

CHAPTER 5

Qumran Messianism

The noun “messianism” and the adjective “messianic” have in recent years been given a rubber-band extension. They have been made at times to include all sorts of expected figures in Jewish and Christian history. To point up the issue, I cite the often-used *Dictionary of the Bible* of J. L. McKenzie:

In general messianism includes those ideas which represent the Israel of the future as identical with the universal kingdom of Yahweh. It is not quite the same as eschatology, which deals with the end of history as accomplished by an intervention of Yahweh, although messianism is at least partly eschatological; nor is it quite the same as apocalyptic thought, which represents the end of history as a world catastrophe, although some forms of messianism contain apocalyptic elements. In spite of the derivation of the word, messianism does not always include the idea of a future king or deliverer; some scholars insist that the term should be so restricted in order to distinguish messianism from eschatology.¹

I class myself among those scholars whom McKenzie mentions in the last half of the last sentence.

1. J. L. McKenzie, *Dictionary of the Bible* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1965) 569. McKenzie makes use of the article of A. Gelin, “Messianisme,” *DBSup* 5 (1957) 1165-1212. Cf. J. J. Collins, “Messiahs in Context: Method in the Study of Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 722; ed. M. O. Wise et al.; New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994) 213-29, esp. 214. See now also J. J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1995).

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND CHRISTIAN ORIGINS

More recently, Lawrence H. Schiffman has taken up the matter in his book, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*.² In earlier chapters I have already agreed with much that Schiffman has said about reclaiming the Jewish character of the Scrolls and putting them in a proper place in Jewish history. In his discussion of Qumran messianism one will find many good interpretative points and proper emphases, but I hesitate to go along with his two types of messianism among Jews, the restorative and the utopian.³ That such ideas became characteristic of Jewish messianism in eras prior to the twentieth century I would not deny; that one can find that distinction in pre-Christian Judaism or in the Qumran period is difficult to admit.

No little confusion has been introduced into the discussion of Qumran messianism by the failure to keep “messianism” distinct from other forms of Jewish expectation and other forms of Jewish eschatological belief. Moreover, there is the tendency at times to confuse “eschatological” and “apocalyptic” in this recent debate.⁴

Related to this question is the way christological titles are predicated of Jesus of Nazareth in the New Testament. “Prophet,” “Son of God,” “Son of Man,” “Lord,” and “Messiah” are used of him in various New Testament writings, where they are all attributed to one individual. In effect, such conflation in Christian thinking is the culmination and fulfillment of different or varied strands of Old Testament and extrabiblical Jewish teaching that have usually been discrete. They are conflated and attributed to him, who is for Christians the “Savior, Messiah, Lord” (Luke 2:11). Christians even speak of him as the “suffering Messiah,” as Lucan theology has taught them (Luke 24:26; cf. Acts 3:18; 17:3; 26:23), but the problem has always been to explain whence Luke derived such a notion of a *suffering* Messiah, which is not found in the Old Testament.⁵ Moreover, such New Testament conflation has made some Christian scholars claim at times that “Son of God” is a “messianic” title, even though no one can detect such a use of this title in pre-Christian Jewish his-

2. L. H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, The Lost Library of Qumran* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994; reprinted in ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1995) 317-50.

3. See also L. H. Schiffman, “The Concept of the Messiah in Second Temple and Rabbinic Literature,” *RevExp* 84 (1987) 235-46. Cf. A. I. Baumgarten, “Rabbinic Literature as a Source for the History of Jewish Sectarianism in the Second Temple Period,” *DSD* 2 (1995) 14-57.

4. Although McKenzie does not confuse them in the above quotation, he does relate them and hints at a definition of “apocalyptic” that is part of the problem.

5. *Pace* R. A. Rosenberg (“The Slain Messiah in the Old Testament,” *ZAW* 99 [1987] 259-61), there is no slain messiah in the Old Testament.

tory. They are used together in John 11:27, σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, “You are the Messiah, the Son of God” (cf. 20:31), and that is what one would expect in such a Christian Gospel. Being found in the Gospel according to John, the last of the four Gospels to be written, it represents the culmination of the Christian conflation of titles attributed to Jesus.

Furthermore, the problem of conflation is not found only among Christians, because in Jewish usage, especially during the early Christian centuries, one also finds conflation, even if it is not the same as the Christian. For instance, the Isaian Servant becomes “My servant, the Messiah” (*Tg. Jonathan*, Isa 42:1 [in some copies]; 43:10; 52:13; 53:10).⁶ This problem is compounded by the messianic interpretation of still other Old Testament passages, which in the Hebrew have no mention of משיח. Such interpretation is found in the classic targums (e.g., Gen 49:10; Num 24:17 in *Tg. Onqelos*).⁷ This interpretation of Old Testament passages in the targums is also problematic, because the date of this targumic tradition does not certainly antedate the third century A.D. One wonders whether this identification of certain Old Testament figures with the Messiah is not a reaction to Christian teaching about Jesus of Nazareth, that he was God’s Messiah. Since it surfaces only when Christianity is already well under way, it seems like a reaction to Christian doctrine as Jewish targumic translators sought to identify who in the Old Testament were Messiahs for the Jewish people.

The problem is further compounded by the fact that משיח is not always used in the same sense in the Old Testament itself, to which one has to trace the origin of both the title and the idea of messianism. Indeed, the same can be said of other christological titles in the New Testament. Yet because they all represent, in fact, outgrowths of strands of Old Testament teaching, which

6. See A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts* (4 vols., vol. 4 in two parts; Leiden: Brill, 1959-73) 3:84, 87, 107, 108. Cf. J. F. Stenning, *The Targum of Isaiah Edited with a Translation* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1949) 141, 145, 179, 181; B. D. Chilton, *The Isaiah Targum: Introduction, Translation, Apparatus and Notes* (Aramaic Bible 11; Wilmington, Del.: Glazier, 1987) 80, 84, 103, 104.

Note also the insertion of משיחא in *Tg. Jonathan* of Isa 4:2; 9:5; 10:27; 11:1, 6; 14:29; 16:1, 5; 28:5. In all these instances there is no mention of משיח in the Hebrew text of Isaiah. In that prophetic book, the title is given only to Cyrus, the Persian king (Isa 45:1). Cf. R. A. Aytoun, “The Servant of the Lord in the Targum,” *JTS* 23 (1921-22) 172-80; P. Humbert, “Le Messie dans le targum des prophètes,” *RTP* 43 (1910) 420-27; 44 (1911) 5-46; A. S. van der Woude, *TDNT*, 9:524.

7. See further S. H. Levey, *The Messiah: An Aramaic Interpretation: The Messianic Exegesis of the Targum* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1974); M. McNamara, *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch* (AnBib 27; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1966) 238-52.

initially appear independently of one another, one should respect this independent emergence and not conflate or confuse either their denotations or the connotations associated with them, until they appear in history. Above all, one should allow for the development of each of them, which is part of their historical usage. When in the course of time they are conflated in certain texts, even in Jewish texts, then it is admissible to conflate the connotations of one title with another; but even then the denotation should remain distinct and should be respected. In doing this, one respects *the history of ideas*, for such titles did not all emerge at the same time in the history of Israel or even relate to one another at the same time.

I shall devote my further remarks on this topic to three headings: the Old Testament data that deal with משיח; the Qumran and related data; and implications of Qumran messianism for New Testament usage.

Old Testament Data Dealing with משיח

We must distinguish the noun משיח, *māšīāh*, “anointed one,” from uses of the verb משה, “anoint.” The verb “anoint” is used often enough, but hardly any of its occurrences has to do with an expected or eschatological figure; so they do not concern us now.⁸

In the Old Testament, the noun משיח occurs thirty-nine times in all. Once it may refer to Saul’s shield (2 Sam 1:21), or perhaps to Saul himself. In two instances commentators debate whether the term is used of Israel as a whole or to its reigning king: Hab 3:13; Ps 28:8. Otherwise in the vast majority of occurrences it refers to a king (usually of Israel), contemporary or past. Its basic denotation is that such a historical ruler is or was an anointed agent of God designated for the guidance, governance, or deliverance of His people.

8. The verb משה occurs sixty-nine times in the MT. Almost half of the instances have to do with the anointing of Aaron and his sons, priests, the altar, or other cultic objects; the other half occur in passages mentioning the anointing of historical kings (Saul, David, Solomon, Absalom, Hazael, Jehu, Joash, Jehoahaz). There is never an instance of the verb that refers to a Messiah (in the strict sense of a future or expected anointed figure).

Cf. J. Becker, *Messianic Expectation in the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980); J. J. M. Roberts, “The Old Testament Contribution to Messianic Expectations,” in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins; ed. J. H. Charlesworth et al.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992) 39-51; R. E. Clements, “The Messianic Hope in the Old Testament,” *JSOT* 43 (1989) 3-19; J. L. Sicre, *De David al Mesías: Textos básicos de la esperanza mesiánica* (Colección ‘El Mundo de la Biblia’; Estella: Editorial Verbo Divino, 1995).

Qumran Messianism

In time, especially when the monarchy was no more, the title was applied to the high priest. In a few instances it may be attributed to prophets or patriarchs, but there the matter is disputed. The instances are as follows:

1. Kings
 - a. A king in a generic sense or an unnamed king of the Davidic dynasty: 1 Sam 2:10, 35; 16:6; Ps 2:2; 20:7; 84:10; possibly 28:8 (see above)
 - b. Saul: called משיח יהוה, “Yahweh’s Anointed One,” in 1 Sam 24:7, 11; 26:9, 11, 16, 23; 2 Sam 1:14, 16; cf. 1 Sam 12:3, 5
 - c. David (as a historical king): 2 Sam 19:22; 22:51; 23:1; Ps 18:51; 89:39, 52; 132:10, 17 (in some of the last-mentioned instances משיח is also extended to descendants of David)
 - d. Solomon: 2 Chr 6:42
 - e. Zedekiah: Lam 4:20 (cf. 2 Kgs 25:4-6)
 - e. Cyrus, king of Persia: Isa 45:1
2. Priests
הכהן המשיח, “the anointed priest”: Lev 4:3, 5, 16; 6:15
3. Prophets/Patriarchs⁹
1 Chr 16:22; Ps 105:15
4. Dan 9:25, 26 (to be discussed below)

What should be noted about these occurrences, first of all, is the books in which they occur. There is no reference to a king as משיח in the Pentateuch,¹⁰ or to a king of Israel as such in any of the major prophets. King

9. See the commentators on these debated passages. Cf. J. Gibley, “Prophétisme et attente d’un messie prophète dans l’ancien judaïsme,” in *L’Attente du Messie* (RechBib 1; Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1958) 85-130. Note the anointing of prophets in 1 Kgs 19:16 and Isa 61:1.

10. This is undoubtedly the reason for the failure of the Samaritans to believe in a coming Messiah. Instead, they spoke of *hat-Tāhēb* (Hebrew) or *Tāhēbāh* (Aramaic), “the Returning One” (*Memar Marqah* 2:9; 4:11, 12), undoubtedly a development in Samaritan teaching of the prophet like Moses (Deut 18:15, 18). The name *Tāhēbāh* is sometimes translated as “Restorer,” but rightly? See J. Macdonald, *Memar Marqah: The Teaching of Marqah* (2 vols.; BZAW 84; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1963) 1:44, 108, 110-11. Cf. A. Merx, *Der Messias oder Ta’eb der Samaritaner: Nach bisher unbekanntenen Quellen* (BZAW 17; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1909) 34-45; J. Macdonald, *The Theology of the Samaritans* (London: SCM, 1964) 362-71; J. A. Montgomery, *The Samaritans: The Earliest Jewish Sect: Their History, Theology and Literature* (1907; reprint, New York: Ktav, 1968) 246-51; R. J. Coggins, *Samaritans and Jews: The Origins of Samaritanism Reconsidered* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1975) 146.

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND CHRISTIAN ORIGINS

Zedekiah is the sole instance in Lam 4:20, which in the Hebrew Scriptures is found among the “Writings.” Cyrus, King of Persia, is the only one called **משיח**, “his anointed One,” in the book of Isaiah (45:1).¹¹

Second, some of these passages, where **משיח** may be used of David or his dynasty (1 Sam 2:10, 35; Ps 2:2; 132:17), celebrate the king’s accession to the throne. In one or other of them one may detect the *seeds* of a teaching about a future or awaited king or his everlasting dynasty, but it is not yet messianism in the full-blown sense and does not use the term.

The origins of messianism are to be traced, indeed, to various divine promises in the Old Testament of a guaranteed and enduring succession of David’s dynasty or of a future “David,” but here one has to respect the vague or nebulous form of such promises.¹² Shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem in the early sixth century B.C., the prophet Jeremiah announced: “Therefore thus says the LORD concerning Jehoiakim, king of Judah, ‘He shall have none to sit upon the throne of David; his dead body shall be cast out to the heat by day and the frost by night’” (36:30; cf. 22:30). Yet the same prophet also announced: “It shall come to pass in that day, says the LORD of hosts, that I will break the yoke off their necks and burst their bonds, and strangers shall no more make slaves of them. They shall serve the LORD, their God, and David, their king, whom I will raise up for them” (30:9).¹³ Or again, Jeremiah announces: “Behold, days are coming, says the LORD, when I will raise up for David a righteous Scion (**צמח צדיק**);¹⁴ he shall reign as king, deal wisely, and execute justice and righteousness in the land. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall live in safety” (23:5-6; cf. Jer 33:14-22; 22:4-5;

11. As J. J. Collins rightly notes, Cyrus is not one who would restore the Davidic kingship, but is rather “an agent of deliverance for the Jewish people” (*The Scepter and the Star*, 31).

12. Note how it is still formulated as late as 1 Macc 2:57: “David, because he was merciful, inherited a kingly throne (or: a throne of kingship) forever.” David is not called “Messiah” in this passage, even though the writing comes from a late period in Judaism when the title in the full-blown sense is already attested.

13. A similar idea is found in Hos 3:5: “Afterward the children of Israel shall return and seek the LORD their God, and David their king.” Some commentators think that the last phrase is a Judean addition of later date.

14. **צמח** means “sprout, shoot, branch,” but it can be used of a “descendant.” This promise is echoed in Zech 3:8: “Behold, I am bringing my servant, the Scion.” It is a clear reference to the same Davidic heir. Some commentators find it to be an echo of Isa 4:2, where **צמח יהוה** occurs as well, and even of Isa 11:1, where **צמח** does not occur but rather **נצר**, “a branch” from his (i.e., Jesse’s) roots. Cf. Isa 9:6-7 (the one to sit “upon the throne of David” is described in terms that will later be used to describe the expected Messiah; but that seated one is *not yet so entitled* in Isaiah 9); cf. 32:1-5.

30:21). To these texts of Jeremiah one can add similar passages in Ezekiel, for example, 34:23-24 (“I will set up over them one shepherd, my servant David, and he shall feed them and be their shepherd. I, the LORD, will be their God, and my servant David shall be prince among them”¹⁵); 37:24-25; 17:3-4, 22-23. In none of these texts, which promise the coming of a future “David” or a “righteous Scion,” is there mention of משיח, “anointed one,” or of any anointing. Even though משיח has already been used of the historical David (in texts of an earlier date?), its absence in the context of these promises is not to be overlooked.¹⁶ משיח as a future or expected “Messiah” has not yet entered the history of Jewish ideas.

Third, what is reflected in these passages is the growth of a tradition about David. That tradition grew up independently of Israel’s ancient credo derived from earlier times: its belief in what Yahweh had done for it in constituting Israel as His people. With the passage of time, especially with the formation of the monarchy, the Davidic tradition grew, for instance, in the work of the Deuteronomist. Eventually the two traditions were fused, and then in the time of exilic and postexilic writers (Ezekiel, Second Isaiah, Haggai, Zechariah, Nehemiah) one begins to read of Yahweh’s intervention on behalf of David and his dynasty as the continuation of His salvific deeds recalled in Israel’s ancient credo.

John J. Collins admits that “we have very little evidence of messianism in Judaism in the period 500-200 BCE.”¹⁷ What he claims to be “messianic” before 500 is non-existent. Whenever משיח is applied to figures before 500 B.C., they are historical persons, and in no sense expected or eschatological figures.

Fourth, along with the promise of a future “David,” who will reign as

15. Note how רעה, “shepherd,” is used, not משיח.

16. For this reason I cannot agree with the analysis of the “biblical background” of messianism given by Schiffman (*Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 318-21), if by that term he means that a “Messiah” is already mentioned there. He considers such texts as the following to supply that background: 2 Samuel 7; 22:44-51 (= Ps 18:44-51); 23:1-3,5; references to the “Day of the Lord” in Amos; Zech 6:9-16; Sir 36:11-14. In none of these texts, which may well be eschatological, is there mention of משיח in the sense of a future, awaited Messiah. True, משיח occurs in 2 Sam 22:51 (= Ps 18:51), but that refers to the historical King David, on whom, as “His anointed,” God has already bestowed “great victories.” The mention there of “David and his offspring forever” makes of that verse the background for the development of messianism only in the sense that I have mentioned above; it supplies the “seeds” of the idea (a “David” of the future), but not the full-grown tree. In the texts cited by Schiffman one finds only a divine promise about the enduring and guaranteed character of the Davidic dynasty, but that is not yet “messianism.”

17. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 33; see also p. 40.

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND CHRISTIAN ORIGINS

king and deal wisely and righteously with God's people, there eventually is formulated the coming of a משיח, "an anointed one," that is, a future anointed agent of Yahweh to be sent on behalf of His people. This we see in Dan 9:25-26:

מן מצא דבר להשיב ולבנות ירושלם עד משיח נגיד שבעים שבעה
ושבעים ששים ושנים תשוב ונבנתה רחוב וחרוץ ובצוק העתים
ואחרי השבעים ששים ושנים יכרת משיח ואין לו

from the utterance of a word to restore and build Jerusalem until (the coming of) an anointed one, a prince, there shall be seven weeks. Then for sixty-two weeks it shall be built again with squares and moats, but in a time of trouble. And after the sixty-two weeks (the) anointed one shall be cut off and have nothing.

This passage in Daniel is part of the prophecy of seventy weeks about the rebuilding and restoration of Jerusalem, the explanation of an oracle once uttered by Jeremiah (25:11-12; 29:10). I have left the translation of משיח as "an anointed one," because one may debate whether "Messiah" would be proper in this case, just as one debates about the one to whom the coming prince (נגיד) refers. This is the only place in the Hebrew Scriptures, however, where one finds *māšiāḥ* used in a temporal phrase with the preposition 'ad, implying a term of expectation and expressing a future or coming "anointed one." It thus contributes in its own way to the emergence of a real messianic expectation among the Jewish people. When Collins discusses this passage in Daniel 9, he speaks of it as "the Transformation of Messianism,"¹⁸ whereas he should have spoken of it as the emergence of messianism, because up to this point in the history of the Jewish people there has not yet been messianism. So it is against this entire, complicated Old Testament background that one has to judge the teaching about expected anointed figures in the Qumran texts.

Fifth, from the foregoing survey it should be clear that I do not consider

18. Ibid., 34. On p. 37 he more correctly says, "Rather than messianic expectation, . . . what we have in Daniel is a transformation of the royal mythology." That is what Collins should have been saying all along, because "there is no evidence for true messianism until the second century B.C." (Becker, *Messianic Expectation*, 50). I am not sure, however, that "there is no role here for a Davidic king" (*The Scepter and the Star*, 37); to my way of thinking, that is exactly what Dan 9:25 is talking about. On the contrary, Collins maintains that Dan 9:25-26 refers to High Priests (pp. 11, 143) or "historical High Priests" (p. 34): "Joshua the postexilic High Priest, who was one of the two 'sons of oil' in Zechariah" and Onias III (pp. 34-35).

such Old Testament passages that express various divine promises of a guaranteed perpetual succession of David's dynasty to be messianic in the proper sense: such as Gen 49:10; Num 24:15-19; 2 Sam 7:11-17; 22:44-51 (= Ps 18:44-51); 23:1-3, 5; Isa 11:1-9; Amos 9:11; Zech 3:8; 6:12-13. As Collins has well put it (in writing about 2 Sam 7:11-17), "The emphasis . . . is on the permanence of the Davidic line, not on an individual king."¹⁹ When such passages speak of future figures or promise that the Davidic dynasty will last forever, those figures are not *eo ipso* anointed "messiahs" without further ado. Some of these Old Testament passages are associated in later times with messianic figures (e.g., in some Qumran texts or in the targums), but then that is part of the *further development*. Such passages then take on further connotations, which they did not have in their original formulation; they then become "messianic."

Sixth, before we proceed to the analysis of Qumran texts, we should note the way some modern Jewish scholars interpret messianism and its relation to their Hebrew Scriptures. As an example, I cite the article on the "Messiah" from the *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, which was written by H. L. Ginsberg, D. Flusser, and others. Ginsberg defines the Messiah as

a charismatically endowed descendant of David who the Jews of the Roman period believed would be raised up by God to break the yoke of the heathen and to reign over a restored kingdom of Israel to which all the Jews of the Exile would return. This is a strictly postbiblical concept. Even Haggai and Zechariah, who expected the Davidic kingdom to be renewed with a specific individual, Zerubbabel, at its head, thought of him only as a feature of the new age, not as the author or even agent of its establishment. One can, therefore, only speak of the biblical prehistory of messianism.²⁰

Ginsberg then lays out the biblical material, in a way similar to what I have given above. In the continuation of that article, Flusser builds on what Ginsberg has already laid out.²¹ Significantly, such modern Jewish scholars treat messianism as a phenomenon in Judaism that emerged in the Roman period.²² I personally hesitate to date the emergence of messianism as late as Ginsberg does, because one usually reckons with 63 B.C. as the beginning of Roman rule in Judea. I should rather date it as emerging toward the end of

19. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 23.

20. *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (Jerusalem: Keter; New York: Macmillan, 1971) 11:1407.

21. D. Flusser, "Messiah: Second Temple Period," *ibid.*, 11:1408-10.

22. See also S. Talmon, "The Concepts of *Māšīah* and Messianism in Early Judaism," in Charlesworth, ed., *The Messiah*, 79-115; L. H. Schiffman, "The Concept."

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND CHRISTIAN ORIGINS

the Hellenistic period. If 165 B.C. is taken as the date of the final redaction of the book of Daniel, then messianism must have emerged not later than the second quarter of the second pre-Christian century, possibly even in its first quarter; at any rate, shortly before the Essenes of Qumran came on the scene.

Seventh, by contrast to such Jewish interpretations of messianism and its relation to the Hebrew Scriptures, I cite the recent interpretation of a Christian scholar, John Collins, who maintains that he is concerned “primarily with Jewish messianism,”²³ but who finds the term of the development about the Davidic dynasty already in its origins. He predicates “messiah” or “messianic” of figures in the Old Testament who are not yet so labeled and thus fails to reckon with the late date when “messianism” really emerges. He does not allow for the development of ideas in Judaism and thus rides roughshod over the history of ideas.

Qumran and Related Data

It is not easy to present the Qumran messianic material because there is still little consensus about the chronological order of the pertinent texts.²⁴ So I shall line up the Qumran texts as best I can and give an interpretation of what is important in them.

1. IQS 9:11²⁵

ונשפטו במשפטים הרשונים אשר החלו אנשי היחד ל>ה<תיסר במ
עד בוא נביא ומשיחי אהרון וישראל

... but they shall be governed by the first regulations, by which the men of the community began to be instructed, until the coming of a prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel.

23. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 3.

24. For attempts to show development in Qumran messianic teaching, see J. Starcky, “Les quatre étapes du messianisme à Qumrân,” *RB* 70 (1963) 481-505; but cf. R. E. Brown, “J. Starcky’s Theory of Qumrân Messianic Development,” *CBQ* 28 (1966) 51-57. See also G. J. Brooke, “The Messiah of Aaron in the *Damascus Document*,” *RevQ* 15 (1991-92) 215-30; A. Caquot, “Le messianisme qumrânien,” in *Qumran: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (BETL 46; ed. M. Delcor; Paris/Gembloux: Duculot; Louvain: Leuven University, 1978) 231-47.

25. See M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark’s Monastery: Volume II, Fascicle 2: Plates and Transcription of the Manual of Discipline* (New Haven, Conn.: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951) pl. 9.

This passage from the *Serek hayyahad*, or *Manual of Discipline*, deals with the continuing validity of the “counsels of the Law,” the primitive precepts in which members of the community were once instructed and which they were to continue to observe, apparently as a preparation for the coming of expected figures. Such a requirement also finds an echo in CD 6:11, but this passage clearly affirms the community’s expectation of three coming figures: a *prophet* (undoubtedly a prophet like Moses, an allusion to Deut 18:15, 18),²⁶ a (priestly) *Messiah of Aaron*, and a (kingly or Davidic) *Messiah of Israel*. The imagery behind the last two terms can be found in “Israel” and “Aaron,” as used in 1QS 8:5-9; 9:5-7.

The expectation of a Messiah of Israel is a natural development of the Old Testament promise of a future “David,” and also of the משיח נגיד of Dan 9:25.

Even though משיח was applied in post-monarchical times to a historical priest in Leviticus 4, it is a surprise to see a priestly figure become part of the Qumran community’s messianic expectations, because there is little in the Old Testament itself about a future “priest,” unless Zech 6:13b is so understood. The Qumran formulation goes beyond Zech 6:13 in making such a priest a “Messiah of Aaron.” If the primitive nucleus, however, of the Qumran community stemmed from priestly families, as many hold, then it is really not surprising that a priestly Messiah would join such expectations.²⁷

The whole last clause of 1QS 9:11, however, is missing in 4QS^e (4Q259) 1 iii 6, the oldest copy of the *Serek*, which has 1QS 9:12 following directly on

26. This allusion is confirmed by the quotation in 4QTestim 1-8 of Deut 18:18-19, preceded by Deut 5:28-29, a combination already found in the Samaritan Pentateuch of Exod 20:21. See notes 76-77 below. There is no evidence that the Teacher of Righteousness was regarded as returning as this prophet like Moses, despite claims to the contrary. See further J. J. Collins, “Teacher and Messiah? The One Who Will Teach Righteousness at the End of Days,” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994) 193-210, esp. 205-6 and n. 39. With this expectation, one should not confuse that of *Elias redivivus*, which is a development of Mal 3:1, “the messenger to prepare the way before me,” eventually identified as “Elijah the prophet,” who will come “before the great and awesome day of the LORD” (Eng. 4:5). See n. 66 below.

27. The expectation of a coming “new priest” is also mentioned in *T. Levi* 18:1 (τὸτε ἐγερῆ κύριος ἱερέα καινόν), which is problematic, because this passage may be a Christian gloss. See M. de Jonge, “The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” in *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (ed. H. F. D. Sparks; Oxford: Clarendon, 1984) 505-600, esp. 536. Cf. J. J. Collins, “Teacher and Messiah?” 207; J. VanderKam, “Messianism in the Scrolls,” in Ulrich and VanderKam, eds., *The Community*, 211-34, esp. 220.

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND CHRISTIAN ORIGINS

1QS 8:12.²⁸ It thus raises a question about the time when this expectation rose in the Qumran community and about the composite character of the *Manual of Discipline*, which apparently passed through different stages of composition or redaction.²⁹ As a result, this reference to two messiahs in 1QS 9:11 may be unique and has to be compared with statements in *Damascus Document* (see CD passages below).

2. 1QSa 2:11-12³⁰

[זה מן] שב אנשי השם [קריאי] מועד לעצת היחד אם יוליד [אל]
א[ת] המשיח אתם יבוא [ב]רואש כול עדת ישראל וכול א[חיו]
בני] אהרון הכוהנים

[This is the as]sembly of the men of renown [summoned] to a meeting for the council of the community, when [God] will beget the Messiah among them. He will enter [at] the head of all the congregation of Israel and all [his] br[others, the sons] of Aaron, the priests.

This passage is controverted, because some think that the reading יוליד is not correct, but it is practically certain.³¹ Noteworthy, however, is the men-

28. See J. T. Milik, *TYDWJ*, 124. Cf. J. H. Charlesworth et al., eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Volume 1, Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994) 88-89; F. García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English* (trans. W. G. E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 1994) 27.

29. J. VanderKam notes, however, that 4QS^c may be “defective,” or actually a classic case of haplography (“Messianism in the Scrolls,” 213). Cf. J. Pouilly, *La règle de la communauté de Qumrân: Son évolution littéraire* (Cahiers de la RB 17; Paris: Gabalda, 1976) 15-34.

30. See D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik, *Qumran Cave I* (DJD 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955) 110. The original editor called it “Règle de la Congrégation,” which is certainly a better title than the misnomer, “Messianic Rule,” used by G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (3d ed.; London: Penguin, 1987) 100; cf. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 75.

31. Barthélemy originally read יוליד, calling this reading “pratiquement certaine,” but later accepted Milik’s emendation of יוליר and translated the clause, “au cas où Dieu mènerait le Messie avec eux” (*Qumran Cave I*, 117 [his italics]). Other scholars, however, have insisted that the final letter is indeed a *dalet*. See F. M. Cross, *Die antike Bibliothek von Qumran und die moderne biblische Wissenschaft* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967) 94 n. 71: “Dalet ist nahezu sicher.” Note also Cross’s rejection of T. H. Gaster’s attempt to read the text differently, in Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (3d ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995) 76 n. 3, where Cross, surprisingly, now toys with the possibility of reading יוליר, even while admitting that “the fifth letter, *dalet* is virtually certain . . . : *ywlyd*.” Cf. J. M. Allegro, “Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature,” *JBL* 75 (1956) 174-87,

tion of only one Messiah (with the definite article). Although in the next two passages derived from the same context mention is made of the Messiah of Israel, “the priest” is given precedence over him in lines 19-21. Consequently **המשיח** here may possibly refer to the Messiah of Aaron, the priestly Messiah, who is then the likely subject of the following verb **יבוא**, “he will enter.”

3. 1QSa 2:14-15³²

ואחר י[שב מש]יח ישראל וישבו לפניו ראשי א[לפי ישראל א]י
לפי כבודו

And afterwards the [Mes]siah of Israel shall ta[ke his seat]. Then there will sit before him the heads of the th[ousands of Israel, ea]ch according to his dignity.

The crucial term is partly restored, but with certainty. The passage speaks of the Messiah of Israel, expected to join an assembly of the community “at the end of days.” The word **ואחר**, “and afterward,” comes after the mention of **[הכוהן]**, “the priest” (restored with certainty), to whom the Messiah of Israel is subordinated.

4. 1QSa 2:20-21³³

ואחר [יש] לח משיח ישראל ידיו בלחם

And afterwards the Messiah of Israel will put forth his hands to the bread.

esp. 177 n. 28. Allegro states: “. . . a special infra-red photograph taken then [Summer of 1955] leaves no doubt as to the correctness of the editor’s reading.” P. W. Skehan, “Two Books on Qumrân Studies,” *CBQ* 21 (1959) 71-78, esp. 74. H. N. Richardson, “Some Notes on 1QSa,” *JBL* 76 (1957) 108-22, esp. 116-17 n. 53; E. Puech, “Fragment d’une apocalypse en araméen (4Q246 = pseudo-Dan^d) et le ‘royaume de Dieu,’” *RB* 99 (1992) 98-131, esp. 100 n. 6; VanderKam, “Messianism in the Scrolls,” 221-24.

Cf. C. A. Evans, “A Note on the ‘First-born Son’ of 4Q369,” *DSD* 2 (1995) 185-201, esp. 186-88; S. Talmon, “The Concepts,” 110 n. 71; G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective* (rev. ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977) 196; M. A. Knibb, *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987) 153; M. Hengel, *The Son of God* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976) 44; P. Sigal, “Further Reflections on the ‘Begotten’ Messiah,” *HAR* 7 (1983) 221-33; L. H. Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Study of the Rule of the Congregation* (SBLMS 38; Atlanta: Scholars, 1989) 53-54 (he follows the reading of J. Licht, **מגילת הסרכים ממגילות מדבר יהודה**, *The Rule Scroll* [Jerusalem: Bialik, 1965] 269-70).

32. See Barthélemy, *Qumran Cave I*, 110, 117-18.

33. *Ibid.*, 111, 117-18.

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND CHRISTIAN ORIGINS

In this case again the Messiah of Israel is preceded by הכוהן, “the priest” (2:19), who is to be the first to bless the bread and the new wine. It seems, then, that “the priest” (= the Messiah of Aaron?),³⁴ together with the Messiah of Israel, is expected to preside over a meal or a banquet באחרית הימים, “at the end of days.” “The priest” (= the Messiah of Aaron?) and “the Messiah of Israel” in these two passages of 1QSa would thus agree with 1QS 9:11 and undoubtedly represent an explicit messianic development of שני בני היצהר, “the two sons of oil,” of Zech 4:14.

5. 1QM 11:7-8³⁵

וביד משיחיה הווי תעודות הגדתה לנו ק[צי] מלחמות ידיכה

And through your Anointed Ones, who discern (your) testimonies, you have told us about the ti[m]es of the battles of your hands. . . .

This passage is difficult to interpret, because it is a poetic composition that refers not to expected figures, but to figures of the past, probably ancient prophets of Israel. In the immediately preceding context, the author alludes to Num 24:17-19, so that Balaam might be considered among such anointed ones.

6. 1Q30 1:2³⁶

[. . .] משיח הקודש [. . .]

. . . the holy [M]essiah (lit., the anointed one of holiness).

The context is lost, and it is impossible to say whether משיח is being used in a future sense or not. A parallel expression is found in CD 6:1 below.³⁷

34. The text is so understood also by Collins (*The Scepter and the Star*, 76) and many others.

35. See E. L. Sukenik, *אוצר המגילות הגנוזות שבידי האוניברסיטה העברית* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute and the Hebrew University, 1954) pl. 26.

36. See Barthélemy and Milik, *Qumran Cave I*, 132 (+ pl. XXX).

37. M. G. Abegg, Jr., “The Messiah at Qumran: Are We Still Seeing Double?” *DSD* 2 (1995) 125-44, esp. 134; he tries to relate this instance to 1QSa 2:11.

7. 4QpGen^a (4Q252) 1 v 3-4 (olim 4QP Bless)³⁸

[ואל] פי ישראל המה הדגלים (vacat) עד בוא משיח הצדק צמח /
 דויד כי לו ולורעו נתנה ברית מלכות עמו עד דורות עולם . . .

. . . and the thousands of Israel are “the standards” until the coming of the righteous Messiah (lit., the anointed one of righteousness), the Scion of David. For to him and to his offspring has been given the covenant of kingship over (lit., of) His people for everlasting generations.

In this passage the biblical term “Scion” is explicitly joined with “David” and related to a coming Messiah, to whom is now attributed the quality of “righteousness,” as it was to the Scion in Jer 23:5 (והקמתי לדוד צמח צדיק), “I will raise up for David a righteous scion”).

It occurs, moreover, in a comment on Gen 49:10,³⁹ which is significantly modified by the addition of שליט, “a ruler.” Instead of לא יסור שבט מיהודה, “the scepter shall not depart from Judah,” as Gen 49:10 reads, line 1 of column v has [לו] א יסור שליט משבט יהודה, “A ruler shall not depart from the tribe of Judah.” That person, a ruler, is further identified as יושב כסא לדויד, “one sitting upon the throne of David,” (line 2). This addition introduces a vague individual into the oracle of Genesis, which thus prepares for the mention of “the righteous Messiah, the Scion of David,” in line 3. Here in this Qumran text one finds explicit reference to a kingly and Davidic Messiah, whose appearance will

38. G. Brooke, “252. 4QCommentary on Genesis A,” in *Qumran Cave 4: XVII. Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD 22; ed. G. Brooke et al.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996) 185-207, esp. 205-6. The text was partly published by J. M. Allegro, “Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature,” *JBL* 75 (1956) 174-87, esp. 174-76 (+ pl. I). The six columns of fragment 1 are also found in B. Z. Wacholder and M. G. Abegg, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four* (4 fascicles; Washington, D.C.: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991-96) 2:212-15, esp. 215. Cf. A. Steudel, “4QMidrEschat: ‘A Midrash on Eschatology’ (4Q174 + 4Q177),” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls Madrid 18-21 March, 1991* (STDJ 11/1-2; ed. J. Treballe Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; Leiden: Brill, 1992) 2:531-41; eadem, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b})* (STDJ 13; Leiden: Brill, 1994); García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, 215; R. H. Eisenman and M. Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered: The First Complete Translation and Interpretation of 50 Key Documents Withheld for Over 35 Years* (Shaftesbury, Dorset: Element, 1992) 86-87; G. J. Brooke, “The Genre of 4Q252: From Poetry to Peshet,” *DSD* 1 (1994) 160-79.

39. Gen 49:10b mentions רגלים, “feet,” a word that some have read in the Qumran commentary too, instead of “the standards,” but the editor insists on the *dalet* as the correct reading in line 3, הדגלים, “the standards,” and not הרגלים.

above (1Q30 1:2), where משיח is singular. Since it speaks of משיח in the past, it is not a reference to expected Messiahs, but undoubtedly refers to prophets of old.

9. CD 2:12⁴³

ויודיעם ביד משיחו רוח קדשו וחוזי אמת <ו>

And He instructed them through (those) anointed with His holy Spirit and those who perceive <His> fidelity (lit., through anointed ones of His holy Spirit).

In this passage one should most likely read the construct plural משיחי, as in 6QD 3:4 (text 8 above), instead of משיחו. A less likely interpretation is to translate it: "And He made known His Holy Spirit to them through His anointed ones," understanding משיחו as defective writing for משיחיו.⁴⁴ In any case, the phrase, used with a past verb, again undoubtedly refers to prophets of old.

10. CD 5:21–6:2⁴⁵

כי דברו סרה על מצות אל ביד משה וגם במשיחו הקודש וינבאו
שקר להשיב את ישראל מאחר אל

For they preached rebellion against the commandments of God (given) through Moses and also by the holy Anointed Ones; and they prophesied deceit to make Israel turn from following God.

In this passage one should again read the construct plural משיחי, as in 6QD 3:4, instead of משיחו. Again, the reference is probably to prophets of old. A slightly different form of this text is found in 4QD^b (4Q267) 2:5-7: כי דברו עצה סרה על מצוות אל ב[י]ד [מוש]ה וגם במשיחי הקודש

43. See M. Broshi, ed., *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 1992) 12-13. Cf. S. Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries* (2 vols.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910; reprinted with a prolegomenon by J. A. Fitzmyer; New York: Ktav, 1970) 1:xxxiii; C. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1954) 8-9.

44. So G. Vermes has taken it (*Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 84). But cf. García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, 34: "And he taught them by the hand of the anointed ones through his holy spirit and through seers of the truth."

45. See Broshi, ed., *Damascus Document*, 18-21.

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND CHRISTIAN ORIGINS

וינבאו שקר לה[ש]יב את [ישראל] אל מאחרי אל
be the same.⁴⁶

11. CD 12:23–13:1⁴⁷

המתהלכים באלה בקץ הרשעה עד עמוד משוח אהרן וישראל עד
עשרה אנשים . . .

Those who walk according to these (statutes) in the wicked end-time until
the rising of the Messiah of Aaron and Israel; and (they shall form groups)
of up to ten men. . . .

Here one should read משיח. One might be tempted to read the plural
<י>משיח, as in 1QS 9:11, but the medieval copy clearly reads the singular.
The change to the singular has been thought to reflect a later understanding.
Whereas the Qumran community looked forward to the coming of two Mes-
siah, the later copyist of this tenth-century manuscript seems to have
adapted the text to the medieval belief in the coming of one Messiah.⁴⁸ How-
ever, the following text, especially in its 4Q form, reveals that the singular was
already used at Qumran. So it raises the question of whether the Qumran
community thought of one or two Messiahs throughout all the stages of its
existence.⁴⁹

12. CD 14:18–19⁵⁰

וזה פרוש המשפטים אשר [ישפטו בהם בקץ הרשעה עד עמוד
משיח] אהרן וישראל וכפר עונם

46. See J. M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4: XIII. The Damascus Document (4Q266-273)* (DJD 18; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996) 97. The text can also be found in Wacholder and Abegg, *Preliminary Edition*, 1:28. The third word עצה, “counsel,” is not found in CD 5:21, but that omission does not change the meaning. Cf. 4QD^d (4Q269) 4 i 2-3, which has preserved some of the same text, but not the crucial words משיחי הקודש. Cf. García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, 60, 68.

47. See Broshi, ed., *Damascus Document*, 32-35.

48. See K. G. Kuhn, “The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel,” in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. K. Stendahl with J. H. Charlesworth; New York: Crossroad, 1992 [originally 1957]) 54-64, esp. 59.

49. One would also have to reckon with the possibly distributive sense of the *nomen regens* in the construct chain; see S. Talmon, “The Concepts,” in Charlesworth, ed., *The Messiah*, 105 n. 64; cf. Abegg, “The Messiah at Qumran,” 129-30.

50. See Broshi, *Damascus Document*, 36-37.

Qumran Messianism

This is the exact interpretation of the regulations [by] which [they will be judged in the wicked end-time, until the rising of the Mess]iah of Aaron and Israel, and he will expiate their iniquity.

Again the singular משיח appears, the first part of which is restored with certainty; note the singular verb that follows. A form of this text is found in 4QD^a (4Q266) 10 i 11-13:

וזה פרוש [המשפטים אשר יש] פטו במ עד {מ} <ע>מוד משיח אהרון
וישראל [ויכפר עונם]

Also possibly in the badly preserved 4QD^d (4Q269) 11 i 1-2: [עד עמוד משיח] אהרון וישראל.⁵¹ Here the Messiah is to perform a notably priestly function (of expiation).

13. CD 19:10⁵²

והנשארים ימסרו לחרב בבוא משיח אהרון וישראל

And those who are left will be given over to the sword at the coming of the Messiah of Aaron and Israel.

Again, the singular Messiah appears, who is of both Aaron and Israel; his appearance marks the time of eschatological visitation.

14. CD 19:35–20:1⁵³

... מיום האסף {יור מורה} {מיום} מורה היחיד עד עמוד משיח
מאהרן ומישראל

... from the day of the gathering in {erasures} of the Teacher of the Community until the rising of a Messiah from Aaron and from Israel.

Instead of היחיד one should read היחד. It seems clear that the medieval copyist did not understand the meaning of יחד, “community,” and so changed it to the better known יחיד. More interesting is the expectation of

51. See Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4: XIII*, 72, 134. Cf. Wacholder and Abegg, *Preliminary Edition*, 1:53; García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, 69.

52. See Broshi, *Damascus Document*, 42-43.

53. *Ibid.*, 44-47.

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND CHRISTIAN ORIGINS

the rising of a Messiah, again a singular one, from both Aaron and Israel,⁵⁴ marking the arrival of the end time.

15. 4QD^e (4Q270) 2 ii 13-14⁵⁵

[או] אשר יגלה את רז עמו לגוואים או יקלל א]ת עמו או ידבר
סרה על משיחי רוח הקדש ותועה ב]חוזי אמתו בהמרותו
את פי אל . . .

[or anyone] who will disclose a secret of his people to the Gentiles or will curse [his people or preach] rebellion against those anointed by the holy Spirit or leads astray [the seers of His truth in rebelling against] God's word. . . .

This passage, which has no counterpart in the medieval CD, seems to be related, at least in some of its formulation, to CD 2:12 and 5:21–6:2 (texts 9 and 10 above). Whereas those passages clearly dealt with the past, this one seems to be related to the present or future; but does the phrase **משיחי רוח הקדש** refer to coming Messiahs as such? It is a puzzling passage.

16. 11QMelch 18⁵⁶

והמבשר הו]א [מ]שוח הרו]ח] אשר אמר דנ]יאל בו . . .

. . . the herald i[s] the (agent) [a]nointed of the Spir[it], [about] whom Dan[iel] spoke . . .

In this instance a different figure, a **מבשר**, “herald,” is regarded as anointed by the holy Spirit. Possibly this instance should not be booked here, since, though the editor A. S. van der Woude originally read **משיח**, it was subsequently corrected by Yigael Yadin to the participle **משוח**.⁵⁷ The phrase, however, is problematic and may be related to that used in CD 2:12 above. If it merits inclusion, then it associates with those figures expected in the

54. On the meaning of **האסף**, see Chapter 12 below, pp. 261-65.

55. See Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4: XIII*, 144. Cf. Wacholder and Abegg, *Preliminary Edition*, 1:41; García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, 64.

56. See A. S. van der Woude, “Melchizedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI,” *OTS* 14 (1965) 354-73. Cf. M. de Jonge and A. S. van der Woude, “11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament,” *NTS* 12 (1965-66) 301-26; J. A. Fitzmyer, *ESBNT* or *SBNT*, 221-67.

57. See Y. Yadin, “A Note on Melchizedek and Qumran,” *IEJ* 15 (1965) 152-54.

Qumran Messianism

Qumran community a coming “anointed herald,” a development possibly from Isa 61:1. Van der Woude already suggested that the Anointed One was meant to be more of a prophetic than a political figure.⁵⁸

17. 4Q521 2 ii + 4⁵⁹

1 [כי הש]מים והארץ ישמעו למשיחו
2 [וכל א]שר בם לוא יסוג ממצות קדושים
3 התאמצו מבקשי אדני בעבדתו
4 הלוא בזאת תמצאו את אדני כל המיחלים בלבם
5 כי אדני חסידים יבקר וצדיקים בשם יקרא
6 ועל ענוים רוחו תרחף ואמונים יחליף בכחו
7 כי יכבד את חסידים על כסא מלכות עד
8 מתיר אסורים פוקח עורים זוקף כפ[ופים]
9 ול[ע]לם אדבק [במ]יחלים ובחסדו י[שלם(?)]
10 ופר[י מעש]ה טוב לאיש לוא יתאחר
11 ונכ>ב>דות שלוא היו ישעה אדני כאשר ד[בר]
12 כי ירפא חללים ומתים יחיה ענוים יבשר
13 ו[דלי]ם ישב[יע] נתושים ינהל ורעבים יעשר
14 ונב[ונים] וכלם כקד[ושים(?)]

- 1 [for the hea]vens and the earth will listen to His Messiah,
- 2 [and all th]at is in them will not swerve from the commandments of holy ones.
- 3 Be strengthened in His service, all you who seek the Lord!
- 4 Shall you not find the Lord in this, all those (= you) who hope in their hearts?
- 5 For the Lord will seek out pious ones, and righteous ones He will call by name.
- 6 Over afflicted ones will His Spirit hover, and faithful ones He will renew with His power.
- 7 He will honor (the) pious ones on a throne of eternal kingship,

58. See van der Woude, “Melchisedek,” 367.

59. See E. Puech, “Une apocalypse messianique (4Q521),” *RevQ* 15 (1991-92) 475-522. The text of this fragment can also be found in Eisenman and Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*, 19-23, but it is to be used with caution; the readings do not always agree with the preliminary publication of Puech. Cf. R. H. Eisenman, “A Messianic Vision,” *BAR* 17/6 (1991) 65. Cf. J. J. Collins, “The Works of the Messiah,” *DSD* 1 (1994) 98-112; F. García Martínez, “Los Mesías de Qumrán: Problemas de un traductor,” *Sef* 53 (1993) 345-60, esp. 347-52.

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND CHRISTIAN ORIGINS

- 8 freeing prisoners, giving sight to the blind, straightening up those be[nt over].
- 9 For[ev]er shall I cling [to tho]se who hope, and in His steadfast love He will [recompense];
- 10 the frui[t of a] good [dee]d will be delayed for no one.
- 11 Wond[er]ous things, such as have never been (before), will the Lord do, just as He s[aid].
- 12 For He will heal (the) wounded, revive the dead, (and) proclaim good news to the afflicted;
- 13 (the) [po]or He will satiate, (the) uprooted He will guide, and on (the) hungry He will bestow riches;
- 14 and (the) intel[ligent], and all of them (shall be) like hol[y ones]

This text differs considerably from the others that refer to the future and mention **משיח**, but it agrees with some of them at least in its expectation of a coming messianic figure. In this case it is again the singular **משיח**, but fitted with a suffix, “His,” that is, God’s Messiah. When J. Starcky first spoke of this text, he wrote, “One fine manuscript mentions the Messiah, but the gracious work of eschatological salvation, spoken of in terms of *Is. xl ff.* and *Ps. cxlvi*, is attributed directly to the Lord, *Adonay*.”⁶⁰ As used in this Qumran writing, Psalm 146, on which it heavily depends, is considerably modified by the introduction of “His messiah,” a term not found in the psalm itself, where the bounties are ascribed to God. Some echoes of Ps 146 are found in this fragment: 6b (כל אשר בם), 7 (מתיר אסורים), 8 (זקף כפופים . . . פקח עורים); as also echoes of Isa 34:1 (תשמע הארץ); 35:5 (תפקחנה עיני עורים); 61:1 (לבשר ענוים).

The editor, Emile Puech, has called this text a “messianic apocalypse,” but what has been preserved in the fragment reveals “none of the formal marks of apocalyptic revelation,” as Collins has rightly noted.⁶¹ Collins is also right in describing this coming Messiah as a prophetic type rather than a kingly type. In this regard the treatment of the Messiah in 4Q521 is again a development beyond what one finds in the Old Testament itself, even though it resembles the way that the Qumran texts have often spoken of historical prophets as anointed agents of God.

As the fragment has been interpreted at times, however, the wondrous deeds of freeing prisoners, giving sight to the blind, healing the wounded, re-

60. See P. Benoit et al., “Editing the Manuscript Fragments from Qumran,” *BA* 19 (1956) 75-96, esp. 96 (French original in *RB* 63 [1956] 49-67, esp. 66).

61. Collins, “The Works of the Messiah,” 98.

viving the dead, and so forth have been ascribed to the Messiah, “as God’s agent” or as “an eschatological prophet.”⁶² This, however, is far from clear, for the deeds seem rather to be those of “the Lord” (אֲדֹנָי), who is mentioned explicitly in lines 4, 5, 11.

Moreover, both the original editor and others have spoken unfortunately about this text as mentioning “resurrection.”⁶³ The word “resurrection” evokes different images among readers, Jewish and Christian; so it is better avoided in the interpretation of this Jewish text.⁶⁴ For “resuscitation,” which is the proper understanding of line 12 of this text, is something different from “resurrection,” whether that of Jesus Christ or of the general resurrection of the dead (Dan 12:2).

In this connection one should consider still another line of 4Q521, which mentions no messiah, but speaks of **יְקִיִּם הַמְחִיָּה אֶת מַתֵּי עַמּוֹ**, “(when) the vivifier will [rai]se up the dead of his people” (7+5 ii 6).⁶⁵ This is almost certainly a reference to God, hardly to a messianic figure.⁶⁶

62. Ibid., 98-99; on p. 112, Collins goes so far as to speak of such “works” as indicative “of a prophetic messiah of the Elijah type rather than of the royal messiah.” This means that Collins is now speaking even of “Elijah” as a kind of messiah! Cf. M. O. Wise and J. D. Tabor, “The Messiah at Qumran,” *BAR* 18/6 (1992) 60-65, who read line 12 differently.

63. Puech, “Une Apocalypse messianique,” 475 (“ce texte aux mentions irréfutables de la résurrection”); J. D. Tabor and M. O. Wise, “4Q521 ‘On Resurrection’ and the Synoptic Gospel Tradition: A Preliminary Study,” *JSP* 10 (1992) 149-62. Cf. G. Vermes, “Qumran Forum Miscellanea I,” *JJS* 43 (1992) 299-305, esp. 303-4, who speaks of “The Resurrection fragment,” but then adds the adjective “so-called.” At the end he says, “Line 12 displays the most explicit evidence to date in the Scrolls concerning the doctrine of the resurrection from the dead (וּמַתֵּי־יְחִיָּה) . . .” (p. 304); cf. also Collins, “The Works of the Messiah,” 98.

64. See the complaints of Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 348. Recall the ancient Jewish prayer, *Šēmōneh ‘Ešre* 2: “Lord, you are mighty forever, reviving the dead . . . making the dead alive out of great mercy . . . healing the sick, freeing the captives, and keeping your word to those who sleep in the dust. . . . You are faithful in making the dead alive. Blest are you, Lord, who make the dead alive.”

65. Puech, “Une apocalypse messianique,” 501. Puech reads the lines 7-8 as follows: [וְנִגְוִי דְהַ וְנִגְוִיָּדָה לְכֶם צַדִּיק וְתֵי אֲדֹנָי אֲשֶׁר] [בְּנֵי תַמְוִתָּה וּפְתַחַן קְבֻרֹת / לוֹחֹת] which he translates, “Alors nous ren[d]rons grâce et nous vous annoncerons les actes de jus[ti]ce du Seigneur qui [a délivré/ressucité?] les fil[s de la m]ort et a ouvert [leurs tombeaux/les tombeaux des (justes)/les tablettes].” Cf. Ps 79:11; 102:21. Puech’s restoration of קְבֻרֹת, “graves,” is far from certain, even if it suits his thesis about “resurrection.”

66. As Collins (“The Works of the Messiah,” 101) agrees; see his critical note on J. Neusner (ibid., n. 12). That “the resurrection of the dead shall come through Elijah of blessed memory” (*m. Sotah* 9:15) is clearly a still further development in the Mishnah of the rabbinic period, a teaching that cannot be ascribed to the Qumran community without further ado. How legitimate is it to cite *Pesiqta de R. Kahana* 76a for the interpretation

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND CHRISTIAN ORIGINS

18. 4Q521 8:9⁶⁷

[ה וכל משיחיה]

[]H and all its (fem.) Anointed Ones (*or* Messiahs).

The text seems to deal with the Temple, but it is broken; so it is impossible to determine further the sense of משיח.⁶⁸

19. 4Q521 9:3⁶⁹

[כה תעזוב ב[י]ד משיח]

[] your [] you will abandon into the [ha]nd of (your?) Messiah (*or* Anointed One).

Again, because of the broken state of the text, the meaning is uncertain.

20. pap4QparaKings (4Q382) 16:2⁷⁰

[משיח ישראל . .]

[M]essiah of Isr[a]el[] .

The context is lost on this small fragment of four lines.

21. 4Q375 (4QapMos^a) 1 i 9⁷¹

לפני / [ה] כוהן המשיח אשר יוצק על ר[ו] אשו שמן המשיחה

of a Qumran text? At the earliest, that text is dated to the fifth century A.D.; some have even dated it ca. A.D. 700 (H. L. Strack and G. Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* [Edinburgh: Clark, 1991] 321).

67. See Puech, "Une Apocalypse messianique," 508.

68. Puech (*ibid.*) restored ה[כהנ] before the phrase, translating it, "la prêtri]se et tous ses oints." Cf. Abegg, "The Messiah at Qumran," 142.

69. See Puech, "Une Apocalypse messianique," 509.

70. See S. Olyan, "4Qpap paraKings et al.," in H. Attridge et al., *Qumran Cave 4: VIII Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (DJD 13; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994) 363-416, esp. 372.

71. See J. Strugnell, "375. 4QApocryphon of Moses^a," in *Qumran Cave 4: XIV, Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (DJD 19; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995) 111-19, esp. 113; cf. his article, "Moses-Pseudepigrapha at Qumran: 4Q375, 4Q376, and Similar Works," in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (JSPSup 8; ed. L. H. Schiffman; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990) 221-56.

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND CHRISTIAN ORIGINS

lines is missing; so there is no certainty about the context or the subject matter. It is mentioned here only for the sake of completeness of coverage.

To these instances one may eventually have to add consideration of three other texts where **משיח** occurs in a badly broken context: 4Q287 (4QBerakot^b) 10:3; 4Q377 (4QapMos^c); 4Q458 (4QNarrative).⁷⁵

These, then, are the Qumran texts in which **משיח** occurs, many of which clearly express messianic expectations. Some, however, have at times been considered “messianic,” but are only problematically so. Some, too, use the word to refer to prophets of old and so are not utilized in a truly messianic sense. Other problematic texts, however, have to be considered.

The first of such texts is 4QTestim (4Q175).⁷⁶ This testimonia list presents a number of biblical and nonbiblical passages written on a single sheet of skin: Deut 5:28-29 + 18:18-19; Num 24:15-17; Deut 33:8-11; and 4QPsalms of Joshua. The original editor, John M. Allegro, admitted that the last paragraph, the excerpt from 4QPsJosh, had no messianic import, but he and others have often understood the first three paragraphs as referring to the prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel mentioned in 1QS 9:11 (text 1 above).

The first paragraph in 4QTestim, which combines Deut 5:28-29 and 18:18-19 and promises a prophet like Moses, has no more “messianic” meaning than the last paragraph, but it is considered to have “messianic” connotation by extrinsic denomination. It contains the Deuteronomy passage to which the “prophet” in the expectations of 1QS 9:11 refers, which also mentions Messiahs.⁷⁷

The second paragraph in 4QTestim is an excerpt from the Oracle of Balaam (Num 24:15-17), which has no more “messianic” connotation than the first. The “star that shall march forth from Jacob” and the “sceptre that shall arise from Israel” are, in the Old Testament, not yet references to a “Messiah” in this book of the Pentateuch. This pentateuchal passage enjoyed favor

75. See M. G. Abegg, Jr., “The Messiah at Qumran,” 140-41.

76. See J. M. Allegro, *Qumrân Cave 4*, 57-60; cf. *JBL* 75 (1956) 174-87, esp. 182-87. Cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, *ESBNT* or *SBNT*, 59-89. This text has been regarded as messianic by Milik, *TYDWJ*, 124-25; A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1961) 315-18; G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 295-96; and T. H. Gaster, *The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1957) 353-59.

77. Years ago P. W. Skehan noted that “the passages named . . . are given as one single text, continuously, in one paragraph . . . [as] a citation from Ex 20,21b, according to the Samaritan recension of the Pentateuch, beginning as that text does with the introductory formula **ויאמר יהוה אלי** instead of with Dt’s **יהוה אל משה לאמר**” (“The Period of the Biblical Texts from Khirbet Qumrân,” *CBQ* 19 [1957] 435-40, esp. 435). 4QTestim actually begins thus: **אל מושה לאמור . . . וידבר**. Cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, *ESBNT* or *SBNT*, 83.

among the Qumran community, as can be seen from the use of it in 1QM 11:6 and in CD 7:18-21. In the latter instance, the star and the sceptre are interpreted as two figures: “the star is the Interpreter of the Law (דורש התורה), who will come to Damascus,”⁷⁸ and who is usually understood to be an eschatological priest. If he is meant to be the same as the Messiah of Aaron, it is only by indirection. “The sceptre is a Prince of the Whole Congregation (נשיא כל העדה),” of whom it is said that “when he rises, he will destroy all the children of Seth” (7:18-21).⁷⁹ The future or eschatological role predicated

78. Another passage in CD perhaps sheds some light on this דורש התורה: “God remembered the covenant of (the) first members and raised up from Aaron discerning ones and from Israel sages, and he made them listen. They dug the well: ‘A well that the princes dug, that the nobles of the people delved with the staff’ (Num 21:18). The ‘well’ is the Law, and those who dug it are the returnees of Israel, who went out from the land of Israel and sojourned in the land of Damascus. All of them God called princes because they sought Him, and their renown has not been diminished in anyone’s mouth. The ‘staff’ is the Interpreter of the Law, of whom Isaiah said, ‘He brings forth a tool for his work’ (Isa 54:16). The ‘nobles of the people’ are those who come to dig the well with the staves, which the ‘scepter’ decreed: to walk according to them in all the age of wickedness, and without which they will not attain it (instruction), until there arises one who teaches righteousness at the end of time” (CD 6:2-11; on this text, see p. 103 below). From this passage it would seem clear that דורש התורה was not always understood as a coming, future figure, as he is in 4QFlor (4Q174) 1-2 i 11-12, but that it was a title sometimes given to a historical person in the community, a teacher who has already imparted an interpretation of the law (compare 1QS 6:6). He would have been someone like the historical מורה הצדק, “Teacher of Righteousness,” not necessarily the same as the expected יורה הצדק, of whom CD 6:10-11 speaks. Note that in this text the דורש התורה is likewise distinct from the יורה הצדק.

79. Recall that נשיא העדה עד is also mentioned in (1) 4Q285 4:2: [נ]שיא העדה עד . . . הגדול . . . , “the [P]rince of the Congregation as far as the [Great] Sea” (if the final word is rightly restored?); (2) 4Q285 5:4 (on which see below); 6:6, 10; (3) 1QM 5:1 (“on the sh[ield] of the Prince of the Whole Congregation they shall write his name and the name of Israel, Levi, and Aaron and the names of the twelve tribes of Israel . . .”); this refers to the eschatological war, but it does not make “the Prince of the Whole congregation” an eschatological figure any more than the rest of those whose names are to be so inscribed; in fact, it suggests that he was indeed a historical figure); (4) 4QpIsa^a (4Q161) 5-6:3 (in a broken context); (5) 4Q376 1 iii 1 נשיא כול העדה mentioned as being “in the camp”). (6) In 4QSap^e (4Q423) 5:3 a figure called נשיא עמכה appears, who has been taken to be the same as נשיא העדה. (7) Only in CD 7:20, copies of which are also found in 4QD^a (4Q266) 3 iii 21 and 4QD^d (4Q269) 5:4, is his “rising” mentioned. The title נשיא may well be derived from Ezek 34:24; 37:25, where it is used of the future “David”; this may explain why a figure with this title is given an eschatological role. The title, however, seems to have been used for a historical leader of the community as well as for an expected figure, who would duplicate the role of the historical leaders in an eschatological sense, just as the historical מורה הצדק did not exclude the expectation of one who would come to “teach righteousness” (CD 6:10-11). That the title has such a double function is not always reckoned with.

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND CHRISTIAN ORIGINS

of the Prince may be meant to identify him as the Messiah of Israel, but again that is done only by indirection. Moreover, any messianic connotation given to both these pentateuchal figures is derived from Qumran interpretation; this does not mean that Num 24:15-17 had such a meaning in itself.

The third paragraph in 4QTestim, quoting Deut 33:8-11, is from the Blessing of Moses pronounced over Levi, whose task it was to teach Israel and minister at the altar in the Temple. It is thus clearly a priestly text, referring to an eschatological figure. Is he the Messiah of Aaron? If so, is he different from “the star that shall march forth from Jacob” mentioned in the second paragraph? In other words, the purpose of the composition of the so-called *Testimonia* from Qumran Cave 4 is badly in need of reassessment.⁸⁰ Its messianic character has simply been overstated.⁸¹

The second text that needs to be reconsidered is 1QSb, the second appendix of the *Manual of Discipline*, which formulates various blessings. J. T. Milik originally named it “Recueil des Bénédiction,”⁸² and doubted that the blessings were ever used in a community liturgy, calling it rather “une composition livresque” (a bookish composition).⁸³ The phrase **בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים**, “at the end of days,” never occurs in this text, and so the reason for regarding it as “bénédiction de la Congrégation *eschatologique*” (blessings of the eschatological congregation)⁸⁴ is far from clear. In it Milik distinguished a blessing for faithful members of the congregation (1-8 i 1-20), a blessing for the High Priest (1-8 i 21-iii 21), a blessing for the Sons of Zadok, the priests (1-8 iii 22-v 19), and a blessing for the Prince of the Congregation (1-8 v 20-29[?]). Geza Vermes concurred with Milik’s messianic analysis.⁸⁵ Despite the reasons that Milik gives, however, nothing in the text indicates that the second blessing was intended for a high priest or for the Messiah of Aaron,⁸⁶ or that the last

80. Collins (*The Scepter and the Star*, 64) rightly calls this text “a collection of passages with eschatological significance”; but it is far from clear that “Balaam’s oracle was widely understood in a messianic sense, and that ‘Prince of the Congregation’ was a messianic title” (ibid.). See further J. Lübke, “A Reinterpretation of 4QTestimonia,” *RevQ* 12 (1985-87) 187-97. Lübke rightly questions the messianic interpretation of 4QTestim, but I am not sure that his alternative interpretation will convince many.

81. See further my article, “‘4QTestimonia’ and the New Testament,” *ESBNT* or *SBNT*, 59-89, esp. 82-86, where I went along with the then-prevailing interpretation.

82. See Barthélemy and Milik, *Qumran Cave I*, 118-30.

83. Ibid., 120.

84. Ibid., 121: “bénédiction de la Congrégation *eschatologique*” (my emphasis).

85. See Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 235.

86. Milik introduced into his translation of 1QSb 1-8 i 21 the phrase, “pour bénir le *Grand Prêtre* . . .” (to bless the *High Priest* [in brackets]), but nothing in the text itself mentions **כֹּהֵן הַרֹאשׁ**, a title for the High Priest that is otherwise used in the sectarian writings

blessing was for the Messiah of Israel. More likely the second blessing was to be uttered by the **משכיל**, “Instructor,” over the priestly head of the Qumran community, whoever he might have been at a given time, and the last blessing over the Prince of the Congregation, some historical member of the community who enjoyed this title.⁸⁷ The blessings in this collection, which were influenced by Isaiah 11 and were to be recited by the Instructor, are florid in their poetic and rhetorical phrasing. They were undoubtedly to be used on liturgical occasions, when the Instructor uttered blessings over members of the community: ordinary members, the priestly leader, the sons of Zadok, and the Prince of the Congregation. Consequently, both the eschatological and the messianic nuances of this text are far from certain.

The third text that needs scrutiny is what some have called the Pierced Messiah text of Qumran Cave 4 (4Q285). It is related to the *War Scroll*, and according to Milik represents a portion that is now lost from the end of 1QM.⁸⁸ It has to be considered along with other texts of the *War Scroll* from Cave 4.⁸⁹ Fragment 5 of this text runs as follows:⁹⁰

] 1 [כאשר כתוב בספר] ישעיהו הנביא ונוקפ[ו]
] 2 [סבכי היער בברזל והלבנון באדיר י] פול ויצא חוטר מגזע ישי
] 3 [ונצר משרשיו יפרה] צמח דויד ונשפטו את [כול]
] 4 [חיל בליעל ועמד מלך הכתיים למשפט] והמיתו נשיא העדה צמ[ח]
] 5 [דויד יצאו בתופים] ם ובמחוללות וצוה כוהן
] 6 [הרואש לטהר את בשרם מדם ח] לל[י] כתיים [וכו] ל[העם]

(1QM 2:1; 15:4; 16:13; 18:5; 19:11; 4QM^d 1 ii 4); or even הכוהן הגדול (11QTemple 15:15; 23:9; 25:16; 26:3; 58:18). Milik’s interpretation has been queried as well by J. Licht (*מגילת הסריים*, 274-75) and J. VanderKam (“Messianism in the Scrolls,” 224-25).

87. See my comment on the diverse usage of this title in n. 79 above.

88. See Milik, “*Milki-ṣedeq et Milki-reša*” dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens,” *JJS* 23 (1972) 95-144, esp. 143. Another copy of fragments 3-4 of 4Q285 is found in A. S. van der Woude, “Ein neuer Segensspruch aus Qumran (11 Q Ber),” in *Bibel und Qumran: Beiträge zur Erforschung der Beziehungen zwischen Bibel- und Qumranwissenschaft: Hans Bardtke zum 22.9.1966* (ed. S. Wagner; Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1968) 253-58 (+ pl).

89. See 4QM^{a-f} (4Q491-96), in M. Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4: III (4Q482-4Q520)* (DJD 7; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982) 12-68. Possibly 4Q285 should now be labeled 4QM^g, as F. García Martínez has suggested.

90. The text of 4Q285 can be found in Wacholder and Abegg, *Preliminary Edition*, 2:223-27 (fragment 5 on p. 225). Tentatively, I am following the form of fragment 5 given by M. G. Abegg, “Messianic Hope and 4Q285: A Reassessment,” *JBL* 113 (1994) 81-91, esp. 87 (with a slight modification). Cf. García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, 124.

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND CHRISTIAN ORIGINS

¹[As is written in the book of] Isaiah the prophet, ²“[And the thickets of the forest] shall be cut down [with an iron axe, and Lebanon with (its) splendor] shall fall. A shoot shall sprout from Jesse’s stump, ³[and a bud shall blossom from his roots” (Isa 10:34–11:1)] the Scion of David. And they shall enter into judgment with [all ⁴the army of Belial; the king of the Kittim shall stand for judgment], and the Prince of the Congregation, the Sci[on(?) of ⁵David,] shall put him to death. [They shall go forth with timbrel]s and with dances. Then ⁶[the high] priest shall give an order [to cleanse their flesh of the blood of th]ose woun[ded by] the Kittim; [and al]l [the people . . .].⁹¹

In this unfortunately badly preserved text, **צמח דויד** may be in apposition to **נשיא העדה** (line 4), but one has to reckon with the broken condition of the text. First, **דויד**, “David,” is wholly restored at the beginning of line 5. Second, the letter following *šade* in line 4 is not certainly a *mem*; it could just as well be a *bet* or a *kap*.⁹² Yet even if one admits the correctness of the resto-

91. 1QIsa^a 10:19 reads the singular **ונקר** along with the MT, but otherwise the text of Isaiah in this fragment agrees with the MT and 1QIsa^a. The niph'al of **שפט** is used in line 3 with the preposition **את**, as in Jer 2:35; Ezek 17:20; 20:35-36, in the sense of “entering into judgment *with*.” The text of this fragment should also be compared with 4QpIsa^a (4Q161) 8-10:2-9, where parts of Isa 10:34–11:1 are preserved and interpreted in a pesher (see Allegro, *Qumrân Cave 4:I*, 13-15). The pertinent part reads:

[וניקפו] סככי [היער] כברזל ולבנון באדיר / יפול פשרו על הכתיאים אש[ר]
 יכת[ו] בית ישראל וענוי / [כול הגואים וגבורים יחתו ונמס ל]בם[]
 [רמי] הקומה גדועים המה גבורי כת[יאים] / ואשר אמ[ר] וניקפו
 סוככי [היער] כברזל ה[מה] / [ם למלחמת כתיאים ולבנון באדיר /
 יפול פשרו על ה]כתיאים אשר ינת[נו] ביד גדולו[ן] / [ים כברחו
 מלפני ל.]מ[]

²“The thickets [of the forest] will be cut down with an iron axe, and by a majestic one [will] Lebanon ³[fall.” The interpretation of it concerns the K[it]tim, who will crush the house of Israel and the afflicted ones of[⁴]all the Gentiles and warriors will be dismayed; and their hea[rt(s)] will melt. [⁵ “the great] in height will be hewn down”: They are the warriors of the Kit[tim] ⁶ And as for what it sa]ys, “And the thickets of [the] forest will be cut down with an iron axe,” th[ey ⁷].M for the war of the Kittim. “And by a ma[jestic one will] Lebanon ⁸[fall,” the interpretation of it concerns the] Kittim, who will be given over into the hand of His great one[]. ⁹[].YM in his flight from before L[].

This pesher on Isaiah, which clearly expresses a promise of eschatological victory over the Kittim, is pertinent to the understanding of 4Q285, because it gives an interpretation of Isa 10:34–11:1 by alluding to the Romans under that code name, but makes no mention of a messianic figure. Even the phrase **ביד גדולו** (line 8) is a studied circumlocution avoiding that.

92. Wacholder and Abegg read **צבא**, as did the preliminary concordance of the

ration of line 4 and the application of **צמח דויד** to the Prince of the Congregation, his “messianic” character is not *eo ipso* evident. Third, I agree with those who have interpreted the text by making the Prince of the Congregation the subject of the verb **והמיתו**, against the interpretation of Robert Eisenman.⁹³ The phrases **צמח דויד** and **נשיא העדה** appear together here and may ascribe an eschatological role to the Prince of the Congregation in executing an enemy. That is the most one can say about this text. It only shows how complicated the interpretation of Isaiah was at Qumran in the development of the community’s eschatological beliefs.

The fourth text that needs to be scrutinized is CD 6:10-11, which reads: **וּזְוֹלְתָם לֹא יִשְׁיִגּוּ עַד עֵמֶד יוֹרֵה הַצְּדָק בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים**, “and without them they will not attain it (instruction) until there arises at the end of days one who teaches righteousness.”⁹⁴ In the last clause **יֹרֵה הַצְּדָק**, “one who teaches righteousness,” is a play on Hos 10:12, **וְעַתָּה לְדַרוֹשׁ אֶת יְהוָה עַד יָבֹוא וִירָה צְדָק, לְכֻם**, “It is time to seek Yahweh that He may come and rain down upon [or: teach] you righteousness.” The expression, “one who teaches righteousness,” derived from Hosea, now becomes a way of referring to an expected figure. The awaited **יֹרֵה הַצְּדָק** may be a teacher like the historical Teacher of Righteousness, but he is not the same person; the text does not imply that the historical **מֹרֵה הַצְּדָק** is somehow to return to become “their resurrected Teacher who would lead the theocratic community of the New Israel in the Last Days.”⁹⁵ The historical Teacher of Righteousness was a priest, but nothing in this text suggests that the expected **יֹרֵה הַצְּדָק** was to be the Messiah of Aaron.⁹⁶

nonbiblical texts from Cave 4, compiled back in the late 1950s by myself, R. E. Brown, and W. G. Oxtoby.

93. Eisenman understood **נשיא העדה** as the object of the plural verb **והמיתו**, despite the absence of the sign of the accusative before those words, maintaining that the text “refers to the execution of a Messianic leader” (*California State University, Long Beach, News Release*, 1 November 1991, p. 1; cf. *New York Times*, 8 November 1991, p. A8). See further M. Bockmuehl, “A ‘Slain Messiah’ in 4Q Serekh Milhamah (4Q285)?” *TynBull* 43 (1992) 155-69; G. Vermes, “The Oxford Forum for Qumran Research Seminar on the Rule of War from Cave 4 (4Q285),” *JJS* 43 (1992) 85-90, summarized in “The ‘Pierced Messiah’ Text — An Interpretation Evaporates,” *BARev* 18/4 (1992) 80-82; R. Bauckham, “The Messianic Interpretation of Isa. 10:34 in the Dead Sea Scrolls, 2 Baruch and the Preaching of John the Baptist,” *DSD* 2 (1995) 202-16, esp. 203, 206. Cf. M. O. Wise and J. D. Tabor, “The Messiah at Qumran,” *BARev* 18/6 (1992) 60-63, 65; J. D. Tabor, “A Pierced or Piercing Messiah? — The Verdict Is Still Out,” *BARev* 18/6 (1992) 58-59; VanderKam, “Messianism in the Scrolls,” 217.

94. See Broshi, ed., *Damascus Document*, 20-21.

95. As J. M. Allegro once put it (*The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reappraisal* (2d ed.; Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1964) 167.

96. See further Collins, “Teacher and Messiah?” 193-210; M. Knibb, “The Teacher of

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND CHRISTIAN ORIGINS

The fifth text that needs to be reconsidered is 4Q246, which mentions the “Son of God” and “Son of the Most High,” but which in my opinion is not messianic. I have treated this text above in Chapter 3 and shall simply refer here to that treatment.⁹⁷

In any case, one sees in the differing Qumran texts that use the term **משיח** three main developments beyond the Old Testament usage itself. The first is the clear application of the title to prophets of old. If this was a debatable issue in the Old Testament itself, it is found clearly in texts 5 and 8-10 above, with a verb in the past tense, and doubtfully in text 15.

The second development is the clear use of **משיח** in the sense of an expected or future Messiah. Although some writers have thought it better to speak only of an “Anointed One,”⁹⁸ in my opinion the Qumran texts show that the term had already become titular in Judaism, referring to an expected or eschatological anointed agent of God to be sent for the good of His people. Many of these texts were written (or at least copied) shortly after the final redaction of the book of Daniel and speak of one or two expected figures, some of them using **משיח** in a future sense. This is a development beyond the future reference found in Dan 9:25, **עד משיח נגיד**. The thrust of Daniel 9 makes one hesitate to say that the translation “Messiah” (with a capital M) should be used there. This, however, is not the case with the Qumran texts cited above, where I have translated **משיח** as “Messiah” (texts 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17). They show clearly the belief in the coming of a Messiah, or of two Messiahs, as prevalent among Essene Jews in Palestine of the last two pre-Christian centuries.⁹⁹

The third development is the expectation of other figures along with the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel. One is the “prophet” like Moses; another is the “anointed herald”; another is “one who teaches righteousness at the end of days,” and another is the “Prince of the (Whole) Congregation,” who may or may not be the same as the Messiah of Israel.

This development of a clear messianic expectation and of other escha-

Righteousness — A Messianic Title?” in *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History* (JSOTSup 100; ed. P. R. Davies and R. T. White; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990) 51-65. Both write against the interpretation given by P. R. Davies, “The Teacher of Righteousness and the ‘End of Days,’” *RevQ* 13 (1988-89) 313-17.

97. See pp. 41-61 above.

98. See L. H. Silberman, “The Two ‘Messiahs’ of the Manual of Discipline,” *VT* 5 (1955) 77-82. Cf. M. de Jonge, “The Use of the Word ‘Anointed’ in the Time of Jesus,” *NovT* 8 (1966) 132-48.

99. See further L. H. Schiffman, “Messianic Figures and Ideas in the Qumran Scrolls,” in Charlesworth, ed., *The Messiah*, 116-29.

tological expectations may be tied in with the Qumran community's understanding of itself as the "New Covenant" (1QpHab 2:3; CD 6:19; 8:21; 19:33-34; 20:12).

In any case, משיח as a title for a coming Messiah is not a Christian invention. It was in use among Palestinian Jews long before Jesus of Nazareth, and even before the period of Roman occupation. How widespread the use of that title was among Palestinian Jews in the last pre-Christian centuries is another question, one to which we have no answer at this time.

There are also passages in other intertestamental Jewish literature that have entered into the discussion of Messianism, on which I should comment, even though they have nothing to do directly with Qumran Messianism. For instance, in the early Enochic literature "Messiah" occurs twice in the so-called Similitudes (*1 Enoch* 48:10; 52:4): "His Anointed" or "His Messiah" (= the Lord's). It is a title used of the mysterious expected figure who is also called "Elect One," "Son of Man," and "Righteous One." These titles seem to refer to a coming ideal ruler of Israel, and they show how various titles were beginning to be conflated and attributed to one individual already in pre-Christian Judaism. The Enochic literature found at Qumran is not clearly sectarian, and undoubtedly it was used by many Jews other than the Qumran community. The title "Messiah" in *1 Enoch* undoubtedly fed into the development of Qumran Essene expectations, even if no part of the Similitudes has been found among the fragments of Enoch at Qumran.¹⁰⁰ A small fragment of 4QEn^c 5 i contains a word or two of *1 Enoch* 105,¹⁰¹ but nothing that corresponds to the passage in 105:2 that is often thought to be "Messianic": "For I and my son will join ourselves with them for ever in the paths of uprightness during their lives, and you will have peace."¹⁰² "My son" is often taken to be a designation of a messianic figure,¹⁰³ but rightly?

100. I consider it sheer chance that the so-called Similitudes have not turned up among the fragments of Qumran Cave 4. I do not share the conviction of J. T. Milik that they were a Christian substitute for the Enochic Book of Giants (*The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1976] 89-107). See my article, "Implications of the New Enoch Literature from Qumran," *TS* 38 (1977) 332-45; cf. J. C. Greenfield and M. E. Stone, "The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes," *HTR* 70 (1977) 51-65; "The Books of Enoch and the Traditions of Enoch," *Numen* 26 (1979) 89-103; M. Knibb, "The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review," *NTS* 25 (1978-79) 345-59.

101. See Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 207 (+ pl. XIV).

102. See M. A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1978) 2:243-44. Chap. 105 is not extant in Greek *Enoch*, and Knibb's interpretation of the chapter as a "Messianic reference" is unsubstantiated.

103. See the quotation from P. Billerbeck in Chapter 4, n. 14 above.

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND CHRISTIAN ORIGINS

In the late first-century-b.c. writing *Psalms of Solomon* the Greek word *christos* occurs four times, but never in an absolute, unmodified form. Psalm 18 is entitled *epi tou Christou Kyriou*, “About the Anointed of the Lord” (or “the Anointed Lord”), and this form is also found in 17:32 and 18:7; but 18:5 has *Christou autou* (i.e., *Kyriou*). *Christos* refers not to a priestly Messiah, but to an awaited faithful descendant on David’s throne, who will do God’s will in Israel: *basileus dikaios didaktos hypo theou . . . hoti pantes hagioi, kai basileus autōn christos Kyriou*, “(he will be) a righteous king, taught by God . . . because they all (will be) saints, and their king the Messiah of the Lord” (17:32).¹⁰⁴ This may be the beginning of a restricted use of “Messiah” in the Davidic or kingly sense that one finds later on.

Here one might also consider 4 *Ezra* 7:28-29; 12:32; 13:32, 37, 52; 14:9, if one could establish the text of these verses, which are badly transmitted (mainly in Latin).¹⁰⁵ The occurrence of a “Messiah” in 7:28-29 is questionable, because it speaks of *filius meus Jesus*, “my son Jesus,” and *filius meus Christus*, “my son the Messiah (or Christ),” whereas 14:9 uses only *cum filio meo*, without any mention of an anointed figure.¹⁰⁶ The use of “my son” in this text is often called “messianic,” as in the case of *I Enoch* 105:2 (above).

There are also problematic passages in the Greek *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. *T. Levi* 8:13-14 possibly alludes to a priestly and a Davidic Messiah, but there *Χριστός* is used as a title for neither figure. *T. Reuben* 6:8 speaks of *μέχρι τελειώσεως χρόνων ἀρχιερέως χριστοῦ*, “the fulfillment of the

104. See M. de Jonge, *TDNT*, 9:513-14; cf. S. P. Brock, “The Psalms of Solomon,” in Sparks, ed., *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, 649-82, esp. 678-79, 681; M. Knibb, “Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Scrolls,” *DSD* 2 (1995) 165-84.

105. 4 *Ezra* is extant also in Syriac, Ethiopic, Arabic, Armenian, Sahidic, and Georgian, almost all of which are translations of a lost Greek text, which is occasionally quoted by patristic writers. It was written originally in a Semitic language by a Jew at the end of the first century A.D. M. E. Stone (*Fourth Ezra* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990] 207-8) compares various versions that have rendered the verses, but he never uses the term “Messiah” or “Anointed One,” and speaks only of a “redeemer figure.” Cf. B. Violet, *Die Esra-Apokalypse (IV. Esra): Erster Teil. Die Überlieferung* (GCS 18; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1910) 140-41.

106. The Syriac version of 4 *Ezra* 7:28-29 has *bēri mēšihā*, but that of 14:9 does not. Moreover, there is no mention of a “Messiah” in chap. 13, even though verses 32, 37, 52 speak of *filius meus* or in Syriac *bēri*. See further J. A. Robinson, ed., *Liber Esdrae Quartus* (Texts and Studies 3/2; text prepared by R. L. Bensley; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1895) 27, 69. Cf. R. J. Bidawid, *4 Esdras* (The Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshitta Version 4/3; Leiden: Brill, 1973) 16, 45; L. Gry, *Les dires prophétiques d’Esdras (IV. Esdras)* (2 vols.; Paris: Geuthner, 1938); S. Gero, “‘My Son the Messiah’: A Note on 4 *Ezr* 7,28-29,” *ZNW* 66 (1975) 264-67; F. Zimmerman, “The Language, the Date, and the Portrayal of the Messiah in IV *Ezra*,” *Hebrew Studies* 26 (1985) 203-18.

times of an anointed high priest.”¹⁰⁷ *T. Simeon* 7:2 reads: ἀναστήσει γὰρ κύριος ἐκ τοῦ Λευὶ ὡς ἀρχιερέα, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Ἰούδα ὡς βασιλέα, θεὸν καὶ ἄνθρωπον, “and the Lord will raise up from Levi as it were a high priest, and from Judah as it were a king, God and man.” Still other passages in the *Testaments* speak of a coming kingdom or priesthood, but make no mention of an anointed figure or an anointing, so they may well be eschatological but are not “messianic” in any sense. The problem with these passages is obvious, because the *Testaments* have always been suspected of Christian interpolation in their Greek form, even though some of them are related to earlier Jewish writings.¹⁰⁸

As for much later Judaism, “Messiah” is found in two places in the Mishnah: *m. Berakoth* 1:5 interprets the phrase “all the days of your life” (Deut 16:3) to “include the Days of the Messiah” (להביא לימות המשיח), which tells us little about the sense in which the title was used; and *m. Sotah* 9:15 speaks of “the footprints of the Messiah” as signs that herald his coming at the end of the time of exile.¹⁰⁹ Thus the rabbinic tradition by the beginning of the third century A.D. had formulated some different nuances of messianic belief, and to these should be added the instances of משיחא inserted in the classic targums of the third and later centuries, mentioned at the beginning of this paper.¹¹⁰

107. A footnote in M. de Jonge’s translation reads: “Or ‘of Christ, the high priest.’” See H. F. D. Sparks, *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, 520.

108. See M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of Their Text, Composition and Origin* (2d ed.; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1975); idem, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (PVTG 1/2; Leiden: Brill, 1978). Cf. L. Rost, *Judaism outside the Hebrew Canon: An Introduction to the Documents* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1976) 140-46.

The only other pre-Christian text that might be considered is *The Sibylline Oracles*, Book 3, which Schiffman (*Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 320) has cited as a text that treats of messianism in the Second Temple Period. It speaks, indeed, of an expected “king,” but the references are to an expected Egyptian (Ptolemaic) king. Even though the oracles may stem from second-century-B.C. Alexandrian Judaism, it hardly refers to a Messiah (in the strict sense). Collins, who translated the text of Book 3 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983-85) 1:354-80, calls the king “a virtual messiah” (p. 355). That title for a non-Jewish king may be influenced by the use of משיח for the Persian King Cyrus in Isa 45:1, but it is not evidence for a Jewish Messiah.

109. So it is explained in H. Danby, *The Mishnah* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933) 306 n. 9. Cf. A. S. van der Woude, *TDNT*, 9:522, who discusses reasons why Messianic expectations seem to have died out. Also Schiffman, “The Concept of the Messiah,” 241-42.

110. See p. 75 above. Note also the way Hos 10:12 was eventually interpreted in

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND CHRISTIAN ORIGINS

I have mentioned these non-Qumran passages in the preceding paragraphs only to state where I stand with reference to them, since they have often entered into the discussion of the Qumran texts. Some of them are of dubious value, but others manifest how the developing messianic tradition progressed among Jews and later among Christians.

Implications for New Testament Usage

Early disciples may have thought of Jesus as a “Messiah” during his public ministry, but apart from Mark 14:62a, where Jesus himself is depicted by an evangelist as admitting before the Sanhedrin that he was “the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed One,” the Gospel tradition displays a reluctance to depict Jesus accepting that title during his ministry (see Matt 16:20; Luke 9:21; the reformulation of the Marcan Jesus’ answer before the Sanhedrin in Matt 26:64b; cf. Luke 22:67-70). Even the confession of Peter, “You are the Messiah” (Mark 8:29), is immediately corrected by Jesus, who “charges” the disciples not to use that title (8:30; Luke 9:21) and rebukes Peter (Mark 8:32). The evangelist substitutes for that another title: “he began to teach them that the Son of Man must suffer” (8:31; Luke 9:22). That early Christians soon after Jesus’ death began to refer to him as “the Messiah” or in Greek as ὁ Χριστός is the widespread message of New Testament writers. Only rarely in the New Testament, however, is Χριστός found as a *title* for Jesus, Rom 9:5 being one such instance. For Χριστός quickly became, as it were, Jesus’ second name, Jesus Christ. Here one is dealing with a Christian development of messianism; it goes beyond the Palestinian Jewish data in its own way. Martin Hengel has rightly noted that “Auferweckung bzw. Entrückung zu Gott haben mit Messianität nichts zu tun.”¹¹¹ Yet resurrection and heavenly exaltation are what New Testament writers have predicated of the Christian Messiah, especially Luke in Acts 2:36: “God has made him both Lord and Messiah, this Jesus whom you crucified” (cf. 2:32). This is what God has made of the crucified Jesus in the view of early Christians.

The title “Messiah” used of Jesus by later disciples may have to be related to the inscription that Pilate affixed to the cross on which Jesus died.

terms of a coming Elijah; see J. J. Collins, “Teacher and Messiah?” 206 n. 42, 210 n. 56. Cf. G. Molin, “Elijah der Prophet und sein Weiterleben in den Hoffnungen des Judentums und der Christenheit,” *Judaica* 8 (1951) 81.

111. See M. Hengel, “Jesus, der Messias Israels,” in *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity Presented to David Flusser . . .* (ed. I. Gruenwald et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992) 155-76, esp. 158.

The inscription has come down to us in four different forms, but the substance of it identifies him as ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων (Mark 15:26; Matt 27:37; Luke 23:38; John 19:19). Pilate's inscription and the title he used undoubtedly became the catalyst for Jesus being recognized as ὁ Χριστός, as Nils A. Dahl has argued.¹¹² Christians would never have said that Jesus was "the king of the Jews," and the Johannine Gospel even records a Jewish objection to Pilate's use of the term (John 19:21). Pilate's use of "king," however, and the contemporary Jewish expectation of a kingly Messiah undoubtedly led Christians to call the crucified Jesus "the Messiah" (ὁ Χριστός), even if that does not explain all the nuances of the title.

In light of the above Qumran evidence, one should consider the Q passage in which Jesus is depicted answering the question put to him by the messengers sent by John the Baptist (Luke 7:18-23; Matt 11:2-6): "Go and inform John of what you have seen and heard: blind people recovering their sight, cripples walking, lepers being cleansed, deaf hearing again, dead being revived, and good news being preached to the poor" (Luke 7:22; cf. Matt 11:5). The Q passage conflates phrases that allude to Isa 35:5; 26:19; 61:1, without exact quotation.¹¹³ This kind of conflation one finds in 4Q521 2 ii + 4:8,12, even if it is not identical. I have already noted the allusions to Ps 146:6-8 as well as to various Isaian passages in that Qumran text. In any case, Jesus' answer preserved in this Q passage implies that he is not a fiery reformer like Elijah, as the Baptist's question implied, "Are you the 'One who is to come,' or are we to look for someone else?" (Luke 7:19), where "One who is to come" is a title derived from Mal 3:1, which in that prophetic oracle was eventually understood of the fiery reformer, Elijah (Mal 3:23-24). Now that a Qumran text speaks of "His (i.e., God's) Messiah" to whom "heaven and earth will listen" and ascribes to God such wondrous deeds as those mentioned in the conflated phrases from Isaiah and Psalm 146 as characteristics of the time and coming of such a Messiah, one sees that Jesus' answer was making use of terminology that implied that he was not a fiery reformer like Elijah, but rather a messianic figure, as his followers would eventually recognize, and undoubtedly a messianic figure of prophetic type.

112. See N. A. Dahl, *The Crucified Messiah and Other Essays* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1974) 10-36; idem, "Messianic Ideas and the Crucifixion of Jesus," in Charlesworth, ed., *The Messiah*, 382-403.

113. Collins ("The Works of the Messiah," 107) limits the allusion to Isa 61:1, where one does not find any mention of reviving the dead. For a better interpretation of this Gospel passage, see J. A. T. Robinson, "Elijah, John and Jesus: An Essay in Detection," *NTS* 4 (1957-58) 263-81, reprinted in *Twelve New Testament Studies* (SBT 34; Naperville, Ill.: Allenson; London: SCM, 1962) 28-52.

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND CHRISTIAN ORIGINS

This, then, is the contribution that Qumran texts have made to the study of messianism in Judaism in the last two pre-Christian centuries and the first of the Christian era. The Qumran texts show that one does not have to work with such a vague definition of “messiah” as Collins has proposed: “an agent of God in the end-time who is said somewhere in the literature to be anointed, but who is not necessarily called ‘messiah’ in every passage.”¹¹⁴ That is another instance of the “rubberband extension” of the term with which I began. “Somewhere in the literature” means that one can predicate “messiah” of every stage of the development of eschatological expectations without any regard for the history of ideas. That is what I question.¹¹⁵

114. J. J. Collins, “‘He Shall not Judge by What His Eyes See’: Messianic Authority in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *DSD* 2 (1995) 145-64.

115. See now J. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran: Königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftenfunden von Qumran* (WUNT 2/104; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998).