

ESCHATOLOGY
— IN THE BIBLE —
**AND IN JEWISH AND
CHRISTIAN TRADITION**

edited by
Henning Graf Reventlow



**JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT
SUPPLEMENT SERIES**

243

Editors

David J.A. Clines

Philip R. Davies

Executive Editor

John Jarick

Editorial Board

Robert P. Carroll, Richard J. Coggins, Alan Cooper, J. Cheryl Exum,
John Goldingay, Robert P. Gordon, Norman K. Gottwald,
Andrew D.H. Mayes, Carol Meyers, Patrick D. Miller

Sheffield Academic Press

This page intentionally left blank

Eschatology in the Bible and in Jewish and Christian Tradition

edited by

Henning Graf Reventlow

Journal for the Study of the Old Testament
Supplement Series 243



To the memory of
Gertrud Luckner
and
Benjamin Uffenheimer

Copyright © 1997 Sheffield Academic Press

Published by Sheffield Academic Press Ltd
Mansion House
19 Kingfield Road
Sheffield S11 9AS
England

Printed on acid-free paper in Great Britain
by Bookcraft Ltd
Midsomer Norton, Bath

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available
from the British Library

ISBN 1-85075-664-3

CONTENTS

Editor's Preface	7
Abbreviations	9
List of Contributors	12
 YEHOSHUA AMIR	
Messianism and Zionism	13
HORST BALZ	
Early Christian Faith as 'Hope against Hope'	31
RACHEL ELIOR	
Not <i>All</i> is in the Hands of Heaven: Eschatology and Kabbalah	49
CHRISTOFER FREY	
Eschatology and Ethics: Their Relation in Recent Continental Protestantism	62
YAIR HOFFMAN	
Eschatology in the Book of Jeremiah	75
CHRISTIAN LINK	
Points of Departure for a Christian Eschatology	98
GOTTFRIED NEBE	
The Son of Man and the Angels: Reflections on the Formation of Christology in the Context of Eschatology	111
BILHAH NITZAN	
Eschatological Motives in Qumran Literature: The Messianic Concept	132
AHARON OPPENHEIMER	
Leadership and Messianism in the Time of the Mishnah	152
HENNING GRAF REVENTLOW	
The Eschatologization of the Prophetic Books: A Comparative Study	169

WINFRIED THIEL	
Character and Function of Divine Sayings in the Elijah and Elisha Traditions	189
†BENJAMIN UFFENHEIMER	
From Prophetic to Apocalyptic Eschatology	200
MOSHE WEINFELD	
Expectations of the Divine Kingdom in Biblical and Postbiblical Literature	218
KLAUS WENGST	
Aspects of the Last Judgment in the Gospel according to Matthew	233
Panel Discussion	246
Index of References	254
Index of Authors	264

EDITOR'S PREFACE

This is the fourth volume of papers read at symposia between the Department of Bible of Tel Aviv University and the Faculty of Protestant Theology of the University of Bochum. The first symposium, held in Tel Aviv in December 1985, and the following over here brought together Jewish and Christian scholars at regular intervals. The aim has always been the same: to open a dialogue between biblical and postbiblical scholars on a topic that, starting from the Bible and going on to problems in history and in the present, seemed to be important and to have an enduring impact on the tradition of both religious communities. We also succeeded in keeping the scholarly character of the discussions, held under the auspices of the above-mentioned universities.

Between the conference held in June 1995 and the publication of this volume, a heavy loss hit our fellowship: Benjamin Uffenheimer, who initiated and arranged the first meeting together with the present editor, who also should have been co-editor of this volume, unexpectedly passed away in April 1996. He had suggested that this volume should be dedicated to Gertrud Luckner's memory. I gladly fulfil this wish. Gertrud Luckner, main editor of the *Freiburger Rundbrief* since 1948, was born in Liverpool in 1900, but left the UK at six years old, returning just for shorter stays, especially during her studies in the Quaker college in Woodbridge, Birmingham. She was promoted Dr rer. pol. in Freiburg with a thesis on *The Self-Assistance of the Unemployed in England and Wales, on the Basis of the English Economic History and History of Ideas* in 1938. During Nazi rule, as a member of Caritas she was busy in organizing help for persecuted people, especially Jews. She supported many of them in leaving the country. During one of these travels she was arrested and finally imprisoned at Ravensbrück. There she was liberated at the end of the war. After the war she was renowned for her continuous work for reconciliation and a closer understanding between Jews and Christians.

She died on 31 August 1995, only half a year before Benjamin Uffenheimer's decease. After his last journey to Bochum he paid her a final visit, as if he had known in advance that there would not be another opportunity to say farewell to one another. Now it seems convenient that the names of both should be united in the dedication. *Requiescat in pace.*

Again I have to express our gratitude to the Evangelical Church of Westphalia for generously sponsoring these symposia. I am also grateful to the publishers who made possible the appearance of this volume. Special thanks go to Professor Y. Hoffman for his invaluable help with identifying recent literature written in Israel in modern Hebrew and not available in German libraries.

Henning Graf Reventlow
Bochum

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
ANET	J.B. Pritchard (ed.), <i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts</i>
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
ARAB	D.D. Luckenbill, <i>Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia</i> (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1826–27)
ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch
BARev	<i>Biblical Archaeology Review</i>
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
BEvT	Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie
BHK	R. Kittel (ed.), <i>Biblia hebraica</i>
BHS	<i>Biblia hebraica stuttgartensia</i>
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar: Altes Testament
BT	<i>The Bible Translator</i>
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZAW	Beihefte zur ZAW
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i> , Monograph Series
CD	<i>Damascus Covenant</i>
CJAS	Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DSD	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
EBib	Etudes bibliques
EdF	Erträge der Forschung
EHAT	Exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament
EKKNT	Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
EM	<i>Encyclopedia Miqra'it</i>
EvT	<i>Evangelische Theologie</i>
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
FzB	Forschung zur Bibel
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HSS	Harvard Semitic Series
HTKNT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
HWPPh	<i>Handwörterbuch der Philosophie</i>
IEJ	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
ITP	H. Tadmor, <i>The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III</i> (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences, 1994)

<i>JAOS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JBT</i>	<i>Jahrbuch für biblische Theologie</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period</i>
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
<i>JSOTSup</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>JTS</i>	Jewish Theological Seminary of America
<i>KAT</i>	Kommentar zum Alten Testament
<i>KD</i>	K. Barth, <i>Kirchliche Dogmatik</i>
<i>KHAT</i>	Kurzer Handcommentar zum Alten Testament
<i>LCL</i>	Loeb Classical Library
<i>NEB</i>	Neue Echterbibel
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>NZST</i>	<i>Neue Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie</i>
<i>OTE</i>	<i>Old Testament Essays</i>
<i>OTL</i>	Old Testament Library
<i>OTP</i>	J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), <i>Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i>
<i>OTS</i>	<i>Oudtestamentische Studiën</i>
<i>PAM</i>	Palestine Archeological Museum
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
<i>RechBib</i>	<i>Recherches bibliques</i>
<i>REJ</i>	<i>Revue des études juives</i>
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
<i>RHR</i>	<i>Revue de l'histoire des religions</i>
<i>SBB</i>	Stuttgarter biblische Beiträge
<i>SBLRBS</i>	SBL Resources for Biblical Study
<i>SBLSBS</i>	SBL Sources for Biblical Study
<i>SBLSCS</i>	SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies
<i>SBS</i>	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
<i>SBT</i>	Studies in Biblical Theology
<i>SEÅ</i>	<i>Svensk exegetisk årsbok</i>
<i>ST</i>	<i>Studia theologica</i>
<i>STDJ</i>	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
<i>SUNT</i>	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
<i>TBü</i>	Theologische Bücherei
<i>ThWAT</i>	G.J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren (eds.), <i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament</i>
<i>TWNT</i>	G.J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren (eds.), <i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</i>
<i>TLZ</i>	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
<i>TRE</i>	<i>Theologische Realenzyklopädie</i>
<i>TZ</i>	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>UTB</i>	Uni-Taschenbücher
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
<i>VTSup</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum, Supplements</i>

WA	<i>Martin Luther, Werke, Weimarer Ausgabe</i>
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZBKAT	Zürcher Bibelkommentar. Altes Testament
ZdZ	<i>Zwischen den Zeiten</i>
ZTK	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Yehoshua Amir is Emeritus Professor in the Department of Bible, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel.

Horst Balz is Professor of Theology and Contemporary History of the New Testament, Evangelisch-Theologische Fakultät, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany.

Rachel Elior is Professor in the Department of Jewish Thought, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel.

Christofer Frey is Professor of Systematic Theology (Ethics), Evangelisch-Theologische Fakultät, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany.

Yair Hoffmann is Professor in the Department of Bible, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel.

Christian Link is Professor of Systematic Theology, Evangelisch-Theologische Fakultät, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany.

Gottfried Nebe is Associate Professor of New Testament, Evangelisch-Theologische Fakultät, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany.

Bilhah Nitzan is Lecturer in the Department of Bible, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel.

Aharon Oppenheimer is Professor in the Department for Jewish History, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel.

Henning Graf Reventlow is Emeritus Professor of Theology and Exegesis of the Old Testament, Evangelisch-Theologische Fakultät, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany.

Winfried Thiel is Professor of Old Testament, Evangelisch-Theologische Fakultät, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany.

The late Benjamin Uffenheimer was Professor in the Department of Bible, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel.

Moshe Weinfeld is Professor in the Department of Bible, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel.

Klaus Wengst is Professor of Theology and Exegesis of the New Testament, Evangelisch-Theologische Fakultät, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany.

MESSIANISM AND ZIONISM

Yehoshua Amir

When sitting at my desk, concentrating on the topic of my present paper, I caught myself humming under my breath a half-forgotten tune of old *halutzig* times, saying something like:

Hi, you foolish *halutz*, what are you doing there
what are you building there,
—I am building a big highway, stones and gravel and earth and sand.
—For whom, for what?
—For Mashiah son of David
who shall come to us
in circles of dancers.¹

After musing for a while upon my unexpected association, I came out with two questions:

First, why is this young Zionist pioneer, probably immigrated to Israel (then: Palestine) from a Polish Jewish Shtetl in the twenties of this century and now working under the hot sun on the road building of a new country, addressed here as foolish?

Secondly, why does the author intimate to him that at the core, the motivation that drove him to his hard new life, which stands in sharp contrast to everything accepted in his family or his social tradition, is, nevertheless, that utopian one indicated by him?

To the first question: a *halutz*, or, more specifically, a member of the Hehalutz organization, belongs to a proletarian movement more or less strictly committed to Marxism. Whatever he will find in his environment that smacks of religious tradition comes under the verdict of 'reactionaryism'. Where this spirit of socialistic revolt takes on a Zionist turn, the applicable derogatory term is 'Galuth mentality'.

1. A slightly defective version of this song I found in *Shiron Halutzi* (compiled by A. Ben-Gera; Delivery Office of the Hehalutz of the General Zionists in Poland, Siwan 5693 [1933]), p. 7.

And the younger generation has good reason to consider belief in the coming of Messiah, the Godsent redeemer, as one of the most repulsive features of this mentality since this was a belief that was frequently used for soothing down any indignation with unbearable conditions and blocking virtually any initiative to changing them. So, the symbol of Messiah could be considered as the negation of the *halutzic* outlook epitomized in the poetess's line:

Here on the surface of earth, not there above in the clouds.²

Coming to my second question I have to start with adumbrating the modifications undergone by the notion of Messiah with the entrance of Jews into modern society. On both the social and the spiritual levels, encounter with the modern world first happened in Germany in the reform movement in the beginning of the nineteenth century. This movement, although denying the actual wish for returning to the Holy Land, and although stripping the idea of all its mythological apparel, singled out as its underlying central idea belief in the ordained final victory of justice in humankind. The traditional expectation of the sudden 'coming of Messiah' was transformed into belief in a gradual process, tending to be identified with the general belief in the progress of humankind. In this garb, messianism was hailed as a central profoundly Jewish concept, especially since one of its expressions was the ongoing process of the Jews' emancipation in modern society. Samuel Hirsch proclaimed this belief as 'the center of Judaism',³ and one of the speakers in the second Rabbinical Assembly at Frankfurt (1845) insisted that 'we are already moving into redemption' (*in die Erlösung einrücken*), for 'everything is on the way to the better' (*Alles wird besser*).⁴

As in this paper I am concerned with the nationalist perspectives of messianism, Reform views that start with bracketing out this national ('particularistic') dimension seem to be irrelevant for our purpose. Yet it will be seen that they are all prejudiced by some features inherited from this first re-interpretation: the commutation of a sudden, catastrophic event into a gradual process, the replacing of a personal

2. *Shirat Rahel* (Tel Aviv: Edition Davar, 1950), p. 58.

3. *Protokolle und Aktenstücke der 2. Rabbinerversammlung abgehalten zu Frankfurt am Main vom 15.-28. Juli 1845* (Frankfurt am Main: Ullman'sche Buchhandlung, 1845), pp. 58-59.

4. *Protokolle und Aktenstücke*, p. 85.

Messiah by the notion of a 'Messianic Age', the obliterating of the borderline between divine and human action and between intra-historical progress and extra-historical redemption, and the conviction that the new era has already begun.

To begin with, Moses Hess (1812–1875), for all his nationalistic fervor, has much more in common with reform views than he may have been aware of. His belief in progress is based on premises anchored in a certain kind of Spinozism. The all-embracing divine life is displayed in three concentric circles, all governed by the identical law of proceeding to perfection: the cosmological, the organic and the human. This last circle differs from the other two in this point: whereas those two are closed already, the human one is as yet on its way. This way, called history, is not working automatically, as the first two are, but proceeds through human conscience and human action. Its fulfilment will be the establishment of a united human society, or a harmonious humankind, organized in socialistic institutions. In our age this process is advanced in such a measure that it is no longer difficult to discover its aim, but in the dawn of history, when humanity was as yet divided into an infinite number of conflicting tiny tribes there was just one single people that, owing to its national genius, discovered the intrinsic meaning of history. This was the Jewish people, which, in its mythical tradition, derived the whole of humankind from one single ancestor and let the course of history end with the figure of Messiah, the uniter of humanity. This understanding of history is made the cornerstone of Jewish society by the institution of *shabbat*, crowning six days of work by one day of fulfilment. That is why Hess calls the Jewish ceremonial cult a 'Geschichtskult' for it epitomizes the course of world history leading through a series of stages—the last outstanding one being the French revolution—till its goal, the harmonic socialist society, called in Jewish tradition 'the day that is *shabbat* altogether'. Yet cult is just the residue of the Jewish social institution that has been left over after the destruction of Jewish statehood. In order to give a full expression to the meaning of our central idea, we need a full-fledged national life, and for such a restoration we need our country as its natural base. In this moment, when humankind is about to reach the ultimate goal of its history, it is in urgent need of the restoration of that people who led it into the way of understanding its own destination. Only as a people on its own soil will the Jewish people be able to occupy its place among the nations

constituting redeemed humankind, and—even more importantly—only after restoring its full humanity will it be able to develop its own socialistic institutions destined to organize Jewish society according to its own intrinsic values of social justice—and this work of organizing itself will be the real reform Judaism has to undergo.

Finally, I note two points concerning this messianic program:

1. The crucial question of drawing a clear demarcation line between divine and human activity in bringing about the messianic world order is here obliterated by the Spinozistic inclusion of human activity into the all embracing 'divine life'.
2. The universalistic aspect of the messianic idea, claimed by reform theology as its true character, is fully maintained in Moses Hess's socialist version, too.

The particularistic aspect, although strongly held by him, has to justify its presence by its function within the universalistic master plan.

It is another question, however, to what degree all this belongs to the history of Zionism proper. *Rom und Jerusalem* by Moses Hess, appearing in 1862, passed almost unnoticed. When in 1895 Herzl started the Zionist movement, the book was virtually forgotten. Only some years later was it rediscovered, and Herzl was surprised to find there many of his own thoughts, but its messianic perspective could appear to him only as a kind of popular rhetoric. This side of Hess's message could find a warmer response only with the emergence of socialist Zionism but in that camp it had to be stripped of its outspoken religious overtones. Those could be tolerated as a *face de parler* but not on their face value.

Important elements of Hess's outlook inside the Zionist world can be traced in Buber. It is true that Buber's thought cannot in the vulgar sense be called messianic, because he did not envisage an end of history close at hand, but certainly the messianic aim is for him the only valid criterion for any social and political activity. As against Moses Hess, Buber preferred finding 'Paths in Utopia' to establishing institutions, for what really matters for him is the emergence of a 'real community' (*wahre Gemeinschaft*), composed of members living in dialogical reciprocity with each other. Such a community would appear as the social reflection of living in God's presence. The earthly pre-condition for such a way of life was the restoration of a free

Jewish society, living on its own soil. From there followed a re-formulation of the reform concept of the Jewish 'mission to humankind': it was not our task to teach humanity that there is only One God, but to show them that he is dwelling among us.⁵ 'To "realize God" means to prepare the world for God, as a place for His reality.'⁶ So, again there is the intricate interconnection between the particularistic and the universalistic aspects of the Jewish hope for the future: by realizing the essence of our Jewish message we shall form a kind of avant-garde for humankind. More than Hess, Buber stresses the responsibility against humankind involved in such an interconnection from the side of a national movement always exposed to temptations of national egoism. That connecting link obliges us, in Buber's view, not only to maintain ourselves against the nations but also to maintain the nations against ourselves.⁷ Apprehensions like that led Buber to a self-critical attitude, which he considered as his main religious duty as a legacy of the prophets of Israel. It is just the super-national meaning of his national commitment that cautions him against nationalistic exuberances.

I return to the *halutz* of our song who professes adherence to a secular, possibly Marxist, variety of socialism, and nevertheless is aware that essentially the aim of the hard work he is doing every day is to pave the way for Mashiah ben David. It is immediately evident that this is not a Messiah coming down surprisingly to an apathetic people and bringing with him ready-made solutions to all its hardships, but a Messiah brought along on a highway prepared for him by people working with a most intense activity. This new trait in the picture of messianism appeared in Judaism, wherever it entered the modern world. Of course 'Messiah' is for those people only a symbolic figure, meaning a new world order, perhaps starting from our country but finally embracing the whole of humankind. I must add that, if this pioneer was to peruse the concepts of messianism reviewed before, he would be likely to strip them of their religious parameters completely outside his horizon and reduce them to the social content

5. M. Buber, *Werke* (Munich: Kösel Verlag, Lambert Schneider Verlag, 1962), I, p. 302.

6. M. Buber, *Der Jude und sein Judentum* (Cologne: Joseph Melzer Verlag, 1963), p. 8.

7. Buber, *Der Jude*, p. 311.

that may have a serious appeal to him. His would be a secular version of messianism.

Yet here I have to raise a crucial question: is it not a sacrilegious usurpation if such a young Zionist dares to apply the name of a sanctified religious figure to an avowedly secular object? Is it not a sort of blasphemy if he uses a holy name for designating a purely political aim? This is, of course, the severe objection that was raised against this use of language from various sides. There is no general answer to that objection. Yet for this type of *halutz* it can be said that he certainly would have denied the right of such an accusation. Probably, he has been brought up in a world where the notion of the Messiah was at home in its mythical traditional meaning. After shaking off from it whatever had no room in his adult world he clings to what seems to him now to be its remaining kernel of value. He does not substitute furtively something different instead of a true meaning, now denied, but he is convinced that now he has arrived at the real thing hinted by that notion. He is sure that now he has got to the secular analogon of what his fathers had termed with their religious notion.

From whence does he derive that feeling to stand near a secular analogon of a messianic situation? I would say that he is aware of unexpected powers arising inside his personality that enable him to cope with his given situation by deeds unparalleled in the social environment from which he is coming. He has broken loose from the suffocating conditions of his origin in a creative way that can be characterized simultaneously on three fields: he transplanted himself into an altogether different country, he went over to an occupation completely outside the horizon of his economical tradition and at the same time he was the main actor in the drama of the renaissance of Hebrew as a spoken language—a success that has no full parallel anywhere in the world. All in all, he must feel not just that he has done something completely new but that he has become something completely new. As a new Jew and a new man he is likely to see himself as a citizen of a world become new. The breakthrough that happened inside himself is understood by him as a reflection of a breakthrough in the world. And that must appear to him as the secular analogon to what is meant by the religious idea of Mashiah.

I began this survey with that part of the Jewish world that has consciously entered the modern world. Now I must switch from mod-

ernistic to orthodox Judaism, to that part of Jewry that did not accept the translation of 'Mashiah ben David' into 'Age of Redemption', stripped of the mythological paraphernalia supplied to it by tradition. In orthodox traditional Judaism, the translation, performed as a matter of course in modernist circles, was not even taken into account.

Nevertheless, there were in the middle of the nineteenth century orthodox rabbis who protested against the usual passive attitude of waiting for supernatural redemption. Redemption, they dared to say, is not to be looked upon as a sudden event but as a process going on step by step. As a matter of course, they would wait for a God-sent redeemer, but they would allow for preliminary steps that may be taken at the time. In this spirit they advocated, for instance, the foundation of agricultural settlements in Palestine instead of the installation of houses for sheltering the poor in Jerusalem.⁸ For this line of thought they had a certain precedent in medieval Jewish tradition that indulged in constructing a kind of timetable for the future drama of redemption, starting with a world catastrophe with bloody wars and the like, but later on including soteriological items like the reappearance of the ten lost tribes of Israel and, finally, the resurrection of the dead. In this series of events the appearance of the Messiah held neither the first nor the last place. Schemes like this tended to obliterate the original sharp dichotomy into two opposed lines of events, pernicious human action on the one side and salutary miraculous divine intervention on the other. 'We shall get the benefices from God after a good preparation, and that shall be done by us. . . We shall work on the earth, to "give redemption to the holy earth" by ploughing and harvesting. . . These are those "good works" that bring redemption nearer.'⁹ While a talmudic saying has it that now redemption depends only on our 'teshuva', meaning reversing our way of life, one of these rabbis declares: teshuva means returning (shivah) into our land.

It was only a very tiny group of rabbis who uttered such opinions, and they did not find much hearing in their time. Their view was fiercely rejected by the overwhelming majority of rabbis. These rabbis saw in them an open rebellion against a longstanding tradition about the 'oaths' that God had made Israel swear not 'to precipitate the end',

8. A. Rabitzky, *Haketz hamgulle umdinat ha-Yehudim* (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1993), p. 47, = *ET Messianism, Zionism and the Jewish Religious Radicalism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996).

9. Hayyim David Hazzan, quoted in Rabitzky, *Haketz hamgulle*, p. 47 n. 8.

not 'to stir up, not to awake the love, till He wants'.¹⁰ This association, from the Song of Songs, was the time-honored way to calm attempts to actualize the latent Jewish urge to set an end to the *galut* situation and to prevent an untimely outburst of yearnings that easily could get out of control. Belief in these oaths had become part and parcel of Jewish self-identification in the period of *galut*, and breaking this oath was held to be a cardinal sin against the whole of Jewish existence. No wonder that the vast majority of non-emancipated Jewry accepted the sentence of their rabbis, condemning opinions that seemed to attenuate the validity of these oaths.

No wonder, also, that the new Zionist organization met with a stubborn resistance by the bulk of orthodoxy. It is true that Herzl's appeal evoked an immense echo in Eastern Europe—'the light took them all away', says young Bialik—but this was the appeal of modernity, and those who wanted to stay firm against its temptation were certainly prone to hardening their opposition to influences that seemed dangerous to their Judaism. Moreover, along with the progress of Zionist immigration, the consolidation of a strong Jewish secular population in the country, later on the War of Liberation and the creation of the State of Israel, the non-orthodox sector became the dominant power in the country, and whoever strove to hold his own against this victorious flood had to radicalize his means of defence. For the Rabbi of Munkàcs Zionism became a work of Satan who had succeeded to entrench himself in the Holy Land and to make it into his fortress.¹¹

In view of this mental situation, religious Zionism could not continue the course formerly steered by the few rabbis of the last century, who were led by their hope of messianic redemption to a sort of proto-Zionism. When inside the Zionist organization there was founded a religious party (Mizrahi), this party had to be cautious not to voice messianic aspirations.¹² Such a party had to cooperate with non-religious Zionists, and such a cooperation could be justified only if the field of religion was excluded from it. Zionism should not be inter-

10. The motif of these oaths stems from a Midrash, brought in *b. Ket.* 11a; *Mekilta* Ismael to Exod. 13.17; *Midrash* to Shir-ha-Shirim, to 2.7. On the reception of this motif in medieval and early modern Jewish thought see the important appendix to Rabinovitch, *Haketz hamgulle*, pp. 277-305.

11. Quoted from a letter of R. Hayyim Elazar Shapira, the Rabbi of Munkàcs, by Rabinovitch, *Haketz hamgulle*, p. 62.

12. Rabinovitch, *Haketz hamgulle*, p. 119.

preted in terms of bringing about the coming of Messiah—this should be left altogether to the unfathomable will of God. Zionism was to be an arrangement for securing a Jewish future within the historical, unredeemed world, and for this arrangement, one had to work side by side with non-religious brethren. Inside the Zionist organization and inside the various sections of Palestinian or Israeli Jewry such a party had to strive for the rights of the religious section of the Jewish population in the field of education and so on, and for respect for the law of *Halacha* in the public section of common life. The strict separation between Zionist politics and messianic hopes was kept inside Mizrahi for decades—till that new development which is described below. It is easy to see that this almost ascetic refraining from indulging in messianic motifs in the day-to-day work of that party was not easily maintained and gave rise to many misgivings within their own ranks. Especially, it must have been a hard task to impose this abstention upon the party's youth movement.

At this point I have to interrupt my current historical account to dwell on the spiritual development of the most profound thinker of Jewish orthodoxy of his time, Rav Avraham Yitzhak ha-cohen Kook, Chief Rabbi of Palestine from 1921. For this part of my essay, even more than for the rest of it, I am leaning heavily on the excellent Hebrew book of Aviezer Rabitzky, soon to appear in English translation under the title *Messianism, Zionism and the Jewish Religious Radicalism*.

This author discovered a forgotten early article of young Rav Kook from 1898,¹³ which is only one year after the founding of the Zionist organization, definitely not in line with what was to become Mizrahi politics. The main thesis of this article was that reassembling the Jewish people in the land of the fathers, as propagated by the new Zionist movement, would prove to be a salutary way for rejuvenating the Jewish religious ideal, but, on the other hand, the political aim was in need of supplementation by the religious ideal because that was the only means to save it from degeneration into sheer patriotism. The concrete means that Rav Kook proposed for reaching his double aim need not concern us here because later on he changed his mind upon this point. Anyway, he was unresolved to take earthly steps in order to prepare the hoped for redemption. 'There is nothing in the principles of our faith that may avert us from the idea that the beginning of our

13. Rabitzky, *Haketz hamgulle*, p. 130.

shaking off the dust of Galut may be undertaken by our own effort, in natural ways and in the course of history.’¹⁴ He rejected the opinion ‘that there is no hope for the salvation of Israel beside sensual miracles like the appearance of Elias and the like, and for those things our actions are of no avail’.¹⁵

Somewhat surprising for an Eastern European rabbi of his time was the serious consideration Rav Kook had for the corporeal and material side of life, notwithstanding the prevalence he always gave to the spiritual side. Later on we shall see how he founded his evaluation on kabbalistic ideas. It is this consideration that did not let him take lightly what the new Zionist initiative had to offer to the Jewish future. Only by grasping the organic connection between the vital and the spiritual sphere in Rav Kook’s thought can we understand his sanguine confidence that the people’s renewed touch with the ancestral soil of the Holy Land would necessarily lead it to a new flickering up of religious fervour. We shall see later how the clash between this early hope and the very different reality he was to meet in the country put him before one of the most serious problems of his life.

At this point an event occurred whose far-reaching consequences Rav Kook could not yet fathom in full: for the first time he felt the touch of history. As long as the coming of Messiah is passively awaited as a break of earthly continuity, history is rushing along and must not concern you. But if you decide that you have to be active to bring him about, you have to work on the earthly plain and to insert your activity into a historical setting. Then, trying to understand history becomes imperative. History presented Rav Kook, at the outset, with an asset that could serve him for all his lifetime as the earthly basis of his messianic striving: the Zionist movement. Of course, it was easy to comprehend that this new phenomenon could not have come into existence in any former generation and that it was the outcome of a long line of historical causes. And so it was only natural for Rav Kook to hold that the course of history is working for the good. Such a view was contrary to the natural tendency of his colleagues in Eastern Europe to see in every new phenomenon a potential danger to the holy accepted order of things but it is in conformity with the universal belief in progress which as yet was in vogue in his times. How it fits into the outlook of a thinker to whom tradition was not less

14. Rabitzky, *Haketz hamgulle*, p. 122.

15. Rabitzky, *Haketz hamgulle*, p. 131.

holy than to that of his colleagues, will be considered later.

As I said before, Rav Kook's optimism as to the practicability of his plans was founded on his view that the interconnection between the physical and the religious rejuvenation of Jewry, or, in his own later language, between the 'national' and the 'divine' idea of Israel, was so obvious that whoever wanted the one side must necessarily embrace the other. Subjectively, this obviousness remained valid for him throughout his whole life but only too soon he encountered an obstinate reality that did not submit to his logic. Yet as he was not ready to put up with the verdict of this reality he had to fight it.

In the course of his life, this battle took on various forms that I may call in short (1) condemnation, (2) categorization and (3) confrontation. These are three stages of his public life, which I will briefly present.

(1) Condemnation. From the Zionist congress in Basel he got the imprecise information that a resolution had been made stating that 'Zionism has nothing to do with religion', a resolution taken by Rav Kook as severing any tie between Jewish nation and Jewish religion. He always referred to it as 'the disaster of Basle'. As long as religion was removed from nationalism, nationalism was lying down 'like unsalted meat'. Only religion, he said once, is capable of saving nationalism from deterioration into 'bestialism'. (One must ask if the religious factor as such is a sufficient safeguard against this danger.) In a fierce vein of attack he proclaimed: 'Those who keep Tora and commandments don't recognize and can't recognize any national bond with those who rid themselves of the soul of the nation and the source of its life; common race and common home country is not enough'.¹⁶ It must be said that declarations like this sound like those of the most extreme anti-Zionist orthodoxy and are unparalleled in the camp of Mizrahi. What keeps Rav Kook, nevertheless, even in this period in the fold of Zionism, is the ongoing activist vein of his messianism.

(2) Categorization. It seems to be the intrinsic contradiction comprised in this dubious brand of Zionism that led Rav Kook to the most remarkable step in his life, his Aliyya to Eretz Israel in 1904. As he could not acquiesce in a symbiosis with secular Zionism, he had to go and convince that part of the movement that had rejected religion of the ultimate absurdity of their standpoint. He had to conquer it from within, and that had to be done in the very place where Zionism was

16. Rabitzky, *Haketz hamgulle*, p. 142.

going to be realized. For this end, he was certainly aware that he would have to change his style of dispute with secular Zionism. It would be much more difficult to tell when it began to dawn on him that from his side he would have to reach a more profound and more empathetic understanding of the mental structure of secular Zionism.

A first opportunity to try his hand in this new task was given to him when in the year of his Aliyya, 1904, Herzl died and Rav Kook took it upon himself to eulogize him. In his commemorative sermon Rav Kook portrays Herzl as an embodiment of the legendary figure of Mashiah ben Yossef, that figure of a kind of proto-Messiah, the warrior who fights the enemies of redemption, falls on the battle field but paves the way for Mashiah ben David, the real redeemer. As is expressly stated in Rav Kook's sermon, the messianism of the first figure remains a partial one because he goes out to redeem the body alone, not the soul. Decisive as this limitation is, it enables Rav Kook to accord to Herzl, although in a restricted sense only, the title of Messiah. He does not leave any doubt that a body without a soul is not a living creature, and so, Herzl and this Zionist concept cannot be enough, but as Zionism is for Rav Kook ultimately a messianic movement, it is for him a thing of highest importance that he could find a certain messianic category for Herzl's Zionism, too.

(3) Confrontation. When coming to Palestine, Rav Kook was appointed as Chief Rabbi of Jaffa and the adjacent new Jewish settlements. There could be no better basis than this for a rabbi who wanted to come in contact with the new non-orthodox population now beginning to arrive in the country. This 'second aliyya' was the first one to bring into the country that type of '*halutz*', of young pioneers bent on settling in the country and setting up there a new socialistic workers' society, I presented at the beginning of this chapter. Naturally, their revolutionary elan was directed against religion and all its institutions but soon they developed a high respect and even affection towards Rav Kook. This attitude was mutual for Rav Kook discovered that he had to revise his previous verdict against secular Zionism. This is not easy to understand for in his view those who denied the 'divine idea of Israel' remained even now 'the wicked ones'. 'Effrontery against heaven' remained for him the severest kind of wickedness. And the young pioneers were not ready to make any gesture that might smack of hypocrisy, although they saw themselves as paving the way for Mashiah ben David. But it seemed to Rav Kook that theirs was a kind

of wickedness for which *Halakha* had not provided. *Halakha* makes a difference between two kinds of apostasy, one out of avidity and one out of obstinacy. It is more lenient towards the first one, which may be attributed to weakness of character more than to wicked intention. Now Rav Kook was aware that these young *halutzim* were people of rigid principles and acted out of an existential urge. I would say that it was this immediate experience that forced Rav Kook to delve deeper into the question of the place of wickedness in the divine world order.

For such a mental revision he could use tools of kabbalistic origin. I spoke of his acceptance of the idea of progress in history. In his view, progress must have meant a steadily ripening of the world to a point where an acute messianic process could start. So, progress could not be imagined as a linear movement, for the world, as Kabbala sees it, is immersed in a steady contest between a tendency for good and another for worse, so that progress can only be conceived as reaching the next point of harmony between the two forces. If that is true, every point of temporary harmony is to be assailed by the negative force in order that the next point of harmony can be reached. This dialectical need turns the wicked into a necessary tool for making progress possible. This is the way Rav Kook interpreted the Lurianic notion of 'breaking of the vessels' as part of an ultimately optimistic world view. In order to elevate the present state of history up to a messianic level, there must occur an onslaught of anti-divine forces in order to shake the insufficient present equilibrium of forces. This activity is called 'destruction for the sake of building'. In German I should call that 'ein Teil von jener Kraft, die stets das Böse will und stets das Gute schafft', which, in Goethe's *Faust*, is the self-definition of Mephisto. Of course, not everything vicious, simply on the strength of being vicious, can fulfill this fatal task, but although being vicious they must be something outstanding. This is what brings him to the paradoxical statement: 'The impertinent ones in our generation, the wicked out of principles, the transgressors not out of avidity but out of obstinacy, own a very high-level soul; they are the "lights of Chaos"'.¹⁷ This last term means, in Lurianic Kabbala, divine lights from the upper world who fell, with the 'breaking of the vessels', down into the sphere of impurity from where they shine with utmost intensity. It is characteristic for the boldness of Rav Kook's last statement that, in defiance of halachic rule, he gives priority to the 'vicious out of obstinacy'

17. Rabitzky, *Haketz hamgulle*, p. 16.

against the 'vicious out of avidity'. Rabitzky points out that the author of such statements is the same Rav Kook who previously appealed to religious people to cut off any connection, both physical and emotional, with the negators of religion. This change of mind must have been brought about by more profound immersion into the paradoxes of kabbalistic thought.

Biographically, as I said before, this process of rethinking seems to have gone on the other way round. When he came to Palestine and met there the new type of secular Zionist, Rav Kook discovered in these people a profundity of mental outlook wholly unexpected for him. The most remarkable spokesman of this group, the atheist writer Joseph Hayyim Brenner with his somber ethos of living without illusions, did not fit into the stereotype of the secular Jew as living just on the surface of life and succumbing to its temptations, as it used to be attributed by religious circles to their adversaries. Here, possibly for the first time in his life, Rav Kook found a challenge to religious life that was his equal. He found in his adversaries a kind of human greatness, and the fact that the anti-religious position was occupied by men of formerly unheard of stature strengthened his conviction that the drama of the world was nearing its final stage. And when Brenner's fanatical sense of veracity found its outburst in the exclamation: 'You have no Messiah, Israel, go to work!', just such a statement could serve Rav Kook as an affirmation of his faith that the age of Messiah had come.

I said 'the Age of Messiah' and not 'the Messiah', for a personal Messiah has hardly a function in this drama. Certainly, his ultimate appearance is not denied and would never have been denied by Rav Kook but it would not be easy to say what redeeming deed was here reserved for him. Such a transmutation of messianism, making it into a crowning link of a permanent progress in history, was that moment in historiography where Rav Kook was influenced by a current mood of nineteenth-century thought, first applied to Jewish messianism by the theologians of the Reform movement. Rav Kook who knew 'reform' only as a swear-word synonymous to licentiousness or apostasy, would certainly have been utterly abashed on hearing of such an ancestry, but it cannot be denied that in this point he moves in a course initiated by reform and integrated into the national fold only by Moses Hess. What was not transmitted to him out of this modern tradition is the essential interconnection between the particularistic and the uni-

versalistic side of the messianic message. After all, as long as messianism was only a glimmering hope projected upon the sky of tomorrow, the lack of this moment, contained from the outset in the biblical messianic vision, later on obscured in the wake of national disaster and restored to it on the dawn of emancipation, must not necessarily be fateful for the way it appears in religious life. This could change in the very moment that messianism would be put to the test of actualization.

It is a fateful fact of history that Rav Kook died in 1935 and did not live on to see the founding of the State of Israel. In one of his writings Rav Kook envisaged a state, 'ideal at bottom, in the entity of which is engraved the uppermost ideal content. . . This state is our state, the "State of Israel", the fundament of God's throne in the world.'¹⁸ Alas, it will always remain an open question whether Rav Kook would have been ready to apply this amazing metaphysical attribute to the state of this name which was proclaimed by David Ben Gurion on 14 May, 1948. We shall never know for sure. On that date his spokesman was his son, Rav Tzvi Yehuda, a reverent son in whose mouth the visionary dicta of his father were hammered out into so many articles of faith. Tzvi Yehuda did not hesitate to apply it in this way; moreover, the identity of the two seems to have been for him self-evident. Again and again he proclaims:

There is one cardinal main fact: the state. This is all holy, no blemish is in it. It is a heavenly revelation from above, from Him who brings His presence back to Zion. All the rest are trifles, small (or big) flaws, problems and complications. . . those don't detract from the sanctity of the state.¹⁹

The crucial point is that we have to distinguish the 'essence' of the state from its incidental shortcomings. It should be noted that distinctions remindful of this can be found in the father's writings, too, but these do not refer to the state but to Israel, that is to say, to the people. The moment you transfer a belief in the *character indelebilis* of Israel to the State of Israel and identify the idea of this state with its given historical reality, you convert, as one of the critics put it, religious Zionism into Zionist religion.²⁰

18. Rabitzky, *Haketz hamgulle*, p. 189.

19. 'From Religious Zionism to Zionist Religion' is the title of an essay of Gideon Aran about the roots of Gush Emunim, contained in his *Studies in Contemporary Jewry* (1986), II, pp. 116-43.

20. Rabitzky, *Haketz hamgulle*, p. 111.

But before documenting such 'Zionist religion', I must say a word about the impact of this new variety of Zionist thought on the other side of the Zionist scene. You can say that since the appearance of this new group any motif reminiscent of messianism suddenly disappeared in left-wing Zionism. It is not accidental that the song I quoted at the beginning of this paper is now almost forgotten. Just as in a former generation religious Zionists carefully avoided using messianic language, it is now secular Zionists' turn to refrain from it. It seems that those who profess a messianic element in their adherence to Zionism feel it imperative to draw a sharp distinguishing line between themselves and that group we have now to characterize. By refraining in this way they concede involuntarily to the other side a monopolistic dominance over an immense treasurehouse of moral, social and religious motivation.

But now to the other side. I referred to it previously as a group, for mainly through the activity of Rav Tzvi Yehuda, a group it became. As the headmaster of his father's Yeshiva, Merkaz Harav, he reached by his inspired teaching an evergrowing number of young students, especially since the yeshivot of the Mizrahi youth movement Bene Akiva began to send their alumni to him for further study. After the Six Day War (1967) these alumni formed the nucleus of 'Goosh Emunim', whose main activity was the founding of as many settlements as possible in newly occupied territories, in order to break their Arabic character. The underlying idea was, and is, that these territories are a part of Eretz Yisrael and have to be brought into Jewish ownership. All this was the outcome of a completely new situation. Israel's victory in the Six Day War was held to be one more proof that the messianic process was already under way. And as this certainty was present, people were able to find daily additional signs to confirm it. It is surprising to see how a considerable number of youngsters grew up to participate in this fervent belief. The natural inclination to scepticism, which had characterized a former generation, gave way to an amazing credulity. I would guess that intoxication with success did much to make this turn possible.

The 'experience' of evidence was so overwhelming that all traditional caution was now to be abandoned. Tzvi Yehuda knew well the traditional warning 'not to urge the end' but this time, he proclaimed, the warning could not be heeded for 'the End urges us'. This time it is claimed to be a necessary process that could not be stopped by any-

thing, not even by our sins. For although we know from the Talmud about a situation where redemption is already due by every criterion but is impeded by our sins, this time it was 'evident' that God had decided to ignore the question of whether the present generation was 'worthy' to be redeemed. It sounds incredible with what degree of certainty those rabbis claimed first-hand inside knowledge of God's resolutions; but no less astounding is how large were the circles of people that interiorized such announcements on their authority.

When speaking of Rav Kook I pointed to one serious limitation of his messianic outlook: the universalistic aspect, the redemption of humanity, did not enter his messianic panorama. The same gap was also to be expected in the views of Tzvi Yehuda. In his outlook there was no room spared for rights or values of other peoples, let alone of other religions. The fact that Jerusalem is holy not only to the Jewish people alone had no place in his scheme of messianic redemption. In what contorted form that facet nevertheless entered his horizon, I illustrate by one fact. When on the outbreak of the war 'for the peace of Galilea' the Israeli Prime Minister Begin declared that by invading Lebanon he had no intention of ordering the State of Lebanon, he was censured by a spokesman of Goosh Emunim²¹ who pointed out that in the present messianic situation Israel has the task of ordering the world of the peoples, too. For people living in the twentieth century the announcement of installing 'a new order' in militarily-conquered countries has very nasty associations, indeed.

Here, I want to break off my account.

As I began on a personal note I want to close in a personal vein, too. Shortly after the erection of the State of Israel the Chief Rabbinate composed a prayer for the State that was distributed to all the synagogues. In this text the state was called 'the beginning of sprouting of our redemption'. It was my good fortune that in those days I was completely uninformed about concrete messianic speculations which then may have circulated around the Chief Rabbinate. I read those words as an utterly cautious hint, clothed in voluntarily indistinct language, with the feeling that what happened to us in our lifetime has something to do with the overall destination of Jewish existence to go, together with the rest of humanity, in the direction of what we call, in the words sanctified by all our generations, 'the days of messianic redemption'. In this sense I embraced these words from

21. Rabitzky, *Haketz hamgulle*, p. 117.

the first moment and have made them into my personal prayer, which I say every *Shabbat* in our synagogue. In the meantime I learned that what spoke to me from this prayer does not exhaust all that those who formulated it wanted to express by the wording they chose. Nevertheless I hope and pray that when the tumult of a chauvinistic hysteria, which at the moment agitates a considerable part of our people, finally will have subsided, there will return to us the possibility of an inner silence that will enable our people, both those who are called 'religious' and those who are called 'secular', to listen to that 'sound of a small voice' telling us that, in a way beyond all definition, within our day-to-day work inside our state something from above is now at work that we are entitled to call 'the beginning of sprouting of our redemption'.

EARLY CHRISTIAN FAITH AS 'HOPE AGAINST HOPE'

Horst Balz

1. *Introduction*

If the Christians of Thessalonica had felt nothing but grief when faced with the death of members of their families or their church, there would have been little difference between them and those 'who have no hope' (οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες ἐλπίδα 1 Thess. 4.13). Instead, they heard the message that enabled and obliged them to comfort one another (4.18) with words like these: 'God will also take with him those who sleep in Jesus' (4.14).

This message is supported by a prophetic 'word of the Lord': 'The dead in Christ shall rise first: Then we who are alive... shall be caught up together with them... and so shall we ever be with the Lord' (4.15-17). This comfort does not brush aside the grief that the community is experiencing, but fortifies them with a solace in mourning which 'others' do not have.¹

Those 'who know not God' (4.5) may cherish their own hopes for their souls' continued existence or promotion or for the survival of their memories among their fellow men; nevertheless, they do not seem to be, by their hopes, carried or held up in a way comparable to those who trust in the message: 'As Jesus died and rose again, so God will treat the dead' (4.14). This is the reason that 'the others' are, actually, 'without hope'.

1. Helmut Merklein has stressed that Paul wanted to make the Thessalonians familiar with the integration of the raising from the dead into the events of parousia (p. 407) as a new understanding, which perhaps was new to him, too (p. 408). So it is through this that the Thessalonians believed in God who raises the dead, capable of bringing back the dead, but not in connection with the parousia of Christ, which was expected in a short time, so that the dead had to be inferior to those who still were alive (H. Merklein, 'Der Theologe als Prophet: Zur Funktion prophetischen Redens im theologischen Diskurs des Paulus', *NTS* 38 [1992], pp. 402-29).

More than a generation later, the letter to the Ephesians will look back on the life of those who had been far away from Christ, but now have come close to him by his death on the cross. They are addressed as 'being aliens from the kingdom of Jesus, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and being without God (ἄθεοι) in the world' (Eph. 2.12). Those, who were far away, and who were close have 'access by one Spirit unto the Father' (2.18), who has proved himself to be 'the one God and Father of all' (4.6). Those who have been estranged and far off before now have access to the Father and, thereby, hope, better expressed in Paul's words from Rom. 15.13: The 'God of hope' is holding them close to himself, winning them over by the root of Jesse, in which the Gentiles will trust, so that they 'may abound in hope, through the power of the Holy Spirit' by faith (Rom. 15.12-13).

If hope, in this sense, is a criterion of being close to God or far from God, even an evidence of the workings of the Holy Ghost in the believers, then it might be possible to throw a definite light upon the nature of early Christian faith, using the early Christian concept of hope. I intend to investigate this as follows. In this respect, it is not unimportant to consider that ἐλπίς and related expressions appear but sparingly in the Gospels (including the Gospel of St John) and not at all in the Revelation of St John; we find them, however, in the epistles of Paul, the Deutero-Paulinic letters, in Acts and in the letter to the Hebrews.² For Paul, 'faith' and 'hope' are bound up closely. Later the message is more concerned with promises that are to be believed in now and that will be fulfilled in future times—the good of hope stored up for the believers in the heavens (Col. 1.15; Eph. 1.18: the hope, connected to the calling of the believers).

2. Essence and Dimensions of Hope in Early Christian Faith

To start with a fundamental question: does ἐλπίς mean 'the being free and prepared for the future', because the believers give up their 'concern about themselves' and about their 'doubtful future' to God?³

2. The noun ἐλπίς is found most often in the Epistle to the Romans: 13 times in Romans and 25 times in Paul's letters altogether. The situation with the verb ἐλπίζειν is different. Paul uses this word 15 times without giving it significant weight in his letters, the Epistle to the Galatians and the first Epistle to the Thessalonians excepted.

3. R. Bultmann, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (UTB, 630; Tübingen: J.C.B.

In that case ἐλπίς would signify the realization of eschatological existence.

Or does hope mean, strictly speaking, 'in the first place the gift of the future, the good of hope, *spes ex qua speratur* as *spes quae speratur*', which means a hope, because of which and aiming at which one hopes, and only hence a hope 'by which one hopes' (*spes qua speratur*), as the state or act which lets men anticipate the hoped-for gift?⁴

In the first case, hope would be an existential and basic content of Christian faith,⁵ in the second, primarily, the fulfilment of the promises God gave, by which the believers are induced to hope.

But perhaps it is better not to distinguish in this way but to integrate the first idea into the second. Then ἐλπίς could mean an existential concept but, viewed theologically, seen as the answer of the believers to the fulfilment of God's promises and his own faithfulness, the act of hoping thereby originating in the hope God is offering. Not that God himself is hope, as stated by Ernst Bloch (*Deus spes*)⁶, but meaning the 'God of hope' who enables the faithful to hope, as formulated in Rom. 15.13.

In this case, hope would neither merely stand for being open towards the future nor simply for the power of *Utopia* on human consciousness, enabling man to approach that which does, so far, not exist, and setting him against that which is present and factual. Hope

Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 9th edn, 1984), pp. 320-21, in the fundamental chapter, 'Die Struktur der πίστις' (pp. 315-24).

4. G. Sauter, 'Hoffnung', *TRE* 15 (1986), pp. 491-98, esp. p. 492. On this topic, in general, read the publication of the same author, 'Zukunft und Verheissung: Das Problem der Zukunft in der gegenwärtigen theologischen und philosophischen Diskussion' (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1965).

5. Cf. R. Bultmann, *Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der antiken Religionen* (Zürich: Artemis, 5th edn, 1986), p. 228: '... die Offenheit der christlichen Existenz nimmt kein Ende' (translation: 'The openness of the Christian existence has no end').

6. E. Bloch, *Das Prinzip Hoffnung* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1959), p. 1458, in connection with Exod. 3.14: 'Der Deus creator einer als sehr gut und als fertig dargestellten Welt und der Deus Spes, den Mose seinem Volk verkündet, sind erst der rabbinischen Theologie (und später dem Credo der christlichen Kirche) völlig identisch' (translation: 'The creator God of a world which is presented as very good and as completed and the God of hope whom Mose announces to his people are regarded as totally the same not earlier than in Rabbinic theology' [and later in the creed of the Christian church]). Bloch also is able to speak about 'God as time' or about 'God of aim' (pp. 1458-59).

would be rather the expression of an experience with God, with him who has created everything that exists and, by this, having initiated a movement in his direction: 'All things were created by him, and for him' (Col. 1.16; cf. 1 Cor. 8.6). This would then, essentially, be the experience of God, given to faith through Christ. The believers let themselves be drawn, through Christ, into the motion of the whole creation towards God, and this is what hope would signify.

a. Hope—Essentially—is Based on God Himself

When Abraham (Rom. 4.16-18) believed in God he was led to trust in him 'who brings to life the dead and calls into existence the things that do not exist' (4.17). So far he 'against hope believed in hope' (4.18). Although there was no hope he engaged in hope that was based on God alone, who let him expect the fulfilment of his promises. This 'engagement in God' represented his faith and, from the beginning, had the characteristics of a well-founded, sure hope, as Abraham, by it, pledged himself to the one who stands for being out of non-being, life out of death. This means, for Paul, 'against hope believing in hope' (παρ' ἐλπίδα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ἐπίστευσεν, Rom. 4.18).⁷

Wherever God becomes, by faith and hope, the foundation and the aim of life for people, they themselves gain life out of death, being released from nothingness. Henceforth they live as those, who, against their own 'hope' or rather their hopelessness, rely alone on the validity of their God-given hope. For Paul, accordingly, Abraham has been and still is father of all believers, Jews or non-Jews.

The 'God of hope' is the one who creates and metes out hope in abundance (Rom. 15.13). Paul, likewise, realizes why he had to suffer the greatest dangers to himself and his life in Asia: to perceive—once again—in whom he has put his trust: alone 'in the God who raises the dead' (2 Cor. 1.9). Where hope has lost all reason of its own it is truly rooted in God or, to be more exact, it is drawing those who are believing and trusting into the force of God's own life power. This does not mean a desperate leap into a future that is still undecided but the assurance based on promises and grants, given to Abraham and also to Paul. This is the reason why believers risk their lives and fight: they put their trust in the living God 'who is the Saviour of all men,

7. The sense of this phrase is especially clear in the translation of Martin Luther. Paul uses the Greek noun ἐλπίς twice: referring to God ἐλπίς means hope; referring to the human possibilities ἐλπίς means the admission that there is nothing but hope.

specially of those who believe' (1 Tim. 4.10). He himself is the origin of their hope, holding them, by this, close to himself and close to life.

The 'cloud of witnesses', known from God's dealings with men and especially with his people (Heb. 11.1–12.1), is composed of a multitude of individuals who hope, trusting in nobody but him, who has called the world into being by his word out of what is non-being and invisible (11.3). Moved by this faith Abraham set out for a far-away country, relying on nothing but hope; and by the same hope Moses was led to leave Egypt for suffering 'the reproach of Christ' (11.26). Faith, therefore, consists in the 'present reality' (ὁπóστασις) of the things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen and, ultimately, of the creative and curative powers of God (11.1–3). Based on these premises, one can after all ascribe to the whole creation a wistful expectation, a hope. Its hopeless condition, caused by man, must not be held to be the final word of the one who poses glory against futility, freedom against servitude (Rom. 8.19–22).⁸ Creation will reach its hoped-for end in liberation from futility and corruptibility, verified in the glorification of the children of God and co-inheritors with Christ. In relation to this, there must not be ascribed to suffering a moment of its own (Rom. 8.18).

b. Hope Based on God Will Reach its Fulfilment through Faith

If believers, through the power of the Holy Spirit, begin to communicate with the 'God of hope' (Rom. 15.13), according to the New Testament it is Christ who will be their 'hope in God' (1 Pet. 1.21; 1 Tim. 1.1), for through him they have belief in God who has confirmed himself by raising Christ from death, and who has presented him with glory (1 Pet. 1.21). By the resurrection of Christ they themselves have been begotten again unto a 'lively hope' (ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν, 1 Pet. 1.3). 'Lively hope', of course, does not mean a natural hope that is especially vigorous or dynamic—for what, taken in this sense, would be understood by the reverse, a 'dead hope'?—but rather a hope that will impart, to those who are hoping, life out of death. Starting out from this life experience Paul has recognized the God

8. In Rom. 8.18–22 the whole creation is named by the noun κτίσις, not only the world of man and not only the world of animals. It is wrong to conclude this from its translation 'Kreatur', not equivalent to 'creature', which is current since Martin Luther. The 'groaning' of the creation is associated with the 'groaning' of the believers and of the Spirit himself in 8.23–25 and 8.26–27.

who raises from the dead as active already in the history of Abraham (Rom. 4.17-18).

Therefore, the hopeful are aware that they rely on 'grace that is to be brought unto you with the revelation of Jesus Christ', and they can meddle with hoping in a definite way (1 Pet. 1.13). Through the truth of the gospel they trust in the hope that is preserved for the believers 'in heaven', which means 'in God' (Col. 1.5), the gospel being, for believers, hope in the same way (1.23) that Christ himself is hope, because both of them procure the gift of the 'God of hope'.

Through Jesus Christ alone the justified are able to rejoice in their hope for the Glory of God that is in store for them (Rom. 5.1-2); rejoice indeed, although the visible side of this hope, namely the tribulations, giving rise to the practice of perseverance and confirmation, are, in themselves, no reason for rejoicing (5.3-4). Still the firm belief in salvation is an unalterable fact, because 'the love of God is shed' into the hearts of the believers 'by the Holy Spirit', the conviction of the reliability and trustworthiness of him who has drawn the faithful and the hopeful to himself and has pledged to them reconciliation and protection from the wrath of his judgment (Rom. 5.9-10). The spirit of Christ, alive in the believing children of God (υἱοὶ Θεοῦ), is reassuring them about the validity of their adoption and is rousing in them such a longing for final deliverance and relief that 'to groan' is appropriate; for in this hope they are saved (8.23-24).⁹

Therefore, faith, hope and charity are the three lasting gifts and fruits of the Spirit, encompassing, as the gifts of God, the final and eschatological reality (1 Cor. 13.13).¹⁰ If charity, believing all, hoping all (13.7) is deemed the greatest among the three, this is so because it permits participation in the reality of God's love and the love of Christ, from whom originate the gifts of faith and hope: 'Now we are the children of God' but then 'we shall be like him' and 'we shall see him as he is' (1 Jn 3.2).

9. This is the meaning of the initial phrase of Rom. 8.24, and not this: we are saved indeed, but we can 'only' hope for it.

10. It seems to be an absurd statement, that hope remains and does not pass, when hope is only conceived as an expectation of what is outstanding: What would be expected and hoped for at the end? But Paul speaks about the main gifts of God, which—according to him—represent the close connection between God and the believers, but also the non-reversible difference between God and them, just 'here and now but also then'.

c. Subject Matters of Hope

The following is concerned with the contents and subject matters of eschatology. For this, a correct understanding of eschatology is indispensable. Eschatology does not only refer to the *eschata* (the 'last things'), covering a well-defined domain and seen as the final chapter of doctrine, which will come into force when everything else has been said before. Likewise it decidedly does not present faith as primarily looking back to the events around Christ, with love being concerned with present activity and hope being directed towards the future that is yet to come. Rather the whole of faith must be taken as the eschatological event, standing for the definite amidst the circumstantial, and specifically, wherever faith is active in charity (Gal. 5.6). So it can be said, that in the contents and subject matters of hope, faith and what it contains is shown to be both, valid and definitive. Therefore, the dimension of the coming or final events is central to theology as a whole but may be treated as a special dogmatic chapter for technical or traditionalistic reasons.

In the following I will briefly present the most important contents of hope: First, I shall talk about the qualification and the trustworthiness of belief up to the very end; for God, who gives the promise, is himself reliable and trustworthy. That which the believers hope for is kept in store for them, providing them with a firm 'anchor' for their lives (Heb. 6.18-19), and they can, therefore, confidentially cling to 'the profession of our faith' (10.23), even diligently stepping towards the 'full assurance of hope unto the end' (6.11).

The end must be discussed in relation to God's right to his creation, with man being a part of it; his right and title, bestowed on the believers as their justification through Christ. Understood this way, the end is both: the all-encompassing revelation of God's creative power and of his saving love. Its decisive content for faith in Christ consists of the expectation that Christ then will be revealed to all as Kyrios and Saviour, himself appearing as judge, but, at the same time, as confidant for those who are existing, even now, through the spirit and through faith 'in Christ' (Phil. 2.10-11; cf. Rom. 8.17: 'If however children, then heirs, heirs of God, then joint heirs with Christ; if in fact we suffer together, that we may be also glorified together'). The hope of those who are chosen and justified consists, therefore, in the foreknowledge of their glorification in Christ that has taken place

and has already been confirmed ('those whom he justified he also glorified', Rom. 8.30).

Consequently, the concern is with the parousia ('arrival' or rather 'second advent') of the exalted one, the 'glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ' (Tit. 2.13). The believers expect to receive, from the hands of Christ the judge, the 'crown of righteousness', which is reserved for them and will be given to them at that day (2 Tim. 4.8). According to Paul, 'joy and the crown of rejoicing' means the parousia of Christ (1 Thess. 2.19), it means the 'praise of God' for everyone, because it is God himself who looks into the hearts and knows their intentions (1 Cor. 4.5). This expectation has its clue in the hope that the exalted Christ will confirm the believers—also the Corinthians—unto the end, that they may be blameless in his day (1 Cor. 1.8), as he is, even now, not withholding from them any of his gifts of grace (χαρίσματα); he also renders the Philippians discerning in all things, that they will be 'sincere and without offence' till this day, 'being filled with the harvest of righteousness' (Phil. 1.10-11). In this way, they already live 'for the glory and praise of God' (1.11).

Certainly, the parousia of Christ signifies for everyone, also for the justified, the disclosure of all they have done during their lifetime (διὰ τοῦ σώματος), may it be 'good or bad' (2 Cor. 5.10);¹¹ 'the work of every man', rooted in Christ, will be made manifest and will have to stand the test, in the same way all kinds of building materials are tested by fire, whereby the quality of the work will be established, or will be destroyed. The believers, rightfully, are trusting in the validity of their justification (1 Cor. 3.12-17; cf. 1 Cor. 5.5; Rom. 5.9-10). And this is the substance and cause of their joy in the Lord that he is near to them in the spirit and that they have every reason to hope that they will find him near in those future times which will bring time to its end ('The Lord is at hand', Phil. 4.4-5). By this Paul feels justified to venture a statement which, unexplained by him, seems to us somewhat hard to comprehend, that 'through the spirit we wait for the hope of righteousness by faith (ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης)' (Gal. 5.5). What is meant here is the righteousness that has been promised

11. In 2 Cor. 5.10 the subject is not only the judgment on the 'deeds' of the believers, but it is the acknowledgment with respect to the 'reward' of individuals in consequence of their life διὰ τοῦ σώματος ('by means of the body' with respect to by means of the concrete course of their earthly life—each alone and also in community with others).

to Abraham and that is imparted to the believers in Christ, which has been bestowed on them fully by baptism and is, nevertheless, placed before them as a good of hope and a gift given by God himself. So they wait, impatiently, for its revelation, even for their glorification and liberation as the children of God, and their being forever with Christ and God (cf. 1 Thess. 4.17; 5.10).

According to Jewish-apocalyptic and early Christian hope the resurrection is part of the final representation of man before God, for this will bring about the subjugation of the powers hostile to God, especially that of death (cf. 1 Cor. 15.24-28). Secondly, it is standing for the victory of God's righteousness over man's unrighteousness, the setting forth of both, his love and his wrath, against everyone (cf. Rom. 1.18-39; 3.25-26; 11.32). For in this he is God, creating life out of death, existence out of non-existence. The Pauline reasoning in 1 Cor. 15.12-58 and also in 1 Thess. 4.13-5.11 indicates that this hope, which was traditional and most central to the Pharisaic Jews,¹² did not necessarily first take place in the missionary message of the Apostle and that, therefore, this hope and its implications may have been questioned by some churches, as requiring further explanation and substantiation.¹³ We see in it rather a consequence, unrenounceable and biblical,¹⁴ of Jewish and early Christian hope in the final establishment of God's power. In early Christian faith, this hope was chiefly founded in and kindled by the witnessing of Christ's resurrection and

12. In the second Benediction of the Jewish Eighteen-Benedictions this hope is established firmly in the Jewish way of prayer in Jesus' time: 'You raise the dead' (cf. Section 3 of this paper).

13. In 1 Cor. 15.35-49 Paul answers the questions and deliberations of those who deny the Resurrection. But their objections and ideas are hard to disclose. In any case Paul makes plain to them that God's aim for his creation and for the believers is the overcoming of the earthly and the transitory by the heavenly and the nontransitory, in the same way as the seed must 'die' to bear the right fruit, or in the same way as after the 'earthly man' (Adam) the 'heavenly man' (Christ) follows.

14. Only in later texts are there clear Old Testament references: Isa. 25.8; 26.19; Ps. 22.29-30; 49.16; 73.23-26; Hos. 13.14; Dan. 12.1-3; as a description of the restoration of the shattered people of Israel: Ezra 37.1-14 Increasingly the resignation, when being faced with death (Ps. 88.11-12; Eccl. 3.19-20), will be overcome by the hope that not only is God able to save man from serious illness or trouble during the earthly life (Pss. 16.10; 116.8; 118.17), but that he 'is there' in the realm of the dead, too (Ps. 139.8; cf. Job 26.6) and finally that he will prove his power over the death. In 1 Cor. 15.54-55 Paul refers to Isa. 25.8 and Hos. 13.14.

by the experience of the living and beneficial presence of the exalted one. Hope for the resurrection of the dead at the end and, respectively, the parousia of the Lord (cf. Section 1 of this paper) would then necessarily become the criterion for hope against all hopelessness, whenever churches that were more hellenistically oriented were living in fear of death more than in fear of God, or were exempting death from God's power to save, seeing it strictly as a material fact of life.¹⁵

'If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all people the most miserable' (1 Cor. 15.19). This statement can and must be declared wherever God is not trusted as having the power of 'resurrection from the dead' (15.12). Therefore, the whole testimony about visions of the risen Christ will be treated as empty rumors (15.13), if the doubters among the Corinthians were significant enough. In this case, faith would indeed be 'vain', 'they, which are fallen asleep in Christ' would be lost, even 'you are still in your sins' (15.17-18).

These three statements relate closely to our inquiry into the subject matter of hope. Faith in God means faith in him who raises from the dead, and where one does not dare to talk about the dead as 'they which are asleep', faith has lost its foundation. In that case, the event of the cross, the offered reconciliation and forgiving of sins must, likewise, be in vain; faith would be placed in a God who does not have the power to create life, to offer justification and life to those who are sinners, as all this derives its reality only through the crowning revelation and manifestation of God's lifegiving powers, therefore, under the postulate that he also has power to look at those who have died as 'they which have fallen asleep' and to establish himself as the God of justice. Gal. 5.5 speaks of justice as the good of hope. Only if Christ has indeed 'become the firstfruits of them that slept' (1 Cor. 15.20) do the faithful indeed belong to the 'God of hope'.

Thus, hope in the non-visible is rooted in the belief in Christ, 'for what a man sees, why does he still hope for it?' (Rom. 8.24; cf. 2 Cor. 4.18; Heb. 11.1). Here the concern is with the reality of God surpassing the reality of this world, and, only by this, with hope. Under

15. The intention of the whole chapter of 1 Cor. 15 points at this aim, which above all is expressed in the final verses 15.54-55 ('Death is swallowed up in victory': v. 54). It is a matter of the overcoming of death and its power, which is already carried out by Jesus Christ, the Kyrios. Only by this can Paul comfort the Corinthians with the trust that their efforts for the 'work of the Lord' and their labour are not 'in vain' (v. 58).

these premises the issue of the living reality of the dead raised should no longer pose a problem. Seen with the eyes of man, the point is liberation and deliverance from this earthly existence (σῶμα, Rom. 8.23), which is doomed to end in mortality and abandonment. Those who shall live to see the parousia shall not enter into the glory without first being transformed (1 Cor. 15.51). Only the faithful who are 'conformed to the image of his Son' (Rom. 8.29) and who are changed from this 'vile body' into the 'glorious body' of the heavenly Christ (Phil. 3.20) will, in the end, be capable 'to live with Christ'. Comparison with the angels (ὡς ἄγγελοι), as in the dispute between Jesus and the Sadducees (Mk 12.25), points in the same direction, conforming with eschatological tradition.¹⁶ The attempts of Paul to elucidate this in 1 Cor. 15.35-49 are similarly worded, climaxing in the statement of 15.49: 'And as we have born the image of the earthly (Adam), we shall also bear the image of the heavenly (Christ)'.

Whether Christ, who has the power to subjugate all things unto himself and to put all things under God's feet (Phil. 3.21; 1 Cor. 15.27-28), will finally part the saved ones from the lost ones, which is what the Jewish and the early Christian apocalyptic thinking firmly expects (cf. Rev. 19-20), is one of those questions that is judged, by Paul, as foolish and inadequate as is the question about 'the times and the seasons' (1 Thess. 5.1-11). There are people living now who will be saved and others who will be lost (1 Cor. 1.18); yet the believers and, above all, the Apostle are charged to seek 'the profit of many' in order to save everybody (1 Cor. 10.33), as God also 'desires all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth' (1 Tim. 2.4), for so he has loved the universe (Jn 3.16) and has reconciled it through Christ (2 Cor. 5.19) and has induced a reconciliation of all reality 'unto himself' (Col. 1.20).

Inquiring into the intermediary state of the dead between their death and the parousia of Christ is also irrelevant. When Paul states in Phil. 1.21 that for him 'to live is (nothing but) Christ, and to die (therefore) is gain', as then the corporeal state will no longer separate him from the heavenly Christ, he expresses his longing to be united with Christ by way of his earthly death, without speculating about the simultaneity of individual death and resurrection. Time will go on for those who are alive, but for the deceased time does not exist anymore.

16. Cf. Ethiopic En. 71.11. There it is said of the Enoch enthroned in heaven: 'my whole body mollified and my spirit transformed'.

After all, Paul knows that his 'abiding in the flesh' is more important than his longing for Christ and he, therefore, may abide for the sake of the Philippians' joy of faith (Phil. 1.24-26). In the same way we shall have to interpret the words of the crucified Christ to the malefactor who was hanged beside him and did not rail at him (Lk. 23.43). For individual persons their death is God's 'today'—there is nothing more to search for. Whoever wants to be informed about further details—for example, about whether a state of being 'unclothed' or a new state of being 'clothed upon with our house which is in heaven'—and is trying to find this out from 2 Cor. 5.1-10, is misunderstanding this difficult text. The issue here is that Paul sees himself as a man being alive but also, because of Christ, being pulled more and more into death, the death of his individual life and his own options. This is in order that 'also the life of Jesus (ἡ ζωὴ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ) might be made manifest' in his body (2 Cor. 4.10-12), already being filled with longing (as stated in Phil. 1) for the heavenly dwelling and, therefore, for his earthly death, as it is correct that, before God, those who have given up their earthly body will not be found 'naked', having gained here the life of Jesus (2 Cor. 5.1-3). The only way to draw near to this longed-for God even now and 'to be at home with the Lord' (5.8) is to 'be accepted by him' (5.9), for at the end Christ will hold each and everyone accountable for his deeds, disregarding his longing for the hereafter which might well have closed his mind to the manifest will and intention of God (cf. Rom. 12.1-2).

d. The Trial and Experience of Hope

What is most important can be quickly said: He who glories in hope of the glory of God (Rom. 5.2) cannot help rejoicing in tribulations and apparent damage to his life, as tribulations work 'patience' (ὑπομονή), patience works 'experience' (δοκιμή) and experience, in turn, works 'hope' (5.3-4). Thus the trial of hope does not mean resistance only, even though resistance may be supported by hope under certain conditions. Rather hope is proved as the power to stand fast, created in the hearts of the believers by God's love in the face of resistance and disappointments, to work, in a final sense, persuasion and the winning of those who resist, remaining victorious in the conflict (ἁγών) that is imposed on the believers (Phil. 1.27-30; cf. 1 Cor. 9.24-27).

Paul, in prison, is entitled to expect and hope that he will not be put to shame as the apostle of Christ, but that by his state of humiliation,

even through the imminence of his death, Christ will be magnified (Phil. 1.20). Everything depends on 'always being ready to give an answer to anyone who asks you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear' (1 Pet. 3.15).

Based on the 'patience of hope' (1 Thess. 1.3), the 'helmet, the hope of salvation' is not to be understood in the sense of a military symbol (1 Thess. 5.8). The experience of hope reconfirms itself in a new understanding and in a sober outlook on the reality (1 Pet. 1.13) of those who are already living through night as the children of light and day (1 Thess. 5.4-7; Rom. 13.11).

3. Fundamental Considerations: The Hope of Israel and the Hope of the Christians

In the following, I will briefly investigate two questions that suggest themselves from New Testament data. The first question is: If Abraham has already encountered the 'God of hope', how then is the hope among the early Christians related to the hope of Israel? And the second question that, likewise, cannot be set aside, is the following: Is hope, in the early Christian sense, identical with Christian hope in principle?

By investigating this extensive question of systematic theology I must restrict myself to giving suggestions and basic outlines.

a. The 'Hope of Israel'

This phrase is a quotation from Acts 28.20, Paul's last effort out of a Roman prison to win the Roman Jews: 'For the hope of Israel I am bound with this chain'. 'Luke' has repeatedly ascribed to Paul this apologetic motive in his programmatic speeches: After being taken prisoner in Jerusalem (23.6-8), trying to win over the Pharisees against the Sadducees ('Concerning the hope and resurrection of the dead I am on trial', 23.6); again, standing before the procurators Felix (24.15) and Festus (26.6-8). By the 'hope of Israel' or at least the hope of the religious ones shaped by pharisaic or apocalyptic teachings, is meant the resurrection of the dead, the righteous and the unrighteous, respectively, and the fulfilment of the promises made to the fathers. 'Luke', by this, tries to show the Jewish attacks as having no foundation and to contradict them. Still, the perspective he is offering appears well founded in itself.

We have been shown, by Paul, how the motives of faith and hope are connecting the Scriptures of Israel to his own teaching. The God of Abraham is, for him, the father of Jesus Christ, who in Christ has revealed himself unmistakably and decisively first to the Jews and afterwards to the non-Jews, as the God who will save 'every one who has faith' (Rom. 1.16; cf. Heb. 1.1: 'God, who at different times and in various ways spoke in time past to the fathers by the prophets, has in these last days spoken to us by his Son'). Hope, therefore, as the Bible sees it, is closely connected with the promises that have been made to Israel.

The same connection can be found between Old Testament and early Jewish applications of the word 'hope', which I demonstrate with a few examples: In Israel the promises given to the fathers have not been invalidated by the unforeseeable and often catastrophic course of history. Rather they are repeatedly taken up by the prophets to show Israel a new future from God, an actualization and a new beginning, even by way of disasters. Only a stump will remain of the great tree symbolizing the people of God, but this stump will be a holy seed (Isa. 6.9-13). God reveals himself to be the first and also the last, and his servant will restore Israel as well as become the 'light to the Gentiles' unto the ends of the earth (Isa. 49.6). Even Jerusalem in ruins is called upon to rejoice and to shake off the dust, for God has forsaken his people for a small moment, but 'my kindness shall not depart from you, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed' (Isa. 52-54; esp. 54.7-10). 'And the Redeemer shall come to Zion' (59.20), which Paul will, later, relate (in Rom. 11.26) to the aim of the history of God with his people. The meek will hear 'good tidings' (61.1-2); Jesus has made use of this according to the Gospels (Mt. 11.1-6; Lk. 4.18-19). When the peoples, heaven and earth will be included in this fulfilment of salvation (Isa. 65.17; cf. Rev. 21.1-22.5), a comprehensive eschatology will emerge increasingly, in postexilic age and further in apocalypticism.

The Jewish Eighteen-Benedictions shows impressively that this hope includes the raising of the dead (second Benediction) as well as the return of the dispersed, the healing of those who are broken, the forgiving of sins and the establishment of the 'Kingdom of God' which corresponds to the downfall of the rule of pride (Rome). Fundamentally, early Christianity lives by this hope and enters it. But there are two main features that are new:

First, according to the New Testament, the hope of Israel turns into a strong and final hope through the events concerning Christ and by the present influence of his Spirit on the believers. Secondly, it is thereby converted into an indisputable hope for those who believe, also from the 'peoples' who will establish the community of salvation through God (ἐκκλησία θεοῦ) at the end of the times. That the faith in Christ has been joined to the hope of Israel in this way must be discussed in the Jewish-Christian dialogue as a fundamental theological problem. Even a despairing and, on first sight, quite hopeless text like Job 14.7-13 ('a tree, if it is cut down, can sprout again, but not a man, when he gives up his spirit') must not be held against this interpretation, for we can see the statement as the pronouncement of Job's lament before God shows himself to be powerful in creation and history by his revealing oration (Job 38-31), whereupon Job is made to realize that he has spoken unwisely, asking God to enlighten him (42.3-4).

b. *Early Christian Hope as 'Christian Hope'*

Looking at the subject matters of hope we cannot distinguish between those that are theologically most important and those that are nothing but a 'cultural tradition' in a historical sense. But the question of relevance must be asked, nevertheless, in the context of their theological interpretation. Do we find elements that take a central place in the context, and others that are more marginal? Are there subject matters of hope that cannot be taken literally because of our outlook on ourselves and our world?

In my opinion, the tight construction and the clearness of the biblical and, especially, of the early Christian evidence is most important for the interpretation. The Scriptures are interpreting themselves. It is shown that at least the following moments constitute Christians speaking about God or about Christ and, by this, about Christian faith:

—when they speak about *God* who keeps his promises and discloses an always new future to humankind;

—when they speak about God's creative and lifegiving power in the present time, passed on to the believers as their righteousness brought about by Christ;

—when they speak about a God who, being Lord of creation and history, will put an end to the expanse of creation and to the time of

history and who will prove himself, at that time, as boundlessly powerful and, nevertheless, bountifully loving, with regard to all human beings, the living and the dead, the righteous and the unrighteous. This, then, means to speak about the 'God of hope';

—when they speak about *Christ* as the one, through whom God in the power of his reign and of his love has turned towards humankind, Jews and non-Jews, in order to render them children of God and turning out to be their father;

—when they speak about Christ as the one whose sacrifice for the sake of sin was admitted by God, although he was perfectly in agreement with the divine will and divine nature, so that the law might be fulfilled and he would establish righteousness for the many. Whom God has raised, through his resurrection, to be Lord and judge, so that in the end the believers can be sure without doubt of their justification and glorification. By this for the Christians he is 'their hope';

—when they speak about Christ as the Lord who is near to themselves and also to the believers in their hearts, in prayer and in various gifts of grace, but also in their readiness to fulfil God's will, in the community of the eschatological people of God, and in the joy at being made new, so that the Christian may trust in his being near as in the drawing near of his day or final appearance;

—when they speak about God's *Spirit*, who gives assurance to their hearts of the love of God, who makes them fearless in temptations and tribulations, who gives them the courage 'always to give an answer to every man who asks you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear' (1 Pet. 3.15);

—when they speak about God's spirit, who kindles in them the longing for the definite fulfilment of the gift of salvation, in which they already have their life, and, by this, for definite liberation and glorification of the children of God, which is the longing of all creation;

—when they speak about the fact that God has caused and offered to the world reconciliation with himself. Now the believers are to bear witness, before man and all creation, because it is God's will that everybody shall be saved;

—finally, when they speak about faith, being hope itself; that the

invisible glory and power of God is already present among those who engage in trust in God and, by this, in trust in Christ. Therefore, in the midst of their earthly existence, the believers stand face to face with the reality of God, who has started his creation in a motion towards himself.

In my opinion, this theological basic evidence can be explained very well in a theological language that has been molded by the language of the Bible. The statements made above might appear to be, as sentences of a theologically founded hope, somewhat sparse and reserved. They fall short of the language of Jewish and early Christian apocalypticism; still they remain part of its foundation.

The concrete apocalyptic texts are not to be disregarded as being 'confused, fantastical and mythological', by which one would entirely misunderstand their message.¹⁷ Still it is legitimate to see them as forms of language and hope which, on the one hand, originated from hopeless misery and distress, and, on the other hand, originated at a time when the biblical hope for salvation became increasingly generalized, are therefore standing as 'images' for what was to be expressed. This is also shown in biblical terms that were adopted from the prophets of Israel, as likewise by contents that are influenced by the hope of David and Zion, and, finally, by the apocalyptic basis of subject matter that indicates that God will, at the climax of ungodliness and escalation of hostility against himself, triumph by the power of his justice over unrighteousness and showing himself as the Lord of all shall overcome all of the heavenly and earthly powers opposed to him.

It is not coincidence that not only Jesus, but also Paul, used apocalyptic language but sparingly. Paul occasionally used it with intentional distance. However, he did not renounce the basic intent of hope that apocalypticism has offered in the course of Israel's history and during early Judaism. But where others try to define the currently

17. The important topic of the existential interpretation of biblical texts was burdened by Rudolf Bultmann with a fundamental theological neglect or a disqualification of the 'mythical' ideas altogether, especially of the apocalyptic passages. But surely the interpretation of single ideas and expectations in their respective historical and causal tradition—with their historical connections—is necessary, contrary to a reduction by interpretation. Only in this way the intense perception of what first seems strange can lead us to an understanding of the unknown in the face of our own way of imagination and formulation.

existing situation before the coming of the end, wherever they try to mark precisely the saved ones and the lost ones, they are following their own hopes instead of the promises of the 'God of hope', who, according to Rom. 10.12 and to Joel 3.5 (2.32) 'is generous unto all who call on him'.

NOT ALL IS IN THE HANDS OF HEAVEN:
ESCHATOLOGY AND KABBALAH

Rachel Elijor

The different manifestations of Jewish mysticism may be categorized loosely into two major periods. The first period emerged in the last centuries before the Common Era and continued until at least the sixth century CE.¹ The written evidence that was preserved from this period is primarily concerned with the mystical perpetuation of the Temple and the accompanying priestly service.² This literature originated from within the prophetic vision of Ezekiel, known as the Vision of the Chariot, and was perceived as a visionary transformation of the desolated First Temple.³ Priestly circles in Qumran, the self-proclaimed Sons of Light or the Priestly Sons of Zadok, elaborated upon this Vision of the Chariot in the second and first centuries BCE and described the divine worship as an eternal angelic liturgy taking place in the seven heavenly Temples.⁴ The angelic worship was described in

1. G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken Books, 3rd edn, 1967), pp. 40-79, 355-69; I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980); R. Elijor, 'Mysticism, Magic and Angelology: The Angelology of Hekhalot Literature', *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 1 (1993), pp. 3-53.

2. Cf. H.H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic: A Study of Jewish and Christian Apocalypses from Daniel to Revelation* (London: Athlone, 1963); J.J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1987); *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. Charlesworth; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983); note there First Enoch, Second Enoch, Jubilees, Testament Of Abraham and the Testament of Levi.

3. See D.J. Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1988); R. Elijor, 'From Earthly Temple to Heavenly Shrines', *Tarbiz* 64.3 (1995), pp. 341-80 (English version in *Jewish Studies Quarterly*, 1998 forthcoming).

4. For a general survey on Qumran literature see D. Dimant, 'Qumran Sectarian Literature', in M. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (Assen:

great detail within these priestly-mystical circles which perpetuated the divine liturgy in their hymns and rituals by replicating the angels in their numinous divine service in heaven.⁵ By the first centuries of the Common Era, after the destruction of the Second Temple, related mystical circles, the self-proclaimed Yordei-Merkavah (descenders of the chariot), became active. These mystics elaborated upon the existing themes of the sevenfold heavenly Temple and the eternal angelic liturgy and created the mystical literary corpus which became known as the Hekhalot literature.⁶ In the Hekhalot literature, both the mythical eternity of the heavenly service, which had been fashioned after the priestly vocation, as well as the mystical ascent, which embodied the angelic myth, overshadow any historical or apocalyptic concerns and take precedence over all interest in mundane affairs and eschatological schemes.

The mystical literary corpus of late antiquity included diverse apocalyptic and eschatological expressions; however, the threefold emphasis on the eternal heavenly temple, on the ongoing angelic service and on the mystical ascent of an elect few replaced all concern with earthly expectations of an imminent redemption that might take place within history.

The second period of Jewish mysticism arose in the first centuries of the second millennium CE and was mainly concerned with queries attempting to delve into the obscured heavenly realm and into the eternal pre-deterministic schemes for spanning the interval between the beginning of time and the end of the days. Mystical writings of both the medieval and early modern periods express great reflection upon the application of these schemes to the concepts of exile and redemption. The literary heritage of this second period is commonly

Van Gorcum, 1984), pp. 483-548. On the Angelic Service cf. J. Strugnell, 'The Angelic Liturgy at Qumran, 4Q Serekh Shirot "Olat HaSabbat"', in *Congress Volume Oxford 1959* (VTSup, 7; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1960), pp. 318-45.

5. See C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), pp. 1-81.

6. Scholem, *Major Trends*, pp. 40-79; *idem*, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkavah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 2nd edn, 1965); Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*; P. Schäfer, *The Hidden and the Manifest God: Some Major Themes in Early Jewish Mysticism* (trans. A. Pomerance; Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992); Elior, 'Mysticism', and *idem*, 'From Earthly Temple' see there extensive updated bibliography on Hekhalot literature and Merkavah Mysticism.

known as Kabbalah and has a distinct eschatological character throughout many of its expressions.⁷

Kabbalistic literature was composed during the afflictions and the anguish of exile and was concerned with the redemption of the Jewish nation or with the creation of an alternative reality which would reverse the course of Jewish history by means of a miraculous divine intervention. The point of departure for this literature was the all too apparent truth that the long expected messianic coming as based on biblical eschatology had not been fulfilled.

Kabbalistic eschatology was nurtured from three sources: (1) from dreams and visions of the mystics themselves which revived the Biblical tradition and envisaged anew the pre-deterministic scope of history, (2) from the mythical eschatology of the Zohar which reflects a profound dualist perception of the Divinity and the Cosmic Processes, (3) and from the Talmudic-eschatological tradition which laid the foundation for messianic expectation within history.

The underlying conception of the Kabbalistic eschatological tradition was formulated in *Tikunei Zohar*, a Medieval pseudepigraphic text written about 1300, which was ascribed most convincingly to Rabbi Simeon Bar Yohai, a sage living in the Late Mishnaic period.⁸ The eschatological tone of the text is readily perceived:

‘[Elijah of blessed memory said to Rabbi Simeon Bar Yohai, may he rest in peace, how privileged are you in that] from this book of yours elevated people will be sustained, until this book is revealed to those below in the last generation in the end of days, and because of it you shall proclaim liberty throughout the land to all its inhabitants...each of you shall return to his dwelling and each of you shall return to his family (Lev. 25.10), and therefore it is explained that through the book of the Zohar they will go out of exile.’⁹ According to the Zoharic

7. G. Scholem, *Kabbalah* (Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, 1974); *idem*, *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead* (New York: Schocken Books, 1991); *idem*, *On the Kabbalah and its Symbolism* (New York: Schocken Books, 1965); I. Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar* (3 vols.; trans. D. Goldstein; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).

8. Scholem, *Major Trends*, pp. 156-204, note esp. p. 162; Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, introduction.

9. *Tikunei Zohar* (ed. R. Margaliot; Jerusalem: Mossad Harev Kook, 2nd edn, 1978 [Mantowa, 1558]), end of Tikun VI f.23b-24a; Raaya Mehemna, Zohar Vaykra, f. 124b:

tradition, the secrets of the Kabbalah (which were assumed to have been written in the second century as noted above) were hidden for a thousand years and were destined to be revealed only at the End of Days. Thus their revelation in the end of the thirteenth century and their dissemination in the following period signified the emergence of the messianic era. Kabbalistic circles inferred from this assertion that by virtue of those who study the Zohar redemption shall come in the near future. The imminent connection between the study of the Zohar and the resultant hastening of redemption enhanced the study of the Zohar with an eschatological perspective. Similarly, the coming of the Messiah was exclusively preconditioned by the dissemination of Kabbalah.¹⁰

Thus, a twofold attitude was established—the revelation of the Zohar attests that the End of Days is near; however, only through the study of this book's mystical content and by means of its wide dissemination could the fulfilment of the hidden eschatological plan for redemption be assured.¹¹

In the mystical tradition, the concepts of exile and redemption were diametrically symbolized respectively as defilement and holiness, as Kelipha and Kedushah, as Satan and Shekinah or as the power of evil combating the forces of the divinity. The struggle between heavenly holiness against earthly defilement signifies the ongoing battle between a prevailing exile and the yearned-for redemption. The study of the Zohar and the fulfilment of the commandments with Kabbalistic intention alongside a denial of mundane concerns were conceived to be the pre-eminent manner by which the powers of holiness could be strengthened and the redemption could be hastened. Conversely, both the commitment of sin, the indulgence in mundane concerns and negligence in the dissemination of the mystical writings were perceived as strengthening the powers of evil and contributing to the

וכמה בני נשא לתתא יתפרנסון מהא' חבורא דילך כד אתגליא לתתא' בדרא בתראה בסוף
 יומא ובגנייה וקראתם דרור בארץ (ויקרא כה, י) בהא' חבורא דילך דאיהו ספר הזוהר
 ... 'פקן ביה מן גלותא

10. Cf. I. Tishby, 'The Controversy on the Printing of the Zohar in 16th Century Italy', *Studies in Kabbalah and its Branches* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1982), pp. 79-182; R. Elior, 'The Dispute on the Position of the Kabbalah in the 16th century', *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 1 (1981), pp. 177-90.

11. Cf. Y. Hayat, introduction to *Minhat Yehudah*, in *Ma'arechet Elohut* (Man-towa, 1558).

continuation of exile.¹² These ideas which had prevailed in diverse esoteric Kabbalistic circles were amplified by the expulsion of the Jews from Spain in 1492.

The Spanish Expulsion uprooted and dispersed overwhelming numbers of the Jewish people and created a devastating impression on this generation and indeed on the generations to follow throughout the course of the entire sixteenth century.¹³ The banishment was perceived neither as a mere historical incident nor as an arbitrary political decision of the mundane powers that could be compensated for within the stipulations of realistic-historical circumstance. The catastrophe was expressly interpreted in religious terms as a part of an all encompassing and predetermined process signifying the End of Days, of which the expulsion was only the initial manifestation of approaching events.¹⁴ There is no doubt that the ordeal of the expulsion sharpened the realities of existence in exile and facilitated eschatological expectations for the miraculous intervention of God in history, a circumstance which would culminate in the imminent coming of the Messiah.¹⁵ The exiles were searching ceaselessly for different signs for their eschatological assertions and they found support in the mystical tradition. The 'revelation' of the Zohar in the late medieval period was considered by the exiles and their followers as a significant

12. Cf. R. Elior, 'The Doctrine of Transmigration in Galia-Raza', in L. Fine (ed.), *Essential Papers on Kabbalah* (New York: New York University Press, 1995), pp. 243-69; Elior, 'The Dispute', pp. 185-90.

13. Y. Baer, *Galut* (Berlin: Schocken Books, 1936), pp. 49-69; H.H. Ben Sasson, 'Exile and Redemption through the Eyes of the Spanish Exiles', in S. Ettinger *et al.* (eds.), *ספר-יובל לייצחק בער* (Yitzhak Baer Jubilee Volume; Jerusalem: The Historical Society of Israel, 1960), pp. 216-27; J. Hacker, 'New Chronicles on the Expulsion of the Jews from Spain', in *Yitzhak F. Baer Memorial Volume*, Zion 44.1-4, (1979), pp. 201-28; G. Scholem, *שבתי צבי והתבועה* (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1967), pp. 9-18; Scholem, *Major Trends* (n. 1 above), pp. 244-51.

14. See Scholem, *Kabbalah*, pp. 67-79. Cf. Joseph the son of Shaltiel HaCohen, who wrote in 1495: 'I suppose that the troubles that happened to the Jews in the Christian world from 1490 to 1495 are the premessianic tribulations' (Vatican MS 187, end of Sefer Ha-Pliah).

15. Cf. A. Halevi, *Mishra Kitrin* (Constantinople, 1510); cf. *Kiriyat Sefer* 2 (1925), pp. 101-104, 269-73; *Kiriyat Sefer* 7 (1930), pp. 149-65, 440-56; S. Eben Lavi, *Ketem Paz* (Gerba: Jacob Hadad, 1940), f. 12a; Shlomo Molcho, *Sefer HaMefoar* (Saloniki, 1529), cf. A.Z. Aescoly, *התנועה המשיחית בישראל* (Jewish Messianic Movement) (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1956), pp. 266-80.

expression of the eschatological times. Already in 1498 the messianic promise of the Zohar was merged with the religious interpretation of the Expulsion by Yehudah Hayat, yet another survivor from Spain:

Hence it is explained that the Zohar was destined to be hidden until the last generation when it shall be revealed unto man; by virtue of its students the Messiah will come, for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord and that will be the reason for his coming.¹⁶

The convergence between the hastening of redemption and the dissemination of the study of Kabbalah was securely founded in the tradition of the Zohar and was increasingly elaborated in diverse directions in different Kabbalistic circles along the sixteenth century.

The traumatic historical event was perceived in the first few decades of the sixteenth century as the foundation and background for the coming redemption since the events were interpreted as pre-messianic tribulations.¹⁷ The tribulations were construed as apocalyptic birth-pangs which would culminate in the inevitable coming of the Messiah, delivered from heaven through the study of the Zohar. This messianic resurgence found various expressions in apocalyptic writings of the sixteenth century and in the pre-messianic figures of David Ha-Reuveni and Shlomo Molcho. This stage of acute expectations for miraculous divine intervention accompanied by eschatological announcers about imminent messianic redemption, reached a dramatic climax with the execution by auto-da-fe of Shlomo Molcho, who chose to be burnt at the stake in Mantua in 1532 as a martyr rather than to submit to the Papal decree demanding a renunciation of his profound belief in imminent messianic expectations.¹⁸

The martyrdom of Molcho imposed a grave impression on the broad Jewish community and caused suppression of acute messianic expectation. Rabbi Joseph Karo, a leading rabbinic figure in Turkey who was associated with Molcho, began to receive what he perceived as auditory and visual heavenly visitations which embody the concepts of exile and redemption in a new way that changed the nature of mystical eschatology. Karo left detailed recordings of his visions in his mysti-

16. Y. Hayat, *Minhat Yehudah*, Introduction.

17. See, R. Elior, 'Messianic Expectations and Spiritualization of Religious life in the Sixteen Century', *REJ* 145 (1986), pp. 1-2, 35-49.

18. Cf. Aescoli, *Jewish Messianic Movements*, pp. 236-80. Cf. Shlomo Molcho, *Hayat Kane* (Amsterdam, 1660 [?]; Paris: Edition Aescoli, 1938); *idem*, *Sefer HaMefoar*.

cal diary which was published posthumously as *Maggid Mesharim*.¹⁹ He wrote of hearing the heavenly voice of the Shekhinah (the Divine presence which dwells, ideally, in the Holy of Holies in the temple. When the temple does not stand the Shekhinah is spoken of as being in exile and is described as the female aspect of the Godhead) urging him and his fellow mystics in Turkey to redeem this divine entity from the bondage of exile:

My friends, my beloved. . . blessed are you. . . that you have undertaken to crown me tonight, for it is now many years since the crown fell from my head, I have no one to comfort me and I am cast into the dust, embracing dunghheaps. But now you have restored the crown to its former glory. . . therefore my sons, be strong, resolute and joyful in my love, my Torah and my reverence; and if you could surmise the minutest part of the grief that is my lot. . . therefore, be strong and resolute and desist not from study. . . therefore, stand upon your feet and exalt me. . . and She repeated, blessed are you, resume your studies and desist not for one instant and go to the Land of Israel instantly. . . and through you I have been exalted tonight.²⁰

The Shekhinah had described itself in the words of the book of Lamentations as a sorrowful captive thrown on the dunghills, desolated and tormented in exile and yearning for deliverance and salvation. This salvation could only be achieved by the actions of the mystical circle of Karo and his associates, who would transform and indeed forever reverse the respective roles of heaven and earth. The human being is perceived as the redeemer of the deity who is in exile, as against the traditional perception in which the redemption descends from heaven in order to free the Jewish nation from the enslavement of exile. The significance of this change is invested in the reversal of man's position from a passive to an active role as well as the shift in focus of the idea of redemption from the earthly historical arena onto a heavenly mythological arena. The Shekhinah can be redeemed from its exile only by man as the redeemer who alone can execute the restitution of heaven and earth back to their pre-exilic positions. Furthermore, the redemption affects directly the heavenly powers and not the

19. R.J. Werblowsky, *Joseph Karo Lawyer and Mystic* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962). Cf. J. Karo, *Sefer Maggid Mesharim* (Petah-Tikva: Y. Bar Lev, 1990. First published in Lublin, 1648, common edition Jerusalem: Ora-press, 1960).

20. Cf. *Maggid Mesharim* (Jerusalem: Ora-press, 1960), Introduction.

immediate destiny of man. The nature of the human engendered redemption—in which the mystic becomes the active agent for redemption while God becomes a passive subject—is detailed in the decree of the divine voice which had been heard by Karo. He and his associates were called upon to ascend immediately to the desolated Land of Israel, to study ceaselessly, to adhere constantly to the Shekhinah in their thoughts and prayers, to study Zohar and to disseminate Kabbalah in order to strengthen the powers of holiness over the powers of evil. Only through these actions could the exiled deity be elevated and restored to its former situation and thus fulfill the call of divine redemption.²¹

After 1536 the members of the Kabbalistic circles could not await passively any longer. They 'elevated' themselves to the Land of Israel in order to fulfil the mystical elevation of the Shekhinah and they established the community of mystics at Safed.

This new attitude—that which concentrated all efforts on affecting the heavenly powers through comprehensive study of Kabbalah and consolidation of new mystical rituals which would generate salvation of the Shekhinah—gradually relinquished a belief in the miraculous intervention of God in history and abandoned the passive stance for external revolutionary change in the order of the universe.

The active attitude towards an eschatological future—which focused upon the dissemination of the Kabbalah and on the ritual practice of *yihudim* and *kavanot* (that is, mystical intentions and Kabbalistic contemplation)—replaced the traditional submissive expectation which entrusted redemption in the hands of heaven and generated profound spiritualization of religious life.²²

In the course of the sixteenth century, Kabbalism underwent a significant transformation as it formed a conjunction with the contemporary eschatological notions. This conjunction between eschatological hopes and mystical beliefs had two major consequences. The first was the transformation of the Kabbalah from an elitistic-esoteric concern of an elect few into a popular doctrine readily available to wide circles. The mystics of the sixteenth century took an active course in the

21. Cf. R. Elijor, 'R. Joseph Karo and R. Israel Baal Shem Tov: Mystical Metamorphosis, Kabbalistic Inspiration and Spiritual Internalization', *Tarbiz* 65 (1996), pp. 671-709 (English translation forthcoming).

22. Cf. Elijor, *Expectation and Spiritualization*.

dissemination of Kabbalistic eschatology, altering the traditional dichotomies between esotericism and exotericism.²³ All were urged and exhorted to engage in the study of Kabbalah. As a result of this overriding demand, the books of the Zohar were published in 1558 since until that date they existed only in manuscript form, being exclusively reserved for the elect few. This unprecedented breach of esoteric tradition was justified by the obligation to hasten redemption through the study of the mystical Scriptures.²⁴ The sense of eschatological expectation is candidly expressed by many mystics who asserted that they were motivated to commit their mystical visions into writing on account of their profound belief in the inevitable eschatological course of history and the imminent approach of the end of days.²⁵

The second significant outcome of the fusion between Kabbalah and messianic expectation was a comprehensive process of spiritualization that entailed a profound change in Jewish religious life. This process was propagated by diverse mystical circles who challenged and criticized the common predominant perception of religion while striving to establish the claim for spiritual supremacy of the Kabbalah in of all aspects of religious life.²⁶ These attempts became apparent with the attempt to establish a new definition of the relation between Kabbalah and Halakhah in light of the prevailing eschatological expectations.²⁷

Before the sixteenth century Kabbalistic interests had existed harmoniously, for the most part, alongside the dominance of the Halakhah, since it occupied a marginal esoteric role. However in the course of the sixteenth century the earlier marginal position of the Kabbalah was replaced with a claim of supremacy through a doctrine that promoted radical change in Jewish life for the sake of advancing the messianic era. The Kabbalistic literature that was written from the turn of the sixteenth century onwards testifies to the various stages in the

23. Cf. n. 10 above.

24. Cf. Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*; *idem*, 'The Controversy', introduction; Elior, 'The Dispute'.

25. R. Elior (ed.), *Galia Raza, A Critical Edition of Oxford Manuscript Opp. 104* (Jerusalem: The Institute for Jewish Studies Publications, 1981), Introduction.

26. E. Gottlieb, *Studies in Kabbalistic Literature* (ed. J. Hacker; Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University Press, 1976), pp. 370-96; R. Elior, 'The Doctrine of Transmigration in Galia-Raza', in L. Fine (ed.), *Essential Papers on Kabbalah* (New York: New York University Press, 1995), pp. 243-69.

27. J. Katz, *Halakhah and Kabbalah* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1984).

formation of alternative religious norms in which the roles of Halakhah and Kabbalah were reversed.²⁸

The common denominator of the diverse mystical writings of the period that challenged the supremacy of the Halakhah, was the negation of the literal conception of the Torah as possessing sufficient religious spiritual meaning and true knowledge of God:

Regarding the Torah in its literality, which is the Torah of the mundane world, it is worthless when compared to the Messianic Torah and the Torah of the world to come. . . Regarding the Mishnah, there can be no doubt that the Mishnah's literal aspects are but veils, shells and outer wrappings when compared to the hidden mysteries which are inherent and insinuated in its inner aspects (i.e. Kabbalah).²⁹

The Kabbalistic conception denied the relevance of the prevailing rational perspective and legal orientation which derived from the literal reading of Scriptures, arguing for the existence of a concealed spiritual perception of the Torah and the Mishnah, perceiving both as being invested with hidden divine significance and messianic vocation. This inner meaning was to be found in the Kabbalah of the Zohar and in the writings of its followers. Thus those scholarly tendencies concerned entirely with the law and with literal interpretation were grasped as a direct contradiction to the foundation of the mystical perception and its messianic vocation and therefore should be rejected and contested.³⁰

The culmination of this new orientation is to be found in the introduction to the Lurianic magnum opus *Etz Hayyim*, written by Hayyim Vital in the later part of the sixteenth century.³¹ *Etz Hayyim* expounds the essence of the new Lurianic Kabbalah that flourished in Safed in the second half of the sixteenth century. Vital's introduction to this work does not relate to the new mystical beliefs that were introduced by Issac Luria but rather summarizes the ideological

28. Elior, 'The Dispute'.

29. Hayim Vital, *Etz-Hayyim* [Warsaw, 1891; Jerusalem, 1910], 'Introduction to the Gate of Introductions', p. 2.

30. G. Sed-Rajna, 'Le Role de la Kabbale dans la tradition juive selon Hayyim Vital', *RHR* 167 (1965), pp. 177-96; R. Elior, 'Messianic Expectations'; J. Katz, 'Halakha and Kabbalah as Competing Subjects of Study', *Da'at* 7, (1981), pp. 61-63.

31. On *Etz Hayyim* see Scholem, *Major Trends*, pp. 254, 409-14; cf. nn. 29, 30 above.

background of the struggle for the new position which the Kabbalah had been seeking to attain throughout the first half of the sixteenth century. Each of Vital's contentions presented in the introduction had been previously stated in the Kabbalistic literature of the generation of the expulsion. In other words, the introduction to *Etz Hayyim* is the summation of the spiritual turning-point of the first part of the sixteenth century and not the annunciation of its second manifestation that was embodied in the Lurianic Kabbalah.

Vital wrote his introduction as a reflection upon the change in the order of priorities stemming from his eschatological hopes. He strove to amend the prevailing misapprehension of the Torah as only law, as *nomos* or, as the literal meaning revealed, narrative-peshat. He aspired to restore the Torah to its inherent hidden divine origin and true spiritual significance. Vital endeavored to identify the spiritual perception of the Torah with the Kabbalah arguing that the Scripture and the law have a concealed stratum, a position which thereby minimizes the priority of the legal position and the revealed literal layer. He argued that the paramount vocation of the Kabbalistic literature lies in the discovery and decipherment of this layer. In his opinion, traditional legal concerns and Halakhic interpretation in their literality were no longer to be viewed as the center of Judaism since they reflect the Torah of exile. The Kabbalah on the other hand should be placed far above the Halakhah in importance and position since it is the Torah of Redemption:

The major scholars of Torah have degenerated into the heresy of denying the validity of the truth while insisting that the only meaning of Torah is the literal meaning, the peshat. The situation is desperate since it is only by means of the Kabbalah that redemption can be brought about while to refrain from it would delay the restoration of our Temple and our Glory.³²

Vital consolidated this dual perception of the Torah as hidden spirit and revealed law under two opposing concepts which originated in the earlier Kabbalistic literature—Torat Etz Hayyim and Torat Etz Hada'at—the Torah of the Tree of Life and the Torah of the Tree of Knowledge.³³ In the previous mystical tradition, the former concept represents the hidden, superior spiritual and eternal holy Torah which

32. Vital, *Etz-Hayyim*, Introduction, p. 4.

33. See G. Scholem, 'The Meaning of the Torah in Jewish Mysticism', in *idem*, *On the Kabbalah and its Symbolism*, pp. 32-86; cf. pp. 66-70 for the radical meaning of the new spiritual conception.

will prevail in the messianic future. The latter term refers to the subordinate Torah which had already been given to the Jews, that which emphasized literal dimension and legalistic determinations. Vital argued forcefully that the Kabbalah is the *Torat Etz Hayyim* while the *Halakhah*, the *Mishna* and the *Peshat* (literal interpretation) are the *Torat Etz Hada'at*. The focus of his contention viewed the literal perception of the Torah and the application of the *Halakhah* as the conclusive deciding medium for all aspects of daily life, as expressions of the era of the exile while the Kabbalah was presented as the expression of the new messianic era, thought to be imminent.³⁴

The mystical interpretation of the law with its eschatological perspective was offered as a spiritual alternative to the dominant contemporary Halachic tradition and to its major exponents. There can be but a small doubt that it was the eschatological orientation, which dominated the mystical circles of this generation, that inspired the daring criticism of the rabbinical establishment as well as the literal legal system. It was the transformation of the acute messianic perspective that motivated a new perception of spiritual priorities and religious hierarchy.

In the first decades after the expulsion, Kabbalistic writings were primarily concerned with immediate redemption delivered from heaven. Mystics were engaged in the definition of an accurate understanding of the eschatological process seen to be obscured within the strata of the Scriptures, and in deciphering the hidden messianic meaning lying behind historical events. These writings concentrated on the attempt to detect apocalyptic meaning within every word of the Scriptures. R. Abraham Ha-Levi, one of the leading Kabbalists of the period once stated: 'Behold, scripture in its entirety is filled with covert allusion to the future redemption'.³⁵

In the course of the century the mystical circles transformed the Kabbalah into the sole content of their eschatological expectation and gradually relinquished hope for any external redemption. The spiritual pursuit of the Kabbalistic writings, the mystical interpretation of the textual heritage, as well as the ceaseless efforts to elevate the *Shekhinah* through comprehensive study and innovative rituals

34. *Etz-Hayyim*, Introduction (n. 29 above), pp. 1-10.

35. A. Halevi, *Mishra Kitrin* (Constantinople, 1510), p. 176; cf. G. Scholem, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism* (New York: Schocken Books, 1971).

taken together replaced the hopes for redemption and turned the end of the days into a mystical frame of mind in which the study of Kabbalah moved to the paramount position.

As against the ongoing chaotic experience of exile and the passive despair generated by historical reality, Kabbalistic eschatology offered hope and consolation for generations of exiles by consolidating an alternative order for reality and by transcending the constraints of history. This viewpoint offered a sublimation of arbitrary meaningless experience by transforming the events into a stage for a meaningful cosmic-mystical drama of exile and redemption as expressed in the Kabbalah.

Kabbalistic eschatological perspective offered freedom, freedom not only from the bondage of arbitrary historical circumstances by serving as a refuge from the external world but, no less importantly, as freedom from the bondage of traditional thought.

The teachings of Karo and Vital and many other contemporary Kabbalists reflect a comprehensive breach of restraint which was motivated by eschatological speculation: Karo broke the borders of divine-human relations by reversing the traditional order of the subject of redemption; Vital broke the confines of tradition by inverting the order of the messianic Torah and the Exilic Torah, while many other Kabbalists transcended the borders of time and place, reconstructing both history and metahistory.

ESCHATOLOGY AND ETHICS:
THEIR RELATION IN
RECENT CONTINENTAL PROTESTANTISM

Christofer Frey

When Moltmann published his 'Theology of Hope' in 1964 he pretended that until the appearance of his new book *eschatology* had been restricted to the last chapter of the manuals of doctrine (*de novissimis*).¹ Furthermore he claimed that eschatology had shrunk to a treatise on individual death and personal fate after death, whereas the social perspective in the preaching of the Kingdom of God had generally vanished. This situation was supposed to change with his new attempt to interpret eschatology.

Some decades later, Moltmann's book will probably lead experts in the sociology of science to discover in his book the first monograph of the age of mass media. It covers everything suited to stir up public attention, especially claiming that most theologians were blind to certain important problems until this treatise appeared. *Ethics*, indeed, changed as a result of his book, because it became inextricably linked to appeals in an eschatological emphasis with a messianological connotation. First was the 'congregation of the exodus', later a plenitude of hammering calls; for instance, appeals to break through the vicious circles of poverty and injustice all over the world.² These are important claims, but an elaborated ethics has to investigate the situations carefully and enlighten the people, because secular life is the sphere in which responsibility is actuated today. But Moltmann's monograph suggests that the consequences of eschatology, translated into the terms of social practice and stylistically transformed into a new exodus,

1. J. Moltmann, *Theologie der Hoffnung* (BEvT, 38; Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1964).

2. J. Moltmann, *Der gekreuzigte Gott* (Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1972), pp. 206-14.

could be concentrated upon a mere motivation to act morally. Consequently, a kind of *eschatological voluntarism* spread over the fields of theology and church practice. This new type of thinking turned ethics into appeals (as mentioned before), and nurtured a mode of thinking which 30 years later is gradually dying down, especially because socialism is no longer attractive or presents an alternative to shaping social life, however unexplained this alternative may have been. It seems that an ethically relevant situation without a transcending perspective is intolerable to most people.

Even if somebody is presented as a scientific revolutionary, he will find it difficult to transform everything. Theologians frequently only repeat what earlier periods discussed. This may be especially true with regard to eschatology in the roaring late sixties.

1. *The Challenge to Interpret Eschatology Anew*

Was eschatology really superseded in Protestant doctrine? There can be doubts that this really happened, for a dominating theme in modern Protestantism is the 'Kingdom of God', and this is a theme right in the centre of eschatology. The theme of the kingdom accompanies almost all church history. As an example, Luther's explanations of the two kingdoms or regimens of God are an attempt to define social and political reality in times expecting the end of history and waiting for God's last action; they do not present however a systematic body of doctrines, but a kaleidoscope of themes of political and legal (juridical) ethics; they are directed towards the consequences in a period where final domination of God has 'not yet' appeared.³

The Reformation period, however, is at a distance of almost 500 years, and the *key concepts of interpretation of eschatology in the twentieth century* were elaborated in the nineteenth century. On the one hand Hegel developed the idea that a rational kingdom of God could be realized in history. Although history did not arrest its process, it had already reached its essential aim, the theodicy embodied in a substantial morality.⁴ This 'Sittlichkeit' was supposed to express itself in a lifestyle, which presented the absolute in its ultimate

3. M. Luther, *Von weltlicher Obrigkeit*, in WA (Weimar edn), XI, p. 245-87.

4. G.W.F. Hegel, *Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts* (4th edn by J. Hoffmeister; Hamburg: Meiner, 1955), §§142-360.

form, in the cult of the church as congregation and in social culture.⁵

On the other hand there is Camille Overbeck, a sceptic par excellence: while he was teaching at Basel he concealed his own distance from the Christian faith and particularly from eschatological beliefs. According to him, eschatology was originally tied to the belief that the final events were coming soon, but this imminent expectation soon faded in early Christianity.⁶ Nobody in the nineteenth century was able to return to these origins. It even turned out to be impossible to rediscover the original agape, yearned after by radical pietists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

During the second half of the nineteenth century most of the liberal Protestants followed neither Hegel nor Overbeck. Many of them identified the kingdom of God with *culture*. Even the German Jewish philosopher Hermann Cohen, who gradually learned to appreciate his Jewish background again, was unable to accept the Hegelian philosophical view of history.⁷ Liberals among the theologians claimed a Kantian hope of *moral progress*; confronted with the overwhelming success of the natural sciences and the definite loss of metaphysical teleology they escaped to moral practice as region of evidence of religious convictions and imagined a kingdom of cultivated moral spirits.⁸

Overbeck's threat to cultural Protestantism, hidden to most of his colleagues in the nineteenth century, was, however, echoed in a new type of theology in the twentieth century, but this echo contrasted severely with his original intentions. It helped to destroy the optimism of moral progress and growing culture, which it could no longer use to identify God's Kingdom with any reality in the world. Karl Barth owed to Overbeck the idea of the origin, particularly because he was influenced by the Platonism of his brother, the philosopher Heinrich Barth.⁹ Stimulated by a Platonic idea of the origin he was unable to

5. G.W.F. Hegel, *Die absolute Religion* (Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Religion, III.1; ed. G. Lasson; repr.; Hamburg: Meiner, 1966), pp. 175-232.

6. C. Overbeck, *Über die Christlichkeit unserer heutigen Theologie* (repr.; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2nd edn, 1963); *idem*, *Christentum und Kultur* (ed. C.A. Bernoulli; repr.; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963).

7. H. Cohen, *Religion der Vernunft aus den Quellen des Judentums* (ed. B. Strauß, repr.; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966).

8. Especially A. Ritschl, *Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*.

9. K. Barth interprets Overbeck's 'Urgeschichte' (history of origin) by

interpret eschatological concepts by a temporal explanation; God himself was to interrupt human history axiomatically; ethics could no longer guarantee cultural amelioration, flowing into the growing kingdom of God; its actual task was to interrupt the activities of mankind more intensively than Lenin's revolution of 1917 did (mentioned in the first edition of Barth's commentary on Romans).¹⁰ Whoever comes to the conclusion that ethics had now to evade the real world and to concentrate on an ideal Kingdom of God is led astray. Barth's ethics emphasizes everyday life almost provocatively. In a speech delivered to 'toothless adherents of Ritschl'—'The Present Problem of Ethics'—Barth consciously ignores the cultural proliferation, but emphasizes that survival under the conditions of everyday life must be the primary concern of all people, and this demonstrated the distance from an ideal Kingdom of God.¹¹ The Hegelian synthesis of nature and spirit can be accomplished neither by theory nor by practice; every synthesis of spirit and nature remains totally transcendent.

It could be a real challenge to rewrite the history of Protestant theology in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and to present it as a history of the interpretation of the Kingdom of God. Such a project would probably support the following thesis: Each interpretation of the Kingdom of God includes *a priori assumptions of reality and history*. They influence New Testament exegesis and—at the same time—frame the horizon of possibilities of moral responsibility.

Against this background exegetes sometimes appear almost as split personalities. Again and again authors claim that Johannes Weiß undermined by his exegesis the foundations of the theology of his father-in-law, Albrecht Ritschl, when he published his well-known

'Ursprung' (cf. Overbeck, *Christentum und Kultur*, p. 21); see K. Barth, *Der Römerbrief* (repr.; Zollikon/Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2nd edn, 1954), pp. 66-81. H. Barth, 'Gotteserkenntnis', in J. Moltmann (ed.), *Anfänge der dialektischen Theologie* (Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1962), I, pp. 221-52, esp. p. 238: 'Im Ursprung ist der archimedische Punkt gefunden, von dem aus das Schwerkgewicht der Physis prinzipiell überwunden wird. . . ' ('The Archimedean point is found in the origin, from where the domination of the physis is principally overcome. . . ').

10. K. Barth, *Der Römerbrief* (repr.; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1963 [1919]), p. 379 ('. . . die absolute Revolution von Gott aus. . . ist mehr als Leninismus!') ('. . . the absolute revolution resulting from God. . . is more than Leninism!').

11. K. Barth, 'Das Problem der Ethik in der Gegenwart', *ZdZ* 1, II (1923), pp. 30-57.

monograph 'The Jesuanic Preaching of the Kingdom of God' in 1892.¹² This destruction may have been the long-term effect; but Weiß himself stated an open discrepancy between the jesuanic vision of the Kingdom of God in Palestine and the idea of Protestant bourgeois modernity. Thoughts and ideas reflected in the circle gathered round Jesus of Nazareth could not be reiterated in modern times. 'This does not mean, that the term "Kingdom of God" can no longer be employed in the traditional manner, on the contrary, it could be the central slogan of modern theology. But we must concede that we use the term in a sense different from Jesus.'¹³ Weiß proposes—independently from his exegetical results—to interpret the Kingdom of God as the highest good (*supremum bonum*) of being a child of God and as the highest moral ideal (following the dogmatics of Kaftan). Although he reaffirmed the liberal attitude towards the world, he did not reflect the ontological status of it.

2. Attempts at Confronting the Problems of Eschatology in Recent Times

Some exegetes seem to be aware of *a priori* assumptions of reality when they interpret the message of the Kingdom, and sometimes they work explicitly on this problem; examples are Rudolf Bultmann and his attempt at existential interpretation,¹⁴ or the Catholic exegete Helmut Merklein, who uses a pragmatist scheme relying on a theory of action.¹⁵ Implicit assumptions in more recent historical and critical exegesis of the Kingdom of God permutate: They can be close to utopia at the one extreme, or to historical or transhistorical reality at the other. The more interesting attempts at a solution of the problem pertain to systematic theology and here especially to ethics. Two systematians teaching at Munich present in themselves a striking contrast: Wolfhart Pannenberg and Trutz Rendtorff. They reiterate two systems of the early nineteenth century: the view of history as a whole elaborated by Hegel on the one hand and by Schleiermacher on

12. J. Weiß, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes* (ed. F. Hahn; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 3rd edn, 1964).

13. Weiß, *Die Predigt Jesu*, p. 246.

14. R. Bultmann, *History and Eschatology* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1957).

15. H. Merklein, *Die Gottesherrschaft als Handlungsprinzip: Untersuchungen zur Ethik Jesu* (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 3rd edn, 1984).

the other. Following these established ways of reasoning they try to direct history and ethics into one single perspective.

Pannenberg explains Israel's historical faith in God as the initial phase of a universal religion with a tendency to comprise all humanity one day.¹⁶ The discovery of *universal history* under the guidance of the unique God stimulates the search for its final sense, which—following Hegel—includes the whole as well as the single, even all singular elements. The historical totality of meaning must state even the death of individual persons as meaningful; for Hegel this was essential, because death defines only the particular, but not the singular case.¹⁷ Pannenberg starts his approaches to universal history by reconsiderations of Jewish apocalyptics in the times of late antiquity; his eschatology is therefore basically an apocalyptic one. The *resurrection* of Jesus Christ from the dead is the great prolepsis of the final aim of history and its final meaning; the prolepsis is factual revelation and not a theoretical postulate.¹⁸ Or, more precisely, the wholeness of history as well as the tendency towards the culmination of meaning can be constructed as a hypothesis: that this will be the final event can only be evident on the last of all days, but as a hypothesis it should be corroborated by a contingent fact, the first of all resurrections from the dead.

This projected totality of meaning could stimulate a severe protest, especially from the ranks of the so-called Frankfurt School. According to its adherents the totality is untrue, but not the uncompleted waiting for its fulfilment. Adorno, the spokesman of the Frankfurt School, fails however to recognize the Hegelian category of the 'singular' (mediating and uniting the general and the particular), and insists on the particular, which must be supported over against ideologies and the falsehood of the totality. By his specific interpretation of Hegel he isolates the subject as a person searching for his meaning and the meaning of his world in the midst of global meaninglessness.¹⁹

16. W. Pannenberg, *Wissenschaftstheorie und Theologie* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1973), pp. 299-348.

17. G.W.F. Hegel, *Wissenschaft der Logik* (ed. G. Lasson; repr.; Hamburg: Meiner, 1963), II, pp. 259-64.

18. W. Pannenberg, *Dogmatische Thesen zur Lehre von der Offenbarung* in, *Offenbarung als Geschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2nd edn, 1963), pp. 11-15; Introduction to Pannenburg, *Offenbarung*, pp. 7-20.

19. T.W. Adorno, *Drei Studien zu Hegel* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1963).

What is the foundation of personal being? Or should the subject be finally eliminated, as recent French philosophers think?

What are the consequences of Pannenberg's global hypothesis on universal history? His interest in ethics is only documented in a number of essays.²⁰ It is the way towards *unity of humanity*—not an ideal, but a hypothetically real destiny. Imminent practical problems, however, are shaped by the not-yet of this destiny. History is incomplete and permits only preliminary norms and means. Thus a historically and hypothetically real view of the Kingdom of God does not release a program of progressive ethics; the fulfilment of history—enclosing the totality of nature and spirit—can only be expected as revelation. Ethics concentrates on love and law. Persons are inclined to love themselves and to find the law for themselves. Therefore they need institutions to protect themselves and others against their arbitrariness.

Trutz Rendtorff, a very influential speaker of liberal and conservative ethics among German Protestants, interprets the Kingdom of God as symbol, not as reality expected in the future.²¹ What does the symbol represent? Rendtorff locates ethics primarily in the life that *persons* live actively. Life is given, life is to be conducted as a gift, to continue and to reflect upon.²² The good of life transcends its present condition: Everything recognized as good is preliminary and points beyond itself to a better state. Transcending every relative good the supreme good becomes the ideal integration of everything good, an ideal to be approximated, but never completely achieved.²³ The guarantor of this view is Schleiermacher and his view of a history governed by logos and spirit, founded on the philosophy of Plato and the life of Jesus. Rendtorff defends the freedom already realized in modern history, particularly in democratic societies. Biblical exegesis hardly plays an important role. Rendtorff's ethics—differing in this point from Pannenberg's—prefers the 'already', the realized to the

20. W. Pannenberg, 'Die Krise des Ethischen und die Theologie', *TLZ* 87 (1962), cols. 7-16; *Geschichtstatsachen und christliche Ethik*, in *Ecclesia agitans* (Stuttgart: Radius, 2nd edn, 1971), pp. 72-89; 'Zukunft und Einheit der Menschheit', *EvT* 32 (1972), pp. 384-402; *Reich Gottes* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1971).

21. T. Rendtorff, *Ethik* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1980), I, pp. 143-48. He agrees, however, with Pannenberg, that the Kingdom of God has a metaethical status and points to a fulfilment beyond the destination of human actions—an ontological surplus.

22. Rendtorff, *Ethik*, pp. 31-66.

23. Rendtorff, *Ethik*, p. 126.

not yet realized. Does a hypothetical realism of the Kingdom of God enforce an ethics of the 'not yet', whereas the symbolism tends towards an ethics of already realized freedom? Both interpretations urge us to uncover the fundamental or a priori assumptions of reality included in the different constructions of history, which cannot completely account for the special shape of ethics.

3. Discussion

Imitating orthodox Judaism some Protestant theologians recently tried to dismiss what they thought to be philosophical thought and ideas, discriminating against them as abstract considerations following a so-called Parmenidean logic of unity.²⁴ Inevitably they became victims of their own misunderstanding of Western history and its social development. Whenever they maintained a minimum of ethics, this turned into a pure voluntarism, and a hidden ontology was covered by an autocensorship as well as uncontrolled dialectics. Philo and Maimonides could not have been Jews.

To interpret the 'Kingdom of God' means to imply certain usually indefinite ontologies or schemes of metaphysics, which generally remain in the background. Theories of history alone are not sufficient guidelines of interpretation. The following paradigms of interpretation can verify this thesis: The future possibilities are not yet developed, but they are in a hidden way present among the real; they represent the $\mu\eta\ \acute{o}\nu$ of Aristotle, they express the utopian element in the midst of reality and at the same time in contradiction to it. Ernst Bloch, the famous German Jewish philosopher, dissolved the God of Israel into the womb of the material.²⁵ Materialistic voluntarists try to identify the possible and the utopian stream among the poor, they hesitate to postulate a Messiah in person, but assume a messianic tendency in actions and revolutions of the hitherto suppressed. The Messiah changes into an anonymous entity.

To interpret *biblical eschatological texts* in their original sense could mean to criticize such apersonal eschatological models. The interpretation should point to the seriousness, indeed the abyss, of the *apocalyptic-eschatological question* in its beginnings: 2 Macc. 7.28

24. Particularly F.-W. Marquardt, *Das christliche Bekenntnis zu Jesus, dem Juden* (2 vols.; Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1990–91).

25. E. Bloch, *Das Prinzip Hoffnung* (3 vols.; Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1959).

designates a nothing, which is neither a semantic negation nor the term for the utopianly dreaming innocence of a coming state of the world. This nothing threatens the actual creation and particularly the personal being. The true God in his power fights nothingness and calls the dead into being. He alone will answer the question as to the meaning of the life and death of the Jewish martyrs—a life too short to be accomplished in the eyes of fellow human beings.

There is another type of understanding of eschatology, following the conception of *emergence*. According to this paradigm the new is a hitherto unaccomplished level of evolutionary events, a state of never before realized complexity, which cannot be deduced from earlier stages. This paradigm is derived from the theory of evolution; some like to use it to demonstrate ongoing creation as an eschatological process.²⁶ Biblical exegesis could contradict this view—not by detail, but by structural marks of biblical eschatology or apocalypics, by themes such as discontinuance, anxiety, chaos and final judgment.

A possible third type combines the first and the second, the possibilities of the future and the emergence of the new, but without taking sufficient account of their discontinuity. This paradigm can be characterized by the classical concept of *teleology*. According to this, intentions cause the events by a reverse effect. Theologians in the second half of the nineteenth century were able to preserve parts of teleological thinking in practical reasoning, but they were unable to identify it in natural sciences and hardly able to find metaphysical aims in history.²⁷ Liberal Protestants as well as Hermann Cohen searched for a teleology of *practical reason*. Biblical exegesis—confronted with this paradigm—has strong reasons to emphasize that the aim and meaning of history are hidden in the transcendence of God and not revealed to any human view.

4. *An Alternative*

These three paradigms are derived from a kind of 'God's-eye view',²⁸ which is not at all a rare perspective in eschatological designs. This triumphant perspective, however, contradicts any biblical idea of

26. The so-called Anglo-American 'process theology' is echoed in a new natural theology on the continent, but not very prominently.

27. See the remarks on Ritschl above!

28. An expression used by St Toulmin and H. Putnam (among others).

revelation, for it implies that human beings cannot transcend their own situation by a type of theory which traces out the totality of what is real. (The first chapter of the Bible should be discussed independently).

It is a main feature of the biblical message, that the God who loves human beings is at the same time the God who sets limits as our benefit, because he has *overcome death in Christ* and will consequently *overcome our death*. Theoretical and practical boundlessness and an absolute perspective may be a case of the promise of the biblical serpent (Gen. 3.5). Every theory of faith therefore has limits; it cannot claim a 'God's-eye view'; but if it claims truth, it is founded in the self-revelation of this God. In the often-quoted words of Eberhard Jüngel God makes the creative distinction between the real and especially the possible from the nothing, and not human intelligence;²⁹ everything possible relies on a reality which is hidden to our everyday perception. Ontological outlines are secondary; they may ensue from the event of God's self-revelation, if divine grace illuminates human reasoning. This, however, encounters us in the middle of our pretheoretical ontology of everyday life.

Some—not all—essentials of this proposal for interpreting eschatology resemble principles of the so-called *transcendental theology* as it was developed by Karl Rahner.³⁰ People do not start their theology, however, from an abstract existential situation (as Rahner believes), but with personal involvement in and the *social analysis of life situations*. There we discover the meaning of our temporal being, whose final justification is promised by God and not our own success. This future adjoins the mystery of God, into which faith projects hopes and expectations. Each eschatological outline includes three dominant elements: the personal hope and the final meaning of life despite an often barely intolerable meaninglessness, the accomplishment of historical time despite the often desperate course of real history and the epistemological limitation of all kinds of theories, which assume that they are able to descend to a timeless foundation of reality or to advance to the timeless structure governing every possibility and real event. A systematical and thoroughly reflected eschatology could claim some analogies in the philosophy of Kant—without,

29. E. Jüngel, 'Die Welt als Möglichkeit und Wirklichkeit', *EvT* 29 (1969), pp. 417-42.

30. K. Rahner, *Hörer des Wortes* (ed. J.B. Metz; Munich: Kösel, 1963).

however, his special differentiation of real and ideal (including the regulating idea of God).³¹ The actual and the potential real in their ideal totality transcend the ensemble of empirical objects; to be expressed they presuppose the virtual totality of language.

An eschatological 'ontology' shaped dialectically always remains a fragment, because it results from the concrete and finite situation of persons. An outline of this kind is a priori relative—determined by the revelatory advent of God, who is never comprised by our finite terms and thoughts. This kind of restricted and restricting ontology transcends the experiencing, speaking and thinking, but strictly finite subject and affirms it in a relative, never in an absolute, position. An *eschatological outline* is by its very nature *preliminary*; its consequences could be displayed in the field between natural sciences and humanities (or hermeneutics) by a pragmatical social orientation: 'If men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences', explain sociologists of the Chicago school³²—a sentence easily misunderstood as a constructivistic statement. Transformed into a biblical perspective it could retain the prevalence of the new over the old, the tension of the finite and the whole delivering an eschatological perspective of reality and liberating ethics from ideological absoluteness. Pragmatism has some affinity with this view, especially if it discloses certain realms as perspectives of our actions.³³ Compared with classical metaphysics this ontology is modest and restricted. It includes a confident finitude which can be corroborated by exegesis, especially by the interpretation of central statements of the Sermon on the Mount, which combines the preaching of Jesus, the tradition of the first Christians and the faith of the congregation of Matthew.³⁴ If the six so-called antitheses were only literal ought-sentences they represented a hypermorality. Interpreted in such a sense they impressed ascetic people in their special life-style as heirs of the eschatological separation from the world. According to the eschatological perspective

31. I. Kant, *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*, B659-B670, esp. B669.

32. This principle was emphasized by W.T. Thomas and F. Znaniecki (for instance, in *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1919–21]).

33. See the article 'Pragmatic Theory of Truth' by G. Ezorsky, in P. Edwards (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, VI, pp. 427–30.

34. See the recent (not yet completed) commentary by U. Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (EKKNT, 1–2; Zürich: Benziger Verlag, 1985–90).

proposed above the radicalism of the antitheses reveals a different sense. Mt. 5.43-45 could be read in the following way: If somebody defines himself as your enemy, he defines you implicitly as his enemy. If you refuse to participate in his definition of the common, but discrepant social situation, you may discover new, unexpected possibilities of behaviour. Unexpected reactions may even break through the trivial, but often dangerous reciprocity of expectations and actions; they may transform the uneschatological ontology of normal behaviour and its innate principle 'as you towards me, so I towards you'. The faithful finds freedom, and so perhaps does the enemy.

According to a certain type of moral consequentialism the Sermon on the Mount is an illusion. Max Weber especially gave prominence to this view.³⁵ However, the eschatological pragmatism proposed here aims at a realism of discovery, at a way to a never definitely determined reality, which promises a changing future. Therefore we have to account for our implicit or explicit definitions of reality and our background assumptions before we come to our decisions and develop our actions. This context permits a new understanding of how Jesus of Nazareth used the tradition of *wisdom*: The beauty of the red anemone, compared to Solomon's garb does not really dress the naked; and not every father gives bread to his children; not all doors are opened, if somebody knocks at them.³⁶ Jesus, claiming the opposite, renders relative the social norm and even our attempts to fixate reality. Contrafactic wisdom demonstrates that the perception of creation is never an immediate event, but relies on finite actual situations and reflections framed by an eschatological definition of reality.

Biblical exegesis challenges our theology only, if it does not turn the texts into our prey. Piracy leads only to the backyard of our fantasy. There remain serious questions concerning the possibilities of the future, the principal temporality and the finiteness of human perception and regarding the meaning of the life of persons, which is never accomplished by any form of life. These three questions could assist us in our exegesis—not only to discover an existential sense in texts, but to offer new 'definitions of situation' by eschatological orientation.

35. M. Weber, 'Politik als Beruf', in J. Winckelmann (ed.), *Gesammelte Politische Schriften* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 2nd edn, 1958), pp. 493ff.

36. Cf. Mt. 7.7-11 and M. Theunissen, 'ὁ αἰτῶν λαμβάνει', in *Jesus: Ort der Erfahrung Gottes* (Freiburg: Herder Verlag, 1976), pp. 13-68.

Theory only succeeds the revelatory event; therefore a lively exegesis, related even to the problems of ethics, will combine narrativity and systematic reflection. Ethics therefore should learn from the often mistrusted statements on Kingdom and regimens of God by Luther.³⁷ In the Kingdom of the world, realities and its limits are important but they should never be absolutized. And it is not only motivation that leads the believer from the spiritual Kingdom of God to the Kingdom of the world to act to the benefit of his neighbour; rather, the fertility of love intends to change the social norms and to establish the law as well as justice among the people.³⁸ This transfer of moral principles and impulses from one side to the other demonstrates the pragmatic sense of eschatological relativism and relation: Now we should no longer quote: 'If men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences', but reformulate it: 'If Jews and Christians perceive God's redefinition of reality despite the paradoxes of life, they will cautiously examine possibilities hidden to their eyes before, and they will be prepared to change some of the consequences which count as normal'.

37. Luther, *Von weltlicher Obrigkeit*, in WA, XI, pp. 245-87.

38. Luther, *Von weltlicher Obrigkeit*, pp. 271-87.

ESCHATOLOGY IN THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH

Yair Hoffman

1. Introduction

Studying eschatology in the Hebrew Bible is a most tantalizing and frustrating assignment. It is first of all a study of the relevant passage. But immediately one faces the question: What are these relevant passages? Anyone who tries to select them confronts an innate obstacle—the obscurity not only of the term ‘eschatology’, but of the very *concept*. This is manifested by the lack of a common definition of eschatology accepted by scholars. Indeed, there are even contradictory views as to the essential motives that comprise the concept. Does eschatology presuppose a clearly dualistic conception of two worlds, the latter of which will be established after the final destruction of the former? Must eschatology necessarily relate to a messianic figure? May it be limited solely to history and nations, or may perhaps no concept be labeled eschatology unless it contains aspects of personal judgment, resurrection, and so on?¹

1. The following are some random definitions of eschatology:

‘... die Wissenschaft von den letzten Dingen (אַחֲרִית). Unter diesem Namen fasste man früher alle die Anschauungen zusammen, die vom Ende—sei es des Einzelnen, sei es der ganzen Welt—handelten. Die durch die Exegese Alten und Neuen Testaments gewonnenen Resultate wurden von der Dogmatic systematisch zusammengestellt und für die Heilslehre verwertet. Neuerdings wird das Wort Eschatologie meist in prägnantem Sinne verwandt und auf den Ideenkomplex beschränkt, der mit dem Weltende und der Welterneuerung zusammenhängt, und nur in dieser engeren Bedeutung soll es für uns in Betracht kommen’ (H. Gressmann, *Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1905], p. 1).

‘The messianic idea is the prophetic hope for אַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים in which political freedom, moral perfection and earthly [material] happiness to the people of Israel in its own land and to the whole human race’ (Y. Klausner, *Harayon Hameshihi* [Heb.; Jerusalem, 1927], p. 8).

One result of this situation is the tendency of scholars to formulate new, personal definitions of the term. While this may be helpful in maintaining the internal consistency of the scholar's own studies, it does not necessarily create a common denominator with other scholars. On the contrary, it adds confusion and complication. Another way to deal with the lack of scholarly consensus as to definitions is to circumvent them by the creation of new terminology. This is where the expression 'biblical eschatology' enters the picture. In such a construct composed of adjective + noun, the adjective may function either as a qualifier or as a nullifier. For example, in the construct 'civil law' the adjective qualifies the noun. On the other hand, in 'preventive medicine' the noun is virtually nullified by the adjective, as the very definition of medicine is something 'used for the alleviation or removal of (already existent) disease'.² I wish to suggest that in many cases, whether they admit it or not, scholars, by using the expression 'biblical eschatology', virtually nullify the term 'eschatology' rather than merely qualifying it. This is indeed a paradox: since the definition of one term has proven unworkable, a new term has been coined in its stead, whose very essence is undefinability. In many studies the

'a form of expectation which is characterized by finality. The eschaton is the goal of the time process that after which nothing further can occur. It is the climax of theological History' (Frost, 'Eschatology and Myth', VT 2 [1952], pp. 70-80).

'Es. is a doctrine or a complex of ideas about the last things which is more or less organically coherent and developed. Every Es. includes in some form or other a dualistic conception of the course of history and implies that the present state of things and the present world order will suddenly come to an end and be superseded by another of an essentially different kind' (S. Mowinckel, *He that Cometh* [Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1954], p. 125).

'The expectations for a final and eternal world order' (Y. Kaufman, *Toldot Haemunah Hyisraelit* [Heb.; Jerusalem/Tel-Aviv: Mosad-Bialik-Devir, 1960], p. 629).

'The certainty that history will be finally broken-off and abolished in a new age' (W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament* [London: SCM Press, 1961], I, p. 385).

'The study of ideas and beliefs concerning the end of the present world order and the introduction of a new order' (R.E. Clements, *Prophecy and Covenant* [London: SCM Press, 1965], p. 104).

'The knowledge of the end of this period, this time, and of the rather short space of time which precedes the end' (J.P.M. van der Ploeg, 'Eschatology in the Old Testament', OTS 17 [1972], pp. 89-99).

2. *Cassell's English Dictionary* (London: Cassell, 1962).

actual meaning of biblical eschatology is, put roughly, something that is not really eschatology, but rather an idea related in one way or another to this unclear concept. The 'one way or another' might refer to personal, national, universal, or cosmic motives of future salvation or catastrophe, providing in post biblical periods that which became essential components of the 'apocalyptic eschatology'. This latter term³ 'apocalyptic' is a semantic qualifier, equivalent to 'real, genuine, true'. Thus, in fact, we have distanced ourselves away from the term eschatology, which becomes dwarfed between the utterly undefinable expression 'biblical eschatology' and the clear term 'apocalyptic eschatology'.

The vagueness of the term 'biblical eschatology' is a result not only of the ambiguity of 'eschatology' but also of the ambivalence of the term 'Bible', which might refer either to the Hebrew Bible or to the Hebrew Bible plus the New Testament. This ambiguity, of course, is a well known fact, yet, it nevertheless still causes confusion, because many scholars cannot totally dissociate their mental preconditioning (to say nothing of their religious beliefs!) from their academic occupation. Anyone preconditioned to consider the 'Book of Revelation' as an integral part of the 'Bible' will be likely to understand 'biblical eschatology' differently than the one whose 'Bible' has always been detached from 'Revelation'.

In light of this difficulty, how can eschatology in the Hebrew Bible be examined and its essence and development studied, when there is no common criterion for selecting the relevant passages? How, in such a situation, can one avoid vicious circularity? I am not pretending to have found the sword for cutting this Gordian knot. Neither do I intend to bring more coal to Newcastle by suggesting a new definition. Rather, it is the intention of this introduction to explain and justify my methodology in this paper, namely, to examine eschatology in Jeremiah without any clear definition of the term at hand. As an ad-hoc substitute for a definition I would like to suggest three elementary conditions which I regard as necessary, albeit not sufficient, for defining any concept of eschatology: (a) future perspective; (b) universal overview; (c) miraculous, supernatural elements. The absence of one of these criteria from a passage excludes it from being eschatological. On the other hand, the presence of all of them makes a passage

3. See D.S. Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964).

relevant to our discussion, enabling us *prima facie* to consider it eschatological.

Are these conditions self-evident? While (a) (future perspective) is clearly so, (b) and (c) are more problematic.

I regard the second criterion as an essential element in possible eschatological passages, since universality is the very essence of any definition of eschatology. Some local, narrow, limited changes are typical of any historical period, and hence cannot be considered eschatological, unless the term is emptied of all specific significance.

The same holds true as to the third requirement, namely, miraculous elements. The reason for coining new terminology is the need to express new ideas, situations, appliances, and so on. Hence, the term 'eschaton' would have been utterly redundant had it meant some usual, natural future phenomena.

Nevertheless, this is the approach towards eschatology expressed in the Talmud. In *b. Ber.* 34b (*Shabbat*, 63a) Shemuel's opinion is quoted: *אין בין עולם הזה לימות המשיח אלא שיעבוד מלכויות*—('There is no difference between this world and the days of the messiah except for the Bondage of Kingdoms'). This concept was likewise adopted by Maimonides. In his guide for the perplexed 2.29, he vigorously attacks the literal interpretation of all the miraculous elements in prophecies. Thus, in discussing the supernatural description in Isaiah 13 he says:

I do not think there has been anyone in whom ignorance, blindness, and the inclination to adhere to the external sense of figurative expressions and of rhetorical speeches, have reached such a point that he thought that the stars of the heavens and the light of the sun and of the moon have been changed when the kingdom of Babylon came to an end. . . .⁴

This concept is based upon Maimonides' philosophical axioms, which reduce to almost nil the existence of non-rational elements in the Hebrew Bible. If, however, these axioms are put aside, and we judge the Hebrew Bible upon its historical background, there is no reason to exclude in principle the existence of miraculous elements therein. Indeed, the acceptance of Maimonides' concept makes it impossible to draw any distinction between a mere historical future and a possible eschatological future in the Hebrew Bible.

4. ואיני חושב כי מי שהוא הגיעה בו הסכלות והעיוורון וההמשכות אחרי פשטי השאלות והמאמרים ההטפתיים, שדמה כי כוכבי השמים ואור השמש והירח נשתנו כאשר נשמרה מלכות בבל . . .

In point of fact, such an opinion is cited in the Talmud as an argument in a dispute, as to what distinguishes between *ימות המשיח* ('the days of the messiah') and *עולם הבא* ('the world to come'). The prophets, some sages claim there, prophesied regarding *ימות המשיח* while only God alone knows about *עולם הבא*.⁵

Essentially, by drawing the line between the eschatological and the historical, this opinion considers only *עולם הבא* and not *ימות המשיח* as eschatological. But since, they claim, there are no prophecies concerning *עולם הבא* in the Hebrew Bible—neither can there be eschatology.

By sticking to criteria (b) and (c) I reject this view.

2. Prophecies of Doom

There are two faces to eschatology: doom ('The day of Yahweh') and salvation.

I will begin with the doom prophecies in Jeremiah. Do any of them adhere to the three above mentioned criteria, hence enabling us to regard them as possible eschatological passages?

The first group of prophecies to be considered are the so-called 'The Enemy From the North' prophecies (mainly 4.6-18; 5.15-17; 6.1-8, 22-26; 8.13-17). I claim that these cannot be considered eschatological because the only condition with which they cohere is the first—that is, that they relate to the future. I therefore disagree with those scholars who regard them as mythological and hence eschatological. Indeed, their style is sometimes stereotypic, close to the style of covenant curses or to the holy war repertoire,⁶ but they are lacking in miraculous elements and their perspective is not universal but rather local, Judaeon. Specific places are mentioned, all of them located in the land of Israel (e.g. Zion, Jerusalem, 4.5-6; Dan, Har Ephraim, 4.15; the cities of Judah, 4.16; Tekoa, Beth Hakerm, 6.1). It is therefore clear that when the word *ארץ* ('land') or even *כל הארץ* ('all the land', 8.16) is used in these prophecies, it means 'the land of Israel'

5. דאמר ר' חיא בר אבא: כל הנביאים לא נתנבאו אלא לימות המשיח, אבל לעולם הבא עין לא ראתה אלהים וזולתך (יש' סד, ג).

6. R. Bach, *Die Aufforderung zur Flucht und zum Kampf im alttestamentlichen Prophetenspruch* (WMANT, 9; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962); W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25* (WMANT, 41; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973), p. 97; R. Carroll, *Jeremiah* (OTL; London: SCM Press, 1986), p. 185.

and not the entire world. The exaggerated metaphoric style should not be misinterpreted: '... though the foe is described metaphorically. . . he is also described concretely: He has chariots, and horses, (4.13; 6.23; 8.16) etc.'⁷ If one accepts the non-eschatological reading of these prophecies, it should be applied to 1.13-16—*מצפון תפוח הרעדה* ('out of the North evil shall break forth'). Thus, I can see no justification to the following interpretation of Duhm:⁸

Here, through the obscure, mysterious indication of the compass point. . . an apocalyptic touch comes into view. . . Actually in v. 15 the later dogmatic eschatology is being articulated according to which in the end times all peoples have to gather around Jerusalem. . . [which] belongs to a more recent author.

Even Duhm agrees that in *כל יושבי הארץ* (v. 14) 'nicht die Erde, sondern das jüdische Land bedeutet' (p. 12). Hence, the scene is not universal but local, notwithstanding the reference to the enemy as *כל משפחות ממלכות צפונה* ('all the families of the kingdoms of the North'). Written in retrospective, the call vision intended to describe Jeremiah as a prophet who from the very beginning of his mission proclaimed the destruction of Jerusalem by Babylonia; it is this historical event, and not any eschatological one, that is meant here.

Another *gattung* to be eliminated from the possible eschatological passages is the group of prophecies against foreign nations (chs. 46–51). At least two of them refer to the past, thus contradicting our first criterion (On Egypt, 46.3–12; 14–24). Four prophecies (against Egypt, 46.26; Moab, 48.47; Amon, 49.6; and Elam, 49.39) conclude with remarks, delineating boundaries between two kinds of future events. I refer to the formulae 'but afterward. . . ' (*אחר כן*) or 'But in the latter days' (*באחרית הימים*), which will be discussed in detail in the next section. These formulae, followed by words of comfort to the foreign nations, indicate that the earlier doom prophecies against these nations referred to a near future, and thus cannot be eschatological. As for all the prophecies against foreign nations in this complex: in none of

7. W. Holladay, *Jeremiah* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), I, p. 43.

8. 'Hier kommt durch die dunkle, geheimnisvolle Andeutung der Himmelsgegend. . . ein apokalyptischer Zug in das Gesicht. . . In Wahrheit spricht in v. 15 die spätere dogmatische Eschatologie, nach der sich in der Endzeit alle Völker um Jerusalem versammeln müssen. . . [die] einem jüngern Verf. angehört.' (B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jeremia* [Tübingen and Leipzig: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1901], pp. 12–13.)

them are there either universal or miraculous features. Each nation is destined to be defeated either by Babylonia or by some unidentified enemy, in the normal course of war, and not by any supernatural, heavenly intervention. Even Babylon, whose destruction is described most fiercely and vehemently, is doomed to be conquered by specific historical nations (Ararat, Meni, Ashkenaz, Madai, 51.27-28; note that a pre-Persian period is reflected here), and not by Yahweh's cosmic powers (unlike, for example, Isa. 13).

Indeed, one might argue that the complex of prophecies against foreign nations as a whole has a universal perspective, and thus fits my second criterion. But since it nevertheless lacks any supernatural, miraculous elements, the complex should not be regarded as a possible eschatological passage.

The majority of the remaining prophecies of doom in the book likewise do not fit our prerequisites for possible eschatological passages, being neither universal nor miraculous. Only a few exceptions need be considered here, the most conspicuous of which is the Vision of the Cup in ch. 25.15-29, written in prose, and its poetic conclusion, vv. 30-33.

Jeremiah 25.15-29 reports that Jeremiah was ordered to take a cup of poisoned wine and make Jerusalem and 'all the nations to whom I am sending you' (v. 15) drink it. A list of some 22 nations is given, summarized by the words 'and all the kings of the north, near and far. . . and all the kingdoms of the world which are on the face of the earth (וְאֵת כָּל מַמְלַכּוֹת הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר עַל פְּנֵי הָאָדָמָה) and after them king Shaishach shall drink' (v. 26). The universal perspective of this vision is therefore unmistakable.

How authentic is this prophecy? The command to make the nations drink refers twice to 'all the nations to whom I am sending you' (vv. 15, 16). Hence, v. 26—'all the kingdoms of the world which are on the face of the earth'—seems to be a secondary interpretation, aimed at nullifying the limiting clause 'to whom I send you' (vv. 15-16). This generates a more total and universal picture. The same tendency is revealed by a comparison between the MT and the shorter, and probably more authentic, version of the Septuagint. In the latter the list of the nations is shorter. The following nations are missing in the Septuagint: וְאֵת כָּל מַלְכֵי אֶרֶץ הָעוֹץ ('and all the kings of the land of Utz', v. 20) וְאֵת כָּל מַלְכֵי עֵרָב ('and all the kings of Arabia', v. 24),

וּמֶלֶךְ שֶׁשָׁךְ יִשְׁתֶּה אַחֲרֵיהֶם, ('and all the kings of Zimri', v. 25), and the king of Shaishach [probably 'Babylon' in Atbash cipher, like 51.41, which is also missing in the Septuagint] will drink after them', v. 26).⁹

One might therefore conclude that the history of the text discloses a tendency to divert the actual political perspective of the original vision into a less concrete and more enigmatic kind of universalism. By 'political perspective' I refer to the concept that Nebuchadnezzar, the cup of wine (see also 51.7-8) was sent by God to defeat the surrounding nations. By 'enigmatic universalism' I mean the non-historical concept that 'all the nations of the earth' including Babylon are destined to drink from this mysterious cup. The difference between these two alternatives is reflected as well in the altered location of the cup vision in the MT and the Septuagint. In the MT the enigmatic cup vision is detached from the prophecies against foreign nations, thereby intensifying the meta-historical character of the vision. In the Septuagint the shorter cup vision is edited right after the prophecies against foreign nations, thereby indicating its actual, political context.

Is the vision miraculous? Does it contain supernatural elements? Its metaphorical character obviates giving a definite answer to this question. The cup (and the sword, in vv. 16, 29) might represent either miraculous acts of God or symbolize the historical Nebuchadnezzar, acting as God's 'rod of anger'. This ambiguity prevents a conclusive decision as to the potential eschatological value of the vision. But having expressed this reservation, I still assume that the present MT edition of the vision depicts irregular, super-historical circumstances. I therefore consider it a possible eschatological passage.

A poetic passage is attached to the vision of the cup, in which God is described as a roaring lion (v. 30), a warrior fighting against 'all the inhabitants of the earth' (וְהָאָרֶץ) (v. 30), 'having an indictment against the nations, entering into judgment with all flesh' (v. 31) 'and the wicked he will put to the sword' (v. 31). A 'great storm is stirring from the edge of the earth' and 'those slain by the Lord on that day shall extend from the end of the earth to the other' (v. 33). The universal, even cosmic features of this representation are obvious. The

9. In v. 25 the Septuagint reads Περσων instead of מֶדִי as in the MT. This also makes the Septuagint more historical, since it was Persia that actually defeated Babylon.

lion and warrior, metaphors for God, directs us to a supernatural rather than a merely historical interpretation of the prophecy. This is strengthened by the lack of any concrete name of any nation, the object of the massacre being the wicked all over the world. Similar features characterize such prophecies as Joel 3-4; Isaiah 13, whose subject is the 'Day of. . . the Lord'.

Some scholars suggest that such prophecies proclaim a universal and cosmic upheaval heralding the eschatological salvation. Yet, intelligible as it is, this exegesis is not the only possible one, but once again depends upon the principled exegetical decision towards descriptions of apparent supernatural events: Should they be taken literally or metaphorically? Only the literal option can lead to an eschatological interpretation, because otherwise no miraculous elements (my third requisite for a possible eschatological passage) would be found in them. Thus, if Maimonides' exegetical approach is followed, even the universality of such prophecies, which is my second prerequisite for a possible eschatological passage, might be questioned, because such phrases as כָּל הָאָרֶץ (the whole earth/land/world) might be no more than a poetic exaggeration. However, as I do not accept Maimonides' principles, my conclusion is that Jer. 25.30-33 is in fact a miraculous description of future universal calamity. Its editorial proximity to the cup vision strengthen these features in both prophecies reciprocally. I therefore consider the whole editorial complex 25.15-33 in the MT a possible eschatological passage.

Who is the author of this complex? Most scholars doubt the Jeremianic authenticity of the cup vision,¹⁰ dating it rather during the exilic or Persian period. Others, while affirming its nucleus authenticity, emphasize a gradual process of growth.¹¹ My position is that if there is an authentic Jeremianic nucleus, its subject must have been Nebuchadnezzar's historical role between 605 and 587 BCE. Thus, the apparent eschatological features are therefore later accretions. As for the tempest prophecy in vv. 30-33, I fully agree with McKane's view:¹²

10. E.g. J. Bright, *Jeremiah* (AB; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1965), pp. 162-64; Carroll, *Jeremiah*, pp. 500-504, 506-508; W. McKane, *Jeremiah* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986), I, pp. 633-47.

11. E.g. M. De Roch, 'Is Jeremiah 25.15-19 a piece of Reworked Jeremianic Poetry?', *JSOT* 10 (1978), pp. 58-69; Holladay, *Jeremiah*, I, pp. 672-76.

12. McKane, *Jeremiah*, I, p. 658.

'If in vv. 15-29 we are brought down to the Persian period... the implication of this line of argument is that vv. 30-33 are later than vv. 15-29. I am aware, however, at the extreme fragility of this statement and that it may represent a process of building on sand.'

I therefore refrain from any conclusive statement about the authenticity of this prophecy.

A similar, albeit not identical, case is 4.23-27, one of the most impressive poetic descriptions of a total desolation:

I saw the earth (הָאָרֶץ) and it was utter chaos (תָּהוּ וּבְהוּ). I saw the heaven and all their lights were out. I saw the mountains and they were shaking, all the hills were trembling I saw no human life and all the birds had taken wings/I saw the farmlands had become desert/and all their townships were in ruins.

The perfect tenses used in this passage should not mislead us. They do not indicate 'past' but rather a 'prophetic past'—that is, a visionary future, therefore conforming to our first condition. Is the prophecy universal? The answer depends upon whether we understand the word אֶרֶץ, to refer to the 'land of Israel' or to the entire universe. In light of the editorial context—Judah's punishment—the former option is preferable. Yet, this is an autonomous poem, and should also be understood independently. As such, is it universal? Yes, if the doom is miraculous and cosmic, characteristics that do not cohere with a narrow, local arena. But a supernatural reading is only justified if we adopt a literal rather than a metaphorical approach towards the descriptions of the catastrophe, returning us to the exegetical dilemma mentioned above. Thus, for example, R. David Kimḥi says the following: 'Since the land is desolate and there are no inhabitants, it is like תָּהוּ וּבְהוּ (the utter chaos) as at the beginning of its creation. . . and all this is said *metaphorically* because of the disaster, *as if* the sky were darkened, and the mountains were trembling'.¹³

Accordingly, the catastrophe must be perceived in purely historical terms. McKane, on the other hand, regards the poem as eschatological, even apocalyptic. He criticizes Kimḥi's metaphorical exegesis as '... too neat a way of limiting the imagery'. McKane claims that 'What is envisaged is an *eschaton*', 'the defeat of order by chaos'.¹⁴ This

13. כיוון שהיא שממה ואין יושבין עליה הרי היא כתהו ובהו כמו בתחילת בריאתה, שנאמר והארץ היתה תהו ובהו... וכל זה דרך משל מרוב הצרה כאילו קדרו השמים ורעשי ההרים.

14. McKane, *Jeremiah*, I, pp. 106-107.

approach is typical of the majority of modern scholars. And, indeed, the methodological considerations discussed above tend to confirm the possibility of a literal and thus eschatological rather than metaphorical interpretation of the poem.

Is the poem Jeremianic? The answer given to this question by most modern scholars is highly indicative of the study of biblical eschatology. They assume Jeremianic authenticity and eschatological interpretation of the poem to be mutually exclusive. A quotation from Carroll's commentary illustrates this: 'Though many commentators attribute the poem to Jeremiah it is better viewed as a later *apocalyptic insertion*. . . the destruction depicted is cosmic, so those commentators who have questioned its Jeremianic authorship are to be followed [for example, Giesebrecht, Volz, Hyatt] . . . elements of a *transhistorical apocalyptic* outlook influence it' (= the poem).¹⁵ This argument clearly demonstrates the hermeneutic trap involved in the study of biblical eschatology.

The style and language of the passage cannot refute its Jeremianic authorship. It is true that the expressions עוף השמים ('the fowl of the heaven') and ובהו תהו are generally characteristic of the priestly code, but their use here definitely refers to the creation motif. Even if P is considered to be post-Jeremianic, it still makes sense to assume that they represent a more ancient creation tradition. However, other terms present quite different evidence. The idiom ערינו נהצו ('its townships were in ruins') is represented in many MT manuscripts, in the Septuagint and in the Hexaplaric Peshitta as נצחו ('burnt')—an expression very typical of the book of Jeremiah.¹⁶ The following expressions are also typical of the book of Jeremiah: חרון אף ה' ('Yahweh's anger');¹⁷ רעשים (trembling).¹⁸ The poetic repetition of a particular word (ראייה) is attested also in Jer. 9.22-23 (אל יתהלל); 50.35-37 (חרב) and 51.20-23 (תופצת). Hence the stylistic evidence is at least inconclusive.

15. R. Carroll, *Jeremiah*, I, p. 168.

16. It occurs seven times in the Hebrew Bible: six times in Jeremiah, and once in 2 Kgs 19.25 (duplicated in Isa. 37.26).

17. It occurs eight times in Jeremiah and only seven times in all other prophetic books (Isaiah, Hosea, Zephaniah, Nahum, Jonah). The total number of occurrences in the Hebrew Bible is 34.

18. As a verb the root רע' is used six times in Jeremiah and 14 times in all other prophetic books (four in Ezra; three in Haggai).

Thus, only an *a priori* premise concerning the development of biblical eschatology, in which the mere definition of a poem as apocalyptic automatically removes it to a late, post Jeremianic context, would lead to a denial of the Jeremianic authenticity of the poem. In our case, this definition was indeed determined more by developmental preconceptions than by philological-literary introspections. Holladay represents the other side of the same coin. Stating that 'it is clear that the poem is genuine to Jeremiah'¹⁹ he answers the question 'is this apocalyptic?' by stating 'clearly not'. Epstein reveals both sides of the coin when stating that v. 23 is 'either proto-apocalyptic or a gloss by an apocalypticist'.²⁰ This sounds logical. But what is meant by proto-apocalyptic? It is an *a posteriori* term, referring to something that, judged retrospectively, and only then, is seen as a factor in the emergence of apocalypse. In this case, exactly what elements in the poem make it proto-apocalyptic? Surely not abstract conceptions about the end of the world—they simply do not exist here—but the strong, colorful imagery of the doom. What transformed this 'innocent' imagery into 'proto-apocalypse'? I suggest that it was the literal, fundamental interpretation of the poem: ארץ = the whole world; תהו ובהו = the primordial chaos; ואין אור = the disappearance of sun, moon and stars. Such an interpretation was called for when people sought biblical precedent for their developing apocalyptic concepts.

In conclusion, I may reduce my speculations concerning 4.23-26 into two exegetical options. First, it was written as an historical, non-eschatological poem, and may be considered in retrospect as 'proto-apocalyptic'. In this case there is no reason to deny its Jeremianic authorship. Secondly, it is an apocalyptic poem, and therefore a later, non-Jeremianic insertion. Unfortunately, neither of these options is free of a hermeneutic circle, namely, a circular reasoning.

Another short prophecy that ought to be mentioned here is 23.19-20, repeated in 30.23-24. In both locations it is a separate unit, detached from the context. Here too, like in 25.32, 'a whirling tempest will burst upon the head of the wicked'. This tempest is 'the anger of God' (ה' אף), which 'will not turn back until He has executed and accomplished the intents of His mind. In the end of the days you will understand it clearly' (באחרית הימים תתבוננו בה בינה). But unlike 25.32

19. Holladay, *Jeremiah*, I, p. 164.

20. V. Epstein, 'The Day of Yahweh in Jeremiah 4.23-28', *JBL* 87 (1968), pp. 93-97. The quotation is from p. 97.

there is nothing universal or miraculous here.

The only reason I mention this short prophecy is because of the use therein of the expression **בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים** which is obviously very important to our investigation, the more so since it appears twice more in Jeremiah—48.47; 49.39.

בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים is systematically translated by the Septuagint ἐσχάτων ἡμερῶν and has become a common post-biblical Hebrew term for the eschatological period. An extensive discussion of this expression is out of place here, and for our purpose only one conclusion as to its meaning will suffice. Sometimes, but not always, it functions as an eschatological term (Isa. 2.1 [= Mic. 4.1]; Ezra 38.16; Hos. 3.5; Dan. 10.14), while in other cases it is definitely not eschatological. Thus, for example, in Gen. 49.1 Jacob says to his sons 'Gather yourselves together, that I may tell you what shall befall you **בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים**'. This is followed by a poem referring to the monarchic or pre-monarchic period, but definitely not to any eschatological age.²¹ The same is true of Deut. 4.30 and 31.29. In both passages the expression **בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים** refers to the exile, which for its actual author was not a future event, but a contemporary reality. Thus, the use of this expression does not in itself mitigate for (or against) its eschatological meaning. Thus, I would suggest (although I cannot prove it here, due to lack of time²²) that **בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים** is always *either* an eschatological term *or* a retrospective phrase, that is one used in a *vaticinium post eventum* to stress that the ancient 'prophecy' has already been fulfilled. The latter is obviously the case in Jer. 23.19-20, where the short prophecy is inserted into an editorial complex attacking the false prophets. They are the 'wicked', and the 'tempest' is the exile, which is the real background of the prophecy. Hence, there is nothing eschatological here. Such, however, is not the case for the use of **בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים** in the parallel passage, 30.23-24. Here the passage has been inserted following a salvation prophecy to Israel, vv. 17-22 being preceded by a prophecy of doom against Israel's foes, v. 16. Thus, two doom prophecies against 'foes', and 'wicked' (vv. 16, 23-34) envelop a prophecy of salvation to Israel. In this context, the object of the swirling tempest,

21. As against Kaufman, *Toldot*, II, p. 157. He suggests that the concept of Gen. 49.1 is that the period of the settlement described in this poem is an eschatological one.

22. See: Y. Hoffman, 'בְּיָמֵי הַהוּא and אַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים as Eschatological Terms' (Heb.), *Beth-Mikra* 71 (1978), pp. 435-44.

the 'wicked', who will be punished, are not false prophets (as in 23.19-20) but rather the cruel foes of Israel. This determines the eschatological significance of the expression *בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים* (and thus the whole prophecy) here. Hence, its editorial context justifies the classification of 30.23-24 as a possible eschatological passage.

The conclusion of this part of our study is that among the prophecies of doom only 25.15-33, 30.23-24 and possibly 4.23-26 are to be considered possible eschatological passages.

3. Prophecies of Salvation

Prophecies of salvation in Jeremiah may be roughly categorized into three types, according to their main motif. These focus on (a) a messianic figure; (b) restoration of the nation and (c) universal elimination of idolatry. Among them, those prophecies which adhere to the three aforementioned prerequisites would be defined as possible eschatological passages.

a. Messianic Prophecies

There is only one prophecy in Jeremiah that might apparently fit into this category—23.5-6. A second version appears in 33.15-16, but for our sake the slight variances between the two versions are meaningless, and we may confine our discussion here to the first version.

Jeremiah 23.5-6 states that the days are coming when God will 'raise up for David a righteous sprout' (*צֶמַח צְדִיק*) 'and he shall reign as king and deal wisely (*וְהָשִׁכִּיל*) and shall execute justice and righteousness in the land. In his days Judah will be saved and Israel will dwell securely.' He will be called 'The Lord is our righteousness' (*ה' צְדִיקֵנוּ*). Neither universal nor supernatural features are overtly expressed here, yet if it in fact concerns a messianic figure it cannot be dismissed as a possible eschatological passage. This is so because 'messiah' by definition relates to eschatology, and therefore miraculous elements should be assumed to be immanent to any messianic prophecy, whether or not they are literally expressed.

Thus, the relevant question for our discussion is whether the future king, whose name will be *ה' צְדִיקֵנוּ*, is in fact depicted as the messiah. I am highly suspicious of this interpretation. Expectations for a righteous king are not necessarily messianic, for such were always the prophetic demands from any historical king. Moreover, one cannot

ignore the association between the name of this future king and *צדקיהו*, the last Judaeen king. Some scholars have suggested that Jeremiah proclaimed these words during the reign of Zedekiah, perhaps on the occasion of his enthronement, thereby expressing his hopes that the new king would save and liberate Judah.²³ This speculation is unacceptable, as it contradicts Jeremiah's political views concerning the lengthy duration of the Babylon hegemony. My own opinion is that this is not a Jeremianic prophecy. Rather, it is one of those prophecies in the book whose historical background is Jerusalem of the last quarter of the sixth century BCE, reflecting the tension between supporters and opponents of Zerubabel. By ascribing such prophecies to Jeremiah, each party harnessed this respected prophet to its own cause, trying to prove that Jeremiah had foreseen the future and either supported or opposed Zerubabel's wish. Against this background our prophecy should be understood as a pro-Zerubabel utterance, implying that, by his claim to the monarchy, Zerubabel was only fulfilling Jeremiah's prophecy to become the true heir of Zedekiah. Another possible clue in this prophecy are the words *וזה שמו אשר יקראו* ('and this is the name by which he will be called'): that is, just as Metanياهو's name was changed to Zedekiah when he was enthroned (2 Kgs 24.17), so shall Zerubabel's name be changed (to *ה' צדקניו*) and he will become a king. The association with the name of Zedekiah might also be directed towards those who disqualified Zerubabel because he was not a direct descendant of the last king, Zedekiah, but of Jehoyachin. Thus it is an indirect response to another prophecy from the same period, similarly ascribed to Jeremiah, 22.24—'though Coniah the son of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, were the signet ring on my right hand, yet I would tear you off'. (This prophecy is in turn a response to Haggai's metaphor of Zerubabel as a 'signet ring', Hag. 2.23.) Hence, Jer. 23.5-6 was written as a polemical political utterance, and inserted as such into the Jeremianic collection. Therefore, it is not a possible eschatological passage.²⁴

Jeremiah 33.17-26. The focus of this prophecy is a promise that 'David shall never lack a man to sit on the throne of the house of Israel. And the Levitical priests shall never lack a man in my presence to offer burnt offerings...'. Upon reading these words one cannot

23. Bright, *Jeremiah*, pp. 143-46; Holladay, *Jeremiah*, I, p. 617.

24. Yet it was later interpreted as eschatological in many post-biblical texts. See Holladay, *Jeremiah*, I, p. 620.

help but recall Zechariah's promise 'and there shall be peaceful council between the two' (6.13), referring to Zerubabel, the צִמְחָה ('sprout') and to יְהוֹשֻׁעַ הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל (the high priest). Zechariah sought to ease the tension between these two leaders by saying that both would share the rule in Jerusalem.²⁵ Did Zechariah regard Zerubabel as messiah, and his period the *eschaton*? Definitely not, as may be learned from his hesitant but still negative answer to the question as to whether or not one should cease to observe the fasts commemorating the destruction of the first temple (Zech. chs. 7–8). Zechariah's prophecy is thus political and historical rather than messianic and eschatological. Since in my opinion Jer. 33.17-26, like 33.15-16, is a later insertion, composed against the same background—the latter quarter of the sixth century—it too is not eschatological.

b. *Prophecies of Restoration*

These may be classified into two groups: (1) restoration of Israel, and (2) restoration of other nations.

The following belong to the first group: 16.14-15 (= 23.7-8) 29.14; most of the editorial complex of chs. 30–31; 32.44; 33.6-26 and some salvation sections in the prophecy against Babylon—50.4-6; 19-20; 33-34. The second group consists of short restoration utterances regarding specific foreign nations: 46.26 (Egypt); 48.47 (Moab); 49.6 (Amon); 49.39 (Elam). The prophecies in both groups refer, of course, to the future. Are they universal and miraculous?

Restoration of Israel. The restoration prophecies to Israel do not contain any universal element. There is no indication that the liberation of the exiles, the return to Zion, and the revival of national independence would in any way influence the universal world-order. Neither are there miraculous elements. A short comparison between Jer. 31.8-9 and Isa. 35.5-7, both of which describe the return of the exiles to Zion, will demonstrate the non-miraculous character of Jeremiah's salvation prophecies.

25. See: B. Uffenheimer, *The Visions of Zechariah* (Heb.; Jerusalem: Kiryath Sepher, 1961), pp. 117-21.

Isaiah 35.5-7

Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, the ears of the deaf unstopped; then shall the lame man leap like a hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing for joy. Yes, waters shall break forth in the wilderness, and streams in the desert. And the burning heat shall become a lake and the thirstiness springs of water.

Jeremiah 31.8-9

I will bring them. . . among them the blind and the lame, the pregnant woman and she who gives birth together. A great company they shall return here. With weeping they shall come and with consolation I will lead them back, I will make them walk by brooks of water in a straight path; they shall not stumble.

Jeremiah 31.31-36. This prophecy of restoration deserves special attention, as its focus is spiritual rather than political or economic. A future 'new covenant' is proclaimed between God and Israel, which shall be written 'on their hearts', never again to be broken: 'And no longer shall each man teach his neighbor and each his brother saying 'know the Lord', for they shall all know me. . . ' (v. 34).

One might claim that the description of the 'new covenant' as eternal, almost genetically inherent, immune to any mutation, ought to be considered a wondrous element. I cannot share this view. This phraseology is rhetoric rather than a conceptual assertion; a wishful hope rather than a clear notion concerning the miraculous characteristics of a new era. It is obviously an interpretation of the deuteronomic commands, such as 'Let these words that I command you to-day be on your heart. And you shall teach them diligently to your children. . . ' (Deut. 6.6-7). The notion of apparent 'eternity' is reflected in Deuteronomy as well, in such expressions as '... the faithful God who keeps covenant and mercy (חסד) with those who love him and keep his commandments to a thousand generations. . . ' (7.9), or 'to keep my commandments כל הימים' ("all the days"—usually translated "for ever") (5.26 [29]). Indeed, in principal the idea of 'eternity' is the very essence of the covenant concept. Thus, 'And I will establish My covenant between Me and you, and your descendants after you throughout their generations for an everlasting covenant. . . ' (ברית עולם Gen. 17.7). This phraseology belongs to the repertoire of international treaties.²⁶ Hence, Jer. 31.31-36 does not portray a miraculous

26. See, e.g., Essarhadon's Vassal Treaty : '[You swear that] as you stand in the place of this oath you will not swear with the words of the lips [alone] but with your whole heart and you will teach the treaty to your children who live afterwards. . . ', D.J. McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963), p. 200.

Restoration of Foreign Nations. Appended to the prophecies against Egypt (46.26), Moab (48.47), Amon (49.6) and Elam (49.39) are short formulas expressing future restoration. The formulas are: אַחֲרֵי כֵן תִּשְׁכֵּן / כִּימֵי קֶדֶם [מִצְרַיִם] נָאִם ה' / וּשְׁבַתִּי שְׁבוֹת מוֹאָב בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים [מוֹאָב] נָאִם ה' / וְאַחֲרֵי כֵן אֲשִׁיב אֶת שְׁבוֹת בְּנֵי עַמּוֹן נָאִם ה' / וְהָיָה בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים אֲשִׁיב אֶת שְׁבוֹת מִצְרַיִם (‘Afterward Egypt shall be inhabited as in the days of old, says the Lord / Yet I shall restore the fortunes of Moab at the end of the days, says the Lord / Afterwards I shall restore the fortunes of the Ammonites says the Lord / At the end of the days I shall restore the fortunes of Elam says the Lord.’). The literary character of these concluding phrases is definitely editorial: nothing in the prophecies themselves anticipates such promises. Some of the prophecies even contradict them. Thus, it is said that ‘Moab will be destroyed and be no longer a people’ (48.42); Elam will be persecuted ‘until I have consumed them’ (49.37).

Were these appendixes intended to be eschatological, pertaining to a universal future of peace and tranquillity as described, for example, in Isa. 2.1-4; 11.1-10? This is Kaufman's notion,²⁸ which I cannot accept. First, because nothing is said about the universality of the restorations. Secondly, the restoration formulas are appended to only four prophecies and not to all of them,²⁹ which would have been expected had the editor wished to convey a universal eschatological message. I would therefore suggest that these formulas were appended retrospectively. They were all added after the mentioned nations had recovered from the Babylonian yoke, in order to emphasize, that the restoration of those nations did not contradict Jeremiah's prophecies, but was rather their fulfilment. Thus בִּשְׁחֵרִית הַיָּמִים is used here in its retrospective meaning. These editorial conclusions are therefore not possible eschatological passages.

27. There is no need in this context to discuss the authenticity of this section. I share the view that it is post-Jeremianic–Deuteronomistic. In this case it adds up to the non-eschatological character of Dtr. as a whole.

28. Y. Kaufman, *Toldot*, III, p. 466.

29. The prophecies on the Philistines, Edom, Damaskus, Kedar, Babylon have no such appendixes.

c. *Elimination of Idolatry*

Against the background of the ancient world, universal exclusion of idolatry and belief by Gentiles in YHWH must have been considered a miraculous event. Hence, prophecies expressing this idea are fully compatible with our criteria. There are apparently *four* such prophecies in Jeremiah—3.17; 10.11; 12.14-17; and 16.19-21—but two of them may be instantly dismissed as less relevant: 10.11 and 12.14-17.

Jeremiah 10.11 is an Aramaic verse, probably non-Jeremianic. It should be proclaimed to the Gentiles that *אלהי ד' שמיא וארקא לא עבדו* 'The gods who did not make the heavens and the earth shall perish from the earth and from under this heaven'. While the idea expressed here corresponds to our heading of 'elimination of idolatry', this is more of a curse than a prediction of a miraculous period. It is therefore not a possible eschatological passage.

The same holds true for 12.14-17. The idea that the enemies of Israel will learn 'to swear in My name "as YHWH lives"' (ח' ה') is only mentioned in a conditional threat: if they do so, they will survive; otherwise, they will perish. Hence, it is not a possible eschatological passage.

Jeremiah 3.17 is a prose conclusion to the previous prose verses concerning the future unimportance of the Ark of Covenant. 'At that time', it says, 'Jerusalem shall be called the throne of the Lord, and all nations shall gather to it ('to the name of YHWH in Jerusalem'—not represented in the Septuagint) and they shall no more stubbornly follow their own evil heart', *בעת ההיא יקראו לירושלים כסא ה' ונקוו*. It is clear that Isa. 2.1-4 is echoed here. Even the metaphor *ונקוו*, 'be collected as water' corresponds to *ינהר* in Isaiah, which is a pun on *נהר*, 'river'. Yet, there are two significant differences between the two prophecies. In Jeremiah the ideas of universal peace and the Temple as the goal of the nations' pilgrimage are absent. The ignoring of the Temple fully accords with the idea, expressed at the beginning of the prophecy, that in the future no cultic symbols will be needed. This explanation, however, does not explain the absence of the peace idea, which makes the prophecy in Jeremiah less universal, less miraculous. Nevertheless, it may still be regarded as a possible eschatological passage.

However, a conceivable textual emendation of the verse would make it completely devoid of any eschatological elements. *BHS* suggests that

כל הגוים—*all the nations*—be amended to read מכל הגוים—‘from all the nations’. This makes sense, because the subsequent words, ולא ילכו עוד אחרי שררות לבם הרע, always refer to Israel and never to foreign nations.³⁰ The emended verse, then, refers only to the Israelites, who will return from the exile to Zion. The historical background of this preferable version is probably after the Cyrus declaration and prior to the inauguration of the Second Temple, in 516 BCE, explaining why the Temple is not mentioned here. Hence, the original verse was free of eschatological intention, thereby coinciding with the national scope of the previous verses about the Ark of Covenant. However, the reading of MT is neither coincidental nor mistaken. It has been deliberately altered, perhaps in order to tint it with slightly eschatological colours, and as such it is a possible eschatological passage. In either case, neither the supposed ‘original’ verse nor, of course, the present version is Jeremianic. Two reasons confirm this latter conclusion, even if we do not support the emendation of the verse. First, the verse is written in prose, and the prosaic sections in the Book of Jeremiah are generally considered non-Jeremianic. Secondly, the historical scope of the whole passage 3.14-18 is obviously exilic.

Jeremiah 6.19-20 envisages a future confession of the Gentiles of their religious blunder and a declaration of faith in YHWH. It should therefore be regarded as a possible eschatological passage.

Is it Jeremianic? It is not a prophecy but a psalm, or more accurately a fragment of a psalm. The opening line, ה' עזי ומעוזי ומגורי ביום צרה (‘O YHWH, my strength and my stronghold, my refuge in the day of trouble’), uses the phraseology both of personal laments (e.g. Ps. 27.1; 91.2; Jer. 17.17) and of Thanksgivings hymns (e.g. 18.3 = 2 Sam. 22.3). In the final strophe—היעשה לו אדם אלהים והמה לא אלהים—(‘Can man make for himself Gods, which are non-Gods?’)—the last colon, והמה לא אלהים is duplicated in an authentic Jeremianic prophecy, 2.11. The combination of a personal lament and the idea that the Gentiles will honor YHWH is also attested in Ps. 86.6-10: האזינה ה' תפילתי... ביום צרתי אקראך כי תענני. אין כמוך באלהים ה' ואין כמעשיך. כל גוים אשר עשית יבואו וישתחוו לפניך אדני ויכבדו לשמך... אתה אלהים לבדך (‘Give ear, O Lord, to my prayer... In the day of my trouble I call on Thee, for Thou dost answer me. There is none like Thee among the gods, O Lord, nor are there any works like Thine. All the

30. The expression appears only in Jeremiah and once in Deuteronomy: Jer. 7.24; 9.13; 11.8; 13.10; 16.12; 18.12; 23.17; 29.18, and Deut. 29.18.

nations Thou hast made shall come and bow down before Thee, O Lord, and shall glorify Thy name. . . Thou alone art God').

Was this mixture of Jeremianic and psalmody phrases a creation of Jeremiah or of a later author? I doubt our ability to substantiate either answer to this dilemma, unless one presupposes a Jeremianic/non-Jeremianic authorship of all the psalm sections in the book, which is, of course, methodologically wrong, as it can be neither proven nor refuted.

4. *Summary and Conclusions*

The discussion may be summarized as follows:

(1) Possible eschatological passages of doom: 25.15-29; 30-33; 30.23-24 and possibly 4.23-26.

(2) Possible eschatological passages of salvation: 3.17; 16.19-20.

In some of these prophecies the possible eschatological passage elements are original, while in others the possible eschatological passage elements are editorial accretions.

Here is a more detailed categorization:

<i>Original possible eschatological passages</i>	<i>Editorial possible eschatological passages</i>	<i>Jeremianic</i>	<i>Non- Jeremianic</i>	<i>Jeremianic nucleus</i>
	25.15-29			+
25.30-33		?		
	30.23-24	+		
4.23-26		?		
3.17?			?	
16.19-20		?	?	

The most significant conclusion is the scantiness of both categories of possible eschatological passages in the book of Jeremiah. Among these the non-editorial possible eschatological passages are either non-Jeremianic or at least of suspicious authorship. On the other hand, in authentic Jeremianic prophecies the elements of possible eschatological passages are editorial, not original. It is important to note that doubts as to the authenticity of the prophecies does not result from any pre-determined assumption concerning the development of eschatology in biblical Israel.

Thus, as a whole, the book of Jeremiah was a non-eschatological collection, slightly tinted with quasi-eschatological elements. This leads

to the conclusion that Jeremiah was not an eschatologically-oriented prophet. The implications of such an assertion are ambiguous. It may be that Jeremiah's non-eschatological character accurately reflects the status of eschatology in pre-exilic sixth-century Judah. This may be explained by the assumption that eschatology in Judah at that period was either not-yet-known, or else just a non-fashionable concept. Another theoretical possibility is that eschatology was a well known and even fashionable concept at that period in Judah, but Jeremiah objected to it.

Between these two options I prefer the former. One would expect cognizant objection to a widely-accepted eschatology to have led Jeremiah to argue with the eschatological expectations. However, such overt, anti-eschatological polemics are lacking in the book.

Was eschatology simply not yet known in Jeremiah's time, or an unfashionable concept? One cannot answer this question without basing the answer upon a pre-determined developmental scheme of biblical eschatology. As I do not have such a scheme yet I must leave the question unanswered; nevertheless, I shall allow myself to engage in a brief speculation.

The non-eschatological image of the book of Jeremiah might seemingly lead one to prefer the option that eschatology emerged only after Jeremiah's time. However, such an evolutionary scheme would be too simplistic, and one should equally consider a more intricate one. As far as history teaches us, eschatology is an up-and-down concept, which might temporarily vanish in some historical contexts after having flourished in a previous period, and vice versa. Thus, for example, during the long period of the Assyrian dominance, a mixture of empirical universalism, peace ('pax Assyriana'), religious and cultural hegemony,³¹ and feelings of national humiliation might well have fertilized eschatological trends. On the other hand, such trends might have transformed into a mundane political program of national revival, once the Assyrian grasp had weakened and faded. Hence, the

31. Whether forced or voluntarily accepted. For a discussion of the extent to which the Assyrians imposed their culture and religion on their vassal states, see M. Cogan, 'Judah under Assyrian Hegemony: A Reexamination of Imperialism and Religion', *JBL* 112 (1993), pp. 403-14. He responds to H. Spieckermann, *Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidenzeit* (FRLANT, 129; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982). Cogan claims that 'No Assyrian text states or implies that conquered peoples were required to worship the gods of Assyria' (p. 412).

non-eschatological quality of the book of Jeremiah is a rather ambiguous testimony for the development of biblical eschatology.

As to the secondary eschatological colours added to the book: they are all exilic or post exilic, even if the exact historical background of most of them cannot be ascertained. Here, too, the reason is the lack of pattern of the eschatological mosaic of that period into which the alleged Jeremianic pebbles are to be inlaid. Hanson wrote a comprehensive study in which he attempted to sketch such a pattern,³² but his speculations and conclusions seem to me rather arbitrary, as if the target was drawn after the arrow had already shot.

In sum: I am afraid that the most appropriate way to conclude this talk would be to use the literary technique of *inclusio*, that is, to repeat the first sentence of the paper, claiming that it has been proved. Thus, 'studying eschatology in the Hebrew Bible is a most tantalizing assignment'.

32. P. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalypics* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975).

POINTS OF DEPARTURE FOR A CHRISTIAN ESCHATOLOGY*

Christian Link

The twentieth century has been called the century of the rediscovery of eschatology. But this rediscovery was not an easy one. 'Nothing is stable'; 'the tide is rising, the dams are bursting'—this is how contemporaries such as Troeltsch and Kähler commented on the event at the turn of the century. What had in fact happened?

In contrast to the theological consensus of that time, Johannes Weiß and Albert Schweitzer had pointed out that Jesus' preaching about the kingdom of God was by no means aimed at the ideal of a community life on earth which was guided by morality and religion. *His* preaching was based on the expectation of God's early intervention which would soon bring the course of the world to its end and establish his supramundane (*überweltlich*) kingdom. 'According to Jesus,' said Weiß, 'the kingdom of God has a solely supramundane dimension and stands in an absolute contrast to this world.'¹ Schweitzer found even more dramatic words:

Everywhere is silent. Then the Baptist appears crying out: Repent! The kingdom of God is near. And within a short time Jesus, knowing himself to be the coming Son of Man, grasps the spokes of the *wheel of history* [a remarkably non-eschatological metaphor! C.L.] to set it in motion, to effect its final rotation and bring the natural history of the world to an end. Since this does not succeed, he hangs himself on the wheel. And as the wheel keeps turning it crushes him.

The only consistent conclusion is, therefore, that: 'instead of *renewing* eschatology [Jesus] has destroyed it'.² In this interpretation, the *cross*

* Translated from German by Gottfried Wilhelm Locher (London) and Pierre-Michael Béguin (London), and reworked by Charlotte Methuen (Bochum).

1. J. Weiß, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reich Gottes* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1964 [1892]), pp. 49-50.

2. A. Schweitzer, *Von Reimarus zu Wrede* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1907),

of Christ is seen as the turning point, the catastrophe of eschatology.

Schweitzer opened up the gulf that separates the expectation of the forthcoming return of Christ as mentioned in the synoptic Gospels—the ‘supramundane’—from our present time. Above his historical achievement Schweitzer rated the fact that what he had just discovered was non-modern, that it had no relevance to modern times. There was no way in which ‘modern theology’ could appropriate ‘Jesus’ outdated view of the world’. ‘We have restored the rights of history and have set ourselves free from [Jesus’] range of ideas.’³ *Consistent* eschatology, as represented by Schweitzer and his school, could, therefore, advance no further than the conclusion that any expectation of a real transformation of the world must be abandoned and that eschatology must be reduced to a consistent but purely worldly ethics. The arrow of a breakthrough discovery ended its flight in the soft cushion of liberal theology.

The situation changed abruptly with the emergence of *dialectic theology*. ‘Christianity which is not at the same time completely and totally eschatology has absolutely nothing to do with Christ!’ wrote Barth programmatically in his commentary to Romans.⁴ According to Barth, eschatology is concerned with the meaning of ‘eternity’, with the *limiting line of all history*, and with that eternal instant at which everything that happens only in time is brought to its final crisis. Here the critical thrust of the New Testament appears in its uncompromising form: the ‘end’ (*das ‘Letzte’*) of human life as seen by Paul means a ‘*radical breaking off* from all the things that have happened before (*von allem Vorletzten*), which at the same time lends them their real meaning and their motive force’.⁵ This end is the *flash of lightning* which, like a thunderstorm, illuminates a world in which cracks have already appeared. But does this flash of lightning illuminate the coming kingdom, which Jesus had promised so convincingly to be near? Or does this a-historical (or, rather, *supra*-historical) vision merely

p. 367. Note: this concluding sentence has been deleted in all the subsequent editions.

3. A. Schweitzer, *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 6th edn, 1951), p. 640.

4. K. Barth, *Der Römerbrief* (Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 2nd edn, 1962), p. 298.

5. K. Barth, ‘Der Christ in der Gesellschaft’, in J. Moltmann (ed.), *Anfänge der dialektischen Theologie* (Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1962 [1919]), I, pp. 3-37 (35).

reflect the dialectical opposite of the apocalyptic tradition which had been placed on the books of history by Weiß and Schweitzer?

Within the framework of these alternatives it is appropriate to include the arguments forcefully put forward by Rudolf Bultmann in favour of an 'eschatological' existence (that is, one emptied of its worldly dimension). If this approach is placed on the left, we could locate to the right the older idea that salvation takes place as a final event in history, this event being so to speak the final act of an earthly drama after which the curtain of the world's history is rung down. Understandably, it was difficult for the older model to hold its ground against the onslaught of the European Enlightenment. In his essay on 'The end of all things' ('Das Ende aller Dinge', 1794), Kant wrote, 'The pious conviction that man steps from time to eternity would mean nothing if we understood eternity as the unending forward passage of time', as though it were just a continuation 'on the other side', 'because if this were so, man would never leave the realm of time. He would just move from one point of time to the other. That conviction must therefore refer to an end of all time of which we cannot really have any understanding other than a negative one.'⁶ The idea of an 'end' of all things fails because of the unresolved nature of time.

In these circumstances, it was understandable that Bultmann should eliminate the time horizon of traditional eschatology by a mere stroke of his pen. Following Heidegger, he dissolved the future (that is, history) into 'historicity' of existence which each individual has to assume. To us, however, this 'solution' appears increasingly to be a *salto mortale* out of the theological problem stated explicitly by Kant. This is because no understanding of the New Testament is possible without mention of the account which is to be rendered of us at the coming judgment. And yet 'what is to come' remains ahead of us in a way that is entirely independent from the 'decisions' of our own existence.

If one were to seek possible 'errors' in these various views (hardly an exciting proposition in the context of this volume) one would point to their almost systematic dissociation of the message and personality of Jesus from the history of Israel (or more precisely from the contemporary *perspectives* Israel had derived from its historical experi-

6. I. Kant, *Werke in sechs Bänden* (ed. W. Weischedel; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966), VI, p. 175.

ences). By 'perspective' I mean the way of perceiving and assessing people, things and events in a given historical context. It makes a difference whether we call the Day of Judgment *dies irae*, classifying it, together with traditional Christianity, as part of the history of the unsaved (*Unheilsgeschichte*), or whether, following the Old Testament, we understand it as the day on which justice will definitely be re-established, as the goal of the history of salvation. It makes a difference whether we understand the promise of a new heaven and a new earth (Isa. 65.17 and, following Isaiah, Rev. 21.1)⁷ as a cosmic drama beyond all our faculties of imagination, or whether it is read against the background of a renewed Jerusalem and a renewed Israel. It makes a difference whether the precepts of this impending judgment (Mt. 25.40: 'Whatever you did to one of the least of these brothers of mine, you did to me') are understood as a universal principle of human behaviour, or whether they are seen as more specifically applicable to the way people should behave towards the Jewish Diaspora scattered among the nations of the world. This latter understanding follows Mt. 24.31, which refers to the re-unification of the Jewish Diaspora by the messianic Son of Man. One's fundamental concept of history makes an essential difference.

According to Hermann Cohen, a Jewish philosopher of religion,

the Greek understood history essentially as a science. It was and it is something that only addressed the past. The prophet, on the other hand, was a visionary. . . . His vision saw history as the essence of the future . . . time becomes future, and this future was the first concern of thinking about history.⁸

Isaiah looks towards a new Zion and a new David, Jeremiah speaks of a new covenant. The prophets saw these future things 'as just as important as the laws of the old canonical accounts'. To some extent, their prophecies were 'distinct from everything that had previously been taught about the worship of Yahweh', and were the first demonstrable instances of eschatological thinking.⁹ That which is to come is not an object of historical forecasting. It does not emerge causally or linearly from what has happened in the past and up to the present day.

7. All Bible citations according to the *New International Version*.

8. H. Cohen, *Religion der Vernunft aus den Quellen des Judentums: Eine jüdische Religionsphilosophie* (Leipzig: Fock, 1919), pp. 307-10.

9. G. von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments* (Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 4th edn, 1962), I, p. 126.

The common linear concept of time, which views the future as continuation of, extension of or emanation from the past, also fails to describe it appropriately. The experience that history start to move again in a hitherto unknown way can only be understood if we observe events from a different perspective and approach time from a different angle. By making a distinction between *adventus* and *futurum* Jürgen Moltmann offers a productive new approach. The God that the believer looks to when concerned about the future is a God who enters into the history of humankind as the future (the *adventus*). This is not a God who exists forever and who, although always present, is always hidden. Rather, this is a *coming* God, a God whose kingdom is described by the New Testament as a reality that can be experienced and that is 'near and approaching'. This nearness of God appears as the 'sudden emergence of the future into the present'.¹⁰

The *eschaton* is essentially that which is forever coming to us from the future. It is at this point that Bultmann's concept and that of the young Barth part company. In both Jewish and Christian understandings the eschaton is what is *still to come* in the realm of time.¹¹ The central focus is not humanity, but *salvation*, which is brought about by God. The eschaton is identical to the 'kingdom' of this God, which, again in Jewish and Christian traditions, will take the time of history to reach its *accomplishment*. However, this interpretation brings with it a number of difficulties. Is it possible to acquire any understanding of the accomplishment of creation and of its history? Is this not an event that, in every aspect, is yet to come? A future that is postulated *post festum*, so to speak, would be an addition from outside and could not even claim the status of a hypothesis. If such a future had not existed before, it would be implausible right from the beginning. Indeed, what is the material basis of eschatology?

1. The Basis of Christian Eschatology

It is true today that the end of the world seems to be revealed by its threatening signs in dying forests and rivers and, indeed, even in the sky. This end is described in apocalyptic scenarios as a calculable

10. M. Theunissen, *Negative Theologie der Zeit* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1991), p. 327.

11. Cf. O. Weber, *Grundlagen der Dogmatik* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962), II, p. 724.

collapse of the biosphere. It is a drastic reminder of the fact that the apocalyptic tradition was once viewed as the 'mother of Christian theology'. However, according to the biblical notion, the *accomplishment* of creation extends beyond every concept of an end of nature. Its promise is *not* concerned with the world we know as a succession of developing states of being. 'For this world in its present form is passing away' (1 Cor. 7.31). The dead are lost to nature but creation preserves them for resurrection in a new life. Fulfilment means that God is going to accompany his creation all the way. He will bring its time into *his* time, and he will reinstate the whole of creation in a *new* form of time, a form that will be freed from earthly conditions. At this point, our powers of imagination can go no further. We cannot comprehend the transition from 'time' to 'eternity', a transition we would have to perceive. There is no gradual progression from one to the other. 'Time' as we experience it has come to its end. We must give up interpreting God's 'eternity' using the criteria of *our* perception of time. No argument that we might draw from our observation of the world, whether cosmological, evolutionary or otherwise, can broaden the horizon of the promised accomplishment.

What, then, gives us grounds to hope for an accomplishment of creation? From what perspective can we go beyond the limit of all experience—death—with as much certainty as do the eschatological pronouncements of the Bible? When even the New Testament is founded on the fact that 'what we will be has not yet been made known' (1 Jn. 3.2), how can faith justifiably claim to have an idea of a new world? It is true that there is no gradual transition at the level of time (which is also the level of our mental cognition). But there is the experience that this level of time has been overcome, an experience that is central for Christian belief. Whenever the kingdom of God is proclaimed and wherever it becomes reality, there God comes towards his creation with a *sign* of that final future. The logic of eschatological statements is based on the ascertainable presence of this sign. The Christian starting point is therefore the acceptance of that sign. It is the belief that the resurrection of Christ has anticipated the coming of the time of this world to its end, foreshadowing the end of time of the entire creation. From beyond the boundary of death, the risen Christ 'actualizes' the time of the *new* creation in our lives. This is the basis for everything that can be said about the accomplishment of God's created world. The statements that are made about the new

creation extend in an unparalleled manner the theological lines that describe the resurrection of Jesus as the foundation of New Testament theology. They are based on the certainty that it is here in the resurrection that the line from creation to new creation has been completed for the first time. These conclusions point to God's unconditional love, to his faithfulness towards his creatures. This unconditional love allows faith to hope for and await *the whole of creation* in a *universal* way which Easter has revealed in a more specific way.

Christian theology has always been concerned with the meaning, or rather the status, that should be attributed to these statements. Do they describe a final period of history within the time span of the world? Do they express a promise under which the people of God are already living in their historical present? Or should they be understood in terms of a radical end of human history, of a reality beyond a historical classification? What should we imagine this *new* beginning to be? The 'new' world God will create: will it be entirely different from ours? The Book of Revelation describes the way in which the new Jerusalem will be seen 'coming down out of heaven from God' (Rev. 21.2). Or do these eschatological statements refer to our 'old' world, a world that has become stuck in its own history and that has not reached its destination? In other words, are they concerned with the life of the unborn; the cancellation of injustice, of innocent suffering and of premature death? Is it a different, second work that is being opened up to us by God, or is it 'our work in this present world which shall appear to us in all its truth, as completely meaningful in its dedication to God, some time in the distant future?'¹²

2. The Problem of Apocalyptic

The conception of life as it has been upheld in the apocalyptic tradition has greatly influenced Christian eschatology. For centuries, it remained the undisputed framework of the doctrine of the 'events of the last days'.¹³ God's world and the human world were in the same spatial relationship as the sky and the earth. The distance between the two was understood to be like the length of a straight line, and this

12. K. Barth, Sermon (24.1.1932) in *Zwischen den Zeiten* 10 (1932), pp. 85-98, (95).

13. Cf. U.H.J. Körtner, *Weltangst und Weltende: Eine theologische Interpretation der Apokalypstik* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988).

meant that time was also understood as a dimension moving forward in a *linear* way and could, therefore, be divided into periods. The course of history had to be crossed in order to arrive at the end of *this* world's aeon, at which point the *new* aeon was to begin with the descent from heaven of the godly master. Just as the world had a beginning in time in God's creation, so too it had to have an end—also in time—marked by the coming of God to judge the world. However, if this end is to take place in the time scale of earthly history, then it can be imagined only as either a sudden destruction, or a drastic transformation of the world. This is why the expectation of the *parousia* of the Son of Man, 'coming with clouds of heaven' (Dan. 7.13; Mt. 24.30), is linked with the dramatic vision of a cataclysmic collapse of the earth.

One can argue about the theological correctness of these dogmatic implications. What cannot be doubted, however, is the fact that in the New Testament Jesus and Paul describe the final future of creation largely in apocalyptic images. They were drawing on the expectations of their contemporary Judaism, with the addition of a new reference point. The *apocalyptic* motif that underlies the resurrection theology in 1 Corinthians 15 is the following question: who has dominion over the world? Paul supplies an answer to this question that ties in with the faith of the early Christian Church. It is *not* the Son of Man who has dominion, for he is way up there in heaven, but the risen *Christ* who at Easter sat at God's right hand and was invested *Cosmocrator*. Paul's characteristic perception of the resurrection of the dead becomes apparent in his idea of the *regnum Christi*. He refers to the ancient concept of the resurrection of the dead at the Day of Judgment. Because Christ must reign (1 Cor. 15.25), he cannot abandon his followers to death. But what does this mean? For a better understanding, we should read this statement in combination with the following remarkable passage at 1 Cor. 6.13: '... the Lord (is) for the *body*'. However, this can only be properly grasped if by 'body' we understand not just a person's individual, physical body (an interpretation that has frequently been taken up by the church), but the body as the privileged example of worldly reality, representing the *first* of all the gifts that were given to us by the Creator.¹⁴ Only then does the argument

14. Cf. E. Käsemann, 'Zum Thema der urchristlichen Apokalyptik', in *idem*, *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), II, pp. 105-131 (129).

become clear: if the hope of the Christian fellowship is directed at the dominion of Christ, then the promise of the resurrection of the body includes the resurrection of *creation*, since this is the world in which the body can live and grow. The coming kingdom of Christ is not aimed at the destruction (*annihilatio*) of the created world, but at its *renewal*, within the future that Christ will give to the world.

There is no great difficulty in incorporating the universal dimension of divine action into the apocalyptic tradition. However, the concepts of space and time upon which this framework is based have become increasingly problematic for recent theology and have transformed eschatology into a theological building site.¹⁵ It is no longer possible today to think of the world of God as a three-dimensional world lying above or beyond our own. How should we revise the corresponding picture of the world that apocalyptic eschatology has implied? To a great extent, this picture has resisted the pressures of change despite the conflict between the original expectation of the forthcoming return of Christ and the long wait for the *parousia*.

If the kingdom of Christ is to be limited by the two 'dates' of his raising and ours, as described by Paul, if it further is to be understood as a temporally stretched *regnum* or *interregnum*, and if this kingdom is subsequently integrated in the last period of earthly history, then one can only conclude that Christ will appear to a last generation which will still be living at the end of time. This is what is implied by 1 Thess. 4.15 and, in a somewhat weaker form, in 1 Cor. 15.51 and the passage that follows. But such a comprehension 'is and always will be mythology'.¹⁶ In this view, the coming of Christ (*adventus*) is equated with the inner-historical *futurum*. On that basis, one will start making calculations to know when this event might take place. Will it be in a few decades or in a few centuries?

The main point is that *parousia* must both be a purely historical event and the end of the chain of historical events, and that this can only occur on the assumption that the continuation of history is made impossible 'from the outside'. In other words, the course of history must be definitely stopped by a cataclysm of universal dimensions. The paradox of an inner-historical end of history can only be

15. G. Lohfink, 'Zur Möglichkeit christlicher Naherwartung', in G. Greshake and G. Lohfink, *Naherwartung—Auferstehung—Unsterblichkeit* (Quaestiones Disputationes, 71; Freiburg: Herder, 5th edn, 1982), pp. 38-120 (60).

16. Lohfink, 'Zur Möglichkeit', p. 61.

'resolved' by the assumption of the end of the world. But that would literally be a *salto mortale* into the eschaton. Who would want to rest their faith on such a view? And how does such a view tie in with God's 'yes' to his creation, through which he defines himself as God (Isa. 42.5; 54.9)?

3. *The Expectation of the New Creation*

It is time to abandon the world view of the apocalyptic tradition. It was nothing other than a view that offered images into which a constellation of undefined wishes could be melted down: longings, fears and dreams. From the outset, these images were exposed to the danger of 'duplicating' our worldly lives. They had compensatory features in that they presented a picture of the beyond, vengeance from heaven, so to speak, which was the reverse picture of this life with all its hardships and injustices. For the last time, the old world's logic, which clung to the perception of time as something that just flowed by, had been vindicated. In this scheme of things, the promises of God were seen as giving support to plain historical objectives, which meant that these promises were deprived of their real meaning. Therefore one conclusion results: theology seeks to establish the *reason* why we should hope for a future accomplishment of the world. This can only be done by interpreting the biblical images of the end of the world and of the new creation, *not* as historical categories, but as tangible images expressing an understanding of God's relationship to the world. Theology does not take an interest in any apocalyptic understanding of history (not even the one upheld by the historical Jesus). Only the *history* of God as it is perceptible in the present may be considered as the basis of eschatological discourse. This will guard against the error of believing eschatology to be concerned with the final stages of human history, which theologians are then expected to probe rather like clairvoyants or fortune-tellers.

How are we to understand this sign of a 'new heaven and of a new earth'? Certainly, it points to an end of the time of dying and suffering, an end of the time when creation looses its truth and nature is threatened with destruction. It also sets clear limits to all those constructs that cling to that time. Theology cannot ignore these limits without becoming mythology. By relinquishing its dependence on time, hope has also had to relinquish its former images. Thus the most

authentic expression of biblical hope is the certainty that the *earthly* history of creation will be embraced in God's *eternal* history, that what is still hidden today will finally become true, and that our time is 'in God's hand' (Ps. 31.16).

a. *The New Time*

The New Testament associates the accomplishment of creation with the *parousia* of Christ. But what is the meaning of the word *parousia*? It is a long time now since theology abandoned the idea of a historical, and therefore chronologically calculable, 'return' of Christ; this would logically imply a former absence. The appearance ('arrival') of Christ, the 'Day of the Lord' (1 Thess. 5.2) is not something that will happen in time. That day is not to be seen as the final day in *our* succession of time, as a point at which there would be a sudden and violent break in our history. Rather, it has to be understood as a reality that lies so to speak at the vertical of every point of our time here on earth. It is not something that will come about after the expiry of history in time, a history evolving towards a postulated final point. It should rather be seen as a reality that comes to join our own time from 'ahead' of our time, and which in the process transforms our time. That day is a symbolic expression of the eternity of God that escapes all chronological considerations. It might be helpful here to turn to the image of Ps. 39.5 where God is seen as embracing our time from all sides. This would explain the otherwise inconceivable notion that on the other side of death the two aspects of time called 'before' and 'now' are no longer distinct. God is the same always, within *every* form of time.

Resorting once again to a metaphor, we could say that as the *first* creation grows by evolving from the past into the future, striving towards its goal, so the *new* creation moves towards the same goal from the opposite direction. This new creation moves 'against' the natural evolution of the universe.¹⁷ It advances from the future into the furthest reaches of the past in order to recover all that has been scattered and left behind in the course of time. According to Eph. 1.10 the new creation will bring together the different times in which creation has unfolded into the fullness of this one time, from which all the others have flowed.

17. J. Moltmann, *Der Weg Jesu Christi* (Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1989), p. 327.

b. *The New World*

What is the secret of the new creation, assuming it is quite different from the logic of history which has come to its end? While it is true that the eschatological statements of the Bible should not be understood as information about the future state of the world, it is also true that they tell us that the promise of the coming kingdom concerns *this* world, which has been created and accepted by God. The end of the history of death will not usher in a kind of 'worldless' situation, and the new world will not be something completely different and unrelated to the old aeon. The hope of a new heaven and a new earth looks forward, not to the annihilation of creation, but to its liberation from bondage (Rom. 8.21).

But how is this to happen? Here we definitely fall on the limits of our ability to comprehend. Any high-handed attempt to overcome these limits would be speculative and theologically irrelevant. Our only course is to look to Easter and to the new beginning which that day symbolizes. Indeed, the only ground for our hope of the life of the world to come is that this life has already 'appeared' symbolically at Easter (1 Jn 1.2). The New Testament moves forward, as it were, by always turning towards the risen Christ. This is where it also becomes obvious that the difference between God's time and worldly time is related to the difference between creature and nature. The raising of Jesus from the dead was not some kind of revival by which a dead person re-enters temporal existence. The risen Christ is welcomed into permanent community with God as *the person he has been*—with all the words he has spoken, all the things he has done and everything that has happened to him. His journey from Galilee to Jerusalem, his prayer alone in the wilderness, his meals in the homes of publicans, his charismatic personality and the stigmata of his body—all these things are not just blotted out and all over. It is not just a dead past but '*talking history*. . . history made to speak'.¹⁸ And as such it is much more than what it was or what it ever could have been historically. Just as death destroys all forms of life on earth, so too it destroyed the biological existence of Jesus and with it his nature as it had been shaped by the history of the Jews. But death could not affect what had become manifest in his life: the reality of creation, in which the future of God's kingdom was allegorically expressed. God has saved this life beyond death. Without any loss of what constituted

18. E. Jüngel, *Tod* (Themen der Theologie, 8; Berlin: Kreuz, 1971), p. 153.

its identity, he transformed it to be at one with the coming kingdom.

The resurrection of the body; the identity of what is to come and what emerged from the first beginning in all its incompleteness: these cry out in protest against the death that annihilates the body. God who 'raised Christ from the dead will also give life to your mortal *bodies*' (Rom. 8.11). He will transform the body of his creation—with which he is in complete solidarity in Christ, because he loved him without measure—into a new form so that nothing will be lost. Says Paul: 'For the perishable must clothe itself with the imperishable, and the mortal with immortality' (1 Cor. 15.53). This *perishable life* that exists and ends within time, that reaches for the glory of the children of God but cannot escape the clutches of death, this very life will be reinstated by God in its fullness and made eternal. Nothing shall be forgotten. Nothing shall remain wiped out, be it the history of a people, or the disappearance of a particular species of animal or plant. In Jesus Christ, God has shared in the pains and contradictions of earthly and physical life. He will not stand by idly while those relationships of life which continue are torn apart by death. On the contrary: only the resurrection on Easter morning revealed the truth of Jesus, for not even his disciples were aware of the meaning of his life. And in the same way the truth of the *entire* creation, that truth which is hidden from itself and from all humankind, will only be revealed in its new realm of time.

Declaring one's faith in life as it has been made manifest in Christ also means declaring one's faith in the power of God which has achieved its design in Christ. Just as it leaves nothing behind and never ceases to act as love, so too this power of God will lead the world to a fulfilment of its design, a world which has *not* come to its end yet. It will give a future to the past, it will 'transform' the nature of our time, and that can only mean that it will bring our time into the history of God, into God's eternity. This is the foundation of our hope. Beyond all the eschatological perceptions of tradition, this means that the proposition that the world will be fulfilled is one that theology is compelled to adopt.

THE SON OF MAN AND THE ANGELS: REFLECTIONS ON THE FORMATION OF CHRISTOLOGY IN THE CONTEXT OF ESCHATOLOGY*

Gottfried Nebe

1. *Introduction and Theses*

I would like to begin with several side-lights, references, and questions on two points.

First, I ask: Do Jews and Christians actually agree—in view of religion and theology—on the angelic concept or on the Son of Man problem, if we look at the idea of an eschatological figure of the Son of Man? I would imagine that here Jews and Christians would come to an understanding more easily with angels than with the Son of Man.

One remembers at this point, for example, remarks in the rabbinic tradition, which are critical and reserved—reserved in regard to apocalypics there, critical of the idea of the Son of Man as in *y. Ta'an.* 2,65b,59: 'R. Abbahu (um 300) hat gesagt: Wenn ein Mensch zu dir sagen sollte: "Ich bin Gott", so lügt er; "ich bin der Menschensohn" בן אדם, so wird er es schließlich bereuen; "ich steige zum Himmel empor", so hat er es gesagt, wird es aber nicht erfüllen'¹ ('Rabbi Abbahu [c. 300 CE] said: If a man should say to you, "I am God", he is lying; if he should say, "I am the Son of Man", he will repent it finally; if he should say, "I am rising to heaven", he may say it, but he will not fulfil it').

* This is a revised, annotated and somewhat expanded English version of my German symposium paper, 'Der Menschensohn und die Engel—Erwägungen zur Genese der Christologie im Zusammenhang der Eschatologie', read on 28 June 1995. This paper is based on a part of my 'Probevorlesung zur Habilitation', read on 3 December 1986, at Evangelisch-Theologische Fakultät der Ruhr-Universität Bochum.

1. Cf. H. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, I (Munich: Beck, 2nd edn, 1956), pp. 486, 959.

One recalls here the interpretation of the 'one like a man' of Dan. 7.13-14 in Judaism in the direction of the Messiah (cf. for example *Sanh.* 98a).² Indeed Christian exegesis knows that in the traditions of Judaism and early Christianity there was a connection between and a mixture of the 'Messiah' and the 'Son of Man' ideas. But mostly Christian exegesis starts with the so-called highness-titles of Jesus in Christology, first of all with the distinction between these two titles of majesty.

On the other hand it seems to be true that the conceptions of angels are in more agreement with or have more in common with legendary religious traditions. Angelic figures like Michael or Gabriel come to mind. One may remember the fact that the traditions about angels in the New Testament clearly build to a high degree upon biblical-Jewish traditions (for example, legendary historical traditions in Tobit and Luke-Acts). At the same time we may ask: What is the importance of eschatology here?

Secondly, I want to address more generally the problem of angelic Christology, especially in the context of eschatology. In Christology itself eschatology plays a basic role, of course. This is valid, as always here, for Christianity, even if eschatology has receded into the background or has been buried in the course of the history of the Church and of Christian theology.

On hearing the formulation of my thesis perhaps one would not expect at first that this subject 'the Son of Man and the angels' would lead you to the centre of the christological problem. Nevertheless one can get a different point of view by looking at the topic in more detail.

Here the passages of the Gospels in the New Testament are remarkable, where it is evident that ancient Jesus traditions have been taken up, where the Son of Man clearly is connected with the angels. This can be seen, for example, in Mk 8.38: 'If anyone is ashamed of me and my words in this wicked and godless age, the Son of Man will be ashamed of him, when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels'.³ Are the angels here only the attendants, the accessories of the Son of Man figure, who will come in the future? Or is the Son of Man himself here also an angel or a being like that of an angel?

2. Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, I, pp. 485-87 (esp. p. 486), 956-59.

3. Cf. *The New English Bible* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970, p. 54.

On the other hand, in this context the subject of angels, demons and so on has been a topic of theological discussion resulting in much controversy and using different paradigms up to this day, especially in the twentieth century. In Christian theology, for example, R. Bultmann and K. Barth took contrary positions here.

Bultmann criticized the belief in ghosts and demons in the New Testament, especially in the context of the so-called 'program of demythologization', for example in his paper 'Neues Testament und Mythologie' of the year 1948.⁴ For him mythological eschatology was out of date in this context. Then he tried, as you will remember, an anthropological and 'existential' interpretation. As Bultmann believed, Jesus stands together with his proclamation in the context of Judaism. So the proclamation of Jesus belongs to the presuppositions of a theology of the New Testament. On the contrary, Christology and theology of the New Testament have to start with the post-eastern 'kerygma'.⁵

In contrast to this, K. Barth had a positive attitude to the subject of angels, for instance, in his *Kirchliche Dogmatik*.⁶ Here eschatology

4. There he uttered: 'Erledigt ist durch die Kenntnis der Kräfte und Gesetze der Natur der Geister- und Dämonenglaube. . . Man kann nicht elektrisches Licht und Radioapparat benutzen, in Krankheitsfällen moderne medizinische und klinische Mittel in Anspruch nehmen und gleichzeitig an die Geister- und Wunderwelt des Neuen Testaments glauben' in *Kerygma und Mythos* (Hamburg: Herbert Reich-Evangelischer Verlag, 3rd edn, 1954), I, pp. 15-48, 17-18 (translation: 'The belief in ghosts and demons is out of date by the knowledge about the laws of nature. One cannot use electric power and radio, in cases of illness claim modern medical and clinical remedies and at the same time believe in the world of ghosts and wonders in the New Testament').

5. Cf. R. Bultmann, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Tübingen: Mohr, 4th edn, 1961), pp. 1-34, esp. pp. 1-2: 'Die Verkündigung Jesu gehört zu den Voraussetzungen der Theologie des NT und ist nicht ein Teil dieser selbst'.

6. See the section 'Die Lehre von der Schöpfung', in *KD*, III/3 (1950), §51. There he has the following thesis in §51 about 'Das Himmelreich, Gottes Botschafter und ihre Widersacher': 'Gottes Handeln in Jesus Christus und also seine Herrschaft über sein Geschöpf heißt darum das "Reich der Himmel" weil es zuerst und vor allem die obere Welt für sich in Anspruch nimmt. Aus ihr erwählt und entsendet Gott seine Botschafter, die Engel, die der Offenbarung und dem Geschehen seines Willens auf Erden als objektive und authentische Zeugen vorangehen, die es als treue und mächtige Diener Gottes und des Menschen begleiten, die den ihm widerstehenden Gestalten und Mächten des Chaos gegenüber überlegene Wache halten.' *KD*, III/3 (1950), p. 426. (Translation: 'God's acting on Jesus Christ and that means, his rule

plays an important role in the relation between the kingdom of God or kingdom of heaven and heaven, the upper world (cf. 'above' and 'below'—cf. also the consequences of the so-called 'dialectic theology' at the beginning of the twentieth century). As regards Christology, Barth tries to appreciate the so-called 'two-natures-christology' in the context of his approach with the theology of revelation and trinity. In this framework in the 'doctrine of reconciliation' Christology is also important, together with the Son of Man,⁷ so in *KD*, IV/2, §64.⁸

Generally one may observe that in the framework of modern reflections about christology in Christian exegesis and theology there arose a broad and somewhat controversial discussion—and this also in an eschatological context. I point to the following: since the turn of the centuries from the nineteenth to the twentieth century theology discovered again the importance of eschatology and especially apocalyptic. Relevant here is J. Weiss's book on Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God.⁹ From this point one may proceed to the well-known angelic Christology of the Swiss Protestant theologian M. Werner. In 1941, M. Werner, referring to A. Schweitzer, took the consistent-

over his creature is called "kingdom of the heavens", because it first of all occupies the upper world. From it God chooses and sends his messengers, the angels, which go in front of revelation and the fulfilment of his will as objective and authentic witnesses, who accompany it as true and powerful servants of God, who guard against opposite figures and powers of chaos with superior watch.)

7. Cf. here the relation of the Son of Man to man (human being).

8. Cf. K. Barth, 'Jesus Christus, der Herr als Knecht', in *KD*, IV/1 (1953), §§59–63, and 'Jesus Christus, der Knecht als Herr', in *KD* IV/2 (1955), §§64–68. §64, 'Die Erhöhung des Menschensohnes', has the thesis (4.2, p. 1): 'Jesus Christus, der Sohn Gottes und Herr, der sich zum Knecht erniedrigt, ist auch der als dieser Knecht zum Herrn erhöhte Menschensohn: der neue, der wahre, der königliche, weil am Sein und Leben, an der Herrschaft und Tat Gottes teilnehmende, ihn ehrende und bezeugende Mensch, der als solcher aller andern Menschen Haupt, Vertreter und Heiland ist, der Ursprung, der Inhalt und das Maß der uns im Werk des Heiligen Geistes gegebenen göttlichen Weisung' (translation: 'Jesus Christ, the Son of God and Lord, which made himself low as a servant, is also the Son of Man, who has been exalted as this servant to be Lord: the new, the true, the royal, because taking part at the being and life, at the rule and act of God, who honours Him and witnesses for Him, who as such is the head, representative and saviour of all other mankind, the origin, the content and the measure of the instruction given to us in the work of the Holy Spirit').

9. J. Weiß, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes* (ed. F. Hahn; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 3rd edn, 1964 [1892, 1900]).

eschatological conception of early Christianity together with the angelic Christology as the starting-point for describing the way to the construction of the dogma in the Old Church.¹⁰ In this context M. Werner described the apocalyptic Messiah—Son of Man of early Judaism (M. Werner: *Spätjudentum*) as a higher angelic being. As evidence he referred especially to passages of the so-called ‘Similitudes’ in *1 Enoch* (chs. 37–71). He meant, too, that in the Synoptic Gospels the Son of Man is taken as such an angelic being, as an angelic prince.¹¹

Certainly in New Testament exegesis an angelic interpretation of the Son of Man has receded for some time. But this has changed in the meantime. Here the development of the research on the book of Daniel played an important part. We also must point to the Dead Sea Scrolls, their significance and the results of Qumran research. All this can have its impact on the interpretation of the Jesus-traditions and Christology—as well in the context of eschatology.

At the end of this first section, I propose the fundamental theses, which are important for the statements that follow.

1. In my opinion especially angelic conceptions—side by side with and in connection with hypostasis ideas—are possibly at the root of the Son of Man problem in the Bible and early Judaism. But I think that in the pronouncement of Jesus and in the Christology of the early Church in the New Testament the Son of Man is no longer an angelic figure; he is a special dignified figure and in certain cases also the figure of a judge.

2. It seems to be important for the development of Christology in the context of the angelic question that Jesus understood himself as a messenger of God. The messenger conception is also especially appropriate in the context of the angelic idea. But Jesus understood himself as a special messenger of God—appearing in the endtime; eschatological; as the decisive prophetic messenger in the horizon of the coming kingdom of God and in the approaching of the Son of Man. The early Christians took up this mission idea as essential in their Christology. From then on they saw Jesus as the particular mediator to God. This could be in connection with the hypostasis idea—cf. the so-called

10. M. Werner, *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas* (Bern: Haupt, 2nd edn, 1954), abridged version (Urban-Bücher, 38; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1959 [1941]).

11. Cf. Werner, *Die Entstehung* (abridged version), pp. 75–76.

Sophia—and the Logos-Christology. The title Kyrios could replace the title Son of Man in the context of the conceptions and motifs of the traditional eschatological statements about the Son of Man and the parousia—cf. the Epistles of St Paul. Other motifs and titles of highness could be connected with this, such as the Son of David/Messiah concept.

All this must be shown more precisely. I put forward a premise regarding the terms 'eschatology' and 'apocalypics'.¹² I understand the terms 'eschatology' and 'eschatological' as denotations of a new salvation-event and salvation-act of God in opposition to something old, through a break¹³ and with the aim of a final, definitive salvation.¹⁴ Also in the history from the Old Testament prophets to Jewish apocalypics there is a growing intensification up to a dualistic *non plus ultra*. Here is a characteristic contrast between the two apocalyptic aeons. Nevertheless the exact definition of the phenomenon apocalypics remains contested.¹⁵ In the twentieth century, the Jewish and Christian perspective on the relation between apocalypics and eschatology has even been that eschatology is valued positively and apocalypics (or apocalypticism) negatively.¹⁶

2. Some Remarks on the Idea of Angels

At this point it is important to consider what is meant when we speak about angels in this context. The term 'angels' means something different today than it did for the biblical writer. This is true even if our ideas of angels are influenced or stamped by the biblical traditions

12. Cf. G. Nebe, '*Hoffnung*' bei Paulus: *Elpis und ihre Synonyme im Zusammenhang der Eschatologie* (SUNT, 16; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), pp. 18-19.

13. Cf. here also 'judgment' and 'calamity'. For this see the works of G. von Rad, E. Rohland, etc.

14. Cf. here the so-called 'eschaton' (which would appear in the future).

15. Cf. D. Hellholm (ed.), *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, 1979: Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1983), which provide no solution for this problem.

16. Cf. especially the relationship between apocalypics and eschatology with R. Bultmann, the contrast between prophecy and apocalypics with M. Buber, *Kampf um Israel* (Berlin: Schocken, 1933), pp. 61-63. Cf. for such problems Nebe, '*Hoffnung*', pp. 18, 219, n. 13.

in many regards. We cannot simply draw conclusions from the Old Testament alone, either, for example, from the so-called messenger of God (מַלְאֲכֵי יְהוָה) or the cherubim. The New Testament and its traditions are also rooted in the idea of angels that was common in early Judaism, the Judaism of the period between the Testaments. For this no doubt the Old Testament was important. But we must consider other essential influences beyond it which had their impact on Judaism, too. They go back to the ancient Near East and the syncretism of the Hellenistic–Roman era.¹⁷

Above all, three aspects are important for the following statements concerning the idea of angels:

1. Angels belong to the heavenly world. They belong to the heavenly court, to the scene around the divine throne. They can form a hierarchy.
2. Angels can be messengers of God or of the deity. The Greek term ἄγγελος (cf. Latin, *angelus*) shows this, too. They are sent out of heaven with a commission to people on earth.
3. Angels must be integrated into the broad context of so-called middle-beings and mediators. So far they can be a kind of ‘Sons of God’ or deities who are bereaved of their power. They can come into relation to the so-called hypostatical ideas, they can even participate in the processes of ‘hypostasis’-building. Especially for early Judaism in the ancient world we have to state such ‘hypostasis’ ideas.¹⁸

3. *The Motif- and Tradition-History of the Son of Man Problem in the Horizon of the Idea of Angels*

As is well known, the New Testament is important for the term ‘Son of Man’ (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) and for the idea of the ‘Son of Man’,

17. It is also well known that the Old Testament refers beyond itself at important points.

18. Here I add an explanatory note to the term ‘hypostasis’. This term, of course, is not necessarily loaded with the later contents of the Trinity-theology of the Old Church in this context. Here it corresponds to the Greek ὑπόστασις (‘basis, foundation, substance’, etc.); simply independent essences or substances as, for instance, Wisdom, Sophia, Logos. These no longer simply represent attributes or activities of God himself. Moreover they have already become independent as such essences or substances, but without leaving the area of the power of God or the relationship to God.

which is connected with this term. In the New Testament we find first the well-known Semitic and biblically-rooted usage of the 'Son of Man' simply as a single specimen of the kind 'human being'.¹⁹ But, secondly, the Son of Man can be used as a title to signify a special person of dignity.²⁰ Here the Son of Man does not simply mean 'I', although some scholars interpret the term 'Son of Man', even in its original sense, as a paraphrase for 'I'.²¹

In following this usage as a title—as in the following—it is recommendable to start with R. Bultmann, H.E. Tödt and other exegetes of the Synoptic tradition; which means beginning with Mark, Luke and Matthew, and their materials.²² Regarded statistically, the Synoptic tradition excels here for the usage of the term. Moreover, it is striking in this context that one deals with words of Jesus.²³ The starting point—following the line of R. Bultmann, H.E. Tödt and others—

19. Cf. Mk 3.28; Heb. 2.6.

20. This seems to refer anyhow to the 'one like a man' in Dan. 7.13, but drops the comparing 'like' of כְּבָר אִשָּׁה and involves the Aramaic status emphaticus, besides. For it seems now to be an important phrase like בְּרִי אִשָּׁה or בְּרִי נִשְׂאָה. Such an emphaticus- and genitive status constructus-composition then has been translated in the traditions, which underlie the sayings about the Son of Man in the Synoptic Gospels, by the Greek determined genitive composition ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Besides, such a term of majesty must be distinguished from the connotation and the usage which on the basis of the specific Greek language have accented later on in the Old Church merely the human aspect of Jesus in distinction from the divine aspect of the title 'Son of God'. Cf. *Ign. Eph.* 20.2 and partly the opposition in *The Treatise on the Resurrection: Nag Hammadi Codex I* 44.10-20, where however at the same time the celestial Man/Adam is soteriologically important.

21. Cf. G. Schwarz, *Jesus 'der Menschensohn': Aramaistische Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Menschensohnworten Jesu* (BWANT, 119; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1986). Besides, here the emphasis on the 'I' of Jesus is important, by distinction from a secondary changed interpretation, which is apocalyptic and ties to Dan. 7, with a wrong translation into the Greek ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου instead of ὁ ἄνθρωπος.

22. Cf. R. Bultmann, *Theologie*, pp. 30-32; H.E. Tödt, *Der Menschensohn in der synoptischen Überlieferung* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1959).

23. The New Testament as a whole brings about 85 passages. We find 70 of them in the Synoptic Gospels; considering the parallels there, only half of them remain for the matter itself. In the rest of the New Testament we find 12 passages in John, one passage in Acts (7.56), two passages in Rev. (1.13; 14.14). Cf. W. Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur* (ed. K. and B. Aland; Berlin: de Gruyter, 6th edn, 1988), col. 1665, and Schwarz, *Jesus*, pp. 11-13.

is with the words that describe the future activity of the Son of Man, if one wants to go back to the proclamation of the historical Jesus. This brings us to passages like Mk 8.38, which I quoted above. That means, the passages in the Gospels that deal with the Son of Man on earth or the suffering and rising Son of Man have to give way to for the history of tradition here.²⁴ In particular, the passages that speak about the future working of the Son of Man show allusions to Daniel 7. Only in this group of Son of Man sayings we can observe angels—not in the other groups. Therefore only the words about the future activity of the Son of Man remain, if the idea of the Son of Man and the angels is traced back to the history of traditions and motifs, that is, eschatological traditions and motifs.

Starting here it seems to me—as Bultmann, Tödt and other scholars have advocated—that one can find the way back to the proclamation of the historical Jesus through passages like Mk 8.38 and Lk. 12.8-9. For in such words, it still shines through that Jesus has conceived of the Son of Man as a person of dignity who is coming as an eschatological figure in the future, in the endtime; that Jesus has clearly distinguished between himself and this Son of Man; that he nevertheless saw a soteriological relation between himself and the Son of Man: 'As anybody behaves to me, so the coming Son of Man will behave to him in the future'.

There are many reasons for suggesting that Jesus in his message of the coming Son of Man could refer to or has referred to the proclamation of John the Baptist about the coming 'baptist with fire' or the coming 'mightier one'. But this is not sufficient as regards the history of tradition—especially as the term 'Son of Man' does not play an important role in the passages about John the Baptist. Angels are missing there, too. Therefore we must go back further on in the direction of early Judaism and the Bible (Old Testament). This is also important in attempting to explain why, in the sayings about the coming Son of Man or the returning Jesus as Son of Man, Kyrios, and so on, so much has been retained about angels, 'holy ones' and heavenly beings, constantly mentioned again in an eschatological-apocalyptic context.²⁵

24. Cf. the description of the three types of Son of Man sayings here in Bultmann, *Theologie*; Tödt, *Menschensohn*.

25. This also comes to an example in the 'Similitudes' of *I En.* in 46.1: 'There I saw the one with an aged head, and his head was white like wool. With him was

In tracing such questions more exactly, in my opinion, out of the great number of motif-historical or tradition-historical attempts at solving the Son of Man problem in the special angelic direction, two basic statements stand out.²⁶ One of them interprets on a broader basis the context of the so-called hypostasis theories. The other begins in the context of the ideas of angels themselves.

The sources and layers of traditions that are important for going back into the history of traditions and motifs are, in particular, the following: passages of Ezekiel, Daniel 7, 4 Ezra 13, 1 Enoch 37–71 (the so-called ‘Similitudes’ of 1 Enoch), the Synoptic tradition.

The book of Daniel originates from the time of the raising of the Maccabees before the middle of the second century BCE. Here especially Daniel 7 and an angelic interpretation of this passage is important. As is well known, the seer describes in Dan. 7.1–15 a vision that is followed by an interpretation in 7.16–28. This vision sees four huge beasts coming up out of the sea, one after another, each one different from the others (like a lion, a bear, a leopard, a fourth beast, dreadful and grisly, exceedingly strong). Then a heavenly court-scene follows, in which thrones are set in place, one Ancient of Days takes his seat, thousands upon thousands serve him, myriads upon myriads attend his presence, the dominion of the four beasts is brought to an end. Finally ‘one like a man’ appears with the clouds of heaven. Dominion and glory and kingship are given to him by the Ancient of Days. Daniel 7 does not simply say ‘Man’ or ‘Son of Man’, but connects it with ‘like a’.²⁷ It is peculiar that the ‘one like a man’ in the following interpretation of the vision is explained collectively as ‘the saints’ or ‘the saints of the Most High’ or ‘the people of the saints of the Most High’ (cf. 7.21–22, 25, 27). How shall we understand all this? Scholars have thought and written very much on this.

another, the face of whom was like the appearance of a man, and his face was full of grace like one of the holy angels’ (cf. the German translation of G. Beer, in E. Kautzsch (ed.), *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments* (T.2; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1962 [1900]), II, p. 262. Werner, ‘Die Entstehung’, had already referred to such passages, when he described the angelic Christology mentioned above.

26. Cf. also, J. Theissen, *Der Auserwählte Richter* (SUNT, 12; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), p. 4.

27. Cf. the ‘one like a man’ in Dan. 7.13 (Aram. כְּבָר אִנָּשׁ, LXX ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου).

In the history of research, so for example by U.B. Müller,²⁸ 'the saints of the Most High' have been interpreted in the vision as the eschatological Israel. Corresponding to this the 'one like a man' in the vision has been understood in the context of the idea of the so-called 'people-angel-prince/people-archon', as we meet with later in Daniel (cf. Dan. 10–12: Gabriel and Michael). The 'one like a man' then must be conceived as an angelic figure, as a figure representing or equivalent to the people of Israel.²⁹ This is for Müller the view of the final Maccabean author of the book of Daniel. Here in the opinion of Müller Daniel 7 does not yet belong to the conception of the Son of Man in a strict sense but to the prehistory of it. Just the interpretation of the later apocalyptic writers has according to Müller created the eschatological Son of Man as an individual figure of a judge.

Besides the idea of the so-called 'archon of the peoples', which at the same time brings in the idea of the so-called 'protecting angel' and 'watchman-angel', recent research takes into consideration some other angelic conceptions for the interpretation of the 'one like a man' in Daniel 7. Thus for example the 'one like a man' has been even directly identified with Gabriel³⁰ or Michael.³¹

Other angels then can come into sight by the the vision of Daniel 7 in the context of the many heavenly beings around the throne of the Ancient of Days.

All such interpretations start with a specific given idea of angels. For the other type of interpretation which orients itself more broadly on conceptions of hypostasis, the book of Ezekiel has played an

28. U.B. Müller, *Messias und Menschensohn in jüdischen Apokalypsen und in der Offenbarung des Johannes* (Studien zum NT, 6; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1972), esp. pp. 19-36, 217.

29. Especially in the conception of the 'Völkerarchonten' according to Müller we find the idea of the correspondence between the earthly and the celestial. Such an 'archon' there is an angel who is especially distinguished in the heavenly council of God. We see this already in the Dead Sea Scrolls (1QM XVII.7-8): '... He will exalt the service of Michael above all the gods and the dominion of Israel over all flesh. . . ' (F.G. Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated* [trans. W.G.E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 1994], p. 112), which Müller also takes up (cf. *Messias*, p. 28).

30. Cf., for example, Z. Zevit, 'The Exegetical Implications of Daniel VIII 1, IX 21', *VT* 28 (1978), pp. 488-92.

31. Cf., for example, J.J. Collins, 'The Son of Man and the Saints of the Most High in the Book of Daniel', *JBL* 93 (1974,) pp. 50-66.

important role. As is well known, in the book of Ezekiel not only is this exilic prophet Ezekiel of the sixth century BCE addressed by God as 'man' ('son of Man'; BHS: בן אדם, LXX: ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου) strikingly often. But we also find remarkable descriptions of visions on the way to apocalypics in Ezekiel. The prophet sees in Ezekiel 1–3, 8–11 and 43 the glory of God being enthroned in Mesopotamia or in Jerusalem. At the throne we see four wheels and four cherubim. In the visions of Ezekiel 8–11, 40–48 we are told of other heavenly, humanlike beings. Here a writing angel and a guiding and measuring person appear on the scene.

At this point especially H.R. Balz started his approach.³² According to Balz we find among the finally mentioned persons a person of human, priestly–messianic features. This person and the glory of Jahwe as a kind of hypostasis induced the author of the vision in Dan 7.1–14 to the important stage on the way to the idea of the Son of Man, as Balz suggests, and so it came to pass that this author 'aus der in menschlichen Zügen geschilderten Herrlichkeit Gottes und ihrem Mandatar, dem himmlischen Stellvertreter, in visionärer Bildsprache zwei himmlische Herrlichkeitswesen gebildet hat, den Hochbetagten auf den göttlichen Thronen und den Menschenähnlichen mit den. . . Wolken' ('formed out of the holiness of God, described with human features and its mandatar, the heavenly representative, in visionary pictorial language two celestial glorious beings, the "Ancient of Days" on the divine throne and the "One like a Man" with the clouds').³³ Therefore the description has condensed to a standing apocalyptic motif with a figurative aspect.³⁴

But against what background can the New Testament and especially the synoptic results and traditions be arranged more exactly in their genesis? Moreover, how did the angels come to function as attendants and as a heavenly background?

To begin with, it seems evident that the conception of the Son of

32. H.R. Balz, *Methodische Probleme der neutestamentlichen Christologie* (WMANT, 25; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967), esp. pp. 61–68.

33. Balz, *Methodische Probleme*, p. 94.

34. Balz can also say about this development: 'Die Gestalt des endzeitlichen Menschen ist ein hypostasierter und ins Bildhafte gewandter Ausdruck für das endzeitliche Handeln Gottes selbst.' ('The figure of eschatological man is a hypostatized term, turned to a pictorial expression, for the eschatological acting of God himself') (*Methodische Probleme*, p. 111).

Man as a special, individual, endtime—eschatological person of dignity, as we find it also in the New Testament has somehow been developed out of Daniel 7; the book of Ezekiel can be important for the development only indirectly and not more than as a first step to the book of Daniel.³⁵ Here the statements about the ‘one like a man’ were hardly understood in the sense of the collective interpretation in Dan. 7.16–28. Rather they have gone further back to the vision itself. With regard to Daniel, angels play an important part as the heavenly throne scenery. The book of Ezekiel clears up the wider context of the process of a hypostatical development. Moreover, the book of Ezekiel gives a rendering that portrays important heavenly mandataries of God. It is also remarkable for its tension between dignity and humility in the context of the conception of the Son of Man.

But the development of the idea of the Son of Man can hardly be explained alone by the fixpoints like the book of Daniel and eventually the book of Ezekiel, in view of the history of traditions. It is also impossible to derive this idea in the context of the conceptions of angels and/or hypostasis. For it is evident that we must begin even further back in the history of religion. Truly, in the context of the sources and layers of tradition the attestation by the book of *4 Ezra* in *4 Ezra* 13 is not earlier than after 70 CE, and the age of origin of the so-called ‘Similitudes’ of *1 Enoch* (*1 En.* 37–71) is contested.³⁶ Still these other layers of tradition and sources in early Judaism also point to older traditions. They show the figure of the Son of Man as an apocalyptic dignified person and specifically as a judge. But at the same time—obviously secondarily—other ideas are connected with it, too. This is, in the case of *4 Ezra* 13 especially, the idea of a national Messiah. But angels do not play an important role here. In the case of the ‘Similitudes’ of *1 Enoch* the ideas of the Messiah, the Elected One and the Servant of God, the angel, and the idea of the exaltation (of Enoch) as Son of Man are remarkable. Here at the same time we generally meet with a rich angelology.

If we begin further back in the history of religion the symbolic description of the beasts coming up out of the sea, furthermore the figure of the Ancient of Days and the ‘one like a man’ in Daniel 7 lead

35. But also see later on Rev. 1.7 and 12–20; 14.14–20.

36. Thus, these ‘Similitudes’ are missing in the Enoch traditions of the Dead Sea Scrolls, as is well known. Cf. on the interpretation of the so-called ‘Similitudes of Enoch’ (*1 En.*) in J. Theisohn, *Richter*.

back to very old and widespread, partly mythological ideas and motifs of the ancient world. Thus, for example, especially in connection with the Ancient of Days and the coming of the 'one like a man' we need to consider a relation to old titles of the deities El and Ba'al (Hadaṭ) which are attested in Canaan, especially in Ugarit. In a broader religious-historical context we have to return to the idea of a Pantheon comprising the Father of the Gods and other heavenly beings, especially that of an eminent divine individual or mediator who has a special charge, like a vezir. Finally we should also attend to the idea in Daniel 7 of the primeval man, appearing there in an eschatological context.³⁷

But in biblical (Old Testament/Jewish) monotheism—the background for the thinking in the books of Daniel and earlier Ezekiel—another deity like Ba'al cannot play a part beside God. Here only an angel, hypostasis or, generally, a mediator can have a place. And we have to notice that the description in Daniel 7 does not allow one to interpret the passages about the 'one like a man' definitely as an angel like Gabriel, Michael, etc. The idea of a hypostasis recedes here as well: The 'one like a man' appears to be a sovereign being *sui generis*. Besides, in Daniel 7 we should also pay attention to the symbolism in the frame of the relations between God, heavenly beings, humankind, and the people of Israel.

In any case, in my opinion, somewhere on the way from the book of Daniel to John the Baptist and Jesus, the traditions about the Baptist and Jesus, 4 Ezra 13, the 'Similitudes' of 1 Enoch, the 'one like a man' has been included and has been understood in a condensed way as a special eschatological sovereign being, perhaps without a Son of Man terminology, but probably with such a terminology. The Synoptic Jesus-tradition about the Son of Man itself does not show a special angelic colouring any more. In this Jesus-tradition we only meet with angels as attendants, mandataries, heavenly scenery. In the Christology of the Early Community and the Old Church Jesus appears in the context of the second coming as placed over the angels or even the archangels.

But how do we understand more exactly passages like Mk 8.38 in the context of the development of Christology in the Early Community and the Old Church?

37. Cf. on such problems in the history of religion and tradition for instance C. Colpe, 'ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου', *TWNT*, VIII, pp. 403-81, esp. pp. 408-33.

4. Exegesis of Mark 8.38, Luke 12.8-9 and their Parallels

As an example of exegesis in the New Testament I start with the passages Mk 8.38, Lk. 12.8-9 and their parallels. A quotation of parallel material is clearly noticeable here. This leads us in the context of the so-called Two Sources theory to the Mark- and Q-line of tradition (Mk 8.38//Lk. 9.26//Mt. 16.27 and Lk. 12.8-9//Mt. 10.32-33).

First of all we start with some statements about the relation of tradition and redaction in a general way. Mark 8.38 is situated in the instruction of the disciples of Jesus and the combination of sayings in Mk 8.34-9.1 which follows the confession of St Peter and the annexed first announcement of Jesus' suffering and resurrection (Mk 8.27-30 and 31-33). In this context, the saying about the Son of Man is located in the larger section of Mark that follows the confession of St Peter which is determined by the disciples' following on the way of suffering and the way to the cross.³⁸ To this Mark adds a saying of close expectation. At the same time the kingdom of God is important here. Therefore we find side by side sayings about the Son of Man coming in the future and about the Kingdom.³⁹ Matthew and Luke on principle keep this placement of the material in their arrangements, even where they change the contents.

The Q traditions Lk. 12.8-9, 11//Mt. 10.32-33, were already in Q a part of the Q block Lk. 12.2-9//Mt. 10.26-33, as the closing of a combination of sayings. It deals with the themes: Covering the uncovered, absence of fear, and confession. The evangelists fitted in the material in different ways. Luke placed it in the first chapters of his so-called travel-report.⁴⁰ Matthew placed it in one of his great speech-com-

38. Cf. H.-W. Kuhn, *Ältere Sammlungen im Markusevangelium* (SUNT, 8; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), p. 221. Immediately before this passage we find the sayings about gaining and losing the 'self' ('soul'). In this context the phrase 'for my sake and for the sake of the Gospel' in 8.35 is remarkable as well.

39. For that reason we find here the problem of side by side sayings and not the mixture of sayings about the Kingdom and the Son of Man in the history of tradition, which P. Vielhauer particularly pointed out; cf. P. Vielhauer, *Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu* (Festschrift G. Dehn, 1957), in *Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament* (TBü, 31; Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1965), pp. 55-91.

40. In Lk. 12.10 the mention of the Son of Man is again remarkable (cf. the slander of the Son of Man and the Holy Spirit). Is the Son of Man there the earthly one (cf. the Holy Spirit), so that we find two types of Son of Man sayings side by side here?

positions, namely the speech to the disciples in Matthew 10. Where this tradition was located in Q is not easy to answer, in view of the literary-critical and redactional-historical problems of this source.⁴¹

As regards the question of the kind of material at the single stages of tradition back to the historical Jesus, I would like to start like other scholars with the Q tradition.⁴² There is a scholarly accord that the Q version originally underlies Mk 8.38.⁴³ Form-critically the Q tradition brings a combination of two sayings, in an antithetic parallelism, as a conditional sentence in Lk. 12.8, introduced by the formula λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν. All of these four formal characteristics can be old. It is a logical progression to trace back through them to the historical Jesus himself.

When we look at the Q tradition Lk. 12.8-9, it is evident that Luke has kept the older form, if we discern between the 'I of Jesus' and the Son of Man, and when it is said 'before the angels of God' instead of 'before my Father in heaven', and when it is introduced by 'I tell you this'. In Matthew it appears that the 'I tell you this'-formula has been pushed back in the combination of sayings, that there is a christologically later and more developed formulation.

On the basis of the presumably more original form of Luke and in combination with the obvious parallels in Matthew, the older form of Lk. 12.8 and its parallels can be reconstructed in the following way:

[But] I tell you this: Everyone who acknowledges me before men, the Son of Man will [also] acknowledge [him] before the angels of God.⁴⁴

Since the fluent parallel structure of Mt. 10.33 compared to 10.32 is

41. If we start with the list of Q traditions given by W.G. Kümmel (cf. W.G. Kümmel, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* [Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 21st edn, 1983], p. 39), we notice that the combination of sayings in Lk. 12.2-9 and its parallels did not stand at the beginning or at the end of Q, but rather in the middle of this source (cf. Kümmel, *Einleitung*, p. 39, Lk. no.17, Mt. no.12, within Q nos. 1-23).

42. Cf. on Q, S. Schulz, *Q: Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972), pp. 66-76.

43. Cf., for example, Schulz, *Q: Die Spruchquelle*, pp. 66-67. The reasons I wish to adduce for the secondary character of Mk 8.38 are above all: 1. the additional 'my words'; 2. the apocalyptic extension, partly in the special relation to Dan. 7 and to the dualism of the aeons: The coming of the Son of Man 'in the glory of his Father and of the holy angels', the addition of 'in this wicked and godless age', replacing 'before man'; 3. the abridgment to the negative side in the context of the theme 'following on the way of the Passion' and in connection with the very negative aspects of the sayings before.

44. Here I do not quote this saying in Greek or Aramaic form.

conspicuous, and in contrast to this, Lk. 12.9 does not appear as fluent compared with 12.8, we here again have to argue starting from Luke and the identical formulations in Matthew. But the passive formulation 'will be disowned'—obviously a *passivum divinum* expression—cannot be attached definitely: is God or the Son of Man at work here? But perhaps the passive is secondary here.⁴⁵ So we arrive at an older form of Lk. 12.9 and parallels with the following formulation:

[But] He who disowns me before men, the Son of Man will disown him or he will be disowned⁴⁶ before the angels of God.⁴⁷

This can lead to the very old Jesus tradition, in which it becomes clear that Jesus has conceived the Son of Man as an eschatological or dignified and sovereign figure, to arrive in the future, that he has emphasized a relation between himself and the Son of Man in the following soteriological way: Like anybody behaves to me, so the coming Son of Man will behave to him in the time of his coming. This conforms exactly to the self-understanding of Jesus as a prophetic messenger and emissary in the horizon of the Son of Man to appear in the future.

Whether Jesus developed this into the positive and the negative aspect and into the parallelism, and if so, how, is the question. It is connected not least with the problem of what kind of working is attributed to the Son of Man who is to appear in the future. The similarity to the heavenly throne- and court-scene of Daniel 7 is striking. Has Jesus deliberately formed connections to this passage, but without an apocalyptic display? It might very well be possible. In the event, the angels here become a part of the heavenly throne- and court-scene, forming a corresponding heavenly forum.⁴⁸ By all accounts in this tradition of sayings, the Son of Man as a figure of dignity appears as a person who makes a contribution to the condemnation in

45. Cf. Schulz, *Q: Die Spruchquelle*, pp. 68-69, on avoiding a collision with Lk. 12.10.

46. The so-called *passivum divinum*.

47. Here I also do not quote the form of this saying in the stage of the Greek or Aramaic language.

48. Perhaps the angels are adduced here to avoid the name of God, paraphrasing 'before God' in this way, but also in order to move the middle-beings including the Son of Man into the foreground in the place of God. The use of the passive instead of mentioning the working of the Son of Man could also lead us to believe that this is just a stylistic variation.

the last judgment, but who also intercedes in a positive way.

So I have tried to go back historically. But now it is necessary to move in the opposite direction and to look forward to the reception of these Son of Man/angels statements in early Christianity in the context of the development of Christology. Some references to the kinds of development follow here. During these kinds of development the following could happen:

1. *Jesus was equated with the Son of Man after Easter.* A so-called implicit Christology of Jesus himself now grew to a so-called explicit Christology.⁴⁹

2. *It has been deliberately apocalyptically extended.* This took place in reference to Daniel 7 and other traditions, as Mk 8.38 shows. The Son of Man himself then also could become the judge who took place on the court-throne. This is clearly witnessed by the 'Similitudes' of *1 Enoch* (cf., for example, 69.26-29). The book of Matthew, in particular, points to this, as is shown by Mt. 19.28; 25.31-32 or 13.41-42; and 16.27-28.

3. *The angelology was built in and extended further.* But on the other hand it is difficult to find passages about the Son of Man to arrive in the future, the Kyrios, and so on—formulations which do not relate to angels.⁵⁰ Here it appears that Jesus could move soteriologically to the centre and very much into the foreground. If angels are mentioned, one can note the following important perspectives.

First, the future, eschatological coming of the Son of Man together with the angels is mentioned. We cannot directly exemplify it by the traditions of the books of Ezekiel, Daniel, *4 Ezra* or the 'Similitudes' of *1 Enoch*, which I mentioned above. But it may have been added in connection with further aspects of the angelology of early Judaism.

Secondly, the Son of Man appearing in the future, or the Son of Man who is sitting on the throne and judges, collects the Diaspora or the elected ones. He separates between people and may send out angels to this purpose. This we find in the so-called Synoptic Apocalypse of Mk 13.26-27//Mt. 24.31, and further in this direction in Mt. 13.41-43;

49. This identification is valid even in the way in which it distinguishes between the Son of Man and Jesus at the level of expression. But this distinction could also have been removed deliberately, as it shows the fact that the Q material is adduced in Mt. 10.32-33. Here Jesus and his heavenly Father (cf. the reference to the Lord's Prayer) are at the forefront and also to the debit of the angels.

50. Cf. also the so-called Q-apocalypse in Lk. 17.22-37 (par.).

25.31-46. We cannot use Daniel 7; 4 *Ezra* 13 that angels are sent out for this purpose. We only find weak proofs in the 'Similitudes' of *1 Enoch*. But one can understand this development more generally in the framework of the angelology of the Bible (Old Testament) and early Judaism.⁵¹ Yet the collection of the Diaspora is witnessed especially by the Messiah/Son of Man in 4 *Ezra* 13 and then by passages in the 'Similitudes' of *1 Enoch* as well.

These items may be sufficient. They clearly show which kinds of development have been possible in the context of Christology, in connection with the Son of Man coming in the future and with the angels, as well as in connection with apocalypics and eschatology. This line of inquiry concerns the Synoptic tradition about the Son of Man, but it can be traced to additional New Testament parousia passages and to the other kinds of christological development in the Synoptic Gospels and the other New Testament writings as well. Here an explicit Christology was expanded more and more, together with a development of further types of Son of Man passages, in connection with further christological titles and functions. At the same time, the idea of the Messiah (davidic Messiah!) became important as well.⁵² Ideas of hypostasis could have become important then, too (cf. the Logos-Christology in the Gospel of John).

5. *Résumé and Prospect*

If we look at the books of Ezekiel and Daniel or at the 'Similitudes' of *1 Enoch*, it is possible that at the roots of the idea of the Son of Man or in the early use of the term Son of Man, angelology may have been important in the picture of the Son of Man himself. Certainly this is not comparable to later uses of the term and idea, if we look at the Son of Man as a figure of dignity and sovereignty and also as a figure of a judge in the proclamation of Jesus. Here in the titular Son of

51. Cf. the biblical (Old Testament)/Jewish conceptions about God's acting by mandataries, sending out messengers and angels, as we already find it in Ezekiel or later also in the 'Similitudes' of *1 Enoch* as well?

52. For this too we already see presuppositions or at least analogies in traditions of early Judaism about the Son of Man, if we look at the Son of Man-Messiah in 4 *Ezra* 13 or the Son of Man in connection with the ideas of the Elect one and the Servant (of God), of the angel in the 'Similitudes' of *1 Enoch*. Cf. the relation between the conceptions of Messiah and Son of Man in U.B. Müller, *Messias*.

Man-sayings of the Synoptic Jesus-tradition, the Son of Man already is exalted above the angels; we have to distinguish him from them. Nevertheless the angels played an important part as heavenly scenery and attendants in the old Jesus-traditions. All the more after Easter in the New Testament Jesus is placed above the angels in the further eschatological–apocalyptic and cosmical contexts, in connection with a richness of conceptions about angels in the development of the Christology and angelology.⁵³

Consequently, in the New Testament, Jesus himself is never called ἄγγελος, ‘angel’. Nevertheless it must be reckoned with that at the appearance of the historical Jesus, he (Jesus) understood himself as a kind of messenger, a kind of prophetic messenger, even as *the* decisive messenger of God, who has been sent in the horizon of the eschatological and closing Kingdom of God and in the horizon of the Son of Man’s appearance in the future, rooted in apocalypics. Here what is called in research an implicit or indirect Christology becomes important. After Easter, early Christianity developed this in the form of many christological titles, conceptions, and motifs. This leads then to the so-called explicit or direct Christology—with an identification of Jesus with the Son of Man and finally also with the reference of the idea of the Messiah to this series of conceptions.

At the same time, this introduces the idea of the mediator/middle-figure, which first of all has been handed down to Jesus and early Christianity especially by the Holy Scriptures (Old Testament) and early Judaism. The angels belong to this topic, as well, on essential points. Together, one may refer to the idea of hypostasis in this context.

If we consider all this, especially if we take into consideration the whole block of problematic relations, such as the Son of Man and the angels, and the proclamation of Jesus and Christology, this brings in the relation of the aspects of messenger and mediation. At the same time, this must be seen under the auspices of soteriology and its orientation on eschatology. Even this must be considered further in Christian exegesis and theology as well, in the context of contrary positions such as the ones of R. Bultmann and K. Barth, quoted at the beginning of this paper. I am reminded here of the so-called ‘program of demythologization’ and the so-called ‘anthropological–existential interpretation’ of Bultmann; Barth’s paradigm of Trinity theology in

53. See, for example, Heb. 1–2.

connection with the theology of revelation and the Christology of two natures. This is to say we must trace under soteriological aspects the mediation which is necessary between God and humanity in the world or creation. On the basis of the whole Bible we can say that we do not have a direct approach to God without mediation. Looking at the Bible we have to learn from the old prophets that to clear up things needs an eschatological 'new', a final, definitive new beginning. This eschatological 'new' is based on God's mighty and gracious acts, which are bestowed on us. By the so-called dualism of aeons apocalypics can indicate how sharply 'old' and 'new' can diverge. At the same time apocalypics can show that the eschatological definitive clearance does not happen without a definitive, final judgment. Apocalypics can also possibly show the need for a special figure of mediation and a special messenger acting on behalf of God. Obviously it is necessary to think of all this in order that God comes to his own right again.

If it is necessary to proclaim such extensive and comprehensive things as a messenger and to mediate them as a mediator, then at the end it needs, I suppose, a figure who is not a simple angel, a simple angel out of the crowd of angels, but one who is more than an angel. In any case, this is the message of the Gospel that Christians find handed down by their Bible in considering the significance of Jesus.

Finally, in this context one may investigate the problem of the dignity and humility of the 'Son of Man', asking for the foundations of Christology. For this question concerns the tension that results from the fact that in the Synoptic Gospels, very different sayings about the Son of Man or types of Son of Man passages are placed together. This tension obviously results as well when the 'eschatological' has already searched for and found its place in time and history.

ESCHATOLOGICAL MOTIVES IN QUMRAN LITERATURE: THE MESSIANIC CONCEPT*

Bilhah Nitzan

I

The eschatological concept in Qumran literature was based upon the biblical tradition. Nevertheless, the apocalyptic philosophy of the *Yahad* community directed this tradition towards particular aspects thereof, both theoretical and practical. Its particular outlook encompassed many areas, both earthly and heavenly—the annihilation of wickedness, the restoration of the leadership of Israel, the Sanctuary, the political situation, and others—which were tied in one way or another with the community's messianic concept.

Since the publication of the scrolls from the first Qumran cave and the identification of the *Damascus Covenant* found in the Cairo Genizah as one of its books (= CD), many aspects of the messianic conception of the *Yahad* community have been studied. Nevertheless, new data pertaining to the messianic idea found in some recently published texts from Qumran shed light not only upon the community's approach, but also upon that of the broader Essene movement.¹

* For titles, signs and *editio princeps* of the texts from Qumran, see S.A. Reed, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Catalogue* (SBLRBS, 32; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994). The conventions used in the cited references to the Hebrew text are the following: Specific passages within the scrolls are identified by scroll title or number, followed by fragment numbers (where relevant) in Arabic numerals, and/or column number in lower-case Roman numerals. Arabic numerals indicate line or lines. Thus, 4QFl 1-2 i 11 corresponds to the document titled Fl (= Florilegium) from cave 4, fragment 1-2, column i, line 11.

1. See F. García Martínez, 'Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis', *Folia Orientalia* 25 (1988), pp. 113-136; F. García Martínez and A.S. van der Woude, 'A "Groningen" Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History', *RevQ* 14.56 (1990), pp. 521-42; H. Stegemann, 'The Qumran Essenes—Local Members of the Main Jewish Union in Late Second Temple Times', *The Madrid*

Thus, the known messianic tradition of the *Yahad* community may be dealt with from a wider aspect, to which this article will allude.

II

A central idea in the thought of the apocalyptic writings of the Second Temple period, and of the *Yahad* community of Qumran, is the belief in an eschatological upheaval that will give rise to eternal change in long standing history.² This upheaval is both cosmological and earthly. In the Qumran writings, one only finds a brief portrayal of the cosmological upheaval, in the *Thanksgiving Scroll* (1QH^a iii).³ Yet this belief is reflected in the expectations of the consequences of this upheaval in which 'the breed of iniquity is shut up, wickedness shall then be banished by righteousness as darkness is banished from the light. . . knowledge shall fill the world and folly shall exist no longer' (*The Book of Mysteries*, 1Q27 i 5-8).⁴ Similarly, 'the upright will understand knowledge of the Most High, and the wisdom of the sons of heaven will teach those of perfect behaviour. . . there will be no more injustice and all the deeds of trickery will be dishonor' (*The Rule of the Community*, 1QS iv 22-23).⁵ The cosmological view reflected

Qumran Congress (eds. J. Trebolle Barrera and L.V. Montaner; STDJ, 11; Leiden: Brill, 1992), I, pp. 83-166.

2. For example: *1 Enoch* 1 (= 4QEn^c 1 i 15-18); 10.11-21 (= 4QEn^b 1 iv 8-11; 4QEn^c 1 v 1-9); 91.7-11 + 12-17 (91.10 = 4QEn^g 1 ii 13-15; 91.11 + 12-17 = 4QEn^g 1 iv 14-26); 108; *T. Levi* 18; *2 Bar.* 70-74. For the text of 4QEnoch, see J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976).

3. Whereas in the biblical prophecy such an idea may be considered metaphorical (cf. Isa. 65.17; 66.22), in apocalyptic writings the boundaries between metaphor and reality are deliberately obscure. See I. Gruenwald, 'From Dawn to Dusk: Towards the Image of Eschatology and Messianism in Judaism' [Heb.], in *Ha-Ra'ayon ha-Meshihi be-Yisra'el* (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1982), pp. 18-36.

4. D. Barthelemy and J.T. Milik, *Qumran Cave I* (DJD, 1; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), pp. 103-105. Translated by G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 3rd edn, 1987), p. 239. For its apocalyptic outlook, see D. Flusser, 'The Reflection of Jewish Messianic Belief in Early Christianity' [Heb.], in Z. Baras (ed.), *Meshihiyut ve-Eskhatologyah* (Jerusalem: Shazar Center, 1983), p. 130.

5. Translated by F. García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), p. 7. According to the specific

in some of these statements is of a communion between men and angels in the eschatological era. Such a communion is likewise apparent in those Qumran writings concerning the eschatological war against wickedness, which is waged simultaneously in both heaven and earth by the angelic hosts and human forces,⁶ and in its messianic concept, as I shall show in the final part of this paper.

Nevertheless, the writings concerning the messianic figures are sometimes vague. Some texts deal with an angelic figure, such as Melchizedek or the Son of Man,⁷ while others deal with human beings, as I shall detail below. Moreover, it has been recognized for some time that certain Qumran texts mention no Messiah, some presumably mention one Messiah, while others speak of two Messiahs. Jean Starcky attempted to deal with this variegated material by arranging the Qumran texts dealing with messianism in as definite a chronological sequence as possible. He accordingly reached certain conclusions regarding the chronological development of the Qumran messianic concept.⁸ However, Starcky's understanding of the texts

sectarian outlook of this idea, the upright are identified with 'those selected by God for an everlasting covenant. . . to them shall belong all the glory of Adam' (1QS iv 22c; cf. CD iii 12-20).

6. 1QM vii 6; xii 1-8; xiii 10; xvii 6-7; 4Q402 4 7-10; *Serek ha-Milhamah* (= 4Q285 1, 9; 10 3-4; 11QBer 1-2 13-14); 1QSa ii 8-9. See J.T. Milik, 'Milkî-sedeq et Milkî-resa' dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens', *JJS* 23 (1972), pp. 95-144 (at 140-144). For 11QBer, see A.S. van der Woude, 'Ein neuer Segensspruch aus Qumran (11QBer)', in H.S. Wagner (ed.), *Bibel und Qumran* (Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1968), pp. 252-58; B. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (STDJ, 12; Leiden: Brill, 1994), pp. 167-70; and see below, n. 58.

7. 11QMelch; 4Q246. See below, section III b.

8. 'Les quatre étapes du messianisme à Qumran', *RB* 70 (1963), pp. 481-505. For an English summary, see J.A. Fitzmyer, 'The Aramaic "Elect of God" Text from Qumran Cave IV', *CBQ* 27 (1965), pp. 348-72. Starcky distinguishes four separate stages in the Messianism of Qumran (1) In the early texts written in the first Hasmonian period, during the life of the Teacher of Righteousness, no titles were attributed to the messianic figure (p. 487; Fitzmyer, 'Aramaic "Elect of God" Text', p. 351). (2) During the latter Hasmonian period, there developed a messianic expectation for 'a prophet and Messiahs of Aaron and Israel' (1QS ix 11) (p. 492; Fitzmyer, 'Aramaic "Elect of God" Text', pp. 351-52). (3) During the Pompeian period (63-37 BCE), the eschatological prophet was identified with the eschatological 'searcher of the Law' (CD vii 18), and the functions of the two Messiahs merging into a single priestly figure, 'the Messiah of Aaron and Israel' (CD xix 10-11; xx 1; xii 23; xiv 19 (= 4QD^b 18 iii 12; D^f 13 2) (p. 498; Fitzmyer, 'Aramaic "Elect of God"

themselves has sometimes been criticized as inaccurate, and has been refuted on some points.⁹ Moreover, in light of some recently published data and texts, a reconsideration of the messianic concept of Qumran seems to be in order.

The full-blown and consistent messianic expectation of the Qumran community is that of the advent of 'a Prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel' (1QS ix 11); a similar expectation, even though not identical, is already apparent in a pre-sectarian composition, catalogued 4Q521, which was published recently in three editions, all of them in 1992: (1) by Eisenman and Wise,¹⁰ (2) by Wise and Tabor (only one fragment),¹¹ and (3) by Puech.¹²

According to the paleographical data, the extant copy of 4Q521 is from 100–75 BCE, and probably later than the date of the composition itself.¹³ The orthography and the literary style, which differ from those of the salient sectarian writings, may also point to an early date of composition. Thus, this text reflects an earlier messianic concept than that of the *Yahad* community.

The reading of the scroll is broken due to its poor state of preservation. Nevertheless, the largest body of extant text contains remnants of three consecutive columns, while other fragments which also hold some successive lines (even if broken) are helpful for the understanding of the text. Moreover, reconstruction of a leather scroll of six columns proposed by Puech,¹⁴ even though interrupted by wide

Text', pp. 352–53). (4) During the Herodian period (37 BC–68 CE), the royal Messiah became 'the shoot of David' (p. 504; Fitzmyer, 'Aramaic "Elect of God" Text', pp. 353–54).

9. Fitzmyer, 'Aramaic "Elect of God" Text', pp. 348–72. For other critical works, see especially R.E. Brown, 'J. Starcky's Theory of Qumran Messianic Development', *CBQ* 28 (1966), pp. 51–57; R.B. Laurin, 'The Problem of Two Messiahs in the Qumran Scrolls', *RevQ* 4 (1963–64), pp. 39–52; S. Talmon, 'Waiting for the Messiah at Qumran', in J. Neusner, W.S. Green and E. Frerichs (eds.), *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 111–37.

10. R. Eisenman and M. Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* (Shaftesbury: Element Books, 1992), pp. 19–23.

11. M. Wise and J.D. Tabor, 'The Messiah at Qumran', *BAR* (Nov.–Dec. 1992), pp. 60–65.

12. E. Puech, 'Une apocalypse messianique (4Q521)', *RevQ* 15.60 (1992), pp. 475–522.

13. Puech, 'Une apocalypse', pp. 477–80, 515.

14. Puech, 'Une apocalypse', pl. 1.

lacunas, might clarify both the context of several terms concerning the Messiah or Messiahs mentioned in 4Q521 and the idea of the composition as a whole.

We shall read the best preserved fragment of this composition according to Puech's edition, as against that of Wise and Tabor. I would like to thank Professor Y. Hoffman, with whom I have studied this fragment, for his helpful notes and for his initiative in the publication of this discussion.

Fragment 2 ii + 4

Marge superior

1. כי [הש]מים והארץ ישמעו למשיחו
2. וכל א[שר] בם לוא יסוג ממצות קדושים
3. התאמצו מבקשי אדני בעבודתו
4. הלא בואת המצאו את אדני כל המיחלים בלבם
5. כי אדני חסידים יבקר וצדיקים בשם יקרא
6. ועל עניים רוחו תרחף ואמנים יחליף בכחו
7. כי יכבד את חסידים על כסא מלכות עד
8. מחיר אסורים פיקח עורים וזקף כפ[ופים]
9. ול[ע]לם ארבק [במ]יחלים ובחסדו י[שלים] (?)
10. ופר[י] מעש[ה] טוב לאיש לוא יחאחר
11. ותכבד דת שלוא היו יעשה אדני כאשר ד[בר]
12. כי ירפא חללים ומחים יחיה עניים יבשר
13. ו[דלי]ם ישב[ע] נתתים יגדל ורעבים יעשר
14. ונב[ותים] ° וכלם כקד[ושים] (?)
15. וא[]

Translation (according to García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, p. 394):

(1) [for the heav]ens and the earth will listen to his Messiah/s, (2) [and all] that is in them will not turn away from the commandments of the holy ones.¹⁵ (3) Be encouraged, you who are seeking the Lord in his service! (blank) (4) Will you not perhaps, encounter the Lord in it, all those who hope in their heart? (5) For the Lord will observe the devout, and call the just by name, (6) and upon the poor he will place his spirit, and the faithful he will renew with his strength. (7) For he will honour the devout upon the throne of eternal royalty, (8) freeing prisoners, giving sight to the blind, straightening out the twi[sted]. (9) Ever shall I cling to those who hope. In his mercy he will re[compense]/jud[ge] (?),¹⁶ (10) and from

15. According to Wise and Tabor, 'The Messiah at Qumran', p. 62.

16. 'il [recompensera/jugera (?)]', see Puech, 'Une apocalypse messianique', p. 486.

no-one shall the fruit [of] good [deeds] be delayed, (11) and the Lord will perform marvellous acts such as have not existed, just as he sa[id] (12) for he will heal the badly wounded and will make the dead live, he will proclaim good news to the meek (13) give lavishly [to the need]y, lead the exiled and enrich the hungry. (14) [. . .] and all [. . .].

Regarding the interpretation of one fragment of 4Q521 (1 ii in Eisenman–Wise’s edition;¹⁷ 2 ii in Puech’s edition¹⁸), Wise and Tabor suggest that it reveals a concept of ‘only a single messianic figure’.¹⁹ The key word upon which Wise and Tabor’s understanding of 4Q521 is based is משיחו, ‘his Messiah’, according to their reading of lines 1 and 10. However, the latter, which is more essential for their case than the former, is a restoration, which they themselves admit to be ‘crucial and straightforwardly speculative’ (p. 63).²⁰ Nevertheless, they did not refrain from reaching (on its basis) some dubious and rather confusing conclusions. One of these is their speculation that 4Q521 expresses the conception that the Messiah, rather than God himself, will be responsible for the resurrection of the dead in the eschatological era, as well as for other wonders mentioned in this fragment.

Yet in order to understand the meaning of the term משיחו in this particular fragment, one needs to consider its context.²¹ It is clear that

17. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*, p. 21.

18. ‘Une apocalypse messianique’, p. 485, and pl. 1.

19. In their opinion, the idea reflected in this text calls for a revision of the ‘two messiahs concept’ in reference to Qumranic thought (‘The Messiah at Qumran’, p. 61).

20. Wise and Tabor read and restore the lacunae of lines 10–11 as follows: (10) וט[ובו] לעד יתאחר [לבוא] (11) ונכ>ב דות שלוא היו מעשה אדני כאשר י[בוא] (10) a[nd in His] go[odness] forever. His] holy [Messiah] will not be slow [in coming.] (11) And for the wonders that are not the work of the Lord, when he (i.e., the Messiah) [come]s’ (‘The Messiah at Qumran’, p. 62). This reading is speculative. These lines may be read and restored otherwise as well. Thus, see the suggestion of Puech: (10) ופר[ו]י מעש[ו]ה מוב לאיש לוא יתאחר (11) ונכ>ב דות שלוא (10) et le fru[it d’une] bonne [oeuvre] ne sera differe pour personne, (11) et des actions glorieuses qui n’ont jamais eu lieu, le Seigneur realisera comme il l’a d[it]’ (‘Une apocalypse messianique’, pp. 485–86, pl. 2). Indeed, a heavy dot is noticeable at the bottom of the first letter of the fourth word at line 11 (see PAM 43.604; 41.676; Puech, ‘Une apocalypse messianique’, pl. 1). Nevertheless, it does not look like a *mem*. Thus the reading מעשה is doubtful. However, any restoration of such a lacuna must be considered as speculative.

21. The messianic concept of 4Q521 has recently been dealt with in some

the (not always grammatical) subject of lines 3-9 is not any Messiah, but the Lord (יְיָ, lines 3, 4, 5), who 'upon the poor. . . will place his spirit' (line 6). It is he who will 'honor the devout upon the throne of eternal royalty' (line 7) and who is 'freeing prisoners, giving sight to the blind, straightening out the twis[ted]' (line 8). It is the Lord 'for [ev]er will I cling' (to him) with 'those who hope' for the fulfilment of 'his mercy' and 're[compense]' (line 9), says the author. Thus, there is neither any literary reason, nor even an unequivocal textual one, for relating the acts described in lines 12-14—'he will heal the badly wounded'²² and will make the dead live, he will proclaim good news to the meek', etc.—which are similar to those ascribed to the Lord in lines 6-8, to a Messiah.

One should note that the above-mentioned eschatological acts are based upon prophetic tidings. Some of these are mentioned in Isa. 61.1 (line 12c) and Isa. 40.31 (line 6b); others, in Deut. 32.39b and 1 Sam. 2.6 (line 12a); in 1 Sam. 2.5a and 7 (line 13); and in the hymn of Ps. 146.7-8 (line 8).²³ Thus the Messiah mentioned in line 1—termed either in the singular, 'his Messiah', or in the plural 'his Messiahs'²⁴—may refer here to a prophet²⁵ or prophets,²⁶ according to whose words these acts are expected.

scholarly works: F. García Martínez, 'Messianische Erwartungen in den Qumran-schriften', *Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie* 8 (1993), pp. 171-208, 181-85; E. Puech, 'Messianism, Resurrection, and Eschatology at Qumran and in the New Testament', in E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam (eds.), *The Community of the Renewed Covenant* (CJAS, 10; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), pp. 235-56; J. VanderKam, 'Messianism in the Scrolls', in E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam (eds.), *The Community*, pp. 215-16; J.J. Collins, 'The Works of the Messiah', *DSD* 1.1 (1994), pp. 98-112; J.J. Collins, "'He shall not Judge by what his Eyes See": Messianic Authority in the Dead Sea Scrolls', *DSD* 2.2 (1995), pp. 161-63; M.G. Abegg, 'The Messiah at Qumran: Are we still Seeing Double?', *DSD* 2.2 (1995), pp. 141-43.

22. Puech translates 'car il guérira les blessés (à mort)', and compares it with Deut. 32.39b; Hos. 6.1; *Jub.* 23.29-30; *1 En.* 96.3. Regarding the idea as a whole, he compares Isa. 29.18-19; 35.5-6; 61.1-2. In Mt. 8.16; 9.35; 10.1, 8; 11.5; Lk. 10.9, such acts are performed by Jesus and his disciples ('Une apocalypse messianique', pp. 486, 493).

23. The acts mentioned in lines 8 and 12 refer in the second benediction of the *'Amidah* prayer to the Lord.

24. See Puech, 'Une apocalypse messianique', pp. 486-88.

25. Cf. Isa. 61.1, where the prophet says: 'the Lord has anointed me'. Yet Collins raises the possibility that even the resurrection may be referred to by a mes-

The most natural reading of משיחו is indeed 'his Messiah', in the singular. Yet as lines 1-2 are written in the poetic form of 'parallelism memorandum',²⁷ the word משיחו (line 1) is paralleled by קדושים (line 2—'the holy ones'), in the plural rather than singular form. One may legitimately claim that 'parallelism' does not mean 'identity', and therefore the singular reading of משיחו is not refuted by the plural of קדושים. However, there are also three other possible, valid explanations:

- (a) To assume that in משיחו the יו"ד of the plural is missing. Such a spelling is quite frequent in the Hebrew Bible, and is still found in some scrolls.²⁸
- (b) To notice that the two parallel terms of lines 1-2, משיחו and קדושים, are joined together in one term in other texts from Qumran. For example: משיחי הקודש—'the holy anointed ones' (CD vi 1; 4QD^d 2 6; 6Q15 3 4), or משיחי רוח קודשו—'the anointed ones of his holy spirit', (CD ii 12; 4QD^a 9 ii 14; 4QBer^b 10 13), both of which refer to prophets. Yet in 4Q521 2 ii 1-2 the terms משיחו and קדושים are still separated.
- (c) To note that the prophetic tidings mentioned in this fragment referred to more than one specific prophet.

However, this differentiation is not of crucial importance for understanding the main idea of the statement ישמעו למשיחו and so on (lines 1-2). Its biblical allusions (Deut. 32.1; Isa. 1.2; 48.13-16) suggest that the author of 4Q521, while writing a hymn about the fulfilment of the prophetic promises, asserts their credibility by

sianic prophet like Elijah. Cf. *m. Sota*, end; *j. Sheq.* 3.3, according to 1 Kgs 17, where Elijah raised the dead during his historical career ('The Works of the Messiah', pp. 89-102; 'He shall not Judge', p. 163).

26. Cf. Ps. 105.5 (= 1 Chron. 16.22), where 'my anointed ones' is parallel to 'my prophets'.

27. In a draft of a study of this text, Y. Hoffman claims as follows: השמים והארץ (line 1: 'The heavens and the earth') is paralleled by הים וכל אשר בם (line 2: 'the sea and all that is in them'); ישמעו (line 1: 'will obey') is parallel to יסוג ממצוה (line 2: 'will not turn aside from the commandment'); and משיחו (line 1: 'His Messiah') is paralleled by קדושים (line 2: 'the Holy ones').

28. For plural forms written in the scrolls without the *yod*, see: מעטו ימו (CD x 9); למשוב חיו (1QS iii 1); עונותיו (1QS iii 6, 7); מעשו (1QS vi 17); ובצדקותו (1QS xi 3). On this phenomenon, see E. Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (HSS, 29; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), p. 59.

invoking as witnesses to their message heaven and earth, which exist forever.²⁹ As the hymn of 4Q521 is guided by the motifs and course of Psalm 146 (cf. vv. 5-8), one may suggest that its author who mentioned here 'the heavens and the earth... and [all th]at is in them' had in mind Ps. 146.6 as well, in which their creation and existence are a metaphor for realizing that God 'keeps faith forever'.

Other fragments of 4Q521 also seem to allude to prophetic predictions. The expectation of the coming of an eschatological prophet may be seen in the statement ב[ר]ב[ר] פ[י]ך כ[י] נכ[ו]ן ב[א]י[ם] אב[ו]ת על ב[נ]י[ם], 'with your word, which is true, parents reconcile with children' (frg. 2 iii 1-2) as restored by Puech, considering Ben-Sira 48.10.³⁰ This statement, alluding to Mal. 3.23-24, is related to the eschatological Elijah (and indirectly to Moses according to Mal. 3.22 [or Mal. 3.24 according to the LXX version]).

The expectation of the resurrection of the dead appears again in frg. 7 + 5 ii 6-8, referring to the Lord, possibly on the basis of such biblical prophecies as Deut. 32.39b; Isa. 26.19; and Ezek. 37.12):³¹

- | | | |
|-------|---|----|
| vacat | י[ק]י[ם] דמחיה את מתי עמו | .6 |
| | ת[נ]ידה ונעידה לכם צד[ק]ות אדני אשר [...] | .7 |
| | בנ[י] תמ[נ]ותה ופתח[ו] קברות... ³² | .8 |

29. Cf. Isa. 54.10, even though otherwise expressed. Thus, what is mentioned here is not the idea of obeying the Messiah nor even a prophet—for creating miraculous changes, as suggested by Wise and Tabor ('The Messiah at Qumran', p. 61, in affinity with Phil. 2.9-10; 1 Cor. 15.24-28; Mt. 28.18; Mk 4.35-41); Abegg ('The Messiah at Qumran', pp. 141-42); Collins ('The Works of the Messiah', pp. 106-107); and Vanderkam ('Messianism in the Scrolls', p. 215) in affinity with Lk. 7.20-22 and parallels, but the idea of the credibility of the words of the biblical prophets. In Qumran literature such an idea may be recognized in 1QM xi 7-8: 'By the hands of your anointed ones, seers of decrees, you foretold us the epochs of the wars of your hands'. The words of the biblical prophecies are explicitly considered at Qumran to be the foretold decree of eschatological events according to 1QpHab ii 8-10; vii 1-5; 1QS viii 13-16; 11QMelch ii 17.

30. 'Une apocalypse messianique', p. 495.

31. Puech, 'Une apocalypse messianique', p. 505. In my opinion, one should note that according to Josephus, *War* 2.8.14 §163, the Essenes' faith was primarily in the immortality of the soul. He nevertheless noted that they believed that the souls of good persons passed on to another new body.

32. According to Puech's suggestion, 'Une apocalypse messianique', p. 501.

6. [he makes] the dead of his people [ri]se. [blank]
7. And we shall give thanks and announce to you the just acts of the Lord, who [. . .]
8. the de[ad] and opens [graves. . .]³³

According to other statements partly preserved in other fragments, this text contains the expectation of restoring קדשו וכל כלי [היכל], '[the temp]le and all the holy utensils'; [כהנה] וכל משיחיה, '[priesth]ood and all its anointed ones' (frg. 8 8-9);³⁴ and likewise of the restoration of the monarchy, as may be suggested by a statement such as כי יכבד את חסידים על כסא מלכות עד, 'for he will honour the devout upon the throne of eternal royalty' (2 ii 7), or the partly preserved statement ויתן כ[... מ]לכות (frg. 12 1-2), possibly referring to the same idea. We may therefore conclude that this pre-sectarian text, possibly written by an author from the Hassidim or Essene circles,³⁵ deals with the expected fulfilment of the prophetic tidings, including the restoration of the prophecy, the priesthood and the kingship, which had become the main subjects of the messianic expectation of the *Yahad* community, at least after the death of the Teacher of Righteousness, as may be understood from IQS ix 10-11:

They 'shall be ruled by the first directives which the men of the Community began to be taught until the prophet comes, and the Messias of Aaron and Israel'³⁶

33. The English translation follows that of García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, pp. 394-95.

34. Other references to the priesthood may be: [בר] כה תעזוב ב[יד משיח]יה (frg. 9 3), related to the anointed priests, whose service of God includes blessings to Israel in the name of God (Num. 6.22-27; Deut. 10.8; 21.5; 1 Chron. 23.13). Another possible reading suggested by Puech is [כהנה] בה תעזוב ב[יד משיח]יה ('Une apocalypse messianique', p. 510). Likewise: [כ]י שמרו בר[ית]ת, 'since they kept the covenant' (frg. 10 2). Cf. CD iii 21-iv 1, related to Ezek. 44.15; IQS v 2, 9, concerning the Zadokite priests; and כהנה ת[ח] in frg. 11 3 (possibly כהנה ל[ח] related to the covenant of priesthood of Num. 25.13; Deut. 33.9; Neh. 13.29; Sir. 45.24).

35. Puech reaches this conclusion thanks to such terms as קדושים, חסידים, עניים אמונים of frg. 2 ii ('Une apocalypse messianique', pp. 515-19). See likewise statements concerning the blessed righteous and the cursed wicked (frgs. 7 + 5 ii 4-5; 14 2); a statement concerning the angels (frgs. 7 + 5 ii 15); and cf. *1 En.* 94-105.

36. This statement does not appear in 4QSe, the oldest copy of the Rule of the Community. J. Starcky based his theory concerning the date of this statement upon this lack ('Les quatre étapes du messianisme'). For the assumption that the lack of

and likewise CD vi 9-11. The expectation referring to the restoration of the ideal leadership of Israel will be discussed below.

III

a. *The Earthly Messianic Leadership*

The Qumran concept of the ideal leadership of Israel is reflected in the text of *4QTestimonia* (4Q175), where a catena of biblical verses concerning the ideal leadership is copied.³⁷ These are Deut. 18.18-19, concerning a true prophet like Moses, 'in his mouth the Lord will put his words, and he will speak to Israel all that the Lord commands him'; Num. 24.15-17, about the ideal 'scepter [that is, 'king'] who will smash the enemies of Israel'; and Deut. 33.8-11, concerning the ideal priest 'who will keep the Lord's covenant, teach his laws to Jacob, and offer him incense to savor and whole-offerings on his altar'. According to the verses from Deut. 5.25-26 quoted in the extant opening of this text, the willingness of the children of Israel to hear the Law will assure the eternal well-being of those who follow the commandments of God.³⁸

The leadership of Israel during the First Temple period indeed consisted of these three institutions: prophecy, kingship and priesthood, such that the anointing of these figures, especially the king and the high priest, symbolized their being the chosen leaders.³⁹ Although these institutions were vitiated when some of the leaders went astray from their commanded duties, their restoration according to the Law

this statement at 4QSe may be an accidental one, see J.T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (SBT, 26; London: SCM Press, 1959), pp. 123-24; VanderKam, 'Messianism in the Scrolls', pp. 212-13.

37. J.A. Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4. I* (DJD, 5; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), pp. 57-60.

38. Assumptions about the purpose of this composition have been suggested by J. Lubbe, 'A Reinterpretation of 4Q Testimonia', *RevQ* 12 (1986), pp. 187-97; and Collins, 'He shall not Judge', p. 150. Each one has suggested a different purpose, based upon a common idea of all the biblical quotations composing the text, including that of Jos. 6.26. Lubbe's suggestion concerning the judgment of God upon those who do not obey his word has been accepted by Abegg, 'The Messiah at Qumran', p. 133. For Collins's suggestion, see below, n. 46.

39. For example, Exod. 28.41; 29.7; 1 Sam. 9.16; 16.1-13; 1 Kgs 1.39; 19.16; Isa. 61.1; Ps. 105.15 (= 1 Chron. 16.22).

became a central motif of biblical eschatological prophecies.⁴⁰ Thus, after the destruction in 586 BCE, the hope for re-establishing these institutions reflected the restorative aspect of the Messianic leadership.

In a certain sense, the renewal of prophecy in the days of the 'Return to Zion'—about seventy years after the destruction of the First Temple—and the call of Haggai and Zechariah to re-establish the kingship from the root of David and the priesthood of the Zadokite house,⁴¹ could have been considered the beginning of the eschatological restoration of these institutions. However, the call for re-establishing the Davidic monarchy could not been realized under the Persian rulers, and in that political situation the High Priest held both the cultic leadership and the political one. The cultic and political functions were once again held by the High Priest during the Hasmonean era.

Notwithstanding the achievements of the priestly leadership at the beginning of the second century BCE, reflected in Ben-Sira 50, Second Temple Jewry was conscious of the gap between the historical achievements of their generations and those promised by the biblical prophets. This may be seen from the prayer of Ben-Sira 36 and the 'Apostrophe to Zion' of 11QPs^a xxii.⁴² According to 1 Macc. 4.46 and 14.41, even during the heyday of the Hasmonean era there was a consciousness of the temporary nature of laws and institutions. These were considered transient until such time when a new prophet would come and teach the eschatological law of the cult and the political leadership.⁴³

The *Yahad* community was established about 150 BCE by the Teacher of Righteousness, not because of rejection of the structure of leadership of the Hasmonean era, but presumably due to a *halakhic* conflict

40. For example, Jer. 33.14-22; Ezek. 34.23-24; 44.15.

41. Hag. 2.20-23; Zech. 6.11-13.

42. J.A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11* (DJD, 4; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), pp. 85-89.

43. C. Rabin mentions other Jewish and Christian writings that held such a concept. Among them: *m.* 'Ed. 8.7; *b.* Bek 24a; 1 Cor. 12.28; 14.29 (*The Zadokite Documents* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954], p. 23). Possibly John Hyrcanus's strong claim to be a true prophet may be considered as fulfilment of the expectation for an eschatological prophet. See Josephus, *Ant.* 13.10.3, §282; 7, §§299-300; *Wars* 1.2.8, §§68-69; *t. Sof.* 13.5 and parallels. Cf. J.A. Goldstein, 'How the Authors of 1 and 2 Maccabees Treated the "Messianic" Promises', in Neusner, Green and Frerichs (eds.), *Judaisms and their Messiahs*, pp. 49-96 (75). See below, n. 46.

with the Hasmonean rulers and the Pharisees, especially concerning the calendaric system, the purity of the Temple and the holy city, as may be inferred from 4QMMT (4Q394 1-2 i-v; 3-7 i) and other sectarian writings.⁴⁴ Its establishment was considered a new beginning for the fulfilment of eschatological prophecies (CD i 5-11), and its leader, the Teacher of Righteousness, was considered a new lawgiver like Moses, albeit in the sense of דורש התורה, 'the searcher of the Law' (CD vi 7).

In considering the laws given by this historical leader as the 'first directives' (1QS ix 10), or the laws 'to walk in them during the whole epoch of wickedness' (CD vi 10), the new generation of the *Yahad* community on the one hand displayed faithfulness to the laws given by their first leader, but on the other hand was conscious about their temporality 'until the prophet comes and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel'. That is, the endeavor of this historical leader was considered as only the first stage in an eschatological process toward the end of days, when the ideal leadership of Israel would be realized. This concept was compatible with the apocalyptic concept of 'times and seasons', upon which I shall not touch here.⁴⁵

The texts of 1QS (*The Community Rule*), 1QSa (*The Rule of the Congregation*) and 4QTestimonia, all copied at the same time, 100–75 BCE,⁴⁶ presumably by the same scribe, reflect the ideology of that

44. For example, CD i 11-16; iv 16-17; vi 14-16; 1QpHab v 10-12; viii 8-13; xi 4-8; xii 7-9; 4QpNah 3-4 ii 8; 4QpPs 37 3-10 iv 8b-9a.

45. See J. Licht, 'Time and Eschatology in Apocalyptic Literature and in Qumran', *JJS* 16 (1965), pp. 177-82.

46. The exact date of the composition of 4QTestimonia may be determined on the basis of the *Pesher* that follows the catena of the copied verses. This *peshet* appears in another text from Qumran, 4QPsalms of Joshua (4Q379 22 ii), which in Milik's opinion was composed some decades before 4QTestimonia, possibly between 152 and 142 BCE (*Ten Years of Discoveries*, pp. 61-64). F.M. Cross dates it to 135/4 BCE (*The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* [Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1958], pp. 147-50), as does also H. Burgmann, 'Gerichtsherr und General-Ankläger Jonathan and Simon', *RevQ* 9 (1977), p. 12. H. Eshel assumed that the original text is that of 4QTestimonia, which according to his opinion had been composed about 103 BCE ('Historical Background of the *Pesher* Interpreting Joshua's Curse on the Rebuilder of Jericho', *RevQ* 15.59 [1992], pp. 409-420). Collins, who accepted Eshel's opinion, assumed that the composition was directed against John Hyrcanus, 'who was said to combine the rule of the nation, the office of High Priest and the gift of prophecy' (Josephus, *Ant.* 13.10.7 §§299-300), in contrast with the ideal leadership of the Torah, stated in 4QTestimonia. The death of

generation concerning the ideal eschatological leadership, in which the priestly and political functions would be performed by separate messianic leaders.

Yet, as this ideology reflects the ideal leadership of the Torah, the assumption regarding its changing in later stages of the sectarian literature, held by some scholars,⁴⁷ should be reconsidered, taking into account the new data known from recently published texts.

The ambiguous title found in the Damascus Covenant, both that of the *Geniza*⁴⁸ and of the fourth cave from Qumran,⁴⁹ משיח אהרן וישראל, 'Messiah of Aaron and Israel', led to some hypothetical assumptions concerning the merging of the two Messiahs in a concept of a priestly messianic figure.⁵⁰ The meaning of this title has been the subject of lengthy discussion—from both the linguistic and literary aspects—as to whether this title refers to one or two messianic figures.⁵¹ One ought to take into account that this ambiguous title is used in all its occurrences as a *terminus technicus* for a definite time, and not in the context of its eschatological functions.⁵² It is thus impossible to deal with its meaning in the functional sense. In any event, the assumption that this title refers to one Messiah would have been a peculiar and inexplicable contradiction to the Torah's ideal of two separate institutions and leaders. As a matter of fact, according to biblical titles and

his two sons, Antigonus and Aristobulus I, in 103 BCE, within a year of their father's death (*Ant.* 13.10.2-3 §§307-309, 318), could imply intelligible connection between Joshua's curse and the quotations from the Torah ('He shall not Judge', p. 150).

47. See Starcky, 'Les quatre étapes du messianisme', and the additional bibliography mentioned in nn. 8 and 9.

48. CD xii 23; xiv 19; xix 10.

49. 4QD^b 18 iii 12; 4QD^f 13 2.

50. See above, n. 8.

51. L. Ginzberg has already rejected the claim that kingdom and priesthood are united in one person (*An Unknown Jewish Sect*, trans. from German [New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1976], p. 248). According to G.J. Brooke, CD vii 13b-viii 1a, where two Messiahs are mentioned, is a revision of an earlier concept of one Messiah of Aaron and Israel ('The Amos-Numbers Midrash [CD 7 13b-8 1a] and Messianic Expectation', *ZAW* 92 (1980), pp. 397-404. Yet see also VanderKam's suggestion below.

52. In CD xiv 18-19, as well, one finds the term מִלְכָּא. However, the continuation of this passage is damaged. This term has not been preserved in the parallels from the 4th cave (see above, n. 49).

terms such as מלך סדום ועמורה (Judg. 14.10), ראש עורב וזאב (Judg. 7.25), and those from the scrolls שם ישראל ואהרן (1QM iii 13), שם ישראל לוי ואהרן (1QM v 1), each of which relates to more than one figure,⁵³ it would seem that the title משיח ואהרן וישראל may belong to this customary form of speech. If our suggestion is correct, one may conclude that there is no alteration in the ideology of two separate Messiahs, from Aaron and from Israel.

Considering the dual-messianic concept from a functional aspect, it becomes clear that the traditional functions of a king—delivering Israel from its enemies and judging in righteousness—are always related to the royal Messiah, whereas functions concerning the knowledge of the Law and the cult are related to the priestly Messiah,⁵⁴ irregardless of their variegated titles. For example, when dealing with the royal Messiah, such verses as Num. 24.17, Isa. 10.34, 11.4b and others are applied to his military function, and he is entitled נשיא העדה, 'the Prince of the Congregation', or צמח דוד, 'the Shoot of David', or both.⁵⁵ According to these statements, 'when he arises "he shall strike violently all sons of Seth"' (CD vii 20); and as the commander of all Israel in the eschatological war depicted in the *War Scroll*,⁵⁶ his military role is to lead the earthly soldiers in their final pursuit of the Kittim, the final enemy of Israel⁵⁷ (*Serek ha-Milhamah*, 4Q285 frgs. 6 + 4, ll. 2-6). His judicial role in *Serek ha-Milhamah*, based upon Isaiah 10-11, is to condemn to death and to slay the king of the Kittim.⁵⁸ Likewise, the metaphorical phrase of Isa. 11.4a

53. See VanderKam, 'Messianism in the Scrolls', p. 230; Abegg, 'The Messiah at Qumran', pp. 129-31.

54. See 1QSa ii 19-20; 4QpIsa^a 8-10 23-24; 4QFl 1-2 i 11; CD vii 18.

55. In some of the writings he is called נשיא העדה, 'the Prince of the Congregation' (1QSb v 20; CD vii 20; 1QM v 1); in others, both נשיא העדה and צמח דוד (4QpIsa^a 5-6 3; 8-10 17; 4Q285 4 2; 5 3-4; 6 2).

56. In 1QM v 1-2, the names of all the tribes of Israel are written on the shield of the Prince of the Congregation, but his specific role is not detailed.

57. According to Num. 24.24. See B. Nitzan, *Pesher Habakkuk: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea (1QpHab)* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1986), pp. 66-68.

58. *Serek ha-Milhamah* (4Q285), frgs. 6 + 4, l. 10; frag. 5, l. 4. For the correct reading of the latter statement (against the reading of R. Eisenmann), see G. Vermes, 'The Forum for Qumran Research Seminar of the Rule of the War from Cave 4 (4Q285)', *JJS* 43 (1992), pp. 86-90. For the biblical allusions of this statement, see B. Nitzan, 'Benedictions and Instructions for the Eschatological Community', *RevQ* 16/61 (1993), p. 78 n. 7.

concerning the judgment of the Shoot of David is interpreted about striking the wicked nations (4QpIsa^a frg. 8-10, ll. 20-21; 4QSb v 24-29).⁵⁹ On the other hand, in statements concerning the eternal kingdom of the royal Messiah, based either upon the prophetic promises to Judah in Gen. 49.10 (4QpGen = 4Q252 l v), or to the house of David in 2 Sam. 7.13b (4QFl. = 4Q174 1-2 i 10-11), the royal Messiah is consistently titled *צמח דוד*. In this case, the consistency of the title is related to the fact that an eternal house is only prophesied for the house of David. There is thus no reason to infer from such statements a change in the concept of two Messiahs merging into a single Messiah figure of the shoot of David, as suggested by Starcky.⁶⁰

There is one subject, however, which does not reflect the biblical prophetic concept of the eschatological restoration of the leadership of Israel (Ezek. 45.16-17)—namely, the advantageous status given the priestly Messiah over the royal Messiah, stated in several scrolls. The cultic facet of this idea is reflected in the communal eschatological feast of 1QSa, as follows:

[No one should stretch out] his hand to the first-fruit of the bread and of the [new wine] before the priest, for [he is the one who b]lesses the first-fruit of bread and of the new wine [and stretches out] his hand towards the bread before them. Afterwards the Messiah of Israel shall stretch out his hand towards the bread. [And after]wards shall bless all the congregation of the community, each [one according to] his dignity (ii 19-21).⁶¹

Yet according to a *peshet* of Isa. 11.3 stated in 4QpIsa^a frg. 8-10, 22-24, the Priest's advantage over the royal Messiah lies in his interpreting and teaching the Law. This idea appears in 4QFl 1-2 i 11-12 as well: 'He is "the Shoot of David" who will arise with the Interpreter

59. Both the military and judicial role of the Prince of the Congregation are mentioned in the eschatological blessings of 1QSb v 20-29. Yet, although the blessing is based upon Isa. 11.1-5, concerning the Davidic eschatological king, his military function is emphasized, related to Mic. 4.13; 7.10. See Licht, *The Rule Scroll* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1965), pp. 286-89 (Hebrew). M.A. Knibb has recently shown that the prophecies of Isa. 11 and others concerning the shoot of David are used as a leitmotif in depicting the royal Messiah in Pseudepigraphic and Qumranic writings ('Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Scrolls', *DSD* 2.2 [1995], pp. 165-70).

60. See above, n. 8.

61. Barthelemy and Milik, *Qumran Cave 1*, pp. 110-12. The English translation follows that of García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, pp. 127-28.

of the Law... [in the l]ast days', etc.⁶² According to the latter writings, one may assume that, in the thought of the *Yahad* community, knowledge of the Law and its teaching in a certain sense took priority over political activity. Such a conclusion is suggested in light of similar statements in the books of *Jubilees* and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* of the Essene circles,⁶³ in which the priority of Levi over Judah, or of the priesthood over the kingdom, refers to the priority given to knowledge of the Law.⁶⁴ Indeed, this concept may be related to the priestly orientation of the sectarian circles. However, the features of this orientation are not only cultic, but also reflect the sectarian philosophy, which gave prevailing importance to knowledge of the Law in the process towards eternal salvation, as stated at the opening of 4QTestim. II. 3-4: 'For assure that the children of Israel will follow the commandments of God, that it may go well with them and with their children forever' (according to Deut. 5.26, and likewise at the epilogue of 4QMMT [C 21-32], etc.)⁶⁵

b. *The Heavenly Saviour*

Beside the writings concerning the earthy messianic leaders, the Qumran corpus includes a text, entitled *11QMelchizedek*,⁶⁶ dealing

62. Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4. I*, p. 54. A statement concerning the commandment of the priest is partly preserved in *Serek ha-Milhamah* 5 5-6, alongside the statement concerning the slaying of the king of the Kittim by the Prince of the Congregation. Yet according to the context (see I.6), it is concerned with the burial of those slain among the Kittim. The prohibition against the king going out or coming in unless he consults with the high priest, who asks the advice of the Urim and Tummim (11QTS 58.18-21), is based upon Num. 27.21 and, according to Y. Yadin, is concerned with the present Temple rather than with that of eschatological time (*The Temple Scroll* [Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, 1977], I, pp. 274, 298; II, pp. 186, and 49 [Hebrew]; ET [Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, 1983], I, pp. 358-60, 390; II, pp. 264-65, 65-66).

63. See J. Liver, 'The Theory of the Two Messiahs', *Studies in the Bible and the Judean Desert Scrolls* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1972), pp. 168-80 (Hebrew).

64. *Jub.* 31.15; *T. Reub.* 7.7; *T. Levi* 18.5-8; *T. Jud.* 21.4.

65. See, e.g., 1QpHab x 15-xi 2a; 1QSa i 1-5.

66. The text was published by A.S. van der Woude, 'Melchizedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI', *סד 1940-1965* (OTS, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1965), pp. 354-73. Later reworkings of this text are found in M. de Jonge and A.S. van der Woude, '11QMelchizedek and the New Testament', *NTS* 12 (1965-66), pp. 301-326; J.T. Milik, 'Milki-sedeq

with the functions of expiation, judgment and salvation in reference to a heavenly eschatological figure, Melchizedek. The traditional status of this figure is known from the biblical status of Melchizedek as the 'King of Salem' and 'a priest of God Most High' (Gen. 14.18), which in Ps. 110.4 became a metaphor for the eternal status of one who is chosen according to God's oath: 'You are a priest forever, a rightful king by my decree'.⁶⁷ Yet nothing is known about the lineage of this figure, and thus he became a metaphorical figure.⁶⁸

In *11QMelchizedek*, the status of the eschatological Melchizedek is based mainly upon Ps. 82.1 and Isa. 52.7c (Col. ii 9b-10a, 23-25a), and his eschatological functions upon Isa. 61.1-2 and Ps. 7.8b-9a; 82.2 (Col. ii 4-6, 10b-14b). The eschatological Melchizedek is not a human being, but an angel of God.⁶⁹ His military function is identical to that of the angel Michael in 1QM xvii 5-8: to fight against Belial the angelic chief of wickedness,⁷⁰ revenging him with 'the ven[geance] of E[li]s judgments' (11QMelch Col. ii 13), for saving the captives, that is, the children of the lot of Melchizedek, who were captured to the way of wickedness by Belial at the epoch of his rule.⁷¹ The full meaning, however, of saving these captives is not physical, but 'relieving them

et Milki-resa'', pp. 95-109; P.J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchiresa* (CBQMS, 10; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1981), pp. 3-23; E. Puech, 'Notes sur le manuscrit de XIMelkisedeq', *RevQ* 12/48 (1987), at pp. 483-89.

67. According to the NJPS translation.

68. See Heb. 7.3-10.

69. This assumption is based upon the *Pesharim* of Ps. 82.1 (Col. ii 10-14) and Isa. 52.7c (Col. ii 23, 25). It may likewise be inferred from the fact that whereas the epithet מלך in the quotation of Deut. 15.2 and Ps. 7.8-9a was changed to the attribute מלך (see Col. ii 4, 11), the epithet מלך in Ps. 82.1 and Isa. 52.7 was not changed, possibly because the author understood it as referring to an angel, and interpreted it thus. See J.A. Emerton, 'Melchizedek and the Gods: Fresh Evidence for the Jewish Background of John X 34-36', *JTS* 17 (1966), pp. 399-401. See also M. Delcor, 'Melchizedek from Genesis to the Qumran Texts and the Epistle to the Hebrews', *JSJ* 2 (1971), pp. 115-35. At pp. 133-35, Delcor argues against J. Carmignac's opinion that Melchizedek in the text of 11QMelch is described as a terrestrial being ('Le document de Qumran sur Melki-sedeq', *RevQ* 7/27 (1970), pp. 343-78). Delcor accepts the opinion of van der Woude ('Melchizedek'), and claims that 'the quotation from Ps. 82.1 seems indeed to refer to Melchizedek who as an assessor angel participates in the judgment of God'.

70. See Kobelski, *Melchizedek*, pp. 71-74.

71. Cf. 1QS iii 21-25; CD iv 12b-19; 4Q510 1 5-8 (= 4Q511 10 1-6).

[of the burden] of all their iniquities' (ii 6)⁷² at the time of the eschatological expiation, on 'the D[ay of tone]ment' at '[the en]d of the tenth [ju]bilee' (Col. ii 7).⁷³ Thus, the eschatological Melchizedek is a heavenly saviour, judge, and priest. *The attribution of all these functions to one figure seems to conform only to a heavenly being, whose activities represent those of God himself.* Thus, one may not infer from the status of a heavenly figure, that of human beings. This text also mentions an eschatological prophet. This prophet, however, is not Melchizedek, but משיח הרוח, 'the one anointed of the spir[it]' (Col. ii 18), a title similar to that of משיחי רוח קודשו, 'the anointed ones through his holy spirit', given to the prophets in CD ii 12.⁷⁴ This eschatological prophet will fulfill the function of the eschatological herald described in Isa. 52.7 (Col. ii 16-20).⁷⁵

Thus, while considering biblical phrases as metaphorical, Qumran writings—according to their cosmological outlook—point to a common activity in heaven and earth, performed by his chosen and anointed figures, for saving Israel and all mankind from wickedness. One should not wonder about this communion, as it reflects the apocalyptic cosmological outlook already apparent in the book of Daniel (chs. 10-12, and 7.13-14, 27), and is in line with the apocalyptic philosophy of the *Yahad* community recorded in 1QS iii 16-25, etc.⁷⁶ According to this philosophy, earthly activity is guided by the heavenly appointed figures. Thus, *earthly wickedness cannot be destroyed until heavenly wickedness is destroyed.* In a certain sense, this outlook towards a heavenly appointed one is found in another Qumranic text, 4Q246, regarding the 'Son of God'. In that case this figure is identified with the 'Son of Man' mentioned in Dan. 7.13-14 (cf. 1 En. 69.26-29). But this facet of eschatological salvation is worthy of a separate discussion, clarifying the identification of this obscure figure.⁷⁷

72. This statement is based upon Deut. 15.2 and Neh. 5.10.

73. For the idea of angelic expiation of the guilt of human beings, see *T. Levi* 3.5-6; 4Q400 1 i 15-16; *b. Hag.* 12b.

74. Cf. 4QBer^b (= 4Q287) frg. 10, l. 2 (PAM 43.314). See Milik, 'Milki-sedeq et Milki-resa', p. 134.

75. The time of his appearance is based upon Dan. 9.25, and his specific eschatological tidings upon Isa. 61.2-3.

76. See, for example, 1QM xiii 9-16, and those writings mentioned above in n. 71.

77. Some of the speculations concerning the identification and role of this figure are summarized in F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic* (STDJ, 9; Leiden:

In conclusion, surveying the texts from Qumran dealing with the messianic concept, one finds that the conservative adherence of the *Yahad* community to the Torah's ideology regarding the ideal leadership of Israel influenced its messianic expectations of the restoration of autonomous earthly authorities, which would realize separately the functions related to prophecy, kingship and priesthood. While following the statements dealing with the anticipated Messiahs, it becomes clear that the variegated titles given to the same figures do not necessarily point towards changes in the basic messianic concept. In order to solve the problems caused by ambiguous titles, it would seem to be useful to trace the Messiah's functions while considering their relation to their biblical origins.

The innovation of the sectarian writings lies in the apocalyptic cosmological idea concerning the eschatological functions fulfilled by a heavenly saviour in the messianic epoch. According to the apocalyptic outlook, a communion between earthly and heavenly chosen ones will assure the complete and eternal salvation from any wickedness throughout the universe.

Brill, 1992), pp. 162-79. For additional speculations, see M.A. Knibb, 'Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha', pp. 174-80 (see the bibliography mentioned there). For discussion of 4Q246 and other related text see C.A. Evans, 'A Note of the "First Born Son" of 4Q369', *DSD* 2.2 (1995), pp. 184-201.

LEADERSHIP AND MESSIANISM IN THE TIME OF THE MISHNAH

Aharon Oppenheimer

The period between the Destruction of the Temple and the redaction of the *Mishnah* by R. Judah ha-Nasi around 200 CE, was decisive in shaping the Jewish people in his own time and for the time to come. The Judaism of the Second Temple Period was concentrated around Jerusalem and the Temple, and their destruction called into question the national existence of the Jewish people in their Land. Jewish life was shaken to its foundations and central *mitzvot* in the areas of Temple ritual, festivals, the calendar, pilgrimage, ritual purity, *terumot* and *ma'aserot*/tithes were either cancelled or lost their intrinsic meaning. At the same time Christianity began to flourish, with its belief in Jesus as Messiah, and with apostles who began to preach its doctrines. In theory, all this in combination could well have prepared the ground for the creation of a messianic strain of Judaism characterized by some form of apocalyptic mysticism. But in fact this is not what happened at all.

Rabban Yohanan b. Zakkai, who negotiated with the Romans during the First Revolt, transferred the leadership institutions from Jerusalem to Yavneh, and took care in his rulings to fill the gap that had been formed by the Destruction of the Temple. Even before the Destruction he realized what was in store, and expressed himself in a sort of inverted apocalypse:

Our rabbis taught: During the last forty years before the Destruction of the Temple the lot ['for the Lord'] did not come up in the right hand; nor did the crimson strap turn white; nor was the lamp in the west lit up; and the doors of the Sanctuary would open by themselves, until Rabban Yohanan b. Zakkai reproached them, saying 'O Sanctuary, Sanctuary, why do you panic? I know that you are doomed to be destroyed. . . .'¹

1. *b. Yom.* 39b. Josephus also gives evidence of signs and prophecies of the impending destruction of the Temple, including the gates of the Sanctuary opening by themselves (*War* 6.288-309).

All Rabban Yohanan b. Zakkai's deeds were the result of his realistic political sense, and his intention was to enable the Jewish people to continue to hold their lands and to carry on as a national entity in their homeland. Rabban Yohanan b. Zakkai and his colleagues concentrated on opposing irrational responses to the Destruction, and their subsequent rulings transferred various practices which were customary in the Temple to the new centre at Yavneh, or even to any place. Rabban Yohanan b. Zakkai was thus even prepared to divorce the people from their ruined Temple to some extent, although at the same time trying to encourage the hope that 'the Temple would be rebuilt speedily'. This is the background against which we must understand his attitude to the coming of the Messiah, as expressed in the following saying:

He [Rabban Yohanan b. Zakkai] used to say. . . 'If you had a plant in your hand and they were to say to you "Look, the Messiah is here!", go and plant your plant [first], and after that go out to welcome him'.²

Rabban Yohanan b. Zakkai's successor as leader, Rabban Gamaliel of Yavneh, who belonged to the dynasty of Hillel, continued the policies of his predecessor, but expanding them to cover the social sphere as well. This stemmed from his understanding that, after the trauma of the Destruction, there was no longer any place for the pluralism that had characterized the Judaism of the last days of the Second Temple. During the final days of the Temple, the people were divided into Pharisees and Sadducees, while the Pharisees were themselves divided between the two schools of Hillel and Shammai. Politically, the people were divided into the two camps of the Zealots and the Peace party, and there were also Moderates in between. The early Christians began as a sect that was Jewish in every respect, while the Essenes or the Judaeen Desert sect were rather more marginal to the main community. And we must not forget the Gnostic sects. Rabban Gamaliel and his colleagues acted as if to say that everyone who

2. מִסְכֵּת אֲבוֹת דִּבְרֵי נָתָן בְּשֵׁם הַנוֹסְחָאוֹת (Avot de-Rabbi Nathan, version B, xxxi [ed. S. Schechter; Vindobonae 1887; newly corrected edn New York: Feldhain 1967], pp. 66-67). Only in an incident connected with his death do we find Rabban Yohanan b. Zakkai expressing deeply felt messianic hopes, when he says: 'Clear the impurities from the courtyard, and bring a seat for Hezekiah King of Judah', (y. *Sot.* ix.24c). In other words, the King Messiah will appear in the form of Hezekiah when Rabban Yohanan b. Zakkai dies, and he must be welcomed as befits him (On Hezekiah as Messiah, see *b. Sanh.* 94a-b).

followed in the same direction as the leadership institutions, which were a continuation of the Pharisees, would be welcomed, while all the rest would find themselves outside the normative community. This put an end to the Sadducees. It is no coincidence that it was at this time that the rule was made that *halakha* usually follows the school of Hillel. After the Destruction of the Temple, the Christians themselves had widened the gap that separated them from Judaism, simultaneously they and the Jewish-Christian sects were expelled from Judaism at the instigation of the Jewish leadership. Among other measures, the *birkat ha-Minim* was added to the prayers, and the Ten Commandments were removed from the reading of the *Shem'a* and from the *Tefillin*³ in order to displace the Jewish-Christian sects from the synagogues, and to counteract the claim of the *Minim* that only the Ten Commandments were binding, unlike most of the other *mitzvot*.

Only two or three generations after the Destruction of the Temple, between 132–35 CE, the Bar Kokhva Revolt broke out in the Land of Israel. It was more extensive than the First Revolt, for the Romans did not manage to suppress it with the two legions stationed in the Land of Israel, nor even with the help of more legions from the neighbouring provinces of Syria, Arabia and Egypt. They were forced to bring still more legions from the Danube and to set in command their best general, Julius Severus the governor of Britain. Of all the revolts against a foreign government in the Land of Israel, the Bar Kokhva Revolt is the only one to be identified by the name of its leader—and this is not merely a coincidence. What was it that made Bar Kokhva the one man to lead the revolt in the eyes of the people? There are two talmudic traditions which present Bar Kokhva as the Messiah. The first is when Rabbi Akiva says of him 'This is the King Messiah'.⁴ In the second tradition, Bar Kokhva says of himself in front of the Sages, 'I am the Messiah'.⁵ Before relating to the internal problems of each of these two sources, we must ask whether Bar Kokhva was seen as a saviour

3. For the reading of the *Shem'a*, see *y. Ber.* i.3c; for the *Tefillin* see A.M. Habermann, 'The Phylacteries in Ancient Times', *Eretz-Israel* 3 (1954), pp. 174-77 (Heb.); Y. Yadin, *Tefillin from Qumran* (A bilingual English-Hebrew edn; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1969). For the break with Christianity during the Yavneh period, see, for example, G. Forkman, *The Limits of the Religious Community* (Lund: Gleerup, 1972), pp. 87-114.

4. *y. Ta'an.* iv.68d; cf. *Lam. R.* 2.4 (ed. Buber, p. 101) and see below.

5. *b. Sanh.* 93b, and see below.

and redeemer with divine and supernatural qualities, or whether the term 'Messiah' is used in a more concrete way, meaning that Bar Kokhva is being described as a military commander and earthly leader.

It is not possible to divorce the Bar Kokhva revolt from the Yavneh Period that preceded it. At this time, paradoxically, Rabban Yohanan b. Zakkai, the dove of peace who negotiated with the Romans at the height of the First Revolt, and together with Rabban Gamaliel aimed all their rulings and actions at unifying the people, in doing this laid the foundations for the extent of the Bar Kokhva Revolt. Both the rationalist approach of the sages of Yavneh, as expressed in their sober discretion and political realism, and their efforts to divorce Judaism from Christianity with its messianic content, together tend to tip the balance towards a Bar Kokhva who is an earthly Messiah and a realistic leader. Even if there is no complete scholarly agreement as regards the reasons for the outbreak of the Revolt and their relative importance, everybody agrees that the Revolt began as a result of certain direct causes. Scholarly opinion now tends to see the main reason for the revolt as the re-definition of Jerusalem as a Roman colony called Aelia Capitolina and the building of a temple to Jupiter within her walls. It may well be that a ban on circumcision was a further cause.⁶ Such contentions thus rule out the possibility that the utopian, messianic factor was a reason or an incentive for the revolt. The Roman historian Dio Cassius provides the best extant description of the revolt, although he does not mention Bar Kokhva himself. Cassius tells us that the Revolt was preceded by intensive and prolonged preparations, and that the Jews did not begin to rebel straight away with the foundation of Aelia Capitolina, but only after Hadrian had left the country some two years later. Archaeological finds of a number of underground hideouts, even if not all of them belong to the Bar Kokhva Revolt, confirm Cassius's claim of careful and extensive preparations for the Revolt.⁷ All this removes the grounds for the

6. For a summary of the current state of research on the Bar Kokhva revolt and its causes, see B. Isaac and A. Oppenheimer, 'The Revolt of Bar Kokhba: Ideology and Modern Scholarship', *JJS* 36 (1985), pp. 33-60; P. Schäfer, 'Hadrian's Policy in Judaea and the Bar Kokhba Revolt: A Reassessment', in P.R. Davies and R.T. White (eds.), *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History* (JSOTSup, 100; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), pp. 282-303.

7. Dio Cassius, *Historia Romana* lxix, pp. 11-15; M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, II (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1980), pp. 390-405. On underground hideouts, see A. Kloner, 'The

claim that the Revolt was the result of messianic fervour, and shows clearly that the basis of the Revolt was rooted in realistic and rational calculations, rather than an apocalyptic, messianic arousal.

There can be little doubt that the key to the solution of the question of Bar Kokhva's messianism is to be found in the analysis of the relationship between him and R. Aqiva. The main source for this is from the Jerusalem Talmud as follows:

R. Shim'on bar Yohai taught: Aqiva my teacher used to explain 'There shall come a star [Kokhav] out of Jacob' [Num. 24.17]—Kozeva shall come out of Jacob. When Rabbi Aqiva saw Bar Kozeva, he said: 'This is the King Messiah'. R. Yohanan b. Torta said to him: 'Aqiva, grass will be growing out of your cheekbones and the son of David will not yet have come'.⁸

R. Aqiva was not the only, nor even the first person, to explain the verse from the prophecy of Balaam in the book of Numbers [24.17]: 'There shall come a star out of Jacob and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel' as having connotations of a messianic leader or king. The Damascus Rule states: '... the *star* is the Interpreter of the Law who shall come to Damascus. ... the *sceptre* is the Prince of the whole congregation'.⁹ It is probable that R. Aqiva is relating Bar Kokhva to the Royal House of David. This at any rate is what appears from the contradiction voiced by R. Yohanan b. Torta, which is intended to disqualify Bar Kokhva's leadership.¹⁰ Other more or less contemporary

Subterranean Hideaways of the Judean Foothills and the Bar-Kokhba Revolt', *Jerusalem Cathedra* 3 (1983), pp. 114-35.

8. y. *Ta'an.* iv.68d. Cf. *Lam. R.* 2.4 (ed. Buber, p. 101). And see also A. Oppenheimer, 'Bar Kokhva's Messianism', in Z. Baras (ed.), *משיחיות ואסכולוגיה* (Messianism and Eschatology) (Jerusalem: Merkaz Zalman Sazar, 1983), pp. 153-65; P. Schafer, 'Rabbi 'Aqiva and Bar Kokhba', in W.S. Green (ed.), *Approaches to Ancient Judaism*, II (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1980), pp. 117-19.

9. Damascus Rule vii, 18-20 (translated by G. Vermes in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* [repr. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1966], p. 104). A similar attitude to the verse from Balaam's prophecy is seen in the *Targumim*. See E.E. Urbach, *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs* (repr.; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1987 [1975]), p. 674 and n. 81, p. 999; E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (rev. and ed. G. Vermes and F. Millar; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973), I, p. 543 n. 130.

10. There are some who think that R. Yohanan b. Torta was only against Bar Kokhva's messianism, and not against the revolt itself, and may have even supported Bar Kokhva as a leader of the rebels without any halo of messianism (see, for

leaders were also seen as connected to the House of David, such as the Exilarch in Babylonia and the Patriarch [*Nasi*] in the Land of Israel. The status of these leaders was also disputed, as we shall see later. However, just as the *nasi* or the exilarch was not expected to bring the Final Redemption, so it is likely that when Rabbi Aqiva called Bar Kokhva 'the King Messiah', he really intended to stress Bar Kokhva's status as king, and the term 'Messiah' should be understood simply in its original Hebrew meaning of 'Anointed'. Calling Bar Kokhva by this term is then not very different from the coronations of biblical times when the kings were anointed with oil.

The Bar Kokhva Revolt took place 62 years after the Destruction of the Temple. Some of the witnesses of the Revolt (or at least their fathers) had actually seen the Temple itself. Thus for them the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the Temple was a real hope. The deeply engrained desire of the Sages of Yavneh 'to rebuild the Temple speedily' together with their attempts to re-organize Jewish religious and national life even without Jerusalem or the Temple, included a hope for a historical change, and this certainly increased the motivation of the rebels. But it did not include utopian, messianic hopes for events such as the Return of the Lost Ten Tribes, the Coming of the Prophet Elijah, the Revival of the Dead, and so forth. This was also the concept of redemption held by Rabbi Aqiva himself, as expressed on one of the occasions when he went up to the ruins of Jerusalem together with Rabban Gamaliel, R. Joshua and R. Elazar b. Azariah:

example, G. Alon, תלדות היהודים בארץ-ישראל בתקופת המשנה והתלמוד (The Jews in their Land in the Talmudic Age 70–640 CE), II [Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1984], p. 630). However, the historical circumstances of the time of the Mishnah and the Talmud do not allow us to distinguish between religion and policy, or between religious leadership, and military and political leadership. At that time religion dictated patterns of life, and opposition to Bar Kokhva's leadership on a religious pretext inevitably meant opposition to his leadership from every aspect. However, it would be going too far to deduce from the argument between R. Aqiva and R. Yohanan b. Torta that the sages were divided into two parties over the question of support for the Revolt and for Bar Kokhva as its leader. First of all, we cannot know to which stage of the revolt R. Yohanan b. Torta's words apply—it is possible that they reflect the desperate last days. Secondly, if a large percentage of the sages had opposed R. Aqiva, there can be little doubt that during the argument one of the important sages equivalent to him in status would have taken up a position against him, and not merely R. Yohanan b. Torta, who appears but rarely in the Talmudic literature.

Another time they were going up to Jerusalem. When they reached Mount Scopus, they rent their garments, and when they came to the Temple Mount and saw a fox running out of the [ruined] building of the Holy of Holies, they began to weep, but R. Aqiva laughed. They said to him 'Aqiva, you never cease to astonish—we are weeping, yet you laugh!' . . . He said to them 'This is exactly why I laughed, for it is said, *And I took unto me faithful witnesses to record, Uriah the priest, and Zechariah the son of Jeberechiah* [Isa. 8.2]. Now what is the connection between Uriah and Zechariah? Uriah said, *Zion shall be plowed like a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps and the mountain of [the Lord's] house as the high places of a forest* [Jer. 26.18]. What did Zechariah say? *Thus saith the Lord of Hosts: There shall yet old men and old women dwell in the streets of Jerusalem etc.* [Zech. 8.4-5]. Said God 'These are My two witnesses'—If the words of Uriah are fulfilled, so will the words of Zechariah; if the words of Uriah are not fulfilled, neither will the words of Zechariah. I rejoice therefore that in the end the words of Uriah have been fulfilled [because this means that] so will the words of Zechariah. . . ¹¹

Thus when R. Aqiva comes to cite prophecies of consolation he does not turn to the magnificent eschatological visions of Deutero-Isaiah, but confines himself to the more down-to-earth, realistic prophecies by Zechariah of the streets of Jerusalem where 'old men and old women [shall] dwell. . . and every man with his staff in his hand for very age', and which 'shall be full of boys and girls playing'. This contrasts with the old people from the prophecies of the book of *Jubilees* and the book of *Enoch*, who will live for nearly a thousand years, not suffering any of the maladies of old age, but enjoying the full strength of youth until their last days.¹² In other words, R. Aqiva's expectations are limited to hoping for the realization of an earthly, historical event. This concept of redemption is expressed clearly in his ruling on the wording of the blessing which ends the Passover *Haggadah*:

11. *Sifre Deut.* xliii (ed. Finklestein, p. 95; translated by R. Hammer in *Sifre on Deuteronomy* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986], p. 90); *b. Mak.* 24b; *Lam. R.* 5.18; Yalqut ha-Makhiri on Mic. 3.12. See Urbach, *The Sages*, p. 673; S. Safrai, 'Pilgrimage to Jerusalem after the Destruction of the Second Temple', in A. Oppenheimer, et al. (eds.), *Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period: A. Schalit Memorial Volume* (Jerusalem: Izhak Ben Zwi/Ministry of Defense, 1980), p. 385 (Heb.).

12. E.g. *Jub.* 23.28; *1 En.* 10.17; and see M.D. Herr, 'Realistic Political Messianism and Cosmic Eschatological Messianism in the Teachings of the Sages', *Tarbiz* 54 (1985), pp. 331-37 (Heb.).

[The *Haggadah*] ends with redemption. . . R. Aqiva adds: Therefore, O Lord our God and God of our fathers, bring us in peace to the other feasts and festivals which are to come for us, while we rejoice in the rebuilding of your city and are happy to worship you; may we eat there from the offerings and Passover-sacrifices etc. Blessed are you, O Lord, who has redeemed Israel.¹³

R. Aqiva's hopes for the rebuilding of the Temple and his attitude to redemption are undoubtedly connected to his activism on behalf of Bar Kokhva. R. Aqiva's picture of redemption strongly supports the contention that in calling Bar Kokhva 'the King Messiah' he wished him to be seen as an earthly leader, who had the potential to realize concrete political hopes culminating in the restoration of the glory of Jerusalem and her Temple.

The picture we find in the Babylonian Talmud is rather different. Here Bar Kokhva describes himself as Messiah:

Bar Kozeva reigned for two and a half years, and then said to the Rabbis 'I am the Messiah'. They said to him 'It says about the Messiah that he judges by [his sense of] smell. Let us see whether he [Bar Kozeva] can do so'. When they saw that he was unable to judge by [his sense of] smell, they killed him.¹⁴

13. *m. Pes.* 10.6. In this *mishnah* R. Aqiva is disagreeing with R. Tarfon who thought that it was sufficient to mention the historic redemption from Egypt. The version in the Passover *haggadah* follows R. Aqiva's opinion. (The copiers of the *Mishna* cut this blessing, which was known to everybody, from the Passover *haggadah*).

14. *b. Sanh.* 93b. Cf. *Yalqut Shim'oni* on 1 Sam. §125 (without the last sentence). On the length of Bar Kokhva's reign, cf. 'And the War of Ben Koseva was two and a half years' (*S. 'Ol. R.* xxx [ed. Ratner], p. 146, but MSS of *Seder 'Olam Rabbah* and the *Rishonim* have 'three and a half years' [n. 82]; 'The reign of Ben Koseva was two and a half years' (*b. Sanh.* 97b). Raymond Martini cites the source from the Babylonian Talmud (*Sanh.* 93b) quoted above as 'Bar Koseva reigned for three and a half years' (*Pugio Fidei* [ed. J.B. Carpzow; Leipzig, 1687], p. 320). It has often been pointed out that these numbers are not necessarily accurate, but are there to signify a small number of years. In the Babylonian Talmud 'two and a half years' indicates a few years, while sources from the Land of Israel uses three and a half years. Cf. also 'Hadrian besieged Betar for three and a half years' (*y. Ta'an.* iv.68d; *Lam. R.* 2.4). And see S. Lieberman, *אל אגדות* (Jerusalem: Sifre Wahrman, 2nd edn, 1970), p. 78; Urbach, *The Sages*, p. 252, n. 43; J. Efron, 'Bar-Kokhva in the Light of the Palestinian and Babylonian Talmudic Traditions', in A. Oppenheimer and U. Rappaport (eds.), *מדר ברכוכבא*

In so far as this source has any historical significance at all for the period of the Revolt, we can deduce from it that Bar Kokhva is a utopian Messiah, far more than a realistic and rational leader. However, we cannot really consider these words as authentic information about the status of Bar Kokhva. The last sentence of the passage, which deals with Bar Kokhva's condemnation to death by the Sages, is not really credible, and indeed conflicts with other traditions of Bar Kokhva's death at the siege of Betar, although these too have legendary additions.¹⁵ The tradition in question comes from a Babylonian discussion of the disagreement over the interpretation of the prophecy of Isaiah [11.3] about the future king: 'And [the spirit of the Lord] shall make him of quick understanding [וְהָרִיחוֹ] in the fear of the Lord: and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears'. This is quoted to show the opinion of Rava, the Head of the *Yeshiva* at Mahoza in the mid-fourth century, that וְהָרִיחוֹ should be interpreted as coming from the word רִיחַ and meaning 'judging through his sense of smell'. This tradition, then, is more than two hundred years later than the Bar Kokhva Revolt. Thus it would be reasonable to see it as a product of the fully developed conceptual world of the Babylonian *amoraim*, who found it difficult to explain why it was that the sages contemporary with Bar Kokhva did not identify him as a false Messiah.

In order to decide finally on the quality of Bar Kokhva's messianism, we must first answer the question of what it was that qualified him in the eyes of the sages and the people to head the Revolt as sole leader, almost unquestioned. In the period we are discussing there were three criteria which qualified a man for leadership—wisdom, family and economic status.¹⁶ There is no certain evidence that Bar Kokhva had any of these qualities. Bar Kokhva was not to be found in

(The Bar-Kokhva Revolt: A New Approach) (Jerusalem: the Zalman Shazar Center, the Historical Society of Israel, 1980), p. 75.

15. See below and n. 26.

16. Not only is it clear from an analysis of the educational and socio-economic status of the leaders of the period that these qualifications were essential, but this is also actually specified by the sources themselves: for example, the method of choosing R. Elazar b. Azariah to head the Academy at Yavneh in place of Rabban Gamaliel after he had been deposed, because he (R. Elazar) was 'wise and rich and the tenth in descent from Ezra' (*b. Ber.* 27b). Compare, too, the words attributed to the School of Shammai: 'One should teach only those who are wise, meek and rich, and from a good family' (*Avot de-Rabbi Nathan*, version A, iii [ed. Schechter, p. 14]).

the study house, he did not have the title of an ordained 'rabbi', and none of his sayings have been preserved in a *halakha* or an *aggada*. His letters, too, do not sound like the writings of the sages, either in style or content. The sources contain no information about money or possessions belonging to Bar Kokhva, and there is no reason to suppose that he belonged to the circles of the rich or the nobility. In fact nothing is really known about Bar Kokhva's family, except for one piece of information which appears in the words of the people of Betar to Bar Kokhva, telling him of a Samaritan who was seen talking to R. Elazar ha-Moda'i: 'We saw this man have dealings with your uncle' [חבִּיבךָ].¹⁷ חבִּיב is a paternal uncle,¹⁸ and this quotation is the basis for the received opinion that R. Elazar ha-Moda'i was Bar Kokhva's uncle. Some scholars would identify Elazar ha-Moda'i with the 'Elazar the Priest' who appears on the coins of the revolt, especially since Modi'in was one of the priestly settlements.¹⁹ All this together provides Bar Kokhva with a reasonably noble pedigree—he is related to R. Elazar ha-Moda'i and to the priesthood. However, the problem here is that if Bar Kokhva did belong to a priestly family, he could not have belonged to the Royal House of David. In fact, it is highly unlikely that there were any families at this period who had a written record of their relationship to the House of David, so that Bar Kokhva's relationship must have been *post factum*.²⁰ It is possible that

17. y. *Ta'an.* iv.68d. Cf. *Lam. R.* 2.4. However *Lam. R.* (ed. Buber, p. 102), the word which expresses the relationship between R. Elazar Ha-Moda'i and Bar Kokhva is חבִּירֶתךָ, 'your friend'.

18. See the dictionaries of Ben Yehuda and Jastrow s.v. חבִּיב II; and cf. Rav Hai Gaon, *Teshuvot Geonim Qadmonim*, p. 71: 'The brother of one's father is called [*haviv*]'; Targum Yonatan to Leviticus 10, 4: '... the sons of Uzziel the *haviv* of Aaron' (Uzziel was the brother of 'Amram); y. *B. Qam.* ix.7b: 'R. Ba bar Hana said: ... R. Hiyya my *haviv*. ...'; Rashi on *b. Ket.* 52a, which begins with the word חבִּיב notes: 'R. Hiyya was his uncle, his father's brother'. And see E.S. Rosenthal, 'Rav, the son of R. Hiyya's brother—could he have been his sister's son?', S. Lieberman (ed.), ספר חנוך ילון (Yalon Jubilee Volume) (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1963), pp. 281-337; A. Schremer, 'Kinship Terminology and Endogamous Marriage in the Mishnaic and Talmudic Periods', *Zion* 60 (1995), pp. 5-35 (Heb.).

19. Thus, for example, Alon, *The Jews in their Land*, p. 623; Schürer, *History of the Jewish People*, I, p. 554; S. Yeivin, מלחמת בר־כוכבא (The Bar-Kochvah War) (Jerusalem: Bialik, 2nd edn, 1957 [1946]), p. 63, but he would make Bar Kokhva the son of R. Elazar's sister, to enable him to belong to the Royal House of David on his father's side. Neither of the relationships which Yeivin proposes can be upheld.

20. This has been definitively shown by J. Liver, בית דוד אחר חורבן ההית, *ibid.*

Bar Kokhva's place of birth helped afterwards in identifying him as Messiah. His name as it appears in his letters is Shim'on Bar Koseva, which means that he may well have come from a village called Koseva or Kozeva. Such a village has been identified at the site called Kh. Kuweizibe in the area of Bethlehem, some two kilometres south of 'Ein 'Arrub.²¹ Near 'Ein 'Arrub, which is sited on the modern Jerusalem-Hebron road opposite Gush 'Etzion an underground hide-away from the time of the Revolt has been found. This can probably be identified with Qiriath 'Arbaiah—one of the rebels' camps mentioned in the Bar Kokhva letters.²² The Midrash tells of an Arab who prophesied the Destruction of the Temple and at the same time foretold the coming of a Redeemer. When asked where the Redeemer was to be found, he replied 'At the well of 'Arrava, near Bethlehem in Judaea'.²³

Bar Kokhva's lack of the qualifications usual for leaders at the time brings us to the inescapable conclusion that he was a charismatic leader, the sort that comes to the fore in a time of crisis, when it is characteristic that such a man does not belong to the group of legal, rational leaders. If we ask how Bar Kokhva's charisma is expressed in the sources, the answer taken from the talmudic sources is unequivocal: in his legendary physical strength. This is particularly striking in the parallel in Lamentations Rabbah to the passage from the Jerusalem Talmud which includes R. Aqiva's statement 'This is the King Messiah'. Lamentations Rabbah continues:

הַבַּיִת (The House of David) (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1959), pp. 37-46, 145-47, and bibliography.

21. Cf. 1 Chron. 4.22. See F.-M. Abel, *Géographie de la Palestine* (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre Gabalda, 1938), II, p. 300; M. Kochavi (ed.), *יהודה שמרון וגולן* (Judaea, Samaria and the Golan: Archaeological Survey 1967-1968) (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1972), p. 28; Y. Tsafir et al., *Tabula Imperii Romani: Iudaea-Palaestina—Eretz Israel in the Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine Periods* (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1994), p. 169. There are remains from the Roman period at this site.

22. See Y. Yadin, 'Expedition "D"', *IEJ* 11 (1961) p. 49; *idem*, *Bar Kokhba* (London: Weidenfels & Nicholson, 1978), p. 130; Y. Tsafir, 'A Cave of the Bar-Kokhba Period near 'Ain-'Arrub', *Qadmoniot* 8 (1975), pp. 24-27 (Heb.).

23. *Lam. R.* 1.51. The logical identification of Birat 'Arava which is Kiryat 'Arbaiah of the letters is with 'Ein 'Arrub. But in the parallel source we find 'from Birat Malka (= the capital of the king), Bethlehem in Judaea' (y. *Ber.* ii.5a).

And what used Bar Kozeva to do? He would catch the missiles from the enemy's catapults on one of his knees and hurl them back, killing many of the foes. On that account R. Aqiva made his remark.²⁴

In other words, the source makes it clear that R. Aqiva's statement about Bar Kokhva's messianism was made because of his physical strength and military prowess. Apparently it is not by accident that the talmudic tradition stresses that R. Aqiva proclaimed Bar Kokhva 'King Messiah' while looking at him. Other sources which describe Bar Kokhva testing the valour of candidates for his forces by chopping off their fingers, or killing R. Elazar ha-Moda'i with a single kick, also show what brute strength was attributed to him.²⁵ The description of Bar Kokhva's death from a snake-bite as found in the sources from the Land of Israel is also connected to this. The intention is not only to show that there was a Divine cause for his death, but also to rule out completely any possibility that so charismatic a hero as Bar Kokhva could have died on the battle-field. This is most clear from the version which relates that the snake was wound round his knee.²⁶ Like Samson who could not be defeated until the locks of hair which were the source of his legendary strength were cut, so Bar Kokhva could not be laid low until he had been wounded in his knee, the same part which caught the Roman missiles and expressed his strength to the utmost.

Maimonides understood very clearly that no miracles were attributed to Bar Kokhva outside the field of military prowess. He states:

24. *Lam. R.* 2.4 (trans. A. Cohen, p. 158). In Buber's edition (p. 101) the last sentence is missing, but there this passage comes before R. Aqiva's statement about Bar Kokhva. Cf. also Šim'on had-Daršan, *Yalqut Shim'oni* on Deuteronomy §946 (eds. D. Haiman and A. Shiloni; Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 1991), pp. 649-50.

25. *y. Ta'an.* iv.68d-69a; *Lam. R.* 2.4. For Bar Kokhva tests see D. Sperber, 'Finger-Chopping', *Magic and Folklore in Rabbinic Literature* (Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 1994), pp. 121-22.

26. *Lam. R.* (Buber), pp. 102-103 and similarly in *Yalqut Shim'oni* on Deuteronomy §946 (ed. Haiman and Shiloni), p. 650, the printed version of *Lam. R.* 2.4 has the snake wound round Bar Kokhva's neck; the parallel in *y. Ta'an.* iv.69d has the snake around Bar Kokhva's penis (or his body, depending on the translation of the word פְּטוּחִיָּה); *Pes. R.* 30 (ed. Friedman, p. 142), has the snake wrapped round his heart. The common denominator in all these versions is that the snake is wrapped round the part that symbolizes valour and strength.

And you must not think that the King Messiah will perform signs or miracles, or renew things in the world, or bring the dead to life, or any thing similar. For R. Aqiva, one of the great sages of the *Mishna*, was also the armsbearer of the King Ben Koziva, and used to say of him that he was the King Messiah, and all the sages of his generation thought he was the Messiah, until he was killed on account of his sins.²⁷

It is clear that Maimonides wanted to use the episode of Bar Kokhva as an element in building his doctrine of the Messiah. Thus there may well be a connection between this statement and the circumstances of Maimonides' own time, and his arguments with his contemporaries, but this does not invalidate the stress he lays on the absence of miracles connected with Bar Kokhva. The expression 'the armsbearer of Bar Koziva the King' is particularly interesting, and it could be that Maimonides had talmudic sources which are no longer extant.

Only Christian traditions give any evidence that Bar Kokhva surrounded himself with a halo of supernatural miracles, and was not just renowned for his military prowess. For example, Eusebius writes that

The Jews were at that time led by a certain Bar Chochebas which means 'star', a man who was murderous and a bandit, but relied on his name. . . and claimed to be a luminary who had come down to them from heaven and was magically enlightening those who were in misery.²⁸

It is most unlikely that this has preserved a genuine tradition about Bar Kokhva and his messianism. On the contrary, this would appear to be a transparent attempt to blacken his image, presenting him as a sort of Anti-Christ. In Christian eyes Bar Kokhva appears as the representative of Jewish, extremist, nationalist messianism, at the opposite end of the spectrum from the pacifist, spiritual, universalist Christian gospel.²⁹ But even here and in similar sources, when we separate out the antagonism to Bar Kokhva and the deception of his miserable followers attributed to him, we can see the same sort of messianic yearning as we have seen with Rabbi Aqiva, which are

27. M. Maimonides [Moše bar-Maimon], משנה תורה (repr. of the Edition Wilna [no year]; 3 vols.; Tel Aviv: 'Am 'Olam, 1959; ET: *The Code of Maimonides [Mishneh Torah]* [14 vols.; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957-80]), *Shofetim*, Laws of Kingship, 11.3; cf. *Zemanim*, Laws of Fasting, 5.3.

28. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 6.4.2.

29. Cf. Efron, 'Bar-Kokhva', p. 54; also Schürer, *History of the Jewish People*, I, pp. 544-45, n. 140; Alon, *The Jews in their Land*, pp. 619-20.

presented in fact, in contrast to Christian heavenly messianism, in a realistic and down-to-earth manner.

The letters from Bar Kokhva which were found in the Judaean Desert Caves are signed in his name 'Shim'on bar Koseva, *Nasi* of Israel. They contain instructions to his lieutenants and deputies couched in very basic language: 'Here you are sitting and eating and drinking away everything the Jews own, and caring nothing for your fellows'; or 'you had better know that I'll get my own back on you' or 'I'll clap your legs in irons'.³⁰ It is clear from these expressions that this is language that would be used not by someone who wants to be seen as a utopian Messiah, but by a very down-to-earth leader whose commands are obeyed from fear of brute force. In sum, Bar Kokhva's messianism is an expression of his position as a political and military leader, known for his physical strength, with a realistic, pragmatic and direct approach. Indeed it is clear that in spite of the fact that all the talmudic material we have was written after the failure of the Revolt, the Palestinian sources do not present Bar Kokhva as a false Messiah, but continue to be ambivalent towards him, stressing his military prowess.

In fact, it was the shock of the failure of the Revolt and the disappointment of any hope of real and immediate redemption that prepared the ground for the appearance of messianic hopes in the utopian and eschatological sense. Now we find a trend towards preoccupation with the Final Redemption and attempts to predict the End of Days.³¹ At the same time, the leadership institutions which were refounded at Ushah in Galilee continued with the same policies begun by the sages

30. For the first example, see Yadin, 'Expedition "D"', p. 47; for the second, 'Expedition "D"', p. 48; for the third, J.T. Milik, 'Textes hébreux et araméens', in P. Benoit, J.T. Milik and R. de Vaux, *Les Grottes de Murabb'at: Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), II, p. 160.

31. See, for example, the words of R. Nathan, one of the chief spokesmen of the Ushah Period, cited in *b. Sanh.* 97b within a group of *baraitot* dealing with apocalyptic subjects. R. Nathan wishes to shew his faith in the Final Redemption, which will be accompanied by supernatural events, but at the same time to point out the impossibility of arriving at the knowledge of how to predict the End of Days. It is interesting that the passage continues to confirm R. Nathan's words with citations of other sages, including R. Aqiva, who is presented here as having been mistaken in his supposition that the Redemption was close at hand (*loc. cit.*, and see Urbach, *The Sages*, pp. 675-76).

of Yavneh in the period which followed the Destruction of the Temple. They used a concrete and pragmatic approach in order to correct the situation which had come about as a result of the Revolt, and put all their efforts into achieving the release of the captives of the Revolt, stopping emigration from the Land of Israel, strengthening the economy and, above all, renewing the activities of studying *Torah* and preparing students for leadership.

Complete recovery from the effects of the Revolt came in the time of R. Judah ha-Nasi [c. 180–220 CE], the ‘Golden Age’ of mishnaic and talmudic times. This was a time when relations with the Roman authorities were greatly improved and the economic situation was good. The leadership was in the hands of a leader with much authority and a dominant personality, who finally concluded the redaction of the *Mishnah*. In spite of the markedly peaceful nature of R. Judah ha-Nasi’s time, there are many points of resemblance between the attitude to his leadership and to that of Bar Kokhva.

A talmudic tradition states: ‘When R. Aqiva died, R. Judah ha-Nasi was born’.³² It is clearly intended to stress that the people were not left without a leader at R. Aqiva’s death, but R. Judah ha-Nasi was born straightaway to fill his place. R. Judah ha-Nasi is called simply ‘Rabbi’ or ‘Our Holy Rabbi’ in the sources. At his funeral the priests were allowed to become ritually impure, as at the funeral of a king, while R. Hiyya said: ‘On the day on which Rabbi died holiness ceased’.³³ The hopes for redemption connected with Rabbi are expressed, as with Bar Kokhva, by the fact that Rabbi too is related to the Royal House of David.³⁴ Rabbi himself ruled that the watchword for the sanctification of the month would be ‘David, King of Israel, Lives Yet’,³⁵ and he further tried to institute a ruling which would have cancelled the Fast of Ninth of Av.³⁶

32. *b. Qid.* 72b, and cf. *Gen. R.* 22.2 (ed. Albeck, pp. 86–87 and the editor’s comments, *ad loc.*).

33. *b. Ket.* 103b. The version in the Munich MSS has ‘the priesthood ceased’: see *The Babylonian Talmud with variant Readings*, (Institute for the Complete Israeli Talmud), on Ketubot, II, p. 445. This was also the ruling for other *nesi'im* descended from Rabbi (*y. Ber.* iii.6a; *y. Nazir* vii.56a).

34. See Liver, *The House of David*, pp. 32–38 and bibliography; A. Oppenheimer, *Galilee in the Mishnaic Period* (Jerusalem: Merkaz Zalman Shazar, 1991), p. 62 (Heb.). At the same time similar connections with the House of David were attributed to the Exilarch in Babylonia.

35. *b. Roš haš.* 25a. Rabbi further compares himself to a king when he asks

Like the reaction of R. Yohanan b. Torta to R. Aqiva: 'Aqiva, grass will be growing out of your cheekbones and the son of David will not yet have come' (y. *Ta'an.* iv.68d; cf. n. 8 *supra*), the sons of R. Hiyya complain about Rabbi: 'The Son of David will not come until the two ruling houses in Israel come to an end and they are the Exilarchate in Babylonia and the House of the *Nasi* in the Land of Israel' (b. *Sanh.* 38a). It seems that their statement was seen as a criticism of the hints of messianism that accompanied Rabbi's behaviour as *Nasi*. Following this, R. Hiyya indirectly justifies his sons' statement, when he says: 'When wine goes in, secrets come out', in other words, after drinking they revealed a truth which should have been concealed. However, R. Hiyya himself was among those who stressed the messianism of R. Judah ha-Nasi, and even at a time when he is reproving Rabbi over a certain issue, he cites the following verse from the book of Lamentations [4.20] about him: 'The breath of our nostrils, the anointed of the Lord, was taken in their pits'.³⁷ R. Hiyya saw the time of R. Judah ha-Nasi as being in some ways the beginning of the Redemption, as is clear from this passage:

It happened that Rabbi Hiyya Rabba and R. Shim'on b. Halafta were walking in that Valley of Arbel in the early morning when they saw the first rays of dawn at daybreak. R. Hiyya Rabba said to R. Shim'on b. Halafta *be-Rabbi*: 'The redemption of Israel is like this. It begins little by little, then the more it progresses, the greater it grows.'³⁸

Thus R. Hiyya sees the period of R. Judah ha-Nasi's leadership as being the beginning of the messianic era, but at the same time he states his opposition to any attempts to predict the End of Days or to force it

R. Hiyya 'Is one like myself to bring an offering of a he-goat?' (b. *Hor.* 11b): a king who had sinned was obliged by the *halakha* to bring an offering of a he-goat (m. *Hor.* 3.2-3). Rav, R. Judah ha-Nasi's pupil, says that if the Messiah had lived in his time, he would have had the appearance of Rabbi (b. *Sanh.* 98b).

36. y. *Ta'an.* iv.69c; b. *Meg.* 5a-b. See too b. *Roš haš.* 18b.

37. y. *Šab.* xvi.15c; for the presentation of R. Judah ha-Nasi as a sort of Messiah, see Urbach, *The Sages*, pp. 678-79; *idem*, 'Class Status and Leadership in the World of the Palestinian Sages', in *Proceedings of the Israeli National Academy for Sciences* (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences, 1965), II, p. 51 = *idem*, מעולם שלוחים (The World of the Sages) (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1988), p. 326.

38. y. *Ber.* i.2c. In another source the redemption brought by R. Judah ha-Nasi is compared to that brought by Daniel and his companions, by Mordechai and Esther, and by the Hasmonaeans (b. *Meg.* 11a, and see *The Babylonian Talmud with Variant Readings, ad loc.*).

to come nearer. From his words we can perhaps distinguish between the messianism of Bar Kokhva, who tried to bring redemption all at once by rebellion against Rome, and between the messianism of R. Judah ha-Nasi, whose policy was to bring redemption step by step. In spite of this, the common ground between them is clear, for both wished to bring redemption by realistic and down-to-earth means. Both these leaders who bore the title of *Nasi*, each in his own time, represented the realistic application of messianic hopes.

THE ESCHATOLOGIZATION OF THE PROPHETIC BOOKS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

Henning Graf Reventlow

The papers in this collection are focused upon the theme 'eschatology', as a topic that has a common interest to Jewish and Christian scholars. The following remarks, therefore, are an attempt at bringing together some comprehensive observations about a process in the redaction of the prophetic books that has been carried on in a similar way in the different prophetic works. Therefore it can be seen as a common phenomenon that does not say as much about the message of a single prophet as about the general development of Israel's faith. It seems that in a certain period of Israel's history a fundamental change in the expectation of the future¹ happened, which can be shown in the prophetic books.²

To begin with, however, before speaking about concrete texts, a consideration about the terminology is appropriate: are we actually entitled to use the term 'eschatology'³ in connection with the Old Testament? G. Wanke used it as a title for an article which appeared 25 years ago: '“Eschatologie”: Ein Beispiel theologischer Sprachverwirrung'.⁴ In it he deplores the dissension between Old Testament

1. Cf. H.D. Preuss, *Jahweglaube und Zukunftserwartung* (BWANT, 87; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1968). S. Talmon, 'Partikularität und Universalismus in der biblischen Zukunftserwartung', in A. Falaturi, W. Stolz and S. Talmon (eds.), *Zukunftshoffnung und Zukunftserwartung in den monotheistischen Religionen* (Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1983), pp. 21-48, 32, favours the use of this formulation instead of 'eschatology', which in his opinion is not the appropriate term.

2. Cf. also J. Nogalski, *Redactional Processes in the Book of the Twelfth* (BZAW, 218; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993). But we check other prophetic books than the ones treated there.

3. The term seems to occur in theological use for the first time in the seventeenth century. Cf. T. Mahlmann, 'Eschatologie', *HWPPh* 22 (1972), pp. 739-43; G. Sauter, 'Begriff und Aufgabe der Eschatologie', *NZST* 30 (1988), pp. 191-208.

4. *KD* 16 (1970), pp. 300-12; reprinted in H.D. Preuss (ed.), *Eschatologie im*

scholars regarding the use of the term which would detain systematic theologians from starting with a fixed exegetical terminology. Since then, different opinions on how to use the terminology continue. Among them is the conviction that the term 'eschatology' is not suitable for the Old Testament because of its origin in Greek diction.⁵ So J. Lindblom,⁶ deplores 'the obvious impossibility to extirpate the term "eschatology" from prophetic research'. Therefore, he only retains its use in a wider sense. Also R. Smend speaks about a 'dilemma'; however, in the end he pleads for keeping it in prophetic research, because prophecy prepares apocalyptics.⁷ As the topic is dealt with by B. Uffenheimer, I will not touch upon the problem here.

In the literature one finds different proposals on how to apply the term 'eschatology' to the Old Testament and especially to prophecy. There exists a near consensus that the idea of an absolute end of the world is unknown in the Old Testament. Even the expectation of a final period reckons with a future *in* the world, if with a period totally different from the present, being a final one insofar as it is impossible that a new change could follow upon it. If one wants to keep speaking about 'eschatology', one has to find a definition suitable to the Old Testament. T.M. Raitt, for instance, proposes 'that eschatology is the search for and discovery of a frame of reference to explain events which are not understandable in terms of any previously existing tradition'.⁸ This definition may hit one aspect of eschatology, but as a description of the whole phenomenon, it is not exact enough.⁹ Another attempt is the one of O. Kaiser: He understands 'eschatology' as 'the expectation of an interference of God in the future which will be decisive for the course of history of the people of God, the city of God and humanity'.¹⁰ But even this circumscription does not seem

Alten Testament (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1978), pp. 342-60.

5. The decisive factor is its use in the LXX.

6. J. Lindblom, 'Gibt es eine Eschatologie bei den alttestamentlichen Propheten?', *ST* 6 (1952), pp. 29-114; reprinted in Preuss (ed.), *Eschatologie* (pp. 31-72), p. 2, n. 6.

7. R. Smend, 'Eschatologie II. Altes Testament', *TRE* 10, (1982), pp. 256-64, 256-57.

8. T.M. Raitt, *A Theology of Exile: Judgement/Deliverance in Jeremiah and Ezekiel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), p. 215.

9. It would also be fitting for a definition of 'miracle'.

10. O. Kaiser, 'Geschichtliche Erfahrung und eschatologische Erwartung: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der alttestamentlichen Eschatologie im Jesajabuch', *NZST* 15

sufficient. As a closer definition, it has to be added what S. Mowinckel once clothed in the words, 'that the present state of things and the present world order will suddenly come to an end and be superseded by another of an essentially different kind',¹¹ or, to speak with Lindblom, the 'idea of two epochs'.¹² Between both there is a break, as von Rad also stresses,¹³ so that, out of a 'situation of zero' something completely new begins, 'a completely new existence that shall also be final'.¹⁴ This dualistic feature surely is an especially typical aspect of Old Testament eschatology; it has to be emphasized, however, that we are dealing with a change between two historical periods, not with the contrast between two worlds, a natural and a supernatural one. Nevertheless, the concluding period—and this is essential for 'eschatology'—bears the character of finality.¹⁵ If we adapt it to this understanding, we can use the term 'eschatology' without problems as a term rooted in the history of exegesis.

Out of this follows a second question: can an 'eschatology' understood in this way be found in the prophets at all? As regards pre-exilic prophecy, S. Mowinckel denied this emphatically:

The prophets of doom were always concerned with contemporary events. Their starting point was always the given, concrete, historical situation, and nearly always the political situation. . . . They foretold the future; but it was the immediate future, which arose out of existing, concrete reality. . . . In a message of this kind there is no room for eschatology.¹⁶

(1973), pp. 272-85; reprinted in Preuss (ed.), *Eschatologie*, pp. 444-61, and O. Kaiser, *Von der Gegenwartsbedeutung des Alten Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), pp. 167-80 (167).

11. S. Mowinckel, *He that Cometh* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1959), p. 125.

12. J. Lindblom, 'Gibt es eine Eschatologie bei den alttestamentlichen Propheten?', in Preuss (ed.), *Eschatologie*, p. 33.

13. *Theologie des Alten Testaments* (6th edn, 1975), II, p. 125.

14. K.-D. Schunck, 'Die Attribute des eschatologischen Messias', *TLZ* 111 (1986), pp. 641-52, 643; also J.H. Grönbaek, 'Zur Frage der Eschatologie in der Verkündigung der Gerichtspropheten', *SEÅ* 24 (1959) (reprinted in Preuss [ed.], *Eschatologie*, pp. 129-46 [134]), stresses the 'aspect of conclusion'. Cf. also H.P. Müller, *Ursprünge und Strukturen alttestamentlicher Eschatologie* (BZAW, 109; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1969), part 1, ch. 3, pp. 69-128, who speaks about 'the final character of the future intervention of God in history'.

15. Cf. also H.P. Müller, 'Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung der biblischen Eschatologie', *VT* 14 (1964), pp. 276-93 (280): 'The expectation aims at something final, not to be surpassed'.

16. Mowinckel, *He that Cometh*, p. 131.

Similarly J. Kegler: 'There is neither a doctrine about the future nor programs transcending inner-historical events. Future activity of God is always destined for the contemporaries of the prophet. . . not for future generations.'¹⁷ This judgment follows on from the definition of 'eschatology' that we tried above. One could perhaps say that in the announcement of an immediately imminent activity of God, which the preexilic prophets proclaim, the possibility of something completely new is included.¹⁸ Although they normally announce judgment for Israel, often in terms of the usual historic catastrophes in the well-known manner, according to the pattern of political-military events and at best unusual in their expected extent, occasionally the prospect of a new salvation becomes visible behind them.¹⁹ This would also be the school of thought that concludes from the occurrence of the word 'end' in prophecy (the earliest examples for עֵץ and אֶחָד appear in Amos 8.2-10) that 'eschatology' can be found in classic pre-exilic prophecy.²⁰ More promising seems to be the proposal of G. von Rad, who spoke of an 'eschatologizing of historical thinking by the prophets', taking as his starting-point the expectation of a new activity of God, and who remarked: 'one should speak of an eschatological message always there, where the up till now valid historical salvation-background is denied'.²¹ The basis of the argument here is von Rad's well-known salvation-history approach, which includes the possibility

17. J. Kegler, 'Prophetisches Reden von Zukünftigem', in *Eschatologie und Friedenshandeln: Exegetische Beiträge zur Frage christlicher Friedensverantwortung* (SBS, 101; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1981), pp. 15-58 (52).

18. Kegler, 'Prophetisches Reden', p. 53.

19. One would have to think, above all, of Hosea; cf. J. Jeremias, 'Zur Eschatologie des Hoseabuches', in J. Jeremias and L. Perlitt (eds.), *Die Botschaft und die Boten* (Festschrift H.W. Wolff; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981), pp. 217-34.

20. To the representatives of this opinion belongs, above all, M. Saebø. Cf., for instance, 'Eschaton und Eschatologie im Alten Testament—in traditionsgeschichtlicher Sicht', in J. Hausmann and H.J. Zobel (eds.), *Alttestamentlicher Glaube und Biblische Theologie* (Festschrift H.D. Preuss; Stuttgart, 1992), pp. 321-30, 325-330; *idem*, 'Zum Verhältnis von "Messianismus" und "Eschatologie" im Alten Testament', *JBT* 8 (1993), pp. 25-55 (40ff.). Cf. also. H.W. Wolff, 'Endzeitvorstellungen und Orientierungskrise in der alttestamentlichen Prophetie', in H.G. Geyer (ed.), *Wenn nicht jetzt, wann dann?* (Festschrift H.J. Kraus; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1983), pp. 75-86.

21. G. von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, II, p. 128. Cf. also Saebø, 'Eschaton', pp. 322-23.

of supposing a succession of different salvation-historical periods: a basic old one (in von Rad's *Theology of the Old Testament*, I, called 'Israel's historical traditions') and a new one, announced by the prophets—von Rad describes this process as 'eschatologizing'. But with this widened use the term loses its contours to a high degree.²²

Given these circumstances, it seems more appropriate to use the more precise definition of 'eschatology' in the sense we tried above. The result would also imply that Mowinckel's objections regarding an unrestricted application to prophecy remain valid. Only then the term is suitable for a delimitation in the prophetic books which makes it possible to show a development that was not from the beginning connected with the original message of the so-called classical prophets.

The older prophecy, beginning with the prophet Amos, did in fact speak about an 'end', although this was not meant in an absolute sense, but was understood as the end of a certain political existence, in the case of Amos obviously of the northern Israelite kingdom.²³ The same way of speaking can still be found in the word of Ezekiel addressed to the 'land of Israel' in Ezek. 7.2-4 (//6aβ-9), which was proclaimed shortly before 587 BCE.²⁴ In both cases it is not correct to speak of 'eschatology'. Though in Ezek. 7.2b a cosmological expansion of the incident is indicated,²⁵ an inner-historical event is also in view. Thus we are conducted close to the period of the exile.²⁶

Eschatological utterances in a closer sense cannot be found earlier than in the post-exilic period.²⁷ If we cast a glance at the basic

22. The same would then apply to W.H. Schmidt, 'Aspekte der Eschatologie im Alten Testament', *JBT* 8 (1993), pp. 3-23.

23. It seems to be evident that R. Smend exaggerated Amos's message by far in seeing in his announcement of the 'end' a 'no to the existence of the people as such': 'Das Nein des Amos', *EvT* 23 (1963), pp. 404-23; reprinted in *idem*, *Die Mitte des Alten Testaments: Gesammelte Studien* (BEvT, 99; Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1986), I, pp. 85-103 (95). In a more reserved way J. Jeremias, *Der Prophet Hosea* (ATD, 24.1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), pp. 32-33, judges that the 'not my people' (Hos. 1.9) is not the last word of the prophet.

24. Cf. W. Zimmerli, *Ezechiel* (BKAT, 13.1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2nd edn, 1979), p. 168.

25. Connected with the tradition of the 'day of Yahweh' overtaken here.

26. Which for Ezekiel had already begun with the deportation of 597.

27. Thus also R. Kilian, 'Überlegungen zur alttestamentlichen Eschatologie', in *idem et al.* (eds.), *Eschatologie: Bibeltheologische und philosophische Studien zur*

material of the early postexilic prophetic books Haggai and (Proto-) Zechariah, we observe also there a concrete reference to contemporary events and conditions. No doubt, now after the catastrophe has already happened, the perspective has shifted from the announcement of judgment²⁸ to the proclamation of salvation, but the expected salvation is also related to the concrete situation of a community—which now has become small and is dwelling inside narrow borders.²⁹ But we find above all with Proto-Zechariah the recurring idea of a fundamental change which is to be expected from the imminent direct intervention of God in the destiny of Juda-Jerusalem, a state of salvation which will replace the present suppressed conditions of the early postexilic community,³⁰ including a distinct cosmological aspect.³¹ Thus, there are some elements together that could justify a characterization of the pictures and announcements at least as proto-eschatological. In any case, it is an altered outward and mental situation. Nevertheless, there is no statement that describes the expected state of salvation as being final, not to be overthrown again. A comparison with the message of Second Isaiah shows that with the exilic prophet the consciousness of a crisis is already present: The contrast between the 'earlier' and the 'new', mentioned in several places (Isa. 42.9; 43.18-19) could point to a thinking in 'periods',³² in which the period of salvation announced as immediately approaching is something totally different from the deplorable past period including the present time. Whether one should, however, speak at this point

Verhältnis von Erlösungswelt und Wirklichkeitsbewältigung (Festschrift E. Neuhäusler; St Ottilien: EOS, 1981), pp. 23-39.

28. However, some indications of present judging acts of God can still be found (cf. Hag. 1.6, 10-11; 2.16-17; Zech. 5.3-4).

29. Therefore it is not appropriate to speak of 'eschatology' with Haggai (against H.F. van Rooy, 'Eschatology and Audience: The Eschatology of Haggai', *OTE* 1 [1988], pp. 49-63).

30. But the opinion of H. Gese, 'Anfang und Ende der Apokalyptik, dargestellt am Sacharjabuch', *ZTK* 70 (1973), pp. 20-49; reprinted in *idem*, *Vom Sinai zum Zion* (BEvT, 64; Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1974), pp. 202-30, must be rejected, who detects apocalypics already with Proto-Zechariah, starting from the form of visions.

31. Visible especially in the first night vision of Zechariah, Zech. 1.8-15, and in the seventh, Zech. 6.1-8.

32. Though this has also been denied, cf. D. Michel, 'Deuterojesaja', *TRE* 8 (1981), pp. 510-30 (519).

of an eschatological message is doubtful, as the other characteristics mentioned are missing with Second Isaiah, above all the finality of the expected state of salvation.³³

Taken all in all, in connection with prophecy as far as to the early post-exilic period, we can not yet speak of an eschatological message. The events, which in the following chapter will be the main topic, belong to a somewhat later phase, in which seemingly altered ways of thinking created other preconditions for a recoinage of the prophetic message. The term 'recoining' indicates a process in which the older prophetic message, be it in written form or a firmly formed oral tradition, was already at hand as fixed material, but not yet in so closed a form that it would have been impossible to work on it. The process of actualization of older tradition has engaged scholarly discussion during recent years to a high degree. It has produced different considerations without as yet approaching anything like an exact picture of what happened. That actualization is a process, which in a certain period of the history of the biblical texts, has intervened in the texts themselves as has been shown, for instance, in the well-known book of Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*.³⁴ This book, however, following rabbinic tradition, is nearly restricted to the realm of Torah and Torah interpretation. That work on the prophetic books also has continued is known because of single books. But an overview is missing to the present day, which by comparing the parallel developments in the single prophetic books could show the inner connection between them. The following remarks intend to make evident that such a connection does exist, because the additions that can be observed in the different prophetic books (which have been mostly detected already in the period of literary criticism and removed from the text as 'secondary') originate in *one* epoch and are stamped by its special ways of thinking.

One of the best known passages belonging to this group is the end of

33. Doubts against such a characterization are expressed by S. Herrmann, *Die prophetischen Heilserwartungen im Alten Testament: Ursprung und Gestaltwandel* (BWANT, 85; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1965), p. 303; A. Schoors, 'L'eschatologie dans les prophéties du Deutéro-Isaïe', *RechBib* 8 (1962), pp. 107-28; *idem*, *I am God your Saviour* (VTSup, 24; Leiden: Brill, 1973), pp. 304-305; Michel, 'Deutero-jesaja'.

34. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985. Cf. also H.G. Reventlow, *Epochen der Bibelauslegung. I. Vom Alten Testament bis Origenes* (Munich: Beck, 1990), ch. 1, pp. 11-23.

the book of Amos (Amos 9.11-12, 13-15). J. Wellhausen in his inimitable manner has given a commentary on it, showing that the passage³⁵ cannot have Amos as its author: 'Roses and lavender instead of blood and iron. . . After he has just surpassed widely all his earlier menaces, he cannot suddenly break off their point, he cannot pour out of the cup of Yahweh's wrath finally milk and honey.'³⁶ More recent commentators have mostly confirmed Wellhausen's conclusions.³⁷ The topic in detail is mainly congruent with the themes we find in other pieces of the same kind. To begin with, there is the messianic aspect, which appears here in the picture of the 'booth of David that is fallen', which God will raise up again (v. 11). M. Saebø³⁸ has pointed to the fact that messianism and eschatology belong closely together, even if not every eschatological message is also messianic. That the utterance is rooted in Judah/Jerusalem is shown also by the distance from Amos's message directed to the northern kingdom. An additional typical feature is that Edom is mentioned (v. 12). Edom seems to play a specific role in the late postexilic period, as one can see from his importance in Isaiah 34 and Isaiah 63. In both cases this country has a typical function, separated from history, as exemplum and place of judgment on the pagan peoples of the world (see below). Here in Amos 9.12 'the rest of Edom and all peoples' are mentioned together; this points to that function. The second saying (vv. 13-15) has numerous parallels to the promises in the form of blessing³⁹ and quotes traditional expect-

35. More exactly, these are two passages: vv. 11-12 and 13-15 (so most commentators).

36. J. Wellhausen, *Die kleinen Propheten übersetzt und erklärt* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 3rd edn, 1898 [= 4th edn, 1963]), p. 96.

37. U. Kellermann, 'Der Amoschluß als Stimme deuteronomistischer Heilshoffnung', *EvT* 29 (1969), pp. 169-83, thinks of a deuteronomistic redaction. H.W. Wolff, *Dodekapropheten 2: Joel und Amos* (BKAT, 14.2; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), p. 406, 'of a later layer of redaction which concludes the book of Amos independently'. For an authentic word of Amos, among others, see H.G. Reventlow, *Das Amt des Propheten bei Amos* (FRLANT, 80; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), pp. 90-110; W. Rudolph, *Joel-Amos-Obadja-Jona* (KAT, 13.2; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1971), pp. 278-87; S.M. Paul, *Amos* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), pp. 288-89. But this opinion cannot be kept if confronted with more recent results in the field of redactional history.

38. Saebø, *Zum Verhältnis*.

39. For the details, cf. Reventlow, *Amt*, pp. 94-103. The conclusions, however, seem now to lead in another direction. Also J.L. Mays, *Amos* (OTL; London: SCM

tations of a miraculous change of nature in the period of salvation.

Similar observations can be made in the book of Hosea. J. Jeremias⁴⁰ perceived in the first part of the book⁴¹ at the end of the first three chapters the addition of postexilic salvation oracles. Hosea 1.7, the first of these additions,⁴² has often been regarded as part of the 'judaic redaction' of the book,⁴³ but it does not presuppose the pre-exilic contrast between the northern and the southern kingdom any more. Instead it is related to the postexilic entity Judah, which is identical with the 'temple-citizen-community' gathered around Jerusalem. Typical for the word is the promise of the salvation of Judah not by weapons, but by God's help—an old feature in tradition-history,⁴⁴ but which occurs especially often in late utterances of this kind. One could say nearly the same to Hos. 2.20, which belongs to the loose collection 2.18-25, in which some sayings may go back to Hosea himself,⁴⁵ while others are surely later. Also visible here are eschatological motives that point to the same period: the announcement of a 'covenant' with the animals and the destruction of weapons.⁴⁶ In Hos. 3.5 the situation

Press; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), mentions the closeness of the formulations to the forms of blessing and curse in Lev. 26 and Deut. 28.

40. Jeremias, *Der Prophet Hosea*, ad 1.7; 2.1-3; 2.18-25; 3.5; cf. also *idem*, 'Hosea/Hoseabuch', *TRE* 15 (1986), pp. 586-98.

41. The situation in the second part of the book is a different one; cf. T. Naumann, *Hoseas Erben: Strukturen der Nachinterpretation im Buch Hosea* (BWANT, 131; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1991), referring only to this second part.

42. In the opinion of Jeremias, 1.5 also is an addition, but it is older and gains a new sense by the addition of v. 7.

43. H.W. Wolff, *Dodekapropheten, 1. Hosea* (BKAT, 14.1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2nd edn, 1965), *ad loc.*, regards the verse already as an addition, but dates it still as historic and belonging in the pre-exilic period. Similarly J.L. Mays, *Hosea* (OTL; London: SCM Press; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), p. 29.

44. Cf. Jeremias, *Hosea*, p. 34.

45. The opinions of the commentators differ: Wolff, *Hosea*, pp. 57-69; similarly, W. Rudolph, *Hosea* (KAT, 13; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1966), pp. 78-83, and Mays, *Hosea*, p. 47, ascribe the collection to a redactor, the single sayings to Hosea himself. T.H. Robinson, 'Hosea bis Micha', in *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten* (HAT, 1.14; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1954), pp. 13-14, takes at least vv. 20-22 as genuine. In the opinion of Jeremias, *Hosea*, pp. 48-52, all sayings come from a late period. Presumably a middle solution is correct: Whereas vv. 18-19 look still hoseanic, the following verses are obviously younger.

46. R. Bach, '... der Bogen zerbricht, Spieße zerschlägt und Wagen mit Feuer

is similar: If we do not approve of deleting the mention of king David, which goes back to Wellhausen⁴⁷ and since then mostly was overtaken, a similarity to Amos 9.11 becomes visible, and we find a genuine 'messianic', that is, a late postexilic⁴⁸ expectation of a final restitution of the Davidic monarchy.

The situation in the book of Micah is different. Here we have only in chs. 1–3 material going back in the main to the prophet himself. Chapters 6–7 also contain prophecy of judgment, but its origin is debated. In the center are two chapters, the content of which is often called 'eschatological'. That this material does not come from the prophet becomes visible at once in the well-known passage Mic. 4.1–5, which I will come back to later in connection with its parallel in Isaiah 2. At the moment I will only call attention to the fact that this material belongs to the Zion tradition. The same can be said of the following passages 4.6–8, 9–10, 11–13,⁴⁹ whereas 5.1–5* represents the Davidic–messianic tradition. The passage 5.6–14—a composition of different pieces⁵⁰—seems to originate likewise in the postexilic period.⁵¹ A witness is, above all, the motif of the destruction of the weapons (v. 9), combined characteristically with God's vengeance on the peoples (v. 14). With the 'rest of Jacob' (vv. 6–7), as with Micah himself

verbrennt', in H.W. Wolff (ed.), *Probleme biblischer Theologie* (Festschrift G. von Rad; Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1971), pp. 13–26, seeks the origin of the motif in the ideology of the Holy War.

47. Wellhausen, *Kleine Propheten*, p. 105.

48. Cf. also Robinson, *Hosea bis Micha*, p. 16.

49. Verse 14 is often taken as a fragment, the origin of which is difficult to explain (cf., e.g., T.H. Robinson, *Hosea bis Micha*, p. 143; B. Renaud, *La Formation du Livre de Michée* [EBib; Paris: Gabalda, 1977], p. 214; D.R. Hillers, *Micah* [Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984], pp. 62–63). Another solution is to take it together with 5.1–3 (cf. A.S. van der Woude, *Micha* [Predeking van het OT; Nijkerk: Callenbach, 1976], p. 165; H.W. Wolff, *Dodekapropheten 4. Micha* [BKAT, XIV.4; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982], pp. 105–106; J.L. Mays, *Micah* [OTL; London: SCM Press; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976], pp. 111–17).

50. Cf. the commentaries.

51. The opinions about the date differ widely: from the supposition that the piece comes from the prophet Micah himself (A. Weiser, *Das Buch der zwölf kleinen Propheten* [ATD, 24; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 8th edn, 1985], I, pp. 274–77; van der Woude, *Micha*, esp. pp. 61–64, and still Hillers, *Micah*, pp. 71–74) until the postexilic period (Wolff, *Micha*, pp. 126–27). Cf. also J.T. Willis, 'The Authenticity and Meaning of Micah 5.9–14', *ZAW* 81 (1969), pp. 353–68.

(3.8), the Judeans are meant.⁵² Also characteristic is the statement that the destruction of all idols in the country and their adorers is connected with the destruction of the weapons, so that in the time of salvation a community of pure adorers of Yahweh is left.

The situation is similar in the book Zephaniah.⁵³ Whereas the bulk of the book apparently can be traced back to the prophet who worked under king Josiah (1.1)⁵⁴ and contains prophecy of judgment,⁵⁵ at the end there are several⁵⁶ appendixes containing salvation oracles to Jerusalem. The characteristic announcement is that Yahweh will be as king in Zion/the center of Jerusalem (3.15, 17), the Diaspora will be repatriated (3.20) and the peoples of Africa⁵⁷ will come here to adore him.

In the book of Jeremiah the circumstances of its growth are less clear. Though it is certain that the percentage of material that can be derived from the prophet is limited, the kind and the extension of the

52. Cf. Wolff, *Micah*, pp. 127-28; also J. Hausmann, *Israels Rest: Studien zum Selbstverständnis der nachexilischen Gemeinde* (BWANT, 124; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1987), pp. 177-80.

53. Also on this book different exegetical methods have been tested. More holistic approaches are being tried recently, such as P.R. House, *Zephaniah: A Prophetic Drama* (JSOTSup, 69; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989); M.A. Sweeney, 'A Form-Critical Reassessment of the Book of Zephaniah', *CBQ* 53 (1991), pp. 388-408. Expressly historical-critical in contrast is the work of E. Ben Zvi, *A Historical-Critical Study of the Book of Zephaniah* (BZAW, 198; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1991). However, the indications that the book is a collection of originally shorter units are meanwhile more convincing. New commentaries are A. Deissler, *Zwölfprophetenbuch*, III (NEB; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1988); K. Seybold, *Nahum Habakuk Zephania* (ZBKAT 24.2; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1991).

54. The additions of apocalyptic character which are scattered through the whole book (1.3-18; 2.2-3, 11; 3.8) can be left aside here, but they show how long one has kept working on the book.

55. The 'day of Yahweh' is no eschatological term in these parts of the book (about his origin cf. recently H. Spieckermann, 'Dies Irae: Der alttestamentliche Befund und seine Vorgeschichte', *VT* 39 (1989), pp. 194-208).

56. Thus Seybold, ZBKAT, and Deissler, NEB, if with different delimitations. Cf. also Ben Zvi, *Historical-Critical Study*, pp. 320ff. However, Sweeney, *Form-Critical Reassessment*, pp. 402-403, understands 3.1-13 as a whole as 'Prophetic Announcement of Salvation to Jerusalem' and 3.14-20 likewise as unity in the sense of 'Prophetic Summons to Rejoice'.

57. To the possible reading in v. 10, cf. Seybold, *Nahum Habakuk Zephania*, p. 113.

later reworking, which also seems to have been multifarious,⁵⁸ is hotly debated. An example of this can be seen in the case of the so-called 'booklet of consolation', Jeremiah 30–31, the most uniform collection of prophecy of salvation, in which the judgments range from a nearly complete ascription to the prophet himself⁵⁹ to the characterization as a postexilic product.⁶⁰ The most common hypothesis⁶¹ suggests that the basic material goes back to Jeremiah himself with more or less extensive later additions. Whether the search for authentic material is on the right path here can, however, be debated. After some too summarily asserted late datings,⁶² recently the careful inquiry of G. Fischer⁶³ has produced arguments of weight for accepting that in the chapters 'presumably we have to do with a creation originating in Palestine in the postexilic period'.⁶⁴ Above all, Fischer has observed, besides similarities to the presumably original Jeremiah, numerous recourses, among others deuteronomistic or (deutero-)

58. The problem of the sources which had been reconstructed by the older literary criticism belongs to the question (Duhm, Mowinckel, Rudolph; cf. the report by S. Herrmann, *Jeremia: Der Prophet und das Buch* [EdF, 271; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1990], pp. 54–66), but it does not touch our theme. Intricate also is the topic of an eventual deuteronomistic redaction of the book (cf. Herrmann, *Jeremia*, pp. 66–87).

59. Cf. recently J. Unterman, *From Repentance to Redemption: Jeremiah's Thought in Transition* (JSOTSup, 54; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987).

60. In the older period, B. Stade, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (Berlin: Grote, 1887), I, pp. 646–47; R. Smend, Sr, *Lehrbuch der alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte* (Freiburg i. Br.: J.C.B. Mohr, 1893), pp. 239–41, n. 1; more recently, R.C. Carroll, *Jeremiah* (OTL; London: SCM Press; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), pp. 568–70.

61. It mainly goes back to B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jeremia* (KHAT, 11; Tübingen and Leipzig: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1901), p. 239, and has been adopted with variations in details by many others. To the history of research cf. Herrmann, *Jeremia*, pp. 146–62.

62. Thus rightly Herrmann, *Jeremia*, pp. 155–56, on Carroll's brief remarks, *Jeremiah*, pp. 588–89.

63. G. Fischer, *Das Trostbüchlein: Text, Komposition und Theologie von Jer 30–31* (SBB, 26; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1993); important also is Fischer's detailed proof that MT is the more original text than LXX (in contrast to the opinion of J.G. Janzen, *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah* (HSM, 6; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973), who regarded the Hebrew text which the LXX used as more original. Against this opinion is S. Soderlund, *The Greek Text of Jeremiah* (JSOTSup, 47; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985).

64. Fischer, *Trostbüchlein*, p. 270.

Isaianic phrases,⁶⁵ but also a specific stamp of the chapters that suggests a separate complex from the respective period.

In starting with these presuppositions, one can observe striking parallels to the texts treated above, which come from the same period. To these belong, to begin with, the parallel mentioning of Israel and Judah (30.3.4; 31, 27.31). 'Jacob' (30.7-10, 18.20; 31, 7.11) is, as in the secondary layer of Micah, a denotation for the (postexilic) community, which has nothing more to do with the old northern kingdom. Nevertheless the fiction is kept that an Israel is in view which comprises the northern territories (31.1, 5 [Samaria] 31.15 [Rama]; also the consciously archaizing label 'Ephraim' 31.6-9, 18-20). The actual situation, however, is the postexilic Judah (31.23-24) or Jerusalem/Zion (30.18; 31, 6.12; 31.38-40). In 30.9 under these circumstances the mentioning of the David redivivus, whom the people shall serve, cannot be regarded any more as an addition. The 'ruler from their midst' (30.21; cf. Deut. 17.15) is nobody else but the 'messianic' representative of the Davidic dynasty. Besides, in the chapters appear a series of eschatological statements: the period of horror preceding the eschatological period of salvation (30.5-7, cf. 12-14), which at the same time is the judgment of all evildoers (30.23), the final return of the Diaspora (30.3, 10; 31.8-9, 10.16-17, 21) and the destruction or punishment of the foreign peoples (30.11 [including a secondary interpretation in b β]; 16.20), the turning of the curse into blessing (taking up the blessing- and curse-form: 30.10; 31.5) and the paradisiac fruitfulness of man and cattle (30.19; 31, 27). Included also is the rebuilding of Jerusalem (31.38-40), the procession to Zion (31.6.12, cf. 14; cf. Isa. 2.2-5; Mic. 4.1-5, see below) and the new covenant with an internalized knowledge of the Torah. The relations are so manifold here that the interpretation in the sense of a one-sided deuteronomistic influence probably is not correct.

From the book of Jeremiah we come to Ezekiel. In the book of Ezekiel one perceives an extended overworking, as W. Zimmerli has remarked in his well-known commentary.⁶⁶ The extent of the material not derived from the prophet is debated;⁶⁷ the prevailing recent

65. Cf. also C. Westermann, *Prophetische Heilsworte im Alten Testament* (FRLANT, 145; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987), pp. 106-16.

66. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel* (BKAT, XIII/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2nd edn, 1979).

67. For the history of research until c. 1980, cf. B. Lang, *Ezechiel* (EdF, 153;

tendency is to reckon with a greater extent of the secondary material. This problem does not need to be decided in principle here; only single passages in which the correspondence to the eschatological reworking observed in the other prophetic books is evident are necessary. To these belongs, among others, Ezek. 34.23-30. The main part of the chapter is the promise of salvation with the picture of the herdsman, in which God announces his will to put the flock himself to pasture instead of the bad herdsmen who have treated it until now in the worst manner (1-22⁶⁸). In vv. 23-24 follows the statement, which stands in tension to it, that God will install his 'servant David' as herdsman over his flock, as 'prince' (נָשִׂיךְ).⁶⁹ Here is a correspondence to the messianic statements in the additions to the other prophetic books already spoken about. It follows—whether as a second addition or as immediate continuation is hard to decide—a passage (vv. 25-29), in which paradisiac fruitfulness and security from outward enemies is announced; the antithetic correspondences to the curse-form in Leviticus 26 are obvious.⁷⁰

Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1981). Since 1980, see H. McKeating, *Ezekiel* (OTG; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), pp. 30-61. The extremes: either the whole book as a unity comes from the prophet himself (M. Greenberg, *Ezekiel, 1-20* [AB, 22; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983]; cf. also *idem*, 'What are Valid Criteria for Determining Inauthentic Matter in Ezekiel?', in J. Lust (ed.), *Ezekiel and his Book* (BETL, 74; Leuven: Peeters, 1986), pp. 123-35 or as a pseudepigraph (thus recently J. Becker, 'Erwägungen zur Ezechielischen Frage', in L. Ruppert, P. Weimar and E. Zengev (eds.), *Künder des Worts* (Festschrift J. Schreiner; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1982), pp. 137-49 are rarely advocated.

68. Some exegetes wish to differentiate here: L. Hossfeld, *Untersuchungen zu Komposition und Theologie des Ezechielbuches* (FzB 20; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1977), cf. especially pp. 284-86, distinguishes between seven all in all (in the main part of the work, however, only six) stages of overworking. The sixth (or fifth) stage is virtually identical with the passage we marked off. Hossfeld notes its linguistic and theological orientation on the basic priestly source and the holiness code. Similarly to our demarcation, H. Fuhs, *Ezechiel* (NEB; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1988), II, pp. 194-95, delimitates the passage in a similar way as we do (except that he takes vv. 23-24 as a separate passage), but he sees the relationship to Lev. 26 conversely: in his opinion the passages Ezek. 36.18-28*; 37.15-28; 34.25-30 are the pattern for Lev. 26 (!).

69. The secondary interpretation betrays itself by overtaking the characteristic Ezechielian title.

70. Cf. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, p. 844.

A further added passage can be found in Ezek. 37.20-28. It refers to the symbolic action of Ezekiel in 37.15-19, in which Ezekiel by putting together two pieces of wood had announced the reunification of the two kingdoms.⁷¹ In the additional passage are all the statements already recognized as typical for the eschatological interpretation of the prophetic books: the repatriation of the Diaspora from all peoples (v. 21),⁷² the purification from the service of the idols (v. 23; cf. Mic. 5.12-13), the instalment of 'my servant David' as king⁷³ (v. 24, cf. 26), the holy place/the dwelling of God (seemingly the Temple in Jerusalem) in the midst (vv. 26-27⁷⁴). Also the statement of a new covenant (called here *שְׁלוֹם*... *בְּרִית* or *בְּרִית עוֹלָם*) is not missing (v. 26).⁷⁵

A similar passage is Ezek. 36.16-38. The authorship of Ezekiel for it is denied by most exegetes.⁷⁶ Though it is not quite certain that this is a coherent text,⁷⁷ the character of the statements is rather uniform. Their specialty can be explained by their function as an interpretation of Ezekiel 20: The several times returning self-statement of God that he acted just 'for the sake of my name' when he did not destroy Israel at once in spite of their rebelliousness (20.9.14; 22.44) is turned from a look back into the previous history to a vision of the future when God will act again for the sake of his name (vv. 21-23). Again the

71. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, p. 908, does not find any objections in deriving the symbolic action from Ezekiel himself. Similarly Fuhs, *Ezekiel*, II, p. 211, sees in it Ezekielian material.

72. Evidently this is not the *golah* in Babylon in the time of Ezekiel in view, but the widely scattered Diaspora in 'the peoples', who are 'assembled from all regions'.

73. Ezekiel himself avoids the title.

74. Cf. v. 28b, presumably a gloss.

75. It also occurs in the passage Ezek. 16.59-63, likewise a later interpretation written in the same period.

76. Including Zimmerli, who derives it from the Ezekiel-school, *Ezekiel*, p. 874.

77. Splitting it up into small fragments, as H. Simian, *Die theologische Nachgeschichte der Prophetie Ezechiels* (FzB 14; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1974), pp. 88-103, however, is not convincing. F. Hossfeld, *Untersuchungen*, distinguishes between a basic word vv. 16-22 and several following additions. K.-F. Pohlmann, *Ezekielstudien: Zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Buches und zur Frage nach den älteren Texten* (BZAW, 202; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992), pp. 77-87, comparing the size of papyrus 967, tries to fix 36, 16-23a,bα (together with chs. 38/39) as the basic text. Arguments against appear already in Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, p. 873. Fuhs, *Ezekiel*, II, pp. 205-206, detects in vv. 29-32, 33-36, 37-38 three additions.

gathering of the Diaspora is the topic (v. 24), a new heart and a new spirit, a carnal heart in the place of the heart of stone and the spirit of God within which makes the Israelites follow God's statutes and observe his ordinances by themselves (vv. 25-27, cf. Jer 31:2, 31-34). Also, the fruitfulness of grain and fruit is not lacking (vv. 29-30), like the garden of Eden (v. 35). The repeated return of the so-called 'form of knowledge' (v. 23:38; cf. v. 36) is an additional indication of the exegetical character of the piece.

A similar passage, in which again the repatriation of the Diaspora is the topic, is Ezek. 20:39-44. There it can be emphasized that the aim of the repatriation is in the same way the service of God 'on my holy mountain' (v. 40), after Israel has turned from the idols (v. 39⁷⁸). We have the identical *Sitz im Leben* as in the other passages: the postexilic Jerusalem with her, now eschatologically elevated, temple-mountain.

Finally the redactional work on the Gog-pericope Ezekiel 38-39 must be mentioned. Zimmerli has indicated⁷⁹ as the original nucleus Ezek. 38.1-9*; 39.1-5, 17-20*.⁸⁰ This most ancient prophecy probably cannot at this point be called eschatological.⁸¹ However, this is the case with the redactional work on Gog's fate which produced the now existing expanded final form of the chapters. In the younger layers of the chapters, the battle against the historical Gog has become an event of the final period.⁸² It shall happen in the land in which the Israelites who are returned from the Diaspora are dwelling again (38.8.12; 39.27), who are living there without walls and gates (38.11; cf. Zech. 2.5-9)—apparently the period before Nehemiah's reconstruction of the walls is the background. A final judgment, connected with an earthquake, shall come over Gog and his hosts (38.18-23); it will be for the birds and wild animals a big offering-feast from the bodies of the slain soldiers (39.17-20), whereas the saved Israelites will gather the weapons of the enemies and burn them (38.9-10). The destruction of the hostile weapons belongs, as seen above, to the standard motifs

78. In the MT this is formulated as an ironic invitation to the Israelites to serve the idols vigorously—Yahweh would ensure, in spite of their efforts, that his holy name would not be profaned any more.

79. Cf. Zimmerli, *Ezechiel*, p. 937.

80. Hossfeld, *Untersuchung*, cf. p. 494, restricts still more: 38.1-3a; 39.1b-5.

81. Cf. also Zimmerli, *Ezechiel*, pp. 942-46.

82. Cf. also B. Erling, 'Ezekiel 38-39 and the Origins of Jewish Apocalyptic', in *Ex Orbe Religionum, Studia Geo Widengren* (Leiden: Brill, 1972), I, pp. 104-14.

of the eschatological picture. The peoples will be the witnesses of this judgment (38.16; 39.21-23).

In the book of Isaiah, there is much material in which can be detected similar layers of redactional work. Only some of them can be touched upon here. Well known is the above-mentioned passage Isa. 2.2-4 (5), which the parallel in Mic. 4.1-5 demonstrates as an anonymous piece. After earlier attempts at proving its derivation from Isaiah himself⁸³ have been shown as unconvincing, a postexilic origin seems to be widely accepted.⁸⁴ The motives occurring there are the prominent role of the Zion as temple-mountain (belonging to the Songs of Zion: Ps. 48, 2b β -3; 87, 5), the pilgrimage of the peoples to Zion,⁸⁵ the goal of the peoples to receive Torah from the 'God of Jacob',⁸⁶ the Torah proceeding from Zion (in both cases, as also the parallel phrase 'word of Yahveh', a comprehensive term⁸⁷), further a function of the 'God of Jacob' as arbitrator, and finally the destruction of the weapons of the peoples—that these peoples are themselves active in beating them into peaceful tools is an increase of the miraculous and is connected with the fact that they are no longer to be destroyed in the final judgment—all these are topics already known as belonging to the eschatological collection. Also of special interest is the central position of the Temple, for this makes the origin of the

83. Especially by H. Wildberger, *Jesaja I* (BK, 15.1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972), pp. 78-80.

84. The most careful recent examination is the one of W. Werner, *Eschatologische Texte in Jesaja 1-39: Messias, Heiliger Rest, Völker* (FzB 46; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1982), pp. 151-63. Cf. also M.A. Sweeney, *Isaiah 1-4 and the Postexilic Understanding of the Isaianic Tradition* (BZAW, 171; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1988), pp. 135-38.164-75; N. Lohfink and E. Zenger, *Der Gott Israels und die Völker* (SBS, 154; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1994), pp. 40-44. B. Gosse, 'Michée 4, 1-5, Isie 2, 1-5 et les rédacteurs finaux du livre d'Isaïe', ZAW 105 (1993), pp. 98-102, regards the passage as a response to Mic. 3.9-12.

85. The motif of the peaceful pilgrimage of the peoples replaces, according to E. Otto, 'יָצַ', *ThWAT* 6 (1989), pp. 994-1028, 1013, the motif of the battle of the peoples Isa. 8.9-10; 10, 12.24-27a; 14.24-27.32; 17, 12-14; 29, 8.31, 5.8-9; 33.1-6; therefore it is younger than this layer.

86. Werner, *Texte*, p. 157, points to the proportionally frequent occurrence.

87. For the eschatologizing of the Torah in this period, cf. H. Gese, 'Das Gesetz', in *idem, Zur biblischen Theologie: Alttestamentliche Vorträge* (BEvT, 78; Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1977), pp. 55-84, 73-76.

ideas in the Zion-tradition very likely (whereas the David-tradition is missing here).⁸⁸

Finally a look at 'Trito-Isaiah'. O.H. Steck's well-known essay 'Tritojesaja im Jesajabuch' brings an understanding of the third part of the book of Isaiah as an actualizing reworking of the second 'deutero-Isaianic' part.⁸⁹ This is congruent with observations in other prophetic books, but here are much longer texts, which are themselves composed of different layers.⁹⁰ But in the interpretation of Trito-Isaiah older exegetical results have also been kept alive, for instance, the assumption that chs. 60–62 belong together as the core of the book,⁹¹ the other chapters having been eventually agglomerated around it. According to Steck⁹² Isaiah 60–62* is the oldest material, which is a *relecture* of Isaiah 40–55. Later, agglomerating layers are Isa. 62.10–12⁹³; Isa. 56–59*; 63.1–6 and 56.1–8; 63.7–66, 24. In this context it is striking that the parallels in content to the texts mentioned above can be found mostly in the central area of chs. 60–62. The topic here is Jerusalem/Zion (addressed in chs. 60 and 62 in the second person feminine), the return of the Diaspora brought home by the host peoples together with their riches (the 'pilgrimage of the peoples to Zion', 60.4–22), the future splendor of the city (60.14b–22). Chapter 61 describes the welfare of the community living around the Zion, ch. 62 speaks again about the glorification of the Zion itself (addressing it in the second person). It is striking that the description of the state of peace in 62.8–9⁹⁴ is a reversal of the formulations of

88. In contrast to Ps. 122.5.

89. It shall not be concealed that questions remain. They are connected especially with the attempts at exact datings in the third or second century BCE, reminding one strikingly of B. Duhm and the period of literary criticism.

90. A continuation of the redactional-historical work on Trito-Isaiah is the dissertation of W. Lau, *Schriftgelehrte Prophetie in Jes. 56–66* (BZAW, 125; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994).

91. Against Steck, who reckoned with different layers in the chapters, Lau, pp. 22–23, again pleads for a far-reaching redactional unity with the origin from one author, cf. p. 117 n. 432.

92. Cf. Steck, *Studien*, passim.

93. According to Steck the original end of an older book of Isaiah. Cf. especially *Untersuchungen*, pp. 143–66.

94. Which is repeated in 65.21–22, but is not original there, but in ch. 62 (against Westermann, *Das Buch Jesaja. Kap. 40–66* [ATD, 19; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966], p. 301). The immediate connection to vv. 1–7 is debated (cf.

the curse-form (Lev. 26.16; Deut. 28.13-14).⁹⁵

Additional passages in the book of Isaiah likewise contain an eschatologizing of prophecy. For instance, Isa. 11.1-10, a messianic piece with its message about justice, peace in animal life and the coming of the peoples to Zion, is a close parallel to Isa. 2.2-4, and the following passage 11.11-15 articulates the return of the Diaspora. One can also refer to the so-called 'apocalypse of Isaiah' (Isa. 24-27), which seems to articulate an eschatologizing and universalizing expectation of the imminent rule of God,⁹⁶ but the examples given must suffice.

It follows from this overview that the eschatological additions in the prophetic books are no isolated phenomenon, but can be found in very different books. Their character is always similar: They take up the statements contained in the earlier layers and give an interpretation fitting to the actual problems of their time. A typical trait of this interpretation is an eschatologizing in the sense that a decisive turn to a new period of salvation is expected which will now be final. In this new period the Diaspora will return from all parts of the world, the land will be turned into a paradise, because the promises of blessing in the blessing-form will be fulfilled in fruitfulness and security of land and inhabitants, the announcements of curse in the curse-form will be reversed to blessing. Disobedience and apostasy of the people which were a hindrance until now will disappear, and this not by the people's return and repentance, but by the transforming action of God who even can replace the old heart with a new one. The danger from the enemies will disappear because their weapons will be destroyed or they will themselves produce peaceful tools out of them. If they are not destroyed, they will be servants to the returners, will bring their precious things or will be integrated into the number of Yahweh's adorers. In the center of the events, however, will stand the mountain Zion, the mountain on which the God of Israel will be adored and on

K. Koenen, *Ethik und Eschatologie im Tritojesabuch* [WMANT, 62; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990], p. 128 n. 421).

95. Cf. above to Amos 9.13-15; Jer. 30.10; Ezek. 34.23-30.

96. Cf. S. Amsler, *Des Visions de Zacharie à l'apocalypse d'Isaïe* in J. Vermeylen (ed.), *The Book of Isaiah/Le Livre de Isaïe* (BETL, 81; Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 1989), pp. 263-73. That it is actually an apocalypse can be doubted. Additional literature can be found in Amsler, *Visions*, p. 263 and nn. 1-9. Cf. also D.G. Johnson, *From Chaos to Restoration: An Integrative Reading of Isaiah 24-27* (JSOTSup, 61; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988), who proposes an exilic date (this seems doubtful) and denies the apocalyptic character of the passage.

which offerings agreeable to him will be offered. Apparently thereby the pre-exilic Zion-tradition is resumed, but also new features are transferred to the Zion, for instance, the Zion-Torah, which replaces the old Sinai-Torah (cf. Gese). If one asks for the period in which such an expectation could arise, one would have to think in the context of Isaiah 60–62 of the fifth century. The Temple is rebuilt, but elsewhere much has to be reconstructed. The situation is oppressive, so that the hope upon a deepgoing change becomes more and more ardent. The chapters that surround the core of Trito-Isaiah—containing still later additions in several layers—show that this extraordinary mood did not continue. The reality overtook the high-tension expectation (also in view of the lack of piety in the people) and a new encouragement for the disappointed believers was needed. Therefore it is not realistic to give too late a date to the eschatologizing of the prophetic books.

It must be emphasized clearly here that this is not yet at all apocalyptic.⁹⁷ Apocalyptic is to be found in the Old Testament only in the book of Daniel and belongs to a much later period. Also the form of eschatological thinking in the redactional layer that has been traced remains in many aspects bound to the traditional forms of thinking. The features typical for apocalyptic⁹⁸ are missing. Therefore a very late date of origin is not possible. However, it seems that already in a comparatively early period—probably in the fifth century—an understanding of history developed that differed substantially from the original prophecy. As an important stage in Israel's theology of history this period deserves attention in the interpretation of the prophetic books.

97. Especially against P.D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975 [2nd edn, 1979]); the discussion in the wake of O. Plöger, *Theokratie und Eschatologie* (WMANT, 2; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2nd edn, 1962; ET; *Theocracy and Eschatology* [Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968]) and Hanson cannot be taken up here.

98. As the periodical scheme, the celestial visions, the computing of the end.

CHARACTER AND FUNCTION OF DIVINE SAYINGS IN THE ELIJAH AND ELISHA TRADITIONS*

Winfried Thiel

I

In 1953 Werner Reiser published an essay in which he referred to a group of divine sayings in the tradition about Elijah and Elisha being connected by common content and form.¹ This essay does not seem to have had as much attention paid to it as it deserves. But this is not the only reason for producing it again after forty years and checking its results. For if these results were correct, we would obtain important insights into the origins and the development of the Elisha traditions. We would also have the opportunity to observe something like an eschatology of salvation that already existed in the prophetic circles of the late ninth century BCE.

The divine sayings that W. Reiser emphasized occur, with one exception, in the Elisha tradition: 1 Kgs 17.14 (the only text belonging to the Elijah tradition); 2 Kgs 2.21; 3.16-17; 4.43; 7.1. All of them are introduced by a messenger formula and all of them are promises. They promise the appeasement of basic conditions of life, hunger and thirst. They speak only about food and water. Most of them are formulated in a neutral way. One addresses 'you' (2 Kgs 3.17) and in one God speaks in the first person 'I' (2.21). Some sayings have a rhythmic form (1 Kgs 17.14a*, 2 Kgs 3.17a, possibly also 7.1* in a form to be reconstructed) and seem to be poetry or at least elevated prose.

First it is necessary to check if the sayings are connected originally with their context, that is, whether they have been handed down from

* Translated by Henning Graf Reventlow.

1. W. Reiser, 'Eschatologische Gottessprüche in den Elisa-Legenden', *TZ* 9 (1953), pp. 321-38.

the beginning in this connection, or if one must presume with W. Reiser that they have been originally handed down as isolated traditions. If the second possibility is favoured, the sayings must at first be inspected separately and only afterwards together with their context. Besides their function in the present context their content is of special interest: Are they eschatological promises or not?

II

Observations in 2 Kgs 3.16-17 can be adduced in favour of the supposition that the sayings were not originally rooted in their present literary context. Here two sayings of this sort follow immediately upon one another, both introduced by the messenger formula. This is a remarkable fact. In the present sequence, indeed, they are related to one another in a causal relationship. They are connected, besides, by the catchword הַנַּחֲלָה. But it strikes one at once that the term is lacking in the whole context. It is neither prepared in advance nor is it taken up later. On the contrary, according to v. 17 the wadi (הַנַּחֲלָה) shall be filled with water; according to v. 20 the whole land is filled. Likewise, the rare term 'pit' (בֹּר) of v. 16 is not used in the surrounding context.

These observations render it probable that the sayings originally did not belong to this context. It is also rather unlikely that their succession could be original, in spite of the parallel contents. Several times the difference of the conceptions has already been stressed. In v. 16 the construction of pits obviously presupposes that water has gathered on the rocky subsoil below the surface. Verse 17 announces that the whole wadi will be filled with water.

It is possible that by putting together both sayings the original sense of the first has been slightly modified. The infinitive absolute עֹשֶׂה opening v. 16b is ambiguous. In the present connection with v. 17 it seems obvious that it stands in place of an imperative:² 'Make this wadi full of pits, because... this wadi will be filled with water'. Whether, however, this was the original meaning of v. 16 is extremely doubtful. Besides, the connection between the two verses does not look very meaningful. Moreover, the infinitive absolute also appears in the saying in 2 Kgs 4.43 and can be understood there only as an

2. Cf. LXX and W. Gesenius and E. Kautzsch, *Hebräische Grammatik* (repr.; Hildesheim: Olms; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 28th edn, 1985), §113 bb.

announcement of the future. Therefore it seems obvious to understand³ the infinitive absolute as an expression 'für das Imperf. in nachdrücklicher Zusage' ('for the imperfect in emphatic promise').⁴

Structure, rise and historic background of the chapter 2 Kings 3 are difficult to determine. But it strikes one that Elisha appears comparatively late on the stage. Not before the lack of water has been observed (v. 9b) is it evident that Elisha is in the camp. After having pronounced the two divine sayings (vv. 16-19) he disappears from the scene as quickly as he came. It agrees with this observation that the water fulfills different functions: According to vv. 9-17 the lack of water threatens the existence of the army in the desert of Edom (v. 8). When the water has appeared, however, it is not used to quench the thirst of the army, but it deludes the Moabites and induces them to a fatal attack. Verse 20 creates the bridge between both ideas. It would be correct to presume that a pre-prophetic war-narrative has been converted into a Elisha story by inserting vv. 9-19.⁵ In this process also the two divine sayings have been worked in. By their promising content they supply to the Elisha episode everything but the real point. In this process the second saying has been expanded in the connection with the new situation (v. 17b → v. 9b) and the pre-existing war-narrative (v. 19 → v. 25).

These observations suggest that the two divine sayings were transmitted at first as isolated, without a narrating context in which any circumstances had been told. Taken on their own, both promise that in the seemingly near future enough water will be disposable.

The first saying does it in a discreet way, the second shows a more miraculous aspect.⁶ In both the return of the water is connected with a

3. With Reiser, 'Eschatologische Gottessprüche', p. 324, who translates 2 Kgs 3.16b: 'Man wird dieses Bachtal zu lauter Wassergruben machen (können)' ('One will [be able] to render this wadi to nothing but pits').

4. Cf. Gesenius/Kautzsch, *Hebräische Grammatik*, §113 ee.

5. Cf. H.-C. Schmitt, *Elisa* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1972), pp. 32-34; E. Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige: 1 Kön. 17-2. Kön. 25* (ATD, 11.2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), pp. 281-87.

6. The motif of surprise ('You shall neither see wind nor rain') distinguishes this saying from the first, in which the digging up of water is imagined. In Palestine, especially in the southern parts of the country, it is, however, not unusual for a dry wadi to suddenly be filled with water without it having rained at the same place. The rain in this case has fallen at a greater distance. The fate of the French group of

wadi (הנחל). The sayings seem to have been proclaimed during a period of possibly long-enduring drought and announce the end of this period. When they were inserted into the new context, the sense was not altered very much. The sayings are now related to a concrete situation—the lack of water for the army of the allies during the campaign against Moab.

In a similar way, if not on such a firm basis, one can judge the case of 2 Kgs 7.1. Also in the long text about the siege of Samaria (6.24–7.20) the Elisha scene looks like an episode (6.31–7.2),⁷ but it fits much more closely into the context and procures to it the central outline of expression. The saying in 7.1 and the proclamation of punishment to the adjutant following in v. 2 lend to the succeeding narrative the theological horizon and consequently are taken up again in vv. 16b, 17abα in a sort of statement of fulfillment. This gives to the whole the image of a well-rounded unity.⁸

Contributing also to this impression is the intended contrast of the saying to the quotations of high prices in 6.25 and to the scene with the women who decided because of the famine to kill and eat their sons one after the other (6.26–30). But also in this case one must reckon with the possibility that the saying once circulated without this context. All of its catchwords do not occur in it. The statement of fulfillment (v. 16b) is joined to the plundering of the Aramaic camp only by content, but does not fit semantically.⁹

The saying contained in 7.1 is connected with the context by its determinations: כעת מחר and בשער שמרון. Neither occur in the repetition in v. 16b. The exclusion of the first determination is self evident at this place, but not the exclusion of the second. It seems as if the older form of the saying is contained in v. 16b. This supposition is

travellers is well known: 28 people were drowned on 28 April 1963 in the Siq of Petra by an unexpected flood-wave.

7. In which the verses 6.31, 32b, as shown by the obvious course of action, are a still later addition (in v. 33 read מלך). It seems to take into consideration the idea of the enmity of an omride king against Elisha. The original historic situation of the tradition can better be sought in the period of the Jehu dynasty.

8. The resumption in 17bβ, 18–20 seems to be an appendix.

9. The context mentions the eating and drinking of the leprous (7.8), but elsewhere does not speak about grain, but rather, other objects of booty such as horses, asses, silver, gold and clothes etc. That the abandoned camp contained also grain is presupposed, but not explicitly mentioned.

supported by the short, rhythmic form with alliteration¹⁰ that can be observed at this place.

Unfortunately nothing is known about amounts of wares and prices in the relevant period. That the saying mentions surcharged prices for grain¹¹ is unlikely, regarding its character as a promise, which the context seems to have preserved rightly. The most likely assumption is that the saying does not promise that the grain will be fantastically cheap, but that it will be bought again at normal prices. Then the saying would originate more likely in an emergency situation, which had driven the prices to unusual heights. It must not refer to a situation of siege only, but also other circumstances: droughts, bad harvests, locust-plagues and hostile invasions could cause extremely high prices and periods of hunger and had had this effect more than once in the history of Israel.

The saying has been built very skilfully into the present context together with the Elisha episode.¹² This shows the contrast of the promise to the statement about the situation in 6.25-30 on one side and the word of punishment in 7.2 on the other side, the statements of fulfilment in 7.16b, 17* as well as the determinations relating to the context in 7.1 itself. The context connects the saying and its content again with a certain historical event: the siege of Samaria by the Arameans and the miraculous end of the emergency situation.

In the case of the saying contained in 4.43 there seems to be another situation. It is, with its two verbs in the infinitive absolute, not only the shortest of all these sayings, but it is also contained in one of the shortest Elisha traditions. One verb of the saying, אכל, is also the leitmotif of the text. Eating is always the subject, more exactly the feeding of 100 people (a round number). About what is 'being left' can of course be only spoken of at the end. The only other remarkable trait of the tradition is the placename Baal Šališa which is mentioned nowhere else. In this case one could think—also in view of the

10. Cf. Reiser, 'Eschatologische Gottessprüche', p. 327.

11. If one takes the scale of *Erub.* 8.2, according to which the prices were half as high. Cf. A. Šanda, *Das zweite Buch der Könige* (EHAT, 9.2; Münster: Aschendorf, 1912), pp. 59-60. But it is not advisable to project these late notices back into the time of our text.

12. Both this observation and the concrete content of the context speak decisively against the supposition of W. Reiser, 'Eschatologische Gottessprüche', p. 331, that 'das Orakel die Legende aus sich entlassen hat' ['the oracle has dismissed the legend out of itself'].

shortness of the text—that the tradition has been produced by the originally independent saying. Only the additional knowledge about the existence of a sympathizer of the Elisha circle coming from Baal Šališa was sufficient for its formation. It is not unthinkable that a saying consisting only of the messenger formula and two infinitive absolutes was handed down. But it cannot be excluded as a possibility that the saying was part of the tradition from the beginning, in the context in which it appears today. Both possibilities must obviously be taken into consideration.

If the saying was handed down in an isolated form, it promises to a group in an emergency that it will be supplied with food, not only sufficiently, but with more than can be required for the moment. About the kind and origin of the emergency nothing is known besides the fact that the food seems to be insufficient. It is not certain whether the drought in the time of Elisha which is presupposed in 4.38 and 8.1-6 is the background also here. The context of the present tradition deals with a certain group, most likely with one of the circles assembling around Elisha, which receives as the gift of one sympathizer food for one meal. In this context the saying promises that the restricted amount of breads and grain will not only be sufficient against all expectations for the 100 people to be fed, but that also a portion will be left. Again one can observe the adjustment to a certain situation.

III

The saying in 2.21 appears to be more closely and organically integrated in the context. Also this is a short tradition, in which some details are enigmatic. The text does not contain a place-name. That it is dealing with the spring of Jericho can only be concluded from the preceding section, but it cannot be rejected in earnest. The water of the spring is at stake, and מֵיִם is also the leitmotif of the piece. The saying announces in the first person of the divine word the healing of the springwater. The wording is largely congruent with the notices of the context. An additional statement adds that the water has also caused death. In v. 19 it has just been said that the water causes mischief (רָע) and that the land produces miscarriages (שָׁכַל [*piel*]). In the saying v. 21, the latter is attributed to the spring and its water. However, it is not possible to detect important differences in these

formulations. The sentence 'the land causes miscarriages' (v. 19) may not be understandable at first glance,¹³ but can be explained without big problems as an abbreviation: the land soaked by the water produces plants, the eating of which—besides drinking water taken from the spring—causes the miscarriages. That the saying also envisages deaths connected with it exceeding the context—in which מוֹת does not appear again—is likewise understandable.

The saying is as strongly interwoven with its context ('this water', 'from here') that one can hardly imagine it in this or a modified form as an entity that was handed down isolated. This, the first person of the divine saying and also the whole content of the tradition distinguishes this saying from the other examples. For only here is it accompanied by an action of the prophet, which it—in a similar way as in the reports about symbolic actions—interprets or even brings into existence in the sense of the effective word. The action, which shows magical traits (especially striking is the 'new dish'), is explained as an action of God taking place exactly at this moment—when the salt is thrown into the water and the saying is spoken out. The form רָפְאוּ is rather a declaratory than a prophetic perfect.

In this case the saying scarcely ever had another *Sitz im Leben* as this one. From the beginning it was related to this concrete situation which the context makes visible: The water of the spring of Jericho is 'healed'. It loses through action and word its power of causing mischief.

IV

The last text, 1 Kgs 17.14a, occurs in an Elijah tradition. But the original background seems to be an Elisha tradition. In 1 Kings 17 the conditions of the text are more complicated than in the other traditions already spoken of. Whereas these were only slightly connected with the context, if at all, 1 Kings 17 is the first part of a bigger composition reaching at least to 18.46; I call it a 'drought composition'. The textual materials integrated in this large unit are subordinated to the large thematic arch reaching from the announcement of the drought in 17.1 until its finish in 18.41-46. In the present context, the

13. The translation in LXX¹, in which the word 'land' is missing and the participle is connected with 'water', is rather a smoothing out than a witness for the original text.

unit 17.8-16 that tells about Elijah's stay with the widow of Sarepta is a stage in the story about Elijah's preservation in the period of the drought (cf. the thematic catchwords in vv. 4 and 9).

The centre of the text is the divine saying in v. 14. The second part of the verse originally did not belong to it: the third person of the name of God does not conform with the introducing messenger formula announcing a divine saying, and the sentence beginning with וְעַתָּה is obviously prose. The saying contained in v. 14a, however, shows a good parallelism. Verse 14b is the only passage in vv. 8-16 alluding to the situation of rainlessness, indirectly also indicating it as the reason for the misery of the widow and her son. But it contrasts with vv. 10-11 in which the existence of water is presupposed. Verse 14b together with 8-10a.16 and the וְעַתָּה in v. 15 belongs to the redactional insertions inscribing the text into the situation of the drought.

The pre-redactional tradition only told about the preservation of the widow and her son through the miracle of feeding. The poverty of the widow is caused by their social position. A longer stay of Elijah with the widow is not in view, but he is on the way: hence his request that bread might be brought out (v. 13).

The problem in the judgment about the pre-redactional material in vv. 8-16 is rooted in its ambivalent relationship to 2 Kgs 4.1-7. The formal and thematic similarity is not to be overlooked, but there are also concrete differences. That the redactor responsible for the final form of the chapter valued the analogies more highly than the differences can be observed by the fact that he put together the traditions about the increase of the oil and the raising of the son from death (1 Kgs 17.8-16, 17-24), as is the case in the Elisha tradition (2 Kgs 4.1-7, 8-37).

The outlines of the content are the same in both stories (increase of oil in favour of a poor widow); in the details both go their own ways, however. Above all, what in 1 Kgs 17.8-16 is the centre of the whole is missing in 2 Kgs 4.1-7: the divine saying. Its content directs the style of the narrative already from v. 12, in which its catchwords appear for the first time. The obvious explanation reckons with the relationship to 2 Kgs 4.1-7 and likewise with the dominating function of the saying 17.14a in its context, from which it cannot be separated: the content of 2 Kgs 4.1-7 (presumably still in oral form) as well as the saying were formed by the bearers of the tradition to an Elijah

story. The narrative offered the frame, the saying the content of the action.

Both building-stones originate from the Elisha tradition. In the case of 2 Kgs 4.1-7 it seems to be obvious. As regards the saying, it can be presumed, as all the other examples occur in the Elisha tradition. Generally, the picture of Elijah as a miracle-worker (1 Kgs 17.8-16.17-24; 2 Kgs 1.9-16) seems to originate with the process of tradition in the prophetic circles around Elisha. With Elisha, miracle stories are a characteristic part of the tradition material. In this way the pupils of the prophet introduced traits of their master into the portrait of Elijah and thereby brought the two prophetic figures closer together.

The result is that the divine saying in 1 Kgs 17.14a did exist once without its context. In its content it is more comprehensive than all the other sayings. The promise that the flour-pot will not become empty and the oil in the bottle will not be diminished reminds one of fairy-tale motifs. But it is questionable whether the promise is actually meant *verbatim*. It seems rather to be a hyperbolic expression for a more restricted fact: Basic food will be there for a longer, although not endless, period. The present context also seems to mean this, when it says that the people concerned by the miracle lived 'for days' (יָמִים) from the stores. If this can also be taken as the original meaning, the promise does not say that the food will never be finished. To a group that seems to have to cope with nourishment sorrows, it is not promised that the basic food supply will exist for a long period, but it will be enough for the foreseeable future. This content is on about the same level with 2 Kgs 4.43.

By its combination with the tradition of 2 Kgs 4.1-7, this saying is also connected with concrete persons and their miserable situation: with a widow whom Elijah meets, who, by her poverty, together with her son is close to starving.

V

The examination of tradition and function of the divine sayings has not produced a uniform result. Most of them seem to be handed down independently, but this is not true for all. The saying in 2 Kgs 2.21 could hardly be handed down without its context. In the case of 2 Kgs 4.43 presumably one cannot say more than a *non liquet*. Some of these sayings were introduced in connection with a 'prophetic' shaping of

older units into them (3.16, 17a; 7.1 [16b]), others induced alone (this could be maintained for 4.43) or together with other traditions a process of tradition (1 Kgs 17.14a).

As regards the content of these sayings, W. Reiser declares (presupposing that *all* of them did exist independently for a while): '... die Orakel weisen bescheiden, aber bestimmt auf eine Zeit hin, welche den gegenwärtigen Alltag übersteigen wird. Sie verheißen eine Heilszeit. Die Orakel sind eschatologische Orakel.' ('The oracles point modestly, but resolutely to a time which will transcend the present everyday life. They promise a time of salvation. The oracles are eschatological oracles.')

¹⁴ For a comparison he adduces Amos 9.13; Hos. 2.23-25; 14.6-9 and later texts. It is true without question that the promises 'transcend the present everyday life', but is this not the case with every promise? Is a period of salvation actually announced?

The comparison with the texts mentioned by Reiser¹⁵ shows the immense distance in the content of the promises. Neither a paradisiac fertility of the land is promised and still less 'ein herrliches Wiederaufleben Israels [a splendid coming to life of Israel]',¹⁶ but only the satisfying of the basic needs of life. Only 1 Kgs 17.14a, with its promise of a pot of flour that will not become empty and the bottle of oil that will not decrease, could point to a fairy-tale-like fullness. But this is not very likely. Probably not more is meant than that the consumption for the day is secured, and this only for a while.

The divine sayings, all of which seem to originate from the Elisha tradition (and this is true also for 1 Kgs 17.14a), have to do with the everyday sorrows of persons who cannot be imagined as well-to-do people. The sayings promise the provision of sufficient and unspoiled drinking water and with food at a normal price and in a measure not only allowing people to survive, but also to keep a portion for the following day or days. The promise of food, particularly, makes it likely that the sayings are referring to the lower class of the country, the farmers and the poor who were not able to conduct an economy of supply for a longer period. This conforms with what we know about the social position of the Elisha groups. They were apparently

14. Reiser, 'Eschatologische Gottessprüche', p. 333.

15. It is unlikely that they are words of Amos and Hosea; they might have originated at some distance from their activity.

16. Thus J. Jeremias, *Der Prophet Hosea* (ATD, 24.1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), p. 172, on Hos. 14.6-8.

recruited from the lowest classes of the people, were threatened by hunger and debt and exposed to the mockery and encroachment of others. That these sayings were handed down in their circles and among the people sympathizing with them is the most likely supposition.

The relation of the sayings to basic needs of daily life was preserved even after they were integrated into broader contexts of tradition—in the phase of oral and of literary delivery. But the contents of the sayings were applied here upon respective concrete situations. The transforming of originally 'eschatological oracles' into actual promises aiming at daily life, which W. Reiser presupposes, is very unlikely and cannot be explained by himself, either.¹⁷

The divine sayings of the Elisha tradition in their original, isolated form were not eschatological promises, whether in this present form or as part of a bigger *Gattung*. They do not contain any 'eschatological' formula. They do not announce any general time of salvation, let alone a final period. But they witness to the care of God for people wrestling for survival, especially for those who for the sake of belonging to God are prepared to accept an existence at the margin of society.

17. Cf. Reiser, 'Eschatologische Gottessprüche', pp. 336-37.

FROM PROPHETIC TO APOCALYPTIC ESCHATOLOGY

†Benjamin Uffenheimer

From the outset I would like to clarify the basic principle of my approach: I am using the term 'eschatology' in a very broad sense, to mean not only a vision of 'the end of history', but also a vision of the ideal conditions expected to materialize in the near future, that is within the scope of the visionary's perception. To quote Reventlow, in his recent commentary on Haggai:

It is not thought of as an absolute end of history, but as a situation that, compared with the present state, has been turned to salvation, a salvation that—so it is expected—will in the future no longer be disturbed by war, drought and other troubles [a salvation] that will be final.¹

In sociological terms, one might say that eschatology encompasses not only utopias that bring history to an end, but also imminent 'reachable' utopian situations. Sometimes visionaries themselves are part of the effort to create this utopian situation, which is considered to have a certain degree of finality.

In the context of this broad definition, the central problem that I would like to discuss here is the relationship between the political-historical outlook of the classical prophets, that is, their pragmatic assessment of the current events, and their eschatological vision.

1. *The Four Major Types of Biblical Eschatology*

For this purpose I shall attempt to outline the four major types of eschatology, which reflect the conceptions developed from the heyday

1. 'An ein allgemeines Ende der Geschichte wird nicht gedacht, wohl aber an einen, gegenüber der Gegenwart grundsätzlich zum Heil gewendeten Zustand, von dem erwartet wird, dass er künftig nicht mehr durch Krieg, Dürre und andere Nöte gestört wird, dem also Endgültigkeit zukommt.' H.G. Reventlow, *Die Propheten Haggai: Sacharja und Maleachi* (ATD 25, 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), p. 23.

of classical prophecy to apocalyptic:

1. The first type, represented mainly by Isaiah, is based on the belief that the final redemptive intervention of God will be the immediate outcome of the present historical situation. The backdrop of this conception is the rise of the Assyrian empire during the eighth century BCE; its downfall was expected by Isaiah to be imminent, as the Assyrian conqueror boasted in his hybris to have destroyed kingdoms and their population by the force of his arms, instead of being aware of his role as God's rod of anger against Israel (Isa. 10.5-34).
2. The second type is also rooted in the book of Isaiah, in 2.1-4 and chs. 24-27, its main representative, however, being Ezekiel, who witnessed the tragic events of the sixth century BCE, which resulted in the destruction of Judah. His approach is the result of complete detachment of eschatology from contemporary history. Moreover, his eschatological vision presents more or less the trans-historic contrast of contemporary events.
3. The third one, that of Deutero-Isaiah, is based on the identification of contemporary history with eschatology. The elevated enthusiastic mode of speech peculiar to his prophecies reflects the belief that the edict of Cyrus (Ezra 1.2-4) ushers in the messianic age, to be completed by the expected miraculous intervention of God. His optimism, however, waned in the end, giving place to the rise of the catastrophic concept of the Day of the Lord (63.1-6), which according to tradition would precede final redemption.
4. The fourth type is Haggai's and Zechariah's attempt to realize, to bring forth, the eschatological era by demanding the completion of the Temple building and by crowning Zerubabel as the messianic King of Judah. The failure of this bold enterprise, as pointed out in my following analysis, resulted in the final decline of prophecy during the fifth century BCE.

Only hundreds of years later, during the persecutions by Antiochus Epiphanes, did prophetic fervor emerge again, according to the testimony of the book of Daniel, but this time it is a completely new phenomenon called 'apocalyptic'. The deterministic historical outlook of

these visionaries is a sharp contrast to the message of the classical prophets who claimed to have been sent in order to rebuke the nation and the individual, thus giving them a chance to avert the divine doom by repentance.

2. Eschatology as the Imminent Continuation of Contemporaneous History

My survey begins with Isaiah, whose political approach and whose eschatological vision were forged mainly by two momentous events, in which he was personally involved. The first one was the siege of Jerusalem by Rezin, King of Aram, and Pekach son of Remalyhau, King of Israel in 733 BCE. It seems that these allies intended to coerce Judah into joining their anti-Assyrian coalition. The second event is Sennacherib's siege of Jerusalem in 701. In the first case Isaiah's intervention failed, whilst in the second case his words of encouragement to King Hezekiah and the nation had a deep impact on the following course of events.

During the events of 733 Isaiah attempted to calm down the intimidated King Ahaz, challenging him to take a courageous stand against the invaders, who intended to depose him and crown a certain Ben-Tab'e'l (7.6)—a person completely unknown to us. In his dramatic public appearance he cheered the king, saying, 'Take heart, be quiet and do not let your heart be faint' (7.4). On that occasion he contemptuously called the invaders 'these two smoking stubs of firebrand', concluding his appeal to the king and the nation with the sentence, אִם לֹא תִּמְצִיחַ כִּי לֹא תִּמְצִיחַ, which I translate: 'If you are not steadfast, you shall not stand' (v. 9).² When Ahaz responds evasively to the prophet's demand that he request a sign, in keeping with the Deuteronomic law (Deut. 18.9-22), Isaiah utters his prophecy, the slogan of which was 'Immanuel—God with us'. There he refers to the child that 'the young woman'—perhaps the young queen³—was then bearing in

2. One of the basic meanings of the root צָמַח is 'to be strong' (Exod. 17.12; Deut. 28.59, etc.). The hiphil means 'to rely, to hold, to stick to, to believe'. In this context, in the absence of any object, it simply means 'to be strong, to be steadfast'.

3. The Hebrew text uses the definitive article: הַעַלְמָה, the young woman, thus designating a specific woman, who was pregnant at the time. Some scholars suggest that the reference is to the prophet's wife, but it is more likely that he refers to the young queen, designated הַעַלְמָה as a familiar name, just as the queen mother is called הַגְּבִירָה.

her womb (7.14-17). From vv. 15-16 it follows,⁴ that shortly after the birth of the child 'the land whose two kings you have a horror of, shall be forsaken' (v. 16). The prophet adds that the Assyrian army will invade Judah and lay the land waste, mainly affecting agriculture, the country's economic mainstay.

It seems that this was the last futile attempt to caution Ahaz against undertaking any political step that could be fatal to his country. But the intimidated king did not heed the prophet's warning and appealed to Assyria for help (2 Kgs 16.7-9). His message to Tiglat-Pileser III opens with the words 'I am your servant and your son', a formula of submission known to us from contemporaneous Assyrian vassal treaties.⁵ This occurred in all probability in 733, when Tiglat-Pileser III was in a campaign to Philistia, according to the Assyrian eponym chronicle, which is our main chronological source for fixed dates (ARAB, 2.436). A text of tributary Kings of Syria-Palestine referring to that year records also the tribute of Iau hazi (= Ahaz) King of Judah.⁶ Again we learn from the eponym chronicle about a campaign to Aram in 732. This is the historical backdrop of Isaiah's above mentioned prophecy about a forthcoming Assyrian invasion (v. 17), which

4. 'Curd and honey shall he eat when he knows to refuse [or: to loathe] the bad and to choose the good' (v. 15). Good and bad are not used in the ethical sense, that is, good and evil, as most translations erroneously suggest; in this context good means tasty, palatable; bad means tasteless food. Every baby knows how to differentiate between both shortly after birth. So the destruction of Israel and Aram is very imminent. Curd and honey, or milk and honey, are the staple food of the nomad, whose livelihood depends on 'honey'—a date syrup and milk products, made from sheep's or goat's milk. The description of the Land of Israel as a land flowing with milk and honey (Exod. 3.8-17; Lev. 20.24, etc.) reflects the conditions of the wandering tribes in the desert. The significance of this expression here is that the agriculture of Judah, which was based on field crops such as wheat, and fruit trees such as vines, figs and pomegranates, would be devastated by the invading armies soon after the birth of the child.

5. Cogan and Tadmor contend that this combined phrase, the Akkadian counterpart of which is '*aradka u marūka anāku* = I am your servant and your son', is rarely attested in extra-biblical documents. A vassal would not have dared to use the term 'son', which expressed familiar dependence. Nevertheless, this is no sufficient reason to doubt the originality of the formula as used here by Ahaz (cf. M. Cogan and H. Tadmor, *II Kings* [AB, 11; Garden City, NY: Doubleday 1988], p. 187).

6. ARAB, 1.801; *ANET*³, p. 282. Cf. H. Tadmor, *ITP* Summ. 7, Reverse lines 7'-13'; Cogan and Tadmor, *II Kings*, p. 336.

would wreak havoc with the country and rob the nation of its agriculture, its economic mainstay.

Isaiah, in his prophecies 8.6-10, 21-23, reiterates the disastrous effects of the expected Assyrian invasion, comparing it to an inundation. Twice he interrupts his own words with the outcry 'Immanuel' (8.8, 10), as if to say, 'Nonetheless, God will be with us, he will not forsake us; the destruction will not be final'.

Indeed, immediately afterwards, in 9.1-6, Isaiah predicts that the Assyrians will be defeated and the country will be liberated from their yoke. This promise, too, is upheld with a sign—this time, the royal child just born. The prophet invests all his hopes in this child, designating him with the composite symbolic name **פלא יועץ, אל גיבור, אבי עד**, **שר שלום** (9.5), which may be translated thus: 'Wonderful counsellor, mighty hero, possessor of spoil [or: everlasting father], prince of peace'. And he adds:

That the government may be increased/and of peace there be no end
Upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom,/to establish it and to uphold it
Through justice and through righteousness/from henceforth and forever
(9.6).

Although the child's symbolic names include such clearly military terms as **אל גיבור**, 'mighty hero', and **אבי עד**, 'everlasting father', or 'possessor of spoil', the central motif of the entire utterance is that of peace. The question is how to explain the whole utterance? As nothing is known about a third child that was born during the crisis of 733, it seems probable that the features of the child mentioned in 9.1-6 reflect the style of the official coronation ceremony of the young prince:⁷ 'Wonderful counsellor, Mighty God, father of the spoil [or everlasting father], Prince of Peace' (9.5). Again it is likely that the expression **אל גיבור** = 'Mighty God' is an allusion to Hezekiah = **קיהו** = 'God is strong' (cf. *EM*, 3.655), which corresponds with additional royal names of that period, many of which are composed of the theophoric element **יהו**, **יה**. Examples are **איהו**, **זדקיהו**, **יהויקים**, and so on. So it is very likely that this is the hyperbolic style of Hezekiah's coronation ceremony in 727, the same year as the Assyrian conqueror and oppressor Tiglat-Pileser III died. The simultaneity of both events aroused

7. Cf. H. Wildberger, *Jesaja. I. Jesaja 1-12* (BKAT, X/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972), *ad loc.*

nationwide waves of rejoicing, mixed with the hope that the expected ideal king of the house of David would now establish the everlasting kingdom of righteousness, justice and peace. There is no doubt that the events alluded to in these verses are conceived by the relator as the immediate continuation of ch. 8. In other words, the eschatological intervention of God into the course of history is imminent, its hoped for result being the establishment and restoration of the eternal kingdom of David.

The same is the case with ch. 11, which follows Isaiah's famous speech against Assyrian imperialism (10.5-23, 24-34), where he proclaims that God will hew down the Assyrian tyrant at the very moment he will shake his fist at Mount Zion (vv. 33-34). The rise of the 'shoot from the stump of Yishai', that is, the establishment of the Kingdom of David, will be the climax of these events.⁸ In comparison to ch. 9, however, the portrait of the expected Davidic king has been spiritualized. Contrary to the traditional conception of the ideal king as a victorious warrior who will slay his enemies with the edge of his sword (Ps. 45), this king will rule 'with the spirit of the Lord', which will rest on him. His righteousness will be extended in particular to the poor and the weak, whilst he will slay the wicked 'with the rod of his mouth'. This spiritual portrait⁹ is in sharp contrast to the image of the

8. Cf. B. Uffenheimer, in T. Baras (ed.), *משיחיות ואסכטולוגיה* (Messianism and Eschatology) (Jerusalem: Ben Zvi, 1984), pp. 27-72.

9. It has been argued (by Wildberger, *Jesaja*, I, pp. 444-47, and many others) that the simile of the shoot from the stump of Yishai involves a critical approach to the living representative of the Davidic dynasty, namely, King Hezekiah. Accordingly, the prophet prefers another line, which descended from Yishai, David's father. Wildberger assumes that this mode of speech reflects a deep crisis of the Davidic dynasty. But as a matter of fact this simile does not contain even the slightest critical allusion to Hezekiah. Its only purpose is to present the contrasting sketch to the foregoing description of the oppressors, who are compared to mighty trees, which will be hewn down by force. The downfall of the mighty Assyrian army is the subject of the following simile: 'The great in height will be hewn down and the lofty will be brought low. . . and the Lebanon in his splendor will fall' (10.33, 34) [MT: *והלבנון באדיר יפול*; BHK reads: *באדיריו*, following LXX: *σὺν τοῖς ὑψηλοῖς*. But the preferable reading, which I propose is: *והלבנון ר' יפול*].

In contrast to the above description of the despotic representatives of violence, brutality and evil, the expected king of justice is a modest scion from the stump of Yishai, who will rule with the Spirit of the Lord which shall rest on him (11.1). 'He will smite the earth with the rod of his mouth; and with the breath of his lips he shall slay the wicked' (11.4). This spiritualized image of the Davidic king

Assyrian conqueror, who, though merely the rod of God's anger, boasts arrogantly of his ability to devastate nations and countries (10.7-11, 13-14; 30.8-10). In his megalomania he even aspires to ascend to the heavens, to be like Elyon—originally the chief divinity of the Caananite-Ugaritic pantheon—and to sit on the heavenly throne (14.13-14).¹⁰

The utopian element of this passage is outstanding in comparison to ch. 9, for the entire structure of the universe will be altered during the rule of the shoot from Yishai's stock. The urge of violence will be suppressed even among beasts of prey (vv. 6-8); the harmony that will prevail in human society shall be extended to the animal world.

Clearly, then, Isaiah's historical-political outlook culminates in the miraculous eschatological intervention of God, which will bring forth

1. the defeat of the Assyrian army
2. the re-establishment of the Davidic kingdom
3. revolutionary changes in the structure of the whole universe.¹¹

A far more restrained language characterizes Isaiah's impressive

stands out in particular in comparison to the above backdrop. Cf. H.L. Ginsberg, 'Reflexes of Sargon in Isaiah after 715 B.C.E.', *JAOS* 88 (1968), pp. 47-53; V. Kaufmann, *תולדות האמנות הישראלית* (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanity, 1937-56), III, 1, pp. 175-79; Y. Hoffman, *The Prophecies Against the Foreign Nations in the Bible* (Heb.) (Tel-Aviv: Tel Aviv University, The Chaim Rosenberg School of Jewish Studies, 1977), pp. 84-85.

10. Ch. 14.3-23 is a satirical song, a *חַסְדָּל* on Helel ben Shazar, the prophet's ironic designation of the tyrant. Most scholars contend that the author of this song cannot be Isaiah, particularly as the prophet identifies the tyrant with Babylonia, which ascended to world domination only by the end of the seventh century BCE. But it seems that vv. 22-23, which mention Babylonia, are a later addition. The song is an artistic creation of Isaiah. It seems to refer to the death of Sargon, who was killed in battle in 705. The Canaanite elements of this chapter possibly reflect one of his boasting addresses to the population of one of the Phoenician cities when he was laying siege to them, similar to Sennacherib's intimidating address to the people of Jerusalem (2 Kgs 18.19-35); cf. B. Uffenheimer, 'The Prophecy on Helel ben Shazar (Isa. 14.4-23)', *Beth-Miqra* 144 (1996), pp. 1-13. Y. Hoffman, *Prophecies*, pp. 84-85; Wildberger, *Jesaja*, I, pp. 531-86 (with comprehensive bibliography).

11. The allegorical interpretation of 11.6-9 is commonplace in medieval exegesis and philosophy, the impact of which on modern scholarship should not be underrated. But in the text there is no single allusion to justify this trend; cf., however, Wildberger, *ad loc.*

speech during the siege of Sennacherib, when he encouraged King Hezekiah and the nation to make a stand against the Assyrian army, assuring them of Divine defense (37.33-36).¹² Here he does not mention any miraculous changes nor the appearance of a new king, for Hezekiah had fulfilled all the prophet's expectations. Instead, he speaks of 'the remnant that is escaped of the house of Judah', thus referring in realistic terms to the survivors of the Assyrian atrocities. This is in sharp contrast to the Deuteronomic historian, who tells us in v. 36 of the angel of the Lord who slew a hundred and eighty-five thousand in the Assyrian camp.

Thus, the defeat of the Assyrian army and the re-establishment of the decimated nation are referred to in these chapters in eschatological terms, whilst the eschatological *Überbau* of ch. 11 consists of the spiritualized description of the expected king and the miraculous changes in nature.

3. *The Detachment of Eschatology from History*

A completely different approach is reflected by Isaiah's vision of the end of the days (2.1-4), which, I presume, is one of his latest prophecies. Chapters 24-27 continue this new trend. First, in ch. 2.1-4,¹³ eschatology is completely detached from contemporary history, as these events will occur in the far future. Instead of the house of David the prophet mentions the establishment of divine kingship over all nations as the final aim of history. This vision seems to have been written by the prophet in a mood of disappointment from the events of his days. Indeed, it is tantamount to a regression from immediate eschatological expectations. On the other hand, the idea of the universal acceptance of the word of the Lord by all nations, that is, his judgment in all their quarrels and squabbles, which is here conceived as the summit of human history, is of major importance for the future of eschatology and monotheism.

12. Cf. Uffenheimer, *Segal Festschrift*; *idem*, in Baras (ed.), *Messianism and Eschatology*, pp. 27-72; 37ff. As to the analysis of both traditions relating to Sennacherib's campaign, see Wildberger, *Jesaja*, I, pp. 1378-438, with rich bibliography, pp. 1378, 1414.

13. Kaufmann, *Toledot*, III.1, pp. 199-200; Uffenheimer, 'History and Eschatology in the Book of Micha', *Beth Miqra* 14 (1963), pp. 48-65. Wildberger, *Jesaja*, I, pp. 75-90.

The editor, possibly one of Isaiah's disciples, places this vision at the head of the collection of prophecies on the day of the Lord (2.5–4.4), the earlier of these dating from the end of King Uzziah's reign, that is, from the beginning of Isaiah's public activity. Herewith he probably wished to hint that the ultimate goal of history was still far off, man's pride being the main obstacle to his final redemption.¹⁴

At this point I shall shortly outline the special character of Isaiah 24–27, which according to most modern scholars¹⁵ is a collection of late apocalyptic writings from the Second Temple period. It was Yechezkel Kaufmann who challenged this approach on historical, literary, linguistic and ideological reasons, making a strong case for the Isaian authorship of all these prophecies.¹⁶ But it should be kept in mind that despite his weighty arguments against the above view, the cosmic extent of the catastrophic events sketched here and their complete detachment from concrete historical facts make the main difference between these prophecies and most of Isaiah's—according to those the disasters which overtook Judah during his days are the prelude of the immediate eschatological intervention of God.

In chs. 24–27 salvation, far from having any relation to current events, is rather a transhistoric process by its very nature. It will begin with the punishment of the host of heaven in heaven and the host of the kings of the earth (24.21), and will be followed by a feast for all nations on the mount of the Lord; there the Lord will swallow, that is, abolish and take away the covering, the veil, spread over all nations which has blinded them from recognizing Him. On that occasion He will also 'swallow'¹⁷ death forever (25.7, 8) and the dwellers in the dust shall awake and sing (26.19). It seems that the feast on the mount of the Lord is conceived as the coronation meal of the Lord as King

14. For a detailed analysis of these chapters see Uffenheimer, 'The variations of "The Day of the Lord" in Isaiah Chs. 2–4', *Beth-Migra* 137 (1994), pp. 97–132.

15. Wildberger, *Jesaja*, I, pp. 892–911, sketches the major trends in modern scholarship concerning these chapters.

16. Kaufmann, *Toledot*, III, pp. 185–92, 312–18.

17. The historical aspect of the belief in resurrection and abolition of death, which found its expression in this pericope, is too complicated to be dealt with sufficiently in this context. But it should be kept in mind that this belief in all its variations is part and parcel of ancient Egyptian, Mesopotamian and Canaanite cultures. So there is no cogent argument for the widely accepted view in scholarship that it was introduced in Israel only after the Babylonian exile. For the latest literature, see Wildberger, *Jesaja*, I, p. 885, and his commentary to the relating verses.

over all nations and over the universe (24.23) similar to the meal of the seventy elders of Israel on Mount Sinai, when they ate and drank in the presence of the Lord (Exod. 24.9-11).¹⁸

The final stage of these events will be the ingathering of all those who were abducted and exiled to Assyria and Egypt in the past when wars and hostile invasions had terrorized the population of Judah (27.12-13).

I assume that the authors of these prophecies belong to the circle of Isaiah's disciples. They seem to have been contemporaries of King Manasseh, who restored the pagan cults all over the country. Their soaring expectations in the wake of the deliverance of Jerusalem in 701 were deeply disappointed, for it had become clear to them that these events were far from being the prelude to final redemption and that the forces of evil continued to dominate history. Therefore they completely detached their eschatological vision from history as such. Only in the wake of the catastrophic events of the day of the Lord the forces of evil would disappear and death, who is here personalized, would be overcome.

The eschatology of Ezekiel is the continuation of this trend. Having witnessed the last days of Judah and the destruction of the State and the Temple, he detached eschatology from the start from all contemporary events. Moreover, the resurrection of the dead bones (Ezek. 37)—be it conceived literally or as a symbol of the rebirth of Israel—and the following defeat of Gog from the land of Magog (38-39), who symbolized the forces of evil, all these are beyond any historical horizon and are entirely utopian.¹⁹

4. *The Eschatological Interpretation of Current Events*

Deutero-Isaiah opens his prophecies with a new, revolutionary concept: not only does he associate eschatology with actual events in the present like Isaiah, moreover, these very events are of eschatological nature; his approach might be termed an eschatological assessment of the present. In order to place the beginning of this prophet's activities in its proper historical context, one must turn primarily to his

18. B. Uffenheimer, הנבואה הקדומה בישראל (Ancient Prophecy in Israel) (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2nd edn, 1973), pp. 98-105.

19. Cf. commentaries to chs. 37-39, in particular W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel* 25-48 (BKAT, XIII/2; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), *ad loc.*

prophecies on Babylon. These tell us that Babylon's fate is sealed; it will suffer destruction, loss of children, widowhood and servitude (47.1-15). This prophecy, however, did not come true: Babylon simply surrendered to Cyrus, who spared the land, treating it generously and with friendship. Most likely, the prophecy in question was pronounced around the year 540 BCE, when the last battle for Babylon²⁰ began. In addition, it can be assumed that chs. 56-66, considered by most scholars to be the work of yet another prophet, known as Trito-Isaiah, were also written by Deutero-Isaiah toward the end of Cyrus' reign (Cyrus died in 530 BCE), or shortly after the first returnees—probably including the prophet himself—reached the Land of Israel. These chapters indicate an eschatological regression, as they reflect the great difficulties met by the returnees in everyday life.

The historical setting of the eschatological optimism characteristic of Deutero-Isaiah's speeches is Cyrus' edict of 538 BCE (Ezra 1-4). The prophet considers the edict a harbinger of the redemption, referring to Cyrus as מָשִׁיחַ, 'the anointed one' (45.1) or, רֹעִי 'my shepherd' (44.28), destined to rebuild Jerusalem, reestablish the Temple and free the exiles (45.13; 48.20); and now the redemption is not confined, as it was at the time of the Exodus from Egypt, to the nation of Israel alone. God's glory will be revealed to mankind in general (40.5), 'that they may know from the rising sun, and from the west, that there is none besides me' (45.6). In other words, the expected eschatological conversion of the nations is treated as a real, immediate event. The nations will come to serve Israel and to confer their riches on God's people (49.22-23; 60.5-22; 61.5-9).

Various passages in Deutero-Isaiah indicate that his prophecies were received with disbelief and doubt (41.21; 42.18-25; 49.14), even with expressions of despair, as may be gained from the following exclamation: 'My way is hid from the Lord, and my right is passed over from my God' (40.27). The prophet appealed to four main considerations in order to convince the doubters:

20. Kaufmann, *Toledot*, IV, 1, pp. 51-156. L. Dürr, *Ursprung und Ausbau der israelitisch-jüdischen Heilandserwartung* (Berlin: Schwetschke, 1925). The commentaries to Deutero-Isaiah consulted in this section are those of A. Dillmann, *Der Prophet Jesaiah* (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1890); E.J. Kissane, *The Book of Isaiah*, I (Dublin: Browne & Nolan, 1943); J. Muilenberg, *Isaiah: The Interpreter's Bible*, I (New York: Abingdon Cokesbury Press, 1956); C.R. North, *The Second Isaiah* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964).

1. The reality of the eschatological events was ensured because sin could no longer obstruct their realization: 'her time of service is accomplished, her iniquity is pardoned' (40.2; 51.17, 22-23). It is in this context, too, that one should interpret the prophecy of the suffering endured by the Servant of the Lord, one of the symbolical aspects of Israel (52.13-53.12).
2. The God of Israel, creator of heaven and earth, is omnipotent, while the idols are powerless (40.12-24).
3. The election of Israel as the Chosen Nation is eternal, being assured by God's personal promises to the Patriarchs (40.2; 43.25). Abraham is called אֱהוּבִי 'my friend' (41.8); '... the rock whence you were hewn... the hole of the pit whence you were dug' (51.1-2). Jacob-Israel is 'your first father' (43.27; cf. Hos. 12.3). The Land of Israel is referred to as 'the heritage of Jacob your father' (58.14).
4. The miraculous present events, which have been foretold by the prophets give evidence to the credibility of the present promises.

Israel's status as a chosen nation brings the prophet to a comparison of its fate with that to the gentiles:

All flesh is grass/and all the goodness thereof is as the flower of the field;
 The grass withers, the flower fades/because the breath of the Lord blows upon it,
 Surely, the people is grass.
 The grass withers, the flower fades/but the word of our God will stand forever (40.6-8).

That is to say: all the nations are subject to the law of mortality that rules nature and history. Israel, however, is exempted from that rule by virtue of the word of the Lord, which is eternal. Like Isaiah, son of Amoz, who envisages redemption on a background of elemental changes in nature (11.6-9), Deutero-Isaiah speaks of impending miracles, like opening of rivers and fountains in the midst of the wilderness and growing of trees in the desert. Indeed, these miracles and wonders—the prophet calls them 'the last things' חֲדָשִׁים or חֲדָשׁוֹת (42.9; 43.19, 48.6)—will exceed what he calls 'the former things'

= ראשונות (41.22; 42.9; 43.9, 18; 46.9; 48.3; 65.17),²¹ that is, the miracles of the distant past that accompanied the Exodus from Egypt and the sojourn in the desert.

Deutero-Isaiah makes frequent use of the root מל"ך, 'to reign' and the noun מלך, 'king', and derived from it: 'the King of Israel and his redeemer' (44.6); 'the Creator of Israel, your King' (43.15); 'your God reigns' (52.7). Also prominent are such expressions as 'your Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel' and the like (41.14-15; 43.14-15; 49.7; 49.7; 52.5). Such references clearly demonstrate that the goal of the redemption is to reestablish the direct kingdom of God over Israel, which will also affect the whole of humanity. In the final analysis, national redemption will be of universal significance, thus disclosing its theocentric nature, as the Lord's glory will be revealed to all flesh: 'For my own sake, for my own sake, will I do it, for how should it be profaned? And My glory I will not give to another' (48.11). In Ezekiel's vision of redemption the theocentric element is already paramount (Ezek. 38.16, 23, etc.); in Deutero-Isaiah it is the climax of a new national and universal utopia. Only one step now remains on the way to cosmic utopia, of which we read in Isa. 65.17: 'For behold, I create new heavens and a new earth'. In sum, one might say that, in addition to the eschatological assessments of present events, the universal nature of the changes and their imminence constitute a climax in prophetic eschatology.

Nevertheless, some prophecies, particularly those in chs. 56-66,²² exude a certain pessimism, an air of disappointment. Contrary to the prophet's soaring expectations, he realizes that the forces of evil have not disappeared; the world continues to go its old way. By mentioning the ancient Hebrew myth about Rahab, the primeval dragon, and Leviathan, the sea monster, who were slain by the Lord when they

21. M. Haran, *בין ראשונות לחדשות* (Between Former Prophecies and New Prophecies) (Jerusalem, 1963); C.R. North, "The Former Things" and the "New Things", in Deutero-Isaiah, in H.H. Rowley (ed.), *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950), pp. 111-26.

22. The problem of unity of Isa. 40-66 and of its historical setting is a bone of contention in modern scholarship. The assumption here is that the arguments in favour of Trito-Isaiah (chs. 56-66) are not compelling, despite the differences between chs. 40-55 and 56-66. To the present problem, however, this question is of minor importance, cf. Kaufmann (above n. 16); M.Z. Segal, 'Isaiah', *EM*, 3, pp. 929-36.

rebelled against him in the dim and distant past, the prophet entreats him to reveal his might again:

Awake, awake, put on strength,/O arm of the Lord;
 Awake, as in the days of old,/the generations of ancient times.
 It was You that hacked Rahab in pieces,/that pierced the dragon. . . (51.9)

Once again, one can discern the motif of 'the Day of the Lord' that will presage the redemption. And now, as in the ancient tradition, that will be a day of judgment upon the nations (49.15-20; 61.2). The prophet paints a picture of the Day of the Lord, using vivid colors borrowed from ancient mythology: God is a 'man of war' (Exod. 15.3); he successfully battles Edom—here, for the first time symbolizing the Gentile world (63.1-6). But it is this radically utopian description that attests to a regression from the eschatological assessment of the present, fueled by disappointment with historical reality.

5. *Eschatological Activism*²³

Inspired by Cyrus's, edict of 538 BCE, Deutero-Isaiah chose to eschatologize the events of his time. The dates that open the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah (Hag. 1.1, 15; 2.10, 20; Zech. 1.1, 7) indicate that the bulk of their activity took place in the second regal year of Darius, that is 521/20 BCE. The revolts referred to in the Behistun inscription were probably seen by these prophets as harbingers of the redemption in terms of 'the Day of the Lord'. Accordingly, they took an unprecedented step: they attempted to accelerate the realization of the messianic/eschatological era. In concrete terms, they demanded the completion of the Temple, God's sanctuary on earth. In addition, they attempted to restore the Davidic kingdom by proclaiming Zerubabel king of Judah. Thus Haggai, in his first prophecy, rebuked the people for their failure to rebuild the Temple, asserting that the frequent droughts and economic distress be God's retribution for this neglect (Hag. 1.2-6, 9-11, 7-8). The text then tells us that the people, influenced by Haggai's admonitions, began to build the Temple under the leadership of Zerubbabel and Joshua son of Jehozadak the high priest. On the day the cornerstone was laid, 21 Tishri, Haggai encouraged the

23. For all details in this chapter, the reader is referred to my book, *The Visions of Zecharia: From Prophecy to Apocalyptic* (Jerusalem: The Israel Society for Biblical Research and Kiryath Sepher, 1961).

people with a speech, apparently cited only in outline (2.2-9). He assured his hearers that the new Temple would be more glorious than the former one, for in a short while God would shake the heavens and the earth, and the Gentile nations would bring all their treasures to the new sanctuary, as predicted by Deutero-Isaiah, too.

Two further speeches, also cited only in outline (2.10-19, 20-23), repeat the prophecy concerning the Temple and add a proclamation concerning the kingship of Judah. Both speeches were given on the 22nd of Kislev of the same year. The second repeats the motif of natural upheavals and political revolutions: 'and I will overthrow the throne of the kingdoms, and I will destroy the strength of the kingdoms of the nations' (2.22). Finally, Haggai addresses Zerubbabel:

In that day, says the Lord of Hosts, I will take you, Zerubbabel, My servant, son of Shealtiel, says the Lord, and will make you as a signet; for I have chosen you, says the Lord of hosts (2.23).

The intent of these words is to counteract and to reject Jeremiah's following prophecy to Jeconiah and his household:

As I live, says the Lord, though Coniah the son of Jehoiakim king of Judah were the signet upon My right hand, would I pluck you hence; and I will give you into the hand of them that seek your life, and into the hand of them of whom you are afraid, even into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon (Jer. 22.24-25).

Thus says the Lord: Write this man down as childless, a man who shall not succeed in his days; for none of his offspring shall succeed in sitting on the throne of David, and ruling again in Judah (22.30).

In other words, Zerubbabel the grandson of Coniah (Yechonyahu) is the promised monarch of the Davidic line, who is to rule Judah, contrary to Jeremiah's above announcements. This proclamation, taken together with the speech delivered on the day that the foundations of the Temple were laid (Hag. 2.2-9), clearly indicates that, for Haggai, the laying of its foundations and the widespread revolts against the government were portents that redemption was near, and with it the re-establishment of the Davidic monarchy. Only on that basis can one understand the prophet's bold proclamation of Zerubbabel as the promised king.

It may be surmised that Zechariah's vision of the lampstand (4.1-6a, 10b-14) took place at about the same time as Haggai's speeches. The lampstand symbolizes the Temple, the two olive-trees fueling it, the

leaders Zerubbabel and Joshua, 'that stand by the Lord of the whole earth' (v. 14). To this prophecy one should add two prophecies addressed to Zerubbabel (4.6b-7, 8-10a), in which he is promised that 'his hands shall also finish it' (v. 9) or 'he shall bring forth the top stone' (v. 7), that is, he shall complete the construction of the Second Temple.

After these prophecies Zerubbabel disappears from the stage of history, and is never heard of again. It has been suggested, that the Persian authorities expelled him or possibly returned him to exile, as they were not favorably inclined toward the establishment of an independent Judah.

Presumably, the vision of the crowns (Zech. 6.9-15) and the vision of the High Priest, in which Joshua is found innocent of an unspecified offense (Zech. 3), took place slightly later, as the sole ruler mentioned by name is Joshua son of Jehozadak. The name Zerubbabel does not appear in the pericope of the crowns—not because it was deliberately dropped, as claimed by some scholars, but because Zerubbabel had already left the stage. It should be noted that the word *עֲטֻרֹת* (= crowns) in v. 11 is spelled *plene*, making it clear that the text was speaking of more than one crown; while v. 14 deals with one crown, the noun *עֲטֻרָה* being spelled defectively and the nearby verb *תִּהְיֶה* being in the singular. The only emendation necessary here affects the vocalization, which should be *עֲטֻרָה* according to the singular form provided by the MT: 'And the crown shall be to Helem, and to Tobijah, and Jedaiah and to Hen son of Zephaniah'—the prophet places one crown on the head of the High Priest, while the other shall be kept 'as a memorial in the Temple of the Lord' (6.15).

Here, then, is a further retreat from the eschatological vision. At first, Haggai and Zechariah identify the laying of foundations for the Temple as the harbinger of redemption. Zerubbabel is even crowned king. However, once he had disappeared (or had been disposed), Zechariah shifted the beginning of the era of redemption to the completion of the Temple, when 'Zemah' would make his appearance. 'Zemah' is the messianic designation of the future representation of the House of David. This representative will wear the crown that was kept in the sanctuary: now it is he who will complete the building of the house.

Then, in Darius's fourth year, on the fourth of Kislev—that is, almost two years later—it turned out that the construction was indeed

nearing completion, but Zemach had not yet arrived. A delegation of priests and levites approached the prophet with a crucial question: 'Should I weep in the fifth month (= the month of Av), abstaining as I have done these so many years?' (7.1, 3-8). In other words: should the people continue to observe the customary mourning for the destruction of the First Temple, or discontinue the practice, adopting instead the law of the messianic era as implied by Zechariah's previous proclamations? Zechariah's answer in chs. 7-8 marks a further, fateful stage of eschatological regression; rather than offer a direct answer, he insists that the fast is not a divine precept. In keeping with the tradition of classical prophecy, he stresses the ethical imperative, that is, if you practice justice and deal compassionately with one another, God will reside in your midst.

Zechariah's rather evasive answer cannot but have affected the people's faith in him. Nevertheless, while not explicit or direct, it delivers a clear message in one respect: from now on the construction of the Temple is freed of its eschatological associations. Moreover, the eschatological idea is purged of its previous catastrophic elements and becomes a matter of slow development, as benefits the ethos of classical prophecy. The historical course of prophecy in Israel thus comes to an end, as the failure of eschatological actualization has undermined its credibility once and for all. In fact, the entire book of Zechariah's visions attests to a decline in man's feeling of dialogic closeness to God, a feeling which is a prerequisite for prophecy. God never speaks directly to Zechariah. The communication always takes place through an intermediary—'the angel who talked with me'—and not at a time of wakefulness, as it did with the earlier prophets, but in night visions, in dreams.

Prophetic zeal and fervor have waned, giving way to a new spiritual leadership—the scribes and the sages. Only centuries later, spurred on by the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes, was there a new outburst of that fervor, as indicated by the book of Daniel, which was written at the time. However, the social status of the visionary had changed completely and the visions themselves assumed a radically new form. The idea of social mission, the epitome of prophecy, had no place whatever in apocalyptic visions. According to the second chapter of Daniel, history constitutes a continual decline, a process of internal collapse, until the advent of the eternal kingdom of heaven.

In brief, historical determination (cf. also Dan. 7-8) leaves no room

for human initiative. The visionary can do nothing but sit in his corner, set apart from reality, and try to calculate the predetermined date of redemption. Such calculations are the epitome of apocalyptic vision. They convey a sensation of humanity's impotence in face of its fate. Man waits helplessly for the end of the great drama that will restore the eternal government to God.

To sum up, the failure of Haggai's and Zechariah's eschatological activism was one of the main causes for the decline of prophecy by the end of the sixth century BCE. The rise of apocalyptic hundreds of years afterwards still bears the import of this failure, for despite the authenticity of the religious fervour of these visionaries they dared not interfere any more in the course of history, nor make any public statements. Their only way of activity was to calculate the time of redemption on the assumption that history is the playground of super-human forces, which could accelerate or prevent the predestined date of final redemption. This passive attitude towards history was the prelude of spiritualistic flight from history and internalization of redemption as has become evident in early mysticism.

EXPECTATIONS OF THE DIVINE KINGDOM IN BIBLICAL AND POSTBIBLICAL LITERATURE

Moshe Weinfeld

In this paper I will try to show that the basic motifs of the divine kingship, such as longing for the coming of Yahweh, the revelation of God's kingdom, the speedy coming of the kingdom and the sanctification of the name of Yahweh in the universe, are reflected in the Old Testament but reached their apogee in Judaism and Christianity.

In the Old Testament these motifs were embedded in the prophecies while in Judaism and Christianity they were formulated as independent prayers and declarations. Thus the sanctification of God's name in the universe comes to expression in the Kaddish on the one hand and in the Christian Lord's prayer on the other. The longing for Yahweh's appearance appears as an attribute of holy persons both in Judaism and Christianity. By the same token the revelation of God's kingdom and the speedy coming of the kingdom are put in the form of a prayer. The following is a survey of the evidence.

The salvation of Israel was depicted from the beginning as *the coming of God*, the King, from his holy abode in order to save Israel from its enemies. This is already attested in the poetry of ancient Israel. According to the Song of Moses (Deut. 33), God appears from Sinai, Seir and Paran in order to help the tribes of Israel in the conquest of the promised land (Deut. 33.26-29). God acts there in the capacity of a king (v. 5) as he acted in Exodus (Exod. 15.18; Num. 23.21-22; 24.7-8). In Deut. 33.2, 5 is written:

Yahweh came (בא) from Sinai and shone forth (זרח)
from Seir, he appeared (הופיע) from Mount
Paran. . .

There arose a King in Jeshurun
when the heads of the people were assembled
all the tribes of Israel together.

At the end of the poem one reads:

There is none like the God of Jeshurun
who rides the heaven to your help. . .
who drove out the enemy before you (vv. 26-27).

Similarly in the Song of Deborah (Judg. 5), the God of Israel came to help the tribes of Israel in their encounter with the Canaanites by his appearance from Seir/Edom and Sinai (vv. 4-5). This is to compare with Ps. 68.8-9, 16-18 where God figures as coming from Sinai with thousands of chariots (v. 17). Likewise, in the ancient poem of Habakkuk 3:

God comes from Teman
the holy one from Mount Paran
his radiance overspreads the skies
and his splendour fills the earth. . .
he stands still and shakes the earth
he looks and makes the nations tremble. . .
the eternal mountains are riven
the everlasting hills subside
the tents of Cushan are shaking
the tent-curtains of Midian flutter.

Here, next to the 'coming' is the revelation of his glory.

The theophany is also reflected in the inscriptions of Kuntilet-Ajrud of the beginning of the eighth century BCE that mention Yahweh Teman (cf. Hab. 3.3):

and when El appears [shines forth, זָרַח]
the mountains melt and the hills dissipate. . .
to bless El on the day of war.¹

The salvation of Israel appears mainly on the day of Yahweh, that is, when God appears to intervene on behalf of his people, as I have shown elsewhere.² There I have tried to demonstrate that the Day of the Lord is reflected in the Israelite prayers, as S. Mowinckel suggest

1. See M. Weinfeld, 'Kuntilet Ajrud Inscriptions and their Significance', *Studi Epigrafici e Linguistici* 1 (1984), pp. 121-30.

2. '“The Day of the Lord”'; Aspirations for the Kingdom of God in the Bible and the Jewish Liturgy', *Studies in Bible* (ed. S. Japhet; Scripta Hierosolymitana, 31; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1986), pp. 341-72.

ed,³ however not in the New Year liturgy as he proposed, but in the liturgy in general.

I will try to show here in detail the components of the divine kingdom as it developed in Judaism and Christianity.

1. Longing for 'the Day of the Lord'

Longing for 'the day of the Lord' is found for the first time in the prophecy of Amos (5.18) but the very longing appears as something known and traditional. It expresses the hope for divine salvation and is encountered in the other prophecies speaking about waiting for divine salvation (Mic. 7.4, 7, צפה, יחל; Isa. 8.17, 30.18, חכה; Hab. 2.3: 'If it delays, wait for it, for when it comes will be no time to linger'; Zeph. 3.8: 'wait for me... for the day when I will stand up as witness'). Daniel continues this tradition into the Second Temple period with the exclamation: 'happy is the man who waits' (אשרי המחכה 12.12). The waiting for God's coming is reflected widely in the Jewish and Christian sources of the Second Temple period. Thus we read in the Qumran prayer devoted to Zion:

Great is your hope, O Zion... those who desire (המתאווים) the day of your salvation will rejoice in your plentiful glory... how they waited for your salvation... Your hope will never die, O Zion, and your aspiration will never be forgotten (11QPs 22.2-11, DJD, IV, p. 43).

The sage Simeon Ben Shetah (first century BCE), is said to have opened his oath with the declaration: 'May I not live to see the Consolation (לוא אראה בנחמה) if... ' (b. Mak. 56).

Similarly, about Joseph from Arimathea it is said in the New Testament: 'that he lived in expectation of the kingdom of God' (Lk. 23.50), as with Simon the righteous and pious who was waiting for the consolation of Israel (Lk. 2.25); compare Lk. 2.38: Simon waiting for the redemption of Jerusalem (= גאולה ירושלים). The Aramaic Targum to 2 Sam. 23.4 refers to those who desired (מחמדין) the consolation (נחמה) to come. Similarly, the Targum to Jer. 31.5 refers to those who desire (מחמדין) the years of consolation (נחמה) to come, who say, 'when will we arise and go up to Zion?' The consolation is not

3. S. Mowinckel, *Zum israelitischen Neujahr und zur Deutung der Thronbesteigungspsalmen: Zwei Aufsätze* (Oslo: Dybwad, 1952), pp. 26-38; *idem, The Psalms in Israel's Worship* (2 vols.; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962), I, pp. 106-92.

necessarily the rebuilding of the Temple but rather all eschatological hopes. The 'waiting' for the 'kingdom of God' or 'kingdom of heaven' was expressed clearly in the Jewish Liturgy. Thus is found in the *Kedusha* Liturgy of Sabbaths and festivals:

from your abode, our King, appear and reign over us for we wait for you (כִּי מַחֲכִים אֲנִינֶךָ לְךָ). When will you reign in Zion? Speedily, in our days, do you dwell there forever. May you be exalted and sanctified (וְהִתְנַדְּרָהּ) in Jerusalem your city throughout all generations and to all eternity. May our eyes behold kingdom, as it is said in your glorious Psalms by your truly anointed, David: 'The Lord shall reign forever, your God, O Zion, for all generations: Hallelujah (*Kedusha* liturgy).⁴

Surprisingly, this is confirmed by external evidence: Shenoute, Abbot of Athribis in Egypt, in the fourth century says:⁵

They [the Jews] assemble, according to their customs. . . on the Sabbaths, New Moon days and festivals. . . to prostrate, calling in the Hebrew language: 'on which day will you come? at what time will you reveal yourself? because we are expecting your coming. . . Do not tarry, even if you tarry, we will wait.'

The anticipation of divine rule in Zion is found in every component of Jewish liturgy, starting with the ancient core of the daily service (the *Amidah*, = 'eighteen benedictions') and ending with the personal prayers of Talmudic sages now appended to the public service. Included in the official *Amidah* prayers are:

Restore our judges as at first. . . reign you alone over us (some rites add: speedily), O Lord (daily *Amidah*).⁶

Make spring up speedily the branch of David for each and everyday we hope for your salvation

Blessed be the lord who makes spring up the horn of salvation (בְּרִיךְ הוּא הַמַּצְמִיחַ קֶרֶן יְשׁוּעָה).

Y. Liebes has suggested that the word יְשׁוּעָה here alludes to ישוע = Jesus, and that the Christian Jews formulated this prayer,⁷ a very

4. Cf. S. Singer, *The Authorized Daily Prayer Book* (New York: Bloch, 1943), p. 99.

5. E. Amelineau, *Oeuvres de Schnoudi* (Paris: E. Leroux, 1914), II, pp. 379-80.

6. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, p. 58.

7. Y. Liebes, קֶרֶן יְשׁוּעָה, in *Early Jewish Mysticism* (Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought, 3; Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, 1984), pp. 313-48; cf. also, *idem*, 'The Angels of the Shofar and Yeshua Sar Ha-panim', in *Proceedings of*

controversial thesis. It is probable however—in my opinion—that the Christian Jews interpreted this old Jewish Blessing as referring to Jesus, who was named Yeshua and considered to be a descendant of David.

May our eyes behold your return in mercy to Zion, blessed are you, O Lord who restores the divine presence to Zion.⁸

2. *The Revelation of the Glory of the Lord*

The revelation of God's glory on the day of salvation is already attested in the ancient poems mentioned above in verbs like 'shine' (זרַח, הוֹפִיעַ) and explicitly in Habbakkuk: 'his radiance overspreads the skies and his splendour fills the earth' (3.3). The Glory of God that fills the whole earth is mentioned in Num. 14.21 and also in the trisagion of Isa. 6.3. Compare Ps. 72.19.

The revelation of the glory of Yahweh is especially stressed in the prophecy of Deutero-Isaiah, see for example Isa. 40.5: 'the glory (כְּבוֹד) of Yahweh shall be revealed (וְנִגְלָה) and all flesh shall see it together'. The LXX renders the second part of this verse: 'and all flesh shall see the salvation of Yahweh', like the Masoretic Text of Isa. 52.10: 'Yahweh has revealed his holy arm in the sight of the nations and all the ends of the earth will see the salvation of our God'. According to H.L. Ginsberg, the term 'arm' in this context serves as a metaphor for salvation (cf. Isa. 51.5; 52.10; 53.1).⁹ In fact, the revelation of the glory (כְּבוֹד) of Yahweh is synonymous with the revelation of his arm (זְרוֹעַ) as well as of his righteousness (צְדָקָה); see, for example, Isa. 62.2: 'the nations will see your righteousness (צְדָקָה) and kings your glory (כְּבוֹד)'; and Isa. 58.8: 'your righteousness will go before you and the glory of Yahweh will go after you'. The same is found in the ascension psalms, for example, like Ps. 98.1-3: 'his right hand and his holy arm helped him (הוֹשִׁיעָה לוֹ), Yahweh has proclaimed his salvation, in the sight of the nations he revealed his righteousness'.

In the prayer of Ben Sira (Sir. 36.19) is included the revelation:

the First International Conference on the History of Jewish Mysticism: Early Jewish Mysticism (Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought, 6; Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, 1987), pp. 1-2.

8. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, p. 62.

9. H.L. Ginsberg, "The Arm of YHWH" in Isaiah 51-63', *JBL* 77 (1958), pp. 152-56.

'Fill Zion with your majesty (הוֹד), fill your tabernacle with your glory (כְּבוֹד).'

Revelation of God's glory and splendor, so characteristic of the Day of the Lord prophecy, is likewise prominent in the Second Temple liturgy. In the 'Aleinu' prayer is stated: 'We hope soon to behold your majestic glory'¹⁰ and in the New Year Amidah we find: 'Reign over the whole universe with your glory and be exalted over all the earth in your grandeur, Shine forth (הוֹפֵעַ) in your splendid majesty (עֶזְרָא) over all the inhabitants of your world'.¹¹ Similarly, in the Musaf for festivals: 'Reveal your glory of your kingship to us and appear and be exalted above us in the sight of all the living', and in the prayer 'Al hakkol' said before the reading of the Torah:¹² 'Let his kingship be revealed and seen over us speedily and very soon' (*Sop.* 14.1). Luke 19.11 says: 'the kingdom of God will be revealed soon' and the epistle to the Romans: 'the glory [of God] that will be revealed' (8.18).

The inclusion of eschatological motifs, and especially the notion of concluding a prayer with such motifs, is found in biblical hymns and prayers. The Song of the Sea concludes: 'The Lord shall reign forever and ever' (Exod. 15.18). Psalm 29 concludes with the establishment of God's kingdom on earth (v. 10). Psalm 68 concludes with a call to all the kingdoms of the earth to acknowledge God's majesty. The doxology following the second book of Psalms concludes with 'Let his glory fill the whole world. Amen and Amen' (Ps. 72.19, cf. Num. 14.21). Psalm 22, a psalm of thanksgiving for salvation from distress, likewise ends with the hope that the whole world will acknowledge the divine salvation: 'Let all the ends of the earth pay heed and turn to the Lord, and the peoples of all nations prostrate themselves before you, for kingship is the Lord's and he rules the nations' (vv. 27-28 [Heb. 28-29]). Mesopotamian prayers also tend to end with an eschatological petition. The hymn to the god Shamash ends: 'may they bear your tribute... the wealth of the lands in sacrifice... may your throne-dais

10. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, p. 94. On this prayer, see J. Heinemann, *The Prayers in the Talmud: Forms and Patterns* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977), pp. 173-75; and recently, Y. Ta-Shma: בסידור "עלינו לשבח" מקורה ומקומה של תפילה "עלינו לשבח" בסידור, *The Frank Talmage Memorial* (ed. B. Wallfish; Haifa: Haifa University Press, 1993), I, pp. 85-98.

11. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, p. 353.

12. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, p. 216.

be renewed. . . whose utterance cannot be changed'.¹³

This tradition of eschatological prayer is continued in the book of Ecclesiasticus. In the prayers of Ben Sira (Sir. 36), many eschatological elements are later incorporated into the Jewish liturgy.

Save us you God of all, put your awe upon all nations (שִׁים פִּחְדֵךְ) (על כל הגוי ים). Raise your hand against the heathen and let them see your power. As you became holy among us before their eyes, so be honored with us before our eyes. Let them learn, as we also have learned, that there is no God but you. . . Hasten the destined hour (קֶץ) and remember the appointed time (מוֹעֵד). For who can tell you what to do? Gather all the tribes of Jacob (vv. 1-11) (Sir. 36).

The beginning of the prayer is echoed in the opening of the New Year Amidah liturgy:¹⁴ 'Put your awe upon all your creatures (תֵּן פִּחְדֵךְ עַל כָּל מַעֲשֵׂיךְ)' (see above), while the continuation 'be honored with us' is echoed in the following section of this New Year prayer: 'Grant honor, O Lord, to your people (תֵּן כְּבוֹד לְעַמְּךָ)'.¹⁵ The formula 'Raise your hand against the heathen' (v. 3) is reflected in the abridged form of the daily Amidah:¹⁶ 'Raise your hand against evildoers' and 'let them learn that there is no God but you (v. 5). This parallels the second paragraph of 'Aleinu': 'May all the inhabitants of the world realize and know that before you every knee must bend'.¹⁷

'Hasten the destined hour (קֶץ), remember the appointed time (מוֹעֵד)' refers to the era of salvation and these two words are used in Day of the Lord prophecies. The motif of the ingathering of the exiles, which follows, is also an integral part of the daily Amidah¹⁸ and Jewish eschatology in general. The prayer of Ben Sira continues:

Show mercy to the city of your sanctuary, Jerusalem, city of your dwelling place. Fill Zion with your majesty, fill your tabernacle with your glory. Give acknowledgement to your creation at the beginning; and fulfill the vision which has been spoken in your name (vv. 13-15).

Here is the motif of glorious revelation, which is attested in both the daily and New Year liturgy. The rebuilding of Zion and Jerusalem are

13. W.G. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960), p. 138, ll. 196-99.

14. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, pp. 350, 360.

15. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, pp. 350, 360.

16. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, p. 67.

17. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, p. 94.

18. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, p. 58.

described as the fulfilment of prophecy. This idea is echoed in the daily Amidah: 'Return in mercy to your city Jerusalem and dwell in it as you have promised (דְּבַרְרָה)'.¹⁹ The 'glory' which is to fill Zion is identical with the 'divine Presence' (שְׁכִינָה), which according to the Abodah Benediction of the Amidah²⁰ is to be restored to Zion: 'Be appeased Lord, our God, and dwell in Zion (וּשְׁכֹן בְּצִיּוֹן)'. All these are to be traced back to the prophecy of Zechariah (2.14; 8.2).

Both the prayer of Ben Sira and the daily Amidah are rooted in the eschatological hopes of the prophets. As I have pointed out elsewhere, these aspirations are likewise to be found in Mesopotamian prophecies,²¹ but without the ideological-religious element of the elimination of idolatry. As in Israelite prophecy and Jewish liturgy, where expressions of aspiration are for the ingathering of the exiles, the restoration of ideal justice the end of evil, and the establishment of a cultic center, so Mesopotamian prayers ended with eschatological petitions.²² As in Israel, both prayer and prophecy reflected eschatological hopes. It is likely that, as in many other cases, prophecy adapted liturgical material to its own purpose, and not vice versa. Although in later liturgy, verses from prophets were incorporated into prayer, the original desire for the revelation and God's kingdom predates classical prophecy. It lies behind the expectations of the people as described by Amos (5.18-20).

3. *The Sanctification of the Divine Name and the Establishment of the Divine Kingdom*

In the light of the above, it becomes clear that the belief in a future redeeming revelation is reflected in the prayers of the people. Although the people are aware, and the prophets constantly remind them, that this revelation is bound up with a last judgment in which even Israelite evildoers will not be spared, the central aspect of the revelation is the sanctification of God's name and the establishment of the God of Israel as King of the universe. This is expressed in

19. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, p. 59.

20. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, pp. 61-62.

21. 'Mesopotamian Eschatological Prophecies', *Shnaton: An Annual for Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 3 (1979), pp. 268-70.

22. See 'The Šamaš Hymn', in Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature*, p. 138, ll. 196-99.

Ezekiel's prophecy (38.18-23) regarding God: 'on that day... a terrible earthquake shall befall the land of Israel. . . I will punish him [the enemy] with pestilence and bloodshed. . . hailstones and sulfurous fire. . . I will be magnified (והתגדלתי) and sanctified and make myself known to many nations.' A similar expression is found in Zech. 14.3-9. 'The Lord will come forth and make war on those nations. . . there shall be a continuous day. . . only the Lord knows when—of neither day nor night. . . And the Lord shall be king over all the earth. . . the Lord will be one and his name one.' Compare also the passage in Isa. 5.15-16: 'humankind shall be brought low. . . humbled will be the haughty. And the Lord of Hosts is exalted in judgment: the Holy God sanctified by righteousness', a motif which belongs to Isaiah's Day of the Lord prophecy (2.9, 11, 17). These motifs of sanctification of God's name and the establishment of his kingdom became dominant in the liturgy. I have cited above references to God's kingdom in the liturgy; to these must be added references to the sanctification of his name.

The *Amidah* prayers of the New Year contain references to the sanctification of God's name along with reference to his kingship. After the petition 'Rule over us you alone speedily', follows: 'you are holy and your name is awesome (קדוש אתה וגורא שמך)',²³ in connection with which Isa. 5.16, 'And the Lord of Hosts is exalted by judgement; the Holy God sanctified with righteousness', is cited. A Benediction regarding the sanctification of God's name (קדושת השם) is contained in the daily *Amidah* as well,²⁴ and according to ancient sources (*Sifre* 343) and Geniza texts,²⁵ this Benediction also contained the above-mentioned phrase 'you are holy and your name is awesome', now recited only on the New Year. The juxtaposition of God's holy name and his kingship is a dominant motif in all Jewish liturgy. The congregation must recite seven times daily the Kaddish,²⁶ which begins with the sanctification of God's name and establishment of his kingdom. Although its origins are unclear, the Kaddish has very ancient roots and it expresses the Israelite aspiration of the Day of the Lord.

23. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, pp. 351, 361.

24. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, p. 55.

25. See recently, Y. Luger, 'The Weekday Amidah based on the Genizah' (PhD thesis, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, 1992), pp. 68-79.

26. See J.M. Epstein, *Aruch ha-Shulchan* (1903-1907), *Orah Hayyim* par. 55.4.

'Magnified and Sanctified may be his name in the universe in the world that he created according to his will and let him make rule his kingship during your life and the life of all Israel speedily and fastly.' Compare the Hebrew prayer before the recital of the Torah: 'Let his name be magnified and sanctified in the worlds that he created... according to his will'; in the Sabbath angelic liturgy: 'Let your name be sanctified and your mentioning, our king, be praised, on the heaven above and on the earth below (שְׁמֶךָ יִתְקַדֵּשׁ וְיִזְכָּר מְלִכְנוּ יִתְפַּאֵר) (בְּשָׁמַיִם מִמַּעַל וְעַל הָאָרֶץ מִתַּחַת)'.²⁷

These prayers parallel the Lord's prayer: 'Sanctified be your name. Your kingdom come; your will shall be done on earth as in heaven [= throughout the world]', (Mt. 6.9; Lk. 11.2).

The 'complete Kaddish' is recited at the end of each service, and is the summit of all the prayers. Similarly, the Aleinu prayer is recited toward the end of each service. This poetic Hebrew prayer expresses the hope that idolatry will pass from the earth, that the world will be perfected in the kingdom of the Almighty and that all will accept the yoke of God's kingship. It is accepted in modern scholarship that this prayer is from Second Temple times (see above). It is in fact the credo recited by the worshipper at the end of the service. According to J. Ta-Shma this prayer stems from the Ma'amadot service when the people recited prayers during the worship of the priests of their turn (משמר).²⁷

Other prayers that combine the sanctification of the divine name and the establishment of the divine kingdom include the prayer before the reading of the Torah, cited in tractate *Sop.* 14.1: 'Magnified and glorified... be the name of the supreme King of Kings... in the world which he has created... according to his desire... May his kingdom be revealed and seen by us',²⁸ which is in fact a Hebrew version of the Aramaic Kaddish. Compare also the prayer in the preliminary morning service, cited in the Midrash Tanna debe Eliahu: 'Reveal your holiness to those who sanctify your name... let all mankind realize and know that you alone are God over all the kingdoms on earth: gather them that hope for you from the four corners of the earth... who among all your creatures can say unto you: what are you doing?...'²⁹ This liturgy has much in common with the prayer in

27. See Ta-Shma, in n. 10 above.

28. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, p. 210.

29. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, p. 10.

Sirach 36, quoted above; especially salient are the parallels in the motifs of sanctification of the Lord: the recognition of all the inhabitants of the world that there is no god besides Yahweh, the hope of the ingathering of the exiles, couples with the idea of absolute sovereignty of God ('who can say to God: what are you doing?').

4. The Speedy Coming of the Divine Kingdom

Public Prayers

The anticipation of the divine kingdom, and the wish that it be revealed 'speedily' and 'soon' (בעגלא ובזמן קריב), Kaddish, 'during your life') is also rooted in the prophecies of the Day of the Lord.

The great day of the Lord is approaching. . . most swiftly (קרוב ומהר מאד) (Zeph. 1.14).

The time has come; the day is near (קרוב היום) (Ezek. 7.7).

For the day is near. The day of the Lord is near (Ezek. 30.3).

For the day of the Lord has come. It is close (קרוב) in the valley of decision (Joel 4.14).

Yea, against all nations, the day of the Lord is close (קרוב) (Obad. 15).

For the vision is a witness [read עֵד, for 'the appointed time'] a truthful יפח³⁰ for the destined hour. . . even if it tarries, wait for it still. It will surely come (בא יבוא) without delay (Hab. 2.3).

Compare the following liturgical passages:

Rebuild it [the Temple] soon, in our days. . . (בקרב בימינו) (*Amidah*),³¹ 'Speedily cause the offspring of your servant David to flourish' (מהרה) (*Amidah*).³² 'May his kingdom be revealed very soon' (prayer before the reading of the Torah).³³ 'We hope (נקה לראות). . . soon to behold your majestic glory' (*Aleinu*).³⁴ 'Speedily in our days (בימינו) (במהרה), in our lifetime do dwell there forever' (Sabbath morning *Kedushah*).³⁵

All these should be compared with the following verses from the Gospel of Luke:

30. For יפח = עֵד see S.E. Loewenstamm, *Comparative Studies in Biblical and Ancient Oriental Literatures* (AOAT, 204; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1980), pp. 137-45.

31. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, p. 59.

32. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, p. 60.

33. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, p. 83.

34. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, p. 94.

35. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, p. 199

. . . they thought that the reign of God will reveal itself at any moment (Lk. 19.11).

. . . you may know that the kingdom of God is near (εγγύς) (Lk. 21.31).

The kingdom of God has come close (ἤγγικεν) to you (Lk. 10.9).

The kingdom of God has come close (ἤγγικεν) (Lk. 10.11).

The closeness of the Day of the Lord must encourage the people to repent. Thus Isa. 56.1: 'Observe what is right and do what is just (social justice), for soon my salvation shall come. . . ' cf. 51.4-5: 'Hearken to me my people. . . The triumph I grant is near, the salvation has gone forth'; Mt. 3.2: 'repent for the kingdom of heaven is close to you (ἤγγικεν)', and Mk 1.15: 'The time has come, the kingdom of God is close to you. Repent.'

Personal Prayers

The personal meditations appended to the public liturgy also express the longing for the establishment of God's kingdom. The original version of the *Elohai nešor* prayer said privately after the recital of the Amidah³⁶ contains such a petition: 'Our king and God, unite your kingdom on earth, rebuild your city, establish your house and restore your temple'. Similarly the petitions following the core of the Grace after Meals begins with requests for the divine kingdom and universal acknowledgment of God's kingship.

May the Merciful reign over us throughout all time

May the Merciful be praised in the heavens and on earth

May the Merciful give us an honorable livelihood.

The 'Lord's prayer' (Mt. 6.9-13; cf. Lk. 11.2-4), which begins with the sanctification of God's name and the wish for his kingdom, likewise belongs to this genre of personal prayer. Jewish and Christian liturgies alike ended with short formulae petitioning the coming of the redeemer (μαρναναθα).

I should mention in this context the liturgical exclamations μαρναναθα (= 'master, come') at the end of 1 Corinthians (16.22) and at the end of Revelation (22.20). There, Jesus says: 'Yes, I am coming soon', to which the response is 'Amen, come our Lord Jesus'. The same response μαρναναθα is found at the end of the Grace after Meals in *Didache* (10.6), which encompasses eschatological petitions such as 'hoshanna (save us), God of David'. This is to be compared with the

36. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, p. 60; cf. *b. Ber.* 17a.

prayers at the end of the Jewish grace after meals: 'May the merciful one send us Elijah the prophet. . .',³⁷ 'Make us worthy of the days of the Messiah'.³⁸ The eschatological aspirations of Judaism were then adopted by the early Christians but the object of the aspirations changed from 'Lord God' to 'Lord Jesus'.

In addition to the above cited eschatological petitions at the closing of various liturgies, is the *כְּאַלְהֵינוּ אֵין* prayer at the end of the Jewish service,³⁹ whose acrostic reads *בָּא אִמֶּן* ('Amen, come'), similar to the Christian formulae.⁴⁰

APPENDIXES

1. Longing

Jewish

May I not live to see the Consolation
(*לֹא אֲרֵאָה בְּנִחְמוֹה*) if I. . . (*b. Mak. 56*).

Those who desire (*בְּחִמּוֹדֵיךָ*) the years of
consolation (*נִחְמוֹהָ*) to come: who say:
'when will we arise and go up to Zion'.

Great is your hope, O Zion. . . those
who desire (*הַבְּחִמּוֹתֶיךָ*) the day of your
salvation will rejoice in your plentiful
glory. . . how they waited for your
salvation. . . Your hope will never die,
O Zion, and your aspiration will never
be forgotten (11QPs cols. 22.2-11
[DJD, IV, p. 43]).

Christian

he lived in expectation of the kingdom of
God (Lk. 23.50).

Simon the righteous and pious who was
waiting for the consolation of Israel (Lk.
2.25), compare Lk. 2.38: Simon waiting
for the redemption of Jerusalem (= *גְּאֻלַּת יְרוּשָׁלַיִם*).

37. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, p. 429.

38. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, p. 430.

39. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, p. 238.

40. See E. Werner, 'The Doxology in Synagogue and Church: A Liturgico-Musical Study', *HUCA* 19 (1945-46), p. 302 n. 89.

2. Revelation

Reign over the whole universe with your glory and be exalted over all the earth in your grandeur. Shine forth (הוֹפֵט) in your splendid majesty (הַדָּר נְאוֹן עוֹד) over all the inhabitants of your world. The kingdom of God will be revealed soon (Lk. 19.11). The glory (of God) that will be revealed (Rom. 8.18).

Save us you God of all, put your awe upon all nations (שִׁים פֶּחַדְךָ עַל כָּל הַגּוֹיִם). Raise your hand against the heathen and let them see your power. As you became holy among us before their eyes, so be honored with us before our eyes. Let them learn, as we also have learned, that there is no God but you. . . Hasten the destined hour (קִיץ) and remember the appointed time (מוֹעֵד). For who can tell you what to do? Gather all the tribes of Jacob (vv. 1-11) (Sir. 36).

3. Sanctification

Kaddish

'Magnified and Sanctified may be his name in the universe in the world that he created according to his will and let him make rule his kingship during your life and the life of all Israel speedily and fastly.' Compare the Hebrew prayer before the recital of the Torah: 'Let his name be magnified and sanctified in the worlds that he created. . . according to his will'.

The Lord's Prayer

'Sanctified be your name. Your kingdom come; your will shall be done on earth as in heaven [= "throughout the world"]' (Mt. 6.9; Lk. 11.2).

4. Speedy Coming

The great day of the Lord is approaching. . . . they thought that the reign of God ing. . . most swiftly (קָרוֹב וְמוֹהֵר מְאֹד) will reveal itself at any moment (Lk. 19.11). (Zeph. 1.14).

The time has come; the day is near (קָרוֹב הַיּוֹם) (Ezek. 7.7). . . . you may know that the kingdom of God is near (ἐγγύς) (Lk. 21.31).

For a day is near. A day of the Lord is near (Ezek. 30.3). The kingdom of God has come close (ἤγγικεν) to you (Lk. 10.9).

For the day of the Lord has come. It is close (קָרוֹב) in the valley of decision (Joel 4.14). The kingdom of God has come close (ἤγγικεν) (Lk. 10.11).

Yea, against all nations, the day of the Lord is close (קָרוֹב) (Obad. 15).

For the vision is a witness [read עֵד] for the appointed time. . . even if it tarries, wait for it still. It will surely come, without delay (Hab. 2.3).

Rebuild it (the Temple) soon, in our days. . . (בְּקִרְבֵּנוּ בְּיָמֵינוּ) (*Amidah*).⁴¹

Speedily cause the offspring of your servant David to flourish (*Amidah*).⁴²

May his kingdom be revealed very soon (prayer before the reading of the Torah).⁴³ We hope. . . soon to behold

your majestic glory (*Aleinu*).⁴⁴ Speedily in our days, in our lifetime do dwell there forever (Sabbath morning *Kedushah*).⁴⁵

41. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, p. 59.

42. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, p. 60.

43. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, p. 83.

44. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, p. 94.

45. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, p. 199.

ASPECTS OF THE LAST JUDGMENT IN THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW

Klaus Wengst

The concept of the Last Judgment is repeatedly encountered in the Gospel according to Matthew, and in the last of Jesus' five great sermons, in chs. 24 and 25, it is even extensively developed. I shall concentrate for present purposes essentially upon these two chapters. It is, of course, impossible to exhaust this topic in one paper, but I can at least attempt to clarify a few aspects.

Like all of the sermons of Jesus in the Gospel according to Matthew, the sermon about the Last Judgment also derives from the evangelist's conscious act of shaping. This sermon has a prominent position both in its narration and also within the Gospel itself. Jesus delivers it upon the Mount of Olives at the end of his earthly mission, looking towards Jerusalem and particularly at the Temple. Directly thereafter comes his passion. Therefore, what we have here is a view both towards the future and also of his legacy.

As to the material treated, the main source in ch. 24—also with reference to its position within the overall concept of the Gospel—is the Apocalypse found in Mark 13. In addition to a small amount of special material, Matthew has worked into it pertinent Q-material which is found in the Gospel according to Luke in chs. 12 and 17. Furthermore, in ch. 25 he has added two great parables and the narrative of the Last Judgment. Only the second parable, that of the talents, has a synoptic parallel in Luke 19. Perhaps it forms the conclusion of the Q-source.

After the introduction of 24.1-3, the actual sermon can be divided into three main parts. First of all the events before the end-time are described (24.4-28), then the end itself and its immediate unpredictable proximity are emphasized (24.29-41), and finally the paraenetic conclusions are drawn (24.42-25.46). The final part is by far the

most extensive. Special emphasis is placed upon it since it is paraenetic. In it we also find the statements about the Final Judgment. To say it somewhat pointedly, these statements in Matthew have their locus not in dogmatics but in ethics.

1. Keys to an Understanding of the Sermon on the End-Times

Before I turn to the actual statements concerning the last Judgment, I should first like to deal with several points that have a general importance for the understanding of the sermon on the end-times. In its introduction Jesus prophesies the destruction of the Temple (24.1-2). Referring to this destruction his disciples then ask him: 'Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world?' The basic version in Mk 13.4 differs in a very characteristic way: 'Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign when all these things shall be fulfilled?' Both clauses of the sentence here refer not to different events but to the single event of the destruction of the Temple. Therefore there was obviously a tradition that looked forward to the end-times and with them to the coming of Jesus within the context of the Judeo-Roman war. For the period in which Matthew was writing there was a problem. The Temple had in fact been destroyed, but the end-times had by no means come. Historical time continued as usual and the coming of Jesus had not yet taken place. After all the experiences that had occurred in the meantime, the tradition had therefore to be interpreted anew. So why were people still hopeful? It surely might have been a possible reaction to view the course of history as a clear refutation of this hope—just as, to draw a certain analogy, Josephus had turned from a fighter against Roman power into one of its admirers and apologists. In the retention of hope and in the change within the tradition derived from it can be seen a documentation of the will not simply to accept the continuation of history since it was perceived as violent and unjust. Here lies the real motivation for this view of the apocalypse.

Accordingly the times before the end are described as a period of terrible afflictions. One should not misunderstand this—neither in Matthew nor in other apocalyptic texts—as the description of a simple schedule of the end-times and most especially not from the cynical point of view that things have to get much worse before they become

better. The description here is on the contrary determined by the experience that the present itself is perceived as catastrophic. It is simply not acceptable for the present state of things to continue. Therefore all hopes are placed in a breaking off of contemporary history.

It is striking that in the description of the end itself (24.29-31) there is such a great density of scriptural quotations. In contrast to Mark, Matthew takes over many more allusions to Scripture, so that this short passage consists almost completely of quotations. In order to avoid speculation in one's view of an end to injustice and violence, it is necessary to refer back to the history of God with his people and also to the hopes that were awakened. A discussion of all the quotations and allusions taking into account their contexts would show that these cases do not deal with abstract speculations but with the idea of the resTorahtion of justice. Matthew attaches to Jesus the concept of hope contained in the Scriptures. And so he presents him as an exegete of the Torah and therefore as a teacher of justice, as a helper and healer of his oppressed people. And above all he discovers a guarantee of this in the testimony of the resurrection of the crucified Jesus. Therefore, when describing the death of Jesus, which he has already portrayed in the light of his faith in the resurrection, he also notes that the graves are opened and the dead emerge from them (27.51-53). In this case he is surely thinking of the prophets and martyrs slain by violence. The opening of the graves of the murdered is equated with the opening of world history, which appeared closed and which has been carried on over the backs of corpses. The triumph of finality is denied to the injustice of the actual course of history, and time and space are granted to hitherto suppressed hopes. The quotations used in this representation of the end-times make it clear that the concern here is not with the cosmological speculations of a spectator enjoying the vision of a dreadful collapse, but rather with the hope of those affected by history that God will finally bring justice through Jesus as the coming son of man. Salvation is held out as a prospect to this small oppressed congregation who thereby are given the courage to endure and carry forward the cause for justice in an utterly unjust world.

The identity of the addressees is made very clear here through the modest request put to them concerning the coming time of tribulations: 'But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the sabbath day' (24.21). Let me emphasize three points here:

1. This presentation does not exceed the dimensions of concrete experience. End-time history is presented very realistically—to be sure from a certain perspective, namely that of such people who have absolutely no power to affect political decision-making but who on the contrary are only playthings of the powerful and who will be able to do nothing more than save their own lives by flight into the mountains.
2. It is precisely in this context that the mention of winter is appropriate. In the Judeo-rabbinic tradition it is considered one of God's mercies that the Babylonian exile took place in summer so that those who went into exile were not exposed to the cold when they had to camp in the open air and on their way thither were at least able to find grapes and figs (*Midr. Tanh., Parasha Tazri'a* 9; *Midr. Ekha R.* 1.42).
3. I should also like to quote a midrash with regard to the admonition that the flight should not take place on the sabbath: 'Thus our teachers taught us: whoever is pursued by the heathen or by robbers may violate the sabbath and save his life'. For so we read in the story of David. When Saul was planning to slay him, he fled from him and escaped. Our teachers told a story. When wicked commandments came from the rulers to the great of Sepphoris, people came and questioned the Rabbi Elieser ben Parta. They said to him: Wicked commandments have come to us from the rulers. What sayest thou? Shall we flee? But he was afraid to say to them: Flee on the sabbath. He said to them: Why do you ask me? Go and ask Jacob, Moses, and David. Jacob has written: "And then Jacob fled" (*Hos.* 12.13). Moses has written: "And then Moses fled from Pharaoh" (*Exod.* 2.15). And in the story of David: "And David escaped" (*1 Sam.* 19.18)' (*Midr. Tanh* [ed. Buber] *Parasha Mas'e* 1; in the parallel versions *Midr. Tanh., Parasha Mas'e* 1 and *Bem. R.* 23.1 the name of the rabbi is Elasar). Here there is visible a strong objective proximity to Matthew. If it is absolutely necessary, one may of course flee on the sabbath. But it is a burden that the sabbath, too, must be violated—which makes matters even worse than they already are. Here—like in so many other passages—is the clear Jewish face of Matthew. The people for whom Matthew writes experience powerlessness and victimization.

All their hopes are focused on a radical break. They find in their Scriptures that God will limit and shorten the time of tribulations. Thus the doom-laden character of history is broken up and they place all their hopes in God as their sovereign even in the midst of the most dreadful experiences.

2. The Paraenetic Meaning of the Final Judgment

Unlike the Gospel of Mark, in which Jesus delivers his sermon about the end-times in the presence of only four disciples (13.3), in the Gospel of Matthew he directs it to all of the disciples (24.3) who are manifest to the congregation in the evangelist's period. The congregation is meant both to rediscover itself in the disciples of Jesus and to be admonished by them. This takes place primarily in the extensive conclusion which also contains the statements about the Last Judgment. The forms in which these utterances appear are revealing: in *meshalim*, in four parables, and in one narrative. This is yet another proof that this is not a sketch for a set of dogmatics. Especially in the case of Matthew it is clear that the appropriate way to speak about the Last Judgment is to place different narratives side by side—and this is in fact done in order to give the congregation some orientation on its way. What the congregation and its individual members do is certainly not a matter of indifference.

The indication of Matthew's own situation as an end-time period, his expectation of the coming of Jesus and his awareness that this coming can certainly not be decreed, lead Matthew to summarize the necessary behavior in his introduction to the paraenetic part: 'Watch therefore, for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come' (24.42). In Mark's basic version ignorance of the time of the coming of the Lord is connected with various times of day, usually with night-times: 'at even, or at midnight, or at the cockcrowing, or in the morning' (13.35). For Matthew it is beside the point to expect the coming of Jesus at any specific time. Since he mentions ordinary work such as grinding at the mill by women and laboring in the fields by men, he is rather concerned with alert readiness to do what is right at all times. In the following stories this is repeatedly emphasized and expanded upon.

In the first little parable the head of a household is introduced: 'But know this, that if the goodman of the house had known in what watch

the thief would come, he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house to be broken up' (24.43). From this is derived the demand for readiness, 'for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh' (v. 44). The word 'watch' is not merely taken over but transferred in its figurative meaning into a commandment to be ready; in this way Matthew avoids a misunderstanding of the commandment as if it were only a suggestion not to sleep in order not to be caught during the parousia taking place in the middle of the night. Matthew is concerned rather with alert readiness carried out in the performance of what is right—a performance that takes sustenance from listening to Jesus' words and which will have to be justified before him as the coming judge.

This is exactly what the second little parable says: 'Who then is a faithful and wise servant, whom his lord hath made ruler over his household, to give them meat in due season?' (v. 45). The situation of a temporarily absent head of a household is presented, who during the period of his absence promotes one of his servants to overseer and entrusts him with the function of taking care of his fellow-servants. 'Blessed is that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing' (v. 48)—'so'—that is, doing that which was commanded of him. At the end of the Gospel according to Matthew, Jesus tells his disciples to teach all nations to observe 'all things whatsoever I have commanded you' (28.20). This is the level of true meaning. Especially in the Sermon on the Mount Jesus is presented as lord and master. Towards the end of that sermon he had said: 'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doth the will of my Father which is in heaven' (7.21). Consequently Jesus appears in the Sermon on the Mount as an exegete of the Torah and lays out its meaning with programmatic precision right down to the smallest commandment (5.19), even to the last jot and tittle (5.18). One could even—analogously to the history of Moses and Akiva in *b. Men.* 29b—see a connection to the oral Torah, especially since the Jesus of Matthew declares this to be binding for his disciples in 23.2-3: 'The scribes and the pharisees sit in Moses' seat. All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do.' On the level of the evangelist this means that Matthew is binding his (Judeo-Christian) congregation to the Halacha of the rabbinical wise men of his time. For Matthew doing what is right—in which the required alert readiness manifests itself—finds a clear precedent in the

orally-transmitted Torah, especially as interpreted by Jesus.

The next parable, the one concerning the ten virgins' meeting with the bridegroom for the wedding, also contains this aspect of alert readiness, which manifests itself in doing what is right (25.1-12). The wise virgins do absolutely nothing in particular. They are merely prepared to do what is required of them. The following parable of the talents (25.14-30) in its version by Matthew introduces the further aspect of the different capabilities. No one is required to do more than he or she is capable of.

The concluding narration about the Last Judgment (25.31-46) also aims at proving oneself in doing what is right. It points out with the greatest emphasis that during the judgment one's *deeds* will be inquired after. This emphasis is shown in an almost monotonous four-fold repetition: to give meat to the hungry and drink to the thirsty, to take in strangers, to clothe the naked, to visit the sick and those in prison. That precisely such deeds constitute justice and lead to God, who represents this justice, is shown very clearly by a midrash on Ps. 118.19: 'Open unto me the gates of justice'. This passage is interpreted as follows: 'In the world to come one will say to man: What have you been occupied with? And he will say: I have fed the hungry. And one will say to him: This is the gate to Adonaj; who feedeth the hungry, let him pass through. I have given drink to the thirsty. And one will say to him: This is the gate to Adonaj; who giveth drink to the thirsty, let him pass through. I have given clothing to the naked. And one will say to him: This is the gate to Adonaj; who giveth clothing to the naked, let him pass through. And the same is true of him who cares for orphans and of him who doeth justice and him who doeth good deeds. And David said: I have done all these things. Therefore one should open unto him all the gates. Accordingly it is said: Open unto me the gates of justice, I will enter through them, I will praise Adonaj' (*Midr. Teh.* 118 §17). This text opens the perspective onto a connecting link stretching from 25.31-46 in the Gospel according to Matthew to a passage in the Sermon on the Mount. Matthew 6.33 presents the commandment that one first look to the kingdom of heaven and to God's justice, which becomes manifest in charitable deeds.

The deeds implied here concern the most elementary requirements of life, the prevention of direct material distress. This corresponds to the enumeration both in the midrash just cited and in further comparable rabbinical texts. There we find frequent mention of the burial of

the dead and the comforting of the bereaved. The absence of such passages in Matthew 25 indicates the origins of this tradition in a different social area, namely in a viatic radicalism with non-familial ethics.

3. The Negative Testimonies and Why they were Made

If Matthew in the above-mentioned two chapters stresses an alert readiness to do what is right, one also finds—side by side and sometimes even more powerfully presented—the negative testimonies about those who are found to be lacking in this behavior. So the end of the last cited narration—that is, at the end of the entire passage on the last times—states: ‘And those (who have not acted charitably) shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal’ (25.46). The unprofitable servant in the parable of the talents will be cast ‘into outer darkness’; ‘there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth’ (25.13). And the bridegroom says to the foolish virgins who futilely beg for admission: ‘I know you not’ (25.13). As to the servant whom the lord of the household discovers upon his return to have been delinquent, the text reads: ‘And he shall cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion with the hypocrites: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth’ (24.51). These are all statements of the most extreme harshness; and they are found exclusively in Jesus’ mouth.

In order to understand these statements correctly, I wish to refer—before turning to particular passages—to the fact that we are dealing here with *stories* told with paraenetic intention, that is, so that the events which are told will not happen. In one passage it is even the case that what is told can no longer be the case precisely because it is told. The listener’s ignorance, for example, as to whether the enacted or unenacted deeds of charity were enacted or unenacted for Jesus as the coming judge, can no longer exist once the story is told. The telling has eliminated the listener’s ignorance and strengthened the sense of responsibility.

After this general remark I shall now turn to individual passages of the testimonies. The final story, the narrative of the Last Judgment, takes a sort of ideal-type approach. Who are those who go to eternal punishment or eternal life; who have done or failed to do what is necessary? Taking up a thought of Walter Benjamin’s about history, which ‘loses nothing with a displacement of perspective [as opposed to

a displacement of standards]', Jürgen Ebach suggests that we should consider a further possible question when reading Mt. 25.31-46. We should ask those who showed solidarity with the least of their brothers and sisters: 'Always?'—and the others 'Never?' If we read the passage in this way, the question as to who ends up where in this judgment is removed from one's personal decision. This, too, would involve a displacement of perspective, but not of standards. The fact that I have to hope for the apocatastasis because it is my only chance, requires that I should not give anyone or anything up for lost.¹ The last sentence of the narrative in Mt. 25.31-46 would—read in this way—serve to allow an unconditional adherence to the standards which it sets up and to emphasize with all clarity that it is not a matter of indifference whether one orients oneself towards them or not. But it would not be appropriate as an axiom for a textbook on dogmatics.

The parable of the man traveling into a far country, who designates one of his servants as his overseer for the period of his absence, presents the negative case (in which the servant upon his master's return is found to be delinquent) in greater detail than the positive version. So in this case the admonition turns into a warning. First of all the consideration presented by the servant and his resulting action are described: 'But and if that evil servant shall say in his heart, My Lord delayeth his coming, and shall begin to smite his fellowservants, and to eat and drink with the drunken. . . ' (24.48-49). The starting point here is the servant's perception that the absent master will stay away, which leads to his conclusion that it is possible to act in such a way that he will not be held responsible. On the literal level it is perfectly clear that this is an error. The master *will* return, and then there will be a rude awakening for the servant. Matthew wants to present this evidence also on the figurative level. Anyone who thinks that they can act without responsibility, because there will be no consequences to their actions, is mistaken. There will be consequences which rebound upon the doer. This is guaranteed by the coming judge. Here is a hint as to why one must speak of a judgment: it cannot be conceded that wicked deeds are without consequences for the doer and that it is accordingly irrelevant what is done.

The parable of the wise and the foolish virgins has a clear structure.

1. J. Ebach, 'Vergangene Zeit und Jetztzeit. Walter Benjamins Reflexionen als Anfragen an die biblische Exegese und Hermeneutik', *EvT* 52 (1992), pp. 288-309 (306).

At the beginning is a general description of the situation: the going forth of virgins in the evening to welcome the bridegroom with torches (v. 1). A distinction is made between these virgins, and a reason for that distinction is given from the very beginning. Some were foolish and took no extra oil along; the others were wise and did (vv. 2-4). Then the tarrying of the bridegroom is rendered as a decisive factor for the rest of the story (v. 5). When he finally arrives in the middle of the night, the differentiation between the virgins given at the beginning now becomes relevant since the one group is ready and participates in the wedding ceremony, whereas the others—compelled to fetch more oil—miss the bridegroom (vv. 6-10). When they arrive too late, they find themselves locked out (vv. 11-12).

In the course of its exegesis this parable has often been interpreted as too harsh. The question as to the historicity of Jesus offered sufficient opportunities to peel off allegedly secondary layers in order to find a 'nicer' story. Gnllka does this with the greatest candor. In his version, the parable concludes with the sentence: 'And those who were ready went with him to the wedding', and his commentary is: 'This would have been a sensible conclusion which would lend the story a happier tone and remove the threatening aspect without doubting its serious character'.² True, most people do not wish to imagine the Lord Jesus as all too threatening; if he must be severe, then within limits. It would be better, they argue, if he were more pleasing. Hans Weder also performs some such mental acrobatics, which I do not wish to describe here. He finally ends up where he always does—with a very general statement about love. Whoever learns to see God as imminent, will—according to Weder—'also learn to see humanity as receptive to him and will no longer miss the opportunity for a deed of love. Jesus' pronouncement that the time for love has come is accompanied by his authorisation to use these times of love profitably'.³ These are the sorts of things that result when critics think that they can make do without the Torah and its exegesis.

Matthew's text places a clear emphasis upon the erroneous behavior of the foolish virgins and upon their rejection. Their error consists in the fact that they were not found ready to do what they were supposed

2. J. Gnllka, *Das Matthäusevangelium* (HTKNT, 1.2; Freiburg; Herder, 1988), II, p. 349.

3. H. Weder, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu als Metaphern* (FRLANT, 120; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), p. 247.

to do when it needed doing. It is precisely this aspect of readiness which Matthew takes over from the narrative and stresses for his figurative level of meaning, when he concludes in v. 13: 'Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh'. With the wording of the virgins' rejection by the bridegroom ('I know you not'), Matthew had already reminded us of Jesus' same utterance in the Sermon on the Mount to those who said 'Lord, Lord', but who were not prepared to do the will of his father in heaven (7.21-23). This makes clear what he means by the alert readiness which he demands: the performance of the will of God as expressed by Jesus in his exegesis of the Torah. This performance may not be postponed; it must be done *now*. Once again it should be emphasized that this story, with its negative conclusion, is told so that that which is indicated in the parable itself does not happen in reality. Objectively speaking, Matthew is in complete agreement with a rabbinical assertion, which in *m. Ab.* 2.10 is traced back to Rabbi Elieser, then taken over into *b. Šab* 153a and connected with a parable ascribed to Rabban Jochanan ben Sakkaj: 'Rabbi Elieser says: Repent one day before thy death. Then his pupils asked Rabbi Elieser: Does man then know on what day he shall die? He said unto them: He must repent today precisely because he may die tomorrow; and he shall spend all his days in repentance. And also Solomon in his wisdom said: 'Let thy raiments be at all times white, and let oil always be upon thy head' (Qoh. 9.8). Rabban Jochanan ben Sakkaj told a parable of a king who invited his servants to a banquet but appointed no time for it. The wise ones among them made themselves ready and seated themselves before the door of the royal palace. They said: Nothing is lacking to the royal palace. But the foolish among them went to their work. They said: There is no banquet without labor. When the king suddenly called his servants in, the wise ones among them presented themselves prepared as they were, and the foolish among them presented themselves to him unclean as they were. And the king rejoiced over the wise ones and waxed wrath about the foolish. He said: Those who made themselves ready for the banquet may sit and eat and drink; and those who did not make themselves ready for the banquet shall stand and look on.'

Readers socialized in the Protestant manner will probably have suspected for some time now that in everything I have said about Matthew I have been applying the concept of 'justification by works'.

Hans Weder very openly expresses this suspicion in his exegesis of the Sermon on the Mount—particularly at the end of his discussion of section 7.15-23 to which the sermon about the end-times repeatedly refers: 'The readers of the Sermon on the Mount have hit upon both aspects: on the one hand the word in which any judgment is abandoned, and on the other hand the word in which the Jewish conception of judgment is taken up again and in which the concept of man is developed from justification by works. Both concepts cannot be true at the same time. And it is precisely for this reason that the reader is puzzled. He has thus entered a space where his existential decision between a just and a loving God is both made possible and demanded'.⁴ Marcion's reappearance here is palpable. It is just as clear that if one takes only the loving God as an alternative to the just God one has given up the concept of the biblical God. There can only be grace for sinners if it comes from the judgment. This is expressed with the greatest penetrance in a midrash: 'Once all the princes of the world came and accused Israel before the Holy, blessed be his name, and said unto him: Lord of the world, how do the Israelites differ from the gentiles? The ones are idolators and the others are idolators; the ones spill blood, and the others spill blood; the ones are sinners, and the others are sinners. The ones will go down into hell—and shall not the others go down unto Gehenna as well? The Holy one, blessed be his name, said unto them: If this is indeed so, may every people—and its gods with it—go down unto Gehenna and test itself. And the Israelites, too, should go and test themselves. The Israelites answered before the Holy one, blessed be his name, and said: Thou art our hope, and thou art our confidence. Who should give us certainty if not thou? If it be thy will, be thou our leader. And the Holy one, blessed be his name, said unto them: Fear not, for ye are all clad with crimson—which means the covenant of circumcision. Rabbi Reuven said in the name of Rabbi Chanina: If it were not written as scripture, it would be impossible to say this: Verily, Adonaj will be judged with fire (Isa. 66.16). It is not written that he judges but rather that he shall be judged' (*Midr. Teh.* 1 §20). God will even go with his people through hell. Not judgment *or* grace, love *or* justice, but judgment *and* grace, love *and* justice. That is the case in the Hebrew Bible and in Judaism, and this is also how it is in the New Testament. In conclusion, I should like

4. H. Weder, *Die 'Rede der Reden'* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1985), p. 245.

to place alongside the midrash I have just quoted the sixth verse from Paul Gerhard's Easter Hymn 'Auf, auf, mein Herz, mit Freuden' ('Up, up, my Heart, with Joy') which should make clear that human beings of all nations participate through Jesus Christ in what the midrash declares valid for Israel: 'Ich hang und bleib auch hangen/ an Christo als ein Glied;/ wo mein Haupt durch ist gangen,/ da nimmt er mich auch mit./ Er reißet durch den Tod,/ durch Welt, durch Sünd, durch Not,/ er reißet durch die Höll,/ ich bin stets sein Gesell.' ('I am and will remain one of the limbs of Christ's body/ In whatever I have experienced, he has always been with me./ He travels through death and the world, through sin and misery,/ He travels through hell, but I will always be his companion.')

PANEL DISCUSSION

Henning Graf Reventlow: The intention of this panel is a final reflection on whether we have reached new insights into the question of how to appreciate together the subject 'eschatology'. This final discussion is intended to sum up the existential relevance of our deliberations. Hopefully the result of our discussions could be that Jewish and Christian members will gain a basis for common opinions on the topic.

Benjamin Uffenheimer: May I begin with a quotation from Gershom Scholem. In his study, 'Towards an Understanding of the Messianic Idea in Judaism', he says at the beginning: 'A totally different concept of redemption determines the attitude to Messianism in Judaism and in Christianity. What appears to the one as a proud indication of its understanding and a positive achievement of its message is most unequivocally belittled and disputed by the other.'¹ Ladies and Gentlemen! From the very first moment when colleague Professor Balz asked his first question to the last moment when colleague Professor Nebe presented his lecture I could verify this idea. Christianity—that is my impression, maybe you will correct me—regards the spiritualized idea of biblical eschatology as an ideal. If I remember correctly, Professor Frey spoke about the overcoming of eschatology. This means that the kingdom of God is a transhistoric phenomenon. In the name of a spiritualized kingdom of God, which has laid bare all material expressions of its existence, history is to be overcome. Judaism interprets this somehow as flight from the world (*Weltflucht*), as Judaism or the Jewish idea stays within the realm of history. This is historic realization. The last lecture we were to hear was by Professor Ninni of Tel Aviv. He intended to speak about a Jemenite messianic movement, thereby attempting to describe the historical content of Jewish

1. G. Scholem, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Essays on Jewish Spirituality* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1971), pp. 1-36 (1).

eschatology according to a certain pattern. I think here we can see the point of difference between the Christian and Jewish views. These are two different basic attitudes. It is not the question of the messiah, nor the person of the messiah—it is the question of the messianic kingdom. What does it look like? Is it a kingdom from this or that world? I believe Scholem.

The statements I heard confirmed Scholem's theory, and in the last lecture Professor Nebe spoke about the idea of the Son of Man (בן אדם). In the Bible the Son of Man is a man of flesh and blood; it is in post-biblical literature, not only in the New Testament, but also in post-biblical literature not accepted by the Rabbis (such as Ethiopic Enoch), that the idea of the Son of Man has its foundation. There Enoch is taken up to heaven and turns into an angel. I think here is the fundamental difference between the biblical and the post-biblical idea. Why? In the Bible, the ontological continuity of the old myth had been broken. The old Canaanite myth always spoke about the continuous transition between heaven and earth. Angels became men, gods became men, and men became gods. The Bible destroyed this transition. The Bible does not speak of an ontological continuity anywhere. In the place of this ontological continuity the Bible sets a dialogical continuity. Of course, there are different traces of the old myth, but it is in the interests of the Bible to suppress this myth. Genesis 6, as one example, tells us about the angels marrying daughters of men. Of course this myth has its origin in the world of the ancient Near East. However, if you read the Bible carefully, you will see that the redactor wants to archaisize the myth, to deprive it of its practical effects. There are many attempts of this kind in the Bible to suppress the remainders of the old myth. It is my opinion that the post-biblical literature, up from Enoch, tries to reconstruct the ontological continuity. Therefore the book of Enoch, the whole angelological literature, was excluded by the rabbis.

Christofer Frey: I feel a little bit misunderstood, but I do not want to defend *me*. I mentioned that there exists a transhistoric view of the kingdom of God in Christian tradition. And certainly there is some kind of dualism between spirit and matter because of the course of Christianity through Hellenism. The assumption that Christianity follows a generally transhistoric view of the kingdom of God may be true in the horizon of this Hellenistic, dualistic view of what is real—

the spiritual and material world. But this difference does not fit a modern understanding of reality. We are urged today to define an open concept of reality, the margins of which we cannot exhaust and which begins in our social surroundings. We do not live in the strictly empirical world of physical objects, but in open relations in human life. You can obtain a positive aspect from the Christian theses about the transhistoric reality of the kingdom of God. An important element of biblical eschatology is the break in history, as we know it here and now—and how it can also be fatefully prolonged—the deed-consequence relationship in the Old Testament. This is very important for God's renewing action. Therefore the impulse of Judaism in this respect is exceptionally welcome.

I think that Judaism—although I have only a vague knowledge—has similar problems. Tonight I read Michael Walser's *Exodus*.² He was an American Jew who told the exodus story anew. He mentions the problem of messianism and Zionism and draws attention to Gershom Scholem, who had strongly opposed messianism and messianic Zionism in the 1967 war. Obviously this was because the mystic—to what reality does the mystic refer?—was more an agent of God's covenant with man and would not follow the messianic revolutionarism. Walser tells us that there are two ways of interpreting the exodus. First, as liberation from capitalism—thus the South American Theology of Liberation—secondly, as liberation from tyranny, a government ruling without human rights. He tells something like a reformed puritanic story of the exodus into American society, the member of which he as a Jew wants to be. Indeed he reproaches the Christians for spiritualizing Doomsday. He wants to return to the exodus and to put aside the Messiah. It is the only function of the Messiah to fulfil the original promises of the exodus again. And how? In a democratic, liberal society which Michael Walzer as an American Jew wishes for the USA. Therefore he is strictly against messianism and—if I am right—against Zionism. His question—what the utopic elements are in Zionism that transcend reality—is intended to show that the opposition between some tendencies in Christianity and in Judaism are not very strong. Walser can conform with the reformed theology of covenant in retelling the exodus anew as God's action in his history. He can be an adversary of a kind of messianism, which he characterizes as

2. M. Walzer, *Exodus and Revolution* (repr.; New York: Basic Books, 1989 [1985]).

spiritualizing the conditions and transcending evolutionary voluntarism. So I do not see that the opposition is between Christianity and Judaism, but it is an opposition within both Judaism and Christianity.

Benjamin Uffenheimer: I spoke as a historian. I wanted to point out facts expressed in the Bible and in the talmudic literature; that means in classic Judaism, not in modern Judaism. If, for example, one reads Jewish mysticism, there exists there an endeavour to restore the continuity. But if our modern interest is our starting-point, we are much more closer to each other.

One word about Scholem, about the messianism after the six-day-war. There were and are several religious circles in Israel that fostered high emotions. They believed that here was the beginning of a new era. However, the facts can be understood historically. We belong to the generation arisen from the ashes of Auschwitz and ascended to Mount Zion. This is a long road, a road no generation of Jewish history has ever stepped on. These high emotions were so prevailing and stormy that one had to be very, very clear-headed to control one's emotions. Scholem was right. But I do not think these ideologic moments should be politically abused. This is quite another question. The political moment has its own rules, to which we also are subjected. Whatever Michael Walser wrote—I do not know him—apparently he has written a new midrash on the book of Exodus. I once asked you if you read exegesis, if your statements are exegesis. Your answer, 'No', relieved me, because this struggle is a modern one, it is our modern point of view. Therefore we are able to start together differently. In fact, our points of view are much closer then.

Henning Graf Reventlow: Let us return to our subject 'eschatology'. I wanted to take up something the previous speakers mentioned. I am a biblical scholar. Christianity adopted the Old Testament as Bible, holds the Scripture holy and connects it with the New Testament. It is my opinion that this fact is secure, that even in Christianity a dualistic conception of the world cannot originate. But on the other hand the Bible knows both spheres in the Old and in the New Testament, for example if you think about Isaiah's vision of his call, Isaiah 6: God's throne is in heaven, but the hem of his robe fills the temple in Jerusalem. There is an earthly point of adhesion for God's presence in reality. The Apocalypse of John imagines how in the last days the

heavenly Jerusalem comes down on the earthly Jerusalem. Here an aspect that is present in any earthly reality becomes clear. The ancient conception of the world as being on a series of levels causes you to imagine that these levels were connected by God's presence or by the descendance of the heavenly upon the earthly reality. But actually we know such pictures intend to hide God's omnipresence again. I think the whole church history shows how Christianity sticks to the corporality and earthly character of salvation. Already the sacraments are incorporations of salvation—and Christians live an earthly existence. There were always sectarian movements which slid off to a dualistic conception of the world or to a negation of the worldly reality. The whole sphere of gnosis, where the soul is lost in the world and has to be led back to heaven—the divine comes down and rises again—was refused by the early church and successfully combated. So a dualistic view was not able to be successful in Christian theology in the long run. I think always being fixed to the biblical message prevents in the long run that such thinking can break in, which disregards reality.

A word about the book discussed here. I did not read it. But the question has always been the same in the history of the Bible in the church: Is it possible to identify specific historical developments with events narrated in the Bible? We heard from India yesterday: 'The Indians are the elected nation'. This was concluded from the Bible on present reality. It is well known that in the USA, Americans understand themselves as the chosen nation and the occupation of the country was understood as the settlement. Walking through the history of Bible understanding you can over and over again perceive how attempts are made to find in the Bible the present time in politics and national existence. Even Liberation Theology is an enterprise of this kind. Liberation is understood as an actual theme nowadays and used for its own aims. When we speak about eschatology, we wish however to say that the present we are living in is provisional. So far, such identifications perhaps only serve as homiletic instruments, because we know that the reality as such, the accomplishment of reality and the presence of God, which will be final, will not be brought about by us and will transcend whatever is a possible event in history and can be realized. Thus, we will be passing to a totally different existence and reality. I think this is a feature that connects us when we start from the Bible. Now the questions can be discussed about how it will be, who will participate, and so on. But in my opinion there is no funda-

mental difference between Judaism and Christianity in the conception of the world.

Yair Hoffman: I would like to refer to the difference between eschatology in Judaism and in Christianity, as I see it. I want to begin with a story. We have in Israel the Rabbi Shach, who is a Mignaget, that is an Anti-Chassidi. He was asked: 'Which religion is the closest to Judaism?' His answer was: 'The Lobawitzscher chassidism'. I think this indicates the situation of eschatology, because the Lobawitzscher Rabbi was considered by his followers as a Messiah. This was the intention of Rabbi Shach saying that it is close to Judaism but it is not Judaism, and I think this indicates the difference between Christianity and Judaism in the subject of eschatology. For in Christianity as I understand it, and I am not an expert, eschatology turned out to be a much more crystallized concept, even a dogma, while in Judaism there is such a great difference between the concept of eschatology of Maimonides and Nachmanides, for instance, or Maimonides and Judah Halevi, and in our generation between Rabbi Shach's concept of eschatology and the chassidic or the Rav Kuk concept of eschatology. We already find it in the Mishnah—there are terms to differentiate between עולם הבא and דרימות המשיח. So I think that in Judaism up to now eschatology has not been crystallized as a clear concept and we can look, as I see it, at Judaism now and throughout the ages as a religion in which eschatology after all is not such a major factor. This is my impression.

Yehoshua Amir: Scholem tells in his book about Shabatai Zwi, a pseudo-messianic movement in the seventeenth century, an incident happening in Smyrna at a time when this messianic enthusiasm, this fascination with the figure of the Messiah, was at its peak. The following happened in the synagogue: at the end of a service a poetic version of the thirteen beliefs of Maimonides was quoted. One of those beliefs is: 'ששלח לקץ ימים משיחנו': 'He will send our Messiah at the end of the days'. In this year the cantor speaks the prayer with only a little change in the synagogue. He breaks into the synagogue: 'שלח משיחנו לקץ ימים': 'He has sent our Messiah at the end of the days.' This is exactly the critical point. Without the belief in the Messiah to come our belief is not sufficient and without him we cannot stand history. But at the moment, when the belief in the Messiah is actual-

ized into a defined historic situation, the whole gets into a horrible danger, as nowadays any Jew keeping his Judaism allows for the case of Shabatai Zwi.

In my paper I described what happens at this moment. People experiencing the present time as a messianic situation suddenly asserted an unbelievable inside-knowledge of God's plans. What happens here is exactly what God plans with the world. Here and now is a messianic situation. Therefore, anything to be kept back in other times is now legitimated. Anything is possible that was forbidden in other times. In my opinion, there is an insurmountable dialectic in the relation of history and messianism. Without messianism history becomes lifeless. With messianism history proceeds to perilous critical situations. As the history of our messianic movements proves, this is the greatest danger among us. We are commissioned to keep our faith in the idea that history has meaning until we achieve redemption in the historical situation. Thereby we are faced with an insoluble dilemma: to give to our political actions a messianic direction in the present situation and yet to avoid perilous messianic exuberance. In my eyes this seems to be the situation which not only our Jewish belief in the Messiah has to endure, but, if I understood rightly, apparently even the Christian one.

Aharon Oppenheimer: I only want to relate an episode combining Yehoshua Amir's statement and my paper from yesterday. Some years ago in the presence of theologians I delivered a paper on the subject of the celebration of Passover in Judaism and in Christianity in Jerusalem in the time of Passover. Most of the theologians were, as I remember, from the Netherlands and from Germany. I told about the Machaloket in chapter 10 of Mishnat Pesachim between Rabbi Traphon and Rabbi Akiva—the redemption. They are speaking about the question of how to finish the Passover Haggadah. (Of course I do not speak about the songs translated into German in the fourteenth century.) But how to finish the main part of the Haggadah: the Midrash? Rabbi Traphon asserts: 'You have to finish with the exodus from Egypt, that is Passover: Jezat Mizrajim. But Rabbi Akiva answered: No. You have to mention the Jezat Mizrajim, but that is not sufficient. You have also to mention the redemption to come, the rebuilding of the temple, the cultural ceremonies, the sacrifice of Passover, etc.' Rabbi Akiva was victorious here like always. Rabbi Akiva's view is accepted to the

present day. It is very interesting: In the Mishna in Pesachim it is written only partially and stands at וכולי, as the writers, copying the Mishna in the Middle Ages knew the Haggadah so well that they did not copy all the words of Rabbi Akiva but only וכולי. You can find it in the Pesach Haggadah, though it belongs to the Mishna Pesachim. After the end of my paper there were some questions. One of the professors asked me if I had לילה סדר also at home at Passover. I said: 'Of course. I have.' First, I am myself מצוות, a religious Jew. Secondly Passover is not exactly law in Israel. Many Jews keep it. No law of the Jewish state obliges children to be circumcised, but nearly all Jews in Israel have their children circumcised. There does not exist any law of the state that you have to have סדר לילה on Passover. About 95 per cent of the Jews in Israel have לילה סדר. But unfortunately I did not understand the question. Then he asked me: 'Do you also say what Rabbi Akiva said? Do you wait for the building of the Second Temple?' It was a very problematic week even in Jerusalem at that time. 'Do you expect the building of the Temple on the הר בית next year, and the Passover sacrifices there?' I was a bit hesitant for a moment, but answered: 'I want to answer. There are some things I would very much like to have. For example, I would like very much to come to paradise. But I am not in a hurry. Even in the question of the building of the Second Temple I am not in a hurry.' I think it is quite the same with the idea of the Messiah. The whole idea is to wait for him. Neither his coming, nor when he will come, but the waiting for the Messiah is one of the Leitmotifs of Judaism.

INDEXES

INDEX OF REFERENCES

OLD TESTAMENT

<i>Genesis</i>		<i>Deuteronomy</i>		16.1-13	142
14.10	146	4.30	87	19.18	236
14.18	149	5.25-26	142		
17.7	91	5.26	91, 148	<i>2 Samuel</i>	
49.1	87	6.6-7	91	7.13	147
49.10	147	7.9	91	22.3	94
		10.8	141	23.4	220
<i>Exodus</i>		15.2	149, 150		
2.15	236	17.15	181	<i>1 Kings</i>	
3.8-17	203	18.9-22	202	1.39	142
3.14	33	18.18-19	142	4.1-7	196
3.19-20	39	21.5	141	4.8-37	196
13.17	20	28	177	17	139, 195
15.3	213	28.13-14	187	17.1	195
15.18	218, 223	28.59	202	17.4	196
17.12	202	29.18	94	17.8-16	196, 197
24.9-11	209	31.29	87	17.8-10	196
28.41	142	32.1	139	17.9	196
29.7	142	32.39	138, 140	17.10-11	196
		33	218	17.12	196
<i>Leviticus</i>		33.5	218	17.13	196
10.4	161	33.8-11	142	17.14	189, 195-
20.24	203	33.9	141		98
25.10	51	33.25	218	17.15	196
26	177, 182	33.26-29	218	17.16	196
26.16	187	33.26-27	219	17.17-24	196, 197
				18.41-46	195
<i>Numbers</i>		<i>Judges</i>		18.46	195
6.22-27	141	5	219	19.16	142
14.21	222, 223	5.4-5	219		
23.21-22	218	7.25	146	<i>2 Kings</i>	
24.7-8	218			1.9-16	197
24.15-17	142	<i>1 Samuel</i>		2.19	194, 195
24.17	146, 156	2.5	138	2.21	189, 194,
24.24	146	2.6	138		197
25.13	141	2.7	138	3	191
		9.16	142	3.8	191

3.9-19	191	<i>Job</i>		1-4	185
3.9-17	191	14.7-13	45	1.2	139
3.9	191	26.6	39	2-4	208
3.16-19	191	38-31	45	2	178
3.16-17	189, 190	42.3-4	45	2.1-4	92, 93,
3.16	191, 198				201, 207
3.17	189, 191,	<i>Psalms</i>		2.1	87
	198	2-3	185	2.2-5	181
3.19	191	5	185	2.2-4	185, 187
3.20	190, 191	7.8-9	149	2.5-4.4	208
3.25	191	16.10	39	2.9	226
4.1-7	196, 197	22	223	2.11	226
4.38	194	22.27-28	223	2.17	226
4.43	189, 190,	22.29-30	39	5.8-9	185
	193, 197,	27.1	94	5.15-16	226
	198	29	223	5.16	226
6.16	192	29.10	223	6.3	222
6.24-7.20	192	31.16	108	6.9-13	44
6.25-30	193	39.5	108	7.4	202
6.25	192	45	205	7.6	202
6.26-30	192	48	185	7.9	202
6.31-7.2	192	49.16	39	7.14-17	203
6.31	192	68	223	7.15	203
6.32	192	68.8-9	219	7.17	203
6.33	192	68.16-18	219	8	205
7.1	189, 192,	68.17	219	8.2	158
	193, 198	72.19	222, 223	8.6-10	204
7.2	192, 193	73.23-26	39	8.8	204
7.8	192	82.1	149	8.9-10	185
7.16	193, 198	82.2	149	8.10	185, 204
7.17	193	86.6-10	94	8.17	220
8.1-6	194	87	185	8.21-23	204
16.7-9	203	88.11-12	39	8.31	185
17.14	189, 198	91.2	94	9	206
18.19-35	206	98.1-3	222	9.1-6	204
19.25	85	105.5	139	9.5	204
24.17	89	105.15	142	9.6-8	206
		110.4	149	10-11	146
<i>I Chronicles</i>		116.8	39	10.5-34	201
4.22	162	118.17	39	10.5-23	205
16.22	139, 142	118.19	239	10.7-11	206
23.13	141	122.5	186	10.13-14	206
		139.8	39	10.24-34	205
<i>Ezra</i>		146.5-8	140	10.33-34	205
1-4	210	146.6	140	10.34	146
1.2-4	201	146.7-8	138	11	147, 205,
37.1-4	39				207
38.16	87	<i>Qoheleth</i>		11.1-10	92, 187
		9.8	243	11.1-5	147
<i>Nehemiah</i>				11.1	205
5.10	150	<i>Isaiah</i>		11.3	147, 160
13.29	141	1-5	185	11.4	146, 205

<i>Isaiah</i> (contd)		42.18-25	210	60.14-22	186
11.6-9	206, 211	43.9	212	61	186
11.11-15	187	43.14-15	212	61.1-2	44, 138,
12-14	185	43.15	212		149
12.24-27	185	43.18-19	174	61.1	138, 142
13	78, 81,	43.18	212	61.2-3	150
	83	43.19	211	61.2	213
14.3-23	206	43.25	211	61.5-9	210
14.4-23	206	43.27	211	62	186
14.13-14	206	44.6	212	62.2	222
14.22-23	206	44.28	210	62.8-9	186
14.24-27.32	185	45.6	210	62.10-12	186
17	185	45.13	210	63	176
17.15-16	203	46.9	212	63.1-6	186, 201,
17.16	203	47.1-15	210		213
24-27	187, 201,	48.3	212	63.7-66	186
	207, 208	48.6	211	65.17	44, 101,
24	186	48.11	212		133, 212
24.21	208	48.13-16	139	65.21-22	186
24.23	209	48.20	210	66.16	244
25.7	208	49.6	44	66.22	133
25.8	39, 208	49.7	212		
26.19	39, 140,	49.14	210	<i>Jeremiah</i>	
	208	49.15-20	213	1.13-16	80
27.12-13	209	49.22-23	210	1.14	80
29	185	51-63	222	1.15	80
29.18-19	138	51.1-2	211	2.11	94
30.8-10	206	51.4-5	229	3.14-18	94
30.18	220	51.5	222	3.17	93, 95
31.31-36	91	51.9	213	4.5-6	79
31.34	91	51.17	211	4.6-18	79
33.1-6	185	51.22-23	211	4.13	80
34	176	52-54	44	4.15	79
35.5-7	90, 91	52.5	212	4.16	79
35.5-6	138	52.7	149, 150,	4.23-27	84
37.26	85		212	4.23-26	86, 88,
37.33-36	207	52.10	222		95
40-66	212	52.13-53.12	211	5.15-17	79
40-55	186, 212	53.1	222	6.1-8	79
40.2	211	54.7-10	44	6.1	79
40.5	210, 222	54.9	107	6.12	181
40.6-8	211	54.10	140	6.19-20	94
40.12-24	211	56-69	186	6.22-26	79
40.27	210	56-66	212	6.23	80
40.31	138	56.1-8	186	7.11	181
41.8	211	56.1	229	7.24	94
41.14-15	212	58.8	222	8.13-17	79
41.21	210	58.14	211	8.16	79, 80
41.22	212	59.20	44	9.13	94
42.5	107	60-62	186, 188	9.22-23	85
42.9	174, 211,	60.4-22	186	10.11	93
	212	60.5-22	210	10.16-17	181

10.21	181	30.18	181	<i>Ezekiel</i>	
11.8	94	30.19	181	1-20	182
12.14-17	93	30.21	181	1-3	122
13.10	94	30.23-34	87	7.2-4	172
16.12	94	30.23-24	86-88, 95	7.7	228, 232
16.14-15	90	30.23	181	8-11	122
16.19-21	93	30.27	181	16.59-63	183
16.19-20	95	30.31	181	20	183
16.20	181	31-34	184	20.9-14	183
17.17	94	31.1	181	20.24	184
18.3	94	31.5	181, 220	20.25-27	184
18.12	94	31.6-12	181	20.29-30	184
18.20	181	31.6-9	181	20.35	184
18.31	181	31.8-9	90, 91,	20.39-44	184
22.24-25	214		181	20.39	184
22.24	89	31.14	181	20.40	184
22.30	214	31.15	181	22.44	183
23.5-6	88, 89	31.18-20	181	23.36	184
23.7-8	90	31.23-24	181	23.38	184
23.17	94	31.31-36	91	25-48	209
23.19-20	86-88	31.38-40	181	30.3	228, 232
25.15-33	83, 88	32.44	90	30.23-24	182
25.15-29	81, 84,	33.6-26	90	30.25-29	182
	95	33.14-22	143	34.1-22	182
25.15	81	33.15-16	88, 90	34.23-30	182, 187
25.16	81, 82	33.17-26	89, 90	34.23-24	143
25.20	81	46-51	80	34.25-30	182
25.24	81	46.3-12	80	36.16-38	183
25.25	82	46.14-24	80	36.16-22	183
25.26	81, 82	46.26	80, 90,	36.18-28	182
25.29	82		92	36.29-32	183
25.30-33	83, 84,	48.42	92	36.33-36	183
	95	48.47	80, 87,	36.37-38	183
25.30	82		90, 92	37-39	209
25.31	82	49.6	80, 90,	37	209
25.32	86		92	37.12	140
25.33	82	49.37	92	37.15-28	182
26.18	158	49.39	80, 87,	37.15-19	183
27.31	181		90, 92	37.20-28	183
29.14	90	50.4-6	90	37.21-23	183
29.18	94	50.19-20	90	37.21	183
30-31	90, 180	50.33-34	90	37.23	183
30.3-4	181	51.7-8	82	37.24	183
30.3	181	51.20-23	85	37.26-27	183
30.5-7	181	51.23	86	37.26	183
30.7-10	181	51.27-28	81	38-39	184, 209
30.9	181	51.41	82	38-29	184
30.10	181, 187			38	183, 209
30.11	181	<i>Lamentations</i>		38.1-9	184
30.12-14	181	4.20	167	38.1-3	184
30.16	87			38.8-12	184
30.17-22	87			38.9-10	184

38.16	185, 212	13.14	39	7.7	220
38.18-23	184, 226	14.6-9	198	7.10	147
38.23	212	14.6-8	198		
39	183, 209			<i>Habakkuk</i>	
39.1-5	184	<i>Joel</i>		2.3	220, 228,
39.17-20	184	2.32	48		232
39.21-23	185	3-4	83	3	219
39.27	184	3.5	48	3.3	219
40-48	122	4.14	228		
44.15	141, 143			<i>Zephaniah</i>	
45.16-17	147	<i>Amos</i>		1.14	228, 232
		5.18-20	225		
<i>Daniel</i>		8.2-10	171	<i>Haggai</i>	
7-8	216	9.11-12	176	1.1	213
7	119-21,	9.11	176, 178	1.2-6	213
	123, 124,	9.12	176	1.6	174
	126, 127,	9.13-15	176, 187	1.7-8	213
	129	9.13	198	1.9-11	213
7.1-15	120			1.10-11	174
7.1-14	122	<i>Obadiah</i>		1.15	213
7.13-14	112, 150	15	228, 232	2.2-9	214
7.13	105, 118,			2.10-19	214
	120	<i>Micah</i>		2.10	213
7.16-28	120, 123	1-3	178	2.16-17	174
7.21-22	120	1.3-18	179	2.20-23	143, 214
7.25	120	2.2-3	179	2.20	213
7.27	120, 150	2.11	179	2.22	214
8.1	121	3.1-13	179	2.23	89, 214
9.21	121	3.8	179		
9.25	150	3.9-12	185	<i>Zechariah</i>	
10-12	121	3.10	179	1.1	213
10	150	3.12	158	1.7	213
10.14	87	3.14-20	179	1.8-15	174
12	150	3.15	179	2.5-9	184
12.1-3	39	3.17	179	2.14	225
12.12	220	3.20	179	3	215
		4	185	4.1-6	214
<i>Hosea</i>		4.1-5	178, 181,	4.6-7	215
1.5	177		185	4.7	215
1.7	177	4.1	87	4.8-10	215
1.9	172	4.6-8	178	4.9	215
1.14	39	4.9-10	178	4.10-14	214
2.1-3	177	4.11-13	178	4.14	215
2.18-25	177	4.13	147	5.3-4	174
2.18-19	177	5.1-5	178	6.1-8	174
2.20-22	177	5.1-3	178	6.9-15	215
2.20	177	5.6-14	178	6.11-13	143
2.23-25	198	5.9	178	6.11	215
3.5	87, 177	5.12-13	183	6.13	90
6.1	138	5.14	178	6.14	215
12.3	211	6-7	178	6.15	215
12.13	236	7.4	220	7-8	90, 216

7.1	216	3.23-24	140	36.19	222
7.3-8	216	3.24 LXX	140	45.24	141
8.2	225				
8.4-5	158	<i>Sirach</i>		<i>I Maccabees</i>	
14.3-9	226	36	224, 228	4.46	143
<i>Malachi</i>		36.1-11	224, 231	14.41	143
3.22	140	36.3	224		
		36.13-15	224		

NEW TESTAMENT

<i>Matthew</i>		24.48	238	2.38	220, 230
3.2	229	24.51	240	4.18-19	44
5.19	238	25	233, 240	7.20-22	140
5.43-45	73	25.1-12	239	9.26	125
6.9-13	229	25.1	242	10.9	138, 229,
6.9	227, 231	25.2-4	242		232
6.33	239	25.5	242	10.11	229, 232
7.7-11	73	25.6-10	242	11.2-4	229
7.15-23	244	25.11-12	242	11.2	227, 231
7.21-23	243	25.13	240, 243	12	233
7.21	238	25.14-30	239	12.2-9	125
8.16	138	25.31-46	129, 239,	12.8-9	119, 125,
9.35	138		241		126
10.1	138	25.31-32	128	12.8	126, 127
10.8	138	25.40	101	12.9	127
10.26-33	125	25.46	240	12.10	125
10.32-33	125	28.18	140	17	233
10.32	126	28.20	238	17.22-37	128
10.33	126			19	233
11.1-6	44	<i>Mark</i>		19.11	223, 229,
11.5	138	1.15	229		231, 232
13.41-43	128	3.28	118	21.31	229, 232
13.41-42	128	4.35-41	140	23.43	42
16.27-28	128	8.27-30	125	23.50	220, 230
16.27	125	8.31-33	125	25	233
19.28	128	8.34-9.1	125		
23.2-3	238	8.35	125	<i>John</i>	
24	233	8.38	112, 119,	3.16	41
24.1-3	233		125, 126,		
24.1-2	234		128	<i>Acts</i>	
24.3	237	12.25	41	7.56	118
24.4-28	233	13.3	237	23.6-8	43
24.29-41	233	13.4	234	23.6	43
24.30	105	13.26-27	128	24.15	43
24.31	101, 128	13.35	237	26.6-8	43
24.42-25.46	233	24.21	235	28.20	43
24.42	237	24.29-31	235		
24.43	238	27.51-53	235	<i>Romans</i>	
24.44	238			1.16	44
24.45	238	<i>Luke</i>		1.18-39	39
24.48-49	241	2.25	220, 230	3.25-26	39

<i>Romans</i> (contd)		15.20	40	1.20	41
4.16-18	34	15.24-28	39, 140	1.23	36
4.17-18	36	15.25	105		
4.17	34	15.27-28	41	<i>1 Thessalonians</i>	
4.18	34	15.35-49	39, 41	1.3	43
5.1-2	36	15.49	41	2.19	38
5.2	42	15.51	41, 106	4.5	31
5.3-4	36, 42	15.53	110	4.13-5.11	39
5.9-10	36, 38	15.54-55	39, 40	4.13	31
8.11	110	15.58	40	4.14	31
8.17	37	16.22	229	4.15-17	31
8.18-22	35			4.15	106
8.18	35, 223,	<i>2 Corinthians</i>		4.17	39
	231	1.9	34	4.18	31
8.19-22	35	4.10-12	42	5.1-11	41
8.21	109	4.18	40	5.2	108
8.23-25	35	5.1-10	42	5.4-7	43
8.23-24	36	5.1-3	42	5.8	43
8.23	41	5.8	42	5.10	39
8.24	36, 40	5.9	42		
8.26-27	35	5.10	38	<i>1 Timothy</i>	
8.29	41	5.19	41	1.1	35
8.30	38			2.4	41
10.12	48	<i>Galatians</i>		4.10	35
11.26	44	5.5	38, 40		
11.32	39	5.6	37	<i>2 Timothy</i>	
12.1-2	42			4.8	38
13.11	43	<i>Ephesians</i>			
15.12-13	32	1.10	108	<i>Titus</i>	
15.13	32-35	1.18	32	2.13	38
		2.12	32		
<i>1 Corinthians</i>		2.18	32	<i>Hebrews</i>	
1.8	38	4.6	32	1-2	130
1.18	41			1.1	44
3.12-17	38	<i>Philippians</i>		2.6	118
4.5	38	1	42	6.11	37
5.5	38	1.10-11	38	6.18-19	37
6.13	105	1.11	38	7.3-10	149
7.31	103	1.20	43	10.23	37
8.6	34	1.21	41	11.1-12.1	35
9.24-27	42	1.24-26	42	11.1-3	35
10.33	41	1.27-30	42	11.1	40
12.28	143	2.9-10	140	11.3	35
13.7	36	2.10-11	37	11.26	35
13.13	36	3.20	41	28-29	223
14.29	143	3.21	41		
15	40, 105	4.4-5	38	<i>1 Peter</i>	
15.12-58	39			1.3	35
15.12	40	<i>Colossians</i>		1.13	36, 43
15.13	40	1.5	36	1.21	35
15.17-18	40	1.15	32	3.15	43, 46
15.19	40	1.16	34	11.2	109

13.2	36, 103	1.12-20	123	21.1-22.5	44
14	232	1.13	118	21.1	101
		14.14-20	123	21.2	104
<i>Revelation</i>		14.14	118	22.20	229
1.7	123	19-20	41		

PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

<i>1 Enoch</i>		94-105	141	31.15	148
1	133	96.3	138		
10.11-21	133			<i>Testament of Judah</i>	
10.17	158	<i>2 Baruch</i>		21.4	148
37-71	115, 120,	70-74	133		
	123			<i>Testament of Levi</i>	
46.1	119	<i>4 Ezra</i>		3.5-6	150
69.26-29	128, 150	13	120, 123,	18	133
71.11	41		124, 129	18.5-8	148
91.7-11	133				
91.10	133	<i>Jubilees</i>		<i>Testament of Reuben</i>	
91.11	133	23.28	158	7.7	148
91.12-17	133	23.29-30	138		

QUMRAN

<i>IQHa</i>		ix 10	144	<i>4QD^a</i>	
iii	133	ix 11	135	9 ii 14	139
		xi 3	139		
<i>IQM</i>				<i>4QD^b</i>	
17.7-8	121	<i>IQSa</i>		18 iii 12	134, 145
iii 13	146	i 1-5	148		
v 1-2	146	ii 8-9	134	<i>4QD^d</i>	
v 1	146	ii 19-21	147	2 6	139
vii 6	134	ii 19-20	146		
xi 7-8	140	v 20-29	147	<i>4QD^f</i>	
xii 1-8	134			13 2	134, 145
xiii 10	134	<i>IQpHab</i>			
xiii 9-16	150	ii 8-10	140	<i>4QEn^b</i>	
xvii 5-8	149	v 10-12	144	1 iv 8-11	133
xvii 6-7	134	vii 1-5	140		
		viii 8-13	144	<i>4QEn^c</i>	
<i>IQS</i>		x 15-xi 2	148	1 i 15-18	133
iii 1	139	xi 4-8	144	1 v 1-9	133
iii 6	139	xii 7-9	144		
iii 7	139			<i>4QEn^g</i>	
iii 16-25	150	<i>IQ27</i>		1 ii 13-15	133
iii 21-25	149	i 5-8	133	1 iv 14-26	133
iv 22-23	133				
iv 22	134	<i>4QBer^b</i>		<i>4QFI</i>	
v 2.9	141	10 13	139	1-2 i 11-12	147
vi 17	139	frag. 10, l. 2	150	1-2 i 11	133, 146
viii 13-16	140				
ix 10-11	141				

<i>4QSb</i>		3-7 i	144	<i>11QMelch</i>	
v 24-29	147			ii 6	150
		<i>4Q400</i>		ii 7	150
<i>4QTestim</i>		1 i 15-16	150	ii 13	149
ll. 3-4	148			ii 16-20	150
		<i>4Q402</i>		ii 17	140
<i>4QpIsa^a</i>		4 7-10	134		
5-6 3	146			<i>11QPs</i>	
8-10 17	146	<i>4Q510</i>		22.2-11	220, 230
8-10 20-21	147	1 5-8	149		
8-10 22-24	147			<i>11QPs^a</i>	
8-10 23-24	146	<i>4Q511</i>		xxii	143
		10 1-6	149		
<i>4QpNah</i>				<i>11QTS</i>	
3-4 ii 8	144	<i>4Q521</i>		58.18-21	148
		1 2	137		
<i>4QpPs</i>		1 2 ll. 10-11	137	<i>CD</i>	
37 3-10 iv		1 2 ll. 12-14	138	i 1-16	144
8b-9a	144	1 2 ll. 3-9	138	i 5-11	144
		1 2 ll. 6-8	138	ii 12	139, 150
<i>4Q174</i>		2 ii	137, 141	iii 12-20	134
1-2 i 10-11	147	2 ii + 4	136	iii 21-iv 1	141
		2 ii 1-2	139	iv 1	139
<i>4Q252</i>		2 ii 7	141	iv 12b-19	149
1 v	147	2 iii 1-2	140	iv 16-17	144
		7 + 5 ii 4-5	141	vi 9-11	142
<i>4Q285</i>		7 + 5 ii 6-8	140	vi 10	144
1	134	7 + 5 ii 15	141	vi 14-16	144
4 2	146	8 8-9	141	vi 7	144
5 3-4	146	10 2	141	vii 13b-viii 1a	145
6 2	146	11 3	141	vii 18	134, 146
9	134	12 1-2	141	vii 20	146
10 3-4	134	14 2	141	x 9	139
frag. 5, l. 4	146			xii 23	134, 145
frags. 6 + 4,		<i>6Q15</i>		xiv 18-19	145
ll. 2-6	146	3 4	139	xiv 19	134, 145
frags. 6 + 4,		<i>11QBer</i>		xix 10-11	134
1. 10	146	1-2	134	xix 10	145
		13-14	134	xx 1	134
<i>4Q394</i>					
1-2 i-v	144				

OTHER ANCIENT REFERENCES

Mishnah		<i>Hor.</i>		Talmuds	
<i>Ab.</i>		3.2-3	167	<i>b. Bek.</i>	
2.10	243			24a	143
		<i>Pes.</i>			
<i>'Ed.</i>		10.6	159	<i>b. Ber.</i>	
8.7	143			17a	229
				27b	160
				34b	78

<i>b. Hag.</i>		<i>y. B. Qam.</i>		<i>Midr. Pss.</i>	
12b	150	ix.7b	161	1	244
				118	239
<i>b. Hor.</i>		<i>y. Ber.</i>		17	239
11b	167	i.2c	167	20	244
		i.3c	154		
<i>b. Ket.</i>		ii.5a	162	<i>Num. R.</i>	
11a	20	iii.6a	166	23.1	236
103b	166				
		<i>y. Naz.</i>		<i>Shir. R.</i>	
<i>b. Mak.</i>		vii.56a	166	2.7	20
24b	158				
56	220, 230	<i>y. Šab.</i>		<i>Sifre</i>	
		xvi.15c	167	343	226
<i>b. Meg.</i>					
5a-b	167	<i>y. Šeq.</i>		<i>Sop.</i>	
11a	167	3.3	139	14.1	223, 227
<i>b. Men.</i>		<i>y. Ta'an.</i>		Philo	
29b	238	2	111	<i>Jos.</i>	
		59	111	6.26	142
<i>b. Qid.</i>		65b	111		
72b	166	iv.68d	154, 156, 161, 167	Josephus	
				<i>Ant.</i>	
<i>b. Roš Haš.</i>		iv.68d-69a	163	7	143
18b	167			13.10.2-3	145
25a	166	Tosefta		13.10.3	143
		<i>t. Šot.</i>		13.10.7	144
<i>b. Šab.</i>		13.5	143		
63a	78			<i>War</i>	
153a	243	Midrashim		1.2.8	143
		<i>Gen. R.</i>		2.8.14	140
<i>b. Sanh.</i>		22.2	166	6.288-309	152
38a	167			68-69	143
93b	154, 159	<i>Lam. R.</i>			
94a-b	153	1.51	162	Christian Authors	
97b	159, 165	2.4	154, 156, 159, 161, 163	<i>Ign. Eph.</i>	
98b	167			20.2	118
		5.18	158		
<i>b. Yom.</i>					
39b	152				

INDEX OF AUTHORS

- Abegg, M.G. 138, 140, 142, 146
 Abel, F.-M. 162
 Adorno, T.W. 67
 Allegro, J.A. 142, 148
 Alon, G. 157, 164
 Amelineau, E. 220
 Amsler, S. 187
 Aran, G. 27

 Bach, R. 79, 177
 Baer, Y. 53
 Balz, H.R. 122, 246
 Barth, H. 64, 65
 Barth, K. 64, 65, 99, 104, 113, 114, 130
 Barthelemy, D. 133, 147
 Becker, J. 182
 Beer, G. 120
 Ben-Gera, A. 13
 Benjamin, W. 240
 Benoit, P. 165
 Bialak, 20
 Billerbeck, P. 111, 112
 Bloch, E. 33, 69
 Brenner, J.H. 26
 Bright, J. 83, 89
 Brooke, G.J. 145
 Brown, R.E. 135
 Buber, M. 16, 17, 116
 Bultmann, R. 32, 33, 47, 66, 100, 102, 113, 116, 118, 119, 130
 Burgmann, H. 144

 Carmignac, J. 149
 Carroll, R.C. 79, 83, 85, 180
 Clements, R.E. 76
 Cogan, M. 96, 203
 Cohen, H. 64, 101
 Collins, J.J. 49, 121, 138, 142, 144

 Colpe, C. 124
 Cross, F.M. 144

 Deissler, A. 179
 Delcor, M. 149
 Dillman, A. 210
 Dimant, D. 49
 Duhm, B. 80, 180, 186
 Dürr, L. 210

 Ebach, J. 241
 Efron, J. 159, 164
 Eichrodt, W. 76
 Eisenman, R. 135, 137, 146
 Elior, R. 49, 50, 52-54, 56-58
 Emerton, J.A. 149
 Epstein, J.M. 226
 Epstein, V. 86
 Erling, B. 184
 Eshel, H. 144
 Evans, C.A. 151
 Ezorsky, G. 72

 Fischer, G. 180
 Fishbane, M. 175
 Fitzmyer, J.A. 134, 135
 Flusser, D. 133
 Forkman, G. 154
 Frey, C. 246, 247
 Fuhs, H. 182, 183

 Gerhard, P. 245
 Gese, H. 174, 185, 188
 Gesenius, W. 190, 191
 Ginsberg, H.L. 206, 222
 Ginzberg, L. 145
 Gnilya, J. 242
 Goethe, J.W. 25
 Goldstein, J.A. 143

- Gosse, B. 185
 Gottlieb, E. 57
 Greenberg, M. 182
 Gressman, H. 75
 Grönbaek, J.H. 171
 Gruenwald, I. 49, 50, 133
 Gurion, D. Ben 27
- Ha-Reuveni, D. 54
 Habermann, A.M. 154
 Hacker, J. 53
 Halevi, A. 53, 60
 Halperin, D.J. 49
 Hanson, P.D. 97, 188
 Haran, M. 212
 Hausmann, J. 179
 Hayat, Y. 52, 54
 Hazzan, H.D. 19
 Hegel, G.W.F. 63, 64, 66, 67
 Heidegger, M. 100
 Heinemann, J. 223
 Herr, M.D. 158
 Herrmann, S. 175, 180
 Herzl, T. 16, 20, 24
 Hess, M. 15, 16, 26
 Hilliers, D.R. 178
 Hoffman, Y. 8, 87, 136, 139, 206, 251
 Holladay, W. 80, 83, 86, 89
 Hossfeld, L. 182-84
 House, P.R. 179
 Hyrcanus, J. 143, 144
- Isaac, B. 155
- Janzen, J.G. 180
 Jeremias, J. 172, 173, 177, 198
 Jonge, M. de 148
 Jüngel, E. 71, 109
- Kaiser, O. 170, 171
 Kant, I. 72, 100
 Karo, J. 54-56, 61
 Käsemann, E. 105
 Katz, J. 57, 58
 Kaufman, Y. 76, 87, 92, 207, 208,
 210, 212
 Kaufmann, V. 206
 Kautzsch, E. 190, 191
 Kegler, J. 172
 Kellermann, U. 176
 Kilian, R. 173
 Kimhi, R.D. 84
- Kissane, E.J. 210
 Klausner, Y. 75
 Kloner, A. 155
 Knibb, M.A. 147, 151
 Kobelski, P.J. 149
 Koenen, K. 187
 Kook, A.Y. 21-27, 29
 Körtner, U.H.J. 104
 Kuhn, H.-W. 125
 Kümmel, W.G. 126
- Lambert, W.G. 224, 225
 Lang, B. 181
 Lau, W. 186
 Laurin, R.B. 135
 Lavi, S.E. 53
 Licht, J. 144, 147
 Lieberman, S. 159
 Liebes, Y. 221
 Lindblom, J. 170, 171
 Liver, J. 148, 161, 166
 Loewenstamm, S.E. 228
 Lohfink, G. 106
 Lohfink, N. 185
 Lubbe, J. 142
 Luckner, G. 7
 Luger, Y. 226
 Luria, I. 58
 Luther, M. 34, 35, 63, 74
 Luz, U. 72
- Mahlmann, T. 169
 Maimonides, M. 164
 Marquardt, F.-W. 69
 Martínez, F.G. 121, 132, 133, 136,
 138, 141, 147, 150
 Martini, R. 159
 Mays, J.L. 176-78
 McCarthy, D.J. 91
 McKane, W. 83, 84
 McKeating, H. 182
 Merklein, H. 31, 66
 Michel, D. 174, 175
 Milik, J.T. 133, 134, 142, 144, 147,
 148, 150, 165
 Molcho, S. 53, 54
 Moltmann, J. 62, 108
 Mowinckel, S. 76, 171, 173, 180, 220
 Muilenberg, J. 210
 Müller, H.P. 171
 Müller, U.B. 121, 129

- Naumann, T. 177
 Nebe, G. 111, 116, 246, 247
 Newsom, C. 50
 Nitzan, B. 134, 146
 Nogalski, J. 169
 North, C.R. 210, 212

 Oppenheimer, A. 155, 156, 166, 252
 Otto, E. 185
 Overbeck, C. 64, 65

 Pannenberg, W. 66-68
 Paul, S.M. 176
 Ploeg, J.P.M. van der 76
 Plöger, O. 188
 Pohlmann, K.-F. 183
 Preuss, H.D. 169
 Puech, E. 135-38, 140, 141, 149
 Putnam, H. 70

 Qimron, E. 139

 Rabin, C. 143
 Rabitzky, A. 19-23, 25, 27, 29
 Rad, G. von 101, 116, 171-73
 Rahner, K. 71
 Raitt, T.M. 170
 Reed, S.A. 132
 Reiser, W. 189-91, 193, 198, 199
 Renaud, B. 178
 Rendtorff, T. 66, 68
 Reventlow, H.G. 175, 176, 189, 200,
 246, 249
 Ritschl, A. 64, 65, 70
 Robinson, T.H. 177, 178
 Roch, M. De 83
 Rohland, E. 116
 Rooy, H.F. van 174
 Rosenthal, E.S. 161
 Rowley, H.H. 49
 Rudolph, W. 176, 177, 180
 Russell, D.S. 77

 Sæbo, M. 172, 176
 Safrai, S. 158
 Sanda, A. 193
 Sanders, J.A. 143
 Sasson, H.H. Ben 53
 Sauter, G. 33, 169
 Schäfer, P. 50, 155, 156
 Schmidt, W.H. 173
 Schmitt, H.-C. 191

 Scholem, G. 49-51, 53, 58-60, 246,
 247, 249, 251
 Schoors, A. 175
 Schremer, A. 161
 Schulz, S. 126, 127
 Schunck, K.-D. 171
 Schürer, E. 156, 161, 164
 Schwarz, G. 118
 Schweitzer, A. 98-100, 114
 Sed-Rajna, G. 58
 Segal, M.Z. 212
 Seybold, K. 179
 Shapira, R.H.E. 20
 Siebeck, P. 33
 Simian, H. 183
 Singer, S. 221
 Smend, R. 170, 173, 180
 Soderlund, S. 180
 Sperber, D. 163
 Spieckermann, H. 96, 179
 Stade, B. 180
 Starcky, J. 134, 141, 145, 147
 Steck, O.H. 186
 Stegemann, H. 132
 Stern, M. 155
 Strack, H. 111, 112
 Strugnell, J. 50
 Sweeney, M.A. 179, 185

 Ta-Shma, Y. 223, 227
 Tabor, J.D. 135-37, 140
 Tadmor, H. 203
 Talmon, S. 135
 Theisohn, J. 120, 123
 Theunissen, M. 73, 102
 Thiel, W. 79
 Thomas, W.T. 72
 Tishby, I. 51, 52, 57
 Tödt, H.E. 118, 119
 Tsafir, Y. 162

 Uffenheimer, B. 7, 8, 90, 205-209,
 213, 246, 249
 Unterman, J. 180
 Urbach, E.E. 156, 158, 159, 165

 VanderKam, J. 138, 140, 142, 145,
 146
 Vaux, R. de 165
 Vermes, G. 146
 Vielhauer, P. 125
 Vital, H. 58-61

- Walser, M. 248, 249
Wanke, G. 169
Weber, M. 73
Weber, O. 102
Weder, H. 242, 244
Weinfeld, M. 219
Weiser, A. 178
Weiss, J. 66, 98, 100, 114
Wellhausen, J. 176, 178
Werblowsky, R.J. 55
Werner, E. 230
Werner, M. 114, 115
Werner, W. 185
Westermann, C. 181, 186
Wildberger, H. 185, 204-208
Willis, J.T. 178
Wise, M. 135-37, 140
Wolff, H.W. 172, 176-79
Woude, A.S. van der 132, 134, 148,
149, 178
Würthwein, E. 191
Yadin, Y. 148, 154, 162, 165
Yehuda, T. 27-29
Yeivin, S. 161
Zenger, E. 185
Zevit, Z. 121
Zimmerli, W. 173, 181-84, 209
Znaniecki, F. 72
Zvi, E. Ben 179

JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT SUPPLEMENT SERIES

- 108 P.M. McNutt, *The Forging of Israel: Iron Technology, Symbolism and Tradition in Ancient Society*
- 109 D. Jamieson-Drake, *Scribes and Schools in Monarchic Judah: A Socio-Archaeological Approach*
- 110 N.P. Lemche, *The Canaanites and their Land: The Tradition of the Canaanites*
- 111 J.G. Taylor, *Yahweh and the Sun: The Biblical and Archaeological Evidence for Sun Worship in Ancient Israel*
- 112 L.G. Perdue, *Wisdom in Revolt: Metaphorical Theology in the Book of Job*
- 113 R. Westbrook, *Property and the Family in Biblical Law*
- 114 D. Cohn-Sherbok (ed.), *A Traditional Quest: Essays in Honour of Louis Jacobs*
- 115 V. Hurowitz, *I Have Built You an Exalted House: Temple Building in the Bible in Light of Mesopotamian and Northwest Semitic Writings*
- 116 D.M. Gunn (ed.), *Narrative and Novella in Samuel: Studies by Hugo Gressmann and Other Scholars, 1906–1923* (trans. D.E. Orton)
- 117 P.R. Davies (ed.), *Second Temple Studies. I. Persian Period*
- 118 R.J. Tournay, *Seeing and Hearing God with the Psalms: The Prophetic Liturgy of the Second Temple in Jerusalem*
- 119 D.J.A. Clines & T.C. Eskenazi (eds.), *Telling Queen Michal's Story: An Experiment in Comparative Interpretation*
- 120 R.H. Lowery, *The Reforming Kings: Cult and Society in First Temple Judah*
- 121 D.V. Edelman, *King Saul in the Historiography of Judah*
- 122 L. Alexander (ed.), *Images of Empire*
- 123 E. Bloch-Smith, *Judahite Burial Practices and Beliefs about the Dead*
- 124 B. Halpern & D.W. Hobson (eds.), *Law and Ideology in Monarchic Israel*
- 125 G.A. Anderson & S.M. Olyan (eds.), *Priesthood and Cult in Ancient Israel*
- 126 J.W. Rogerson, W.M.L. de Wette, *Founder of Modern Biblical Criticism: An Intellectual Biography*
- 127 D.V. Edelman (ed.), *The Fabric of History: Text, Artifact and Israel's Past*
- 128 T.P. McCreesh, *Biblical Sound and Sense: Poetic Sound Patterns in Proverbs 10–29*
- 129 Z. Stefanovic, *The Aramaic of Daniel in the Light of Old Aramaic*
- 130 M. Butterworth, *Structure and the Book of Zechariah*
- 131 L. Holden, *Forms of Deformity*
- 132 M.D. Carroll R., *Contexts for Amos: Prophetic Poetics in Latin American Perspective*
- 133 R. Syrén, *The Forsaken Firstborn: A Study of a Recurrent Motif in the Patriarchal Narratives*
- 134 G. Mitchell, *Together in the Land: A Reading of the Book of Joshua*

- 135 G.F. Davies, *Israel in Egypt: Reading Exodus 1–2*
- 136 P. Morris & D. Sawyer (eds.), *A Walk in the Garden: Biblical, Iconographical and Literary Images of Eden*
- 137 H.G. Reventlow & Y. Hoffman (eds.), *Justice and Righteousness: Biblical Themes and their Influence*
- 138 R.P. Carroll (ed.), *Text as Pretext: Essays in Honour of Robert Davidson*
- 139 J.W. Watts, *Psalms and Story: Inset Hymns in Hebrew Narrative*
- 140 W. Houston, *Purity and Monotheism: Clean and Unclean Animals in Biblical Law*
- 141 G.C. Chirichigno, *Debt-Slavery in Israel and the Ancient Near East*
- 142 F.H. Cryer, *Divination in Ancient Israel and its Near Eastern Environment: A Socio-Historical Investigation*
- 143 D.J.A. Clines & J.C. Exum (eds.), *The New Literary Criticism and the Hebrew Bible*
- 144 P.R. Davies & D.J.A. Clines (eds.), *Language, Imagery and Structure in the Prophetic Writings*
- 145 C.S. Shaw, *The Speeches of Micah: A Rhetorical-Historical Analysis*
- 146 G.W. Ahlström, *The History of Ancient Palestine from the Palaeolithic Period to Alexander's Conquest* (ed. D. Edelman, with a contribution by G.O. Rollefson)
- 147 T.W. Cartledge, *Vows in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*
- 148 P.R. Davies, *In Search of 'Ancient Israel'*
- 149 E. Ulrich, J.W. Wright, R.P. Carroll & P.R. Davies (eds.), *Priests, Prophets and Scribes: Essays on the Formation and Heritage of Second Temple Judaism in Honour of Joseph Blenkinsopp*
- 150 J.E. Tollington, *Tradition and Innovation in Haggai and Zechariah 1–8*
- 151 J.P. Weinberg, *The Citizen-Temple Community*
- 152 A.G. Auld (ed.), *Understanding Poets and Prophets: Essays in Honour of George Wishart Anderson*
- 153 D.K. Berry, *The Psalms and their Readers: Interpretive Strategies for Psalm 18*
- 154 M. Brettler & M. Fishbane (eds.), *Minhah le-Nahum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of his 70th Birthday*
- 155 J.A. Fager, *Land Tenure and the Biblical Jubilee: Uncovering Hebrew Ethics through the Sociology of Knowledge*
- 156 J.W. Kleinig, *The Lord's Song: The Basis, Function and Significance of Choral Music in Chronicles*
- 157 G.R. Clark, *The Word Hēsed in the Hebrew Bible*
- 158 M. Douglas, *In the Wilderness: The Doctrine of Defilement in the Book of Numbers*
- 159 J.C. McCann (ed.), *The Shape and Shaping of the Psalter*
- 160 W. Riley, *King and Cultus in Chronicles: Worship and the Reinterpretation of History*
- 161 G.W. Coats, *The Moses Tradition*

- 162 H.A. McKay & D.J.A. Clines (eds.), *Of Prophet's Visions and the Wisdom of Sages: Essays in Honour of R. Norman Whybray on his Seventieth Birthday*
- 163 J.C. Exum, *Fragmented Women: Feminist (Sub)versions of Biblical Narratives*
- 164 L. Eslinger, *House of God or House of David: The Rhetoric of 2 Samuel 7*
- 166 D.R.G. Beattie & M.J. McNamara (eds.), *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context*
- 167 R.F. Person, *Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomic School*
- 168 R.N. Whybray, *The Composition of the Book of Proverbs*
- 169 B. Dicou, *Edom, Israel's Brother and Antagonist: The Role of Edom in Biblical Prophecy and Story*
- 170 W.G.E. Watson, *Traditional Techniques in Classical Hebrew Verse*
- 171 H.G. Reventlow, Y. Hoffman & B. Uffenheimer (eds.), *Politics and Theopolitics in the Bible and Postbiblical Literature*
- 172 V. Fritz, *An Introduction to Biblical Archaeology*
- 173 M.P. Graham, W.P. Brown & J.K. Kuan (eds.), *History and Interpretation: Essays in Honour of John H. Hayes*
- 174 J.M. Sprinkle, 'The Book of the Covenant': A Literary Approach
- 175 T.C. Eskenazi & K.H. Richards (eds.), *Second Temple Studies. II. Temple and Community in the Persian Period*
- 176 G. Brin, *Studies in Biblical Law: From the Hebrew Bible to the Dead Sea Scrolls*
- 177 D.A. Dawson, *Text-Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*
- 178 M.R. Hauge, *Between Sheol and Temple: Motif Structure and Function in the I-Psalms*
- 179 J.G. McConville & J.G. Millar, *Time and Place in Deuteronomy*
- 180 R. Schultz, *The Search for Quotation: Verbal Parallels in the Prophets*
- 181 B.M. Levinson (ed.), *Theory and Method in Biblical and Cuneiform Law: Revision, Interpolation and Development*
- 182 S.L. McKenzie & M.P. Graham (eds.), *The History of Israel's Traditions: The Heritage of Martin Noth*
- 183 J. Day (ed.), *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites (Second and Third Series) by William Robertson Smith*
- 184 J.C. Reeves & J. Kampen (eds.), *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honour of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*
- 185 S.D. Kunin, *The Logic of Incest: A Structuralist Analysis of Hebrew Mythology*
- 186 L. Day, *Three Faces of a Queen: Characterization in the Books of Esther*
- 187 C.V. Dorothy, *The Books of Esther: Structure, Genre and Textual Integrity*
- 188 R.H. O'Connell, *Concentricity and Continuity: The Literary Structure of Isaiah*
- 189 W. Johnstone (ed.), *William Robertson Smith: Essays in Reassessment*
- 190 S.W. Holloway & L.K. Handy (eds.), *The Pitcher is Broken: Memorial Essays for Gösta W. Ahlström*

- 191 M. Sæbø, *On the Way to Canon: Creative Tradition History in the Old Testament*
- 192 H.G. Reventlow & W. Farmer (eds.), *Biblical Studies and the Shifting of Paradigms, 1850–1914*
- 193 B. Schramm, *The Opponents of Third Isaiah: Reconstructing the Cultic History of the Restoration*
- 194 E.K. Holt, *Prophecy in the Past: The Use of Israel's History in the Book of Hosea*
- 195 J. Davies, G. Harvey & W.G.E. Watson (eds.), *Words Remembered, Texts Renewed: Essays in Honour of John F.A. Sawyer*
- 196 J.S. Kaminsky, *Corporate Responsibility in the Hebrew Bible*
- 197 W.M. Schniedewind, *The Word of God in Transition: From Prophet to Exegete in the Second Temple Period*
- 198 T.J. Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel: A Literary Comparison*
- 199 J.H. Eaton, *Psalms of the Way and the Kingdom: A Conference with the Commentators*
- 200 M.D. Carroll R., D.J.A. Clines & P.R. Davies (eds.), *The Bible in Human Society: Essays in Honour of John Rogerson*
- 201 J.W. Rogerson, *The Bible and Criticism in Victorian Britain: Profiles of F.D. Maurice and William Robertson Smith*
- 202 N. Stahl, *Law and Liminality in the Bible*
- 203 J.M. Munro, *Spikenard and Saffron: The Imagery of the Song of Songs*
- 204 P.R. Davies, *Whose Bible Is It Anyway?*
- 205 D.J.A. Clines, *Interested Parties: The Ideology of Writers and Readers of the Hebrew Bible*
- 206 M. Müller, *The First Bible of the Church: A Plea for the Septuagint*
- 207 J.W. Rogerson, M. Davies & M.D. Carroll R. (eds.), *The Bible in Ethics: The Second Sheffield Colloquium*
- 208 B.J. Stratton, *Out of Eden: Reading, Rhetoric, and Ideology in Genesis 2–3*
- 209 P. Dutcher-Walls, *Narrative Art, Political Rhetoric: The Case of Athaliah and Joash*
- 210 J. Berlinerblau, *The Vow and the 'Popular Religious Groups' of Ancient Israel: A Philological and Sociological Inquiry*
- 211 B.E. Kelly, *Retribution and Eschatology in Chronicles*
- 212 Y. Sherwood, *The Prostitute and the Prophet: Hosea's Marriage in Literary-Theoretical Perspective*
- 213 Y.A. Hoffman, *A Blemished Perfection: The Book of Job in Context*
- 214 R.F. Melugin & M.A. Sweeney (eds.), *New Visions of Isaiah*
- 215 J.C. Exum, *Plotted, Shot and Painted: Cultural Representations of Biblical Women*
- 216 J.E. McKinlay, *Gendering Wisdom the Host: Biblical Invitations to Eat and Drink*
- 217 J.F.D. Creach, *Yahweh as Refuge and the Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*

- 219 G. Morris, *Prophecy, Poetry and Hosea*
- 220 R.F. Person, Jr, *In Conversation with Jonah: Conversation Analysis, Literary Criticism, and the Book of Jonah*
- 221 G. Keys, *The Wages of Sin: A Reappraisal of the 'Succession Narrative'*
- 222 R.N. Whybray, *Reading the Psalms as a Book*
- 223 S.B. Noegel, *Janus Parallelism in the Book of Job*
- 224 P.J. Kissling, *Reliable Characters in the Primary History: Profiles of Moses, Joshua, Elijah and Elisha*
- 225 R.D. Weiss & D.M. Carr (eds.), *A Gift of God in Due Season: Essays on Scripture and Community in Honor of James A. Sanders*
- 226 L.L. Rowlett, *Joshua and the Rhetoric of Violence: A New Historicist Analysis*
- 227 J.F.A. Sawyer (ed.), *Reading Leviticus: Responses to Mary Douglas*
- 228 V. Fritz and P.R. Davies (eds.), *The Origins of the Ancient Israelite States*
- 229 S.B. Reid (ed.), *Prophets and Paradigms: Essays in Honor of Gene M. Tucker*
- 230 K.J. Cathcart and M.J. Maher (eds.), *Targumic and Cognate Studies: Essays in Honour of Martin McNamara*
- 231 W.W. Fields, *Sodom and Gomorrah: History and Motif in Biblical Narrative*
- 232 T. Binger, *Asherah: Goddesses in Ugarit, Israel and the Old Testament*
- 233 M.D. Goulder, *The Psalms of Asaph and the Pentateuch: Studies in the Psalter, III*
- 234 K. Stone, *Sex, Honor, and Power in the Deuteronomistic History*
- 235 J.W. Watts and P.R. House (eds.), *Forming Prophetic Literature: Essays on Isaiah and the Twelve in Honor of John D.W. Watts*
- 236 T.M. Bolin, *Freedom beyond Forgiveness: The Book of Jonah Re-Examined*
- 237 N.A. Silberman and D. Small (eds.), *The Archaeology of Israel: Constructing the Past, Interpreting the Present*
- 238 M.P. Graham, K.G. Hoglund and S.L. McKenzie (eds.), *The Chronicler as Historian*
- 239 M.S. Smith, *The Pilgrimage Pattern in Exodus* (with contributions by Elizabeth M. Bloch-Smith)
- 240 E.E. Carpenter (ed.), *A Biblical Itinerary: In Search of Method, Form and Content. Essays in Honor of George W. Coats*
- 241 R.K. Gnuse, *No Other Gods: Emergent Monotheism in Israel*
- 242 K.L. Noll, *The Faces of David*
- 243 H.G. Reventlow, *Eschatology in the Bible and in Jewish and Christian Tradition*
- 244 W.E. Aufrecht, N.A. Mirau & S.W. Gauley (eds.), *Urbanism in Antiquity: From Mesopotamia to Crete*
- 245 L.L. Grabbe, *Can a 'History of Israel' Be Written?*
- 248 E. Nodet, *A Search for the Origins of Judaism: From Joshua to the Mishnah*