jews and Godfearers." Pages 11-20 in *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives*. Edited by Joseph B. Tyson. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Johnson, Luke T. *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts*. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.
- Kasher, A. *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1985.
- Keck, Leander E. and J. Louis Martyn, eds. *Studies in Luke-Acts*. London: SPCK, 1968.



- Kee, Howard Clark. *Good News to the End of the Earth: The Theology of Acts*. London: SCM/Trinity, 1990.
- Kelly, Joseph G. "Lucan Christology and the Jewish-Christian Dialogue." *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 21/4 (1984): 689-708.
- Kilgallen, John J. "The Function of Stephen's Speech (Acts 7, 2-53)," *Biblica* 70 (1989): 173-93.
- King, David M. "The Use of Amos 9:11-12 in Acts 15:16-18." *Ashland Theological Journal*, 1989 21: 8-13.
- Kinman, Brent. "Lucan Eschatology and the Missing Fig Tree." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 113 (1994): 669-78.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Parousia, Jesus' 'A-Triumphal' Entry, and the Fate of Jerusalem (Luke 19:28-44)." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 118 (1999): 279-94.
- Kirschner, Robert. "Apocalyptic and Rabbinic Responses to the Destruction of 70." *Harvard Theological Review* 78 (1985): 27-46.
- Klassen, William and Graydon F. Snyder, eds. *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation*. New York: Harper, 1962.
- Klausner, Joseph. *The Messianic Idea in Israel*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1956.
- Klein, Ralph W. *Israel in Exile: A Theological Interpretation*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.
- Knibb, Michael. "Exile." Pages 276-77 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. Volume 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Exile in the Damascus Document." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 25 (1983): 99-117.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Exile in the Literature of the Intertestamental Period." *Heythrop Journal* 17 (1976): 253-72.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Interpretation of Damascus Document VII, 9b-VIII, 2a and XIX, 5b-14." *Revue de Qumran* 15 (1991): 243-51.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Note on 4Q372 and 4Q390." Pages 164-77 in *The Scriptures and the Scrolls. Studies in Honour of A. S. van der Woude on Occasion of his 65<sup>th</sup> Birthday*. Edited by F. García Martínez, A. Hilhorst, and C. J. Labuschagne. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Place of the Damascus Document." Pages 149-62 in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects*. Edited by Michael O. Wise et al. New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994.

- Kolenkow, Anita Bingham. "The Literary Genre 'Testament'." Pages 259-67 in *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters*. Edited by Robert A. Kraft and George W. E. Nickelsburg. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- Kraabel, A. T. "The Diaspora Synagogue: Archaeological and Epigraphic Evidence since Sukenik." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*. 19.1.477-510. Part 2, *Principat*, 19.1. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. New York: de Gruyter, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Roman Diaspora: Six Questionable Assumptions." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 33 (1982): 445-64.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Unity and Diversity among Diaspora Synagogues." Pages 49-59 in *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Lee I. Levine. Philadelphia: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1987.
- Kraft, Robert A. and George W. E. Nickelsburg. *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- Kurz, William. *Farewell Addresses in the New Testament*. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Reading Luke-Acts: The Dynamics of Biblical Narrative*. Louisville, Ky.: John Knox, 1993.
- Lambrecht, J., ed. *L'Apocalypse johannique et l'Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament*. Leuven: University Press, 1980.
- Levenson, Jon D. *Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40-48*. Harvard Semitic Monograph Series 10. Missoula, Mo.: Scholars, 1976.
- Levine, Lee I., ed. *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity*. Philadelphia: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1987.
- Levine, Amy-Jill. "Tobit: Teaching Jews How to Live in the Diaspora." *Bible Review* 8 (1992): 42-64.
- Licht, J. "Taxo, or the Apocalyptic Doctrine of Vengeance." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 12 (1961): 95-103.
- Lim, Timothy H. "11QMelch, Luke 4 and the Dying Messiah." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 43 (1992): 90-92.
- Lohfink, Gerhard. *Die Sammlung Israels: Eine Untersuchung zur lukanischen Ekklesiologie*. Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus and Community: The Social Dimension of Christian Faith*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1996.

- Lull, David J., ed. *SBL Seminar Papers, 1988*. Atlanta: Scholars, 1988.
- Mack, Burton L. *Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic: Ben Sira's Hymn in Praise of the Fathers*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.
- Maddox, Robert. *The Purpose of Luke-Acts*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.
- Mainville, Odette. *L'Esprit dans l'Oeuvre de Luc*. Montreal: Fides, 1991.
- Manek, J. "The New Exodus in the Books of Luke." *Novum Testamentum* 2 (1957): 8-23.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Luke: Historian and Theologian*. Downers Grove: Intervarsity, 1970.
- Marshall, I. Howard and David Peterson, eds. *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Matera, Frank J. "Jesus' Journey to Jerusalem (Luke 9.51-19.46): A Conflict With Israel." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 51 (1993): 57-77.
- Mattill, A. J. *Luke and the Last Things: A Perspective for the Understanding of Lukan Thought*. Dillsboro, N. C.: Western North Carolina Press, 1979.
- Mauser, Ulrich W. *Christ in the Wilderness: The Wilderness Theme in the Second Gospel and its Basis in the Biblical Tradition*. London: SCM, 1963.
- McConville, J. G. "Restoration in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic Literature." Pages 12-40 in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*. Edited by James M. Scott. *Journal of Judaism Supplement* 72. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- McKelvey, R. J. *New Temple: The Church in the New Testament*. London: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- McKnight, Scot. *A Light Among the Gentiles: Jewish Activity in the Second Temple Period*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- Mélèze-Modrzejewski, Joseph. "The Birth of a Diaspora: The Emergence of a Jewish Self-Definition in Ptolemaic Egypt in the Light of Onomastics." Pages 93-127 in *Diasporas in Antiquity*. BJS 288. Edited by Shaye J. D. Cohen and Ernest S. Frerichs. Atlanta: Scholars, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "How to be a Greek and yet a Jew in Hellenistic Alexandria." Pages 65-91 in *Diasporas in Antiquity*. Brown Judaic Studies 288. Edited by Shaye J. D. Cohen and Ernest S. Frerichs. Atlanta: Scholars, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Jews of Egypt: From Rameses II to Emperor Hadrian*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.

Mendels, Doran. *The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in Hasmonean Literature Recourse to History in Second Century BC*. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 15. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1987.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Pseudo-Philo's Biblical Antiquities, the Fourth Philosophy," and the Political Messianism of the First Century C.E.," Pages 261-75 in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Rise and Fall of Jewish Nationalism: Jewish and Christian Ethnicity in Ancient Palestine*. 2d ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.

Merk, O. "Das Reich Gottes in den lukanischen Schriften." Pages 201-20 in *Jesus und Paulus*. Edited by E. E. Ellis and E. Grässer. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1975.

Merkel, Helmut. "Israel im lukanischen Werk." *New Testament Studies* 40 (1994): 371-98.

Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (Third Edition)*. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1975.

Meyer, Ben F. *The Aims of Jesus*. London: SCM, 1979.

Michel, O. et al., eds. *Studies on the Jewish Background of the New Testament*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1969.

Milik, J. T. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea*. Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, 1959.

Minear, Paul S. "Luke's Use of the Birth Stories." Pages 111-30 in *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. London: SPCK, 1968.

Moessner, David P., ed. *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim upon Israel's Legacy*. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1999.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Jesus and the Wilderness Generation: The Death of the Prophet like Moses according to Luke." Pages 319-40 in *SBL Seminar Papers, 1982*. Atlanta: Scholars, 1982.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Ironic Fulfillment of Israel's Glory." Pages 35-50 in *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives*. Edited by Joseph B. Tyson. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1989.

- Moore, Carey A. *Tobit: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday, 1996.
- Mowinkel, Sigmund. *He That Cometh: The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and Later Judaism*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1956.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "The Damascus Document Revisited." *Revue Biblique* 92 (1985): 223-46.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Essenes and their History." *Revue Biblique* 81 (1974): 215-44;
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Original Text of CD 7:9-8:2 = 19:5-14." *Harvard Theological Review* (1971): 379-86.
- Mussner, Franz. "Die Idee der Apokatastasis in der Apostelgeschichte." Pages 293-306 in *Lex Tua Veritas*. Edited by H. Gross and F. Mussner. Trier: Paulinus, 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Tractate on the Jews: The Significance of Judaism for Christian Faith*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Neirynck, F. ed. *L'Evangile de Luc: The Gospel of Luke*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 32. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989.
- Neusner, Jacob. *Judaism and Its Social Metaphors: Israel in the History of Jewish Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Self-fulfilling Prophecy: Exile and the Return of Judaism*. Boston: Beacon, 1987.
- Neusner, Jacob, William Scott Green and Ernest S. Frerichs, eds. *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Newsom, Carol A. and Sharon H. Ringe, eds. *Women's Bible Commentary: Expanded Edition*. Louisville: John Knox, 1998.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. "An Antiochan Date for the Testament of Moses." Pages 33-37 in *Studies on the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 4. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg. Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1-36; 81-108*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Salvation without and with a Messiah: Developing Beliefs in Writings Ascribed to Enoch," Pages 49-68 in *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. Edited by Jacob Neusner, William Scott Green, and Ernest Frerichs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Stories of Biblical and Early Post-biblical Times." Pages 33-87 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum. Section 2.2. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Studies on the Testament of Moses*. Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973.
- Nielsen, Anders E. *Until it is Fulfilled: Lukan Eschatology according to Luke 22 and Acts 20*. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck 2000.
- Nolland, John. *Luke 1-9:20*. Word Biblical Commentary. Volume 35a. Dallas: Word Biblical, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Luke 9:21-18:34*. Word Biblical Commentary. Volume 35b. Dallas: Word Biblical, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Luke 18:35-24:53*. Word Biblical Commentary. Volume 35c. Dallas: Word Biblical, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Salvation History and Eschatology." Pages 63-81 in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Noth, Martin. *Überlieferungsgeschichte Studien*. Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse, 18 Jahr, Hft. 2. Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1943.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Deuteronomistic History. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplemental Series 15. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981.
- O'Neill, J. C. *The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting*. 2nd ed. London: SPCK, 1970.
- O'Toole, Robert F. "Reflections on Luke's Treatment of Jews in Luke-Acts." *Biblica* 74 (1993): 529-55.
- Oegema, Gerbern S. *The Anointed and His People: Messianic Expectations from Maccabees to Bar Kochba*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Oppenheimer, Aharon. *Jüdische Geschichte in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit, Weg der Forschung: Vom alten zum neuen Schürer*. München: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1999.
- Otzen, Benedikt. *Tobit and Judith*. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Pao, David W. *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000.

- Parry, Donald W. and Eugene Ulrich, eds. *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Pate, C. Marvin. *Communities of the Last Days: The Dead Sea Scrolls, the New Testament, and the Story of Israel*. Downers Grove, Ill.: Intervarsity, 2000.
- Pines, Shlomo. "Notes on the Twelve Tribes in Qumran, Early Christianity, and Jewish Tradition." Pages 151-54 in *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity Presented to David Flusser on the Occasion of his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by Ithamar Gruenwald, Shaul Shaked, and Gedaliahu G. Stroumsa. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1992.
- Plöger, Otto. *Theocracy and Eschatology*. Richmond: John Knox, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Theokratie und Eschatologie*. Neukirchen: Neukirchner Verlag, 1959.
- Pomykala, Kenneth E. *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism: Its History and Significance for Messianism*. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature 7. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Porten, B. and A. Yardeni. *Textbook of Ancient Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt*. 3 vols. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1986-1992.
- Porten, B. *Archives from Elephantine: The Life of an Ancient Jewish Military Colony*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968.
- Powery, Emerson B. *Jesus Reads Scripture: The Function of Jesus' Use of Scripture in the Synoptic Gospels*. Brill: Leiden, 2003.
- Pritchard, James B., ed. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955.
- Purvis, James. "Exile and Return: From the Babylonian Destruction to the Reconstruction of the Jewish State." Revised by Eric Meyers. Pages 201-29 in *Ancient Israel: From Abraham to the Roman Destruction of the Temple: Revised and Expanded Edition*. Edited by Hershel Shanks. Upper Sadler River, N.J.: Prentice, 1999.
- Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. *Septuaginta*. Stuttgart: Biblia-Druck, 1979.
- Raisanen, Heikki. "The Redemption of Israel: A Salvation-Historical Problem in Luke-Acts." Pages 94-114 in *Luke-Acts: Scandinavian Perspectives*. Edited by Petri Luomanen. Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society, 1991.
- Rajak, Tessa. "The Location of Cultures in Second Temple Palestine: The Evidence of Josephus." Pages 1-14 in *The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting*. Edited by Richard Bauckham. Volume 4 of *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*. Edited by Bruce W. Winter. Grand Rapids: 1995.

- Ravens, David. *Luke and the Restoration of Israel*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 119. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Reeves, John C. and John Kampen, eds. *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 184. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Reiser, Marius. *Jesus and Judgment: The Eschatological Proclamation in its Jewish Context*. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Die Gerichtspredigt Jesu: Eine Untersuchung zur eschatologischen Verkündigung Jesu und ihrem frühjüdischen Hintergrund*. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, Neue Folge, Band 23. Münster: Aschendorff, 1990.
- Rengstorff, Karl Heinrich. "The Election of Matthias: Acts 1:15 ff." Pages 178-92 in *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation*. Edited by William Klassen and Graydon F. Snyder. New York: Harper, 1962.
- Rese, Martin. "The Jews in Luke-Acts: Some Second Thoughts." Pages 185-201 in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Edited by Joseph Verheyden. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999.
- Richard, Earl. "The Divine Purpose: The Jews and the Gentile Mission (Acts 15)." Pages 267-279 in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*. Edited by Charles H. Talbert. New York: Crossroad, 1984.
- Richardson, Peter and David Granskou. *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity*. Volume 1 of *Paul and the Gospels*. Edited by David Granskou. Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1986.
- Riches, John. *Jesus and the Transformation of Judaism*. New York: Seabury, 1982.
- Riesner, Rainer. "James' Speech (Acts 15:13-21), Simeon's Hymn (Luke 2:29-32), and Luke's Sources." Pages 263-78 in *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ*. Edited by Joel B. Green and Max Turner. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.
- Ringe, Sharon. *Luke*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995.
- Roberts, J. J. M. "The Old Testament's Contribution to Messianic Expectations." Pages 39-51 in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Rowland, Christopher and John Barton, eds. *Apocalyptic in History and Tradition*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 43. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003.
- Salmon, Marilyn. "Insider or Outsider? Luke's Relationship with Judaism." Pages 76-82 in *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives*. Edited by Joseph B. Tyson. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988.



Sanders, E. P. "The Covenant as a Soteriological Category and the Nature of Salvation in Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism." Pages 11-44 in *Jews, Greeks, and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Robert Hamerton-Kelly and Robin Scroggs. Leiden: Brill, 1976.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus and Judaism*. London: SCM, 1985.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Jesus and the Kingdom: The Restoration of Israel and the New People of God." Pages 225-39 in *Jesus, the Gospels, and the Church: Essays in Honor of William R. Farmer*. Edited by E. P. Sanders. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1987.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE-66CE*. London: SCM, 1992.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.

Sanders, Jack T. "The Jewish People in Luke-Acts." Pages 51-75 in *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives*. Edited by Joseph B. Tyson. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Jews in Luke-Acts*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

Sanders, James A. "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4." Pages 46-69 in *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

Sandmel, S. "Philo Judaeus: An Introduction to the Man, his Writings, and his Significance." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*. 21.1.3-46. Part 2, *Principat*, 21.1. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. New York: de Gruyter, 1984.

Sayler, Gwendolyn B. *Have the Promises Failed: A Literary Analysis of 2 Baruch*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertations Series 72. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1984.

Schäfer, Peter. *Judeophobia*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. "The Concept of Restoration in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 203-21 in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*. Edited by James M. Scott. Journal of Judaism Supplement 72. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their True Meaning for Judaism and Christianity*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publications Society, 1994.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. and James C. VanderKam, eds. *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Volume 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Schmid, Konrad and Odil Hannes Steck. "Restoration Passages in the Prophetic Tradition of the Old Testament." Pages 41-81 in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*. Edited by James M. Scott. Journal of Judaism Supplement 56. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Church in the New Testament*. New York: Herder & Herder, 1966.
- Scholem, Gershom. *The Messianic Idea in Judaism*. New York: Schocken, 1971.
- Schrenk, Christopher J. "The Nazareth Pericope: Luke 4:16-30 in Recent Study." In *The Gospel of Luke*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 32. Edited by F. Neirynck. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989.
- Schuller, Eileen M. "Tobit." Pages 272-78 in *Women's Bible Commentary: Expanded Edition*. Edited by Carol A. Newsom and Sharon H. Ringe. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1998.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. "Diasporan Historiography of the Second Temple Period." Pages 29-40 in *Jüdische Geschichte in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit, Weg der Forschung: Vom Alten zum neuen Schürer*. Edited by Aharon Oppenheimer and Elisabeth Müller-Luckner. München: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1999.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. "Diasporan Historiography of the Second Temple Period." Pages 29-40 in *Jüdische Geschichte in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit, Weg der Forschung: Vom alten zum neuen Schürer*. Edited by Aharon Oppenheimer and Elisabeth Müller-Luckner. München: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1999.
- Schweizer, Eduard. *The Good News according to Luke*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1984.
- Schwier, Helmut. *Tempel und Tempelzerstörung: Untersuchungen zu den theologischen und ideologischen Faktoren im ersten jüdisch-römischen Krieg (66-74 n. Chr.)*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Reprecht, 1989.
- Scott, James M. "Exile and the Self-Understanding of Diaspora Jews in the Greco-Roman Period." Pages 173-218 in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*. Edited by James M. Scott. Journal of Judaism Supplement 56. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*. Journal of Judaism Supplement 56. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Paul and the Nations: The Old Testament and Jewish Background of Paul's Mission to the Nations with Special Reference to the Destination of the Galatians*. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*. Journal of Judaism Supplement 72. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Philo and the Restoration of Israel." Pages 553-75 in *SBL Seminar Papers, 1995*. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Seccombe, David. "The New People of God." Pages 350-72 in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

- Shanks, Hershel, ed. *Ancient Israel: From Abraham to the Roman Destruction of the Temple: Revised and Expanded Edition*. Upper Saddle River, N. J.: Prentice, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Essene Origins—Palestine or Babylon." Pages 79-84 in *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reader from the Biblical Archaeology Review*. Edited by Hershel Shanks. New York: Random, 1992.
- Schürer, Emil. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135)*. Rev. ed. Revised and Edited by Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, Matthew Black, and Martin Goodman. 3 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1973-87.
- Simon, Marcel. "Saint Stephen and the Jerusalem Temple." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 2 (1951): 127-42.
- Skehan, Patrick W. and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes*. Anchor Bible 39. New York: Doubleday, 1987.
- Skehan, Patrick W. *The Hebrew text of Sirach: A Text Critical and Historical Study*. The Hague: Mouton, 1966.
- Smith, Morton. "The Gentiles in Judaism: 125 BCE-CE 66." Pages 192-249 in *Cambridge History of Judaism: The Early Roman Period*. Edited by W. Horbury, W. E. Davies, and J. Sturdy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Snodgrass, K. R. "Streams of Tradition Emerging from Isaiah 40:1-5 and their Adaptation in the New Testament." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 8 (1980): 24-45.
- Soll, William. "Tobit and Folklore Studies, with Emphasis on Propps' Morphology." Pages 39-53 in *SBL Seminar Papers, 1988*. Atlanta: Scholars, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Misfortune and Exile in Tobit: The Juncture of Fairy Tale Source and Deuteronomistic Theology." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 51 (1989): 209-31.
- Spencer, Richard A. "The Book of Tobit in Recent Research." *Currents in Research* 7 (1999): 147-80.
- Squires, John T. *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 76. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Steck, Odil Hannes. *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes in Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 23. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967.
- Stegemann, Harmut. *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Sterling, Gregory. *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephus, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 64. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

- Stern, Menahem. *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism. Edited with Introductions, Translations, and Commentary.* 3 vols. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1974-1984.
- Steudel, Annette. "אחרית הימים in the Texts from Qumran." *Revue de Qumran* 16 (1993): 225-246.
- Stone, Michael E. *Features of the Eschatology of IV Ezra.* Harvard Semitic Studies 35. Atlanta: Scholars, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra.* Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- Stone, Michael E. "The Axis of History at Qumran." Pages 133-49 in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature 12-14 January, 1997.* Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Stone, Michael E., ed. *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus.* Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum. Section 2.2. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Stone, Michael E. "Reactions of Destructions of the Second Temple," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 12 (1981): 195-204.
- Strauss, Mark L. *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology.* Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 110. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. *Angel Veneration and Christology: A Study in Early Judaism and in the Christology of the Apocalypse of John.* Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2.70. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Book of Daniel and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Making of the Remaking of the Biblical Tradition." Pages 154-71 in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Qumran.* Vol. 1. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. N. Richland, Tex.: BIBAL, 2000.
- Swartley, Williard M. *Israel's Scripture Traditions and the Synoptic Gospels: Story Shaping Story.* Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Sykes, S. W., ed. *Sacrifice and Redemption: Durham Essays in Theology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Sylva, Dennis D. "The Meaning and Function of Acts 7:46-50," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106 (1987): 261-75.
- Tabor, J. and M. O. Wise. "4Q521 'On Resurrection,' and the Synoptic Gospel Tradition: A Preliminary Study." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 10 (1992): 149-62.

Talmon, Shemaryahu. "The 'Desert Motif' in the Bible and in Qumran Literature." Pages 31-63 in *Biblical Motifs*. Edited by A. Altmann. Texts and Studies 3. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Types of Messianic Expectation." Pages 202-24 in *Kings, Cult and Calendar: Collected Studies*. Edited by Shemaryahu Talmon. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1986.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Waiting for the Messiah: The Spiritual Universe of the Qumran Covenanters." Pages 111-37 in *Judaisms and their Messiahs*. Edited by Jacob Neusner, William S. Green, and Ernest Frerichs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Tannehill, Robert C. "Israel in Luke-Acts: A Tragic Story." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104 (1985): 69-85.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Rejection by Jews and Turning to Gentiles: The Pattern of Paul's Mission in Acts." Pages 83-101 in *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives*. Edited by Joseph B. Tyson. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986 -1990.

Tatum, W. Barnes. "The Epoch of Israel: Luke I-II and Theological Plan of Luke-Acts." *New Testament Studies* 12 (1966-67):184-95.

Taylor, Joan E. *The Immerser: John the Baptist within Second Temple Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

Tcherikover, Victor. *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. New York: Atheneum, 1970.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Jewish Apologetic Literature Reconsidered." *Eos* 48 (1956): 169-93.

Thackeray, Henry St. John, ed. et al. *Josephus*. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press, 1929-1965

Tiede, David L. "'Glory to thy People Israel': Luke-Acts and the Jews." Pages 21-34 in *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives*. Edited by Joseph B. Tyson. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Exaltation of Jesus and the Restoration of Israel in Acts 1." Pages 278-86 in *Christians among Jews: Essays in Honor of Krister Stendahl on his Sixty-fifth Birthday*. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg with George W. MacRae. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.

Tiller, Patrick A. *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch*. Society of Biblical Literature: Early Judaism and its Literature 4. Atlanta: Scholars, 1993.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The 'Eternal Planting' in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 4 (1997): 313-35.

- Torrey, Charles. C. *The Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah*. BZAW 2 Giessen: J. Ricker, 1896.
- Trafton, Joseph L. "The Psalms of Solomon in Recent Research." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 12 (1994): 3-19.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Syriac Version of the Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Evaluation*. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 11. Atlanta: Scholars, 1985.
- Tromp, Joannes. *Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary*. Leiden: Brill, 1993.
- Troyer, Kristin de. *The End of the Alpha Text of Esther: Translation and Narrative Technique in MT 8:1-17, LXX 8:1-17, and AT 7:14-41*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 46. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1997.
- Tuckett, Christopher M. *Luke*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Q and the History of Early Christianity*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Turner, Max. *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*. Journal of Pentecostal Theology Monograph Series 9. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The 'Spirit of Prophecy' as the Power of Israel's Restoration and Witness." Pages 327-48 in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Tyson, Joseph B. *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts*. Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Problem of Jewish Rejection in Acts." Pages 124-37 in *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives*. Edited by Joseph B. Tyson. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988.
- van der Ploeg, J. *Le Rouleau De la Guerre*. Leiden: Brill, 1959.
- van Goudoever, J. "The Place of Israel in Luke's Gospel." *Novum Testamentum* 8 (1966): 111-23.
- van Unnik, Willem Cornelius. *Das Selbstverständnis der jüdischen Diaspora in der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 17. Leiden: Brill, 1993.
- VanderKam, James C. *Enoch and the Growth of the Apocalyptic Tradition*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 16. Washington, D. C.: Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 1984.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Exile in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature." Pages 89-109 in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*. Edited by James M. Scott. Journal of Judaism Supplement 56. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- VanderKam, James and Peter Flint. *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, and Christianity*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2002.
- Verheyden, Joseph. "What Are We Up To?" Pages 3-56 in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Edited by J. Verheyden. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999.
- Vermes, Geza "Messianism." Pages 489-55 in *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*. Edited by Emil Schürer. Rev. edit. Revised and edited by Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, and Matthew Black. Volume 2. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1973-1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. London: Penguin, 1997.
- Vielhauer, Phillip. "On the 'Paulinism' of Acts." Pages 33-50 in *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. London: SPCK, 1968.
- Wainwright, Arthur W. "Luke and the Restoration of the Kingdom to Israel." *Expository Times* 89 (1977-1978): 76-79.
- Weinert, Francis D. "Luke, Stephen, and the Temple in Luke-Acts, *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 17 (1987): 88-90.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.
- Weitzman, G. "Allusion, Artifice, and Exile in the Hymn of Tobit." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115 (1996): 49-61.
- Westermann, Claus. *Prophetic Oracles of Salvation in the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.
- White, Sidnie A. "A Comparison of the 'A' and 'B' Manuscripts of the Damascus Document." *Revue de Qumran* 48 (1987): 537-53.
- Willett, Tom W. *Eschatology in the Theodicies of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 4. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
- Williamson, H.G.M. *Ezra Nehemiah*. Word Biblical Commentary. Vol. 16. Waco, Tx., 1985.
- Wills, Lawrence M. *The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King* (Harvard Dissertations in Religion 26. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- Wilson, Stephen G. *Luke and the Law*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 50. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 23. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

- Winter, Bruce, ed. *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting*. 6 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993-1996.
- Wise, Michael O. "4QFlorilegium and the Temple of Adam." *Revue de Qumran* 15 (1991): 103-32.
- Wise, Michael O. and Robert H. Eisenman. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*. Rockport, Ma., 1992.
- Wise, Michael O. et al., eds. *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects*. New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994.
- Wright, B. G. *No Small Difference: Sirach's Relationship to its Hebrew Parent Text* Septuagint and Cognate Studies 26. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- Wolfson, Harry A. *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*. Rev. ed. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Wright, N. T. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God 2. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The New Testament and the People of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God 1. London: SPCK, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Resurrection of the Son of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God 3. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Paul's Gospel and Caesar's Empire." *CTI Reflections* 2 (1999): 42-65.
- Yadin, Yigael. *The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada with Introduction, Emendations, and Commentary*. Jerusalem: Israel Explorations Society, 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Temple Scroll: The Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1985.
- Young, T. Cuyler. "Cyrus." Pages 1231-32 in vol. 1 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D. N. Freeman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday 1992.
- Zwiep, A.W. *The Ascension of the Messiah in Lucan Christology*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

