

Bibliography at Tyndale House

HERMENEUTICS

Webb, Wm J, *Slaves, Women, and Homosexuals—Exploring the Hermeneutics of Cultural Analysis*, IVP, Downers Grove, IL 2001

Redemption Movement hermeneutics

Retroverting a modern ethic on slavery on the founding fathers is like rejecting the teaching on slavery in the Pentateuch. The Quakers were presenting an ideal perspective and demanding that congress act on it. They should have pushed for a gradual abolition with perhaps a time table, a view shared by most of the founders. Instead they lost, and slavery increased and resulted in the Civil War. Politics is the art of the possible. HH

Webb works progressively. He looks for preliminary movement, then seed ideas, then Breakouts (significant departure from the original statement), then purpose/intent statements, and finally basis in the fall and/or curse.

It seems to me that evangelicals have viewed the NT as “frozen in time.” I.e., there is no progression in meaning beyond the statements of the apostles. Webb is arguing that since Paul uses a primogeniture system to make his argument in 1 T 2:10-14, and since we don’t use today (and even in the Bible it was overridden by God many times), we can move beyond Paul in our understanding women’s roles. The reason is that the logic used is cultural not transcultural.

Webb’s conclusion

“Determining what should be assessed as cultural components within a biblical text in contrast to transculturally enduring aspects is no easy task. Some examples are widely accepted. For instance, most of the Western church no longer practices what Scripture says (at a nonabstracted, concrete level) about head coverings, holy kisses, foot washings, hairstyles, slavery, and so on. But we have not been particularly clear in explaining why we have discontinued certain practices yet continued others. The lack of explanation and consistency has often left thorny problems for the next generation of Christians. We pass on to them both the Scriptures themselves and our assessment of what to practice and what not to practice within those Scriptures, but without a clear guide as to how those decisions have been reached. This book attempts to provide a collection, in one volume, of the various criteria that can be used in cultural analysis. In order to make the process more objective, I have attempted to establish each criterion from neutral examples before moving to two of today’s more debated topics—women and homosexuals.” (p. 246)

Slavery: The way that the Bible deals with slaves, as well as numerous other topics, should convince us of the influence of culture on the formation of the text. Scripture does not present a ‘finalized ethic’ in every area of human relationship. God challenges his covenant people to act redemptively in the area of slavery (e.g., release for Hebrew slaves every seventh year, provisions upon release limitations on beatings, slave-free equality statements). The text takes us on a journey that clearly involves restoration of the society to which it was given. However, to stop where the Bible stops (with its isolated words) ultimately fails to reapply the redemptive spirit of the text as it spoke to the original audience. It fails to see that further reformation is possible and that further reformation must happen in order to fulfill the spirit-based component of meaning within the text’s words.” (p. 247)

Women: “Having completed a cultural analysis of the texts concerning women, it is reasonable to say that much of the portrait of patriarchy within Scripture contains culturally bound components and is not uniformly transcultural in nature. Through the writers of Scripture, God brought about significant improvement in the social situation of women relatively to the original setting. But that improvement needs to continue today. While the biblical text spoke redemptively to its generation, we would not want to advocate much of the legislation we find in Scripture concerning women. Like the slavery issue, we need to reapply the spirit of the text and attempt to make things fairer and more equitable for women in our time. As I have argued, we need to reform the biblical legislation about women in many areas within Scripture (e.g., adultery, inheritance, rape, property concepts, virginity expectations, divorce, treatment of women in war). Our ethic needs to embrace the renewing spirit of the original text (in its social setting) and move to an even more equitable and just treatment of women today. Without a doubt, we should do whatever we can to de-marginalize women in our contemporary Western setting.” (p. 248)

HEBREW TEXT

Herbert, Edward D. and Emanuel Tov *The Bible as Book. The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries. British Library and Oak Knoll Press 2002.*

IV. TEXTUAL CHARACTER (Emmanuel Tov)

A. Sites Other Than Qumran

“All the twenty-three texts found outside Qumran are almost identical to the medieval consonantal text of MT, even more so than the proto-Masoretic Qumran texts. This grouping comprises the following sites and texts: Masada (Genesis, Leviticus [2], Deuteronomy, Ezekiel, and Psalms [2], Wadi Sdeir (Genesis), Nahal Se’elim (Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Minor Prophets), as well as three scrolls of unknown origin. The only differences with the medieval text pertain to orthography, a few minute details, paragraphing, and the layout of individual Psalms, and these variations resemble the internal differences between the medieval manuscripts of MT themselves.” (p. 146).

“The main depository of texts was cave 4, which contained copies of all the books of the Hebrew Bible, with the exception of Esther. [fn 48: The absence of this book should probably be ascribed to coincidence (decaying of the material) rather than to any other factor.]” See also Shemaryahu Talmon fn 76 “It appears, however, that Covenanters authors knew the book in its present form. See Shemaryahu Talmon, ‘Was the Book of Esther Known at Qumran?’, *DSD* 2 (1995) 249-67; Jonathan Ben-Dov, ‘A Presumed Citation of Esther 3:16 in 4QD(b), *DSD*, 6 (1999), 282-84.” (p. 150)

“We prefer a middle course [on the origins of the scrolls], according to which some of the Qumran texts (probably not more than twenty percent) were copied by the scribes of the Qumran community, while the remainder were brought to Qumran from outside.” (p. 152).

3. Classification of the Texts According to Textual Character (p. 152)

“The classification of the Qumran texts remains a difficult assignment. The texts should not be grouped by cave, since the contents of each individual cave were not homogeneous. Nor should they be classified by origin (copied by the Qumranites/brought from outside), since this

distinction is neither firmly secured nor sufficient. Nor should the texts be classified by date, by palaeographical or codicological criteria, since none of these criteria are firm. Probably the best criterion for classification is according to textual character, even though this criterion is also problematic.”

“In the forty-six Torah texts that are sufficiently extensive for analysis (out of a total of fifty-two such texts included in the calculation), twenty-four texts (fifty-two percent) reflect MT (or are equally close to the MT and SP), seventeen are non-aligned (thirty-seven percent), three reflect the SP (6.5 percent), and two the LXX (4.5 percent). In the remainder of the Bible, in the seventy-five texts included in the calculation that are sufficiently extensive for analysis (out of a total of seventy-six such texts), thirty-three texts (forty-four percent) reflect MT (or are equally close to the MT and LXX), forty are non-aligned (fifty-three percent), two reflect the LXX (three percent). The overall preponderance of the Masoretic and non-aligned texts in the Qumran corpus is thus evident, in the Torah more than MT and in the other books more the non-aligned texts.” (p. 153)

There seem to be certain characteristics of writings that can be attributed to Qumran people. These are found in 27 documents. Using these criteria Tov can say, “The great majority of these texts reflect a free approach to the biblical text which manifests itself in adaptations of unusual forms to the context, in frequent errors, in numerous corrections, and sometimes, also, in careless handwriting. This approach seemingly contradicts the strict approach of the Qumran Covenanters to their Bible interpretation, but this contradiction is only apparent, as different aspects of life are involved”. (p. 154)

“That all these different groups of texts coexisted in Q and in P as a whole, shows that no fixed text or textual family had been accepted as the central text for the country as a whole. That conclusion may, however, be misleading, since in certain milieus in Palestine one of the texts of textual families could still have been the only accepted text. This, we believe, was the case for the Masoretic family which probably was the only acceptable text in Temple circles and therefore very influential elsewhere. **In a way this text should be considered a preferred text**, and the assumption would explain the large number of copies of this text found at Qumran and its exclusive presence in Masada, as well as in the later finds from Wadi Sdeir (-Nahal David), Nahal Hever, Wadi Murabba`at, Nahal Se`elim. The sociological data known about Masada fits into this picture since the community which lived there would have adhered to the rabbinic text. This assumption also applies to the other sites, reflecting a reality from the time of the Second Jewish Revolt (135 CE). (p. 157).

“The impression created by this data is that we should posit a group of de luxe Bible scrolls, especially among the later scrolls, as indicated by large top and bottom margins, a large number of lines, a proximity to MT, and a low incidence of scribal intervention. In fact, almost all the leather texts from Nahal Hever, Murabba`at, and Masada are of this type. At the same time, some de luxe texts are of a different nature, as is shown by 4QpaleoExod(m) and 4QSam(a)”. (p. 160).

Arie van der Kooij: The Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible

Some scholars have suggested that this situation [uniformity and pluriformity within Palestinian Judaism] might be accounted for by the assumption that, at least since the late first century BCE, a particular group within Judaism, probably that of the Pharisees, adhered to, or even preferred, this proto-MT textual tradition.”

“Be this as it may, the fact that this textual tradition is attested—in a few cases, it is attested as early as the late third century BCE (e.g., 4QJer(a)) indicates that there must have been a scribal milieu in which texts were copied in an accurate and conservative manner. It may well be that the milieu responsible for a conservative transmission was to be found in Temple circles, since the Temple was the primary place where ancient books were kept. This is not to say that this type of text was considered to be a standard text, or a fixed text, because the emphasis on an accurate transmission in these circles does not need to be seen as part of a religious ideology (such as the idea of canonicity); rather, the accurate transmission may be due to the fact that the work was done by ‘official,’ in the sense of highly trained, copyists.” (p. 171).

Armin Lange, “The Status of the Biblical Texts in the Qumran Corpus and the Canonical Process.

Conclusion: Scripture was of central importance for the literature and religious life and thought of the Q Covenanters. Their collection of authoritative scriptures differed distinctively from the canon of the later Hebrew Bible. This give evidence to the fact, that the different Jewish parties in the years 150 BCE to 70 CE adhered to different collections of authoritative scriptures. It seems to be a strong possibility that, in the time after the destruction of the Herodian Temple in 70 CE, the Pharisaic collection of scriptures developed by default into a canon adhered to by all Jews. For the Essenes the different text types and redactions of the later biblical books were of equal authority. That text types, which differed in the case of several biblical books substantially from each other, have been of equal religious authority for one of the main groups of late Second Temple Judaism, raises the question, as to whether the concept of an ‘Urtext’ with special religious dignity existed at all in this time. More probably, even biblical texts like the so-called Reworked Pentateuch (4QRP(a-e)[4Q158; 4Q364-7]) have been regarded as the word of God which he spoke ‘through Moses and through all his servants, the prophets’ (1QSI, 3).

George Brooke, “The Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for understanding the Text of the Bible.”

“Firstly, the dependence of a rewritten scriptural text on its source is such that the source is thoroughly embedded in its rewritten form not as explicit citation but as a running text.” (p. 32)

“Secondly, the dependence of a rewritten scriptural text on its source is also such that the order of the source is followed extensively.” (Exception 4QJosh(a): MT ch 8.)

Thirdly, the dependence of a rewritten scriptural text on its source is also such that the content of the source is followed relatively closely without very many major insertions or omissions.” P. 32-33

“Fourthly, the dependence of a rewritten scriptural text on its source is such that the original genre or genres stays much the same. Narrative is represented as narrative, law as law, oracle as oracle, and poetry as poetry.” (p. 33)

He argues (p. 34) that the idea of a uniform, consistent transmission of the text from the 2 temple to the rabbis to the middle ages is anachronistic. The text was always fluid. “Part of the scribe’s role (2 temple era) seems to have been what might have been deemed as the steady improvement of the text. This was always recognized in some fashion both for the translators of the various scriptural books into Greek and also for the text which underlies the Samaritan tradition, but often the variant readings in these were viewed as aberrant in some way and clearly of a secondary character (with ‘secondary’ having a pejorative force). In one sense every copy of an authoritative scriptural book made in the late Second Temple period is a rewritten scriptural manuscript.”

“Open any guide to the text criticism of the Hebrew Bible and you will be told that the sole or principal aim of text criticism is the quest for the original form of the biblical text. Emanuel Tov, who knows the scriptural and rewritten scriptural manuscripts from Qumran better than anyone, has modified the aim somewhat, but still has written as follows: ‘textual criticism deals with the origin and nature of all forms of a text, in our case the biblical text. This involves a discussion of its putative original form(s) and an analysis of the various representatives of the changing biblical text.’ This puts it neatly, but perhaps it is time to shift the emphasis. Text critics may indeed still make suggestions about the original form or, rather, forms of a scriptural text, but the wealth of information both in what seem to be the scriptural manuscripts and also in their rewritten forms provides us with an enormous descriptive task in which the original forms of the text become significant not so much in themselves but because of the way in which they might provide explanations for the variety of witnesses that exist. The text critic’s quest would be for a greater understanding of the ‘changing biblical text,’ to borrow Tov’s phrase, and less for what any putative author, whether an Isaiah or even a Moses in earlier centuries may have written. The rewritten forms of the scriptural books mentioned briefly in this study show that the suitable analysis of the transmission of authoritative compositions, broadly conceived, in the second half of the Second Temple period should become a major focus of pre-Masoretic studies.” (p. 36)

“F. Rewritten Texts and the Definition of Authority. A further issue concerns the place of the rewritten scriptural compositions in the analysis of the emergence of collections of authoritative books in Second Temple Judaism. If the over-arching defining characteristic of rewritten scriptural compositions is that they are dependent on a text which is deemed authoritative in some way, then their very existence is an assertion of the authority of the texts which they rewrite. . . . It is commonly argued, for example, that the author of the Book of Jubilees 6:2: ‘I [the angel of the presence] have written in the book of the first law which I have written for you’); the Law in some form may need supplementing or adjusting, it may need a particular halakhic spin, but it cannot be done away with.” (p. 37)

“III. Conclusion

This brief survey has raised some of the issues which are provoked by the presence in the Qumran literary corpus of a collection of so-called Rewritten Bible texts. We can summarize which I have tried to say in three points. Firstly, the rewritten scriptural texts need to become much more explicitly part of the arsenal of the text critic, playing their full part in the description of the fluid transmission of the texts of the various scriptural books in the late Second Temple period. Secondly, when these fascinating texts take their proper place, then the canons of the practice of text criticism must themselves change: most obviously this is seen in three respects: in the shift away from a sole concern with the quest for the original form of the text; with the adoption of a more neutral set of terms for describing what is attested in the manuscript evidence; and in a move away from seeing every variant principally in terms of scribal error. Thirdly, the rewritten scriptural compositions must not be prevented on the basis of anachronistic reasoning from taking their proper place, not as secondary and therefore second class witnesses to the book of the Bible themselves, but as primary evidence for how authoritative traditions were appropriated and managed in particular communities in the late Second Temple period. From the sensitive appreciation of such appropriation may come lessons for today about how authoritative scriptures should be used rather than abused by those who hold them to be of ongoing importance.” (p. 38)

Scanlin, Harold P., “Text, Truth and Tradition: the Public’s view of the Bible in the Light of the DSS” (pp. 289-299)

Discusses the issue of variant texts at Qumran and elsewhere in the translation of the Bible, particularly from a conservative view point.

**Yadin, Yigael, Masada Vols. 1-5: The Yigael Yadin excavations 1963-1965: final reports (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1989-1999)
Vol.V ed S Talmon**

24f The biblical texts found at Masada conform almost exactly to the MT. This is especially significant where other ancient versions show variants which are not found at Masada. This is in sharp contrast to the biblical texts at Qumran where a large variety of variants are found. Biblical texts at other sites in the Judaean Desert at Nahal Selim (Wadi Seiyal) and Wadi Maurabb'at, also show very little difference to the MT. This suggests that there was already a proto-masoretic text in existence in normative Judaism before 70CE.

David Instone-Brewer (not a quote)

Rabin, C., S. Talmon, and E. Tov, eds. *The Book of Jeremiah. The Hebrew University Bible. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1997.*

Four apparatuses.

Apparatus I is primarily the versions with pride of place given to the LXX. This deals with material from the 3d c. BC (Manuscript documentation—the earlier period is lost to history because of no documentation).

Apparatus II is the early Masoretic period when other texts were suppressed and for the most part, the MT is uniform. The exception to this is the inclusion of Qumran readings.

Apparatus III is primarily an issue of MT transmission from 800 A.D. on. There is a thin layer of variant texts preserved in rabbinic writings that are reflected here.

Apparatus IV is primarily accentual issues.

I don't yet understand what the two columns at the bottom are.

MESSIANIC STUDIES

Evans, Craig. A. and Peter W. Flint, eds. *Eschatology, messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.*

“Not only does the New Testament collapse the diarchic messianism into one Messiah, but Christianity's messianic idea also includes the idea of suffering. The Qumran Scrolls describe a period of struggle (a forty-year war, according to the *War Scroll*) and persecution (of the Teacher of Righteousness and of the community as a whole), but the Scrolls expect the advent of the Messiah to precipitate a great victory over wicked Rome and the wicked of Israel. The suffering and death of Jesus led early Christians to sift through the prophetic Scriptures. The Song of the Suffering Servant (Isa 52:13-53:12) and Zechariah's pierced one (Zech 12:10), along with several of the psalms of lament (e.g., Psalms 22 and 69), clarified for the early Church the meaning of Jesus' death. Early Christians understood God's purposes to be realized through the work of one Messiah, whose death and resurrection brought an end to the old order and the beginning of the

new. The idea of a suffering Messiah is almost certainly absent from the Dead Sea Scrolls, although from time to time some scholars have tried to find it” (pp. 8-9).

Craig C. Broyles, “The Redeeming King: Psalm 72’s Contribution to the Messianic Ideal.”

Psalm 72 historically refers to the intercession for the human king, but it becomes a paradigm for the Messianic rule. “The above analysis shows a remarkable conjunction of themes that are also central to the New Testament. The reign of the Davidic king or Messiah is characterized by justice, righteousness, and peace. He not only attends to the poor and outcast; he also ‘saves’ and redeems’ them. The Abrahamic promise of blessing to the nations or Gentiles is here localized to the Davidic king or Messiah. And, finally, the natural world responds with fruitfulness to his righteous reign.

Psalm 72 may, therefore, help us to make sense of why Jesus directed so much of his attention to the marginal in society, and why so much of his Church is composed of those who are not ‘wise’ or ‘powerful’ or ‘of noble birth’ (1 Cor 1:26). It helps us to make sense of why the Gentile mission is so critical to Jesus’ coming and why it issues forth not from Abraham’s descendants in general but from the Christ in particular. One thinks here of Gal 3:14: ‘*Christ redeemed us . . . in order that in Christ Jesus the blessing of Abraham might come upon the Gentiles.*’ This verse thus brings together Christ’s work of ‘redeeming’ his people and the recognition that ‘the blessing given to Abraham’ must be channeled through the ‘Christ’ in order to reach ‘the Gentiles’ (i.e., the nations). It also makes clear that redemption is to result in international blessing. And Psalm 72 helps us to make sense of a passage such as Rom 8:18-25, where following the ‘redemption’ of God’s people ‘creation itself will be set free from its bondage to decay.’ The land will finally experience ‘shalom.’ So, while Psalm 72 is only seldom cited or alluded to in the New Testament, its key themes and their unique conjunction in Psalm 72 are foundational to the New Testament and surface in some of its key passages” pp. 39-40.

Peter W. Flint, “The Daniel Tradition at Qumran” pp. 41-60.

“A total of eight manuscripts of the book of Daniel have been discovered at Qumran; none has come to light so far at other sites in the Judean desert” (p. 41). Hasmonian period (1QDan^b, 4QDan^a, 4QDan^c, 4QDan^e). Herodian period (1QDan^a, 4QDan^b, 4QDan^d, pap6QDan). “Because of the ravages of time, the elements and humans, none of these finds preserves a complete copy of the book of Daniel. However, between them they preserve a substantial amount of it” p. 42.

“What was the *status* of the book of Daniel at Qumran? Was it regarded as Scripture, or only as an important writing alongside many others? We may conclude that Daniel was regarded as a scriptural book at Qumran for two reasons. First, the large number of preserved copies is a clear indication of Daniel’s importance among the Qumran covenanters. Second, the way in which Daniel was used at Qumran is indicative of its authoritative status; for instance, the *Florilegium* (4Q174) quotes Dan 12:10 as ‘written in the book of Daniel, the Prophet’ (frgs. 1-3 ii 3-^a). [f.n. 11: The *Florilegium* is dated to the late first century BCE or the early first century CE]” (p. 44).

Hess, Richard S. and M. Daniel Carroll R., eds. *Israel's Messiah in the Bible and the DSS* Baker Academic, 2003.

Block, Daniel I. "My Servant David: Ancient Israel's Vision of the Messiah."

Summary from J. Daniel Hays' response to Block:

Block has questioned the traditional understanding of the messiah as prophet, priest, and king. He argues that the prophetic and priestly aspects are not present in OT messianic passages, and that the royal image—that of David—dominates the messianic picture. Furthermore, Block even proposes that this royal Davidic image is to be identified with the suffering servant of Isaiah's Servant Songs." (p. 57)

See p. 24 for discussion of the Hebrew form.

See p. 50 for translation of *msht* (*marred?*) as from *msh* (superhumanly anointed)

See p. 52 for Walton, "The Imagery of the Substitute King Ritual in Isaiah's Fourth Servant Song" JETS

Argues that the Messiah is primarily identified with the Davidic kingship. Activities as prophet and priest are secondary to that.

Although complex, the OT picture of the messiah gains in clarity and focus with time. But the messianic hope is a single line that begins in broadest terms with God's promise of victory over the serpent through 'the seed of the woman' (Gen. 3:15), then is narrowed successively to the seed of Abraham (Gen. 22:18), the tribe of Judah (Gen. 49:10), the stem of Jesse (Isa. 11:1), the house/dynasty of David (2 Sam. 7), and finally the suffering and slain servant of Yahweh (Isa. 53). This is the shepherd and guardian of our souls, who bore our sins in his body on the cross that we might die to sin and live to righteousness, and be healed by his wounds (1 Pet. 2:21-25). This is the great shepherd of the sheep, through whose blood the eternal covenant is sealed and whom the God of peace raised from the dead." (p.. 56)

Hays responds in his conclusion (p. 66) "The Book of Acts makes a very clear statement that Jesus is the coming prophet of Deut. 18. Isaiah 49:1-2 connects the servant with the prophetic call and with the prophetic ministry of proclaiming the word of Yahweh. Isaiah 52:3-53:12 presents a servant who is unsightly and unroyal in appearance. As the other prophets suffered, so he too will suffer, and even more so. Isaiah 61:11-3 also presents the 'anointed one' in a ministry of prophetic proclamation. The royal connotations in these texts are extremely vague, if present at all." Hays responds by arguing strongly for both prophetic and priestly antecedents in the predictions of messiah.

Craig Evans, "The Messiah in the DSS" (pp. 85-101)

"So the evidence at first glance seems to cut in two directions: not many scrolls are concerned with messianism (fewer than 2 percent of the nonbiblical scrolls) but those that are concerned with the topic have been produced by the sectarians. Judgments about Q's messianism will have to be mindful of these two observations. What we may say is that the Q sect was not a 'messianic movement,' but neither did the sect entertain ideas of final victory over its enemies without the leadership of a royal messiah." (p 89)

Three passages in particular played an important, generative role in the rise of messianism: (1) Gen. 49:10; (2) Num. 24:17; and (3) Isa. 10:34-11:5. All three are interpreted in a messianic sense in the DSS and in other early Jewish and Christian writings. Let us briefly review their interpretation in the scrolls and in related texts.” (p.91)

Conclusions:

- “1. Qumran is not preoccupied with messianism; the community presupposes it and utilizes it as part of the community’s eschatology and hopes of restoration.”
2. In comparison to Jewish messianism of late antiquity, Q’s messianism is not distinctive in any significant way.”
3. If Qumranian messianism is not distinctive, that does not mean that it was not important. The restoration of Israel, and the vindication of the Community of the Renewed Covenant that is a vital part of this restoration, will not and cannot take place until the ‘anointed of Israel’ appears, whom God will raise up, or in the words of Ps. 2:7 echoed in 1QSa, whom God will beget’ among his faithful remnant, the ‘poor.’”
4. Q’s messianism sheds important light on the context of Jesus’ ministry and how his contemporaries may have perceived him and his proclamation of the kingdom. The coherence between 4Q521’s messianic expectation and Jesus’ reply to the imprisoned and questioning John the Baptist (Matt. 11:5=Luke 7:22) is a significant example.” (pp. 100-101)

Response by Richard Hess: “This collection of prophetic references [4Q491c, frag. 1, lines 7-11, I made a copy from Martinez and Tigchelaar, *The DSS Study Edition*, Vol 2. Leiden: Brill, 2000] includes allusions to the unique text of Isa. 53, the passage of the suffering servant. The psalmist of this Qumran text therefore identified with the suffering of that servant and, in the same breath, with the exaltation to the highest places of heaven, in the presence of God. This integration of both themes is a key text. Whether or not the composer was a messiah such as Wise and Knohl describe, the text, as it appears among the Dead SS, demonstrates an awareness of the importance of the suffering servant passage and its close tie to an exalted, perhaps divine, figure. This connection was present before the coming of Jesus and thus served as one source for the Gospel writers’ understanding of his mission.” (p. 108)

Craig Blomberg, *The Messiah in the NT* (pp. 111-141)

Conclusions: “In the midst of all this diversity we must not lose sight of a fundamental unity of thought. David Wenham best sums up the unifying features of NT theology more generally under the headings ‘context, center, community and climax.’ With respect to Christology in particular, he includes, under the ‘center’ of NT thought, the claim that ‘Jesus was the Spirit-filled messiah of Israel and the Son of God.’ This summary comports well with my findings about the consistent use of ‘Christ’ throughout the NT documents.” (pp. 140-141) “There is no unambiguous evidence to demonstrate the ‘Christ’ in any of its 5321 NT uses ever ‘degenerated’ into a mere second name for Jesus.”

Klausner, Joseph. *The messianic idea in Israel: from its beginning to the completion of the Mishnah*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1956. (This book is the product of several editions beginning with his dissertation in 1902)

“But the definition of belief in the Messiah is: *The prophetic hope for the end of this age, in which a strong redeemer, by his power and his spirit, will bring complete redemption, political and spiritual, to the people Israel, and along with this, earthly bliss and moral perfection to the entire human race*” (p. 9).

He links Messiah with Moses. All the things Moses did he will do, including in suffering for the sins of others (p. 18).

“The different elements of the belief in the Messiah—in which are included parts of the nationalistic expectation—were continually changing, above all, under the influence of historical events, though the emphasis upon one element or the other was more or less dependent upon the individual character of the proclaimers of the expectations. In those periods in which the people Israel was still living an independent political life in its own land, ethical perfection and earthly bliss were more emphasized; but in the period of subjugation and exile the yearning for *political* freedom took first place. In times of national freedom, the world-wide, universalistic part of the Messianic hopes was the basic element in the Messianic idea; but in times of trouble and distress for the people Israel the nationalistic element was stressed much more. But this much we can determine with complete confidence: in the belief in the Messiah of the people Israel, *the political part goes arm in arm with the ethical part, and the nationalistic with the universalistic*. It is Christianity which has attempted to remove the political and nationalistic part which is there, and leave only the ethical and spiritual part. Yet the influence of Judaism on the first Christians was so strong, that the ‘chiliasts’ (those early Christians who believed that Jesus the Messiah would return, coming down to earth and setting up the millennial kingdom) pictured to themselves the Kingdom of Heaven filled with bodily and earthly pleasure, precisely as did the Jews” (p. 10).

“... the dualism mentioned above had to create, under certain historical circumstances, a twofold Messiah: *Messiah ben Joseph*, an earthly Messiah, who fights against God and Magog and falls in battle; and *Messiah ben David*, a spiritual Messiah, who prepares the world for the Kingdom of God” (p. 11).

“Of the *divine* nature of the Messiah, there are perhaps certain indications in the later Midrashim; in the authentic writings of the Tannaitic period there is not a trace. Trypho the Jew says in the book of Justin Martyr: ‘All of us (Jews) expect the Messiah to come as a man from among men.’ Thus, even if we were possible to prove that the post-Tannaitic literature does indeed ascribe divine nature to the Messiah (though Castelli and Drummond doubt it), we may assume that this feature was indirectly and unconsciously borrowed from Christianity. Or else we must conclude that the increasingly exaggerated and fantastic veneration of the Messiah did not shrink, from the seventh century C.E. onward, even from making him divine. *But in the earlier literature there is no trace of this*” (p. 466).

The problem of the origin and source of Messiah ben Joseph (or Manasseh or Ephraim) is very complex. “It is not necessary to speak at all of the view of those Christian theologians who wish to see in ‘Messiah ben Joseph’ a Messiah who makes atonement for the sins of Israel or of all mankind (a theme found later in the Kabbalistic books, for example, ‘The Two Tables of the Covenant’ by Isaiah Horowitz). For Castelli has already conclusively proved that the death of the Messiah killed in battle has no atoning power whatever” (p. 483).

Klausner believes that the dual nature of the Messiah (spiritual/political) demanded two messiahs, one to fight Gog and Magog and one to lead the people to spirituality (p. 494). This contradiction, he says, was felt most significantly with the untimely death of Bar Cochba and Rabbi Akiba. Hence, two messiahs were developed (p. 494).

“The kingdom of the Messiah is actually the kingdom of David, except that it is extended over a wider area, and possesses every worldly blessing; it also exemplifies a pure and refined morality, in so far as a rich Oriental imagination could conceive of this kind of spirituality without thereby

obliterating the political side of the Messianic idea. For the kingdom of the Jewish King-Messiah was and remained—at least as far as the Tannaitic period is concerned—a *kingdom of this world*” (p. 517).

“Each man is responsible for himself, and through his good deeds he must find atonement for his sins. He cannot lean upon the Messiah or upon the Messiah’s suffering and death” (p. 530). This is a clear statement that Klausner, at least, believes that he atones for his sins by his good works. N.T.W. Wright (Romans—NIB) argues that Jews don’t hold to this position.

Gen 3:15 held by “Targum Jonathan ben Uzziel and Targum Yerushalmi as an indication that the people Israel would conquer Sammael [Sammael it is thought this angel of death was the demon who tempted Eve. Also the prince of air. This is merely another name for Satan.] ‘in the days of the King-Messiah’” (p. 26).

Gen 49:8-10 Rabbis tend to point it shello. But another possibility is Shelomo (or Solomon) assuming that the text was composed after Solomon had become king. He says the passage is not messianic (pp. 29-30).

Numbers 24 Rabbi Akiba said of Simon ben-Coziba, “A star has gone forth out of Jacob”; from this circumstance, apparently, this Messiah acquired the name Bar-Cochba, “son of a star” (p. 31). He says that the passage refers to David and is not messianic.

Leviticus and Deuteronomy: promises of restoration (return to Zion) are messianic (age).

“The Messianic idea, whatever its origin, was not created in a day as we have it now” (p. 34). “I did wish to emphasize one thing at the end of this chapter: if we see that Amos and Hosea—and a little later Isaiah and Micah—already had a very highly developed Messianic ideal then we *must* suppose that this ideal was not born at one moment, but developed during the course of several generations before the time of Jeroboam II (son of Joash) and Uzziah son of Amaziah” (p. 35).

Isaiah 7, 9, and 11 refer to Hezekiah, but when they were not fulfilled in his time, they were postponed for a later Messianic age (pp. 56-57).

Micah 5:2 “For from ‘Bethlehem Ephratha,’ the city in which lives ‘the least among the thousands of Judah,’ will come forth one ‘that is to be ruler in Israel, whose origins are from of old, from ancient days’ (5:1). This will be the *King-Messiah*. It is obvious that here is indicated only a king from the *royal line* of the house of David, which originated in Bethlehem, and there is no need to suppose that this king himself is to be born in Bethlehem. Likewise, the words ‘from of old, from ancient days’ indicate only the antiquity of his origin (since from the time of David to the time of Micah several centuries had passed), but nothing more” (p. 77).

Jeremiah 23:6 refers to Zedekiah, who in his earlier days, was considered a messianic ideal by Jeremiah (p. 105).

“A prophet, out of his broad understanding of basic principles and out of his accurate observation of the events taking pace in his time and of conditions as they actually existed, could, of course, have visions of the future; but these visions would always be of a *general* sort. To now the details of future events so well as the name of the participants in them, as Isaiah apparently names Cyrus, king of Persia . . .—this is something that is not only unnatural, but also beyond all reason” (p. 143).

“It is clear that here [Isaiah 53] ‘the servant of the LORD’ is both the prophet, along with his disciples, and also all the righteous and upright of Israel, who in the eyes of the prophet are the whole people Israel” (p 167).

Daniel 7 “son of man” was quickly taken by the Jews as Messiah. Even Jesus hints at this in the Gospels. But “son of man” refers to all Israel who will rule the world (p. 230).

Daniel 9 “anointed one” Cyrus and Onias the Priest (p. 233).

The apocrypha, he argues, are more like the hagiography than the prophets. The personality of the Messiah is not mentioned in any book of the Apocrypha (p. 250). Messianic ideas occur in seven books of the Apocrypha (p. 251).

“The pseudepigraphical books are especially rich in *Messianic portrayals*” (p. 274). The vicissitudes and victories of the Hasmonean period produced much of the Pseudepigrapha. The split between the Hasmonean dynasty and the Pharisees produced the strong distinctions between Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes (p. 275). The Essenes “steeped themselves in a multiplicity of dreams and visions, and thus were created the Pseudepigraphical books, with their multiplicity of visions and ‘revelations’ (apocalypses). The best of these books—the Book of Enoch, the Book of Jubilees, the Psalms of Solomon, the Testaments of the Twelve Tribes [Patriarchs], and even the Sibylline Oracles—are from the Hasmonean period” (p. 275).

With the coming of the Romans and the destruction of the temple, “the people found consolation and hope in the Messianic expectations and in descriptions of the life after death as found in the later Pseudepigrapha: the Assumption of Moses is from the time of the Herodian dynasty; the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch and the Book of IV Ezra—the choicest among the books of the Pseudepigrapha—are from the first years after the Second Destruction” (pp. 275-76).

“The Jewish Messianic idea, in its authentic form, came forth from an essentially political aspiration—the longing of the nation to recover its lost political power and to see the revival of the Davidic kingdom, a kingdom of right and might alike. Hence this idea, in spite of its increasing spiritualization and the great ethical height to which it rose, necessarily remained in essence mundane and political. The kingdom of the Messiah is actually the kingdom of David, except that it is extended over a wider area, and possesses every worldly blessing; it also exemplifies a pure and refined morality, in so far as a rich Oriental imagination could conceive of this kind of spirituality without thereby obliterating the political side of the Messianic idea. For the kingdom of the Jewish King-Messiah was and remained—at least as far as the Tannaitic period is concerned—a *kingdom of this world*” p. 517.

Charlesworth, James H. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha Vols 1-2: Vol.1. Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments Vol.2. Expansions of the ‘Old Testament’ and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic*, 2 v. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1983-1985.

Charlesworth, James H. Herman Lichtenberger and Gerbern S. Oegema. *Qumran-Messianism: studies on the Messianic expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1998.

Charlesworth, James H. and Craig A. Evans, eds. *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*. Journal for the study of the Pseudepigrapha, 14, Supplement series. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

“*Conclusion*. A change has occurred in the study of pre-70 Palestinian Judaism. In the last twenty years the Pseudepigrapha have come into their own. Now these writings are accorded some respect, and it is generally and internationally recognized that the history of pre-70 Judaism must depend upon them in describing the fluid and vibrant culture known as Early Judaism.”

“If we desire to understand the origins and sociological functions of the Pseudepigrapha, we must now recognize that they were fashioned in the crucible of biblical interpretation. They point to the importance of Torah in the daily life of the religious Jew, especially in Palestine before the destruction of the nation in 70. As the late Samuel Sandmel stated in a very popular article on the Pseudepigrapha, ‘Without a Genesis, there could never have been a “Jubilees”. Indeed, had there not already been a Bible, there could have been no Pseudepigraphy for, in one way or another, these books all derive from the Bible.’ Biblical exegesis is the crucible of the Pseudepigraphy. In it ancient humanity’s wisdom, scientific observations, and speculations were melted down and shaped to reappear as Jewish tradition” (pp. 42-43).

Charlesworth, James H., ed. *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Augsburg Fortress, 2002.

Charlesworth, J. H. “From Messianology to Christology: Problems and Prospects.” (pp. 3-35)

“We now know also that there were descendants of David living in Palestine during the time of Jesus.” [See D. Flusser’s discussion (of the ossuary with the inscription which clarified that the bones inside belonged to a descendant of David) in *Jesus’ Jewishness*, ed. Charlesworth (NY, 1991), pp. 153-76]. (p. 9)

1. Most of the Jewish texts contain no reference to “a” or “the” Messiah or to “a” or “the” Christ.
2. The texts that do contain references to “the Messiah,” “Christ,” or “Anointed One” do not reveal a coherent picture.
3. Hence we have no evidence for the assertion that the Jews during Jesus’ time were looking for the coming of “the” or “a” Messiah, and there was no paradigm, or checklist, by which to discern if a man was the Messiah. In such an ideological and social setting it was not possible for a group to point to objective proofs for its own idiosyncratic belief.” (p. 14)

Charlesworth then evaluates the ancient literature. He, it seems to me, begs the question by only using texts that specifically have the word *Mashiah* in them.

The Samaritans: “They longed for the coming of Taheb, apparently their term for “the Messiah”; but it means “restorer” and was perceived not as a new David but as a new Moses.” (p. 14)

Josephus: Uses the word *Christos*, but the passages are suspect. Where it is not suspect, he translates “so-called Christ.”

The Targums: Considerable number of messianic passages. One of the most militant portraits is Pseudo-Jonathan (Targum to Gen 49:11). But the Targums are too late (postdate 200 A.D.) to bear on the discussion.

The Mishnah: Reflects the discussions at Yavneh and the antiapocalyptic and antimessianic reactions to the horrifying revolt of 66-63/4 A.D. and the clearly messianic but abortive revolt of 132-135. Rabbi Akiba called Bar Kokhba the messiah.

OT Apocrypha: Messiah or Christ does not appear in the 13 books. (p. 16) This would mean that the Maccabean revolt was not a messianic movement. The expansion to the Hebrew Scriptures (e.g., the Epistle of Jeremiah, additions to Daniel, and the Additions to Esther) were not produced by some messianic interpretation.

OT Pseudepigrapha: at least 52 documents have some of the most impressive and significant records of Jewish messianism. (p. 16-17)

Conclusion: “We have seen why it is impossible to define, and difficult to describe the Messianology of the early Jews. There is no discernible development in messianic beliefs from the first century B.C. to the first century A.D. Some Jewish writings in the first century A.D. before 70—namely Pseudo-Philo and the Testament of Moses—show little interest in Messianology and seem even to be antimessianic. The traditions in 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch, and the New T. documents preserve a totally different picture.

His summary is found on p. 35.

Roberts, J. J. M. “The Old Testament’s Contribution to Messianic Expectations.” (pp. 39-51).

Use of *Mashiah* (39 occurrences); not one refers to an expected figure of the future whose coming will coincide with the inauguration of an era of salvation. (p. 39) Make an assignment to look up all 39 occurrences. The most common use of the term, however, is as a singular nominalized adjective in construct with a following divine name or with a pronominal suffix referring to the deity. They all refer to the king but one and that refers to Cyrus (Isa 45:1). “The use of the term seems intended to underscore the very close relationship between Yahweh and the king whom he has chosen and installed.” The uses in Daniel he takes to be historical references (back to Zechariah’s two anointed and forward to Onias III). (p. 40)

“Even if some of these passages where משיח occurs were later understood as prophetic predictions of the Messiah, as happened for example with Ps 2:2, such passages provide an inadequate base from which to discuss the OT contribution to the development of messianic expectations. By far the majority of biblical passages given a messianic interpretation by later Jewish and Christian sources do not contain the word משיח. The passages selected as these messianic proof texts remain remarkably consistent for both Jewish and Christian interpreters, however, and this suggests that one might approach our task by analyzing the different types of material included in this fairly consistent body of messianic texts. [fn2: The basic consistency in the choice of texts can be seen by a simple comparison of the work of the Jewish scholar J. Klausner, *The Messianic Idea in Israel* (NY, 1955), to any of the countless works by Christian scholars on the same subject. Nor is this consistency a modern phenomenon. Early Christians, rabbinic sources, and the sectarians at Qumran cite the same biblical texts in their portrayals of the royal messiah.” (p. 41)

Five categories of messianic texts:

Ex eventu prophecies (Num 24; Gen 49)

Enthronement (Ps 2, 110, Isa 9:6)

Restoration and Dynastic texts (Isa 11:10, 32:1-8; Hos 3:5; “Amos 9:11-12 and Micah 5:1-5 are generally taken as expansions of eighth century material—he is less skeptical and believes the 8th c is a good place to place them)

The difference in these last texts is that they do envision a future ruler not yet on the scene.

Because of the eternal covenant made with David, in times of crisis people could dream of the restoration of the Davidic dynasty and the kingdom. (p. 44)

Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Related Texts (Jer 23:508; 30:9, 33:14-26; Ezek 17:22-24, 34:23-24, 37:15-28).

Postexilic texts “Finally, picking up the older Jeremianic prophecies concerning the “sprout” (צמח) of David, he announced that God was bringing his servant the צמח (Zech 3:8), and in Zech 6:12 he identified the צמח as the man who would build the Temple, that is, as Zerubbabel the Davidic governor. There can be little doubt that Zechariah identified Zerubbabel as the one who would restore the Davidic dynasty.” (p. 50)

The mythological elements in the enthronement ceremony (divine sonship, divine names [Isa 9:6], e.g., are influenced by Egypt. Though they were probably not taken literally at the time of the enthronement, they make later remythologizing possible.

Summary. (p. 51)

1. Nowhere in the OT has the term Mashiah acquired its later technical sense as an eschatological title.
2. OT expectations of a new David are probably to be understood in terms of a continuing Davidic line (not a final Davidic ruler who would actually rule for all time to come).
3. The mythological language of the royal protocol, influenced as it was by Egyptian conceptions of the royal office, provided a textual base for the development of later, far more mythological conceptions of the awaited Messiah.
4. The later expectations of a priestly Messiah can be traced back to the promises of the restoration of the priesthood found in Jeremiah 33 and in Zechariah’s oracles concerning the high priest Joshua.
5. Malachi provided the catalyst for further speculation about prophetic figures who would precede the great day of Yahweh’s coming judgment.

Horsley, R. A., “‘Messianic’ Figures and Movements in First-Century Palestine,” 276-295.

The term Messiah should be abandoned at least in the composite sense that has been standard in Christian biblical studies. “Christ” the Greek-derived term used in most of the early Christian literature, will do quite well for composite references. (p. 277)

Because we are dependent on literary sources, and literary people were dependent on and subservient to political movements, we cannot assume that they represent the general thinking of the people. This is quite a shift and seems to reflect a post-modern approach.

There was little interest in a messiah in late 2d temple literary circles. This makes it even more significant that there were several concrete figures and movements among the common people (p. 280). However, none of these were eschatologically oriented or apocalyptically inspired.

“It is becoming increasingly evident that there was little interest in a Messiah, Davidic or otherwise, let alone a standard messianic expectation, in the diverse Palestinian Jewish literature of late Second Temple times. It could be that, until we attain a far more precise historical sense of groups, and expectations in the Jewish Palestine from which ‘Christianity’ and ‘Judaism’ emerged, we should simply drop the concept ‘Messiah/messianic’ altogether. Meanwhile it seems

possible, on the basis of Josephus' reports, to discern distinctive types of concrete social movements and their leaders. Figures such as Theudas and 'the Egyptian' would appear to have been 'prophets' who, like Moses and/or Joshua in paradigmatic biblical history, were leading their followers to join in what they anticipated as new acts of liberation. The movements led by Judas, Simon, and Athronges in 4 B.C.E. and that led by Simon bar Giora in 68 would all appear to share the same social form, in which the people recognized the leader as 'king,' somewhat as the ancient Israelites had acclaimed Saul or David as king. These figures and movements were directed toward asserting the independence of the people from Roman and Herodian or high-priestly rule and a more egalitarian social-economic order in Jewish society." (p. 295)

S. Talmon, "The Concepts of *MASIAH* and *Messianism* in *Early Judaism*, pp. 79-115.

"In view of these circumstances, the student of the Hebrew Bible can only attempt to achieve some measure of comprehensive appreciation of ancient Israelite messianism by collating and integrating partial descriptions and fragmentary formulations found in a great variety of texts stemming from widely separated periods, differing from and at times contradicting each other. There emerges, at best, a kaleidoscopic picture which lacks consistency. This state of affairs should cause no surprise. We are after all dealing with a corpus of writings which grew over an extended period and which necessarily reflects the heterogeneous attitudes of authors who may have entertained diverging appreciations of the *messiah* concept and its actual crystallizations in history." (p. 85)

"From the very outset, the biblical conception of an 'anointed,' and also the Jewish messianism which grew out of it, exhibits a bewildering internal tension. It is stressed between a topical rationalism rooted in historical experience, and a mystical utopianism which transcends all reality." (p. 85)

"Nathan's prophecy (2 Sam 7) which echoes in related traditions (1 Kgs 8:22-26; 1 Chr 28:4-7; 2 Chr 6:16-17; 13:5 *et al.*) assured the House of David of everlasting divine support. Out of it grew the image of the ideal anointed king blessed with infinite understanding and wisdom, inspired and righteous, a savior who would reunite Judah and Ephraim and regain for Israel its national splendor as in the days of the united monarchy under David and Solomon. Innumerable passages in the Hebrew Bible extol this vision of the perfect future age which Jeremiah portrays as follows: [Jer 23:1-6]" (p. 86)

"From these variously accentuated emphases on the utopian or the restorative outlooks which mark unequally distinct strata in the biblical literature appear to derive the differentiated manifestations of messianism in the post-biblical era. Messianic visions which bear upon them the imprint of utopianisms will gravitate toward a reliance on 'prooftexts' culled from the Psalms and the prophetic books. They will accordingly foreshadow an idyllic picture of the future, the likes of which humanity and Israel had never experienced." (p. 86-87)

"It could be said that the structurally not directly connected but nevertheless consecutive three Isaiah oracles reflect on their juxtaposition the posited three stages in the development of the biblical *masiah* theme: historicity (Isa 7:14-16); ideation (Isa 9:5-6); idealization (Isa 11:1-10). That progressive dehistoricization and the *masiah* notion appears in the oracles of the postexilic prophets Haggai and Zechariah concerning Zerubbabel, the last anointed of the Davidic line in the biblical era." (p. 97)

Important note on Zerubbabel to be added to Ezra notes on p. 97.

He argues that Jeremiah expects the Davidic kingdom to be restored after the 70 years. Hence he encourages the people to normalize their lives in Babylon so that a 4th generation can be restored (father, children, grandchildren + 4th). Contrariwise, Zechariah does not accept a fulfillment in time for the restoration. He says, Yahweh will *yet* נִיר comfort Zion, and will again make Jerusalem the city of his choice. The “yet” makes it indefinite, contra Haggai who expects Zerubbabel to establish the Davidic kingdom.

“The surprising peculiarity of the Qumran ‘Twin Messianism’ highlights the diversity in which the *masiah* idea expressed itself in Second Temple Judaism by supplying a novel, hitherto unknown, configuration of this concept. At that time Judaism was altogether ‘a richly varied phenomenon.’ In that diversity no one mainstream can be identified due to the lack of pertinent contemporary source material.” (p. 101) Thus he concludes that the idea of “normative Judaism” does not apply at all to the much earlier age in which the Covenanters’ Community, the *Yahad*, arose.

“The Q scrolls reflect the creedal concepts of a group of Jewish extremists who propounded a millenarian messianism. They had constituted themselves as the ‘New Covenant’—or the *Yahad bene Sadok*—roughly at the beginning of the second century B.C.E., seceding from what may be called proto-Pharisaic Judaism. The community persisted into the first or possibly the early second century C.E. An appraisal of the Covenanters’ socioreligious outlook and their history can therefore throw new, albeit indirect, light on the messianic conceptions of Rabbinic Judaism and nascent Christianity. Such enlightenment can be gained by pointing out features which Q messianism shared with this or the other or with both, or else by putting in relief specific traits which contrast with characteristics of one or the other, or both.” (p. 101)

He quotes CD (Cairo Damascus Document) 6:2-5 which uses the 390 days of Ezekiel 4 added to the 40 of Ezek 4:6 makes 430 years (same as the sojourn in the Exodus). Thus Ezekiel’s 430 years of woe take on for the Covenanters the same meaning which Jeremiah’s prophecy of a period of tribulation lasting 70 years had for the Judeans who were exiled to Babylon in 597 and 586 B.C.E. as for those who after 538 returned to their homeland. (p. 103) However, the CD does not mention the 40 years. How does he account for that?

He then argues that when the fulfillment did not come, they turned to a militant approach with a great apocalyptic battle ensuing to defeat their enemies and usher in the “millennium.” (p. 104)

Passages dealing with “Twin Messianism”:

1QS 9:10-11
CD 12:22-23
CD 13:20-22
CD 19:34-20:1
CD 14:18-19
CD 19:9-11

Even though CD is a medieval MS from Cairo, there is enough at Qumran to verify its antiquity. (p. 104-5)

He argues that the “twin messiahs” originate in Zerubbabel. The limited authority of the Jews returning under the Persians, led an elevation of the priesthood (in the first temple era, they were subordinated to the king). The *Yahad* take Zechariah’s vision of the two lampstands as their model. (p. 108)

“Viewed from the angle of typology, the *Yahad* must be assessed the most decidedly millenarian or chiliastic movement that arose in Judaism at the turn of the era and possibly altogether in antiquity, Christianity included. However, unlike the followers of Jesus, the Covenanters did not live to see their hopes materialize and remained suspended in limbo between their topical reality and their vision of the impending onset of the future immaculate era. Like the men in Beckett’s play who were waiting for Godot, who never came, the Covenanters stood in watch for the Twin Messiahs who ultimately failed to appear on their horizon. *Yahad* messianism is a prime example of stumped millenarianism.” (pp. 112-113)

Hengel, M. “Christological Titles in Early Christianity.” (pp. 425-448)

“It is therefore clear that the Christianity of the first century—like contemporary Judaism—was reluctant to transfer the term ‘God’ directly to a heavenly mediator figure, although it did not rule it out completely. It was expressed as a kind of ‘upper limit’ statement, similar to those of Philo, who—in contrast to the definite *ho theos*, which was reserved for God alone—could describe the Logos with the indefinite *theos*, indeed even *deuteros theos*. [*QuaestGen* 2, 62; *leg. all.* 3, 207; *som.* 1, 229f., 238f.] Later Rabbis charged the Christians unjustly with ‘ditheism.’ Yet even rabbinic mysticism knew godlike mediators such as Metatron, who was named ‘the little Yahweh,’ and the Essenes of Qumran dared to refer a passage such as Isa 52:7, ‘Your God has become King,’ to the heavenly redeemer of the Sons of Light, Michael-Melchizedek.” [3 En 12:5] (p. 431)

Segal, A. F., “Conversion and Messianism: Outline for a New Approach,” pp. 296-340)

Excellent discussion on God fearers: “‘God-fearer’ refers to those Gentiles with varying degrees of commitment to Judaism, who have been attracted to the synagogue but who are unwilling to become proselytes. Acts uses the term *σεβομενος* literally a *worshiper* (sometimes *θεοσεβης* and variants suggesting a worshiper of God most high), or *φοβουμενος*, literally a *fearer* of God. ‘Fearing God’ is the normal Hebrew idiom for describing worshiping him, while the term *sebomenos* appears to translate the sense of the Hebrew idiom into Greek. The term ‘God-fearer’ is used most obviously in Acts 10, where Cornelius is described also as a donor to the synagogue. But the term is not a Lukan invention, for Josephus uses it as well (*Ant* 14.110) to describe Gentiles and so does Julia Severa, a co-sponsor of the synagogue building in Acmonia.” (p. 312)

Neusner, Jacob, ed. *Judiasms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (Cambridge; New York, 1987).

Kaiser, Walter. *The Messiah in the OT*. Zondervan, Paternoster Press, 1995.

Argues that 9 of the 39 occurrences of Mashih refer to some “anointed one” who would be coming in the future, usually in the line of David, and who would be Yahweh’s king: 1 Sam 2:10,35; Ps 2:2; 20:6; 18:8; 84:9; Hab 3:13; Dan 9:25, 26. (p. 16)

He uses the biological term epigenetical to describe the concept that a given term (oath, covenant, promise, word, etc) had within it seminal ideas that only later amplifications would unfold from the terms of thought that were just barely visible when first announced. (p. 27)

“That is the aspect of the messianic doctrine that has been missed in the debate over whether to emphasize the original context of the OT writer or its NT fulfillment. That tension calls for us to jump the chasm and declare ourselves to be on either one side or the other. We sympathize with

most of the traditional understandings of messianic prophecy in the OT as they were used to point to Jesus of Nazareth as the Coming One, but we cannot reach these conclusions by adopting some form of a dual meaning, an eisegesis that reads the NT automatically into the OT, or by a type of reader-response hermeneutic that assigns new meanings by some process such as *relecturing* or *sensus pelenior*. Of what value would the claims of the NT Evangelists and apostles be if the original OT meanings did not anticipate in some adequate way what eventually took place during the days of Jesus of Nazareth?” (pp. 27-28)

Cites R. A. Martin. “The Earliest Messianic Interpretation of Genesis 3:15.” *JBL* 84(1965) 425-427. Martin believes that “he” is the wrong translation of the Hebrew. The antecedent is zer` and therefore, the translation should be “it” or “they” (descendents of the woman). Because the LXX violates this translation, it indicates that it is an early messianic interpretation of the text. Though the Targums have a messianic translation, the written version is 5th c A.D. even though the oral antecedents are pre-Christian.

Cites O.T. Allis. “The Blessing of Abraham.” *PTR* 25 (1927): 263-98. Who argues for 18 places where the hithpael (Gen 12 niphal) has a passive meaning. Gesenius supports this as well.

“The word “seed” is to be understood in some exclusive way, for not all of Abraham’s biological progeny are intended (e.g., none of Keturah’s children or the child Hagar bore Abraham). That is only a portion of Abraham’s seed is marked as being the objects of this designation. This narrowing of the promise is likewise seen in the posterity of Isaac (Esau is excluded) and of Jacob (where the blessing bypassed the eldest son, Reuben, and the next oldest brothers, Simeon and Levi, but came to the fourth son, Judah).” (p. 49)

Cites W. L. Moran, “Genesis 49:10 and Its Use in Ezekiel 21:32,” *Bib* 39 (1958):405-25. Moran lists the three major interpretations. He demolishes the Akk root theory and says it should be banished from the Akk dictionaries and commentaries on Gen 49:10. (p. 409) [there is no reference to Shilu as “prince” in CAD.] He argues that Shelo is untenable on grammatical grounds (p. 410). He rejects the proper noun Shiloh (the hardest to reject) because it is explaining *obscurum per obscurius*. He concludes that the word should be divided into Shay loh and the yabo’ should be vocalized as yuba’ and translated “Until tribute is brought to him and his is the obedience of the peoples.” (p. 412) “That the prophet does allude to this verse of Genesis (49:10) is generally held today by scholars, at least as extremely probable; in our opinion there can be little doubt about it. For, just as in Gen 49,10 ‘until Shiloh comes’ indicates, in some sense, a term to Judah’s history, so in Ez 21,32 the `ad bo `aser lo hammispaspat terminates, in some sense, the history of Judah’s kingdom. Structurally, there is the similarity of the ‘until. . .’—clause being preceded by a negative clause (a point to which we shall return). Lexically, we have the same elements in `ad and bo/yabo’.” (p. 417)

Refers to Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., “Balaam, Son of Beor, in Light of *Deir `Alla* and Scripture: Saint or Soothsayer?” in *Go to the Land I will Show You: Studies in Honor of Dwight W. Young*, ed. Joseph Coleson and Victor Matthews (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1996).

Cites R. D. Wilson, “The Headings of the Psalms,” *PTR* 24 (1926):353-95 for a defense of the headings of the Psalms originality; and Sigmund Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel’s Worship*, trans. D. R. Ap-Thomas (Nashville: Abingdon, 1967, 2:98-101 for an argument against.

In Psalm 40 he argues that the LXX (a body have you prepared...) is dynamic equivalent to “my ears you have opened” since the Greeks did not have a metaphor like the Hebrew.

Throughout these Psalms, he sees David as the seed promised from Eve on down who also identifies with the coming Messiah. So that what is done in him is fulfilled ultimately in the Messiah.

Psalm 68 has its base (v. 18) in Exodus 32-34 (setting aside the Levites), Numbers 8 and 18. The pre-incarnate Messiah came down to speak with Moses, then ascended on high, and gave gifts (Levites) to God. In the same way he gives the gifts of servants (Eph 4:11) to God. (p. 132)

Two important hermeneutical principles to interpret the Messianic prophecies in the prophets:

- 1) Inaugurated eschatology; now along with a not-yet aspect. “Thus, each chosen son of each of the three patriarchs and each successive king in the Davidic line of Judah is at once a fulfillment of the promise of the Messiah (in the sense that he is an earnest and down payment on what God will ultimately do) and a further prediction that the Messiah will yet come.” (p. 137)
- 2) Corporate solidarity. [He dates Joel early as do I, f.n. 5, p. 138]. Oscillation in referent between group and individual. Offspring (seed), son, chosen one, holy one, servant of the Lord, branch, anointed one, and the like. (p. 138)

I wish Walt would have interacted more with the critical objections to his conclusions (e.g., he deals with Jer 23:5-6 and 33:15-16 without ever noting the problem of *lo* vs *la*). He takes any passage that may sound similar to activities in Jesus’ life and treats it as prediction.

John J. Collins. *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the DSS and other Ancient Literature*. NY Double Day, 1995.

VanGemenen, Willem A., Gen. Ed. *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. Paternoster Press, 1996. 5 vols.

Orlov, Andrei A. *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition in Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism*, 107, Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

Etymology of name Metatron is unknown. He gives nine different suggestions. This is a high level angel that takes on semi-divine status. The Targum Pseudo-Jonathan identifies him with Enoch. (p. 97) “Such a description would not fit into the whole picture of the new celestial profile of Metatron, who now assumes such spectacular roles as the second deity and the lesser manifestation of the divine name.” (p. 101) “In *Sefer Hekhalot*, however, when Enoch is elevated above the angelic world and brought into the immediate presence of the Deity, the traditional divinatory techniques have become unnecessary since the hero himself is now situated not outside but inside the divine realm and becomes a kind of a second, junior deity, the lesser manifestation of God’s name.” (p. 137) “As noted in the previous discussion, the significance of Metatron’s figure among the angelic hosts can be briefly and accurately summed up in his title יהוה הקטן, the lesser YHWH . . . “ (p. 137).

Lust, Johan. edited by K. Hauspie, *Messianism and the Septuagint: collected essays (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium (BETL), 178; Leuven: Leuven University Press; Leuven: Peeters, 2004).*

Martin, R. A. “The Earliest Messianic Interpretation of Gen. 3 15” JBL 84 (1965) 425-427.

Maier, Gerhard. *Biblical Hermeneutics*, trans. Robert W. Yarbrough (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 1994).

Coppens, Joseph. *Le Messianisme et sa relève Prophétique: Les anticipations vétérotetamentaires Leur accomplissement en Jésus*. Leuven: University Press, 1989.

Briggs, Charles A. *Messianic Prophecy: The Prediction of the Fulfillment of Redemption through the Messiah*. Hendrickson, 1988. Reprinted from the edition originally published by Charles Scribner's Sons, NY, 1886.

Landman, Leo. *Messianism in the Talmudic Era*. NY: KTAV Publishing House, 1979.

Landman provides an introduction to these reprints ranging from 1897 to 1975. The coming of Messiah and redemption according to some Rabbis was conditioned on Israel's repentance. Others argued that it would happen regardless of whether Israel repented. (xix-xxi). "The idea of a Messiah in Judaism centered around a human figure. He may have been assigned exceptional qualities of wisdom and understanding; he was to bring peace and a just life to Israel and to mankind, but he was never more than a being of flesh and blood. Israel will be redeemed from all oppression; the yoke of the exile will be removed; the exiles will be gathered-in; the kingship of Israel will be restored and the world will recognize the sovereignty of God. None of these will be brought about by means other than natural ones. . . .Even those who spoke of a supernatural Messianic era, which would be preceded by supernatural events and a radical transformation of the world, still spoke of it as being this-worldly." (p. xxiv)

The traumatic experience of Bar Kokhba's failure and the persecutions that followed brought sharp reactions to the Messianic hopes. With the Bar Kokhba rebellion ending in disaster, the concept of two Messiahs, the Messiah b. Joseph and the Messiah b. David, seems to have been created. Their origin and purpose have been the subject of great debate." (p. xxix)

"One problem which was never quite resolved in Jewish thinking concerned the arrival of the Messiah. Was the Messianic idea dependent upon human action, and therefore could the Messiah be induced to arrive at any time, or did the Messianic dream not include human responsibility and determination to do something about its realization, but was left to the complete discretion of God? Messianic activism, lured by utopian ends, always urged man's participation in his own destiny. Many rabbinic sages, however, warned against 'forcing the End,' threats that were resented by the revolutionary minds." (p. xxx)

"In the earlier [Tannaic] period, as in the amoraic [220-500] period, it appears that the Messianic idea, important as it may have been, had not assumed the status of a creed. Individuals, and perhaps even groups of sages, had deep feelings concerning the Messianic idea, but the fact remains that R. Judah and the Prince did not include the Messianic idea in the Mishna." (p. xxxii)

Gressmann, Hugo. "The Sources of Israel's Messianic Hope" (pp. 3-23) (pp. 173-194 in *The American Journal of Theology* 17, 1913).

"For our purpose there are to be considered among the many species of prophetic poesy only two, and they meet us in all the prophetic books: the 'threats' and the 'promises.' These are in direct contrast with each other both in content and in temper. The threats predict ill fortune, the promises, on the contrary, good fortune for Israel. In the threats, therefore, lives the wrath of the prophet against the sins of Israel; hence the threats are mostly combined with 'denunciatory words,' to give plausibility to the coming calamity. The promises, however, are filled with the

love of the prophet for his people; hence they are often joined with an ‘exhortation’ to bring the hearers back to the right way and to lead them to happiness.” (p. 5 [175])

He begins with Micah 5:1-5. “Secondly, the Messiah, the pious king, will govern his people in the name and by the power of Jahve, and so his kingdom will be a kingdom of peace and will extend over the whole world. All nations are subject to the Messiah, even the Assyrians. If they are coming to subject Judah, as they did Northern Israel, then it will be the worse for them; for in that case, the Messiah has come to save Judah from this great distress. The author therefore expected the return of David [the real David] soon after the conquest of Samaria, before Asshur had advanced the second time to menace Judah.” (p. 10 [180])

“Like Micah, Isaiah, too, speaks in a mysterious manner of the young wife who shall bear [Isaiah 7:1-14]. Nobody knows who she is, not even the prophet; only one thing is known, that in the immediate future the Messiah shall be born of a woman. Contrary to Micah, we here have nothing of David’s return;’ it even seems to be excluded, for finally the prophet turns against the governing dynasty: it shall see worse days than at the time of the kingdom’s division, when in Northern Israel a foreign dynasty mounted the throne. With these words, the fall of the Davidic dynasty is announced: when the Messiah mounts the throne, then ‘the scepter will be taken from Judah’ as is already said in other words in Gen. 49:10. When Herod hears that the Messiah is born, he orders the child to be killed because now the end of his dynasty has come.” (p. 12-13 [184-85]).

“Besides this, we have to explain why Isaiah [9:5-6] endowed his Messiah with demigod-like attributes: ‘marvelous of counsel, God of battle, father of eternity, prince of peace.’ No other than Isaiah has insisted upon the unequalled grandeur of Jahve; only God is majestic, and in his presence all men, even the kings are ‘flesh and not spirit.’ How could the same prophet transfer the attribute of God, the *El Gibbor* to the king that was to come?” (pp. 14-15 [184-85])

Then Isaiah 11.

“To this may be added a second argument, *the deification of the Messiah*. Some traces are found, it is true, that even in Israel the reigning rulers were extolled like gods or sons of gods, although not as often as in Egypt (Pss. 2, 45, 110, which are not messianic). But such courtly ideas are not to be supposed in the case of the prophets who dared to tell the kings their faults in such a manner that they sometimes offend the royalist sensibilities of modern men. The more peculiar, then, is the fact that they have adorned the messianic king without scruple with such godlike attributes as ‘God of battle’ or ‘father of eternity,’ with epithets usually reserved for Jahveh alone.” (pp. 18-19 [188-89])

He argues that Paradise motifs (Gen 1-3) are not to be identified with the Messianic hope which he derives from Egypt not Babylon (p. 23 [193]).

Klausner, Joseph. “The Source and Beginnings of the Messianic Idea.” Pp. 13-25 [pp 25-37 in *The Messianic Idea in Israel*, NY 1955]

Idea did not begin anywhere but in Israel. (p. 13 [25]). Moses is the prototype of the Messiah not the kings (since Messiah as a word is not used of this coming one). Moses is the first redeemer; Messiah the second. “Not only this, but the acceptance of suffering because of the iniquities of others, which late Jewish legend attributes to the Messiah, is in the Talmud and is also attributed to our master Moses. (This may be called ‘suffering for atonement;’ Christian scholars call It

‘vicarious suffering,’ and in Christianity this idea has become an important article of faith.) (p. 18 [30])

“Thus the Messiah, as I have said, became a truly pre-eminent man, to the extent that the *Jewish* imagination could picture him: he was supreme in strength and heroism; he was also supreme in moral qualities. A great personality, which is incomparably higher and stronger than ordinary people, a personality to which all very willingly make themselves subject and which can overcome all things, this is the pre-eminent man of Judaism. Of a pre-eminent man like this it is possible to say, ‘Thou has made him a little lower than God.’ For from a pre-eminent man like this to God is but a step. But this step Judaism did *not* take. It formed within the limits of a humanity, which is continually raising itself up, the ideal of flesh and blood, ‘the idea of the ultimate limit of man’ (in the language of Kant), this great personality only by means of which and by the help of which can redemption and salvation come to humanity—the King-Messiah.” (p. 24 [36] [HH but what about the Metatron?])

Scholem, Gershom. *Toward an Understanding of the Messianic Idea in Judaism*. (pp. 51-74) [pp. 1-74 in *The Messianic Idea in Judaism*. NY, 1971]

“The predictions and messages of the biblical prophets come to an equal degree from revelation and from the suffering and desperation of those whom they addressed; they are spoken from the context of situations and again and again have proven effective in situations where the End, perceived in the immediate future, was thought about to break in abruptly at any moment. To be sure, the predictions of the prophets do not yet give us any kind of well-defined conception of Messianism. Rather we have a variety of different motifs in which the much emphasized utopian impulse—penetrated with restorative impulses like the reinstatement of an ideally conceived Davidic kingdom.” (p. 55 [5]).

Smith, Henry Preserved. “Origin of the Messianic Hope in Israel.” (pp. 75-98) [pp. 338-360 in “The Origin of the Messianic Hope in Israel.” *AJT* 14, 1910]

Quotes from Psalms of Solomon 17:23-36. Get this plus the date.

“Our conclusion is that the messianic hope in its various forms is a product of Hebrew and Jewish religious faith. This faith rested upon the mercy and fidelity of Israel’s God and on his election of a people in whom his glory should be manifested. In the struggle which this faith went through to maintain itself under heathen oppression the hope gradually developed until it reached the transcendental form which it assumes in the latest documents. Here and there, in minor details, it may have been influenced by mythological survivals, but these survivals had already passed into folklore and do not in any case affect the substance of the hope.” (p.98 [360])

Zeitlin, Solomon. “The Origin of the Idea of the Messiah.” (pp. 99-111 [pp. 447-459 in “The Origin of the Idea of the Messiah,” *In Time of Harvest*, NY, 1963]).

“True, the prophets do speak of a millennium—a period of happiness and prosperity when there will be no more wars between nations, and people will live in peace with one another. But this is not an expectation of a personal messiah. We must differentiate between a millennium and a messiah. The Prophet Isaiah, who according to tradition was of the family of David, voiced a longing for a period when a descendant of Jesse, that is, of the family of David, imbued with the spirit of Yahweh, would rule.” (p.103 [451])

“That the Jews during the first part of the Second Commonwealth did not have the expectation of a personal messiah is evident from the literature produced during that period. The word *mashiah* does not occur in the book of Ben Sirah nor does it occur in the other apocryphal literature--Tobit, Judith, the Wisdom of Solomon, I Maccabees. In the latter it is stated that when the high priesthood was given to Simon the Hasmonean, a clause was inserted, ‘Until a true prophet will arrive in Israel.’ From this we may deduce that Jews believed prophecy would be restored but there is no indication that they expected a messiah. Even in II Maccabees, wherein physical resurrection and the hope that all Jews would be gathered in Judaea are given prominence, the word *mashiah* does not occur—the author believe this would be accomplished through the intervention of God.” (pp. 103-1045 [451-452])

“The term “messiah” occurs only in the apocalyptic literature; once in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs (6:8), twice in the Book of Enoch (48:10; 52:4), and twice in the last two chapters of the Psalms of Solomon (17:6; 18:8). The first two books mentioned as well as the last two chapters of the Psalms of Solomon (17th-18th) were written after the time of Herod. We may even assume that ‘Lord Messiah’ in Chapter 17 is a later Christian interpolation. The word ‘messiah’ also occurs in IV Ezra (5:29; 12:32) and the Apocalypsis of Baruch (29:3; 39:7; 40:1; 70:9). The messiah is portrayed in this literature as being a scion of David who will rule over Israel and free the Jews from their foreign yoke. The Jews believe that the messiah would be a supernatural being and yet a son of David. In the Book of Enoch the son of David is named ‘the anointed of God,’ ‘the Elect One,’ ‘the Son of Man,’ ‘the Son of God.’” (p. 104 [452])

The Apocalyptists aware of the might of Rome, knew that the Judaeans could not free themselves from the Romans by force. They believed that God would perform miracles to free His people. They introduced the idea of a supernatural *mashiah*, who would reveal himself in due time, vanquish the Romans, free Israel, and sit on the throne of his father David. Then the millennium would come, looked forward to by the prophets of old.” (p. 109 [457]) See Jewish War 7. 8.6-7 (321-380) Even though the Apocalyptists and Sicarii were offshoots of Phariseeism, the Pharisees opposed them, arguing against a supernatural messiah.

“Believe in a supernatural *mashiah*, a scion of the family of David, was first brought forth by the Apocalyptic Pharisaic group. It did not greatly influence the Judaeans during the Second Commonwealth, but after the destruction of the Second Temple, and particularly after the revolt of Bar Kokba, it gained stimulus and shaped the life of the Jewish people throughout the centuries. The idea of a supernatural *mashiah* became the cornerstone of Jewish survival . . .” (p. 111 [459])

Heinemann, Joseph, “The Messiah of Ephraim and the Premature Exodus of the Tribe of Ephraim” (pp. 339-353 [1-15 in *HTR* 68, 1975])

Says any connection between the death of Messiah ben Joseph (or Ephraim) and Zech. 12:10 has been disproved (p. 339). The Qumran sect expected the coming of the “Messiahs of Aaron and of Israel” (MoD IX.11. (p. 342) “Hence we have no longer any reason to doubt evidence to the same effect found in the Testaments of the Patriarchs. Moreover, other messianic figures, such as Melchizedek, are seen to emerge.” (p. 343) “We need not, therefore, any longer be astonished by the very existence of the Messiah ben Joseph, apart from and besides the Messiah ben David; this is neither an ‘enigma’ nor ‘a curious aberration,’ but merely one of many messianic figures which were in existence in the pre-Christian or early Christian era.” (p. 343)

On pp. 344-45 he lists the sources for the dual messiah in the rabbinical literature, some of which reflects early material. B. T. Sukkah 52a, speaks of the death of Messiah ben Joseph [BT, Socino,

Tractates Sukkah, Mo'ed Qatan, vol 8. 52a: "What is the cause of the mourning ? R. Dosa and the Rabbis differ on the point. One explained, The cause is the slaying of Messiah the son of Joseph, and the other explained, The cause is the slaying of the Evil Inclination."], his end in battle features prominently also in the 'Tosephta'-Targum on Zech 12:10 (p. 344)

Because some references to Messiah ben Joseph (or Ephraim) refer to his victorious battles but not to death, he argues that the dying Messiah (in battle) is a later development and agrees with J. Levy that it should be connected with Bar Kokhba. (He argues that Bar Kosba is not a pejorative name but from his letters we know it is a variant on his name. He cannot believe that he would be treated as a fraud by his contemporaries after his death. (p. 347 [9])

The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years, eds Flint, Peter W. and James C. Vanderkam, 2 vols., Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Sanders, James. "The Scrolls and the Canonical Process." II:1-23

Argues that the Psalms Scroll (11QPs) indicates a state of fluidity that probably continued until the Bar Kokhba revolt and for the NT in the time of Constantine.. Argues that prophetic scripture was (re)signified in each generation to make it relevant.

Knibb, Michael A. "Eschatology and Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls." II:379-402.

"... there can be no question but that eschatological and messianic beliefs were of considerable significance in the theological outlook of this group at all stages of its existence." (p. 379)

Texts containing the "end of days phrase": 1QSa, the Pesharim, 4Qeschatological Midrash (4Q174 and 4Q177) and 11QMelchizedek (11Q13), as well as text that don't: War Rule, 1Qsb 4QTestimonia. The latter includes in Hebrew the Messianic Apocalypse (4Q521). See É. Puech, "Une apocalypse messianique (4Q521)," *RevQ* (1992) 475-522. Also "521.4QApocalypse messianique," in É. Puech, *Qumran Grotte 4.XVII: Texte Hébreux (4Q521-4Q528, 4Q576-4Q579)* (DJD 25; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998) 1-38 + pls. I-III.

Recurring themes such as the final judgment in which the righteous will be rewarded and the wicked punished, last great battle with the forces of evil, descriptions of the blessings of the new age, the expectation of a new Jerusalem, rules for ordering of life in the new age, an explanation of the delay in the expected time of the end, believe in resurrection and messianic beliefs. (p. 382)

"The starting point for the discussion of messianism at Qumran ought to be the statement in 1QS 9:11, 'until the coming of a prophet and the messiahs of Aaron and Israel,' and the list of messianic roof texts in 4QTestimonia. These manuscripts were both copied by the same person and can be firmly dated to the beginning of the first century BCE. Thus, leaving on one side for the moment the expectation of a prophet, these two texts clearly attest the existence from about 100 B.C.E. of the typical Qumran expectation of two messiahs, one a priest, the other a royal figure. The roots of this belief in exilic and post-exilic texts are well known, but we do not know just how far back the actual belief in two messiahs goes, nor do we know whether a version of the Rule of the Community ever existed without the reference to two messiahs." (p. 385)

"Thus it may be argued that in both the Amos-Numbers Midrash and the passages referring to 'the messiah of Aaron and (the one) of Israel' the Damascus Document presents the same dual messianism as the Rule of the Community." (pp. 387-388) (CD dates probably from 100 BC)

“But the messianic interpretation which is apparently given to Gen 49:10 and Num 24:17 in the Septuagint shows that these ideas were already traditional by the second century BCE, and at least to this extent Stegemann’s emphasis on the creative role of the Essenes in the formation of messianic beliefs seems questionable.” (p. 392)

“We have clear evidence for about 100 BCE for a belief in the coming of a prophet and of the messiahs of Aaron and Israel. The expectation of a prophet took various forms and in any case does not occur all that frequently, but the belief in two messiahs is reflected, in one form or another, in a wide range of texts.” (p. 400)

Schiffman, Lawrence H. “The Qumran Scrolls and Rabbinic Judaism.” II:552-569.

“Conclusion: The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls has presented us with the opportunity to learn a great deal not only about the group which collected the ‘ancient library’ but about the entire constellation of sects which existed in the Second Temple period. This means that as texts from the Qumran caves continue to be published, our knowledge of the background against which Rabbinic Judaism emerged will become clearer. We will see that ideas and practices which we formerly could date no earlier than the destruction of the Temple can now be shown to be earlier. The Tannaim [80-200] will increasingly be viewed as inheritors of tradition, who expanded, developed and adapted that tradition to a new time—a time which brought with it new circumstances, most notably the destruction of the Temple and the cessation of sacrificial worship. Yes, the Second Temple was a period in which different approaches vied with one another for the mantle of history, and the Dead Sea Scrolls negate the assumption of a monolithic Judaism. Yet these very same scrolls are helping us to understand how, after the revolt and the destruction, this period of great variegation gave way to that of standardization and consensus, and the emergence of Rabbinic Judaism.

“If we are to understand the transition which brought about what we call Talmudic or Rabbinic Judaism, it will have to be against a much wider backdrop than what has previously been drawn. For in this way we will be able to see not only the marked changes which took place in this new manifestation of Judaism, but also the essential continuity which it evidences with the varieties of Judaism of the Second Temple period.” (p. 569)

Evans, Craig. “Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls.” II:573-598.

“Elsewhere in the Scrolls there appears to be a close relationship between God’s kingdom and an earthly, Israelite kingdom, over which the Messiah reigns: ‘... until the Messiah of righteousness, the Branch of David has come. For to him and to his seed the covenant of the kingdom of His people [מלכות עמו] has been given for the eternal generations’ (4Q252 1 v 3-4).” (p. 582)

Isaiah’s Vineyard Song was directed against the general populous, but Jesus directs his diatribe (Mark 12:1-11) against the priesthood. The priests assume it is against them and the people do not assume it is against them (as in Isaiah). Why is this? The Targum of Isaiah turns it against the priests, but some argue that the Targum is too late to have influenced people in Jesus’ time. Now we have 4Q500 from Qumran which seems to do the same thing the Targum did. And predates Jesus by a generation.

“Conclusion: All five of the topics in which comparison between Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls has been made form components of a theological perspective that is coherent and interlocked. Jesus’ understanding of the kingdom of God, his assurance to the imprisoned John that he was in

fact the Coming One, his threatening vineyard parable, his anticipation of exaltation even when overpowered by the Temple authorities, and his conviction that obedience to Torah assures life in the world to come testify to a form of Jewish piety that looks for Israel's restoration and that in general terms situates Jesus close to the type of piety and eschatological expectation witnessed in so many of the Scrolls and related literature.

“At Qumran there were visions of God's kingdom, the expectation that someday it would be restored to Israel and/or to Israel's Messiah, concomitant criticisms of the Temple establishment, pneumatic and charismatic interpretation of Scripture that clarified and confirmed these expectations, and the abiding assumption that the Law of Moses undergirded every aspect of Jewish life, both in this world and in the world to come.

“Although the Dead Sea Scrolls do not offer any major surprises for Jesus research, at many points they do help clarify and contextualize important features of Jesus' message and mission. Perhaps their greatest contribution to Jesus research will prove to be the establishment of parameters and boundaries in which future research will take place. One may hope that ultimately the Scrolls will discourage faddish scholarship and will promote in its place informed discussion that will truly advance the field.” (pp. 596-97)

Puech É. “Une apocalypse messianique (4Q521),” *RevQ* (1992) 475-522.

Puech dates 4Q521 paleographically between 100 and 80 BC but because of the corrections it is assumed not to be the original. So he will lean on the ideas to help date the original. (p. 480)

Fragment 2 ii +4 begins with “Indeed the Heavens and the earth will listen to his messiah” Puech says, “Le contexte très lacunaire de ces passages ne permet pas de savoir si ce manuscrit est témoin de la fusion en un seul personnage de la double attente d'un messie sacerdotal et d'un messie davidique comme il est de règle à Qumrân (voir fig. 11), ou si on a affaire simplement à deux passages bien distincts traitant séparément des deux oints.” P. 487 The very broken context of these passages does not allow us to know whether the MS is a witness of the fusion into one personnage of the double expectation of a priestly messiah and a Davidic messiah as is the rule in Qumran (see fig. 11), or if one simply has a case of two quite distinct passages treating the two anointed ones separately.

Because of the themes in these fragments that coincide with themes in other apocalyptic literature, Puech can say that the dominant eschatological and messianism leads to identifying the genre of this text as “apocalyptic” from the Jewish milieu of the 2 c. BC from which the designation “messianic apocalypse” is proposed for this MS. (p. 515)

Greidanus, Sidney. *Preaching Christ from the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

“These considerations lead to the fundamentally decisive conclusion that the two Testaments are not two books but one. And this conclusion, in turn, leads to the equally fundamental hermeneutical conclusion that *the Old Testament must be interpreted not only in its own context but also in the context of the New Testament*.

“This conclusion is but an application of the standard hermeneutical principle that every text must be understood in its context. Since the literary context of the Old Testament in the Christian canon is the New Testament, this means that the Old Testament must be understood in the context

of the New Testament. And since the heart of the New Testament is Jesus Christ, this means that every message from the Old Testament must be seen in the light of Jesus Christ.” (p. 51)

Schlatter, Adolf. *The History of the Christ*. Tr. Andreas J. Köstenberger. Baker, 1997 (Original edition *Die Geschichte des Christus*, 1923).

Satterthwaite, Philip E., Richard S. Hess, and Gordon J. Wenham. *The Lord's anointed: interpretation of Old Testament Messianic texts*. Carlisle: The Paternoster Press, 1995.

HEBREW TEXT

Bergsträsser, G. *Introduction to the Semitic Languages*. Trans. & sup. P. T. Daniels. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983.

McFall, Leslie. *The Enigma of the Hebrew Verbal System*. Sheffield: The Almond Press. 1982.

This is a historical survey of the study of the HVS. Leslie tells me he had a third chapter in which he introduced his own understanding of the HVS, but his advisors said it was material for another thesis so would not let him present it for his doctorate. It was translated into Hungarian, and as a result no one would publish it in English. Waltke uses Leslie's work as the basis for his discussion of the history of the HVS.

Joüon, Paul. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Tr. and rev. T. Muraoka. 2 Vols. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute. 1991.

Waltke, Bruce K. and Michael O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Eisenbrauns (IN), 1990.

Quotes Albright (p. 17) (Stone Age to Christianity, 79): “A principle which must never be lost sight of in dealing with documents of the ancient Near East is that instead of leaving obvious archaisms in spelling and grammar, the scribes generally revised ancient literary and other documents periodically. This practice was followed with particular regularity by cuneiform scribes.”

Adonai = is probably an relative “Lord of all” (p. 124)

Peniel may be the old nominative plural case ending and Peniel may be the old nominative/accusative case ending. The directional aH is not accusative as once thought because of Ugaritic grammar (see UT). The genitive singular (Abinadab, e.g.) could mean My Father or simply Father of.

Suffixes of connections (litterae compaginis). Consonants that connect (not same as construct plurals). Dibarti Melchizedek = order of Melchizedek (genitive but it usually serves in a nominative function, so patterns not clear (p. 127).

The interesting use of “god” as a superlative of a thing: `ir gedolah elohim (a mighty city). P. 269.

“There are various approaches to elucidating the stem system; more traditional grammarians stress the *Qal:Piel* relation as key, while recently the *Piel:Hiphil* relation has been emphasized.

The *Piel* is the key to the system, and the first major step toward unlocking the system was taken by Albrecht Goetze in his survey of the Akkadian D stem; his work has been extended to West Semitic by Ernst Jenni and others. To some extent, scholars prior to Goetze and Jenni failed to perceive the function of the Hebrew verbal stem system because they thought that the *Piel* signified primarily intensive action. Jenni's study of the Hebrew *Piel* demonstrates that it fundamentally entails a notion related to the basic active:passive dichotomy of voice. This new insight offers an opportunity to see the system in its entirety, though we believe Jenni fails to catch the full significance of his thesis because he excludes the notion of causation from his understanding of the *Piel*." P. 354.

I find his discussion of the verbal stems hard to follow. He is bringing out nuances in Hebrew that are impossible to express in the English form, but he says "Awareness of the ambiguities within the English verbal system when set *vis-à-vis* the subtle distinctions used in the Hebrew verbal stem system with regard to causation and voice, should warn the researcher against giving priority to the stem's apparent function over its manifest form in trying to decide its functions. Prejudged categories, dictated by the 'cruder' English structures, are inadequate for interpreting the Hebrew categories; we must be guided by the Hebrew forms and usages rather than by those of English." P. 359.

He follows Jenni on the *Piel* (it is neither intensive or causative). "Rather it expresses the bringing about of a state. With *Qal* intransitive verbs the *Piel* is factitive: it designates without regard to the process the bringing about of the state depicted by an adjective. The object experiences this action as an 'accident.' The difference between a true factitive meaning and a declarative-estimative meaning consists in whether the effected state, described in terms of an adjective, is experienced externally (by the senses) or subjectively (in the mind). With *Qal* transitive verbs the *Piel* is resultative: it designates the bringing about of the outcome of the action designated by the base root, which action can be expressed in terms of an adjective, and without regard to the actual process of the event. The species of the resultative (metaphorical meaning, indirect action, summarizing successive action with plural objects, etc.) are to be understood in contrast to the actual action, which is presented by the base root. Denominative verbs in the *Piel* have either a factitive or resultative meaning. More specifically, the denominative expresses itself in terms of productive, or successive iterative, or privative verbal meanings, rather than in terms of an actual event or a causative meaning." (p. 400)

Because the *piel/pual* are essential involved with a derived state of existence, the *pual* will be in the participle 40% of the time. Likewise since the infinitive would indicate the action of being put in a condition, and the *pual* is concerned not with an act but with an attained condition, the *pual* infinite does not exist (a couple of questionable forms) p. 418.

He follows Jenni on *Hiphil/Piel* distinction: "Ernst Jenni, beginning with the assumption that the two morphologically distinct stems have a different semantic values, undertook an exhaustive study of the *Piel*, focusing on the *Piel* and *Hiphil* stems of the same verbal root in similar contexts. According to Jenni, the *Piel* signifies *to bring about a state*, and the *Hiphil*, *to cause an event*. His distinction involves two contrasting ideas: *state* versus *event*, and *to bring about* versus *to cause actively*. According to Jenni, the differences between *Piel* and *Hiphil* can be understood by appealing to deep differences: the *Piel* is analogous to a nominal clause, the *Hiphil* to a verbal clause (p. 433).

On verbs: the *wqtl* and *wyqtl* are probably different verbs originally from the unbound verbs. He prefers to refer to them as *waw* relative. "The term *waw*-relative, by contrast, suggests the relationship with the preceding verb and leaves open the possibilities of subordinate meaning. As

we have already noted, the origin of this system may lie with the *yqtl*~*wayyqtl* forms, the first derived from a long prefix form with a non-perfective sense and the second from a short prefix form used as a narrative preterite [past]. But whatever the origin of the system, there has eventuated in Hebrew a quite different system of *yqtl* with relative *waw* used as a perfective. As we shall argue, this new system (32.1.2b) was developed at first in opposition to the *w^eqtl* combination used to introduce the apodosis after a conditional protasis (e.g., ‘If this be so, *w^eqtl* = then so is/will be this’) and later led, by analogy, to the development of the *w^eqtl* combination used as a non-perfective. Our view of the relative *waw* combines and enriches *the* old notion of *waw hippuk* and Ewald’s consequential *waw*” (p. 477).

“This is an impressive range of arguments [comparing Ps 18 with 2 Sam 22] from morphological development and from usage that the Hebrew prefix conjugation contains at least two paradigms, the long (<*yaqtuluu*) signifying imperfective and dependent situations and the short (<*yaqtul*) signifying a jussive when unbound and a preterite, especially when bound with the relative *waw*” (p. 498).

He goes on to point out that the unbound prefix form used as a preterite is not without problems. However, his conclusion is, “On balance the comparative-historical evidence seems to demand some respect, and we believe that vestiges of historical *yaqtul* survive in the prefix conjugation beyond the jussive. In prose the *waw*-relative is normally bound with the offspring of preterite *yaqtul*, a form not consistently differentiated from the descendants of *yaqtulu*. The basically similar situation in poetry is complicated by stylistic and idiosyncratic usage as well as by variation. Poetry, especially early poetry, occasionally preserves a *yaqtul* preterite in unbound form, as an archaic or archaizing usage (1.4.1)” (p. 501).

“In sum, we find both relative and copulative *wqtl* in a Canaanite dialect shortly before the emergence of Hebrew. Moran has proposed that the relative *waw* in Biblical Hebrew developed its many diversified uses from an original function of introducing the apodosis after a conditional clause. In these uses the *w^e* never lost its notion of succession ‘then, and so’ (temporal or logical)” (p. 522).

Conjunctive *waw* pointed with kamets (cf. Isa 14:22) indicates a pair (Kith and Kin) (p. 649 #8).

OLD TESTAMENT STUDIES

Graham, Matt Patrick. *The Utilization of 1 and 2 Chronicles in the Reconstruction of Israelite History in the Nineteenth Century.* SBL Dissertation Series, Number 116. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.

Historical study of the approach to Chronicles. He adds nothing to the discussion. A PHD dissertation.

Craigie, Peter C. *The Old Testament; Its Background, Growth, and Content.* Nashville: Abingdon. 1986.

A popular, very readable text, designed to appeal to all religious groups. Somewhat helpful.

Kitchen, Kenneth A. *On the Reliability of the Old Testament.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 2003.

Kitchen divides the "minimalists" into three historical periods: 1) recent (1990s) Thompson, Lemche, Davies, Whitelam. 2) middle (1970s) Redford, Thompson, van Seters. 3) Early period: 19th century: e.g., Wellhausen.

Kitchen makes a slashing attack on the biblical minimalists on pp. 449-500. See his discussion of Philistines and camels during the patriarchal time on p. 465. The lack of records re the exodus is discussed on p. 466. He interacts with Dever's, *Who were the Early Israelites and Where Did They Come From?* on pp 468ff. "There seems to be a psychological hangover here; in the 1950s to 1960s, Albright and Dever's much-hated 'American Biblical Archaeology' (plus theology) movement had believed in the patriarchs and exodus—so (irrationally) nobody *now* (two generations later) must either be allowed to study them seriously or to produce any data (no matter how genuine or germane) that *do* suggest their possible reality. In the light of what is now known, there is no excuse whatsoever for dismissing either the patriarchs (with a firm date line) or the exodus; see the entirely fresh treatments in chapters 6 and 7 above. The treatments given here by me are not based on Albright, Gordon, or the vagaries of the little local (and very parochial) United States problem of the long-deceased American Biblical Archaeology/theology school. Archaeologists that 'have given up hope of recovering any context that would make Abraham, Isaac or Jacob credible 'historical figures' (98) are not thereby rendered 'respectable'; in fact, they simply do not know the relevant source materials (which are mainly *textual*), are not competent to pass judgment on the issues, and would be better described as pitifully ignorant, and can now be mercifully dismissed as out of their depth." (pp. 468-469) He approves the 70's work of the minimalists in demolishing "the overspeculative, and thus unsafe, hypotheses that formed too large a part of the views of Albright, Gordon, Speiser, et al. The Hurrianism of Nuzi and the more inappropriate comparisons (sororarchs, etc.) went by the board; Speiser's and Albright's donkey-caravanning merchant-patriarchs were a chimera that the biblical text itself does not countenance; Abraham and company were simply transhumant pastoralists, able at need to defend themselves. Nothing more, nothing less." P. 482. The Philistines of Genesis are located in Gerar not the pentapolis. This is an earlier group. P 483 also 340-41.

P. 37: Tendency for kings to take credit for the killing of their enemies. So when Hazael claims to have killed Jehoram and Ahaziah while the Bible attributes their deaths to Jehu, he says this is normal. Same is true of Sargon II claiming to have defeated Samaria when the Bible says Shalmaneser V did it (details on p. 39).

"TP III took 13,520 people . . . Then Sargon II boasts of having removed 27,290 (var. 27,280) people from Samaria. And in 702 Sennacherib claimed to have reduced forty-six of Hezekiah's walled towns and to have taken 200,150 people from them. Such measures did not necessarily depopulate a given region entirely, and some Assyrian kings brought in new populations from elsewhere (Sargon II and 2 Kings 17; contrast TP III). But the 'Assyrian exile' of both Israelites and Judeans was considerable—and in the former case, permanent. (p. 65). A listing of the numbers taken into exile is found on p. 66.

For the number s of Judeans exiled by Nebuchadrezzar II (especially in 597 and 586), we have no Babylonian statistics so far—only the Hebrew figures in 2 Kings 24:14, 16 and Jer. 52:28-30. But these (7,000, 1,000, 3,023, 832, 745 people) are entirely consistent in scale with the range of figures for deportations from Israel practiced earlier by the Assyrian kings (cf. just above). Two facts here are worthy of comment: the relative modesty of almost all these figures compared to what the total populations of Israel/Samaria and Judah/Jerusalem would have been; and the status of the people taken away, and those left behind. The idea that the Babylonians carried *everybody* from both Jerusalem and Judah off to Babylon is true neither archaeologically nor to the biblical text itself. In the Hebrew accounts, we read that 'the poorest people of the land were left

(behind) for 597 (2 Kings 24:14), and that ‘the commander [i.e., Nebuzaradan] left behind some of the poorest people of the land, to work the vineyards and fields’ (2 Kings 25:12; Jer. 52:16). In other words, the land of Judah became in effect an imperial estate, to be cultivated for the profit of its conquerors by the local food producing community (farmers and pastoralists). Precisely such procedures had been followed by Egypt’s New Kingdom pharaohs nearly a millennium before this, and in turn by the Assyrians. Empires were not run just to give ancient kings militarily glorious ego trips, but to yield revenue! See further below. Nebuzaradan (also in Jer. 39:11-13) is known from the Babylonian ‘court list’ as Nabu-zer-iddin, a high officer of Nebuchadrezzar’s administration” (p. 67).

Referring to Jehoiachin’s release and rations under Awel-Marduk at his accession (562), he says, “This happened not for the first time, and he is not the only such person, as original Babylonian sources make clear. From a vaulted building closely adjoining the royal palace proper came a series of cuneiform tablets dated to the tenth to thirty-fifth years of Nebuchadrezzar II (595-570), being ‘ration tablets’ for people kept or employed in Babylon and its palace. Among the beneficiaries in receipt of oil were ‘Jehoiachin king of Judah’ (just once, ‘king’s son of Judah’) and ‘the 5 sons of the king of Judah in the care of (their guardian?) Qenaiah’ (cf. fig. 10C). Thus the exiled young king and his infant children were already on a regular allowance in Nebuchadrezzar’s time (one tablet is of Year 13, 592), but under the palace equivalent of house arrest” (p. 68).

For a study of “cultivators” of this period, see J. N. Graham, *BA* 47, no. 1 (1984):55-58.

“Thus the people of Judah ended up in three different locations by about 580—the elite and ‘useful’ people in Babylon; the ordinary working people still in Judea; and sundry fugitives in Egypt” (p. 70).

See page 76 for decrees from Persia regarding local religious issues in three languages. In one, the text differs considerably in details from one version to another. This supports my idea of a “fill in the blanks” edict.

In speaking of Judges, he talks of the “deuteronomistic” theology as wrongly dated in 621. He shows that the same theme of Judges, sin, judgment, prayer, deliverance is found in 13th c. Egypt in more than one document (p. 217).

“In the last quarter-century current knowledge of the processes of settlement, de-settlement, and resettlement in the Middle Bronze to Iron Age Canaan has been transformed, both by excavations at individual sites and by far-reaching and (at times) very thorough surface surveys. The gain in practical data is considerable. But given the differing intellectual starting points of the variety of scholars interested—both on the field and off it—much disagreement on the conclusions to be drawn has arisen and continues, not least on two issues: interaction with the biblical data and questions of ethnicity (Israelite or other). (p. 222).

MBII was prosperous and numerous (1900-1550).

In 16th to 13th c, New Kingdom pharaohs incorporated Canaan and drained it. Population and number of settlements visibly declined.

1230 onward Sea People ended up in Canaan (coastal and Jezreel). Edom and Moab and Ammonites appear. Arameans become prominent in the north. And Israel shows up on the Merenptah stela.

With all this the text and archaeology agree.

“These and other surveys have shown a dramatic rise in the intensity of settlement in the hill country, especially north from Jerusalem, from around 1299 onward through Iron I. Thus the Ephraim-Samaria survey registered just 9 sites for Late Bronze I-II (with another 3, LB/Iron I), a dozen at most. Then for Iron Age phase I, they were able to list not fewer than 131 sites (plus another 94 of Iron I-II), a huge increase. Next door in West Manasseh, Zertal noted some 39 sites for Late Bronze but over 200 for Iron I, again a huge increase. This great rash of farmsteads, hamlets, and small villages represents a wholly new development, as is universally admitted. In Manasseh at least, two-thirds of these sites were founded entirely new; one-third were both founded and abandoned during Iron I, while two-thirds continued to be used and developed in Iron II (monarchy period)” p. 225. He argues that this growth is too rapid to sustain a “revolting peasant” and “early Hebrews indigenous to the highlands” theories (p. 227).

The pottery changes indicate an east to west settlement that supports the biblical account of Israel’s entry to the land.

On the Exodus: all the material evidence would have to come from the Delta and NOTHING has survived. There is no native stone and what stone was imported was used and reused. So there could be no evidence of Israel in the Delta (p. 246).

Argues for a 13th century Deuteronomy within the middle eastern setting (pp. 299-304).

Philistines is an updated term for non Canaanite people in Abraham’s time. They were probably Caphtorim (Crete) and there is evidence from the 2d Millennium of contacts with these people by the Mesopotamians (339-341).

To support his concept of “retouching” or glossing, he cites Sinuhe where we have an 1800 copy and a later ostrakon from the 14th c with updating of spellings and vocabulary. So for “Dan,” “Philistines,” “Ramases,” “Ur of the Chaldees,” etc.

Argues against long periods of oral transmission of the prophet’s words through the example in Mesopotamia and Egypt of instant writing of prophet’s oracles (pp. 390-92).

Gordon, Robert P, *The Place is too small for us’: the Israelite Prophets in recent scholarship,* Sources for Biblical and theological study, 5. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1996.

Grayson, A. K. *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles. Vol. V in Texts from Cuneiform Sources,* ed. A. Leo Oppenheim, et al. Locust Valley, NY: Augustin Pub., 1975.

This is an important source of information on relationships between Assyria and Babylon and the people of the OT. It apparently is an up date or expansion of D. J. Wiseman’s Babylonian Chronicles of 1956. See especially the Neo-Babylonian section beginning on p. 69. Sennacherib’s murder by his son is recorded on p. 81 (Chronicle I:35). Kitchen refers also to Esarhaddon Nineveh records as by two sons (ROOT p. 42). For Nebuchadnezzar’s invasion of Egypt (see Jeremiah), see p. 101. “The fourth year: The king of Akkad mustered his army and marched to Hattu. [He marched about victoriously] in Hattu. In the month Kislev he took his army’s lead and marched to Egypt. (When) the king of Egypt heard (the news) he *m[ustered]* his army. They fought one another in the battlefield and both sides suffered severe losses (lit. they inflicted a major defeat upon one another). The king of Akkad and his army turned and [went back] to Babylon.” “The seventh year: In the month Kislev the king of Akkad mustered his army and marched to Hattu. He encamped against the city of Judah and on the second day of the month Adar he captured the city (and) seized (its) king. A king of his own choice he appointed in the city (and) taking the vast tribute he brought it into Babylon.” According to Kitchen, the foray into

Egypt and mauling caused Babylon to take a year to refit. This led Jehoiakim to believe that Nebuchadnezzar was done for and he could rebel (ROOT p. 44).

Assign this Neo-Babylonian section to ThM students for historical background.

Finkelstein has pushed down the archaeological dating so that material attributed to David and Solomon is now attributed to later kings (p. 139-140). In so doing, he must posit a third wave of sea people which Kitchen says does not show up anywhere in the Egyptian records. Finkelstein posits his redating on the absence of Mediterranean pottery from the contemporary Lachish strata, but Kitchen argues that Lachish would have been outside the purview of the Philistines and sites other areas where new pottery was not used by adjacent groups to the newcomers (p. 140-141). He concludes that the gates and buildings of Hazor, Gezer, and Megiddo belong to the united monarchy of Solomon (pp. 146-150).

The Merenptah stela gives us a date of 1210 for an Egyptian invasion that encountered a group called Israel. The period from 1210 to 1042 (almost 170 years) would be the period of the judges. “The latest setting of the book of Joshua (if granted even minimal credence) would then in principle lie immediately in the decade or so before 1210, along with any Israelite entry into Canaan from the outside” (p. 159).

“Thus, to sum up, the book of Joshua in reality simply records the Hebrew entry into Canaan, their base camp at Gilgal by the Jordan, their initial raids (without occupation!) against local rulers and subjects in south and north Canaan, followed by localized occupation (12) north from Gilgal as far as Shechem and Tirzah and (b) south to Hebron/Debir, and very little more. This is *not* the sweeping, instant conquest-with-occupation that some hasty scholars would foist upon the text of Joshua, without any factual justification. Insofar as only Jericho Ai, and Hazor were explicitly allowed to have been burned into nonoccupation, it is also pointless going looking for extensive conflagration level as at any other Late Bronze sites (of any phase) to identify them with any Israelite impact. Onto this initial picture Judges follows directly and easily, with no inherent contradiction: it contradicts only the bogus and superficial construction that some modern commentators have willfully thrust upon the biblical text of Joshua without adequate reason. The fact is that biblical scholars have allowed themselves to be swept away by the upbeat, rhetorical element present in Joshua, a persistent feature of most war reports in ancient Near Eastern sources that they are not accustomed to understand and properly handle” (p. 163).

The sweeping statements in Joshua (“he subdued the whole region,” or “wholly destroyed all who breathed”) are rhetorical summations, practiced by all the ancients. “In 10:20 we learn that Joshua and his forces massively slew their foes ‘until they were finished off’ (‘ad-tummam), but in the same breath the text states that ‘the remnant that survived got away into their defended towns.’ Thus the absolute wording is immediately qualified by exceptions” (p. 173-74).

“That Abimelek of Gerar should have a successive treaties with Abraham and Isaac is no more a ‘doublet’ than (e.g.) Talmi-sharruma of Aleppo having successive treaties with the two Hittite kings Mursil II and Muwatallis II (first summarized in the second), or than Kurunta king of Tarkhunta having successive treaties with no fewer than three Hittite kings, Muwatallis II, Hattusil III, and Tudkhaliya IV. There are no ‘doublets’ or triplets here, and none need be found in the Genesis examples either, except on flawed a priori theory” (pp. 323-324).

He deals with the statement in Ex 6:3 as a rhetorical negative that implies a positive “I appeared to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as El-Shaddai (‘God Almighty’)—and by my name YHWH did I not declare myself to them?” (p. 329).

See W.H.C. Propp, "Monotheism and 'Moses'" The Problem of Early Israelite Religion." Ugarit-Forschungen 31 (1999/2000):537-75 for a refutation of the limitation of Hebrew monotheism to the Babylonian exile and afterward. He believes Akhenaton influenced Israelite monotheism (perhaps more during the monarchy).

"In sum, alongside the official central cult at all times in tabernacle and temple, the Hebrews were happy to experiment with adding to the cult of YHWH, even having (an) Asherah by his side in the temple itself (never mind the high places), or to go over to cults of Baal and Asherah alongside of, or in stead of, YHWH. This affected high society, not just peasantry. The prophets sought to recall both rulers and people to the ancient covenant, and invoked its curses, while looking also for future blessing when the discipline of punishment was over" (p. 401).

Rejects any direct connection between Ennuma Elish and Genesis 1-2. Says most Assyriologists agree (pp. 424-25).

"Given the noncomposition of this type of fourfold and fivefold narrative framework after about 1600, it is logical to suggest that the framework and basic content of Gen. 11 goes back to the patriarchal period, and came as a tradition with the patriarchs westward from Mesopotamia" (p. 426).

Younger, K. L. *Ancient Conquest Accounts: A Study in Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical History Writing*, JSOTSup 98 Sheffield: Academic Press, 1990.

Hess, Richard S. *Joshua: An introduction and commentary*, The Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1996.

Macdonald, John. *The Theology of the Samaritans*. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1964.

Chronicle II is a text giving the history of Israel and the Samaritans after the Pentateuchal period. Claim to be the true Israel. First split came when Eli wanted the high priesthood and moved to Shiloh. He was the descendent of Ithamar and the Samaritan priesthood are descendents of Phinehas. 2 Kings 17 seems to indicate that Israel was depopulated, but Sargon II says that he carried off some 27K people. 2 Kings 15:19-20 indicates that Tiglath Pileser exacted 50 shekels from the wealthy people so that he might pay TP the thousand talents of silver. This would indicate 60,000 wealthy people according to Macdonald (p. 22). Furthermore, Hezekiah's reform in 2 Chron 30 indicates that he sent messengers to the "remnant" who had escaped the King of Assyria. The later prophets do not refer to the Samaritans, but to Israel, and assume that they are in the plan of God rather than a "mongrel" race. He believes that the Judean account of the origins of the Samaritans is suspect, but this does not mean that the Samaritan account is reliable. Each had polemic reasons to bend history to their own dogmas. "Any claim for Samaritan borrowing from Judaism is nonsense, as anyone who has read all the available literary material must judge. What is true beyond doubt is that both Samaritanism and Judaism developed from a common matrix. Both possessed the Law, albeit they were at variance over points of difference in their respective texts of it, and both were evolving in an atmosphere wherein many ideas and ideals were being nurtured." P. 29.

"The rise of Christianity is by far the most outstanding event of all in the period, and it was that religion that was to have the most direct bearing on the way the Samaritan religion was to evolve out of the Pentateuch. This book quotes many examples illustrating the process, leaving the reader in no doubt that Samaritanism is really Pentateuchal religion evolved along lines

influenced by Christianity. For one thing there is Chronicle II's actual mention of the four Gospels (with dates for three of them), all the Pauline Epistles (complete with dates) and no less than thirty-five uncanonical Gospels, most of which are known to NT scholars today, even though that knowledge is based in some instances on fragmentary and modern findings. The Samaritans knew about Christ and spoke of him without any hostility or malice whatsoever. They express neither approval nor disapproval, but merely comment that he did not stand in their way nor they in his. The Judaists, especially the Pharisees, are condemned for their action in having him crucified. In the descriptions of the Roman era the Pharisees, never the Sadducees or Hasidim, are regarded as enemies" (p. 32).

"Our final period is the period of Islam, a time when the Samaritans lived under Islamic aegis and spoke Arabic (at least from about the eleventh century). No longer was Aramaic the first language. In the fourteenth century there was a great revival in Hebrew composition and all writings from this time are either in Hebrew (mainly for liturgical purposes) or in Arabic. In that century eastern and western Samaritanism met, when several small emigrations from Damascus to Nablus took place. As will be indicated later at various points, it is from the literature of that century that direct and obvious dependence on Christian traditions and teachings becomes visible, and it is more than likely that Christian concepts were for the first time accepted overtly into Samaritan belief, in each case the new tradition or teaching being traced by exegetical skill back to a Pentateuchal warrant, at least in germ" (p. 37).

"The affinities of the Epistle to the Hebrews with the Samaritan teachings are in some respects so close that it is not an irresponsible act to suggest that the Epistle was written to Samaritan Christians. Was not Jesus' first success *in a community* in Samaria? Were not the Samaritans the only Palestinian community with a living priesthood?" p. 421.

Some parts of the Pauline Epistles seem to have provided ideas that the Samaritans could use, but, of course, both St Paul's teachings and Markah's show Gnostic-type affinities, and they may both have inherited the same ideological background to some extent. In all this we must recall our earlier assertion that the Samaritans, consciously or unconsciously, used Christian material only where there could be found a biblical base for it" (p. 421).

On pp. 421-446 Macdonald lists comparisons between Samaritan teaching on Moses and NT teaching on Christ. Striking!

Millard, Alan R. "Sennacherib's Attack on Hezekiah." Tyndale Bulletin 36 (1985): 61-77.

He responds to R. E. Clements' monograph "Isaiah and the Deliverance of Judah" JSOT Supplement Series 13. Sheffield: Dept of Biblical Studies, 1980) who argues that the divine intervention of Isaiah/Kings is a later theological interpolation.

Crown, Alan D. ed. *The Samaritans*. Tübingen, 1989.

This is a large compendium of articles (865 pages) on practically every facet of Samaritanism.

Yamauchi, Edwin M. *Africa and the Bible*. Baker, 2004.

Identifies the Ethiopian Eunuch with Meroe and Napata not Abyssinia. Pp. 161-181. He also deals with Afrocentric interpretation on pp. 205-220.

Whybray, R. N. *The Making of the Pentateuch: A Methodological Study*. Sheffield: Univ. of Sheffield, 1987. JSOT Supplement 53.

“1. Many different explanations could be given of the process by which the Pentateuch attained its present form. The Documentary Hypothesis in its classical form is a particular and elaborate example of one main type of literary theory, which has predominated for many years. It relies on a complexity of converging arguments, each of which needs examination.

“2. Its supporters claimed that it accounted for almost all the material in the Pentateuch. But in practice Wellhausen himself admitted that certain sections—notably law-codes—could not be satisfactorily accommodated within it. It was also universally admitted that the distinction between the earliest documents, J and E, was frequently blurred.

“3. The hypothesis was unduly dependent on a particular view of the history of the religion of Israel. [evolutionary]

“4. The authors of the documents are credited with a consistency in the avoidance of repetitions and contradictions which is unparalleled in ancient literature (and even in modern fiction), and which ignores the possibility of the deliberate use of such features for aesthetic and literary purposes. At the same time, the documentary critics were themselves frequently inconsistent in that they ignored such features *within* the documents which they had reconstructed.

“5. No allowance was made for the possibility that repetitions, doublets and inconsistencies might have already been present in the oral stage of the transmission of the material used by the authors of the written text.

“6. The breaking up of narratives into separate documents by a ‘scissors and paste’ method not only lacks true analogies in the ancient literary world, but also often destroys the literary and aesthetic qualities of these narratives, which are themselves important data which ought not to be ignored.

“7. Too much reliance was placed, in view of our relative ignorance of the history of the Hebrew language, on differences of language and style.

“8. The hypothesis depends on the occurrence of ‘constants’, i.e. the presence *throughout* each of the documents of a single style, purpose and point of view or theology, and of an unbroken narrative thread. These constants are not to be found.

“9. The fact that the authors of the pre-exilic literature of the Old Testament outside the Pentateuch appear to have known virtually nothing of the patriarchal and Mosaic traditions of the Pentateuch raises serious doubts about the existence of an early J or E.

“10. Subsequent modifications of the Documentary Hypothesis have not increased its plausibility. The postulation of additional documents, which are of limited scope, marks the breakdown of an hypothesis which is essentially one of *continuous* documents running through the Pentateuch. Attempts to make the hypothesis more flexible by speaking rather vaguely of ‘strata’ and the like rather than of documents are essentially denials of a purely literary hypothesis.

“11. The Supplement and Fragment Hypotheses have suffered neglect for many years, but have recently been revived in new forms and need to be reassessed. (pp. 129-131).

Tradition History (Gunkel) is an attempt to get behind the written documents (already hypothetical) and develop an understanding of their development as oral history. P. 138.

“Gunkel took for granted the validity of the Documentary Hypothesis, according to which the Pentateuchal traditions were first committed to writing in the ninth or eighth century BC. Later scholars have revised this date: von Rad placed the Yahwist in the tenth century—the period of David and Solomon—and Noth argued for the existence of a single continuous narrative source (‘G’) which may have been already committed to writing earlier still, in the period which preceded the establishment of a national state under Saul and David. All these scholars took it for granted, however, that the earliest written records of the traditions had been preceded by a lengthy period during which the individual narratives were created, transmitted and developed without the aid of writing (p. 139).

“As is well known, writing was invented and was widely used by the civilized peoples of the ancient Near East well before Israel appeared on the scene. However, it was long believed by Old Testament scholars that at least until their settlement in Palestine the ancestors of the historical Israel were nomadic tribes living apart from the centres of culture and having little contact with them. Consequently it was believed to be out of the question that they could have been acquainted with the art of writing (pp. 139-140).

“However, more recent research has shown that the nomadic theory of Israelite origins does not present an accurate picture of actual social conditions in the ancient Near East. Although there is the present time no consensus of opinion about the precise nature of Israelite and proto-Israelite society, it is now known that in the ancient Near East generally the kind of social dichotomy once assumed to have existed between urban and agricultural communities on the one hand and pastoral tribes on the other is a misconception based on a false analog with modern Middle Eastern nomadism, which is a comparatively recent phenomenon” (p. 140).

The fact of Canaanite and Phoenician writing from an early period (Ugaritic tablets (14th c), Wen-Amun (11th c.), Proto-Semitic inscriptions argue against the “no-writing” hypothesis. It does not prove that the early forms of the narratives were written, but allow for it (pp. 140-41).

Whybray then takes apart all the work done by the Tradition history people (pp. 185-219).

“The Pentateuch, then, it may be suggested, is an outstanding but characteristic example of the work of an ancient historian: a history of the origins of the people of Israel, prefaced by an account of the origins of the world. The author may have intended it as a supplement (i.e. a prologue) to the work of the Deuteronomistic Historian, which dealt with the more recent period of the national history. He had at his disposal a mass of material, most of which may have been of quite recent origin and had not necessarily formed part of any ancient Israelite tradition. Following the canons of the historiography of his time, he radically reworked this material, probably with substantial additions of his own invention, making no attempt to produce a smooth narrative free from inconsistencies, contradictions and unevennesses. Judged by the standards of ancient historiography, his work stands out as a literary masterpiece” p. 242).

Whybray indicates *passim* that later theories contradict older theories. E.g., D originally had no part whatsoever in the composition of the other four books. Now people see Deuteronomistic history in several places. Once priestly stuff had to be late, now it has to be early, etc. All this should cause us to treat with great suspicion any theory of the origin of the Pentateuch (except the one the Scriptures themselves present).

Grabbe, Lester L. ed. "Like a Bird in a Cage" the Invasion of Sennacherib in 701 BCE. JSOT Sup 363; European Seminar in Historical Methodology: 4. Sheffield: Academic Press 2003.

Argues that Jerusalem was not besieged but a series of forts were built around it. Argues that "shut up like a bird in a cage" means contained and limited. Argues that the biblical account is more prophetic propaganda (my words) than true. Follows the Assyrian account completely. Argues that the mention of Tarhaqa is anachronistic (contra Kitchen in Third Intermediate Kingdom).

Gallagher, William R. *Sennacherib's Campaign to Judah.* Leiden: Brill, 1999. He takes issue with Mayer on the tribute coming to Assyria after the fact and also argues for limited success by Sennacherib (contra Mayer). Does not believe Kitchen's argument is conclusive. Postulates that a later writer inserted his name since he knew that Tarhaqa was involved with Assyria in the latter years of S's reign. Pp. 221.222. Gallagher generally defends the biblical text.

Israelite and Judaeon History, Old Testament Library. Edited by John H. Hayes and J. Maxwell Miller. London: SCM Press, 1977.

This book is out of date (1977) but has a good survey approach to all the issues. Thompson does the section on Moses and Joseph (a good indication of the tenor of the book). Still worth referring to. Soggin on Davidic-Solomonic Kingdom is helpful (pp. 343-380).

Donnor argues that the Omiride purchase of Samaria was a Canaanite purchase (not according to the law of Yahweh). Further the temple built was to Baal not Yahweh. He concludes that the Omrides were therefore ruling from a Canaanite city in Samaria with Canaanite rules and religion and an Israelite rule in Jezreel with Yahweh as the God (p. 403).

Argues that the Azryau of Yaudi is not Azariah. Says "Recently, Na'aman [Nadav Na'aman. "Sennacherib's 'Letter to God' on His Campaign to Judah," BASOR CCXIV (1974) 25-39] has shown conclusively that the fragment presumably mentioning Azriau king of Yaudi actually belongs to the time of Sennacherib and refers not to Azariah but to Hezekiah. In Tiglath-pileser's annals there are two references to an Azariah (in line 123 as Az-ri-a-[u] and in line 131 as Az-r-ja-a-í) but neither of these make any reference to his country. Thus the Azriau of Tiglath-pileser's annals and Azariah of the Bible should be regarded as two different individuals. Azriau's country cannot, at the present, be determined." Na'aman separates the country (Yaudi) from the name Azriau (p. 36). Also p. 28 on line 5 where the original transcription was "[I]zri-ja-u mat Ja-u-di" he reads "*ina birit misrija u mat Jaudi*" This removes Azariah from the picture entirely.

Napier, B. D. "The Omrides of Jezreel." VT IX (1959) 366-378.

Argues for several glosses since there seems to be confusion between Samaria and Jezreel. Also says "palace of Ahab" in archaeology may belong to Jeroboam II (G.E. Wright *Biblical Archaeology*, Westminster Press, 1957, pp. 151 ff. "The extant narratives on the Omri dynasty, critically examined, strongly suggest that, as a place of royal residence, Jezreel was as important as Samaria, if not more so. The Deuteronomic formula of course includes Samaria, not Jezreel, as the place of the king's reign. That we should expect: under Omri, Ahab, Ahaziah and Joram it was the capital city and presumably grew steadily in importance; and after Jehu's ruthless purge of Jezreel (2 Kings x 11), Samaria was not only the capital but probably the year-round home of Israel's royal family" (p. 378).

The Blackwell Companion to the Hebrew Bible. Ed. Leo G. Perdue. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2001.

Jobling, David, "Methods of Modern Literary Criticism (pp. 19-35). Surveys the literary approach to the interpretation of the Bible.

Carroll, Robert P., "Exile, Restoration, and Colony: Judah in the Persian Empire" (pp. 102-116). Argues that there were many exiles and to choose only one is to promote a propaganda for a particular group of people. "As Jacob Neusner has expressed it: 'The paradigm of exile and return contains all Judaisms over all times, to the present' (Neusner, 1997, "Exile and Return as the History of Judaism," in J. Scott, ed., *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*, SJSJ 56 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997), 221-37)." This article may be helpful in my discussion of the numbers of the exile vis-à-vis the people who remained in the land.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph, "The Household in Ancient Israel & Early Judaism" (pp. 169-185). Survey of the issue of family, etc., based on limited information found in the biblical texts.

Provan, Iain, V. Philips Long, Tremper Longman III. *A Biblical History of Israel*. Louisville: John Knox Press. 2003.

The first 100 pages deals with the issue of the "death of biblical history." He responds to the minimalist arguments, beginning with K. W. Whitelam, *The Invention of Ancient Israel: The Silencing of Palestinian History* (London: Routledge, 1996). Whitelam denies any historicity for the Davidic era. Provan, et al. argue that the groundwork was laid for this extreme position by earlier writers such a Soggin who argued arbitrarily that the biblical statements regarding pre-Davidic issues were not to be accepted but Davidic statements were to be accepted. Whitelam, Provan, et al., is only taking Soggin's argument to a logical conclusion. He then takes on Hayes and Miller, *Israelite and Judean History* (London: SCM Press, 1977) with the same results: "We (and Whitelam) are entitled to ask why [they can use the Bible for Solomonic reconstruction but not for the Pentateuchal history]. Is the fact that the Bible is the only source of information we possess a sufficient ground for using it? If so in the case of Solomon, why not also in the case of Abraham? Conversely, if we can say nothing about Abraham, should we say anything about Solomon? Whitelam thinks not; indeed a very short step takes one from Miller and Hayes's 'A cautious historian might be inclined to ignore . . .' to the suggestion that the responsible historian *ought* to ignore the biblical text, because it presents an imagined past rather than a real one" (p. 18).

After tracing the history of the concept of biblical history and showing the early movement toward a "scientific" approach that denigrates tradition and argues that it must get behind the tradition, he says, "The ultimately unconvincing nature of the arguments for such a partial use of biblical tradition have led directly from de Wette to Whitelam. The search for firm ground, as Whitelam correctly points out, has failed. The history of the history of Israel from the nineteenth century until the present is in fact largely—and not just in the case of Soggin and Miller and Hayes—a history of indefensible starting points and not entirely coherent arguments. Judged in terms of the criteria that have driven the enterprise or at least heavily influence it, it stands condemned" (p. 25).

In his brief history of biblical historiography and the history of the history of Israel (pp. 18-32) he shows how the Cartesian need to test everything empirically, led to a down grading of the traditions of the Bible. Even so the earlier histories arbitrarily chose a point that they believed could be treated as history (e.g., M. Noth on the Amphictyony or tribal structure which he chose

because of its historical existence in Greece). Provan argues that they were inconsistent in following out their presuppositions to their logical conclusions. Even Davies argues for the historicity of the post-exilic documents because there is to a degree non-biblical verification of the events. Yet when someone does the same thing for other parts of the tradition he accuses him of producing a “sanitized” version and not doing “proper history.”

“General agreement exists that, for critical scholarship, suspicion of tradition should be the starting point; that tradition cannot be given the benefit of the doubt where history is concerned. Yet, having adopted this principled stance of suspicion towards the tradition, no one can agree with the other as to where suspicion should then be suspended and faith in the tradition reinvested. The stance is adopted in the first instance in the name of critical inquiry; yet critical inquiry itself raises questions about whether the suspension of suspicion that characteristically has followed shortly after its initiation has any rationally defensible grounds” (p. 32).

“Examples of this kind of discourse [denouncing a previous scholar as naïve or biased] abound in histories of Israel that covet the label ‘critical.’ The entire modern history of the history of Israel can, in fact, be characterized as one in which scholars seeking to qualify as critics—as members of what has been called ‘the post-Enlightenment club of historical scholarship’—have applied ‘scientific’ methodology partially to the subject matter at hand, hoping to demonstrate in their jettisoning of this or that aspect of the tradition that they are worthy of inclusion. Denouncing others in a given group for not being true believers has always been an effective way of suggesting one’s own commitment to the cause. Like the decisive moves that lie behind modern historiography itself, this tactic can be traced back at least as far as the French Revolution. As those who live by denunciation tend also to die by it, however, so scholars who have won their critical spurs in this way have in due course found themselves accused by still others of not being sufficiently critical—of naïveté (or worse still, devotion) in respect of some aspects of the tradition. For one could always say that their arguments against the traditional material they chose *not* to use in composing their history applied equally to the material they *did* utilize, and thus, one could always claim that factors other than criticism were exercising undue influence upon them. Thus, by degrees, dependence on tradition has been purged from the collective, not so much through argument as through intellectual intimidation. Scholars have been denounced as naïve, or even as fundamentalist, not because they depend on the tradition *in the face of* other evidence, but simply because they depend on parts of the tradition disliked by the denouncer. Coherent argument vanishes in the process; all that remains is ideological warfare” (p. 33).

He says the following questions must be addressed in establishing a historiography for the Bible:

1) Which conclusions may truly be drawn from the fact that our biblical traditions are artistically constructed and ideologically shaped entities that are perhaps distanced in time from the past they apparently seek to describe?

2) What in reality is the role that extrabiblical data, including archaeological data, can or should have in the reconstruction of the history of Israel?

3) How should the relationship between biblical and extrabiblical testimony be regarded?

What role does or should the ideology of the historian play in such reconstruction, and what should be the relationship between ideology and evidence?

4) Is historiography a science or an art? (p. 34).

“History, it turns out, is indeed, *fundamentally*, ‘the believing of someone else when that person says that he remembers something’; or to put it more accurately, history is the openness to acceptance of accounts from the past that enshrine such people’s memories” (p. 46).

He argues that archaeology deals with artifacts that are silent. They must be interpreted within the framework of narrative.

His discussion on p. 49 regarding witnesses is helpful. The Rankean approach is that eye-witnesses are more valuable than texts produced after the event. He points out the problem with eyewitnesses: they can be biased, selective, and ideological in what they report. Whereas a later text may do a better job of sorting out the events and presenting them objectively. Thus “primary sources” are not necessarily better than “secondary sources.”

P. 54 One of the reasons for doubts about OT history is the lack of external verification. He then quotes both Miller/Hayes and Soggin to that effect. Both these works are considered watershed works in “part precisely because they apply the verification principle to the extent that they do.” “Thus it is made to seem inevitable that any truly critical scholar will adopt a principled suspicion of the whole Old Testament in respect of historical work; conversely, those historians who partially or generally adopt the biblical story line in writing their histories of Israel are, to the extent that they do this, religiously motivated obscurantists rather than critical scholars.”

“Our view, on the other hand, is that this headlong rush to skepticism is a result not of being more purely critical, but rather of being insufficiently critical. Criticism is indeed widely employed, but not in respect of the sacred cow at the heart of the matter: the verification principle itself. Why should verification be a prerequisite for our acceptance of a tradition as valuable in respect of historical reality? Why should not ancient historical texts rather be given the benefit of the doubt in regard to their statements about the past unless good reasons exist to consider them unreliable I these statements and with due regard (of course) to their literary and ideological features? In short, why should we adopt a verification rather than a falsification principle? Why should the onus be on the texts to ‘prove’ themselves valuable in respect of history, rather than on those who question their value to ‘prove’ them false? It cannot be, as many seem to assume, that verification is necessary because of the merely general *possibility* that any given biblical text is not in fact reliable as historiography. We must grant the possibility in any given case, but the individual case still must be examined in order to come to an individual decision about it. How the general possibility leads on logically to the methodological stance just described is not clear” (p. 55).

Three rules many follow: 1) Eyewitness or otherwise contemporaneous accounts are to be preferred on principle to later accounts, 2) Accounts that are not so ideological or not ideological at all in nature are to be preferred to accounts that are, 3) accounts the fit our preconceptions about what is normal, possible, and so on, are to be preferred to accounts that do not fit such preconceptions (pp.56-57). These rules have been followed for a long time, but the difference today is that they are applied more extensively than they used to be.

“The function of holy places, and specifically temples, as repositories of texts is well attested throughout the ancient world. The Egyptians used holy places in this way as early as the third millennium B.C., for example, as the Greeks and Romans did in later times. The Old Testament itself reflects such practice when it describes, for example, the laying up of the Ten Commandments in the Tabernacle (Exod. 40:16-33; Deut. 10:105); Josephus later tells us that a copy of the Jewish Law was taken away to Rome from the Jerusalem Temple in A.D. 70. Temple library resources like these, reflecting traditions stretching back for generations, enabled Berossus to write his *Babyloniaca* (280-270 B.C.), which sought to persuade his Greek masters of the venerable age and achievements of the Mesopotamian peoples, and enabled Manetho to write his *Aegyptiaca* (c. 280 B.C.), a history of ancient Egypt” (p. 59). [Does this have something to say about “official” texts of Scripture kept at the Jerusalem vis-à-vis Qumran?]

“We conclude this section, then, by asserting again that any facile and general distinction between earlier and later testimony in terms of the reliability of the testimony cannot be defended. The contention is false that testimony about Israel’s past which comes towards or at the end of a chain of testimony is in principle more suspect than that which comes at or towards the beginning of the chain. There is no reason to assume that a particular rendering of earlier tradition at a later date cannot be a truthful rendering, any more than there is reason to assume that an early rendering cannot be false. That any modern historian should argue otherwise is perhaps surprising, since many modern historians have typically wished to argue that *their* very late renderings of earlier tradition are truthful—and indeed, more truthful than earlier attempts. Presumably because these historians have typically regarded their contributions as ‘scientific truth’ rather than as fresh renderings of tradition, this inconsistency has not occurred to them. Be that as it may, we possess no ‘rule’ or ‘method’ with regard to the chronology of testimony that can truly help us in deciding, in advance, in which testimonies about the past to invest our faith. Each testimony, including all biblical testimony, must be considered on its own terms” (pp. 61-62).

P. 64: Archaeological data must be read ideologically. They are interpreted in light of one’s prejudices and theories. Likewise the extra biblical texts (particularly Assyrian) which are usually taken as objective, are as ideological as any other.

“In summary of the whole section thus far: there is no account of the past anywhere that is not ideological in nature, and therefore in principle to be trusted more than other accounts” (p. 68).

“Our final claim in respect of the ‘rules’ of scientific historiography is this: that there is no good reason to believe that just because a testimony fails to violate our sense of what is normal and possible, it is on this account more likely to be true than another; and there is no good reason to believe, either, that an account which describes the unique or unusual is for that reason to be suspected of unreliability” (p. 70).

He argues that historians must read the biblical texts with literary sensitivity so as to understand how to interpret them. He concludes the first major section with the example of Solomonic history and the wrong way that Miller and Hayes evaluates the Kings passage and the parallels in Chronicles (pp. 88-97).

Voltaire: “If you have nothing to tell us other than that one Barbarian succeeded another Barbarian on the banks of Oxus or Iaxartes, of what use are you to the public?” (p. 104)

A puzzling feature of the biblical account is the numbers used in reference to the Israelites who left Egypt in the exodus. Numbers 1:46 calculates the total number of fighting men at 603,550; and on the assumption that many of these men would have had wives and children, this implies that approximately 2 million people were involved in the exodus and wilderness wanderings. Many have questioned the logistics of such a massive movement through the wilderness; some indications within the text itself are that the number is far too high. In a recent article, C. J. Humphreys has pointed out that the number 603,550 understood as a literal number of warriors, is in fact inconsistent with other numbers in the text, most blatantly Numbers 3:46, which suggests that there were ‘273 firstborn Israelites who exceed the number of the Levites.’ Humphreys works with that number in its context and shows that it points to a much smaller number for the total population, something like 5,000 males and a total population of 20,000. He then reminds the reader of the established fact that the Hebrew word *‘elep* (‘thousand’) which is used in Numbers 1 has other possible meanings in this context, like ‘leader’ or ‘troop.’ Space does not permit a full presentation of this view, and it may not in the final analysis be correct, but this approach serves to point out that alternative understandings of the census accounts can exist

rather than the one that posits a total population of 2 million Israelites. Numbers in biblical narrative frequently have purposes other than merely to communicate literal fact” (pp. 130-31).

“C. J. Humphreys, ‘The Number of People in the Exodus from Egypt: Decoding Mathematically the Very Large Numbers in Numbers 1 and 26,’ *VT* 48 (1998): 196-213. Criticisms may be found in J. Milgrom, ‘On Decoding Very Large Numbers,’ *VT* 49 (1999): 131-32; and R. Heinzerling, ‘On the Interpretation of the Census Lists by C. J. Humphreys and G. E. Mendenhall,’ *VT* 50 (2000): 250-52; and Humphrey’s response in ‘The Numbers in the Exodus from Egypt: A Further Appraisal,’ *VT* 50 (2000):322-28. The debate continues at the time of writing” (p. 333). Also M. McEntire, “A Response to Colin J. Humphreys’s ‘The Number of People in the Exodus from Egypt: Decoding Mathematically the Very Large Numbers in Numbers 1 and XXVI’” *VT* 49 (1999): 262-64.

I read 150 pages of Provan, et al.’s book to see how he applied his philosophy to methodologically to the Bible history. I’m pleased with what I see. This book should replace Bright in schools that are more conservative and I believe they are more conservative than Bright.

Dever, William G. *What did the Biblical writers know and when did they know it?: What archaeology can tell us about the reality of Ancient Israel.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2001

Dever gives his testimony in his introduction. He was raised in a “fundamentalist” environment. His father was a preacher (would not use the word clergyman). Dever went to a small Christian Liberal Arts College in the south but then went to a liberal seminary and finally to doctoral studies under G. Ernest Wright at Harvard. In the process, he moved away from his conservative background and finally converted to Judaism (in the formal sense—he is not a theist). Pp. ix-x.

“It is at this point that I think we can comprehend the revisionist agenda in biblical studies. It is, I suggest, thinly-disguised postmodernism, in this case specifically deconstruction. If the reader thinks this proposal too far-fetched, or too severe an indictment, consider the following, which are the main points that the revisionists themselves have set forth—what I would call the manifesto of a movement that self-consciously portrays itself as revolutionary.

- 1) All the texts of the Hebrew Bible in its present form date to the Hellenistic era (as late as the 2nd-1st century). . . .
- 2) Interpretation of the biblical texts should be ‘liberated from historical consideration.’ It should proceed strictly on the basis of literary analysis of the Bible’s ‘stories,’ which reveal mainly the ‘self-perception’ of the narrators.
- 3) This radically ‘anti-historic movement’ in the study of ancient Israelite ‘history’ has at last brought us such ‘new knowledge’ that it makes all other approaches obsolete, indeed illegitimate. Those who persist in traditional approaches may be dismissed as either servants of the religious Establishment, or simply crypto-Fundamentalists.
- 4) Attempts to write any more histories of ‘Israel’ should be abandoned. Instead, we should be writing ‘Palestinian history,’ which American and Israeli Biblicists and

archaeologists have conspired to ‘suppress’ because of their biblical and nationalistic biases” (pp. 26-27).

He says that Finkelstein in his earlier work on the survey of the Manasseh area talked about an ethnic Israel. Dever challenged him on this (in spite of the Merenptah stela) as did the revisionists. Some years later Finkelstein has changed his position completely. Dever wants to know why, since there has been no additional archaeological data. He fears it is because Finkelstein tends to be iconoclastic and politically correct (p. 42).

“The central proposition of this book is very simple. While the Hebrew Bible in its present, heavily edited form cannot be taken at face value as history in the modern sense, it nevertheless *contains* much history. Obviously most such ‘facts of history’ lie embedded in many kinds of quasi-historical narratives, where the overriding theological framework of the writers and editors of the Hebrew Bible will tend to obscure them to all but the most critical and discerning eye. The historian must patiently dig out these nuggets of truth, a task that should never be underestimated but in my judgment is possible. That is the exact opposite of the approach of the ‘revisionists,’ who as we have seen declare that ‘the Hebrew Bible is not about history at all,’ i.e., it is mere propaganda. For them, if *some* of the Bible’s stories are unhistorical, they *all* are—a rather simplistic notion” (p. 97).

“Extensive surface surveys of the Israeli-occupied West Bank carried out by several teams of Israeli archaeologists, together with excavation in depth at a few sites, have revealed that in the heartland of ancient Israel about 300 small agricultural villages were founded *de novo* in the late 13th-12th centuries. They are quite small, a few acres at most, often situated on hilltops adjacent to arable land and good springs, almost always unwallled and without defenses of any kind. These villages are located principally in the central hill country, stretching all the way from the hills of lower Galilee as far south as the northern Negev around Beersheba. None are founded on the ruins of a destroyed Late Bronze Age site; indeed, the sites chosen for occupation in early Iron I are nearly all in areas conspicuously devoid of Canaanite urban centers. They are situated on the marginal hill-country frontier that had previously been only sparsely occupied. The dispersed pattern of settlement and the overwhelming predominance of small villages point to a distinctive nonurban society and economy, undoubtedly agrarian. Population estimates, based on well-developed ethnographic parallels and site size, indicate a central hill-country population of only about 12 thousand at the end of the Late Bronze Age (13th century), which then grew rapidly to about 55 thousand by the 12th century, then to about 75 thousand by the 11th century. [80K and 100K by mid-late 10th century on p. 87] Such a dramatic ‘population explosion’ simply cannot be accounted for by natural increase alone, much less by positing small groups of pastoral nomads settling down. Large numbers of people migrated here from somewhere else, strongly motivated to colonize an underpopulated fringe area of urban Canaan, now in decline at the end of the Late Bronze Age” (p 110).

“On the other hand, a number of American archaeologists of conservative religious background, who undertook archaeological research no doubt hoping to be able to defend ‘invasion theories’ like those of the book of Joshua, must have found the overwhelming evidence of the ‘indigenous origins’ of most early Israelites hard to accept. But one and all they did so. As Joseph A. Callaway of Southern Baptist Theological Seminary concluded, henceforth it is the archaeological evidence, not the textual, that will be decisive in understanding Israelite origins. [“Response,” in *Biblical Archaeology Today: Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology*, Jerusalem, April, 1989, ed. J. Amitai (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1985), 72-78.]” (p. 120).

Beginning with chapter 4 (p. 97) he discusses areas of “convergences” of the text and archaeology. This is excellent material. He shows that a new group appears in the hill country, their pottery, house styles, etc., are new and not Canaanite. Above all there are few to none pig bones. Later he deals with the gate entrances of Hazor, Megiddo, and Gezer which he dates to Solomon’s time (by pottery). Then the Merenptah stela, the Sheshonq list, and Solomon’s administrative districts. He argues that there is ample proof in surrounding cultures for the temple of Solomon.

He discusses cult places and folk religion (174-94) as though he was giving the paganism from a biblical point of view its rightful place. The fact that folk religion can carry on side by side with orthodox religion does not make it right—only practiced. Note the Cult of Priapus carried on under the name of St. Cosmio in “folk-Catholicism” elsewhere in this bibliography.

Ostraca and landed owners paying taxes (Amos) on p. 210.

“One isolated ostrakon deserves special mention here. It was found in Itzhaq Bet-Arieh in his 1982-88 excavations at Horvat `Uza in the eastern Negev desert. Dating to the 7th century, it is written in Hebrew but also contains a list of Egyptian hieratic signs for numbers. Many of these same Egyptian hieratic numerals are found in other 8th-7th Hebrew inscriptions, even on sheqel-weights (below), indicating that for some reason an Egyptian system of numerals was preferred and used throughout Israel and Judah. Nadav Na’aman has recently suggested that this system must have been adopted from Egypt by the 10th century; it cannot have been borrowed from Israel’s Semitic neighbors, since none used it. And it is conspicuously unattested in Egypt itself in the 8th-7th centuries, so it must derive from an earlier time. Finally, the Egyptian system is used in both the northern and the southern kingdoms. Thus Na’aman concludes: ‘These hieratic signs must have entered the Hebrew script before the division of the monarchy—namely in the tenth century B.C.E.’” (p. 213).

Yavneh Yam Ostraca mentioning the taking of a cloak (begged) cf Amos 2:8.

Jehoiakim’s palace (Jeremiah 22) and the palace at Ramat Rahel (pp. 241-43).

McConville, J. G. *Grace in the end: a study in Deuteronomistic theology*, Studies in Old Testament biblical theology. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1993.

Good popular discussion of deuteronomism. On p. 109-10, he discusses Judges 18:30 where the captivity spoken of is usually identified with the Assyrian deportation in 721 B.C. This would make that the *terminus a quo* for this section. However, he argues that it refers to the Philistine invasion and destruction of Shiloh in the days of Samuel.

Kitchen, Kenneth, “A Possible Mention of David in the Late Tenth Century BCE, and Deity *DOD as Dead as the Dodo?” JSOT 76 (1997) 29-44.

Strong definitive statement that bytdwd refers to Judean kingdom. Also argues for btdwd in the Mesha inscription as the same and a possible reference to the “heights of David” in the Sheshonq inscription. The problem with the latter is that it has dwt rather than dwd. This shift in Egyptian from a soft “d” to a “t” says Kitchen is not unusual. Furthermore he points out a 5th c A.D. Ethiopian inscription in South Arabia with just such a shift. The emperor is referring to a Psalm of David and vocalizes the latter as dwt. He then argues strongly that any reference to a “Dod” deity be laid to rest. There is no evidence any place of such a deity.

Whitelam, Keith W. *The invention of Ancient Israel: The silencing of Palestinian history*. London: Routledge, 1996.

At this point I have only read the introduction, but his goals and evaluation reflect a post-modern rejection of any revelation, and a willingness to dismiss Israel's place in history (let alone God's program). I view this as part of the growing stream of anti-Semitism. Palestinian history (history sans Israel) is an attempt to reconstruct a history of modern Palestinians. Hence, Whitelam has become an advocate of the ancient peoples who were ousted by Israel (at God's command) and the modern peoples (who are not descendants, after all, of the ancient Canaanites) in whose midst an Israeli state exists.

In chapter 1 he argues that the "history of Israel" has been shaped by the western world with the nation state as its ideal. He worries that his presentation will be dismissed as politically motivated, as part of the modern fad of deconstruction and revisionism in history, or as an outrageous attack upon the objectivity of biblical scholarship" (p. 23), but this is precisely what he is doing. He leans on Said and the idea that modern history has been written by white, western males who have ignored the history of the other peoples of the world.

He faults the biblical historians of the past century with failing to identify the people of "Palestine" as Palestinians (p. 44). But they were never referred to as such historically. They were referred to as Canaanites. In the same way, he faults Hayes and Miller for referring to things physical and to even naming the various inhabitants (Amorites, retenu, etc), they do not name the people as Palestinian. This it seems to me reveals his political interest: he wants the modern Palestinians to have a history in the land as large and ancient as the Jews. The very thing he accuses biblical historians of doing, he is doing.

Van Dam, Cornelis. *The Urim and the Thummim: A means of revelation in ancient Israel*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1997.

Kofoed, Jens Bruun, . *Text and history: historiography and the study of the biblical text*. Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns, 2005.

I have not read this book, but he seems to be (from the introduction and a scan of a chapter) to be defending a more conservative approach to the text of the Bible than the Copenhagen/Sheffield school.

In search of pre-exilic Israel: proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series (JSOTS), 406. Edited by John Day. London: T & T Clark, 2004.

Boling, Robert and G. Ernest Wright. *Joshua Vol. 6 in Anchor Bible Commentary*, Garden City: Doubleday, 1982.

Wright in the introduction:

"Since the oldest manuscripts of Qumran (4QEx^f and 4QSam^b) of this type from the third century B.C. and a second-century copy of the canonical Psalms (4QPs^a) is easily distinguished from a contemporary collection of psalms (1QH)k we are forced to

conclude that a canon of Law, Prophets, and Writings must have existed at least as early as the fourth century B.C. In other words, we are forced back to the Persian Age for the major collections of the canonical literature, even though marginal books like Daniel, Esther, Ecclesiastes, and the Apocrypha were either not yet composed or agreement on their status was not yet attained” (p. 39).

“As for the listing of these books among the prophets, it is to be noted that as early as 900 B.C. the practice of extending the term ‘prophet’ to include every great leader of Israel’s past tradition was well fixed.” (p. 40).

“The etiological saga about the occupation of Ai (chap. 8) and of Gibeon and related cities (chap. 9) indicate that the Samarian middle of the country was also captured by the Israelite tribes” (p. 63).

Woudstra, M. H. *The Book of Joshua in The NICOT*, R. K. Harrison, gen. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.

“Although the Latter Prophets contain many promises concerning a return to the land after the period of punishment, the NT, while holding out some promise of ultimate restoration to the people of the ancient covenant (Rom. 11:25-26), does not combine this promise with a repossession of the land of the fathers” (p. 34).

“But what about the view of the Conquest as found in Joshua itself? Is it as optimistic and unrealistic as often alleged? On the one hand, a repeated emphasis is upon the fulfillment of God’s promises to the fathers and upon the complete subjugation of the land (11:23; 21:43-45). But the unfinished nature of the “Conquest also receives attention (cf. 13:13; 15:63; 16:10; 17:12-13; 23:4-5; cf. 23:9). Thus the picture drawn in Joshua is more composite than is sometimes acknowledged in critical discussion” (p. 10).

Thompson, *The Mythic Past*, p.57 (On Jonah)

Thompson, Thomas. *The Mythic Past, Biblical Archaeology and the Myth of Israel*

Two other prophets of II Kings, Jonah and Elijah, tell us much about the reception of this tradition within the world of Old Testament texts. Words such as irony and caricature are hardly foreign to discussion of the Book of Jonah, with its prophet playing the role of anti-prophet. . He is the only one of all the Bible’s prophets— beginning already with Moses and the murmuring traditions of Exodus — whose prophecies were listened to! This observation, given the central role that the concept of prophecy has in modern scholarship’s creation of ancient Israel, should lead to healthy self—criticism among scholars, if not deconstructive laughter.

In fact, this ironic understanding of prophecy is central to the tradition’s view of prophecy. Rather than playing the role of messengers of God’s word in Israel’s history, prophets have functioned as catalysts for old Israel’s faithlessness and betrayal. Prophets harden hearts. They provoke stories of Israel’s disobedience. They create rejection of the way of God’s torah. As Isaiah has already stressed, the prophets present the proof that Israel neither knows nor understands anything. This is the role that the that the Book of Jonah unfolds in its well-known spoof on II Kings’ prophet Jonah.

The Jonah of II Kings is the prophet who, as the servant of Yahweh, had instructed the king in Samaria, Jeroboam ben Joash, to save Israel by destroying its enemies. Following Jonah's instruction, Jeroboam brings Israel to greatness, expanding its boundaries to the Dead Sea and southward. Such a Jonah — this saviour of Israel — is the kind of prophet that the prophet in Jonah's book implicitly imagines himself to be. He wants to bring down destruction on all of God's and Israel's enemies. He wants to save Israel in its great need. This is a prophet unlike others. He is not disloyal and unpatriotic like Jeremiah, nor does he oppose the great king Jeroboam, nor anyone who 'walks in the way of Jeroboam'. He stands with, not against Israel. However, the irony of his fate is that he cannot be the Jonah of Kings. Hardly! This poor Jonah is ordered to bring Yahweh's word to Israel's enemies.

When this prophet receives the divine call to go to Nineveh to preach repentance, he runs; he wants none of it. 'Knowing that Yahweh was a gracious and merciful God, slow to anger and, overflowing with faithful love, and that he would repent of the evil' (Jonah 4: 2) that he intended against Nineveh, Jonah ran. Jonah at heart was a prophet like Elijah of the stories I Kings 17—19. Jonah would be a prophet of doom and wrath. He wants destruction and disaster on all of Yahweh's enemies: especially over great Nineveh. However, when Jonah is caught in the belly of the great fish, he can no longer resist God's importunities and submits to the divine will. This, after all, the story insists, is Yahweh, '*elohei shamayim*, 'the God of heaven', the 'creator of both heaven and earth'. Jonah preaches to Nineveh.

Just as Jonah had predicted, Nineveh to his horror listens to Jonah's preaching, and Yahweh repents the evil he had planned. Even the animals, fasting and covered in sackcloth and ashes, cry out to God.

PP. 70-71 Matthew's use of the David story to tell Jesus' story

One of the most striking examples of historical echoing is in the structuring of Matthew's story of Jesus on the Mount of Olives the night he is arrested (Matt. 26: 30—46). While Jesus is walking to the Mount Olives he talks to his friends of their coming betrayal and rejection of him. When they arrive, he asks Peter and John to pray with him, but they fall asleep. He is full of anxiety, abandoned by his friends, and prays that he might avoid his coming fate. Yet, in the end, he submits to the divine will: 'Not as I will, but as you will.' The story is told in a threefold repetition of this prayer, alternating with the motif of his disciples' carefree slumber. When the scene closes, Jesus announces that the 'son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners'.

Our model for Matthew's account is found in the story of David in II Samuel 15: 13—37. In that story, David's son Absalom has just been declared king in Hebron, causing civil war. The people go over to Absalom and David is isolated and has to flee Jerusalem. Only Ittai and the Gittites remain faithful to him, as David crosses the Kidron and goes out into the wilderness in preparation for new beginnings. David then goes to the Mount of Olives, crying the whole way, and everyone who goes with him bows their head and weeps, 'the whole country and all the people' (II Sam. 15: 23). It is here that we find the wellspring of the gospel story's pathos, in this first story of the Messiah's rejection. In mortal danger, David decides to entrust himself to what God wants and accepts his fate: 'so shall God do with me as he sees fit' (I Sam. 15: 26). David then goes up to the top of the Mount of Olives, 'where it is the custom to pray to God'. Luke's gospel picks this motif up in the line that opens his story: 'So he rose and went out to the Mount of Olives, as was the custom' (Luke 22: 39).

Although both Matthew's and Luke's gospels centre their scenes on Jesus' prayer and build them on David's commitment, confided to Zadok, whose cue—name marks the

‘righteousness’ of David’s prayer that he will follow God’s will rather than his own, the David story does not present this as David’s prayer. In fact, though David goes up the mountain to pray, the prayer itself is not given. This is provided by the interpretive setting given in the title of Psalm 3: ‘This is the psalm that David sang when he fled from his son Absalom.’ The song is remarkably appropriate to its dramatic task: ‘My enemies are many; many rise against me; many say: “God will not save him”’ (Psalm 3: 2—3). The psalmist’s David commits himself totally to Yahweh, who ‘answers him from his holy mountain’ (Psalm 3: 4). David prays to be saved from his enemies and Yahweh answers him from his holy mountain. With Yahweh’s support, David will not fear, for he knows that Yahweh destroys his enemies and crushes the ungodly. All salvation and all blessing come from Yahweh.

The interpretative technique that Matthew uses shares the perspective of the Psalter. Matthew 26:30 introduces the story of Jesus’ prayer in the garden of Gethsemane. ‘After they had sung a psalm, they went out to the Mount of Olives.’ ‘The reference to singing a psalm at first appears inconsequential, until one realizes that Matthew knows his Psalter well. Not only does he use the David story of II Samuel 15 for Jesus’ prayer, but he introduces his reiteration of this story with a cryptic reference to the singing of Psalm 3, the very same song that the titles in the Book of Psalms had placed in David’s mouth. Psalm 3: 6—7 makes this argument certain. ‘I lay down to sleep; I awake because the Lord has supported me.’ Matthew reiterates this verse as his audience’s voice of a new Israel, in a subtle contrast to the threefold episode of the faithless disciples who sleep but do not wake (Matt. 26: 38—46).

In II Samuel 16: 1—2, David passes the summit of the Mount of Olives is given an ass to ride as a symbol of his royalty. He is given food and wine for his return from the wilderness. This scene finds its echo in Matthew 21, when Jesus first goes from the Mount of Olives to be hailed People as king, like David. The scene offers a humble foreshadowing of the celebration of Jesus entering his kingdom on that other mountain Golgotha at the gospel’s close (Matt. 28). The theme of the David story in David’s acceptance of the fate that God wills him: ‘perhaps, God willing, Yahweh will hear his plea and give him happiness instead of this curse’ (II Sam. 16: 12). The Mount of Olives scene closes, but the story continues until chapter 18: 9 when the threat to David and to his kingdom is finally resolved. David’s son Absalom, who has also been anointed as king and God’s messiah, is killed, ‘hung fast on a tree’, a scene that will be echoed in the story of Jesus’ crucifixion. When David hears of Absalom’s fate pierced through the heart by Joab with three arrows (II Sam. 18: 14), the king weeps over his son’s death, and in chapter 19 David is brought home to Jerusalem to rule his kingdom. The shared interpretation of the David story by both Psalm 3 and Matthew’s story is glimpsed once again in the personal emotion both the Jesus story and the original David story captures. The use of Psalm 3’s first-person voice supports an identification between the reader and each text’s messiah (David or Jesus). This transference has pedagogical purpose. So, too, should the reader accept his tile. The story has positive implications. God brings all things to good. Even despair, betrayal and loneliness presage salvation. It becomes quite clear that the characters who play such roles have their primary purpose in dramatically illustrating virtue.

P. 86 On Adam and Eve

It begins in a scene, comic and ironic. The deity tells the person that the whole garden is at its disposal. Yet one small demand is made: do not eat any of the fruit from the ‘tree of knowledge of good and evil, because it will kill you!’ It is important to remember that the people in this story are not yet very bright. They still do not know they are naked. So they don’t recognize this strange idea — this tool of oppression — that knowledge is dangerous and can kill the one possessing it. One can, however, be sure that no audience will miss such an emphatic

echo of reality's world. It is only when the friendly talking snake enters the story that humanity's ignorant bliss is shattered. Unlike people, the snake understands. In fact, the snake is wiser than any other of God's creatures. When the woman tells him of the danger of the Tree of Wisdom, he takes what she tells him quite literally. He tells her that God knows this isn't true. The snake explains to her that in fact if she eats this fruit, she won't be killed. Her eyes, in fact, will be opened and she will become like God, having wisdom herself. A Tree of Wisdom is, after all, a tree of wisdom! And so the woman looks at the tree and sees it once again. She doesn't see the dangerous tree of the divine patron's warnings. It appears to her now as attractive. She sees it as good to eat in order to gain knowledge.

In this scene in which the woman and her husband take their fate in their own hands, the story stresses an implicit contrast and alienation between human understanding and divine wisdom, a perspective similar to Genesis 1. With the woman playing the everyman's role in the garden story, she takes the world as it seems good to her, from her own perspective. The garden story explores this human perspective as woman sees eating the forbidden fruit as good, because it will make her wise. When she reaches for the fruit to eat it, the story presents her as the philosopher seeking wisdom. She takes on the cloak of the philosopher king. She is Solomon of the Book of Ecclesiastes. He too gave his life to seek wisdom, only to find that he had been chasing the wind. Only in the Book of Ecclesiastes does a philosopher offer such self-criticism as our narrator of Genesis' tale does.

The literalist predictions of the snake now come true. The eyes of the woman and her husband are opened. They now possess wisdom and understanding. But what is that wisdom they now have? What is human knowledge and understanding? In answer, the story—teller offers us heavy-handed mockery. His summation of human wisdom is that great divine quality that distinguishes us from other animals — that, in the language the Bible, makes us a little less than angels. What is the wisdom? Nothing less than knowing we are naked! The irony doesn't stop there. As soon as they find out that they are naked, they busy themselves making skirts of - leaves to hide all that they have learned! As it does to us, knowledge makes the couple afraid: they become afraid of their nakedness and hide when Yahweh walks through the garden.

P. 104 If the Bible is not history, what is it?

The problem is not that the Bible is exaggerated or unrealistic, and it certainly not that the Bible is false. The writers of the Bible are surprisingly realistic and truthful. In their own terms — which are not terms of critical historical scholarship — they express themselves well about the world they knew. They are talking about a real world, and they write about it in ways we can often understand quite well. They write however with ideas, thoughts and images, metaphors and motifs, perspectives and goals, that are quite at a tangent to those of the present day. For the most part, it could be said that what modern historians and archaeologists are normally interested in has little to do with the Bible. The conflict surrounding the Bible and history — one that has played a considerable role in Western thought since Napoleon occupied Egypt at the end of the eighteenth century is essentially a false controversy. It has occurred only because our commitment to myths of origin as part of an historically base modern world has caused us to interpret the biblical perspective as historical, until faced with definitive proof to the contrary. We should not be trying to salvage our origin myths as history. That hides their meaning from us, and ignores the strong anti-intellectual strain of fundamentalism that underlies so many of the historical interests invested in biblical archaeology.

P. 109 No Semitic invasion into the Mesopotamian valley

They[Babylonians] had been followed, it was thought, by Amorites', who had supposedly migrated into the Fertile Crescent in successive raids from late in the third millennium until around 2000 BCE. These 'Amorites' were described as having established ruling dynasties in Babylon and Mari and in having conquered most of Syria. Their migration into Palestine was credited with destroying the Early Bronze civilization and creating a period which Palestine fell under the control of nomads.

Scholars used this image of marauding Amorites as plundering Bedouin as to make sense of the then unexplained political disruptions in Egypt during the First Intermediate (c. 2150—1990 BCE). Migrations of Amorites are credited with the development of the earliest Semitic languages of Syria and Palestine and the ancestors of Canaanite and Hebrew. This migration scenario was also used to explain the differences between Aramaic and Hebrew. New emigrations from Arabia were suggested, now in the second half of the second millennium BCE. This was used to explain the appearance of Aramaic: first in North Mesopotamia and then in the newly formed states of Aram, Ammon, Moab and Edom in eastern Palestine from about 1200 BCE.

PP. 111-12

That was the argument from the point of view of language classification. Closely tied to this theory was a revision of our understanding of the Semitic languages themselves. While Arabic seemed earlier because so much of its grammar had preserved antique forms, Akkadian — known from inscriptions dating to as early as the third millennium BCE — had in fact been the earliest Semitic language we had direct evidence of. Although the western branch of the Semitic languages, which represented languages spoken in Syria and Palestine, had been unknown before the second millennium BCE, texts from ancient Ebla in Syria were discovered in the 1970s. These showed that West Semitic had been the language spoken in the regions of Syria and Palestine in the third millennium BCE. Arabic, Akkadian and the West Semitic languages have a common vocabulary for words related to agriculture, horticulture, and sheep — and goat— herding. Such a vocabulary must have come from a period before Semitic divided among its many regionally distinct languages and dialects. The earliest speakers of that original Semitic language could hardly have been Arabia's Bedouin. They must have been both a sedentary and an agricultural people. As Mesopotamia had only a very short period of pre-Bronze Age settlement, Syria and Palestine became the most promising area for the earliest development of the Semitic language.

The close association of archaeology with linguistics brought strength to this direction of research by bringing a clear historical dimension to what had always been primarily a linguistic theory without a chronology. Semito-Hamitic (also known as Afro-Asiatic), and proto-Semitic were no longer merely theoretical models, they began to look like actual historical languages. Though we had no texts written in this language, we knew when it existed! Proto—Semitic was to be dated to the period before akkadian went its own way and took on its own character as a language. We know when that happened: when Semitic speakers first entered the Tigris and Euphrates valleys and joined with the Sumerians of South Mesopotamia in the course of the third millennium BCE. This merger of peoples created the first of the great 'Akkadian' cultures.

The different historical and archaeological understandings about the development of Semitic languages were satisfactorily brought together in early 1980s. The history of these developments is still schematic. Between 9000 and 7000 BCE, global sea levels were considerably higher than they are today. This supported an extended period of Neolithic prosperity in the South Levant, A warmer and wetter climate existed throughout the

Mediterranean region. Winters were longer and summer monsoon rains, rather than the summer droughts we have today, were typical. In Palestine, the area put under agriculture was greater than ever. extended in the east at least to the watershed of the Transjordanian plateau. In the south, it included the great plain of the Beersheva Basin and the northwestern slopes of the central Negev and North Sinai highlands.

In North Africa, the Sahara was not yet closed. The favourable climate supported agriculture and steppeland grazing across this now very inhospitable area. The Kordofan-Darfur region of the Sudan supported wide-ranging groups of transient goat-herders. Some have suggested this as the birthplace of the earliest speakers of Afro—Asiatic. If this is correct, the development must have come sometime before 6000 BCE. The Berber language, which today is found both south and north of the Sahara, must have entered the area of the Sahara before desert isolated North Africa from the Sudan. Alternatively, Afro—Asiatic may have developed within agricultural zones in the area of the Sahara itself, at some time before the spread of the desert had closed the Berber regions from Libya, and Libya from Chad.

Nine thousand years ago, the Great Sahara of North Africa did not exist. The region rather supported a village culture of farmers and shepherds. They left remains of their art, religion and culture from the mouth of the Nile in the east to Gibraltar in the west. It was from such Neolithic villages that there emerged the ancestors of the people whose changes in language developed the first Semitic speakers of Asia. Before North Africa became the great closed desert that it is today, Neolithic farmers were settled in small villages along the many valleys of this immense coastal region. They lived primarily from croppings of wheat and barley, supplemented by hunting and herding of pigs and beef cattle, sheep and goats. One must also assume that, as in Asia, groups of pastoralists lived in the steppelands that bordered the better-watered, agricultural zones of the 'green Sahara'.

PP. 130-31 No migration of Semites into Palestine

Until the mid-1970s, biblical and archaeological scholarship understood the transition between the Early Bronze and Middle Bronze periods in terms of the old theory of a migration of Semitic nomads from Arabia. Many linked this theory to cuneiform and Egyptian texts that referred *Amurru* and *Amu*. Historians had created a history of Amorite migrations and invasions that overwhelmed the Fertile Crescent from the Persian Gulf to the Egyptian Delta. These nomadic tribes were thought to have destroyed the Early Bronze cultures of both Mesopotamia and Palestine, to have created Egypt's First Intermediate and, after several centuries, to have led to the development of an Amorite dominance among the Mesopotamian states in Syria and Palestine. Biblical archaeology had linked this 'Amorite movement' to the tales of the biblical patriarchs especially to the stories of Abraham and Jacob. They read behind the stories a history of movements of peoples.

In doing this, they created a double created a double history of origins for early Israel: one as nomads from North Mesopotamia in the early second millennium and the other as semi-nomadic pastoralists at the end of the Bronze Age, around 1200 BCE. This 'history' depended on carefully selected biblical stories for its coherence. Abraham moved from Ur of southern Mesopotamia to Harran in the north. From there, he entered 'Canaan' with his family. Yet later, Jacob and his family went down to Egypt, there to become Israel and return to Palestine under Joshua. This story was thought to reflect a second invasion of Palestine by Israelites, who shared in a wider 'Aramaean' migration that created the peoples of the Transjordan.

This was neither really an historical synthesis nor an historical reconstruction on the basis of argument. It was an assertion of harmony and identity between selected biblical stories and archaeological data. It was the Bible's story, however, not the archaeological data that gave this history coherence and continuity. The collapse of this synthesis, which had placed an impossible demand on our evidence, was both sudden and definitive. With the acceptance of Afro-Asiatic as the ancestor of the Semitic languages, not only had the romantic picture of Arabian origins to be given up, but the successive migrations of 'Amorites' and 'Aramaeans' from Arabia's fertile womb evaporated. Old ideas of invasions had made it possible for historians to use hordes of nomads to wipe away earlier cultures and to start over with a new culture. In this way, they shifted from Early to Middle Bronze, and from the world of Late Bronze Canaanites to a new world of Iron Age Israelites. Without the Amorite and Aramaean invasions to explain these transitions, the continuities of culture became clearer. What differences there were — and they were not so great as the history books of the 1960s and 1970s led us to believe — they were far better explained as internal changes and developments of the economy.

p. 149 No Solomon or David.

The political system of patrons and clients fits the different regional economies typical of Palestine. This kind of politics and social organization stands in contrast to the great bureaucratic states of Egyptian and Assyrian imperial fame. It totally excludes a Palestine that could conquer Egypt. It also stands against historical ideas of a Solomonic empire. Historically, it is very difficult to speak of a Palestine during either the Bronze or Iron Ages. Palestine is a geographical idea that we have. It fits no historical reality. The stories of Solomon and David, and even the story of good king Josiah, must wait for a second-century John Hvrcaus before they can find an historical context that makes sense. Before the Hellenistic period, the political centres of southern Syria are many. Centralized governments are small, regionally bound, and economically competitive.

PP. 164-165 No Saul, David, or Solomon

The greatest expansion of settlement occurred in Judaea from about 900 to 700 BCE. An extension of Jerusalem's political influence to the south is not clearly supported either by excavations in Jerusalem or by the archaeological surveys of the Judean hills. Jerusalem's dominance over Judea is unlikely to have developed at any period earlier than the seventh century, and perhaps not before the middle of that century, when the population of Jerusalem explodes. Only after Lachish had been destroyed by the Assyrians in 701 does Jerusalem develop the political or economic structures and capacity of a city. Only then is the agriculture of the Shephelah oriented around new smaller towns, lying close to the Judean watershed and within easy access of a populous Jerusalem. The political development of Jerusalem lagged behind the consolidation of the central highlands further north. This conclusion cannot be avoided. Jerusalem is not known to have been occupied during the tenth century. The basis of power in Jerusalem, before the seventh century, was related to the city itself and to the Ayyalon valley, not to Judea. Jerusalem did not take on the role of capital for the regional state of Judah with control of the highlands, until after Lachish had been destroyed.

4 The slates of Israel and Judah: c. 1000—600 BCE

The earliest part of this period in the hill country has been traditionally presented as the 'Golden Age' of an ancient Israel with its capital in Jerusalem. The era has been associated with a 'United Monarchy' wielding the political power of a Saul, a David and a Solomon and controlling, huge land-bridge from the Nile to the Euphrates, as well as with the concept of a

temple built by Solomon as the centre of the worship of Yahweh. These images have no place in descriptions of the real historical past. We know them only as story, and what we know about such stories does not encourage us to treat them as if they were or were ever meant to be historical. There is no evidence of a United Monarchy, no evidence capital in Jerusalem or of any coherent, unified political force that dominated western Palestine, let alone an empire of the size the legends describe. We do not have evidence for the existence of kings named Saul, David or Solomon; nor do we have evidence for any temple at Jerusalem in this early period. What we do know of Israel and Judah of the century does not allow us to interpret this lack of evidence as a *gap* in our knowledge and information about the past, a result merely of the accidental nature of archaeology. There is neither room nor context, no artifact or archive that points to such historical realities in Palestine's tenth century. One cannot speak historically of a state without a population. Nor can one speak of a capital without a town. Stories are not enough.

P. 183 Builds his history on an Assyrian account but denies the biblical account

He [Shalmaneser III] claims decisive victories against further coalitions of a stock 'twelve' kings in the sixth, eleventh, twelfth and fourteenth years of his reign. In the eighteenth year, he lays siege to Damascus and receives tribute from Phoenicia and a king of Israel ('Jehu, son of Omri').

It was at the end of the ninth and the beginning of the eighth centuries, in the campaigns of Adad-Nirari III, that the Assyrians finally succeeded in occupying Damascus. They turned their interests towards Palestine, including Tyre and Sidon of Phoenicia, Israel and Edom. In the third quarter of the eighth century, Tiglath Pileser III moved Assyrian interests to reassert authority over Damascus, Byblos, Tyre, Samaria and the states of the north, and into southern Palestine as well. They fought against Ammon, Moab, Ashqelon, Judah, Edom and Gaza. The king reports deporting people from Israel and replacing its king, Peqah, with a king of his own choice, Hoshea. As an Assyrian vassal, Hoshea's Samaria is given control over the Jezreel. With the authority of Assyrian troops and under Assyrian patronage, Israel finally gains undisputed control over the Jezreel for the first time in 731 BCE. Such 'control' was to last less than a decade

The historical Israel

The many different societies that had begun to develop in Palestine during the tenth and ninth centuries all had their own regional differences in economy, language, religion and culture. By the close of the ninth century they were well on their way towards emergence as distinct regional states, each with a political identity closely associated with the primary geographical regions it controlled. When Assyria began expanding its interests into Palestine in the mid-ninth century, however, the growth of such regional identity was undermined. The first Assyrian policy was to subordinate these patronage states under the empire as subject vassal states. Once their army had stabilized the area, they systematically proceeded to integrate the component regions directly into the imperial system, as part of the provinces ruled by Assyria.

During the first century of Assyrian control, following the battle of Qarqar in 853 BCE, until the mid-eighth century, Assyria's influence in Palestine proper had been felt primarily in the direct and indirect cost of war. Further costs came with taxation as treaties subordinated the Palestinian states to the Assyrian king as vassals. The regional economies were integrated into the international trade of the empire. The sovereignty and autonomy of these regions were decisively curtailed. Even greater changes took place after Tiglath Pileser's accession to the throne in 745

BCE. In his western policies, Tiglath Pileser began a process of cumulative subordination of Syrian and Palestinian agriculture to Assyrian interests.

In 733/732, he conquered Damascus and annexed it as a province. The petty kings of Palestine, including those of Byblos and Tyre, Israel, Ammon, Moab, Edom, Ashqelon, Gaza and the Judaeen territories, reconfirmed their allegiance as vassals of Assyria. With its takeover in Damascus, Assyria became a direct participant in the affairs of Palestine and especially of the Jezreel.

PP. 185-88 Contrast with the way he uses biblical records versus Assyrian records

II Kings' narrative is a theological text. It extols the virtue of trust in divine providence. Rabshakeh's speech goes beyond the mere statement of Assyrian policy. It also prepares us for the story's dramatic reversal in Jerusalem's unpromising fortunes. In his hubris and pride, not only does the Assyrian general taunt Jerusalem's good king, Hezekiah, but, in ignorance of the true God, he dares to mock Yahweh:

Do not listen to Hezekiah when he misleads you by saying: 'Yahweh will deliver us.' Has any of the gods of the nations ever delivered his land out of the hands of the King of Assyria? Where are the gods of Hamath and Arpad? . . . Have they delivered Samaria out of my hand? Who among all the gods of the countries have delivered their countries out of my hand, that Yahweh should deliver Jerusalem out of my hand? (II Kings 18: 32-35)

Hezekiah's pious humility contrasts instructively with the blasphemy of the Assyrian general. Like David before him (II Sam. 15), good King Hezekiah turns in prayer to recognize Yahweh as his refuge — 'that you, Yahweh, are alone God' (II Kings 19: 19) — and, as in the David story, Yahweh saves the kingdom for his servant. Sennacherib's god, in contrast, is unable to save his king:

That night the angel of Yahweh went out and killed 185,000 of the Assyrians, and when men arose early in the morning: there 'a ere all dead bodies! Sennacherib, king of Assyria left and went home and lived in Nineveh. And as he was worshipping in the temple of Nisroch his god, his sons killed him with the sword. (II Kings 19: 35—37)

That is the Assyrian campaign of biblical legend. In contemporary Assyrian accounts of the campaign, Sennacherib claims to have put Jerusalem under siege and to have attacked and then reorganized its territory of Judah. He subordinated some of its towns under the patronage of Padi, the king of the coastal town of Ekron. He claims that the siege of Jerusalem had been successful as he lists tribute that Jerusalem's king Hezekiah sent to Assyria. He closes the account with his recognition of Hezekiah as his client. The Assyrian text presents the account as a rebellion among client states, with the siege and reorganization as Assyria's response.

Historically, the Assyrians' campaign does not seem to be directed against Jerusalem. It is oriented rather towards putting down a rebellion in the coastal town of Ekron and in the Shephelah's town of Lachish. Lachish had been a key to olive production in the Judean highlands, and had apparently been the region's primary threat to Assyrian policies, which supported Jerusalem's control of Judea. When Lachish fell in 701, it was destroyed. Apparently, its entire population was deported. Large bas-reliefs celebrating this victory by illustrating the Assyrian army's destruction and burning of the city once decorated the walls of Sennacherib's palace at Nineveh. Today, these famous reliefs can be seen in the British Museum. Lachish was never rebuilt. Assyria proceeded to annex the coastal towns, including Ekron, and most of the

Shephelah. This area was placed under direct Assyrian administration. The primary task of the campaign was to stabilize the region by reorganizing its olive industry. Jerusalem, as an Assyrian client state, was a willing collaborator, and played a major role in this reorganization. Once rid of the competition from Lachish, Jerusalem expanded its hold on the Judean highlands and extended its influence southward into the northern Negev. The integrity of the Judean mountain range lent itself to the funnelling of produce northwards along the watershed to Jerusalem. As the chief market town of a now much expanded region, Jerusalem grew some five-fold in the course of the next half-century.

Simultaneously with the reorganization of olive production through Jerusalem, the Assyrians built up coastal Ekron as their southern provincial producer of olive oil. They installed presses there, with huge storage vats to supply Assyria's overland markets. Like Jerusalem, Ekron saw a half-century period of extraordinary growth. Both Ekron on the coast and Jerusalem in the hills became the dominant economic centres of their regions. With support from Assyria, Jerusalem had finally become the regional capital of Judah. By the mid-seventh century it was a city with some 25,000 people. With its development as an economic and political centre, Jerusalem began to take on cultural and religious functions similar to what Samaria had carried out in the north. It is at least possible that the temple dates from this period. Evidence, however, is wanting. This development may not have occurred before the Persian period.

While the importance of the city of Jerusalem looms large in biblical stories, its actual historical importance in both the politics and the economy of the hill country regions was short-lived. Jerusalem, with a population of about 5,000 people from the mid-ninth to the end of the eighth century, had hardly been in a position to compete with the regionally far more powerful town of Lachish. Certainly, it was Lachish that had dominated the olive industry, which was the primary cash crop of the region. Only after the destruction of rebellious Lachish and the deportation of its population in 701 was Jerusalem allowed to expand and become the regional centre of trade.

The history of the development and importance of Jerusalem up to the time of its destruction early in the sixth century has little common ground with traditional reconstructions of the history of Israel that have been written to date. These have been based primarily on paraphrases of the much later, theologically oriented, biblical traditions. The poetic and literary theme of the success of the unpromising, seen for example in the David and Goliath story, or indeed the story of Jerusalem as a great city and capital of empire, is a motif that runs through the Bible's traditions. Such stories are always attractive. This is not only because audiences are always filled with little people, but also because in the real world such successes are rare. Nevertheless, this dominant motif of the Bible does have historical reality behind it. That reality was harsh and brutal. Stories about the success of the unpromising belong to a form of literature that is the possession of the defeated and the oppressed. It is the unsuccessful who most need to be able to believe in the possibilities of the unpromising. They too dream of changing the world.

P. 190 Summary of his position No, No, No

In writing about the historical developments of Palestine between 1250 and 586, all of the traditional answers given for the origins and development of 'Israel' have had to be discarded. The patriarchs of Genesis were not historical. The assertion that 'Israel' was already a people before entering Palestine whether in these stories or in those of Joshua has no historical foundation. No massive military campaign of invading nomadic 'Israelites' ever conquered Palestine. There never was an ethnically distinct 'Canaanite' population whom 'Israelites' displaced. There was no 'period of the Judges' in history. No empire ever ruled a 'united

monarchy' from Jerusalem. No ethnically coherent 'Israelite' nation ever existed at all. No political, ethnic or historical bond existed between the state that was called Israel or 'the house of Omri' and the town of Jerusalem and the state of Judah. In history, neither Jerusalem nor Judah ever shared an identity with Israel before the rule of the Hasmoneans in the Hellenistic period.

In short, the only historical Israel to speak of is the people of the small highland state which, having lost its political autonomy in the last quarter of the eighth century, has been consistently ignored by historians and Bible scholars alike. This is the Israel whose people, understanding themselves as 'Israelites', return to the light of history as the same highland farmers they had been for millennia. They are referred to in the stories of Ezra 4 as enemies of Benjamin and Judah. Their offence: they wish to help in the building of a temple to 'the God of Israel' in Jerusalem. They are rejected in the story by Ezra's Jews and given a sectarian identity as 'Samaritans' by historians. This Israel is not the Israel that biblical scholars who write 'histories of Israel' have been interested in. It is not the Israel that we find in our biblical narratives. It is historical Israel.

PP. 203-05 Beyt David Inscription

However, there were problems with the discovery — with the reading of the text, its dating and interpretation — and these problems have not yet been resolved. The difficulties were obvious to many as soon as a good photograph of the text was published. Some were typical of most new finds, especially those that are met with great fanfare and enthusiasm. Inconsistent descriptions appeared of how and where the text had been found, whereas to some the dating of the archaeological context seemed optimistically early; others suggested that the form of writing should be dated a century or more later than had originally been proposed, perhaps even to the late eighth or early seventh century. To read . . . *k* as *mlk* = 'king' was just guesswork, of course. Nothing in the inscription itself required that the word or name *bytdwd* be directly linked to Jerusalem and to Judah. It might well refer to a place much closer to Tel Dan.

As in many place names, the first part of this name, *byt*, can be translated as 'House', and reflects the patronate that rules the town. Also commonly — especially when *byt* has been joined to the name or epithet of a god or goddess — it can be translated 'temple'. This is found among place names in Palestine such as Bethel ('The Temple of El') and *beyt dagon* ('the temple of Dagon') of the Samson story.

The second part of the name in the Tel Dan inscription is *dwd*. This is certainly the way the name of the biblical hero David would be spelled in early Hebrew writing. However, 'David' is very unusual as a name. It is used as a personal name in the Bible only for our particular hero. It also occurs as the epithet for a deity (*dwd/dwdh*) in at least one other eighth-century inscription, the famous Mesha Stele from Transjordan. *Dwd* is not the name of a god, but it could be a divine title and be translated 'the Beloved', which has echoes in many biblical metaphors. In the Mesha Stele, it seems to be used as a divine title for Yahweh, the ancient deity of Palestine and the name of God in the Bible. This has led some to suggest that the name *beytdawd* of Tel Dan's inscription possibly referred to a place called 'Temple of Dwd', which might have been located somewhere near Tel Dan in northern Palestine. If we were to understand it in the sense of the 'dynast of *dwd*', the inscription would give evidence of a 'House of David' that existed at the time of the inscription. It tells us nothing, as such, of a person David as the founder of that patronate in an earlier period.

However, even this gloss reads the text too much in the light of popular ideas about the Bible. When we look at the way the words 'House of David' are actually used in the Bible,

understanding it as a reference to an historical David becomes very difficult. The Bible does not use the term 'House of David', in the way the British use a similar term, 'The House of Stuart' — that is, with the specific meaning of 'dynasty'. In the Bible, the terms 'House of Saul' and 'House of David', are often used to refer to the patronage of the hero himself while he is still alive (e.g., I Sam. 24—26). Moreover, we also find such terms as the 'House of Jonathan', though we have no story of Jonathan as the head of any state. The term 'House of David' in the Bible captures the narrative metaphor of patronage. It refers to all who belong to such and such a leader: what in Corsica and Sicily until modern times was spoken of as 'the family' and in ancient Israel as *byt b* ('patronate', literally: 'father's house'). This fictive language of family — 'brother', 'son', 'father', 'servant', 'cousin'. etc. — uses terms borrowed from language reflecting personal commitment and trust. It is used to express various forms of commitment, agreement and allegiance. In this way, for instance, David is referred to in the biblical story as the 'son' of Saul, and as the 'brother' of Jonathan. Saul is described as David's 'father'. In the Bible's stories about the United Monarchy, the 'House of David' and the 'House [that is, 'Temple'] of Yahweh' are very closely linked. The real head and founder of the 'House of David'. in fact, is Yahweh. The 'House of David' that is eternal is no dynasty of a person called David, but rather the temple of Yahweh in Jerusalem. That is, *byt.dwd*: the 'Temple of the beloved'. David is an eponymous hero. In the origin story of the temple's founding, the role of David gives expression to the confidence, and to the hopes and promises, that the people of a much later Jerusalem attached to their temple.

P. 254 No Bible as such in the Hellenistic period. Must be dated by *extant* texts!

Texts do not give direct evidence for the construction of a history of any world of the past asserted by their authors, but rather for the history and perspective of the authors' own world as implied in the texts' projections. This world is rather Greco-Roman than Hellenistic. We should be dating not traditions but the historical contexts of texts. These are first known from Qumran in the second century BCE, in contexts which clearly show that the formation of biblical books is still in process. No Bible as such existed in the Hellenistic period, only some very specific texts and collections of them. The analysis and interpretation of these texts is our primary historical source for understanding Hellenism in Asia. The intellectual worlds of the Old and New Testament text—traditions hold a common perception, distinguishable at most as older and younger contemporary witnesses of a common tradition.

GENERAL STUDIES

Instone-Brewer, David. *Divorce and Remarriage in the Bible: The Social and Literary Context.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

Available on line at <http://www.tyndale.cam.ac.uk/Brewer/PPages/DRC/>

Knight, Richard P. *A Discourse on the Worship of Priapus.* London: Privately Printed, 1865. (Electronic Format) <http://www.oto.no/pdf/priapus.pdf>. Electronic version of an old book showing the relation of Priapus and his worship to St. Cosmio and in general the transfer of paganism to Romanism particularly in the reproductive area.

Thompson, Michael B. *The New Perspective on Paul.* Cambridge: Grove Books Ltd (Ridley Hall Rd, Cambridge CB3 9HU, 2002.

The is a popular pamphlet (28 pp) describing the New Perspective on Paul. He says the most popular proponent is N. T. (Tom) Wright. “Although he disagrees in a number of points with Sanders and Dunn, he accepts the former’s fundamental point about the ‘pattern’ of the Jewish faith and the latter’s suggestion that the phrase ‘works of the law’ primarily refers to specific ‘boundary markers,’ rather than ‘self-help moralism.’ Like Sanders and Dunn, he emphasizes that in his letters Paul was not primarily concerned with how individuals with burdened consciences like Martin Luther’s can find forgiveness, but with *what defines the people of God*—how the Gentiles could come to be accepted as God’s own without having to ‘get in’ and ‘stay in’ as Jews” (p. 11).

“One of Wright’s controversial contributions is what he says about ‘justification’. . . Reformed theology understands ‘justification’ to refer to how an individual *enters* a relationship with God. Furthermore, it typically emphasizes a judicial, law-court background for the word, seeing it referring to God’s action of acquitting a person and regarding him or her as having a new status as righteous. This, in tern, is seen as the heart of Paul’s gospel, which is basically about ‘getting in.’” (p. 11)

“Wright responds that the word ‘justification’ is much richer in meaning. It is first of all *covenantal*, reflecting the 1st century Jewish belief that because of his faithfulness, God would act to sort out the world and deliver his people. Justification is not primarily about God’s dealings with individuals (as such) but with peoples. Second, it is indeed *law-court* language, but that should be seen within, the context of God’s covenant faithfulness and his desire to deal with evil and to put all things right. Third, it is *eschatological*, relating not only to a past event of salvation but also to the present and future. Justification is just as much about the future deliverance of God’s people as it is about the past. More subtly, Wright argues that justification is not *how someone enters the people of God*; it is fundamentally *how you can tell who is in* (because God has already declared them to be acquitted). It is a broader notion than some Protestants have previously thought” (p. 12).

Leander E Keck, *New Interpreter’s Bible Volume 10: Full texts and critical notes of the New International Version and the New Revised Standard Version of the Bible in parallel columns* (Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 2002).

N.T(om).W. Wright did Romans in this section. Wright is an evangelical Anglican bishop. In his introduction he presents one of his more controversial theses: Israel still (as does Paul) view itself in exile. The promises to the fathers and by the prophets in conjunction with the return from the exile have not been fulfilled. The “righteousness of God” is therefore that Yahweh would be faithful to his covenant promises. “Never leaving behind this covenantal meaning, the word ‘righteousness’ is also shaped by the Second Temple Jewish setting of the lawcourt. In the lawcourt as envisaged in the OT, all cases were considered ‘civil’ rather than ‘criminal’; accuser and defendant pleaded their causes before a judge. ‘Righteousness’ was the status of the successful party when the case had been decided; ‘acquitted’ does not quite catch this, since that term applies only to the successful defendant, whereas if the accusation was upheld the accuser would be ‘righteous.’ ‘Vindicated’ is thus more appropriate. The word is not basically to do with morality or behavior, but rather with status in the eyes of the court—even though, once someone has been vindicated, the word ‘righteous’ would thus as it were work backward, coming to denote not only the legal status at the end of the trial but also the behavior that had occasioned this status” (pp. 398-99). “The covenant between God and Israel was established in the first place in order to deal with the problem of the world as a whole. Or, as one rabbi put it, God decided to make Adam first, knowing that if he went to the bad God would send Abraham to sort things out.

The covenant, in other words, was established so that the creator God could rescue the creation from evil, corruption, and disintegration and in particular could rescue humans from sin and death” (p. 399). His section on apocalyptic literature (p. 401) is very helpful. Paul must adjust his thinking as a Second Temple Jew to the Christian question. Wright believes that Paul’s teaching about righteousness refers to God’s covenantal righteousness with his people: the way God will make right all things in conjunction with his promises to Israel.

On chapters 9-11: “The controversial revolution in Pauline studies that produced the so-called new perspective of the 1970s shifted attention away from late-mediaeval soul-searchings and anxieties about salvation, and placed it instead on (in Sander’s phrase) the comparison of patterns of religion. It was a self-consciously post-Holocaust project, aimed not least at reminding Paul’s readers of his essential Jewishness. But this should not blind us to the fact that, precisely as a Jewish person, Paul begins this section with grief and sorrow—because he sees his fellow Jews rejecting the gospel of their own Messiah. Paul is not writing a post-Enlightenment treatise about how all religions are basically the same; nor is he writing an essay on the modified version of the same project—namely, how the one God has made two equally valid covenants, one with Jews and the other with Christians. Nor is he writing a postmodern tract about how everybody must tell their own story and find their own way. As we shall see these chapters remain profoundly Christian—that is, centered on Jesus as Messiah and Lord. Paul does not accommodate himself to our agendas and expectations any more than he did to those of his contemporaries” (p. 621). His overview of 9-11 argues that it is integral to the argument of the whole book which has a constant emphasis on Israel.

The hardening of Pharaoh’s heart was predicated on his own hardness of heart, but it was designed to provide the redemption of Israel. In the same way the hardening of Israel is designed to provide redemption to the gentiles (p. 639).

On chapter 11:26 he concludes, “. . . that in this passage Paul speaks of the ultimate salvation of all God’s people, not only Gentiles but also an increasing number of Jews, a salvation to be brought about through the suspension of judgment (involving the ‘hardening’ of those who do not believe) so that the gospel could spread to the Gentile world, and so by that means ethnic Jews might become ‘jealous’ and so come to believe in their own Messiah” (p. 693).

LITERARY STUDIES

Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. London: George Allen & Unwin. 1981.

On Genesis 38, which Alter does not believe is a separate, unconnected account, he quotes the midrashim: “You said to your father, *haker-na*. By your life, Tamar will say to you, *haker-na*” (*Bereshit Rabba* 85:22 23).

He quotes and supports Herbert Schneidau’s point that pagan literature is metaphor and hypotactic and uses the epic as its base. The Bible as a reaction is metonymy (different word to represent the concept) and paratactic. (pp. 25-27).

“If one may presume at all to reduce great achievements to a common denominator, it might be possible to say that the depth with which human nature is imagined in the Bible is a function of its being conceived as caught in the powerful interplay of this double dialectic between design and disorder, providence and freedom” (p. 33).

It may be that the above antithetical items affected the canonical status of books. So “the Book of Yasher” and the “Book of Wars” may be too one-sided in presenting God’s role (more along the epic line) and so were excluded from the canon (p. 34-35).

Consider writing an article on the several characters in David’s flight from Jerusalem and quote Alter, “Nevertheless, these stories (Samuel: David) are not, strictly speaking, historiography, but rather the imaginative reenactment of history by a gifted writer who organizes his materials along certain thematic biases and according to his own remarkable intuition of the psychology of the characters” (p. 35).

His discussion of the judge, Ehud, is very helpful. So also the Jacob/Esau discussion (pp. 37-46).

In reference to “duplicate” stories (Abraham/Sarah, Isaac/Rebecca in Egypt, e.g.) he discusses “type scenes” in Homer studies. This refers to certain conventions that one looks for in each story. “Some of this obviously cannot apply to biblical narrative because the epic type-scene involves descriptive detail, while the Bible is not descriptive . . . Nevertheless, I should like to propose that there is a series of recurrent narrative episodes attached to the careers of biblical heroes that are analogous to Homeric type-scenes in that they are dependent on the manipulation of a fixed constellation of predetermined motifs . . . Some of the most commonly repeated biblical type-scenes I have been able to identify are the following: the annunciation (and I take the term from Christian iconography precisely to underscore the elements of fixed convention) of the birth of the hero to his barren mother; the encounter with the future betrothed at a well; the epiphany in the field; the initiatory trial; danger in the desert and the discovery of a well or other source of sustenance; the testament of the dying hero” (p. 51).

Alter discusses the importance of repetition in Biblical narrative (pp. 88-113) He references Bubar and Rosenzweig’s German translation where they talk about *leitwörter* as in *leitmotif* (p. 93).

He gives a beautiful and brilliant analysis of the Baalam story (pp. 104-107).

“There is a supreme confidence in an ultimate coherence of meaning through language that informs the biblical vision. When the action and speech of men and women, always seen in some fateful course of convergence with or divergence from divine instruction, are reported to us in biblical narrative, repetition continually sets their lives into an intricate patterning of words. Again and again, we become aware of the power of words to make things happen. God or one of His intermediaries or a purely human authority speaks: man may repeat and fulfill the words of revelation, repeat and delete, repeat and transform; but always there is the original urgent message to contend with, a message which in the potency of its concrete verbal formulation does not allow itself to be forgotten or ignored. On the human plane, a master speaks (for spiritual and social hierarchy is implicit in this patterning), his servant is called upon to repeat through enactment; and, most frequent of all, an act in is reported by the narrator, then its protagonist recounts the action in virtually the same terms, the discrepancy between ‘virtually’ and ‘exactly’ providing the finely calibrated measure of the character’s problematic subjective viewpoint. As human actors reshape recurrence in language along the biases of their own intentions or misconceptions, we see how language can be an instrument of masking or deception as well as of revelation; yet even in such deflected form we witness language repeatedly evincing the power to translate itself into history, a history whose very substance seems sometimes men and their actions, sometimes the language they use” (p. 112).

His chapter on the Characterization and the Art of Reticence (pp. 114-130) shows how the narrator, by a minimal presentation, makes his points. He uses Michal (David's wife) as an example. The Bible uses direct discourse more than descriptive narrative to make its point.

His chapter on Composite Artistry (pp. 131-154) deals with "duplicates." He denies that all duplicates posited by text critics are that, but admits to several duplicate stories (David/Goliath, Creation story, etc.) but says they did not come together because the "editor" did not know what else to do with them—rather they are artistically brought together to make both points. David is both a warrior and a soother of spirits. David the shepherd is also the one who kills the giant.

"The conception of biblical narrative as prose fiction which I have been proposing entails an emphasis on deliberate artistry and even playfulness that may seem a little odd according to common notions, both popular and scholarly, of what the Bible is. Having considered some of the major aspects of the Bible's narrative art, I think it may be useful now to restate a basic question raised near the outset of this inquiry. The ancient Hebrew writers, or at least the ones whose work has been preserved because it was eventually canonized in the biblical corpus, were obviously motivated by a sense of high theological purpose. Habitants of a tiny and often imperfectly monotheistic island in a vast and alluring sea of paganism, they wrote with an intent, frequently urgent awareness of fulfilling or perpetuating through the act of writing a momentous revolution in consciousness. It is obvious enough why the Prophets would have used poetry, with its resonances, emphases, significant symmetries, and forceful imageries, to convey their vision, for prophetic poetry is a form of direct address which is heightened, mad memorable and almost inexorable through the rhetorical resources of formal verse. By contrast, biblical narrative, if it is also to be construed as a kind of discourse on God's purposes in history and His requirements of humanity, is indirect discourse on those subjects (the one great exception being the Book of Deuteronomy, which is cast in direct discourse as Moses' valedictory address to the people of Israel). (p. 155).

Conclusion (pp. 156-189). "This I am convinced, was at the heart of the authors' intentions: the Hebrew writers manifestly took delight in the artful limning of these lifelike characters and actions, and so they created an unexhausted source of delight for a hundred generations of readers. But that pleasure of imaginative play is deeply interfused with a sense of great spiritual urgency. The biblical writers fashion their personages with a complicated, sometimes alluring, often fiercely insistent individuality because it is in the stubbornness of human individuality that each man and woman encounters God or ignores Him, responds to or resists Him. Subsequent religious tradition has by and large encouraged us to take the Bible seriously rather than to enjoy it, but the paradoxical truth of the matter may well be that by learning to enjoy the biblical stories more fully as stories, we shall also come to see more clearly what they mean to tell us about God, man, and the perilously momentous realm of history" (p. 189).

Fokkelman, J. P. *Reading Biblical Narrative, an Introductory Guide*. Tr. Ineke Smit. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press. 1999.

He argues that the text must be read from the point of view of the 21st c., not 2000 or 1000 B.C. He says that a story can "only come into its own or blossom through the channel of a competent reader" (p. 21). This seems to be reader response hermeneutics.

"It is true that the text of the Bible comes from the Near East, that it is almost 2000 to 3000 years old, and that it originated in a culture which differed greatly from ours, both materially and spiritually. These differences should not be underestimated; yet these distances are only half-truths, and if you treat them as unshakeable axioms they will quietly turn into lies and optical

illusions. There is a greater, more important truth, which is that these texts are well-written. If they are then so fortunate as to meet a good listener, they will come into their own without having to be pushed into the compartments ‘far away,’ ‘long ago’ and ‘very different.’ As products of a deliberate and meticulous designing intelligence they have been crafted to speak for themselves, provided there is a competent reader listening closely. They are, after some training on our part, extremely able to reveal and explain themselves” (p. 21).

David’s stone did not go into Goliath’s forehead, but into the knee joint of his greave. “In v. 49 we read that the stone that comes whizzing from David’s sling ‘penetrates [Goliath’s] *mitscho*.’ Now, the same word has been used earlier in the story, in the plural form (*mitschot*), and appears, of all places, in the weapon inventory [4-9]. From time immemorial this has been translated correctly by ‘shin-guards’ or ‘greaves.’ For v. 49 no other meaning is necessary at all!”

“What exactly happened? . . . David slings the stone right above the shin guard into the knee joint of Goliath’s armor. As a result, this part of the armor is locked, so that the warrior is suddenly unable to bend his leg. This proves fatal, as according to 4. 48 he has just started moving. Walking towards David with clumsy tread, he is hit, and hampered by the knee joint which will not hinge anymore, he has a nasty fall—on his face, as a natural consequence of his own movement. The correct translation of v. 49 would be that David ‘put his hand into the bag; he took out a stone and slung it; it struck the Philistine in the greave. The stone penetrated above the greave, and he fell face down on the ground.’” [I believe this is a cogent argument, but it should be noted that *ניצה* is translated elsewhere, some eleven times, as forehead.]

On Deborah/Barak: “Judges 4 is an ingenious construction about two men from opposing camps, who both cut a foolish figure with two strong women. The position of heroine falls to Deborah and Jael. They complement each other, as Deborah figures only in the first half, Jael only in the second. Hidden in the background there is another hero, who made Deborah clairvoyant: she has divine foreknowledge when she foretells the glory of a woman (=Jael). It is this hero, too, who instantly decides the battle in v. 15a: ‘And Yahweh threw Sisera and all his chariots and army into panic before the onslaught of Barak.’ This is the only instance of the writer bringing Yahweh on stage. In the end, all the inspiration and courage shown by Deborah is due to him” (p. 86).

His discussion of the old prophet in 1 Kings 13 is similar to mine. Refer to it in my notes (p. 92).

“The Bible can only come into its own through a creative reading if we have first realized that the position of Israel’s narrators and poets is almost diametrically opposed to our own, as regards the use of repetition” p. 112.

“To Summarize: the principal difference between poetry and narrative prose is based on both negative and positive characteristics. Negative: the poet could not care less about chronological order and plot. There is no epic poetry. Positive: his clauses conform to rules of quantity and meter; on an average, they are more compact and make even more intensive use of all sorts of devices for varied repetition” (p. 173).

Kraus, Wolfgang and R. Glenn Wooden, *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*, SBL: Society of Biblical Literature. Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Ed. M. K. H. Peters. Vol 53 Septuagint Research.

See Copy of White's article "A Devil in the Making: Isomorphism and Exegesis in OG Job 1:8b" (referring to me) in my personal file.

Kreuzer, Siegfried. "From 'Old Greek' to the Recensions: Who and What Caused the Change of the Hebrew Reference Text of the Septuagint."

"On the one hand the biblical texts from Qumran have confirmed the good quality and reliability of the MT. This has enabled us to go back behind the oldest known manuscript about one whole millennium and has showed that there was a truly faithful Hebrew tradition. ON the other hand there are also texts in Qumran that are quite close to the Samaritan tradition and so confirmed this branch of the Hebrew text. At the same time the fact of having proto-Samaritan texts in the Judean desert means that the Samaritan textual tradition—oat least apart from some specific Samaritan differences—was not just a development in Samaria, but there existed the same kind of texts in Judea as well."

"At the same time the discovery of these proto-Septuagint texts means that the textual tradition of the Septuagint is not just a tradition from Alexandria, but that the basic Hebrew tradition of the Septuagint is found in Judea as well. This observation further means that the theories about the local affiliation of the three text types have to be modified or probably abandoned altogether. We will return to this question later."

"The other important fact is the discovery of actual Septuagint texts in Qumran and in the Judean desert. This fact was most surprising. It showed that Greek translations of the holy scriptures were not only in use in the Diaspora but also in Judea." P. 228.

"Conclusions. If we return to the question of our title (Who and what caused the change of the Hebrew reference text of the Septuagint?), we have to answer that the change was caused by the Hellenistic crisis of the old Jerusalemite priesthood in the time of Antiochus IV and especially by the success of the Maccabean revolt and the establishment of the Hasmonean dynasty. These events and the establishment of a new temple hierarchy in Jerusalem led to the domination of the MT, and that led to the change in the Hebrew text type on which the Septuagint was based.

"This change is reflected in the *Letter of Aristeas* with its defense of the OG Septuagint. Yet this defense, at least in the long run and especially in Palestine itself, could not avert the change of the reference text and the subsequent revisions of the OG toward the MT." p. 237.

Janowski, Bernd and Peter Stuhlmacher, eds., *The Suffering Servant; Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources*, 2004. Originally: *Der leidende Gottesknecht*, by Mohr Siebeck, 1996.

Stuhlmacher "Isaiah 53 in the Gospels and Acts." Summary: The New Testament's Christological interpretation of Isaiah 53 goes back to Jesus' own understanding of his mission and death, here explored by a tradition-historical argument. Jesus' understanding, in turn, depends upon a demonstrable early Jewish messianic interpretation of Isaiah 53, into which Jesus also incorporated passages such as Isaiah 45:3-4; 52:7 and 61:1-2. By making one of the first applications of the whole Servant text, including its suffering motif, to an individual historical figure (cf. also the Aramaic *Aprocryphon of Levi*, 4Q541), Jesus and his disciples after Easter extended the early Jewish interpretation independently. Messianic interpretations of the chapter,

both ancient Jewish and early Christian, are commonly attributed to an “individualistic” understanding of the servant, as opposed to the ‘corporate’ understanding favored in much recent scholarship. The dichotomy is, however, a false one. In Judaism the individual figure of the Servant-Messiah is the prince appointed by God, a prince who rules over the people of God and simultaneously represents them before God. So also with Jesus. He is the Son of God who leads the people of God; yet that people also constitutes his body. One can call this understanding “individual” only so long as one also remembers the collective aspect and refuses to oppose the two conceptions.