

THE RELEVANCE OF THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS FOR NEW TESTAMENT INTERPRETATION WITH A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL APPENDIX

J. Frey¹

ABSTRACT

The article demonstrates why the Dead Sea Scrolls are important for NT scholarship. After a sketch of the main periods of Qumran research, the author discusses four patterns of relating Qumran with the NT which he considers problematic. Neither was the Qumran community a prototype of Early Christianity, nor do Qumran texts reflect Early Christian history. The opinion that NT texts can be found in the fragments from Cave 7 is erroneous, and the view that an Essene Quarter in Jerusalem formed the nucleus of the Primitive Christian Community there cannot be established. Based on the fact that the Qumran library is not the literary production of a single "sect" but a broader collection of texts from different groups in Ancient Judaism, the relevance of the Qumran library is rather that it shows the pluriformity of Judaism at the turn of the era, and that numerous terms and ideas in the NT which were thought to be non-Jewish can now be explained from the variety of Jewish texts from the library. The interpretative value of Qumran is then demonstrated by two examples: John the Baptist can be interpreted more precisely in contrast with the purification rites and Scripture interpretation of Qumran, and some of the Pauline anthropological terms, especially the notion of sinful flesh, can be seen as influenced by Palestinian Jewish Wisdom traditions. As an appendix, the author presents a select and commented bibliography for the study of Qumran texts and their relation with the NT.

1 Prof. Dr. Jörg Frey, Institut für neutestamentliche Theologie, Evangelisch-theologische Fakultät der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Schellingstrasse 3/V VG, D-80799 München, and Guest Professor, New Testament Studies, Faculty of Theology, University of the Free State, Bloemfontein. This lecture was delivered in February/March, 2003, at the Universities of Pretoria, Potchefstroom and Stellenbosch, with additional footnotes and bibliographical references. I am indebted to Prof. Dr. Jan van der Watt (Pretoria) for the invitation to lecture in South Africa, and to Prof. Dr. Francois Tolmie (Bloemfontein) for the invitation to publish the lecture in the *Acta Theologica*. I am also thankful to Angelika Ohloff and Nadine Kessler for correcting this article.

For Biblical scholarship, the “Dead Sea Scrolls”² (or better: the “Library of Qumran”) are the most important documentary finds of the last century. From the late forties up to the present, the library of Qumran has caused a library of its own, consisting of thousands of articles and books. Fifty-five years after the first discoveries, a highly specialised branch of scholarship is doing research on details of smallest fragments, using most refined technological tools such as infrared photography, digital image-processing, radio-carbon-dating, DNA-analysis and others in order to get the most detailed information on the provenance and content of every single manuscript. But the public interest in the Scrolls is stimulated most vigorously when their impact on our understanding of the Bible and the origins of Christianity is considered. There have always been attempts to put the Scrolls in a close relation with Jesus and Earliest Christianity. But even though we might come to the conclusion that these relations were not as close as some authors have suggested, the relevance of the Qumran Library for understanding of the New Testament should not be underestimated.

Starting with a brief sketch of the discussion (1), I will critically review four influential patterns of relating Qumran with the New Testament (2). After a few methodological considerations (3), I would like to discuss two major test cases (4) in order to show how to determine the relevance of the Qumran Library for New Testament scholarship.

1. FOUR PERIODS OF DISCUSSION

a) In 1947, the first discoveries were made by Beduins in the desert of Judah, near Jericho, in the area of the ancient ruin called “Ḥirbet Qumran”. The news about the discovery of ancient manuscripts spread quickly and raised interest among scholars and in the public discussion in Europe and North America. But from more than 900 manuscripts (as we can count today), only the scrolls from Cave 1 were edited and translated until 1956, and the discussion was based almost exclusively on some of the well-preserved manuscripts from that cave, the great Isaiah Scroll (1QIs^a), the so-called Manual of the Community (1QS), the Peshar to Habakkuk (1QpHab), the Thanksgivings Scroll (1QH^a), and the War Rule (1QM). On

2 Normally, this term is used to denote the discovery of ca. 900 manuscripts in 11 caves near *Ḥirbet Qumran* at the NW side of the Dead Sea near Jericho. Except from some texts found at *Masada*, the other documentary finds from sites near the Dead Sea such as *Wadi Murabba'at*, *Nahal Hever*, *Wadi Daliyeh*, *Ḥirbet Mird* and *Ketef Jericho* are not related with the texts from Qumran, even if they are sometimes included in the term “Dead Sea Discoveries”.

the basis of such a narrow evidence, it was impossible even to estimate the wealth of the library and the vast diversity within. Scholars read the Scrolls as the heritage of a Jewish sectarian group (which was quite early identified with the Essenes known from ancient authors) and compared their words and motifs with the Hebrew Bible and with later Rabbinic sources. The marked difference from both seemed to confirm the sectarian character of the scrolls and the related group. For the general public, however, the most sensational discovery was the great Isaiah Scroll. A Biblical Scroll which was more than thousand years older than the earliest Masoretic codices but witnessed to the complete book of Isaiah with only few orthographical and textual differences could be interpreted as an impressive evidence for the accuracy of the transmission of the Old Testament text.³

In this early period, only few specialists noticed the significance of the Scrolls for the New Testament. Mention should be made of the French scholar André Dupont-Sommer⁴ who saw wide-scale analogies between Jesus and the so-called Righteous Teacher of the Qumran texts and of the German Karl-Georg Kuhn who suggested that the Scrolls showed the mother soil of Johannine Christianity, a sectarian type of Gnostic Judaism.⁵ Even if some of their ideas appear to be crudely overstated from a later viewpoint, the effect of their suggestions was that more New Testament scholars began to look at the Scrolls and discuss their relevance for the understanding of the background of Early Christianity.

b) A second period of discussion from the mid-fifties until the end of the sixties can be characterised as the "Qumran fever". In 1956, the scrolls from Cave 1 had been published, the ruins of Hirbet Qumran had been investigated by archaeologists and between 1952 and 1956 ten more caves with thousands of fragments had been discovered. The ideas of the earliest Qum-

3 It should be noted, however, that the problem of the Biblical text types within the Qumran library became much more complex when the majority of the Biblical manuscripts could be studied. Cf., most recently, J. C. VanderKam & P. W. Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 2002), 103-153.

4 A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey* (tr. E. M. Rowley, Oxford: Blackwell, 1952); id., *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes: New Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (tr. R. D. Barnett, London: Vallentine, Mitchell & Co., 1954).

5 K.-G. Kuhn, "Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament", *ZTK* 47 (1950) 192-211 (209f.); id., "Zur Bedeutung der neuen palästinischen Handschriftenfunde für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft", *TLZ* 75 (1950) 81-86.

ran research were popularised by scholars such as John Allegro⁶ and by journalists such as Edmund Wilson whose book was the first about Qumran to be read by a wider audience.⁷ The growing public interest also stimulated the scholarly efforts. Scholars such as the archaeologist William F. Albright, or the Swiss New Testament scholar Oscar Cullmann entered the discussion,⁸ young scholars such as Otto Betz, Matthew Black, Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer or David Flusser began to work with the Scrolls at the beginning of their career and integrated the Qumran documents into a new picture of the background of Early Christianity.⁹ Almost every aspect of

- 6 J. Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Baltimore: Penguin, 1956); id., *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of Christianity* (New York: Criterion Books, 1957).
- 7 E. Wilson, *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1955); cf. the revised and expanded edition: *The Dead Sea Scrolls 1947-1969* (London: W. H. Allen, 1969).
- 8 Cf. W. F. Albright, "Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of St. John", *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology* (ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube; Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1954) 153-171; O. Cullmann, "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity", *JBL* 74 (1955) 213-226; id., "Secte de Qumran, Hellénistes des Actes et Quatrième Évangile", *Les manuscrits de la mer morte. Colloque de Strasbourg 25-27 Mai 1955* (Bibliothèque des Centres d'Études supérieures spécialisés; Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1957) 61-74.
- 9 Cf., e. g., O. Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte* (WUNT 6; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1960); id., *Der Paraklet. Fürsprecher im häretischen Spätjudentum, im Johannes-Evangelium und in neu gefundenen gnostischen Schriften* (AGSU 2; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963); M. Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins: Studies in the Jewish Background of the New Testament* (New York: Scribner, 1961); id., "The Scrolls and the New Testament", *NTS* 13 (1966-67) 81-89; id., *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Doctrine. A Discussion of Three Parallels to be found in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Sacerdotal Messiah, the Atonement, and Eschatology* (Ethel M. Wood Lectures; London: Athlone, 1966); R. E. Brown, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles", *CBQ* 17 (1955) 403-19. 559-74; id., "The Semitic Background of the New Testament Mysterion", *Bib.* 39 (1958) 426-48; J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Qumran Scrolls, the Ebionites, and their Literature", *Theological Studies* 16 (1955) 335-72; id., "'4QTestimonia' and the New Testament", *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (London: Chapman, 1971) 59-89; id., "Jewish Christianity in Acts in the Light of the Qumran Scrolls", *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, 271-303; D. Flusser, "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity", *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. C. Rabin and Y. Yadin; Scripta Hierosolymitana 4; Jerusalem: Magnes Press,

possible relations was discussed in that period. New Testament messianism and eschatology, baptism and the Last Supper, the ideas of the Spirit, of dualism and of predestination, the use of the Scriptures and the organisation of the early Church were reflected on in the light of the Scrolls. Jesus and Paul, John the Baptist and the Fourth Evangelist were interpreted against the background of possible Qumran influences. The results, however, remained controversial. Some scholars remained sceptical and continued to see the predominant background of Paul and John in Hellenistic Judaism or even Gnosticism.¹⁰ The doyens of German and British New Testament scholarship, Rudolf Bultmann and C. H. Dodd, felt no need to alter their general ideas of the religio-historical background of the New Testament, and in view of the bulk of still unpublished fragments, many scholars preferred to await further publications to get a fuller picture of the evidence.

In retrospect it must be said that many issues could not be answered sufficiently in that period. The discussion was still limited to the texts from Cave One, and only a small portion of other documents could be included. So, the true character and the diversity of the Qumran library could not be seen adequately at that time. Furthermore, most of the scholars viewed the Qumran Community as a marginal "sect" in separation from the predominant traditions of contemporary Judaism.

c) A third period, from the beginning of the seventies to the end of the eighties, might be characterised as the period of stagnation. There were no discoveries any more, and the publication of the thousands of small fragments chiefly from Cave 4 went on very slowly. The bulk of fragments was accessible only to a small group of specialists who were entrusted with the publication of the fragments.

d) The situation changed rapidly in 1991, when the bulk of previously unknown texts became accessible first by the publication of a computer generated reconstruction,¹¹ then by the release of the facsimile and the micro-

1958) 215-266; id., "Blessed are the Poor in Spirit", *IEJ* 10 (1960) 1-13; cf. now id., *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988).

10 Cf., e. g., the comprehensive survey of early Qumran research by H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament* (2 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr, 1966).

11 B. Z. Wacholder and M. G. Abegg, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four* (fasc. 1-3; ed. B. Z. Wacholder and M. G. Abegg; Washington, D. C.: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991-95). This 'edition' was generated from an unpublished word-in-context concordance of the non-Biblical fragments which was made in the 50s and later distributed among scholars.

fiche edition of photographs of all the Scrolls,¹² and, definitely, by the rapid sequence of new editions under the chief editorship of Emanuel Tov. In 1992, Martin Hengel predicted a new “Qumran springtime”.¹³ After the turn of the Millennium and more than 50 years after the first discoveries, the series of ‘official’ editions is almost complete and all readable Qumran texts are published and accessible. Now, every scholar can look at the texts and make up his or her own mind about them.

In contrast to the earlier periods of research, we can now estimate the real wealth of the Qumran library and the pluriformity of the documents especially from Cave Four. With the publication of previously unknown Pseudepigrapha, calendric and halakhic documents, sapiential and liturgical texts, scholars have to rethink all the earlier statements on Qumran and its library, the classification of the texts and their relations with the different traditions of Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity. On the basis of the complete evidence, the discussion must begin again.¹⁴ Well-known ideas become questionable, and new ideas may rise. This is also valid for the issue of the relations between Qumran (resp. its “group” and its library) and the New Testament or Early Christianity.

2. FOUR PROBLEMATICAL PATTERNS

Within scholarship and public discussion, the relations between Qumran and the New Testament have been described in very different ways. Authors who saw a close connection between the Qumran library and the New Testament or between the Qumran Community and Early Christianity have made use of a number of patterns, which seem to be more or less questionable. But since some of them are quite popular, I will discuss them briefly, in order to advance a more cautious view of the relations between the Qumran library and Early Christian traditions.

12 For references, see the bibliographical appendix.

13 M. Hengel, “Die Qumranrollen und der Umgang mit der Wahrheit”, *Theologische Beiträge* 23 (1992) 233-237 (235).

14 Cf., e. g., on Messianism the important study by J. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran. Königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftfunden von Qumran* (WUNT II/104; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998); cf. also J. H. Charlesworth, H. Lichtenberger & G. S. Oegema (eds.), *Qumran-Messianism* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998).

a) Pattern 1: The Qumran Community as a “prototype” of Early Christianity (Dupont-Sommer, Wilson)

One of the first patterns of interpretation was inaugurated by André Dupont-Sommer and then popularised by Edmund Wilson. According to this pattern, the Qumran Community is seen as a forerunner or prototype of Early Christianity. Dupont-Sommer was struck by some of the similarities between the community mentioned in the new documents and Early Christianity. The observation that a community used the term “New Covenant”¹⁵ as a self-designation inspired him to a wide-scale comparison between this Jewish “New Covenant” and the Christian “New Covenant”:¹⁶ He thought that, like Jesus, the teacher of the Scrolls already saw himself as Messiah, was the object of the hostility of priests and finally was put to death. He observed, that, like Jesus, the teacher had founded a group with the ideal of unity, common property, communion in love, with baptisms and a sacred meal and so on. These observations lead him to the conclusion that Earliest Christianity had borrowed its ideas from Qumran, and that the “Teacher of Righteousness” was the prototype for Jesus or — at least — for the way in which he was described, afterwards. The journalist Edmund Wilson adopted this view and saw the Qumran texts as the decisive evidence that Christianity was not “unique” but should “be generally understood as simply an episode of human history rather than propagated as dogma and divine revelation”.¹⁷ So, Wilson spread the suspicion that theologians could have an interest in hiding the texts from the public because they were a danger for Christian doctrine.

However, for any learned theologian or historian there is nothing new and nothing dangerous in the idea that the teaching of Jesus and the phenomena of Early Christianity have analogies in Biblical and post-Biblical Judaism. On the other hand, the wide-scale analogies drawn by Dupont-Sommer were based on some early misreadings of the documents. The Righteous Teacher mentioned in the Scrolls¹⁸ did not view himself as Messiah nor did his followers view him in messianic categories. There is evidence that the Teacher was persecuted by his enemies,¹⁹ but none of the docu-

15 1QpHab 2,3; compare also CD 6,19; 8,21; 19,34; 20,12f.

16 Cf. Dupont-Sommer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 99f.

17 E. Wilson, *The Dead Sea Scrolls 1947-1969*, 107.

18 Cf. the fundamental study by G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (SUNT 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), see also H. Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist and Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995).

19 Cf. 1QpHab 9,2–8.

ments attests to a violent death, let alone crucifixion.²⁰ So even though there are some analogies between Jesus and the Teacher, the idea that the fate of Jesus was prefigured in the fate of the Teacher is completely mistaken. Other analogies between the Qumran Community and Early Christianity in matters such as baptism and communal meals call for explanation. But the Qumran Community is not the prototype of Early Christianity.

b) Pattern 2: The Qumran texts as reflections of Early Christian history (Eisenman, Thiering)

Another popular theory on the relation between the Qumran documents and Early Christianity should be mentioned here even if it has to be assessed as completely erroneous and misleading: It is the claim of some authors that the Qumran documents are actually documents of the Christian movement, telling the history of Early Christianity in an allegorical manner. Even if these ideas are based only on very superficial textual data, they are a fertile basis for writing novels drawing a new picture of Jesus and the first Christians completely different from all what we know from the New Testament.

According to Robert Eisenman,²¹ the “Teacher of Righteousness” should be identified with James “the Just”, the Brother of the Lord, so that his opponent, the “Wicked Priest” or the “Liar”, can be nobody else than Paul. The Australian Barbara Thiering²² went even further: She identified the Teacher of Righteousness with John the Baptist, whereas the “Wicked Priest” and the “Liar” refer to Jesus. The result is a bizarre novel of the “new”

20 This is also correct in view of the recently published fragment 4Q285 5 for which such claims were made afresh. This small fragment, however, does not mention the Teacher of Righteousness but a messianic figure, the Prince of the Congregation or bud of David (cf. Is 11:1) who is said to kill his enemies (4Q285 5 4; cf. 4Q161 III 21f.; 1QSb 5.24–29), as predicted in Is 11:4b. Cf. J. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 83 and 86f.

21 Cf. R. Eisenman, *Maccabees, Zadokites, Christians and Qumran: A New Hypothesis of Qumran Origins* (Studia Post-Biblica 34; Leiden: Brill, 1983); id., *James the Just in the Habakkuk Pesher* (Leiden: Brill, 1986); id., *James the Brother of Jesus: the Key to Unlocking the Secrets of Early Christianity and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1996). Eisenman’s ideas about a common Jewish-Christian zealot movement including the Qumranites as well as Jewish Christianity were also adopted in the popular bestseller by M. Baigent and R. Leigh, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Deception* (New York: Summit, 1991), together with the suspicion that the Vatican could hide the Scrolls from the public.

22 B. E. Thiering, *Jesus and the Riddle of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Unlocking the Secrets of His Life Story* (San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1992).

life of Jesus, from his birth near Qumran, his education among the Essenes, his surviving crucifixion until the marriages with Mary Magdalene and, later, with Lydia of Philippi and his final journey to Rome where his traces get lost.

The decisive argument which fundamentally destroys all these constructions is the argument from the dating of the texts. A Christian dating of the majority of the Scrolls was already excluded by the early paleographical studies,²³ and their results have been basically confirmed during the last years by methods of radiocarbon dating.²⁴ Even if some of the manuscripts were written in the 1st century CE (Herodian era), many others were already written in Hasmonean times or even earlier. The conclusion is inevitable: The Qumran documents do definitely not reflect the history of early Christianity, and none of the figures known from there is mentioned in the Scrolls.

c) Pattern 3: Christian Documents within the Qumran library: the problem of the 7Q-documents (O'Callaghan, Thiede)

A theory which has been defended in conservative Christian circles focuses on the fragments from Cave 7, some of which are suggested to be fragments of New Testament texts. In contrast to the other caves, in Cave 7 only Greek fragments had been found. Some of them were identified early as part of Septuagint manuscripts, others remained unidentified, until a Spanish papyrologist, José O'Callaghan, suggested that fragment 7Q4 contained parts of 1 Timothy and fragment 7Q5 portions of Mark 6:52-53. Such an identification would challenge the usual dates for New Testament texts and require a date fairly before 68 CE not only for the Gospel of Mark but also for 1 Timothy which is commonly viewed as a pseudo-Pauline letter from the first half of the 2nd century CE. The possible impact on introductory issues might be the reason why the 7Q-fragments caused such an intensive debate.²⁵ Even though the early identifications were rejected by a considerable number of scholars, the identification of 7Q5 was again adopted and

23 Cf. F. M. Cross, "The Development of the Jewish Scripts", *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright* (ed. G. E. Wright; Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1961) 133–202.

24 Cf. the report in J. C. VanderKam/P. Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 20–33.

25 It should be noted, however, that an earlier date of Mark would not necessarily imply an improved historical reliability. The historical or theological consequences of such an identification would remain quite uncertain.

fiercely advocated by Carsten-Peter Thiede.²⁶ But the identification has been refuted by most of the specialists. On the tiny fragment only 10 letters are clearly legible, they are spread on four subsequent lines, and the only certain word is a simple “and” (καί). Within the small portion of text, there are three major differences from the text of Mark, and as more recent photographs have demonstrated, one of them requires a totally different syntactical construction so that the identification of 7Q5 with Mark 6:52-53 is quite impossible.²⁷ As an alternative, scholars have proposed that some of the fragments represent texts of the Greek Zechariah and the Greek version of the Book of Enoch which fits much better within the context of the Qumran library. The result should be clear: None of the fragments from Qumran reads the text of a Gospel or an Epistle from the New Testament, and there is no reason to speculate on the presence of Christians at Qumran.

d) Pattern 4: Personal Links between Essenism and the Primitive Church: the hypothesis of a Essene Quarter in Jerusalem (Pixner, Riesner)

Another pattern suggests not textual but local and personal links between the Essene movement and Early Christianity. The basic argument is the assumption of an Essene quarter in Jerusalem, which is supposed to be located on the South-Western hill of Jerusalem, today called “Mt. Zion”. In the tradition, the place of the Last Supper and of Pentecost are connected with this area. So, if the theory developed by the Benedictine archaeologist Bargil Pixner and the German New Testament scholar Rainer Riesner was correct,²⁸ this would offer the possibility for extensive Essene influences on the

- 26 C. P. Thiede, “7Q—Eine Rückkehr zu den neutestamentlichen Papyrusfragmenten in der siebten Höhle von Qumran”, *Biblica* 65 (1984) 538–559; id., *The Earliest Gospel Manuscript? The Qumran Papyrus 7Q5 and Its Significance for New Testament Studies* (London: Paternoster, 1992); most recently id., *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Jewish Origins of Christianity* (Oxford: Lion Publishing, 2000).
- 27 Cf. H.-U. Rosenbaum, “Cave 7Q5! Gegen die erneute Inanspruchnahme des Qumranfragments 7Q5 als Bruchstück der ältesten Evangelien-Handschrift”, *BZ* 31 (1987) 189–205 (198–202); G. N. Stanton, *Gospel Truth? New Light on Jesus and the Gospels* (London, 1995) 28f.; R. Riesner, *Essener und Urgemeinde in Jerusalem: Neue Funde und Quellen* (2nd ed.; Biblische Archäologie und Zeitgeschichte 6; Giessen: Brunnen, 1998), 133f.; S. Enste, “Qumran-Fragment 7Q5 ist nicht Markus 6,52-53.” *ZPE* 126 (1999) 189-194; most comprehensively S. Enste, *Kein Markustext in Qumran: Eine Untersuchung der These, Qumran-Fragment 7Q5 = Mk 6, 52-53* (NTOA 45; Freiburg Schweiz: Universitätsverlag, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000).
- 28 Cf. B. Pixner, “An Essene Quarter on Mount Zion?”, *Studia Hierosolymitana I. Studi archeologici on onore di P. Bellarmino Bagatti* (SBF.CMa 22; Jerusalem,

Primitive Community. I cannot go into detailed discussion here, but the historical and archaeological evidence is not strong enough to prove the suggestions. So even if it is quite probable that members of the Qumran Community (which is mostly linked with the “Essenes” mentioned in ancient authors) lived not only at Qumran, but, as Josephus says, in every village and also in Jerusalem, there remain a number of problems with the assumption of a peculiar Essene Quarter, and the links between the Essenes in Jerusalem and the Primitive Community cannot be established without doubt. There is no indisputable evidence for the idea that Jesus and the Apostles were in contact with Essene circles or that Essenes joined Primitive Christianity. At least, assumptions like that cannot provide a historical framework for the interpretation of the relations between New Testament and Qumran texts.

3. SOME METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

In order to get an adequate point of departure for relating the Qumran texts with the New Testament, we basically have to consider a twofold negative evidence: Firstly, neither Jesus nor any other person which is known from Early Christian texts are mentioned in the documents from the Qumran library. And secondly, there is no mention of Qumran or the group of the Essenes in New Testament texts.

The last observation is even more astonishing and calls for explanation. Why do New Testament authors mention Pharisees and Sadducees but no “Essenes” who — according to Josephus — had an equally important position in Judaism at that time? Is the silence of the New Testament due to

1976) 245-285; id. “The History of the ‘Essene Gate’ Area”, *ZDPV* 105 (1989) 96-104; id., *Wege des Messias und Stätten der Urkirche: Jesus und das Judenchristentum im Licht neuer archäologischer Erkenntnisse* (ed. R. Riesner; Biblische Archäologie und Zeitgeschichte 2; Giessen and Basel: Brunnen, 1991); R. Riesner, “Essener und Urkirche in Jerusalem”, *Bibel und Kirche* 40 (1985) 64-76; id., “Josephus’ ‘Gate of the Essenes’ in Modern Discussion”, *ZDPV* 105 (1989) 105-109; id., “Jesus, the Primitive Community, and the Essene Quarter of Jerusalem”, *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1992) 198-234; id., “Das Jerusalemer Essenerviertel und die Urgemeinde. Josephus, *Bellum Judaicum* V 145; 11QMiqdash 46, 13-16; Apostelgeschichte 1-6 und die Archäologie”, *ANRW* II.26.2 (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1995) 1775-1992; id., *Essener und Urgemeinde in Jerusalem* (Biblische Archäologie und Zeitgeschichte 6; Giessen and Basel: Brunnen, 1998).

the distance between Primitive Christianity and the Qumran group or Essenism as a whole, or can we interpret it as a sign of close relations between the two movements? Are the Essenes hidden under another New Testament term, the “Herodians” (Mk 3:6; 12:13; Mt 22:16) or the “Scribes”? Or did the authors view them as part of the Pharisees — or the Sadducees? On these issues we can only speculate. The sources — in the New Testament or in the Qumran library — do not provide any safe evidence to give an answer. In particular, there is no textual evidence to postulate a close personal or historical relationship between the Essenes and Jesus or Primitive Christianity.

Of course, it is possible that Jesus met Essenes — at least in Jerusalem. But in Galilee where he started preaching, a presence of Essenes cannot be proved. It is also possible or even likely that the Primitive Christianity came into contact with some members of that party. But we should consider that the Qumran *Community Rule* and also Josephus’ account on the Essenes tell that the members were bound to conceal “the secrets of knowledge” (1QS 4:5f.; cf. 10:24f.; Josephus, War 2.141), and that the instructor should “hide the counsel of the law” (1QS 9:16-17). So, we cannot presuppose that peculiar sectarian views and interpretations were open for everybody or discussed publicly. Even if an influence on the Primitive Church cannot be ruled out, the sources of both groups remain silent, and their silence can be interpreted in various ways. Moreover, not all the parallels can prove an Essene influence: similarities of the community organisation, communal meals, the community of goods or some theological issues might also be explained by similarities of the situation of the respective groups or by the common reception of Biblical and Post-Biblical traditions. It is the question, therefore, how many of the textual parallels actually allow the assumption of textual or other Essene influences.

The similarities and differences between the documents from the Qumran library and New Testament texts must be analysed with all sophistication. But the situation is much more complicated than in the early periods of research. This is also due to the recent developments in Qumran research.

One of the most important results of Qumran research which has found wide acceptance since the late 80s is the distinction between “sectarian” and “non-sectarian” (or Essene and non-Essene²⁹) documents. The publica-

29 In English, the terms “sectarian” or “sect” do not have the implications of the German terms “Sekte” and “sektiererisch” which denotes a religious splinter group and its behaviour in contrast to a normative or mainstream religion. Therefore, in German scholarship, the terms “essenisch”/“nicht-essenisch” are

tion of the texts from Cave 4 has demonstrated the great diversity within the library which united texts of very different language, literary genre, and theological position. Not all of these texts were originally composed by the group which inhabited Qumran and hid the scrolls in the caves. This is obvious regarding the Biblical texts and the well-known Pseudepigrapha such as *1 Enoch* or the *Book of Jubilees*. But even many of the remaining non-Biblical documents lack any peculiar reference to the community and the community terminology which characterises texts such as the *Thanksgivings Scroll*, the *Pesher on Habakkuk*, or the *Rule of the Community*.³⁰ Many of these documents do not share the particularistic, “sectarian” position but address Israel as a whole. So, we have to assume that they were not composed by authors of the “Qumran” group or the Essene party. They were studied or even copied by members of the community, but their origin is outside the community or in a time before its foundation. Probably all the documents written in Aramaic, most of the sapiential texts, many new pseudepigrapha, and even a passage such as the well-known “Doctrine of the Two Spirits” (1QS 3:13-4:26) belong to the literary treasure the Essenes inherited from other Jewish circles, probably from precursor groups. As part of the library, they were hidden in the caves before the attack of the Romans in 68 CE, and this is the only reason they could survive through the centuries.

So, the significance of the Qumran library is related not only with the “sectarian” texts of the Qumran Community, but also with the numerous “non-sectarian” texts. They have opened up a new and broader perspective on the Jewish literature of the Second Temple period. Before the Qumran finds, there were practically no Hebrew or Aramaic documents from Palestinian Judaism at the turn of the era. Scholars got their information only from the Maccabean literature, from various pseudepigrapha, from the writings of Josephus and Philo, and from later Rabbinic sources. In view of

much more useful even if they do not take into account the problem of the identification of the Qumran yahad with the Essenes. Cf., on these issues J. Frey, “Zur historischen Auswertung der antiken Essenerberichte. Ein Beitrag zum Gespräch mit Roland Bergmeier”, in: *Qumran kontrovers* (ed. J. Frey & H. Stegemann; Einblicke 6; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003) 23-56.

- 30 On the community terminology, D. Dimant, “The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance”, *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute of Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989–1990* (ed. D. Dimant and L. H. Schiffman; STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995) 23–58; on the criteria of Essene texts, cf. A. Lange, “Kriterien essenischer Texte”, in: *Qumran kontrovers*, 59-70; Ch. Hempel, “Kriterien zur Bestimmung ‘essenischer Verfasserschaft’ von Qumrantexten”, *ibid.*, 71-85.

the documents from Qumran, we can now see that Judaism at that time was much more pluriform than scholars thought before. Numerous terms or ideas from the New Testament which were thought to be influenced by non-Jewish, Hellenistic, Syncretistic or Gnostic ideas, can now be explained from the variety of Jewish traditions as evident within the Qumran library. And the library hidden in the caves is not only a piece of evidence for a marginal Jewish "sect" but a treasure that sheds new light on the wealth of traditions within the Palestinian Jewish context of Earliest Christianity.

4. TWO MAJOR TEST CASES

a) John the Baptist

As a first test case for the discussion of similarities and dissimilarities between the documents from Qumran and the New Testament I would like to discuss the figure of John the Baptist, because he is the figure from the New Testament which most numerous scholars considered to be closely related with Qumran or the Essenes.³¹ From the New Testament we learn that the Baptist was of priestly descent (Lk 1:5ff), and lived in the desert before he should appear (Lk 1:80). Possibly, the place where he baptised was not too far from Qumran. His celibacy (Lk 1:15) and ascetic lifestyle (Mk 1:6) make up a striking similarity, and some scholars even thought that his diet, locusts and honey, was chosen according to Essene dietary law.³² John's concern for eschatological purity and his baptism as a rite of purification by living can be paralleled with Essene purification rites. So, the analogies are quite remarkable, and, in addition, the image of the Baptist as it is depicted by Flavius Josephus (*Ant.* 18.116-119) seems to strengthen the relation between John and Essenism. Josephus presents the Baptist in Essene terms without calling him an Essene. Had John really "at one time been an Essene, but by the time of his public preaching had separated himself from the sect, and could no longer with accuracy be called an Essene?"³³ Does Jo-

31 Cf., e. g., O. Betz, "Was John the Baptist an Essene?", *Bible Review* 18 (1990) 18-25; S. J. Pfann, "The Essene Yearly Renewal Ceremony and the Baptism of Repentance", *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 337-352; J. H. Charlesworth, "John the Baptist and Qumran Barriers in Light of the Rule of the Community", *ibid.*, 353-375.

32 Cf. J. H. Charlesworth, "John the Baptist and Qumran Barriers in Light of the Rule of the Community", 366f.

33 Cf. H. Lichtenberger, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and John the Baptist: Reflections on Josephus' Account of John the Baptist", *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of*

sephus actually draw on historical information, or does he just intend to present the Baptist as a pious and just personality? When reading Josephus, we must always take into account his apologetic interests against the Roman accusation of Jewish zealotism. In the episodes on Essene prophets Judas, Menachem and Simon,³⁴ Josephus deliberately conceals the aspect of political prophecy by stressing the piety and virtue of these prophets and of the group to which they belonged. Similarly, in his presentation of the Baptist, he stresses justice and piety as part of his preaching, depicting him as a “good man” (*Ant.* 18.116), even though he was put to death by Herod Antipas because of his political prophecy. Consequently, Josephus’ account does not provide a reliable information whether John was actually in contact with the Essenes or not.

However, the striking similarities mentioned above have caused many scholars to assume that the preacher in the desert had once been an Essene before he was expelled or separated himself from the community. Recently, James H. Charlesworth has formulated the hypothesis why John had left the community. He could have “progressed through the early stages of initiation” (cf. 1QS 6.21) and “taken the vows of celibacy and absolute separation from others.”³⁵ He could have been impressed and attracted by many items of Essene theology. But possibly he could not accept the curses on the “men of Belial” which were pronounced in the ritual of the covenantal renewal (1QS 2.4-10 and 2.11-18), so he kept silent when all said “Amen, amen”, and this was the first step of his segregation from the community.³⁶ From that moment on, John would have been bound by his vows, but cut off from the community. But even if the scenario sounds plausible, there is the question whether John’s segregation from the Essenes is reconstructed here in a too “modern” way. In view of traditions like Lk 3:7 or 3:9, it can be doubted whether the “younger” John should have had difficulties with the curses from the covenantal ceremony.³⁷ It seems impossible to conjec-

Research (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport (Leiden: Brill, 1992) 340-346 (346). Lichtenberger mentions parallels between Josephus’ note of the Baptist and his reports on the Essenes, concerning purification rites, the contents of his preaching, and his political prophecy.

34 Cf. the notes on Judas (*War* 1.78-80; *Ant.* 13.311-313), Menachem (*Ant.* 15.372-379) and Simon (*War* 2.111f.; *Ant.* 17.345-348).

35 J. H. Charlesworth, “John the Baptist”, 361.

36 *Ibid.*, 363f.

37 H. Lichtenberger, “Die Texte von Qumran und das Urchristentum”, *Judaica* 50 (1994) 68-82 (77f.) rightly states that the assumption that John had first entered and then left the community (for what reason) puts one hypothesis on

ture a “Life of John the Baptist” as it is impossible to write a coherent “Life of Jesus” from the sources we have.

We should rather ask how the Qumran texts help to understand the profile of the Baptist more precisely. And we can see that, in view of the analogies, the differences are most helpful. There are two important points of comparison, the Scriptural quotation from Is 40:3 and the character of John’s rite of baptism.

One of the striking similarities between the Qumran texts and the reports on John the Baptist is that they are linked with the same Biblical passage, Isaiah 40:3: “the voice of one crying out in the wilderness: Prepare the way of the Lord...” The prophetic utterance is quoted in the *Rule of the Community* (1QS 8.14; cf. 9.19f.) and in the New Testament, when the appearance of the Baptist is described (Mk 1:3; cf. Mt 3:3 and Lk 3:4-6) or his self-definition is given (Jn 1:23): In Christian view, the prophecy characterises the Baptist as the one who prepares the way for the Lord, i. e., the precursor of Christ. But it is the question whether the quotation is only a later Christian interpretation. Apart from the Qumran library, Isaiah 40:1-5 is referred to in numerous traditions of contemporary Judaism.³⁸ So, it seems quite plausible that the reference to Isaiah 40:3 comes from the circle of the Baptist or, possibly, from himself. In relation with Malachi 3, the last chapter within the canon of the prophets, this passage provides the key for understanding the appearance and message of the Baptist.³⁹ Here, we find the image of judgement with fire (Mal 3:2-3 and 3:19; cf. Mt 3:12 and Lk 3:9) and the message of repentance (Mal 3:7 and 3:24), and Elijah is mentioned as the last warner before the “great and terrible day” of judgement (Mal 3:23-24). Possibly, the reference to Elijah was also important for the place where John acted: According to 2 Kings 2, Elijah crossed the river Jordan at the place where Israel had entered the Holy Land, and beyond the Jordan, on the Eastern side, he was carried away to heaven. In close correspondence with this, John preached and baptised on the Eastern side of the river Jordan, possibly near the trade route where Israelites had entered the land. Just where Elijah was carried away, he acted as the last warner, called for repentance and baptised. Isaiah 40:3 is referred to in Malachi 3:1, and

the other and is, therefore, even less probable than the idea that John was an Essene during the time he preached.

38 Cf. Bar 5.7; Sir 48.24; 1 En. 1.6; As. Mos. 10.4; Lev. Rab. on 1.14; Deut. Rab. on 4.11; Pesiq. R. 29; 30; 33 (see W. D. Davies and D. C. Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew* (Vol. 1; ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988) 294.

39 Cf. H. Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran*, 212-221.

it adds the notion of the desert which is not repeated in Malachi 3. So, John's appearance could be viewed as a verbal fulfilment of Isaiah 40:3: "In the desert prepare a way for the Lord" (Is 40:3).

Completely different is the reference to Isaiah 40:3 in the *Rule of the Community* (1QS 8.14):

In the desert, prepare the way of יהוה, straighten in the steppe a roadway for our God. This is the study of the law which he commanded through the hand of Moses.⁴⁰

Here, the preparation of the way of the Lord is linked with the communal study of the Tora (cf. Ezra 7.10). Here, the communal attention to the Scriptures which was decisive for the community in its formative period is seen as the fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah.⁴¹ When we see that this part *Rule of the Community* was composed certainly before the Essene settlement at Qumran, we can assume that the prophecy was an additional reason for the foundation of the settlement "in the desert". There, the study of the Tora could be practised in segregation from the world outside, and this was seen as fulfilment of Isaiah 40:3.

From the comparison we can see that the Essenes and John used the same scriptural tradition, but interpreted and fulfilled it quite differently. For the Baptist, the fulfilment is linked to the Elijah tradition which is of no relevance for the Essene understanding. For him, it is linked to the call for repentance from Malachi 3 and with the purifying rite of baptism, whereas the Essene usage of Isaiah 40:3 is not linked with the purification rites at all.

Even more striking are the differences regarding the purification rites.⁴² Of course, the Essenes were strongly interested in purity, as we can see in a number of texts and also in the kind of water supply of the Qumran settlement. But whereas for the Essenes immersion was a regular, or even daily practice, John's baptism was granted only once. The Essenes practised immersion by themselves, baptism in the Jordan was carried out by the Baptist. The ablutions of the Essenes were limited to full members, and all who wanted to take part had to pass through the stages of initiation. In contrast,

⁴⁰ Translation according to F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Qumran Study Edition* (Vol. 1; Leiden: Brill, 1998).

⁴¹ Cf. T. Lim, "Midrash Peshar in the Pauline Letters", *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (JSP Supplement Series 26; Roehampton Institute London Papers 3; eds. S. E. Porter and C. A. Evans; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997) 280-292 (286).

⁴² Cf. H. Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran*, 221-227.

the Baptist preached and baptised publicly, and in view of the coming day of judgement, there was not time to wait for admission to baptism. So, the people who came along the trade route and heard his preaching, could repent and be baptised immediately. The purification rituals of the Essenes could be carried out at any place where Essenes lived, whereas John baptised in the Jordan, at the place where Israel once had entered the Holy Land and Elijah was taken up by the heavenly chariot. These differences show that the eschatological purification ritual of John's baptism can not be paralleled with the purity rites of the Essenes. Even though repentance and forgiveness of sins played a significant role in their understanding of purity, the baptism of the Baptist is different, and its distinctive character is visible in contrast with the Essene purity rites. So, John's brothers are not primarily the Essenes, not a figure like Bannus (Josephus, Life 11) but the series of eschatological prophets, and his baptism cannot be explained from the purification rites, nor can the difference between the two explained by the fact that John held a more universalistic view of salvation than the Essenes. But it would be impossible to describe John and his appearance so precisely without the texts from Qumran. So, the Qumran texts provide an important decisive tool for the understanding of John the Baptist in the context of his religious environment.

b) Paul and his anthropological terms: Flesh and Spirit

My second example is related with the religio-historical interpretation of Paul. It is well-known that the older, religio-historical school interpreted Paul's terminology chiefly from Hellenistic Judaism, or even Paganism.⁴³ Now, the Qumran finds have brought out a large number of phrases and ideas which are clearly parallel to passages in Paul's letters and can show the Palestinian-Jewish roots of Pauline thought or, at least, of some of its elements. The expression "works of the law" (ἔργα νόμου) which is quite significant for Paul's argument in Galatians and Romans⁴⁴ was unparalleled before the Qumran finds. An equivalent for the Greek phrase could be found neither in the Hebrew Bible nor in the rabbinic writings.⁴⁵ But now

43 Cf., e. g., the most influential work by W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos* (2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921), 134.

44 Cf. Gal 2:16; 3:2, 5, 10; Rom 3:20, 28.

45 Cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls", *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years* (Vol. 2; ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1999) 599-621 (614f.). Cf. also H.-W. Kuhn, "Qumran und Paulus. Unter traditionsgeschichtlichem Aspekt ausgewählte Parallelen", *Das Urchristentum in seiner literarischen Geschichte* (Festschrift Jürgen Becker; ed. U. Mell and U. B. Müller; BZNW 100; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1999) 227-246.

there are significant parallels in the Qumran library. The closest parallel occurs in the early Essene halakhic work 4QMMT⁴⁶ where the writer affirms: “We have sent you some of the precepts of the Torah ...” (מעשי התורה). The parallel shows that the Pauline usage of “works of the law” refers to a discussion within Palestinian Judaism on the deeds prescribed by the law.

Another phrase which is quite important in Paul’s teaching on justification is “the righteousness of God” (δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ). Even though many passages in the Hebrew Bible call God “righteous” or mention his “righteousness”, a precise Hebrew equivalent of the phrase could not be found. Now, in Qumran, we can see equivalents which show that Paul took the phrase from a genuine Palestinian Jewish tradition.⁴⁷ I should also mention the designations “sons of light” and “sons of the day” used in 1 Thessalonians 5:5 which have a close parallel in the expression which is used quite frequently for the members of the community: “sons of light” in contrast to the “sons of darkness” (cf. 1QS 1.9-11). Although Paul does not use the phrase “sons of darkness”, his expression “works of the darkness” in Romans 13:12 strongly reminds of the dualistic opposition between light and darkness which is prominent in the sectarian texts from Qumran.⁴⁸

Another important parallel between Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls can be shown regarding the Pauline notion of “sinful flesh”⁴⁹ which is also unparalleled in the Hebrew Bible where “flesh” (בשר) only has the notion of weakness and mortality. So, interpreters asked whether the Pauline usage

46 4QMMT^c (4Q498) 14-17 ii 2f (= C26f.).

47 J. A. Fitzmyer, “Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls”, 615. Cf. la qdx (1QM 4.6); la tqdx (1QS 10.25; 11.12).

48 On Qumran dualism see J. Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library”, *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Cambridge 1995. Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten* (STDJ 23; Leiden et al.: Brill, 1997) 275-335.

49 On these issues, cf. J. Frey, “Die paulinische Antithese von ‘Fleisch’ und ‘Geist’ und die palästinisch-jüdische Weisheitstradition”, *ZNW* 90 (1999) 45-77; id., “The Notion of Flesh in 4QInstruction and the Background of Pauline Usage”, *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998, Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet* (eds. Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez, and Eileen M. Schuller; STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 197-226; id., “Flesh and Spirit in Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Texts: An Inquiry into the Background of Paulinian Usage”, *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (eds. Charlotte Hempel, Armin Lange, and Hermann Lichtenberger; BETL 149; Leuven: Peeters, 2002) 367-404.

was derived from Hellenism or even Gnosticism, with the notion that the material body is inferior to the spiritual world. But the notion of “flesh” as related with sin and upheaval, or even as a power opposed to God is also unparalleled within Hellenism. Instead, the closest parallels have been found within the Qumran library. A first example from the concluding hymn in the Rule of the Community (1QS 11.9-10):⁵⁰

However, I belong to evil humankind, to the assembly of unfaithful flesh (בשר עיר); my failings, my iniquities, my sins with the depravities of my heart let me belong to the assembly of worms and of those who walk in darkness.

But then, the author praises the divine grace (1QS 11.11-15):⁵¹

As for me, if I stumble, the mercies of God shall be my salvation always, and if I fall by the sin of the flesh (בשר), in the justice of God which endures eternally, shall my judgment be ... in his justice he will cleanse me from the uncleanness of the human being and from the sin of the sons of man, so that I can give God thanks for his justice and The Highest for his majesty.

Here, and in some of the *Thanksgiving Hymns*, we can see a far-reaching consciousness of sin. The author — and the members of the community reciting the hymns — consider themselves predestined to participate in salvation even though they share the sinful lot of all human beings. In spite of characteristic differences, these texts show remarkable similarities with Paul’s idea of justification of the ungodly (Rom 3:23ff.; 4:5).⁵² In 1QS 11.9, 12, there is also the notion of “flesh” (בשר) as a sphere which is characterised basically by sin and upheaval, or even as a power which provokes and causes evil deeds.⁵³ This is the closest parallel to the Pauline use of “flesh” (σάρξ) as opposed to the “spirit” (πνεῦμα), in Galatians 5:17 or Romans 8:5ff.:

50 Translation according to F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Vol. 1; Leiden: Brill, 1998) 97-99 (modified at the beginning of line 10).

51 Translation *ibid.*, 99 (modified in line 12).

52 Cf. also S. Schulz, “Zur Rechtfertigung aus Gnaden in Qumran und bei Paulus”, *ZTK* 56 (1959) 155-85; J. Becker, *Das Heil Gottes. Heils- und Sündenbegriffe in den Qumrantexten und im Neuen Testament* (SUNT 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964).

53 Cf. J. Becker, *Das Heil Gottes*, 111f. Cf. also 1QHa 5.30-33 (= 13.13-16 Sukenik), 1QHa 7.34f. (= 15.21 Sukenik) and especially 1QHa 12.30f. (= 4.29f. Sukenik). References to the manuscript 1QHa are quoted according to the counting of columns and lines in H. Stegemann’s reconstruction of the scroll.

For the Flesh is actively inclined against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the Flesh. Indeed these two powers constitute a pair of opposites at war with one another, the result being that you do not actually do the very things you wish to do. (Gal 5:17)⁵⁴

For those who exist in terms of the flesh take the side of the flesh, whereas those who exist in terms of the Spirit take the side of the Spirit. For the flesh's way of thinking is death, whereas the Spirit's way of thinking is life and peace. Because the flesh's way of thinking is hostility toward God, for it does not submit itself to the law of God; for it cannot. And those who are in the flesh are not able to please God. (Rom 8:5-8)⁵⁵

Such a negative use of "flesh" goes far beyond the range of meanings of **בשר** in the Bible, it carries a strong notion of evil and iniquity. It even seems to denote a sphere or power opposed to God and his will. The parallels adduced from Hellenistic Judaism, e. g. the Wisdom of Solomon or the works of Philo only share the Hellenistic view in which "flesh" (**σάρξ**) like "body" (**σῶμα**) is viewed as a part of the earthly sphere, but not as the reason or occasion for sin,⁵⁶ nor as a daemonic power with cosmic dimensions. Therefore, "the Qumran tradition offers a ... closer correlation than Hellenistic Judaism."⁵⁷

But there is the question how Paul could have become acquainted with the Qumran traditions. It is unlikely that Paul — even when he was a Pharisaic student of the Tora in Jerusalem — had the opportunity to read the

The reference according to the *editio princeps* by E. L. Sukenik is given in brackets. Cf. H. Stegemann, *Rekonstruktion der Hodajot: Ursprüngliche Gestalt und kritisch bearbeiteter Text der Hymnenrolle aus Höhle 1 von Qumran* (philological dissertation; typoscript; Heidelberg, 1963). I owe thanks to Prof. Stegemann for permission to use his unpublished dissertation and to quote according to his reconstruction of the *Thanksgiving Hymns*.

54 Translation from J. L. Martyn, *Galatians* (AB 33A; New York etc.: Doubleday, 1998) 479.

55 Translation from J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8* (WBC 38A; Waco: Word, 1988) 414.

56 This holds true for On the Giants 29 as well, where "flesh" is said to be "the chief cause for ignorance". But in this passage, flesh denotes only the duties of daily life, marriage, rearing of children, provision of necessities and the business of private and public life which tie the human being to the earthly sphere and hinder the growth of wisdom.

57 R. Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms. A Study of their Use in Context Settings* (AGJU 10; Leiden: Brill, 1971)92f.

“sectarian” texts of the Essenes.⁵⁸ But recently, the publication of the new sapiential documents from Qumran Cave 4⁵⁹ has opened up new perspectives, because these documents do not originate within the “sectarian” Qumran community.

First of all, these documents provide a great number of new instances for בשר, most of them within the document *4QInstruction*, one other example in a text called *Book of Mysteries* (4QMyst^c = 4Q301).⁶⁰ In these texts, there are also passages on the creational humility of the human being and on the “spirit of flesh” (or “fleshly spirit”: רוח בשר). In 4Q418 81 1-2, the addressee is told:

He separated Thee from every fleshly spirit, So that thou mightest
be separated from every thing He hates, And (mightest) hold thy-
self aloof from all that His soul abominates.⁶¹

This passage links the notion of “flesh” with “everything that God hates”.⁶² In this, it clearly goes beyond the notion of “flesh” in any text of the Hebrew Bible. Another passage announcing an eschatological judge-

58 Even if they had contacts with outsiders, Essenes were obliged to hide the peculiar knowledge of the community from them, cf. 1QS 9.16-17; 10.24-25; Josephus, *War* 2.141.

59 The texts are edited in DJD vols. 20 and 34. On the character of the texts, cf. generally D. J. Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran* (London and New York: Routledge, 1996); id., “Ten Reasons Why the Qumran Wisdom Texts are Important”, *Dead Sea Discoveries* 4 (1997) 245-254; J. J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997) 112ff.; and, most recently, the volume by Ch. Hempel, A. Lange & H. Lichtenberger (eds.), *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (BETL 149; Leuven: Peeters, 2002).

60 Cf. A. Lange, “Physiognomie oder Gotteslob? 4Q301 3”, *Dead Sea Discoveries* 4 (1997) 282-296 (283) who shows that 4Q301 is another manuscript of the *Book of Mysteries*, but cf. the differing view in L. H. Schiffman, “Mysteries”, *Qumran Cave 4: XV. Sapiential Texts. Part 1* (DJD 20; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997) 31-123 (31.113f.).

61 Translation from to the edition by J. Strugnell and D.J. Harrington in DJD 34, 302.

62 Another passage is 4Q417 2 i 15-18 where the “spirit of flesh” is characterized by the fact that it did not know the difference between good and evil. Cf. on this text the extensive interpretation in A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden etc.: E. J. Brill, 1995) 50ff.

ment reads “and every spirit of flesh will be destroyed”, while the “sons of Heave[n] s[hall rejoice in the day]” (4Q416 1 12-13). Here, “flesh” is not used in the sense of pure humanity but of sinful humanity, and we can see a dualistic antithesis between two groups of beings, a kind of cosmic and eschatological dualism which is similar to the type of dualism in the doctrine of the two spirits 1QS 3-4.⁶³

The sapiential instruction which is roughly contemporary with Ben Sira⁶⁴ provides the first examples for the use of “flesh” (בשר) with the notion of sin or hostility against God. Here, the term characterises the whole of sinful humanity that will be destroyed in judgement and from which the pious have to keep separate. As we know from the number of manuscripts, these texts were highly esteemed by the Essenes, they read and copied them, moreover, they cited passages in their own texts, e. g. the *Thanksgiving Hymns*,⁶⁵ and took up peculiar ideas or even phrases from them, such as “the mystery to become” (רז נהיה) and the phrase “spirit of flesh”.⁶⁶

We can conclude, therefore, that the notion of “flesh” as a hostile sphere was developed in sapiential circles in Palestine, possibly in the context of the temple. So, when Paul later uses the term “flesh” (σάρξ) with the notion of sin and in a dualistic opposition against “spirit”, his usage shows striking similarities with Essene and with non-Essene texts. But the Pauline usage does not necessarily call for the assumption of an immediate Essene influence. It is rather to be explained by the fact that he shares traditions of Palestinian Jewish Wisdom which might have been discussed in the circles

63 Cf. J. Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library”, 298f.; D. J. Harrington, “Two Early Jewish Approaches to Wisdom: Sirach and Qumran Sapiential Work A”, *JSP* 16 (1997) 25-38 (35): “The world view of Sapiential Work A seems midway between Ben Sira’s timid doctrine of the pairs and the fully fleshed out dualistic schema of 1QS 3-4.”

64 Cf. the most thorough argument in A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 47; id., “In Diskussion mit dem Tempel: Zur Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kohelet und weisheitlichen Kreisen am Jerusalemer Tempel”, *Qohelet in the Context of Wisdom* (ed. A. Schoors; BETL 136; Leuven: Peeters, 1998) 113-159 (129f.); id., “Die Endgestalt des protomasoretischen Psalters”, *Der Psalter im Judentum und Christentum* (ed. E. Zenger; Freiburg etc.: Herder, 1998) 101-136 (122); id., “Die Weisheitstexte aus Qumran: Eine Einleitung”, *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*, 3-30.

65 1QH^a 18.29f. (= 10.27f. Sukenik) cites 4Q418 55 10, and 1QH^a 9.28f. (= 1.26f. Sukenik) alludes to 4Q417 2 I 8; cf. A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 46.

66 Cf. 1QH^a 5.30 (= 13.13 Sukenik); cf. also 4Q301 5 3.

of the sages in Palestine but have been preserved only within the library of Qumran.

The religio-historical explanation is also important for interpretation: When Paul uses the term “flesh”, this should not be understood from Hellenistic thought with its dualism of body and soul and from the negative view of the bodily existence but rather from the Biblical and post-Biblical sapiential tradition in which the strife of human beings was seen as inclined towards evil and hostile against God’s will. This could be demonstrated only on the background of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The recently published wisdom texts show, however, that Paul is not immediately dependent from Qumran sectarian thought, but uses terms which were common to a larger tradition of sapiential discussion.

5. CONCLUSIONS

1. As the last example has shown, the release of the numerous fragments from Cave 4 has changed the situation of scholarship considerably, and it will take some time for scholarship to notice the changes and adapt its views. Now we can concentrate not only on the “sectarian” documents and the party of the Essenes, but also of a great variety of documents representing traditions from various groups of Second Temple Judaism in the two or three centuries before the turn of the era. All these traditions and groups can only be investigated because the Qumranites collected the texts in their library and hid them in the Caves. But they do not necessarily point to a peculiar “sectarian” group or tradition, but to a rich variety of traditions and ideas representing a wide spectrum of contemporary Palestinian Judaism.

2. The issues to be discussed are far more complicated than only the question of direct “genealogical” dependence of Jesus, Paul or John on the views of the Qumran Community or the Essenes. Even if some relations between the Essenes and Early Christianity cannot be ruled out, such assumptions most often remain very speculative and cannot be firmly established. It seems to be much more promising to ask for the impact of the Qumran texts on New Testament interpretation by the study of linguistic parallels, traditio-historical relations and the common use and development of literary forms.

3. One of the most obvious points where the Dead Sea Scrolls have been fruitful for New Testament scholarship is a great number of verbal or phraseological parallels. Words and phrases from New Testament Greek can now be explained by Hebrew or Aramaic parallels from the library of Qumran.

Of course, the linguistic difference cannot be overlooked. According to language theory, Greek texts have to be understood in Greek terms. But Earliest Christianity is a tradition which goes back to the linguistic milieu of first century Palestine. The mother tongue of Jesus and his disciples was Aramaic, and Paul was familiar with Hebrew and Aramaic as well. The same is probably true for the authors of the Fourth Gospel, of Revelation, and of other New Testament texts. Therefore, the Hebrew and Aramaic documents from the time before 70 CE provide an important key to understand the language of the New Testament authors and to grasp the concepts behind the words and phrases they use.

4. The history of scholarship demonstrates, that the discovery of the Qumran library was a decisive turning point for the religio-historical classification and interpretation of the New Testament. Before the Qumran finds or before their publication, many elements of Early Christian tradition were viewed as un-Jewish, Hellenistic or syncretistic. Based on the earlier view of a "normative Judaism" in Palestine before 70 CE, this could be assumed for a great number of phrases and concepts unparalleled in the Hebrew Bible, the major pseudepigrapha and the early Rabbinic writings. In the light of the Scrolls, we can see that Judaism of that time was characterised by a greater diversity and that concepts such as the notion of the sinful "flesh", predestination, or cosmic dualism were developed within pre-Christian Palestinian Judaism.

5. The Qumran library has, therefore, changed our view of Early Christianity considerably. It has shown its rootedness within contemporary Judaism and its many and diverse traditions. One could say, therefore, that the Qumran texts have served to rediscover the Jewishness of Jesus and Early Christianity (including Paul and the Johannine literature). This is perhaps the most important impact of the Qumran finds on New Testament scholarship. This is also important theologically: The message of Jesus and his disciples did not come overnight, and we are bound to understand them within their historical context. Christianity is essentially linked with the elements of its Jewish mother soil, even in issues like the view of Christ or the Law where Early Christian positions differ markedly from most of the other positions held within contemporary Judaism.

6. Finally, the Qumran library has shown how fragmentary our knowledge of the past is. The documents which have been preserved are only a small part of Antiquity, and it might be pure chance that they have not been rotten in the mud. This knowledge should stimulate our attention on the sources we have, and it can motivate us to study them with all effort in order to get a most adequate view of the world in which Christian faith had its beginnings.

APPENDIX: SELECT AND COMMENTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. EDITIONS AND TRANSLATIONS

a) Facsimile, Microfiches and CD-ROM

The facsimile edition of the photographs offered the first access to the vast majority of previously unpublished documents. In order to identify the fragments, however, it is necessary to work with the Companion Volume by E. Tov and S. Pfann. The best pictures are provided on the CD edition which unfortunately is unaffordable even for many institutions. The second CD is much cheaper, it lacks the Biblical texts and does not contain as many photographs as Vol. 1, but it contains a database, including Hebrew transcriptions, an English translation, word lists and a search engine that allows to search for words or create a concordance.

R. Eisenman & J. M. Robinson, *A Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Vol. I-II (Washington D. C.: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991).

E. Tov & S. J. Pfann, *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche: A Comprehensive Facsimile Edition of the Texts from the Judaean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 1993).

T. Lim (ed., in consultation with P. Alexander), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Electronic Reference Library* (Oxford: OUP; Leiden: Brill, 1997)

E. Tov (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library*, Vol. 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1999).

E. Tov (with the collaboration of S. J. Pfann), *Companion Volume to the Dead Sea Scrolls Microfiche Edition* (2nd rev. ed.; Leiden: Brill and IDC, 1995).

b) "Official" editions

After the first editions of the larger documents from Cave 1, most of the documents (with the famous exception of the Temple Scroll from Cave 11) were officially published in the series *Discoveries of the Judaean Desert* (vol. III-V: *Discoveries of the Judean Desert of Jordan*) published by Oxford University Press (resp. Clarendon Press, Oxford). These volumes provide plates with photographs, codicological information, transcriptions, translation (most volumes in English, but some in French), notes on readings, and other philological tools. A list of the 39 volumes of this series can be found at the website of the Orion Institute (Hebrew University, Jerusalem): <http://orion.mscc.huji.ac.il>. An introduction and the most recent list of the documents is provided in the concluding index volume: *The Texts from the Judean Desert: Indices and An Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judean Desert Series* (DJD 39; ed. E. Tov; Oxford: Clarendon, 2002).

M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery* (fasc. I/II; New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950/1): Fasc. I: *1QIs^a, 1QpHab*; fasc. II: *1QS*.

E. L. Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press/The Hebrew University, 1955): Includes *1QS^b*, *1QM*, *1QH*.

N. Avigad & Y. Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press and Heikhal ha-Sefer, 1956): Edition of (parts of) *1QGenAp*.

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

Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (3 Vols; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983).

c) Other important editions and study editions

The most important “non-official” edition is the *Princeton Dead Sea Scrolls Project*, directed by J. H. Charlesworth, which provides a comprehensive text of the non-Biblical documents, with text critical notes (and, compared with the older DJD volumes, some improved readings), an English translation and brief introductory information. 5 of presumably 12 volumes have been published up to the present:

J. H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck and Louisville, KN: Westminster John Knox, 1994ff.).

The more affordable “Study Edition” by García Martínez and Tigchelaar provides a composite Hebrew/Aramaic text of almost all non-Biblical texts and an English translation (which is not in every case quite in correspondence with the given text). A very useful edition of the most important texts with vocalized Hebrew/Aramaic texts and German translation is available in the two volumes by Lohse and Steudel.

F. García Martínez & E. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998).

E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran. Hebräisch und deutsch, mit masoretischer Punktation, Übersetzung, Einführung und Anmerkungen* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1981).

A. Steudel (Hg.), *Die Texte aus Qumran II. Hebräisch/Aramäisch und Deutsch. Mit masoretischer Punktation, Übersetzung, Einführung und Anmerkungen* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2001).

d) Translations

A comprehensive account of the contents and textual variants of the Biblical Scrolls is given in the “Dead Sea Scrolls Bible” by Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich. Other recommendable English translations are by García Martínez, Vermes, or in German by Maier.

M. G. Abegg, Jr., P. W. Flint & E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible* (San Francisco: Harper-SanFrancisco, 1999).

F. García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated. The Qumran Texts in English* (trans. by W. G. E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 1994).

G. Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (London: Penguin, 1997).

J. Maier, *Die Qumran-Essener: Die Texte vom Toten Meer* (3 vols.; München and Basel: Reinhardt, 1995/96). Vol. 3 provides chronological tables and a German key word concordance.

J. Maier, *Die Tempelrolle vom Toten Meer und das "Neue Jerusalem"* (3rd ed., München and Basel: Reinhardt, 1997).

e) On the Essenes according to ancient authors:

The ancient texts on the Essenes are given in original in the edition by Adam, an English translation is provided for the more important texts in the textbook by Vermes & Goodman.

A. Adam (ed.), *Antike Berichte über die Essener* (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen 182; 2. neu bearbeitete und erweiterte Auflage von Ch. Burchard; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1972).

G. Vermes & M. D. Goodman (eds.), *The Essenes According to the Classical Sources* (Oxford Center Textbooks; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989).

2. Bibliographies, concordances, and philological tools

a) Bibliography

A current bibliography on Qumran is provided on the website of the Orion Institute in Jerusalem (<http://orion.mssc.huji.ac.il>). Previously, the Qumran Bibliography was published regularly in the *Revue de Qumran*.

A reliable bibliographical guide to the earlier editions and tools was the booklet by Fitzmyer. A more recent (but not always accurate) bibliography was provided by García Martínez and Parry.

J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study* (3rd ed.; SBL Resources for Biblical Study 20; Atlanta: Scholars, 1990).

F. García Martínez & D. W. Parry, *A Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah 1970-95* (StTDJ 19; Leiden, New York and Köln 1996).

b) Language

Whereas many words from Qumran texts are not referred to in the dictionaries of Biblical Hebrew, there is an extensive use of Qumran material in the most recent Dictionary of Classical Hebrew. For the Aramaic words, there is a dictionary in Beyer's work. In the later volumes of the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* (ed. Botterweck, Ringgren & Fabry) there is also extensive use of Qumran references. Additionally, a separate volume *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumranschriften* is planned.

The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew (ed. D. J. A. Clines; Sheffield, Sheffield: Academic Press, 1993-). Vols. 1-5 have been published up to now (including *aleph — nun*).

K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer; samt den Inschriften aus Palästina ...* (2 vols., Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984/1994).

E. Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (HSS 29; Atlanta: Scholars, 1986).

T. Muraoka (ed.), *Studies in Qumran Aramaic* (Abr-Nahrain Supplement 3; Louvain: Peeters, 1992).

c) Concordances

In addition to the classical concordance by Kuhn, which only covered the texts published in the early years, concordances are given in the more recent DJD volumes. The graphic concordance by Charlesworth is arranged not according to the words/roots, but according to the sequence of Hebrew letters in the word forms used.

K. G. Kuhn etc., *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960). Cf. also the additions in *Revue de Qumran* 4 (1963/64), 163-234; *Zeitschrift für Altbraistik* 4 (1991), 213-215; 8 (1995), 340-354.

J. H. Charlesworth (ed.), *Graphic Concordance on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck and Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991).

M. Abegg etc. (ed.), *Concordance to the Non-Biblical Scrolls* (Leiden etc.: Brill, 2003, in press).

3. Introductions and comprehensive information

a) Introductions

The most up-to-date introduction is the work by VanderKam and Flint (published 2002). Other quite useful introductions are the booklets by VanderKam and by Stegemann. The classical book of F. M. Cross is only an updated version of a work written in 1958.

J. A. Fitzmyer, *Responses to 101 questions on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Chapman, 1993).

J. C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994).

F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (3rd ed., Philadelphia: Fortress, 1995).

H. Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist and Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995).

b) Major reference works

D. Dimant, "Qumran Sectarian Literature", in: M. E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (CRINT 2; Assen: van Gorcum, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984, 483-550).

E. Schürer, G. Vermes & F. Millar, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B. C.-A. D. 135): A New English Version* (4 vols. in 3; Edinburgh 1973-87), vol. 2, 555-597; vol. 3/1, 380-469.

c) Archaeology

The classical report is from de Vaux, but cf., most recently, the book by Jodi Magness.

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

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

c) Comprehensive information

Comprehensive articles on almost every field of Qumran research are given in the volumes by Flint & VanderKam. Articles on most of the subjects can be found in the Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

P. W. Flint & J. C. VanderKam (eds.), k (2 vols., Leiden: Brill, 1998/99).

L. H. Schiffman & J. C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (2 vols., New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

4. Qumran and the New Testament

a) Jesus and Messianism

J. H. Charlesworth (ed.), *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ABRL 4, New York: Doubleday, 1992).

J. J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (ABRL 10; New York: Doubleday, 1995).

C. A. Evans, "Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls," Flint & VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After 50 Years*, vol. 2, 573-598.

C. A. Evans, "Jesus and the Messianic Texts from Qumran," in: id., *Jesus and His Contemporaries: Comparative Studies* (SGJU 25; Leiden: Brill, 1995) 83-154.

b) Paul and Christian Origins

J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature* (Grand Rapids, Mi, and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2000).

J. Murphy-O'Connor (ed.), *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis* (London: Chapman, 1968), repr. in: J. H. Charlesworth (ed.), *Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Crossroad, 1990).

H.-W. Kuhn, "The Impact of the Qumran Scrolls on the Understanding of Paul," in: D. Dimant & U. Rappaport (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (STDJ 10, Leiden: Brill; Jerusalem: Magnes and Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1992) 327-339.

J. A. Fitzmyer, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in: Flint & VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After 50 Years*, vol. 2, 599-621.

c) Johannine Literature

J. H. Charlesworth (ed.), *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Crossroad, 1990).

R. Bauckham, "Qumran and the Fourth Gospel: Is there a Connection?" in: S. E. Porter & C. A. Evans (eds.), *The Scrolls and the Scriptures. Qumran Fifty Years After* (JSP.S 26 / RILP 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997) 267-279.

J. Frey, "Der johanneische Dualismus und die Texte von Qumran," in: J. Frey & U. Schnelle (eds.), *Kontexte des Johannesevangeliums* (WUNT; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004, in press).

D. Aune, "Qumran and the Book of Revelation", in: Flint & VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After 50 Years*, vol. 2, 622-648.

Keywords

Qumran

Dead Sea Scrolls

New Testament Interpretation

John the Baptist

Pauline Theology: flesh

Trefwoorde

Qumran

Dooie See-Rolle

Interpretasie van die Nuwe Testament

Johannes die Doper

Pauliniese Teologie: vlees