

Second Temple Jewish Messianism as Social Political Discourse

by

Joshua R. Scott

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Near Eastern Studies)
in The University of Michigan
2022

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Gabriele Boccaccini, Chair
Professor Jay Crisostomo
Professor Ian Moyer
Professor Terry Wilfong

Joshua Scott

scottjos@umich.edu

ORCID iD: 0000-0001-7418-8323

© Joshua Scott 2022

DEDICATION

There are many people I need to thank who have supported me on this journey, more than I have pages available, without which I never would have succeeded. On this first draft of my research, I expressly thank my parents for their support – Ray and Nancy Scott. While they always welcomed my crazy ideas with excitement and sometimes with wise words of caution, they never deterred me from following my dreams. I also thank Sarah Scott, without whom I would not have persevered all these years.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I have presented several papers and publications on Second Temple Jewish messianism. These experiences would not have been possible without the invitation to present my research from colleagues across multiple disciplines and institutions. The research for this project developed out of those conference papers and academic projects, which I mention in the footnotes as the argument develops. However, there are too many interlocutors to name individually. Thank you to everyone who posed insightful questions and pushed me to refine my thoughts on Jewish messianism.

Words cannot accurately describe my debt to my advisors and conversation partners at the institutions I attended throughout the years: Loren Stuckenbruck and Shane Berg, my advisors from Princeton Theological Seminar, Anthea Portier-Young, my advisor from Duke Divinity, and especially, Gabriele Boccaccini, my *dokervater* at the University of Michigan-Ann Arbor. Thank you to my colleagues who tolerated my inquisitive mind and never-ending questions.

Beyond these interlocutors and advisors, I also acknowledge the support of several people who commented on drafts of various parts of this project: R. Gillian Glass, Andrew Higginbotham, Andrew Smith, Dr. Mary Pappalardo, and Katelyn Wells. Any errors that remain are my own.

PREFACE

The completion of this dissertation represents for me a strand of research that began in 2004 when I started my undergraduate studies at Augsburg University (MN). At Augsburg, I learned through the study of the history of religions that religion, politics, and culture are inextricably intertwined. At each stage of my scholarship, I asked new questions of ancient textual and non-textual evidence about this relationship. I learned new tools for research that allowed me to see the overlapping layers anew. The enduring joy for me comes not when I have settled on answers to those questions but the unfolding afresh of the questions themselves, the soul-searching and deep-dive into new realms of knowledge.

This work hopefully provides an intervention into what everyone who works with written or spoken word knows and feels: words convey an inherent power. They are the signs and symbols that entice our mind and frame our views of the world. I believe this sentiment is as true for the modern world as for the ancient world. While certainly not the only mode of communication, the exchange of words is a dominate form. The following project proposes that some authors recognized the power of words and myth, and employed them to shape the ethnic, social, and political boundaries of their respective communities. This work presents four case studies in which authors employed Second Temple Jewish messianism to strengthen or shift these boundaries within their burgeoning communities. By nature of their relationship with YHWH, the god of Israel, the messiah figures claimed or were ascribed a position of power. However, it is the literary and social context, or the words that surround them, where their practical authority is manifest. This study pushes scholars to move beyond the analysis of ancient charismatic religious leaders to understand how authors employed them within their literary context.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	ii
ACKNOLWEDGEMENTS	iii
PREFACE	iv
LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF FIGURES	x
ABSTRACT	xi
CHAPTER	
1. Introduction	1
Introduction	1
Definitions of Messiah	5
History of Research	7
History of Ideas	8
Messianic Typologies	12
External Methodology	14
Direction of Previous Studies	18
Discourse as Social Power	19
Messianic Discourse	27
Advantages of this Approach	30

Definition of “Jew” and “Judaism”	31
Overview of Project	34
2. “A Signal for the Peoples – The Nations Will Look to Him:” Messianic Discourse in Isaiah’s Reconceptualization of the Davidic Monarchy	37
Introduction	37
Isaiah or Isaias?: A Multiplicity of Voices	39
The Failing of Judah and Jerusalem: Isaiah’s Projection of the Past into the Present	43
Isaiah 1-2:4: An Accusation of Sin and a Future Hope	48
Reconceptualizing the Davidic Monarchy as Messianism	51
Isaiah 11-12: ‘Shout aloud and sing for joy, O royal Zion’	52
The Problem of Cyrus: A Different Type of Messiah	58
Context Matters: Dtl’sa’s Servant Songs	67
Evaluation of Messianic Discourse	78
The Role of Royal Messianism: Restoration as Idealization and Transformation	79
3: Enoch’s Chosen One: An Apocalyptic Messiah	81
Introduction	81
“Enoch, Where are You?”: The Status of 1 Enoch	82
The Good, the Bad and the Ugly (Their Offspring)	86
The World through the Eyes of Enoch	96
Dream Visions	103
The Similitudes of Enoch: A Messianic Reinterpretation	107
Messianic Terms in the Similitudes	112
Similitudes and Isaiah: A Literary Relationship?	124
Conclusion: An Apocalyptic Messiah	130

4: “From Now on You Will See the Son of Man:” Messianic Discourse in the Gospel of Matthew	132
Introduction	132
The Gospels: A Shared Narrative	133
The Corrupted World: The Legacy of Evil in Matthew	136
Origin over Effect: Jesus’ Birth Narrative	142
Origin over Effect: Jesus’ Farewell Speech	148
Matthew’s Messianism	154
Son of David Title	154
Son of Man Title	158
A Conflict Among Siblings: A Pattern between John the Baptist, the Pharisees, and Early Jesus Followers	164
Conclusion: Jesus as Eschaton	169
5: Bar Kosiba and the Yetzer Hara: Messianic Discourse in Rabbinic Literature	171
Introduction	171
Simeon Bar Kosiba and the Jewish Heritage	173
Evil in Rabbinic Judaism	184
The <i>Yetzer</i> of David	188
Bar Kosiba in Messianic Discourse	193
Conclusion: Kosiba or Koziba?	199
6: Conclusion	201
Introduction	201
Four Messianic Discourses: A Review	204

Results of this Study	206
Future Studies	207
Conclusion	209
BIBLIOGRAPHY	210

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE

III.1 Cross References of Fallen Angels in 1 Enoch with Titles and Brief Descriptions	89
III.2 Cross References of Angels in 1 Enoch with Titles and Brief Descriptions	94
III.3 Human Figures and their Animal Metaphors in the Animal Apocalypse	105
III.4 Comparative References of 1 Enoch 1-16 and 31-71	109
III.5 Comparative References of 1 Enoch and Isaiah	125
IV.1 Comparison of Matthew 1:2-17 and Luke 3:23-38	143

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE

II.1 The Cyrus Cylinder.	60
V.1 Kosiba coin. Commemorating year 1 (132 CE) of the revolution. Bronze.	181
V.2 Kosiba coin. Commemorating year 2 (133 CE) of the revolution. Silver.	181
V.3 Kosiba coin. Commemorating year 3 (134 CE) of the revolution. Silver.	182
V.4 Hyrcanus coin. Late second or early first century BCE. Bronze, 18.5 mm.	182
V.5 Hyrcanus coin. Late second or early first century BCE. Bronze, 18 mm.	182

ABSTRACT

Ancient Jewish authors wrote extensively on Jewish messiahs. Scholars have identified in these works the social, religious, and political agendas of Jewish writers. While some recent research has underlined some aspects of messianism, such as conflict over the place and authority of the Jewish law or the Jerusalem temple in relation to messianism, there has not been an acknowledgement of the pervasiveness, function, or social location of messianism as a social political discourse. My project reframes messianism as a social linguistic discourse, in that the concept of a real or imagined messiah is accentuated in literature as a response to specific ideological concerns within a local community. I argue that ancient Jewish messianism is a linguistic effort by elite leaders to shift or affirm group boundary markers.

Chapter 1:

Introduction

Ideas don't exist unless they're communicable.¹

Introduction

Following the return from the Babylonian exile, Jews recorded their origin stories and narratives to document their historical development as they established various forms of leadership, conquered lands and were conquered by foreign invaders, and established social dynamics that defined group identity. The authors of these traditions are represented by material culture such as coins, archeological remains, and texts, written in different languages and grouped today in different ancient collections. They utilized a number of linguistic strategies to define their own social, ethnic, and religious boundaries that fluctuated throughout the Second Temple period (538 BCE – 135 CE). This study seeks to understand what role messiah figures played within these contexts. Two central questions guide this work: How did Second Temple authors implement messianism and messiah figures within social, ethnic, and religious boundary tension? Did messiah figures in the Second Temple period all serve a similar literary function so that they represent a distinct sociolinguistic strategy? The study analyzes anew the deployment of messianism as a linguistic tool within ancient Jewish literature to appreciate the full spectrum of applications within boundary-making practices. As the epigraph above suggests, an idea or concept such as messianism cannot exist in the abstract.

This project addresses messianism on a literary level and a social level. A central intervention of this work is to advance the study of messianism apart from characteristics of previous projects, namely a hyperfocus on (a) specific terms relating to messiahs or (b) notions of messianism within select textual corpora of ancient Judaism. While these studies are foundational, they do not provide enough attention to the diversity of messianism. Changes in

¹ Eric Hayot, *The Elements of Academic Style: Writing for the Humanities* (New York: Columbia University Press: 2014), 47.

ideology and even tangential details, such as a difference in the number of imagined messiahs or the imagined roles of the messiahs within the same text, become a liability for interpreters. That a messiah may be named or alluded to in both a poem and a legal dispute from the same text speaks to its universal influence on and application within ancient Jewish literature. Where one author might reference messianism in an apocalyptic vision, another author might reference the messiah in a court proceeding. If we are to honor the individual occurrences of this concept, we must look for another means of organizing our evidence beyond the current limitations. We have over focused on the act of categorization rather than the observation of function.

This exploration also applies on a social level, for all texts are social occurrences. I describe below that every text represents a social context. Encoded within texts are the establishment of social, ethnic, and religious boundaries. The four case studies analyzed below describe the messiah as the ideological gate between the people or behavior that author(s) wishes to emphasize and encourage members to participate in or to demoralize or deter perspective participants from engaging. In this way, the references to a messiah establish an interior ideological boundary for the author's community. By examining to whom, against whom, and why the messiah is referenced across several internal references as well as comparative occurrences, we come to a greater understanding of how authors deployed messianism as a literary trope within social, ethnic, and religious conflict. This analysis will permit us to reorganize the categorizations of messianism.

This proposed socio-linguistic approach also acknowledges that the deployment of a concept is better defined by its individual use than its historical instances across literature. A greater attention to the deployment of messianism within its individual social and literary settings reveals prominent connections. Messianism is not a separate genre of literature or belief system, but an idea or concept. However, abstracted from its usage, the concept of messianism is impenetrable. Using Pierre Bourdieu's approach to language, I frame messianism as a discrete discourse. Bourdieu's emphasis upon language as a dialectical process, a give-and-take between two or more participants, illuminates that messianism is a social function. I argue that the concept of messianism might only be fully understood within its social and literary context.

In this study, the parallel concept that receives the most attention is the concept of sin or evil. While at times I use these terms as synonyms and overlapping semantic domains, they are different. In this project, I understand sin to mean to disobey or break expectation with a given

religious rule. Within ancient Judaism, authors commonly understand this law (Torah) as the covenant with YHWH, the national god of Israel. Ancient Jewish authors most commonly mark the covenant through the narrative and legislation in the Torah traditionally connected to Moses. Some chose to recraft this base narrative for specific literary purposes. For example, stating that a patriarch abided by the law before it was given might bolster his faithfulness. Appealing to a primordial event relating to evil prior to the reception of the Torah might allow an author to reframe how the law functions. Whether the disobedience was the result of the individual or an outside force, the concept of sin almost always centers the individual within this broad conceptual framework of ‘wrongdoing.’ Appealing to the concept of evil instead of sin decenters the individual and focalizes on a broader scheme. I define evil as a negative and harmful force. In ancient Judaism, discord and disharmony are usually attributed to non-human figures – angels, demons, and other beings. In the messianic discourse I explore below, the subgroup or particular behavior the authors attempt to isolate and label as unacceptable according to their values and norms is described as or said to be the effect of evil or sin. I hypothesize that when, through the voice of the messiah, an author labeled their opponents as evil or a certain behavior as sinful, the readers understood this as an ethnic distinction. Framing ethnicity in this manner makes ethnicity a moral judgment.

As I will describe in specific chapters, at various points within the intellectual development of Second Temple Judaism, authors depict the messiah along a rhetorical spectrum, with an angel of superhuman origin and strength at one extreme, and at the other, a human being who, selected after birth and through divine intervention, ascends to power. Across this spectrum, the character is marked by their superior strength and power over and against personifications and ancillary notions of evil. This study focuses on the literary intervention that the deployment of messianism has on this context.

Although anthropological and social-linguistical in focus, this study is an exercise of history and descriptive in nature. Each chapter has six sections: (a) an overview of the chapter; (b) introduction and analysis of the focal text and the ancient cultural setting; (c) a study of the socio-religious problem within the group, which is described as the manifestation of evil or sin; (d) analysis of the references to the messiah; (e) investigation of the application of messianism in relation to the addressed socio-religious problem; (f) and a conclusion. I postulate that by analyzing the constellation relating to messianism – the messiah, the problem in the community,

how the proposed ‘outsiders’ are depicting in relation to that problem – we find a similar linguistic pattern, a mythologizing of the local social context, that ancient authors and readers alike understood.

This study aims to advance our understanding of messianism through three claims. These claims are not criteria about the messiah in particular but about how messianic discourse is formed and employed by ancient Jewish authors in my four test cases. First, every messianic claim addresses a social reality. Second, Jewish messianic discourse contains (at least) three elements: statements about a messiah, evil or sin, and a specific social context. Third, the difference between varied forms of messianic discourse stem from the drastic variations of the identity and positionality of the messianic agent, the claim of power (social, economic, or cultural capital) which the author addresses, and the specific rules of the social field (area of application). The purpose of this study is not to limit what is considered messianic discourse, but focus upon works that utilize it in a like manner. The sources studied here demonstrate that, while messianism might have existed in an abstract form as a resistance to abuse of Persian and Roman power, its use is not limited to the oppressed. Authors – aggressors or defendants – employed the linguistic trope in social, political, and ethnic conflict to enact the same or greater violence upon the original violators. I do not find a strong distinction in form between the literary and ideological tools of those who are in power and those who are not in power. Centralizing the figure of the messiah within discourse highlights that these figures are frequently employed both by those trying to regulate a community as much as those trying to overthrow leadership of a community and envision a new one. Messianic discourse is primarily a discourse of power.

The remaining introduction will proceed in the following way. I begin by introducing the definition of messiah and three examples of trends within the history of research surrounding and relating to messianism. These examples are by nature reductive of the rich reception history of messianism but will serve as a basis for the argument that follows. I will then establish the concept of messianism as an expression of discourse using works from social linguists, especially Pierre Bourdieu, who help recognize that texts are social and enmeshed within minor or major social conflict. I then briefly locate messianism within the ideological conflict in Second Temple Judaism because multiple ideologies utilize messianism as a symbol of power to

define and redefine ethnic, social, and religious boundaries. I conclude with a brief description of the main body of the project, the four case studies of messianism.

Definitions of Messiah

Second Temple studies has not yet found a consensus on how the term ‘messiah’ should be defined nor who the multiple messiahs represent.² A minimalist perspective argues that only characters described as *χριστός* or *מָשִׁיחַ* should be considered ‘God’s anointed.’ James Charlesworth argues that “Jewish messianology developed out of the crisis and hope of the nonmessianic Maccabean wars of the Second Century BCE...For an undeterminable number of Jews the yearning centered on the future saving acts by a divinely appointed, and anointed, supernatural man: the messiah.”³ The field of messianism has been overly complicated by researchers consolidating key terms like ‘messiah,’ ‘christology,’ and ‘canon’ in ways that are foreign to the evidence.

A maximalist position understands the term more broadly in its function within the period. William Horbury suggests messianism developed in the Second Temple period and represents a real or imagined eschatological manifestation among Jews.⁴ He states, “‘Messianism’ can stand for all biblically inspired Jewish communal hope, spiritual and political, with or without a messiah figure.”⁵ This manifestation assumes a certain degree of “coherence in the messianism of the Greek and Roman periods, despite diversity,” such as various titles, descriptions, and classifications (human vs. superhuman; prophetic vs. political; cosmic vs. eschatological).⁶ While the minimalist position provides clarity as to the specific use of the

² Andrew Chester’s research on messianism neatly maps on to this maximalist/minimalist divide (cf., *Messiah and Exaltation* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007)). The ideas for this section were refined at the 2019 Department of Middle East Studies Lecture Series. I express my thanks to the participants who received my work and pushed me to clarify my language. Cf., “The ‘Messianic Worldview’ in Second Temple Judaism: Problems and Promises” (Paper presented at the Department of Middle East Studies Lecture Series, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor (2 December 2019).

³ James Charlesworth, “From Messianology to Christology: Problems and Prospects,” in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (ed. by James Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 3-35, here, 3 and 6, respectively.

⁴ John J. Collins takes a similar position in his 1995 *The Scepter and the Star*, in which he suggests ‘messiah’ or ‘messianism’ should include figures “who have important roles in the future hope of the people” (*The Scepter and the Star: Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2nd edition. Grand Rapids: 2010), 12).

⁵ William Horbury, *Messianism Among Jews and Christians: Biblical and Historical Studies* (2nd ed.; New York: T&T Clark, 2016), 1.

⁶ Horbury, *Messianism Among Jews and Christians*, 10.

phrase or phrases, the maximalist position more clearly illuminates the ideology associated with messianism. The evidence is historically limited to texts, sources which are likely to use lexical variance to describe the complexity of the idea, over other mediums, such as coins and pictorial depictions. However, the diversity of evidence indicates the maximalist approach is necessary to understanding the linguistic function of messianism. Likewise, while the minimalist position highlights how people might have understood the term in Second Temple Judaism, it indirectly funnels the study of messianism through a single term with a complex meaning within early Christianity. To incorporate the competing perspectives who utilize this term, this study will use *messiah* in the maximalist sense, to describe charismatic figure who, whether real or imagined, whether in sources typically listed as Jewish or Christian, represents hope and a catalyst for change. This change is sometimes positive and sometimes negative depending on the author's intent.

In addition, most scholars now acknowledge that *χριστός* was adopted as a title within the early Christian movement.⁷ Concerning this lexical debate, George Macrae ruminates,

Whoever attempts to survey early Christian belief that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah of Israel is immediately confronted by a well known but nevertheless major problem. The problem of the translation of the Christian proclamation from that of a Palestinian Jewish sectarian group to that of a broader Greco-Roman religious movement... aimed to appeal to the gentile world at least as much as it did to the Jewish world of the Diaspora. The [lexical] issue is problematic because, except for a very few isolated words [i.e., *messiah*] and phrases [i.e., Son of Man] the oldest written sources of the Christian movement already reflect the transition. Virtually all efforts to describe the process of the transition are theoretical reconstructions.⁸

⁷ This is the guiding question of Charlesworth's volume *The Messiah*: "*Christos* is the title or term most frequently applied to Jesus in the New Testament. Scholars agreed that the crucial question is the following: How did this happen, since 'the Messiah' is rarely found, and the functions or attributes of 'the Messiah' are even less explained, in extant pre-70 Jewish documents?" (xv). Merrill Miller suggests that the title was applied to Jesus for the sake of legitimacy, "The general significance of the use of *masiah/christos* in Jewish Literatures outside the Bible, at least until the latter part of the first century C.E., is to give theocratic grounding to each of the institutions considered essential to the proper functioning of the life of the people" ("The Anointed Jesus," in *Redescribing Christian Origins* (ed. by Ron Cameron and Merrill P. Miller; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004), 375-416, here 408). Matthew Novenson argues that *christos* is better understood as an honorific: "If Paul intends to express the inalienable uniqueness of Jesus, he does not do so by using an unparalleled onomastic category. Paul's *χριστός* is an honorific, and it works according to the syntactical rules that govern that onomastic category" (*Christ Among the Messiahs: Christ Language in Paul and Messiah Language in Ancient Judaism* (New York: Oxford, 2012), 97).

⁸ George Macrae, "Messiah and Gospel," in *Judaisms and their Messiahs and the Turn of the Christian Era*, ed. by Jacob Neusner, William S. Green, and Ernest Frerichs (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 169-186, 169.

Because of this fluid question concerning when this change happened, this project will use the term *messiah* in the maximalist sense and in a collective measure, so as not to prematurely limit the scholarly dialogue to Christian notions of messianism.⁹

History of Research

There has been a plethora of studies on the terms related to messiah figures in the Second Temple period,¹⁰ despite the fact we do not have much additional textual evidence since the periodic finding of the manuscripts in the Judean desert (Qumran, Masada, the Cave of Letters).¹¹ Nonetheless, the field of messianism can be divided into three major approaches that

⁹ Martin Hengel addresses this tension head-on, suggesting that the time lapse between messianism (human understanding of Jesus) and christology is inconsequential: “The time between the death of Jesus and the fully developed Christology which we find in the earliest Christian documents, the letters of Paul, is so short that the development which takes place within it can only be called amazing” (Martin Hengel, “Christology and New Testament Chronology,” in *Between Jesus and Paul* (Orig., London: SCM, 1983; Rep., Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2003), 30-47, here 31). Em Stephen attempts to avoid the lexical bees nest by dividing Christology into three subfields, *Dogmatic Christology*, *Biblical Christology*, and *Historical Christology*. His study inadvertently shows, however, that the theological and historical notions of messianism and christology are too closely intertwined, and such a division cannot be made (*Christology Today* (New Delhi: Serials Publications, 2016)).

¹⁰ There has been a steady number of impressive book-length projects in the last ten years, not to mention articles: Shirley Lucas, *The Concept of the Messiah in the Scriptures of Judaism and Christianity* (LSTS 78; London: T & T Clark, 2011); Alexei M. Sivertsev, *Judaism and Imperial Ideology in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); James Waddell, *The Messiah: A Comparative Study of the Enochic Son of Man and the Pauline Kyrios* (JCTC 10; London: T & T Clark, 2011); Daniel Boyarin, *The Jewish Gospels: The Story of the Jewish Christ* (New York: New Press, 2012); Novenson, *Christ Among the Messiahs*; Martha Himmelfarb, *Jewish Messiahs in a Christian Empire* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2017). While prior to WWII, messianism was seen as a separate field to christology, the two fields are now indissoluble and serve as a channel for the larger cultural dialogue in Jewish-Christian relations. For an overview of this tension, see John J. Collins, “Early Judaism in Modern Scholarship,” in John J. Collins and Daniel Harlow (eds), *The Dictionary of Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 1-19. In addition to the texts highlighted below, see the following studies on the Christian-Jewish relationship: P. S. Alexander, “The Parting of the Ways’ from the Perspective of Rabbinic Judaism,” in *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways AD 70 to 135* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 1-26; Gabriele Boccaccini, *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E.* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1991); Stanley E. Porter and Brook W. R Peason, eds., *Christian-Jewish Relations through the Centuries* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000); Annette Y. Reed and Adam H. Becker, eds., *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007); Steven Katz, “Issues in the Separation of Judaism and Christianity after 70 CE: A Reconstruction,” *JBL* 103 (1984): 43-76; Ian H. Henderson and Gerbern S. Oegema, with the help of Sara Parks Ricker, eds., *The Changing Face of Judaism, Christianity, and other Greco-Roman Religions in Antiquity* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2006). See the following texts that address the Jewish and Christian relation in relation to specific elements of messianism: Samuel Sandmel, *We Jews and Jesus* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965); Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, “Wisdom Christianity and the Parting of the Ways Between Judaism and Christianity,” *Christian-Jewish Relations through the Centuries* (ed. by Stanley Porter and Brook Peason; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 52-68; James McGrath, *The Only True God: Early Christian Monotheism in its Jewish Context* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2009); Martha Himmelfarb, *Jewish Messiahs in a Christian Empire*.

¹¹ This is a subfield unto itself. To name but a few important monographs: Matthew Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (New York: Scribners, 1961); Z. Baras, *Messianism and Eschatology* (Jerusalem: The Historical Society of Israel, 1983 [in Hebrew]); George Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran. 4QFlorilegium in Its Jewish Context* (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 29; Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, 1985); John J. Collins and Craig A. Evans (eds), *Christian Beginnings and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006); Gabriele Boccaccini (ed), *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007).

have interpreted “messiah”: the History of Ideas approach, a typological approach, or as a linguistic phenomenon.¹²

History of Ideas

The most prominent approach is the History of Ideas perspective, which understands messianism as a singular idea prevalent across Israelite and Judean texts. Texts, such as 2 Samuel, Daniel, Psalms of Solomon, or 1 Enoch, all seem to testify to the same belief though with different terms and nuances.¹³ The most prominent depiction is that of King David. Based on 2 Samuel 7, David received a promise that his offspring would assume his mantle of leadership.

Thus says the LORD of hosts: I took you from the pasture, from following the sheep to be prince over my people Israel; and I have been with you wherever you went, and have cut off all your enemies from before you; and I will make for you a great name, like the name of the great ones of the earth. And I will appoint a place for my people Israel and will plant them, so that they may live in their own place, and be disturbed no more; and evildoers shall afflict them no more, as formerly, from the time that I appointed judges over my people Israel; and I will give you rest from all your enemies. Moreover, the LORD declares to you that the LORD will make you a house. When your days are fulfilled and you lie down with your ancestors, I will raise up your offspring after you, who shall come forth from your body, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever.

I quote this passage in full because its historical effect cannot be overstated. The promise of David’s offspring included a claim to land and geographical boundaries. This passage references the early period of the monarch, in which all of Israel was safely united under King David. In addition to the promise of a centralized and holistic government, the Davidic promise includes the establishment of the temple system. The throne and the sacrifice system are unequivocally and forever intertwined. The hope for the promised offspring carries several religious and ethnic promises, an enduring covenant between God and God’s people. David, who captured Jerusalem

¹² Because of the breadth of scholarship, this selective review highlights examples rather than displaying the development of thought.

¹³ For specific historic examples, see Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (Re. ed. by G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Black; 3 vol.; Edinburg: Clark, 1973-87; G. F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era* (2 vols.; New York: Schocken, 1971, original copyright, 1927).

and unified the nation under Judah's banner, was the king par excellence and is remembered in later Israelite history as the standard by which all kings were compared.

The passage expresses hope for the revitalization of Judea. Josephus Klausner boldly professes that the Davidic offspring (Jer. 23:5-6; Am. 9:11), the messianic king, was the "summation of the most exacted hopes for a shining future, which our greatest and most venerated dreamers await."¹⁴ In some examples, ancient authors invoke hope for the fulfillment of David's promises without invoking need for his offspring (Isa. 11:1; Mic. 5:1; Ezek. 34:23-24; 37:24-25). In this one hope, "political salvation and spiritual redemption of necessity were combined in the consciousness of the nation to become one great work of redemption." The Davidic figure represented the fulfillment of the Abrahamic promise to make the nation powerful and enduring. Klausner depicts messianism as a restorative movement that will not only restore the Jews to their land, but gather together those who were dispersed (Jer 27:12-13).¹⁵

Another significant term is the Son of Man. The usage in Daniel 7 (late Second Century BCE) represents the earliest and most prominent appearance of the term:

As I watched, thrones were set in place, and an Ancient One took his throne, his clothing was white as snow, and the hair of his head like pure wool; his throne was fiery flames, and its wheels were burning fire. A stream of fire issued and flowed out from his presence. A thousand thousands served him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood attending him. The court sat in judgment, and the books were opened....

As I watched in the night visions, I saw one like a human being coming with the clouds of heaven. And he came to the Ancient One and was presented before him. To him was given dominion and glory and kingship, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion that shall not pass away, and his kingship is one that shall never be destroyed.

Within Daniel's vision, the Ancient One represents the YHWH and the human being, YHWH's messianic agent. At the end of time, the Son of Man will take his place before the Ancient One and rule over all of creation. The idiomatic use of Son of Man in Daniel has befuddled

¹⁴ Josephus Klausner, *Messianic Idea in Israel from its beginning to the completion of the Mishnah* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1955), 6.

¹⁵ Klausner, *Messianic Idea*, 241-42.

scholars.¹⁶ Historical-critical scholarship assumes that in Daniel and similar apocalyptic narratives like 1 Enoch (esp. 62, 70-71) and Revelation, the messiah is the same angelic character.¹⁷ This messianic figure is, in the words of Sigmund Mowinkle, “a pictorial symbol of the people of Israel, not an individual figure, and not a personal messiah of any kind.”¹⁸ Similar to concepts of the Davidic heir, the Son of Man messiah represents a hope for the unification of Israel. Mowinkle is most interested in this phrase as it relates to Jesus, thus collapsing the textual traditions together. He believes that Jesus himself utilized this Aramaic phrase as a marker to reveal his messianic intentions. When Jesus used the term, Mowinkle contends, he used it with “a certain emphasis” and knowledge of the term, thus transforming it into a personal designation.¹⁹

Within the History of Ideas approach, this concept of messianism offers a competing projection of the role of Son of Man in the form of an angel. Humans could only gain access to the figure and the offerings of the figure through vision and mediation. The messiah is hidden from all creation. Its primary task is one of judgment, performed at the end of time on the behest of the God of Israel. The act of judgment is itself a revelatory act that reveals not only the character of the messiah, but the essence of God. The function and character of the Son of Man is tied to the eschatological outcome of humanity. The function of judgment, similar to the Davidic heir, promises to bring hope. Mowinkle ties the angelic vision of the Son of Man in 1 Enoch to the messianic program of Jesus: “When the Son of Man is called ‘the Elect One’ it is, in the first instance, the normal Messianic sense that the expression conveys, the messianic salvation. He

¹⁶ Geza Vermes’ 1978 article “The Son of Man Debate” carefully outlines both the philological issues at stake and the state of the question in the 1970s (*JSNT* 1 (1978): 19-32). For Vermes, the first-person singular, indefinite Aramaic idiom from Dan 7 is placed upon the lips of Jesus by the Gospel authors, not as a messianic title but in a prophetic declaration to be fulfilled through the crucifixion. Martin Hengel further explores the thesis in his short *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976), in which, similar to Bousset, he argues for the quick development of high christology in the earliest Jewish-Christian communities. In his usual snarky tone, Maurice Casey (*The Solution to the ‘Son of Man’ Problem* (New York: T&T Clark, 2009)) argues that debate continues over the Aramaic phrase because of linguistic ‘incompetence’ and commitment to theological overtones of the Son of Man. Similar to Vermes, he views the Son of Man as an indefinite relative that can refer to the speaker, the person in front of her/him, or an entity not present. While he may be correct concerning the Aramaic idiom, I do not think his argument that all references to the Son of Man in 1 Enoch actually refer to Enoch himself. For an overview of this debate, see Joshua Scott, *The “Human One” and Social Theory: A Study of 1 Enoch and the Gospel of Matthew* (ThM Diss., Duke University, 2014).

¹⁷ For a differing perspective on the relation between angels and messianism in Revelation, see Christopher Rowland, “The Vision of the Risen Christ in Rev. 1:13ff: The Debt of an Early Christology to an Aspect of Jewish Angelology,” *JTS* 31 (1980): 1-11.

¹⁸ Sigmund Mowinkle, *He That Cometh* (trans. by W. G. Anderson; New York: Abingdon Press, 1954), 350.

¹⁹ Mowinkle, *He That Cometh*, 347.

has an especially close relationship to the Lord of Spirits, is the object of His favor, is appointed by Him to a glorious heritage, and will carry out His eschatological purpose and work.”²⁰ This approach assumes a diachronic relationship between ideas that spans several collections of texts,²¹ which signals to interpreters a shared common knowledge, a common bond and a shared entity.

Recent years have seen a sharp reaction to this diachronic unity of messianism and its assumption that because these traditions all relate to Judaism, they must all believe the same tenets. In his oft quoted claim, James Charlesworth states, “No member of the Princeton Symposium on the Messiah holds that a critical historian can refer to a common Jewish messianic hope during the time of Jesus...”²² In his magisterial study, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, E. P. Sanders argues that from documents that represent Second Temple Judaism “a common pattern can be discerned which underlies otherwise disparate parts of tannaitic literature,”²³ which included belief in one God, the Scriptures, and the Jerusalem temple, but messianism is not included. Johann Maier is not even willing to consider using the terms messiah or messianic in relation to the scrolls. Although there are a few references to anointed figures, his preferred distinction, they do not carry with them the same ideological framework as “Christian texts.”²⁴ The early History of Ideas approach was of great benefit for its recognition of sources that reference messiahs, but assumed a ‘salvation history’ in which all people hoped for a messiah, which the evidence does not support. In addition, it frequently projected a

²⁰ Mowinkle, *He That Cometh*, 366.

²¹ In addition to works mentioned in other notes, significant works include James Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah: A Critical History of the Messianic Idea among the Jews from the Rise of the Maccabees to the Closing of the Talmud* (London: Longman, 1877); Richard Longnecker, *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity* (London: SCM, 1970); Geza Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* (2d ed.; Leiden: Brill, 1973); Joachim Becker, *Messianic Expectation in the Old Testament* (Trans. by David E. Green; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980); Donald Juel, *Messianic Exegesis: Christological Interpretation of the Old Testament in Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988); Antti Laato, *A Star is Rising: The Historical Development of the Old Testament Royal Ideology and the Rise of the Jewish Messianic Expectations* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997); Gerbern Oegema, *The Anointed and His People: Messianic Expectation from the Maccabees to Bar Kokhba* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998); Israel Knohl, *The Messiah before Jesus: the Suffering Servant of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Trans. by David Maisel; Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000); Craig A. Evans, ed., *The Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity: Studies in Language and Tradition* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000).

²² James Charlesworth “From Messianology to Christology,” 5.

²³ Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), 70.

²⁴ Johann Maier, “Messias oder Gesalbter? Zu einem Übersetzungs- und Deutungsproblem in den Qumrantexten,” *Revue de Qumran* 17 (1996): 585-612.

supersessionist view in which Christianity is the fulfillment of all previous Jewish texts; those now outside of Christianity are (theologically) displaced.

Messianic Typologies

The second approach has focused upon specific appearances of the messiah within individual literary contexts or corpora. G.G. Xeravits convincingly argues that previous studies of messianism too frequently reflect a “particular concept of Christian theology.”²⁵ Xeravits focuses instead upon the Qumran material to explore messianism at a specific point in post-exilic Judaism. The starting point for his study is the claim that messianism developed from eschatology, a belief in the end of time.²⁶ He reflects:

The belief in the coming of a definitive future period of history is a development in the Israelite faith. The roots of the emergence of this belief are twofold. On the one hand, eschatology is an outcome of a sort of historical-theological thinking. On the other hand, the challenges of post-exilic events towards prophecy were a strong impetus for transforming prophecy into eschatology.²⁷

History is imagined as a series of independent and interconnected events, in which God continues to intervene based on the covenantal relationship. Based on past events, Jews expected God to act again. Hope for restoration, Xeravits contends, “formed and supported Israel’s self-consciousness.”²⁸ Eschatological hope was the expectation for a definitive future period of history in which God corrects the manifestations of evil in the world. The Deuteronomistic history and “some like minded authors of the psalms” projected Israel’s past successes into the distant future. For the Qumranites, this hope was a continuation of the present age that had begun

²⁵ Geza Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet: Positive Eschatological Protagonists of the Qumran Library* (STDJ 83; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 430.

²⁶ Cf. Michael Knibb, “Eschatology and Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years* (eds. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam; vol. 2; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 379-402.

²⁷ Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 3-4.

²⁸ Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 4.

within their community, an “eschatology that had begun to be realized.”²⁹ This time was directly connected to an agent of God, an idealized leader, who was described in typological form.

Xeravits’ survey demonstrates the three most common messianic types are a divine king (Davidic house, with great variance of terms *צמח דוד* and *נשיא העדה*), an eschatological prophetic figure (Deut 18:18-19; Mal 3:23-24), and the future expectation of a priestly leader (Melchizedek).³⁰ The emphasis with the kingly figure falls upon the importance of his relationship with the divine, thus eschatologizing themes of divine adoption. Texts commonly imagine the prophetic protagonist as Elijah or Moses who serve a precursor to the eschatological judgment. The ideal priestly leader serves as the head of the community both in the pre-judgment phrase and after the eschaton. While the three roles rarely appear in pure form (e.g., 1QSb V, 20-29; 4Q174, frag. 1, 10-13; 4Q521 frag. 2, II, 4-15; 11Q13 II, 14b-19), a combination of two types is more frequent (e.g., 4Q161 frag. 8, 18-21; Zech 4; 6:13; *Test. Simon* 7:2; *Test. Judah* 21:1-2; *Jubilees* 31).³¹ Thus, the Damascus Document I, 7 claims: “He took care of them and caused [them] to grow from Israel and from Aaron a root of planting to inherit His land and to grow fat on the good produce of His soil.” The divine agent descends from both Israel and Aaron, who is a political and priestly leader that will claim dominance over all of creation.³² Immediately following this passage, the Damascus Document states God’s continual provision of

²⁹ Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 7.

³⁰ See also the comparison work in Eric F. Mason, *You Are a Priest Forever: Second Temple Jewish Messianism and the Priestly Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Boston: Brill, 2008), and Martin G. Abegg, “1QSb and the Elusive High Priest” in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (vol 1; eds. Shalom Paul, Lawrence Schiffman, Robert Kraft, and Weston Fields; Leiden: Brill, 2003) 3-16. For an early, detailed analysis of messianic themes in Qumran literature, see John M. Allegro, “Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature.” *JBL* 75 (1956): 174-87.

³¹ See also John Liver, “The Doctrine of the Two Messiahs in the Sectarian Literature in the Time of the Second Common Wealth,” *HTR* 52 (1959): 149-185; Smith, Morton. “What is Implied by the Variety of Messianic Figures?” *JBL* 78 (1959): 66-72; Kuhn, Karl G. “The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel.” Pages 54-64 in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. Krister Stendahl; New York: Harper, 1957); George Brooke, “King and Messiah in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceeding of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* (ed. John Day; Sheffield: Sheffield Press, 1998), 435-455; Gerbern S. Oegeman, “Messianic Expectations in Qumran Writings: Theses on Their Development” in *Qumran-Messianism* (ed. James Charlesworth, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Gerbern S. Oegema; Tübingen: Mohr & Siebeck, 1998), 53-82. A more formal list of passages considered ‘messianic’ can be found in Craig E. Evans, “Qumran’s Messiah: How Important is He?” in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. John J. Collins and Robert A. Kugler; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 135-149. Xeravits’ conclusions are similar to F. García Martínez, “Messianische Erwartungen in den Qumran-schriften,” *Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie* 8 (1993): 171-208.

³² See also William Horbury, “The Messianic Associations of ‘the Son of Man,’” *JTS* 36 (1985): 34-55.

the community will manifest itself in a Teacher who will more fully reveal these truths.³³ There is no agreement among the sources who or in what role the ideal messiah will appear.

The advantage of organizing the data into messianic types is that the typological info can be brought to bear upon other interpretive issues.³⁴ Messianic types, just like other typologies, represent abstractions. Xeravits cannot ignore the evidence that in actual use, no one single metaphor of messiah is sufficient. Furthermore, a study of typology relies upon similar criteria as the History of Ideas approach: it is assumed that there existed a clear relationship between texts or collection of texts. Xeravits does not attempt to answer potentially the most pressing question surrounding the messianic typologies: what is the relationship between references to messiah across the complexity of texts? Xeravits' study is not precise enough to address how typologies relate to the historicity of the text beyond apocalypticism.

External Methodology

The third approach organizes the textual material through an criteria or method that emphasize external considerations. Comparative studies, such as that from Moshe Idel, identify at least four common methodological approaches to the study of messianism:

³³ Michael Wise argues that the Teacher of Righteousness fulfills the role of messiah within the sectarian group. He finds support for this perspective in several of the DSS, but especially the Thanksgiving Hymn (*The First Messiah: Investigating the Savior before Christ* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1999)). For Wise, when the Teacher passed away, his interpretive tradition became an identifying mark. To humanize the Teacher of Righteousness, Wise describes him as 'Judah.' He states, "The remnant was Judah's movement. They believed themselves to be 'in exile,' a notion whose genesis was the literal exile of Judah and his first followers. After Judah's death, under the pressure to reinterpret prophecy and so avoid disconfirmation, the literal seed had grown into a pattern, a typology. The genesis had become an exodus" (215). For a parallel argument, Knohl, *Messiah*.

³⁴ For example, Loren Stuckenbruck draws attention to the modes of angelic veneration in ancient Judaism in relation to messianism, arguing that the author of Revelation utilized the angelic tradition to elevate the position of Jesus relative to God. Using texts, inscriptions, and amulets that span from the Persian through the Rabbinic period, Stuckenbruck shows that the elevation of a messiah did not deviate from the monotheistic scheme in Second Temple Judaism. For instance, the polemic implicit in Hebrews 1:5-2:18 represents a safe guard rather than a polemic of messianism, for "the tradition taken up in Hebrews was targeted against cosmological ideas in which the fluidity of Hellenistic-Jewish speculation concerning angels and ideas about intermediary figures threatened to undermine the soteriological significance of Christ's exaltation" (Loren Stuckenbruck, *Angel Veneration and Christology* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2, Reihe 70; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 148.) In Revelation, the Lamb and God are never compared on a singular level. The author of the Apocalypse preserves the tradition that angelic beings are mentioned if not also worshiped alongside of YHWH, but never on their own and never over and above the *Theos*, despite the author's polytheistic-syncretistic environment in which "Christology and angelology were more tightly interwoven" (265). He concludes from the comparison of sources that reverence of angels was permissible within Second Temple monotheism and created a pattern from which high Christology developed. For a differing perspective on the relation between angels and messianism in Revelation, see Christopher Rowland, "The Vision of the Risen Christ." For more and competing studies on angelic beings in the Second Temple period, see Charles A. Gieschen, *Angelmorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence* (Leiden: Brill, 1998) and Susan R. Garrett, *No Ordinary Angel: Celestial Spirits and Christian Claims About Jesus* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008).

Messianism may be approached from various vantage points. The sociological approach emphasizes the expressions of messianism that appear in various strata of the population, particularly the masses, while the psychological approach is ideal for analyzing the messianic consciousness of the masses and the extraordinary personality of a Messiah. Messianism may also be studied as part of complex religious concepts, with the aim of integrating them into a certain theology or placing them within the framework of the history of ideas. Yet it is also possible to investigate the relationship between messianic awareness and an individual's private mystical experience.³⁵

The programs of study Moshe identifies provides a helpful grouping of approaches. As Moshe frames it, the sociological approach within messianism strives to define messianic expectation among the masses. The hope for "political and spiritual redemption was not always connected with the idea of a personal messiah,"³⁶ but upon return from Exile, Jews hoped for restoration of the Golden Age of Israel.³⁷

Similar to the History of Ideas approach, Moshe speculates too much in assuming a unified idea of messianism. Harris Lenowitz's *Jewish Messiahs* raises a similar stress in understanding the 'messianic mind.' There is no doubt for Lenowitz, whose background is in linguistics, that the literary records provide clear access to the minds of the messiahs.

When we examine the [accounts of messiahs] as a collection, they offer insight into Jewish messiahs and the messianic ritual. It is clear that these narratives cannot be taken as factual reports of the messiahs and their deeds; whatever "facts" might have been available are marshaled in them to guide the messiah and his followers in what they are doing and are then used again, after the event has occurred, to show how it was successful, how that messiah was and is real, or how it failed and that messiah was not in fact the messiah.³⁸

The character of one messiah is defined by previous messiahs, assuming a diachronic relationship between mindsets. When one messiah fails, another will arise and complete the script. Building upon the work of Gershom Sholem, Lenowitz's approach focuses upon the

³⁵ Moshe Idel, *Messianic Mystics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 1. I am indebted to Novenson, *The Grammar of Messianism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 4, for drawing out this point.

³⁶ Joseph Klausner, *The Messianic Idea*, 14.

³⁷ This hope is first highlighted in Heinrich Graetz, *History of the Jews* (ed. Bella Löwly; 6 vols; Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1891-98).

³⁸ Harris Lenowitz, *Jewish Messiahs* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 14.

apocalyptic and revolutionary figures whose charisma convinced the masses to revolt. In this sense, messianism was a regular method of criticism, a system by which individuals claimed over and over again the right to lead. The crossover between messiah and prophet becomes explicit. The power of the movement and, as a result, the authority of the leader, is based upon the individual's ability to rally people.

Richard Horsley more rigorously applies the social/psychological approach to understand how messianism and political movements relate in the Second Temple period. His primary avenue of study is investigating the sudden growth of sectarian division. He notes that standard portrayals of messianic movements only focus on sectarian groups that left behind a literary tradition, as Xeravits above, at the expense of other rival, mostly illiterate and poor, peasantry groups. This attention to literary remains has emphasized “*ideas* at the expense of other fears because of a strong interest in Jewish messianic expectations which Christians believed were fulfilled in Jesus, and because of the keen interest in the Pharisaic origins of rabbinic teachings.”³⁹ Horsley carefully marshals evidence from the Hebrew Bible, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, New Testament, Josephus and others to show that the primary conflict in Jewish Palestine was between the rich, Jewish elite and Romans, on the one hand, and the Jewish peasantry on the other.⁴⁰

According to Horsley, this social antagonism was intrinsic to the Israel-Jewish identity. He shows that from Israel's origins, popular groups stood in contrast to oppressive rule.⁴¹ When the monarchical leaders failed to honor the people of Israel, prophets rose to speak on behalf of the people. During Hellenistic rule and among the onset of new forms of imperialism, writers described the atrocities of oppression with the genre of apocalypticism to express hope and faith in God's judgment and future redemption. Under the economic crisis of Roman taxation, social banditry formed, which demonstrates a shift from theoretical to practical resistance. These

³⁹ Richard Horsley, *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs: Popular Movements in the Time of Jesus* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1985), 244, emphasis original.

⁴⁰ Horsley, *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs*, 245.

⁴¹ For another perspective on this point, see also Adam Green's *King Saul: The Truth History of the First Messiah*, in which he speculates that Saul is “the only person with a genuine claim to the title ‘king-messiah’” who was “traduced by the biblical chroniclers and consigned to an almost forgettable role in the national and spiritual history of the Jews” (21). Green suggests that by the time of David's death, he had “succeeded in weaving a mythology for his entire rise to power.” The David encountered in Second Temple Hebrew texts is “not only a fantastic tale, but also a fabulous alter ego in the form of the wonder-boy warrior and ‘beloved of God’” (21). Out of the conflict between Saul and David, messianism was born as a political form.

“brigands usually share, and often symbolized the common people’s fundamental sense of justice and their basic religious loyalty.”⁴² Out of their desire to honor God, these groups responded to Roman directives and oppression.

Central to Horsley’s thesis is the rectification of two movements, royal messianic movements and prophetic movements. “It is striking,” Horsley claims, “that throughout the whole Hellenizing reform, Antiochean persecution, and Maccabean revolt, there is no evidence of a revival of royal messianic hopes.”⁴³ However, the audacities of the failing Hasmonean and the commencement of harsh Roman rule provoked and called for the reinstatement of popular kingship. According to Josephus, several figures (Judas, son of Ezekias (*War* 2.56); Simon, servant of Herod (*War* 2.57-9); Athronges, a shepherd (*War* 2.60-65); Menahem (*Ant.* 15); Simon bar Giora (*War* 4-7)) came from ‘humble origins’ to contend for control.⁴⁴ “The principal goal of these movements was to overthrow Herodian and Roman domination and to restore the traditional ideals of a free and egalitarian society.”⁴⁵ These figures are similar to but distinct from prophetic movements. Taking the form of new *shophet(s)*, these prophets (Theudas; Tholomaus; the unnamed Egyptian; John the Baptist; Jesus, son of Hananiah) claimed to be, or were interpreted by the Romans as, apocalyptic military and religious-political leaders who address “concrete social-historical situations and announcing that God was still concerned about, and active in, those situations.”⁴⁶ These two types of movements rallied the populace against Roman legislation in low levels of protestation, climaxing in the First Jewish Revolt. Horsley’s advances finally break the barrier between the textual evidence and context. Messianism, according to Horsley, was a form of resistance against foreign overseers. By framing messianism as a movement within a specific class, his theory demonstrates a strong relation between ideology and movements of authority and power.

The most recent theoretical approach to messianism is Matthew Novenson’s 2017 *Grammar of Messianism*. Novenson argues that, although these perspectives all approach the

⁴² Horsley, *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs*, 49.

⁴³ Horsley, *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs*, 101.

⁴⁴ Horsley, *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs*, 115.

⁴⁵ Horsley, *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs*, 116.

⁴⁶ Horsley, *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs*, 152.

messianic tradition from different angles, they are using the same linguistic categories. He states, “Although one might not know it from the modern history of research, what we call messianism is most basically a way of talking about the world, a set of linguistic resources – and, equally important, linguistic constraints – inherited from the Jewish scriptures.”⁴⁷ Novenson builds upon Ludwig Wittgenstein’s *Philosophical Investigations*, which understands language not as “a set of common symbols corresponding to things in the world, but rather a set of rules for a particular kind of discourse.”⁴⁸ In relation to messianism, authors are engaging in a “language game,” that negotiates “a common set of social realities by using a common set of scriptural source texts to solve a common set of interpretive puzzles.”⁴⁹ For Novenson, the ‘grammar of messianism’ is the rule that guides and limits the discursive possibilities of messiah figures. Authors initiate a well-used exegetical approach to make sense of their current problems: they impute the past upon the present by applying the cultural and religious notion of messiah to their current context.⁵⁰ Novenson believes that following the legend of David, “all subsequent messiah language inherits the twin ideological poles of ancestry and merit, rightful succession and divine inspiration. All early Jewish and Christian messiah texts, therefore have to navigate both these poles, and in practice do so in creative ways that suit its own rhetorical ends.”⁵¹ Extrapolating from Novenson’s linguistic theory, Jesus, for example, represents a messianic figure within a large diversity of Second Temple Judaism. He symbolizes a Davidic scion in Matthew, a revealed emissary from God in Mark, and the pre-existent Son of Man in John. Framing it as a ‘language game,’ Novenson emphasizes how messianism functioned as a repeatable linguistic phenomenon that is defined by specific ideological poles.

Direction of Previous Studies

This brief history indicates the study of messianism has functionally changed over time, as it moved from religious interest of salvation history to a more precise understanding of

⁴⁷ Novenson, *Grammar of Messianism*, 14.

⁴⁸ Novenson, *Grammar of Messianism*, 12.

⁴⁹ Novenson, *Grammar of Messianism*, 12.

⁵⁰ Klausner was well aware of this: “the fashioning of the Jewish Messianic idea is inevitably influenced by the outstanding historical events of the time” (*Messianic*, 401).

⁵¹ Novenson, *Grammar of Messianism*, 112.

messianism within the textual evidence of Second Temple Judaism. Klausner and Mowinkle are limited by their teleological focus upon the messiah as an agent of transformation. The messiah cannot be separated from its eschatological framework. Studies of individual terms (e.g., Xeravits) demonstrate how respective authors incorporate a messiah into their narratives as an expression of hope, without making assumptions about the universality of that hope. Additional approaches deploy specific criteria or methodologies to interpret the figure (e.g., Horsley), providing additional depth into the relation of the textual references to messiah and the larger social world. The three approaches are both concentric and diachronic: concentric in that the initial concerns of language, ideology, and social location limit the field of inquiry; diachronic, in that every approach acknowledges in some sense the longevity of the concept of the messiah.

Discourse as Social Power

Novenson's recent methodological approach is a helpful starting place to think about messianism outside of the ideological limitations of religious inquiries (salvation history) and philological approaches that highlight individual terms. Recognizing 'messianism' as a coherent 'language' that touches upon ideological poles helps to further explain its repeated use. But what benefit is messianism? Novenson's claim that all messianism revolves around specific ideological poles should immediately draw our attention to the dynamics of messianism. If it is a regular way of describing the world, what does it accomplish? If it is synthesized into regular patterns of language, what can be said about those patterns? And how do the nuances of writing, such as literary dynamics, genre, and social context, affect the use of messianism? While extremely helpful, Novenson's inductive approach does not go far enough to position messianism in relation to social linguistic studies in order to appreciate the depth of messianism as a linguistic phenomenon.

To see the minute, sometimes we must scale up our view. I attempt to move us from the lexeme level to subsection or pericope level of individual texts. Paired with historical critical tools, I draw upon Pierre Bourdieu's work as a framework to argue that messianic discourse should be more broadly understood in relation to claims of social power.⁵² To frame messianism

⁵² The subfield of Language Ideology definitively raises concern about the relation of language, speakers, and claims for power. As an offspring of Bourdieu, Language Ideology initially developed as a study of culturally distinctive patterns of speech (e.g., Paul Friedrich, "Language, Ideology, and Political Economy," *American Anthropologist* 91 (1989): 295-312; Susan Gal,

as a discourse is to claim that it is inherently dialectical, with two or more participants, and unintelligible without a broader literary and social context. While these relationships might be observed and constructed through material evidence, this project focuses upon the occurrences of messianic discourse within ancient literature for the traditions represented therein are witness to a linguistic phenomenon. The presence of evidence relating to messianism defines the social field.⁵³ The intent of these nuances is to expand Novenson's understanding of messianic language within the scheme of social dynamics within Second Temple Judaism. With these concerns in place, I now turn to Bourdieu's theory of language that provides a framework by which I approach messianic discourse. Bourdieu's theory is foundational for this project, but I present it as the scaffolding to support my research into specific case studies of messianic discourse. The case studies that follow implicitly incorporate this theory.

Framing messianism primarily within the terms of language rather than in terms of religion broadly or corpus is frequently overlooked. However, a purely philological approach to messianism falls within the science of language, rather than the social science of language.⁵⁴ At its most basic level, language manifests itself in written and spoken forms that are both descriptive and communicative. Phonemes are imputed with meaning through organizational structure and social context. Sounds themselves have no meaning, but when voiced to another, an actor creates agency, an ability to shape the world. Although Novenson uses the term

"Language and Political Economy," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 18 (1989): 345-367), though some scholars focused more on the sociocultural emphasis. Judith Irvine, for instance, defines Language Ideology as "any sets of beliefs about language articulated by the users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use" (Irvine, "Language Ideology" *Oxford Bibliographies*, <https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199766567/obo-9780199766567-0012.xml?rsk=kdffiR&result=2&q=Language+Ideology#firstMatch>, accessed January 20, 2020; cf. Irvine, "When Talk Isn't Cheap: Language and Political Economy," *American Ethnologist* 16 (1989): 248-267). Several authors, across several geographical and ideological regions, appropriate messianism and so Language Ideology may be too narrow an approach in that it focuses upon the language structure itself or language in relation to political realms, rather than the social efficacy of the language within context. The strength of Bourdieu's approach is that it understands that material culture plays an equally important role in claims of power. In addition, Bourdieu's categorization of specific fields of influence in which language is deployed, narrowly defines the field of influence, delimiting the scope of this study. I will defend this sentiment below.

⁵³ Although my nuances proposed here are definitively shaped by French language experts, primarily Pierre Bourdieu and Michel Foucault, I am not tied to the structuralist programs represented by their early respective works that focused upon functional organization of social arrangements. Rather, in closer alignment with their later works, that the meaning of messianism is best illuminated at the intersection of linguistic, sociopolitical relationships and systems that support them. Cf., Elizabeth Clark, *History, Theory, Text: Historians and the Linguistic Turn* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004); Nancy Partner, "'There is No Verb for History: Practicing Historians and Postmodern Theory,'" *Graduate Faculty Philosophy Journal* 37 (2016): 325-40; François Dosse, *History of Structuralism: The Sign Sets, 1967-Present* (trans. Deborah Glassman; 2 vols; Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press, 1997).

⁵⁴ Pierre Bourdieu, *Language & Symbolic Power* (ed. and intro. John B Thompson; trans. Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982), 107.

‘grammar’ as a collective statement to describe the qualifications that delimit messianism, the more common meaning of a grammar is the whole system and structure of language with layers of semiotic complexity. To describe messianism with the term of ‘grammar’ places it at a hermeneutical center, but Novenson does not provide enough methodological support to suggest how messianism relates to and shapes other factors.

All language is organized on both the micro-organizational level, the functional difference between grammatical expressions (such as nouns and verbs) that create a collected expression of that agency, and the macro-organizational level of sentences, discourse that creates a unified communication of one or more parties. Although Novenson utilizes the term ‘grammar’ to describe a means of categorization, messianism is more appropriately defined as a discourse, which shifts attention away from the often-stilted hierarchical system of systems associated with the meaning of specific words. Marianne Mithun states this well: “Grammar provides speakers with tools for packing information... Many of the grammatical choices speakers make at all levels – morphology, simple clause structure, and complex sentence structure – can be detected and understood only with respect to the discourse situation.”⁵⁵ Discourse defines communication at a more complex organizational level than a real or analogized level of grammar, but at a less complex level than ‘language.’

Discourse is situational and naturally dialectic, in that every communication operates on behalf of the originator towards the receiver. Language is never accidental nor without purpose. When people communicate, they communicate with intentionality, though this intentionality is multifarious, multidirectional, and at times with competing purposes. The range of intentionality, for example, spans from spreading information (e.g., news report), to persuasive presentations (e.g., political speeches), and even providing humor (e.g., a stand-up comedian). The intentionality of communication cannot be sorted abstractly into separate categories; something that was intended as humor may also be informative. Other, second-order linguistic cues may further define discourse, such as irony, sarcasm, and intonation, elements that are potentially obscured in written forms of discourse.⁵⁶ While discourse has verbal and non-verbal elements, Bourdieu’s framework amplifies how language, spoken and written, relies on social conventions

⁵⁵ Marianne Mithun, “Discourse and Grammar” in *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (Ed. by Deborah Tannen, Heidi E. Hamilton, and Deborah Schiffrin; 2nd ed.; Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2018), 11-41, here 12.

⁵⁶ Cf., Michael Silverstein, “Metapragmatic Discourse and metapragmatic Function,” in *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics* (ed. John A. Lucy; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 33-58.

that establish and sustain social constructs. Because the central focus of this project is messianism in ancient texts, I will use the terms ‘speaker’ and ‘author’ within the introduction interchangeably to describe the originator of the communication.⁵⁷

Discourse is always situational because it stands between an originator and a receiver. The content of the communication is important, but the social, cultural, and religious position of the speaker is equally important because language mediates the relationship to institutions of authority. The receiver has the possibility to accept or reject the communication of the originator. The receiver evaluates the communication not only on a descriptive level, but also on a prescriptive level. When those who have authority speak, they do so with the authority of their authorizing institution and social body. The speaker’s words communicate more than an abstract or simple idea or need. The receiver’s evaluation of the discourse analyzes the descriptive and performative force of the language, for the discourse represents not only the values of the speaker, but that of the institutions in which the speaker participates. The subtlety of the conflict draws upon “highly ambiguous vocabulary of rules, the language of grammar, morality, and law, to express a social practice that in fact obeys quite different principles.”⁵⁸ The receiver must choose to participate in or reject the discourse shaped by the speaker, who represents a social, cultural, and religious positionality when they speak. Those not associated with the institution of authority can make the same declaration, but the inherent communication is different. The difference is, in Bourdieu’s words, “the straight forward imposture of masqueraders, who disguise a performative utterance as a descriptive or constative statement, and the authorized imposture of those who do the same thing with the authorization and the authority of an institution.”⁵⁹ Language is a performative act by nature, but the power to enact that communication expressed in that language is defined by the circumstantial sphere – the speaker, the receiver, and the social and historical context. The efficacy of the language is based upon the speaker’s position to the authorizing institution. A declared utterance will fail if the speaker does not have the authority to make such a declaration.

⁵⁷ The problems of authorship and compositional status of texts constantly remain in the background of this formulation. For the sake of clarity, I will address specific questions of authorship in each chapter.

⁵⁸ Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, 19.

⁵⁹ Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, 109.

Language is never acontextual or asocial. Bourdieu hypothesizes that all content of communication reflects a collective ideology. While the communication highlights the ideological tension within the current context, it is also diachronic in nature: the communication may or may not take into account the inherited and contextual meaning of the language, as the speaker shapes the communication. The language and deployment of the communication is simultaneously adopted and adapted from the position of the speaker. Similarities and differences are equally important, for if language is truly diachronic the speaker places herself in relation to that context. This highlights that the powerful have a dominant position to use communication as an instrument of “knowledge and expression of social reality,” a non-arbitrary organization of the world.⁶⁰ When placed together, these ideological instruments create symbolic systems of thought.

Communication establishes and sustains these systems. Bourdieu claims,

...it is not enough to note that relations of communication are always, inseparable, power relations which, in form and content, depend on the material or symbolic power accumulated by the agents (or institutions) involved in these relations and which, like the gift or the potlatch, can enable symbolic power to be accumulated. It is as structured and structuring instruments of communication and knowledge that ‘symbolic systems’ fulfill their political function, as instruments which help to ensure that one class dominates another (symbolic violence) by bringing their own distinctive power to bear on the relations of power which underlie them and thus by contributing...to the ‘domestication of the dominated.’⁶¹

Communication, for Bourdieu, is the metaphorical space in which the powerful claim and express their social dominance. Language serves as the key component in this expression and collection of social power. Likewise, this study approaches the ancient literature as the metaphorical space in which some Jews claim authority over and against other Jews.

Bourdieu was expressly interested in understanding how language shaped relationship through inherited patterns or *habitus*. His concept of *habitus* takes us to an important nexus by which language and society mutually develop. Although he employs the concept in several competing manners, the term *habitus* describes ingrained thought, traditions, and conditioned dispositions within a person. More than just someone’s habits, these actions are conditioned

⁶⁰ Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, 168.

⁶¹ Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, 167.

responses to specific stimuli. For Bourdieu, *habitus* is acquired through imitation of actions and representation of the ideals of institutions. These dispositions are not innate but learned traits, defined by class, religion, ethnicity, and education, among other things. *Habitus* is a force that both frees and constrains based on the norms and values of the respective institutions that exert force upon the individual. While *habitus* primarily represents learned responses, these responses in some contexts are forced, in that participants are not permitted to appropriate the *habitus* of institutions with which they are not associated. When communication commences between a speaker and receiver, both parties perform according to their *habitus*.

Bourdieu understands *habitus* was inherited through interaction with varying institutions. To delineate the institutional relationships, Bourdieu structures *habitus* within diverse *fields* of relationships. A *field* is an instrument “for knowing and constructing the world of objects.”⁶² These fields are both conceptual and tangible, in that the field, such as religion, include concepts of the world (belief in a divine figure) and objects associated with that belief (e.g., altar, temple). A field “represents a structuring power only because they themselves are structured,” creating a means of social integration and ideological consensus.⁶³ A simplified example is that to participate in the religious structure of a temple, it may be assumed one has a belief in the god represented by the temple. Bourdieu’s theory with *habitus* implies the contrary, that the belief may or may not be the primary reason for participation within the temple, but participation represents engagement within that symbolic system.

Institutions are defined as collective groups within the respective fields, bound together through mutual interests. The use of this term is very general because the institution may or may not be a formalized group but represents a minimum social constituency for utterance to be effective. Nor are participants members of only one institution, but simultaneously hold shared identities and competing interests. This lack of specificity does not remove an institution’s active agency within the social parameters, for the institution is a network of relationships. This understanding of institution is not limited to economic realms, but social and cultural spheres as well. When a speaker communicates, the communication is filtered through the speaker’s network of relationships. The hypothetical speaker and receiver may claim different relations to

⁶² Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, 164.

⁶³ Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, 166.

these networks, and these differences are shaped by the socio-economic, religious, political, and familial contexts, among others. The possibilities of comparison are endless.

Language is also at the heart of the ‘symbolic systems’ for institutions. Overt or subtle expressions of power in language represent the symbolic overtures of the social, cultural, and economic capital or power of an institution. Bourdieu uses the language of capital to describe the “accumulated labor (in its materialized form or its ‘incorporated,’ embodied form) which, when appropriated on a private, i.e., exclusive, basis by agents or groups of agents, enables them to appropriate social energy in the form of reified or living labor.”⁶⁴ Bourdieu finds this principle underlying to all societies, without which there is no opportunity, no competition, and the community is without inertia.⁶⁵

Capital (power) takes a long period of time to accumulate, some of which contains immediate payoff and other capital that develops over time. The distribution and structure of different types and subtypes of capital represent the “immanent structure of the social world.”⁶⁶ While this view of society pushes beyond an economic framework of the world (Marxism), it reduces the universe to a system of exchanges that focuses upon the cost and benefit of all interactions.⁶⁷ Bourdieu advocates that this gain (capital) presents itself within three interconnected forms, and I describe them here in brief to further contextualize how messianic discourse effects as a capital.

Bourdieu defines *cultural capital* as a nonmaterial form of social influence or privilege. This privilege permits special rights, advantages, or immunity to an individual. While the capital itself dies with an individual, it is not unique to one individual; it is embodied and communicable through the institutions described above. It is the expression of “external wealth converted into an integral part of the person, into a *habitus*.”⁶⁸ This influence is initially inherited through

⁶⁴ Pierre Bourdieu, “The Forms of Capital” in *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (ed. J. Richardson; Westport: Greenwood, 1986), 241-58, here 241.

⁶⁵ Bourdieu, “The Forms of Capital,” 241.

⁶⁶ Bourdieu, “The Forms of Capital,” 242.

⁶⁷ Bourdieu uses the term *transubstantiation* here to describe the connection between the material and immaterial in relation to ‘capital’ (“The Forms of Capital,” 242).

⁶⁸ Bourdieu, “The Forms of Capital,” 245. I am conflicted by the language of *habitus* in relation to messianism. In previous conference presentations, I argued that Bourdieu’s *habitus* might be equated with a messianic *worldview*, a comprehensive understanding of the individual’s perspective of the world shaped around a messiah. John J. Collins was, to my knowledge, the

familial settings, but becomes institutionalized through access to education and other capitals. Thus, it is class oriented. Cultural capital cannot be “accumulated beyond the appropriating capacities of the individual agent,” nor is it fully transferable beyond someone’s death.⁶⁹ Bourdieu claims it manifests among people in three states: an embodied state, within one’s own *habitus*; an objectified state, in the form of cultural objects (e.g., pictures, books, instruments); and the institutionalized state, within cultural entities.⁷⁰ Books are a helpful object to consider in this case. The books on a shelf, whether or not the owner has read it, represent to an observer something of the subject: their potential education level, their potential beliefs of the world, their assumed values, and their possible social location (field).

Social capital is the advantage of relationships, including family and social networks, that is institutionalized in the form of social mobility.⁷¹ It is “the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network or more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition.”⁷² While objects might represent these relationships, social capital is based primarily upon immaterial and expressed symbolic exchanges. Obligations imputed to others and freely accepted creates a series of exchanges in which individuals claim, authorize, and exchange social power. These networks are the product of long-term investment strategies. One may inherit a social network based on birth, but it is not necessarily given – the connections are built through long-term commitment. This form of capital is most clearly witnessed in group dynamics. The contextual success of one individual versus another is based on the speaker’s ability to designate their position as an ideal, as

first to utilize the category of worldview as an interpretive approach to messianism and ancient Jewish apocalyptic texts. In his monograph *Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), Collins defines a worldview as a central component or construct upon which an ideology, the values of the collective, is formed. The apocalyptic worldview is a belief in supernatural revelation, the heavenly world, and eschatological judgment. In this sense, a worldview is the building blocks that make up someone’s ideological outlook and the genre is the medium by which that ideology is expressed. While Collins’ focus upon the genre of apocalypticism creates heuristic categories to organize texts, it over-postulates a connection between the belief of the author(s) and the texts (e.g., those who wrote apocalyptic texts believed in an apocalyptic organization of the world). There is no way to substantiate the claim based on extant evidence. This break in thought caused me to realize that if someone can write about apocalypticism and not ‘believe’ in it, then that certainly holds true for messianism. I think the category of worldview or *habitus* is still a helpful category but might only be applicable when there is a culturally authoritative or imperial system that supports and enforces its socioreligious perspectives. There is more work to be done on this subject.

⁶⁹ Bourdieu, “The Forms of Capital,” 245.

⁷⁰ Bourdieu, “The Forms of Capital,” 243.

⁷¹ Bourdieu, “The Forms of Capital,” 242.

⁷² Bourdieu, “The Forms of Capital,” 248.

representative of one network or ideology over another, and marked by institutional rites: someone is designated welcome in a group or may be designated into different positions.

Bourdieu claims:

If the internal competition for the monopoly of legitimate representation of the group is not to threaten the conversion and accumulation of the capital which is the basis of the group, the members of the group must regulate the conditions of access to the right to declare oneself a member of the group, and above all, to set oneself up as a representative of the whole group, thereby committing the social capital of the group.

Social capital is closely regulated and imputed to individuals within groups. That power is only removed through conflict.

The third form is *economic capital*, or assets that are “immediately and directly convertible into money and may be institutionalized in the form of property rights.”⁷³ For Bourdieu, it is assumed that those who have assets seek to preserve control and rights over them. These assets are purely physical in nature, but cannot be separated from the other two forms of capital: without social and cultural capital, individuals have little chance of access or ability to obtain and keep assets; neither does elevation of social capital exist without economic or cultural capital.

For Bourdieu, the unifying factor and tool of disbursement of capital is language – that is, written or spoken, in descriptive or performative manner – for it represents a symbolic system. At the discourse level, communication is inherently diachronic and confrontational, because a speaker builds upon inherited forms of communication, which places the speaker in a specific context of institutions and the respective fields in which those institutions operate; and confrontational, in that the speaker must decide how to respond. When these communications are summed, they represent symbolic systems that express power toward the securing of capital. Only the powerful can access and wield this capital.

Messianic Discourse

Bourdieu’s deductive understanding of language as symbolic power is a more useful methodology by which to analyze messianism than the language of “grammar.” The earliest reference to the concept of a messiah in the Second Temple period is in manuscripts that

⁷³ Bourdieu, “The Forms of Capital,” 242.

represent a complex cultural capital that maintained an ideological relationship to the people who inhabited ancient Israel and their respective traditions. Stemming from different ideological circles, the texts are remnants of competing respective ideologies. I frame the four test cases below as the point of contact between respective social groups where one group claims a messiah in some way to achieve some amount of capital. Bourdieu's methodology highlights the socio-political aspects of that language. This is not to claim that belief in messianism was ubiquitous in the Second Temple period, or even that all members of groups who reference a messiah figure in their writings believed everything that was claimed about the messiah.

I suggest that the evidence of messianism is better understood as a linguistic phenomenon utilized to define group dynamics. While messianism on the discourse level might have been a means of referring to external power, texts represent static instantiations of that referential process. I hypothesize that ancient authors inherently understood what it meant to claim a close relationship to YHWH through a relationship with the messiah, and this became an integral part in the literary life of some ancient Jews. Thus, a central claim of this project is that those who claimed to be the messiah asserted that their closeness to God gave them knowledge and power to pass judgment on all aspects of life. One group presents their perspectives as the right and proper expression of Judaism. In this way, the longevity and effect of Jewish messianism is a byproduct of textualization.

Two brief examples introduce this intersection between Bourdieu's social linguistic theory and Second Temple Jewish messianism. The hope for the restoration of the Davidic Kingdom in 2 Samuel 7 expected God to intervene within human history to displace those who have wrongly supplanted the people of God and place a Davidic heir upon the throne of Israel. Likewise, the Son of Man in Daniel 7 presumes God will intervene within human history to pass judgment upon those who have wrongly supplanted the people of God. These two expressions represent a long literary and social development; that authors returned to this language suggests to me that there was a recognition that they were successful in claiming social, cultural, and economic capital: both expressions make a number of assumptions concerning the rights and ownership of land, financial and cultural resources, military strength, and social positionality of those relating to the God of Israel. Where 2 Sam 7 imagines a removal of the antagonists and the restoration of God's people to the land, Dan 7 describes the destruction and recreation of all of existence. These two manifestations rely upon different concepts concerning the course for the

end of existence, the problem and extent of evil, and the manner in which God will intervene into creation. The teleological purposes of these manifestations appear diametrically opposed, yet claim a similar relation to the God of Israel. References to the messiah in these two sources indicate in its earliest form, originators deployed messianic discourse to shift cultural capital against economic abuses and those who possessed it. The argumentative affect of the narratives draws the recipients into a tighter social and political bond in the author's community.

If we reconceive of messianism within Bourdieu's understanding of symbolic power, the earliest manifestations of messianism appear as a minor element within the cultural and social capital of competing ancient Jewish groups. Claiming to be a messiah, or a claim of relationship to a messiah, imputed authority upon specific agents to reimagine and reorganize the world. From the point of view of the collective, the messiah metaphorically served as the sharp tool of dissent against other individuals or collectives. In later manifestations, messianism appears as the defining element that mediates social placement and advancement within the community: the true members of the community follow the direction and teachings of the messiah, while those who do not follow the messiah will suffer consequences. This reconstruction purports that as groups developed within the Second Temple period, responding to each other and other cultural and political forces, the messiah became a defining mark of some collectives (Bourdieu's institutions) within their specific social context (fields). In this sense, messianism becomes a window into the socioreligious make-up of some ancient Jewish religious groups. Due to its accumulating effect within the theory of symbolic language, messianism is better understood as a discourse of power that builds upon other values of the collective and is aimed at other parties inside of the collective.

Bourdieu's approach emphasizes that a medium is not linked to ideology but function. In each of these texts, the messiah is associated with the protagonists or righteous group, and speaks and acts over and against the antagonists, those the authors depict as evil. The unifying function of this discourse is in its deployment within ethnic conflict. Early in the Second Temple period, authors utilize, for example, the images of the Davidic heir and the Son of Man to critique those who abuse power outside of the Jews. Building upon these disparate images, the Gospel authors combine characteristics of both literary figures to address those within the community. This use of messianism across several texts of different genres suggests that this was a static symbol of power, which is not limited to the genre of apocalyptic.

Advantages of this Approach

The dexterity of this approach is that it builds upon the knowledge of previous approaches while synthesizing texts from a sociolinguistics perspective. Removing the limitations of previous studies brings greater appreciation for the diversity of messiah figures and ancient religious traditions. Studying messiah figures from a confined time frame both illuminates the diversity of Jewish messianism and resists the homogenizing effect of previous studies. Messianism, as Novenson points out, has a long history of research with no new evidence. By utilizing an explicit methodology that focuses upon the sociohistorical function of messianism, this approach permits me to study not only the location of its occurrences in texts, but the perceived social ramifications of its use.

Text and non-textual material alike are equal participants within messianic discourse. The second advantage of Bourdieu's approach is that it permits the use of non-textual data to complement textual data. Objects, like texts, are participants within socioreligious and sociopolitical developments. Coins, for example, depict the success of rulers. The Hasmonean leaders stamped small copper coins (prutah) with images on the verso and a Hebrew inscription with the leaders' names listed on the recto. The images, such as a palm branch, lily, and anchor, exemplified local symbols, while other symbols, such as a wreath, sun dial, and cornucopia are likely adaptations from Greek culture. It does not matter whether or not the images originated within the cultural borders of ancient Israel; what is important is the combination of text and image on the object that associates a ruler with the cultural signs. As a form of currency, which all citizens are required to use, the image, words, and potential social contexts associated with coins combine to make a unifying theme that celebrates the respective ruler's ability to symbolically provide (cornucopia) or to bring about peace (palm branch). This advantage is especially helpful in the analysis of the Bar Kokhba (Kosiba) materials discussed in chapter five.

The third advantage of language as symbolic power is that it locates the earliest textual evidence of messianism as the product of a slim minority in the ancient world.⁷⁴ Although literacy rates shift depending on biases and personal assumptions of the ancient world, generous

⁷⁴ Michael Owen Wise, *Language & Literacy in Roman Judea: A Study of the Bar Kochba Documents* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015) highlights that ancient Judea was likely trilingual as early as the second century BCE. The act of writing was a professional activity and limited to a very few who were responsible for religious and political roles in society.

estimates posit rates at no more than seven percent of the population.⁷⁵ As Karel van der Toorn states, “‘high literacy’ was confined to a small group.”⁷⁶ If literacy was so low, it is a logical assumption that the earliest textual evidence of messianism stems from the upper class. This assumption locates the origin of messianism within the upper-class institutions. I take this point as a foundational presupposition that necessitates an approach beyond traditional philological approaches.

The fourth advantage of this approach is that the isolation of evidence representing key messianic figures is illuminating for both the fields of history and anthropology. One messianic claimant builds upon the work, teachings, and influence of previous claimants. The claimant may apply the same symbolic language as a previous claimant, yet his or her context is different. We might infer from this that the figure hoped to produce similar (or better) results. The study of messianic discourse can help us better understand the duration and effect of symbolic language, and the nature of messiahs, if they or their followers deploy a specific form of messianism. From the perspective of anthropology, the study of messianic discourse reveals the function of language within sociopolitical tensions. Messianic discourse will provide another approach by which we might study ancient and modern sects who utilize different forms of capital (power) to shape sociopolitical and socioreligious relationships.

Definition of “Jew” and “Judaism”

But *who* are the collectives who utilized this discourse within ancient Jewish social, religious, and ethnic tensions? Throughout this study, I will use the term Judaism in the singular, though I understand the term to represent a diversity of religious and ethnic traditions relating to Judaism.⁷⁷ Ἰουδαῖος in its primary instance references “a member of the tribe of Judah.” Josephus, one of our earliest sources, states, “From the time they went up from Babylon they

⁷⁵ Karel van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007), 10.

⁷⁶ Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 10.

⁷⁷ The question of ethnic distinctions among ancient Jews is currently a hot topic. For examples, see Matthew Thiessen, who argues that while Jews were defined ethnically by circumcision, circumcision for non-Jews did not equate to conversion (*Contesting Conversion: Genealogy, Circumcision, and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Christianity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)). Isaac Oliver analyzes Torah praxis in Matthew and Luke and concludes that both authors portray Jesus within Judaism, in terms of keeping Shabbat, kashrut, and circumcision, among other praxes (*Torah Praxis after 70 CE: Reading Matthew and Luke-Acts as Jewish Texts* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe; Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 537-38). For Oliver, these texts uphold Jewish boundaries while in some instances, push a broadening of the movement. This broadening, however, does not require non-Jews to acquiesce to Jewish halakha.

were called by this name (Ἰουδαῖοι) after the tribe of Judah” (Ant. 11.173). For Josephus, Ἰουδαῖος is bonded with the land, but his Roman audience frames their identity in relation to conquest of land. Although he grew up in Judea, does his language reflect the Roman method of describing people based on their location? We cannot be sure. Neither is it clear whether Josephus meant this usage in terms of social, religious, or ethnic sense. Summarizing several studies, David Miller defines ethnicity as “an abstract noun derived by non-vernacular morphological processes from a substantive that does not exist ... a term that only makes sense in a context of relativities, of processes of identification, and that nevertheless aspires to concrete and positive status both as an attribute and as an analytical ‘concept.’”⁷⁸ This description reinforces that as an abstract noun, ethnicity is a fluid concept defined by its context. Does a text that references Ἰουδαῖος speak specifically of Jews or Judeans, assuming a unified bond based on shared religious and ethnic continuities?⁷⁹ Or are shared religious and/or ethnic continuities anachronistic in their entirety and the only probable collection of this people group is their real or imagined connection to land, an ethnic-geographic term?

Scholars’ responses have run the gamut of an ethnic-geographical emphasis to a religious distinction. Shaye Cohen makes those conceptual connections by defining Jewish ethnicity as “a named group, attached to a specific territory, whose members shared a common sense of origins, claimed a common and distinctive history and destiny, possessed one or more distinctive characteristics, and felt a sense of collective uniqueness and solidarity.”⁸⁰ For Cohen, Ἰουδαῖος is an ethnic-geographical term because, similar to Josephus, the nature of Ἰουδαῖος carries its basis in a connection to the land of Judea.⁸¹

⁷⁸ Chapman, M., M. McDonald and E. Tonkin, “Introduction – History and Social Anthropology,” in *History and Ethnicity* (ed. E. Tonkin, M. McDonald and M. Chapman; ASA Monographs; London: Routledge, 1989): 1-21, here 16, citing David Miller, “Ethnicity Comes of Age: An Overview of Twentieth-Century Terms for *Ioudaios*,” *CBR* 10, 2 (2012): 293-311, here 294.

⁷⁹ Reflecting upon the Jesus-movement, Amy-Jill Levine brilliantly states, “The translation ‘Jew,’ however, signals a number of aspects of Jesus’ behavior and that of other ‘Jews’, whether Judean, Galilean, or from the Diaspora: circumcision, wearing tzitzit, keeping kosher, calling God ‘father,’ attending synagogue gatherings, reading Torah and Prophets, knowing that they are neither non-Jews nor Samaritans, honoring the Sabbath, and celebrating the Passover. All these, and much more, are markers also of traditional Jews today. Continuity outweighs the discontinuity” (*The Misunderstood Jew: The Church and the Scandal of the Jewish Jesus* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2006), 161-66, here 162).

⁸⁰ Shaye Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (Berkeley: University of California Press), 7.

⁸¹ See also Steve Mason, “Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History,” *JSJ* 38, 4 (2007): 457-512. He states, “According to both insiders and outsiders, the *Ioudaioi* (just like Egyptians, Syrians, Romans, etc.) were an *ethnos* with all of the usual accoutrements” (484). Cf., Anders Runesson, “Inventing Christian Identity: Paul, Ignatius, and

Opposite him, E. P. Sanders believes that focus upon Jewish diversity distracts from the core of Judaism. According to Sanders, there is only a singular form of Judaism that is defined by halakha, or in Sanders' terms, "covenantal nomism." The election of Jews by the God of Israel established an unending agreement of relationship, bound around specific requirements. The value of the relationship depends upon proper intention and obedience. The variance of practice and organization does not nullify this grouping under the laws preserved in the early Second Temple Jewish texts. Sanders rejects any assumption that "Judaism was divided into parties."⁸²

In his preface to the now classic *Judaism and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*, Jacob Neusner insisted that it is in some ways disingenuous to collapse the manifestations of norms or peoples under the single heading Ἰουδαῖοι. He maintains, "All we propose is to describe things item by item, and to postpone the work of searching for connections and even continuities until all the components have had their say, one by one."⁸³ By dividing out segments of Judaism, he reasons, we can see with greater clarity the commonalities.⁸⁴ Neusner's sentiment is helpful because it reminds interpreters that each tradition is a representative of Judaism. The division is only as thorough as the criteria by which each text is separated.

This is an important distinction in relation to messianism because in the examples explored in this project, the messiah defines who is or is not a part of the 'Jews,' the 'Judeans,' and 'Judah.' It cannot be ignored that in the ancient world this collective solidarity was based in ethnicity, politics, and religion. The fine line between a religious and ethical obligation is almost impossible to determine. BDAG raises a similar concern in the entry for Ἰουδαῖος, "Complicating the semantic problem is the existence side by side of persons who had genealogy

Theodosius," in *Exploring Early Christian Identity* (ed. Bengt Holmberg; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 62-70; Moshe David Herr, "The Identity of the Jewish People Before and After the Destruction of the Second Temple: Continuity or Change?" in *Jewish Identities in Antiquity: Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern* (ed. Lee Levine and Daniel Schwartz; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 211-36; Philip Esler, *The Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 63-74.

⁸² E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE-66CE* (Philadelphia: Trinity, 1992); see also, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism; Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Trinity, 1990).

⁸³ Jacob Neusner, "Preface" in *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (ed. W. S. Green and E. Frerichs; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), xiii.

⁸⁴ Neusner's main focus in the preface and in other works was upon documents relating to Rabbinic Judaism, namely the Babylonian Talmud (*The Systematic Analysis of Judaism* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1988), 9-15).

on their side and those who became proselytes.”⁸⁵ For the context of this study, it is more profitable to define groups in relation to the socioreligious and political context of Second Temple ideology. I will use the English word ‘Judaism’ to represent a collective who, according to some of our sources, define themselves as Ἰουδαῖος in ethnic, religious, or social terms.

Overview of Project

By reassessing the role of messiahs in socio-historical contexts and ideological strategies of Second Temple Jewish texts, the argument of this book recontextualizes the deployment of messianism through the lens of social linguistics. To limit the scope of this project, I take up four examples as test cases of messianic discourse. These test cases all stem from Jewish traditions and invoke the messiah within conflict (e.g., social, ethnic, and political). While I review how each author deploys messianic discourse within the specific context of the document, I am most interested to compare the function of messianism: these four test cases are connected in their approach to messianism. While each author appeals to different understandings of the messiah figures that can be loosely tied to a role in society (e.g., king, angel, sage, prince), I understand them to function the same way: to affirm or shift the social, ethnic, and/or political barriers of the respective communities. Messianism in these four test cases all appear to function as a marker within the author’s perceived community.

Chapter One has laid the framework for this study. While this theoretical framework is central to my argument, the chapters that follow are not overtly dedicated to extending Bourdieu’s theoretical perspectives. For instance, I do not assume that Bourdieu’s strict definitions of capital map perfectly on to ancient examples. Bourdieu’s evaluations attempt to take into account a macro view of modern capital, class, and culture that our evidence of the ancient world cannot sustain. What is viewed as economic capital in modern times may be better categorized as social capital in the ancient world. Furthermore, I do not think we can speak of one *habitus* among Jews in the ancient world. Despite the lacunae in our knowledge and the division between ancient and modern thought, however, I find this framework useful for exploring how the four test cases deploy messianic discourse within their respective literary traditions for it centers the competing power relationships between social groups.

⁸⁵ BDAG, 478.

Chapter Two argues that the tradition of Isaiah exemplifies how messianism, formulated around the memory of King David, was adapted as a strategy to adjust Jewish ethnicity through translation and localization. The texts of the early Second Temple period preserve a tradition that promises the heirs of David will forever rule Israel. However, for Isaiah, and especially Third Isaiah, the Davidic heirs are reinterpreted in two ways: (1) as a means of moving away from the focus upon David and (2) a greater focus upon reformed community identity markers. I show that the conception of the messiah is invoked within Isaiah to resolve the problem of evil and, in so doing, redefines the post-exilic, communal boundaries. Using the trope of the messiah, the author(s) attacks how some priests used their position to gain economic capital. In addition, the author(s) employs messianism to increase social capital by relaxing some of the ethnic parameters of their community. The references to messiah functions similarly in all three parts of Isaiah, though the social field and context shifts from exilic to post-exilic Judea.

Chapter Three contends that the several parts of 1 Enoch represent a reception and projection of a malleable tradition around the seventh antediluvian patriarch at different points during the Second Temple period. Only two parts of this collection refer to a messiah: the Similitudes of Enoch and the Animal Apocalypses. Analysis of these two texts suggest that the messianic discourse in 1 Enoch functions to define the collective of the Chosen, those who follow the appointed agent of YHWH. Encoded within the relationship of Chosen One (the respective messiah) and Chosen Ones (the righteous community) are Jewish identity markers that acknowledge all of humanity under the power of sin prior to the giving of the law of Moses (Torah). Forgiveness of sins by the eschatological judge to the repentant offers a new mechanism for Jews and non-Jews alike to join the righteous community. Messianism in 1 Enoch reverberates between the dual poles of protology and eschatology, as Enoch's visions report the corruption of the world in primordial time and its solution at the end of time through the messiah. This use of messianism levies cultural and economic capital to increase social capital. This symbolic language resists the limiting of the Chosen to a small subset of Jews.

Chapter Four asserts that the Gospel of Matthew escalates the contention between the Pharisees and Jesus to a cosmic level. Matthew's conception of evil manifests itself in the land and people alike. His biography of Jesus represents one of several first-century CE narratives that depicts the wandering preacher as a predicted Jewish messiah and central solution to the problem of evil. This vision of the messiah, cast through two common appellations – Son of

David and Son of Man – demonstrates that the messiah was created for the ‘people’ and set against the Pharisees, scribes, and the followers of John the Baptist. Matthew’s messianism is best understood within a theory of competition centered in the reconstruction period immediately following the destruction of the second temple in Jerusalem. Matthew’s Jesus repeated redefines social and economic capital to shift cultural capital.

Chapter Five analyzes the literature relating to the second century CE revolutionary Sim’eon Bar Kokhba (Kosiba) and his reception in later rabbinic sources. While there is little evidence within the desert caches that indicates Kosiba saw himself as a messiah, some rabbis identify Kosiba as a *false* messiah due to his *yetzer hara*, the evil desire within that prevents him from controlling himself. By comparing the reception of David and Kosiba in the rabbinic literature, I show that the ‘myth’ of Bar Kokhba is overlaid with the concept evil to bolster early rabbinic authority. This mythologizing shifts cultural capital away from the person and memory of Kosiba and buttresses the rule of Jehudah HaNasi, a self-proclaimed Davidic heir and leader after the Second Jewish Revolt.

Chapter Six offers a summary of this project and future projections of research. Messianic discourse is not unique to Judaism or the ancient world. I offer brief examples of modern messiah figures and messianic discourse across Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, to suggest that this social linguistic approach will be useful to analyze the ways that social, economic, and cultural capital is claimed or assigned through messianic terms and phrases. To conclude this study, I introduce four areas for additional research.

Chapter Two:

“A Signal for the Peoples – The Nations Will Look to Him:” Messianic Discourse in Isaiah’s Reconceptualization of the Davidic Monarchy

Introduction

Some early Second Temple Jewish texts, such as Psalms 2 and 110, 2 Sam 7, Isa 8:23-9:6, are usually understood by scholars to preserve the pre-exilic monarchical ideology of David.⁸⁶ These passages reflect a hope for an ideal king, but not necessarily a specific, named individual, nor do they necessary call for a messiah (מָשִׁיחַ), an anointed agent of YHWH.⁸⁷ These passages describe a Davidic king in the present tense, implying that the Davidic line is still known and active. Limited to a present hope for success, John Collins points out that these texts, “likely reflect enthronement ceremonies from ancient Judah.”⁸⁸ If they reflect court traditions, and I think they do, the texts themselves become an authorization of the Davidic rule and those who inherit it.

The tradition of Isaiah exemplifies how the expansion of the hope for the Davidic messiah through translation and localization in a specific community adapted messianism as a strategy to adjust Jewish identity markers. For Isaiah, especially the third portion of Isaiah, the

⁸⁶ On Davidic psalms, see also Sigmund Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel’s Worship* (trans. D. R. Ap-Thomas; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962), 62-63; Patrick D. Miller Jr., *Interpreting the Psalms* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 87-93; Susan E. Gillingham, “The Messiah in the Psalms: A Question of Reception History and the Psalter” in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (ed. John Day; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 209-37; cf., Michael K. Snearly, *The Return of the King: Messianic Expectation in Book V of the Psalter* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016).

The parallelism concerning the elevation of the son to a higher position in Ps 110 has been accentuated by many: e.g., Kraus, *Psalms 60-150* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 344; Susan Gillingham, “Psalms 90-106: Book Four and the Covenant with David,” *European Judaism* 48, 2 (2015): 83-101.

⁸⁷ See the discussion in chapter 1 for the expanded meaning of this term.

⁸⁸ Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 24.

Davidic heirs are reinterpreted in two ways, as a means of moving away from focus upon David and as a greater focus upon identity markers. The words of John Levenson ring true:

Even in the religious consciousness of an Israelite for whom kingship was of central importance, the entitlement of the House of David could remain peripheral. That is why, despite the presence of a great quantity of material bearing on royal theology, the specific covenant with David is expounded in clear form so very rarely. Not all royal theology was Davidic, and not all Davidic theology was covenantal.⁸⁹

David and the Davidic rule are referenced on several occasions in Isaiah (7:2, 13; 9:7; 16:5; 22:22; 37:35; 55:3) within messianic discourse. In this sense, Isa 11:10 clearly projects the hope for the future glorification of David through the ‘root’ of Jesse, which reapplies the language of David to a group suffering the consequence of sin (1:4). The author claims that in the process of divine fulfillment, the house of Judah will be remade. “He will raise a signal for the nations, and will assemble the outcasts of Israel, and father the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth” (11:12). In the second portion of Isaiah, the author goes one step farther to craft Cyrus the Great as YHWH’s anointed (45:1), the party responsible for the repatriation of Jews to ancient Palestine, thus fulfilling the Davidic responsibility to unite the nation. The false division in English texts between Isa 44 and 45 separates YHWH’s declaration that Cyrus will be successful because of divine support from the oracle against idol makers in Isa 44:9-20. This brings into focus the question of the rituals and economic practices of associations (Bourdieu’s institutions) relating to the temple. Likewise, in the third portion of Isaiah, the servant (52:13-53:12) who YHWH brought as a ‘root out of dry ground,’ takes upon himself the punishment for Judah’s sin. The immediate context of the servant is also a pronouncement welcoming foreigners and eunuchs, individuals who from the perspective of some priestly Jewish groups, were outsiders of society. These three examples in Isaiah are connected by an intertextuality in which the messiah (re)constitutes the social, ethnic, and political boundaries of ‘Judah’ through the resolution of sin. Approaching messianic discourse as a distinct strategy for group identification pushes us beyond our dependence on individual terms and highlights how authors used messianic discourse to define a post-exilic, priestly point of view.

⁸⁹ Jon Levenson, “The Davidic Covenant and its Modern Interpreters,” *CBQ* 41 (1979): 205-19, here 217.

This chapter begins with a study upon the textual tradition of Isaiah and how interpreters have addressed the several parts of Isaiah. The second section is divided in three parts, that contextualizes three instances of messianic discourses in relation to concepts of sin and ‘the other.’ Exegesis of Isa 1-2 and 11-12 listed above point to the last figure, the unnamed servant (52:13-53:12), who, in the second portion of Isaiah, does not directly refer to David yet builds upon the language associated with his tradition to support Judah as the rightful ruler. This shift away from the Davidic lineage signals a further development within post-exilic Judaism. Through the comparison with sin, I will show that the conception of the messiah functions similarly in the three parts of Isaiah, though the social field and context shifts in post-exilic Judea. These examples demonstrate a shift in the field of Davidic messianism: where once the focus was on the eternal promise of land and security, Isaiah reconceptualizes the Davidic messiah as a tool for restoration of the priesthood and its changing understanding of identity markers.

Isaiah or Isaiahs?: A Multiplicity of Voices

The tradition of Isaiah was well preserved in both the Hebrew (MT) and Greek (LXX) traditions from the Second Temple period.⁹⁰ Based on internal evidence, the Hebrew texts were likely redacted during and immediately after the Babylonian exile (sixth/fifth century BCE). It is likely that Greek Isaiah (fifth/fourth century BCE) reflects one of our earliest records of the Isaiah tradition, though the traditions likely originated during the Babylonian exile.⁹¹ Reference

⁹⁰ Until the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the earliest known Hebrew manuscripts that contained Isaiah were the Aleppo Codex (c. 920 CE) and the Leningrad Codex (1008 CE). The Isaiah scroll was one of the first scrolls discovered. It contained the full 66 chapters also preserved in Aleppo and Leningrad codices. Dated to 125 BCE on style, it is one of the few manuscripts that contains fully vocalized Hebrew. This evidence suggests that the prophet Isaiah was a well-known and authoritative in Jewish traditions of Second Temple Judaism.

⁹¹ Greek Isaiah preserved all 66 chapters. The first attempt at a critical edition of the Septuagint was Robert Holmes and James Parson’s five-volume edition (1798-1827), which closely followed Codex Vaticanus. However, H. B. Swete’s three-volume collection popularized Septuagint studies and fostered continued interest in the Septuagint both as an ancient witness as well as a ‘pre-Christian’ Old Testament commentary prior to the New Testament. The more substantial Cambridge edition was finished nearly a century later by Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray who sought a broader amount of manuscript evidence. Alfred Rahlfs’ 1935 *Handausgabe* provided a mobile, two-volume collection, but was quickly superseded in authority by the Göttingen critical editions (1931-).

Concerning the date, see Odil Hannes Steck, “Tritojesaja im Jesajabuch” in *Le Livre D’Isaïe: Les Oracles et Leurs Relectures Unité et Complexité de l’Ouvrage* (ed. Jacques Vermeylen; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 361-406.

to Isa 2:1 and 61:2–3 in Sirach 48:23–25 implies that by the second century BCE, Isaiah was read as a unified tradition.⁹²

A common thread of approaches to Isaiah is the relationship between the Hebrew and Greek texts. Early in Isaiah studies, Anton Scholz (1880) based the origin of the Isaian translation from Hebrew to Greek in Hellenistic Alexandria. Based on the comparison with Hebrew evidence, Scholz suggested that the Greek redactor attempted to render the translation word-for-word, indicating the author had profound knowledge of Hebrew. The differences between the two translations cannot be clearly separated or projected back to the translators, attributing differences instead to transmission errors or a confusion of metaphorical language.⁹³ While the LXX translation included several additions, Scholz found very few subtractions, marking the additions to MT not present in LXX. I agree with Scholz who finds it very improbable that someone would omit large sections of text in the ancient world. Such a presupposition preserves the LXX from significant error.⁹⁴ This translation process, according to Scholz, imputed authority to Isaiah in Hellenistic Jewish communities and explains its continued use.⁹⁵

⁹² Ian Wilson, “Isaiah 1-12: Presentation of a (Davidic?) Politics” in *Tzedek, Tzedek Tirdof: Poetry, Prophecy, and Justice in Hebrew Scripture* (ed. Andrew Gow and Peter Sabo; Leiden: Brill, 2018), 50-71. See also, Shalom Paul, *Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary*, Eerdmans Critical Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2012), 1, and Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1-39*, ABC 19 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 84. Beyond the sources listed below, see also the bibliographies in Brevard Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress: 2011) and Marvin Sweeney, *Isaiah 1-39: With Introduction to Prophetic Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996). This is not to assume that unified meant stable or represents a finished ‘book’ product, though I occasionally use this term as a synonym for the redacted three parts of Isaiah. An undercurrent of this chapter is the assumption the text remained relatively fluid until at least the end of the first century CE. For an example of this process, see Eva Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

⁹³ Anton Scholz, *Die Alexandrinische Übersetzung des Buches Jesaias. Rede zur Feier des 298. Stiftungstages der Kgl. Julius-Maximilians-Universität* (Würzburg: Woerl, 1880), 15–16.

⁹⁴ Scholz, *Alexandrinische Uebersetzung*, 17.

⁹⁵ There is no agreement concerning the relation between the Hebrew and Greek Isaiah sources. For instance, Johann Fischer responded to Scholz’s claim concerning the characteristics of the Greek Isaiah translator. In his *In welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaias den LXX vor? Eine textkritische Studie* (BZAW 56; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1930), Fischer notes that where the Hebrew of the MT is easy, Greek Isaiah closely follows the text, but where the Hebrew is complicated the translator morphs the text or employs conjecture to make sense of the text. This indicates that the translator did not attempt a word-for-word translation, but freely alters the text to make sense of the meaning. Fischer marks several translation shifts such as dittography, haplography, and transposition of consonants. The text, according to Fischer, reached a stable form in the fourth century BCE.

In contrast, Joseph Ziegler’s *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (Münster: Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1934) described a fluid manner of translation in Greek Isaiah. He sought to uncover the complex methods of the translator of Isaiah through word studies and direct comparisons with Hebrew Isaiah and other Second Temple Hebrew texts. Unlike Scholz, this process allowed Ziegler to identify additions and subtractions in the Septuagint, recognizing greater independence of Greek Isaiah to the MT. Ziegler believed the translator created intentional omissions by skipping words that

Mirjam van der Vorm-Crouchs provides to date the most systematic and robust presentation of the textual traditions of Isaiah within the Second Temple period.⁹⁶ The several additions and subtractions to Greek Isaiah elucidate the common trends of the translator, who sought to remove redundancy of wordage based on context in order to make a more precise text. Doublets and condensations similarly function as an improvement to the rhetorical effect of the text. Anaphoric translations, one of the largest categories within Vorm-Crouchs, are portions of Greek Isaiah adapted or harmonized with other scriptural passages where other sections are adapted not for correspondence in wording but in concept. The precise reasons for these differences, according to Vorm-Crouchs, are many and cannot be determined with certainty, but indicate a consistent understanding and stable presentation of the tradition. Vorm-Crouchs states, “While, on the one hand, the translator is concerned to abbreviate his text and to remove synonymous or identical words from it, on the other hand, one can also find in his text plenty of

were unknown or without good equivalents in Hebrew. In contrast, unintentional subtractions are likely accidents of a Hebrew scribe or Greek translator.

Jean Koenig heavily criticized these interpreters in his *L'herméneutique Analogique Du Judaïsme Antique D'après Les Témoins Textuels D'Israël* (Leiden: Brill, 1982), for positing that the differences between versions stems from the ignorance or subjectivity of an individual or collective translator. Instead, Koenig uses the term *analogy* as a means to understand the differences between the Hebrew and Greek Texts as an authoritative norm, enacted with purpose and precision. The translator, Koenig surmised, utilized other readings from Second Temple Hebrew texts as an interpretive lens. This translation method influenced not only Greek Isaiah, but also the Isaiah Scroll. Koenig finds evidence of this method within Rabbinic Judaism, allowing him to claim that the approach was common among Second Temple Jewish communities. While Koenig utilizes the language of *analogy* to describe the relation of the text, later interpreters (e.g., Mirjam van der Vorm-Crouchs) describe this as ‘midrash’ or adjectively, ‘midrashic.’ This classification of interpretive method imputes foreign characteristics from later texts onto earlier texts. For clearer definitions of midrash, see Alexander Samely, *Rabbinic Interpretation of Scripture in the Mishnah* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002) or Hermann L. Strack and Günter Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (trans. Marcus Bockmuehl; rev. ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992).

⁹⁶ Central within Vorm-Crouchs’s argument is the manuscript evidence from Khirbet Qumran. The Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a) was one of the first and best-preserved manuscripts found at Qumran (Eugene Ulrich, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXXII: Qumran Cave 1: II. The Isaiah Scrolls: Part 2: Introductions, Commentary, and Textual Variants* (Oxford: Oxford Press, 2011)). 1QIsa^a is made up of seventeen sheets of sheepskin, sown together with thread. Besides small lacunae at the beginning and the bottom of the manuscript, the manuscript preserves the entire book of Isaiah, formed in 54 columns (Edward Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a)* (STDJ 6. Leiden: Brill, 1974). Cf., Elisha Qimron, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a): Indices and Corrections* (Leiden: Brill, 1979)). 1QIsa^a was written in a single hand, probably between 125 and 100 BCE, and underwent several revisions within the next century (See also, Eugene Ulrich, “Biblical Views: Insertions in the Great Isaiah Scroll” *BAR* 37:4 (2011): https://www.baslibrary.org/biblical-archaeology-review/37/4/13?ip_login_no_cache=eg%29%E9%B8%0Avv). Mirjam van der Vorm-Crouchs supposes that “if a plus or minus is supported by a Qumran document, and cannot be clarified by one of the translation tendencies LXX Isaiah displays, one may reasonably suspect that this plus or minus to be due to a Hebrew text deviating from the MT” (Vorm-Crouchs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah: An Analysis of Its Pluses and Minuses* (Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 61; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014), 447). One example is MT Isa 39:6, that has one sentence and a twofold object (Vorm-Crouchs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah*, 480), where LXX Isa and 1QIsa^a create two clauses each with its own object. In LXX Isa and 1QIsa^a, the second clauses are governed by יבואו/יָבֹאוּ, suggesting a different Vorlage for the two witnesses. Another example that demonstrates the rule is 1QIsa^a 2, which removed verses 9b and 10 in the tradition preserved in the MT and LXX, that itself does not fit into the context of Isaiah, but represents a smoothing of the narrative.

examples of double translation.”⁹⁷ The most significant source Greek Isaiah borrowed from was the Greek Pentateuch though it remains less clear whether Isaiah utilized other texts, such as Psalms or the Prophets.

Other scholars have approached the text of Isaiah through ideological analysis, which has revealed a complicated editorial history. Johann Christoph Döderlein, already in the eighteenth century BCE, raised the concern that Isa 40-66 represented the values and norms of the sixth century, a later redaction of the Isaianic tradition.⁹⁸ Approximately 100 years after Döderlein, Bernhard Duhm separated Isa 40-55 from 56-66, arguing that 40-55 contextually represented the Babylonian exile and chapters 55-66 represented the hopes of restoration upon the return to Judea.⁹⁹ Thus, as they are termed, Proto-Isaiah (1-39) represents story from the Assyrian period, Deutero-Isaiah (40-55) represents the Babylonian period, and Trito-Isaiah (56-66) represents the restoration of the Judeans upon their return.¹⁰⁰ While recent interpreters now find a greater unity between chapters 40-55 and 56-66, suggesting a singular author but potentially different geographical contexts, the tripartite division is generally accepted among Isaiah scholars. More recent interpreters have focused upon individual sections within the context of the whole,¹⁰¹ but for the sake of this chapter I will use the distinction of Proto-Isaiah (hereafter: PrIsa), Deutero-Isaiah (hereafter: DtIsa), and Trito-Isaiah (hereafter: TrIsa) to reflect this textual history. While the MT Isaiah will take center place in this study, I note here that LXX Isaiah and Isaiah manuscripts from Qumran (i.e., 1QIsa^{a-b}) play an important part as witnesses to the tradition. The minor differences between these witnesses indicate that the process of translation and transmission affected the production of the text. While I rely on those listed above who have performed extensive review of the additions or subtractions to the Isaiah

⁹⁷ Vorm-Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah*, 519.

⁹⁸ Ulrich Berges, *Jesaja 40-48* (Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2008), 31. This interpretive move was further supported by Wilhelm Gesenius, *Der Prophet Jesaja* (3 vols.; Leipzig: F. C. W. Vogel, 1820-21).

⁹⁹ Bernhard Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaja* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht, 1914).

¹⁰⁰ This thesis has appeared in many studies: Childs, *Isaiah* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 441-49; Odil Jannes Steck, *Studien zu Tritojesaja* (BZAW 203; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1991); Rolf Rendtorff, “The Composition of the Book of Isaiah,” in *Canon and Theology: Overtures to an Old Testament Theology* (trans. Margaret Kohl; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 146-69.

¹⁰¹ Cf. Marvin A. Sweeney, “Reconceptualization of the Davidic Covenant in Isaiah” in *Studies in the Book of Isaiah. Festschrift for Willem A.M. Beuken* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium; Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1997), 41-61.

tradition, I will only draw out those differences here as they pertain to the exploration of messianic discourse in Isaiah.

The Failing of Judah and Jerusalem: Isaiah's Projection of the Past into the Present

Before focusing on the Davidic references within Isaiah, I turn to Judah and Jerusalem. The book of Isaiah undoubtedly focuses upon the life and religious traditions of Judah and Jerusalem (1:1; 2:1). In PrIsa and DtIsa, messianic discourse functions as a foil to sin related to Judah and Jerusalem. As a result, Isaiah rewrites the history of Judah and Jerusalem. The (re)written history of Judah and Jerusalem represents a shifting in social and cultural capital. This section will identify Isaiah's use of Judah and Jerusalem in relation to the narrative plot and conception of sin.

Judah, the fourth son of Jacob and Leah (Gen 29:35), was the eponymous ancestor of the tribe of Judah.¹⁰² While it was common in ancient Judaism that names were repeatedly used in families, the names of the Patriarchs – e.g., Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob – were honored for their role in history and not passed on from father to son. The name Judah was also used in reference to two areas of land. One area is the swath of land south of the mountain ridge in central ancient Israel that extended from the Jezreel Valley to the Negeb. This land formed the base for the tribe of Judah and during David's reign, the capital was located at Hebron. The only reference to the 'hill country of Judah' is in Josh 21:11 that designates this land for the tribe. Judah is also associated with a section of arid wilderness (מְדִבְרָה), located east of the Jordan River and north of Jericho. Because of its proximity to fertile land, it is likely that shepherds took their flocks there to graze.

This land was a symbolic element in several narratives as a place of struggle and refinement. During his conflict with Saul, David first absconded to the stronghold at En-Gedi (1 Sam 22:4; 23:39), and again when Absalom, David's third son, revolted against his father (2 Sam 15-16). Its dense mountainous area provided natural protection. Psalm 57, which does not directly reference the land in any qualitative fashion, depicts David as crying out to YHWH for aid from the wilderness. Likewise, Psalm 63 gives voice to David's wilderness pleas:

¹⁰² Victor Hamilton, "Judah," *ABD* 3:1032.

My soul clings to you; your right hand upholds me. But those who seek to destroy my life shall go down into the depths of the earth; they shall be given over to the power of the sword, they shall be prey for jackals. But the king shall rejoice in YHWH; all who swear by him shall exult, for the mouths of liars will be stopped.

The remembrance of this place from ancient Judah marks it as a place of deliverance. Embedded within narratives of David and his offspring's success, the location takes on an independent identity in which YHWH responds to prayer. Jeremiah 9 laments the plight of Judah and, among warnings not to trust kin, the author asks YHWH for a space safe from invasion. Matthew 3-4 picks up on this imagery as a location for Jesus' baptism by John the Baptist and testing by Satan, the only pericope in the Gospels in which Jesus directly interacts with Satan. I will say more about this pericope in a later chapter, but Matthew's reference to this location plays a significant role in mutually disclosing evil and revealing Jesus as a messiah figure, associating Jesus with a stronghold of David. This was also the location of the later Bar Kokhba (Kosiba) revolt. Isaiah 32 similarly adapts this location within the author's plea for justice, "a king will reign in righteousness." The appointed king and princes in Isaiah 32 become the origin of wind and water (32:1-2). Through metaphor, Isaiah directs the revitalizing power of the monarchy towards his community: the rulers will open people's eyes and minds, "A fool will no longer be called noble, nor a villain said to be honorable." In this description, the center of power is not in the city but in the people of the wilderness in which righteousness will abide.

The tension between place and people is a constant theme throughout Isaiah. A number of references in Isaiah depict Judah (יהודה) and Jerusalem (ירושלם) as synonyms, combining the fate and identity of the location with the people.¹⁰³ There is no reference to Hebron (חברון) in Isaiah, but rather Isaiah portrays the physical center of Judah as Jerusalem, blending the images of assurance described above. Isaiah depicts Jerusalem after David's conquest of the Jebusite stronghold (2 Sam 5:6-8; 1 Chr 11:4-7), which assumes the temple is at the center of the life of Judah. Jerusalem becomes the scene of several acts of judgment and redemption. Isaiah 31:5 reads, "Like birds hovering overhead, so the LORD of hosts will protect Jerusalem; he will protect and deliver it, he will spare and rescue it." Additionally, the outcome of Jerusalem can

¹⁰³ 1:1; 2:1; 3:1; 5:3; 7:1; 7:6; 22:21; 36:7; 37:10; 40:9; 44:26. Only Judah 5:7; 7:17; 8:8; 9:21; 11:12-13; 19:17; 22:8; 26:1; 36:1; 37:31; 38:9; 48:1; 65:9. Only Jerusalem: 2:3; 4:3, 4; 10:10, 11, 12; 10:32; 22:10; 24:23; 27:13; 28:14; 30:19; 31:5; 31:9; 33:20; 36:2; 36:20; 37:22 (2x); 41:27; 44:28; 51:17; 52:1; 52:9; 62:1; 62:6; 64:10; 65:18-19; 66:10, 13; 66:20.

stand in for the plight of Judah. Isaiah 40:2 pleads, “Speak tenderly to Jerusalem, and cry to her that she has served her term, that her penalty is paid, that she has received from the LORD’S hand double for all her sins.” Isaiah 64:10 overlaps the images of wilderness and Zion: “Your holy cities have become a wilderness, Zion has become a wilderness, Jerusalem a desolation.” Judah’s successes and failures are precariously mapped onto Jerusalem; the seat of power and people of power were codependent.

Isaiah’s projection of land and tribe likely stems from post-exilic concerns about definitions of Judah. A number of scholars now assume that the early Second Temple Jewish texts were created in the post-exilic period in order to address the needs of Persian-era Judeans.¹⁰⁴ Theodore Mullen, for instance, contends that the Babylonian exile created a deep-seated crisis of identity among the survivors that played out in the Second Temple texts. Mullen separates the Deuteronomistic History (hereafter: DtrH) from the Tetrateuch (Gen-Num) as two collections that project different distinct ethnic, religious, and political identities. The DtrH, written by Jews in exile, laments the loss of land, the traditions associated with the land, and the dynastic history that supported it.¹⁰⁵ At least one generation passed while in exile, which made the threat of cultural assimilation and dissolution of a unique people group a realistic threat to the tradition’s way of life. Within this context, Mullen suggests that the compiler of DtrH redacted previous traditions and exilic experiences together in a shared history that envisages values and religious, ethnic, and cultural ideals. DtrH projects two central beliefs upon all: a unique relationship with YHWH (election, monotheism) that must be preserved at all cost (ethics). This theme is repeated throughout DtrH. For example, Moses proclaims in Deut 4:7-8:¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁴ John J. Collins, *The Bible after Babel: Historical Criticism in a Postmodern Age* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005). Cf. Niels Lemche, *The Canaanites and Their Land* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991); Philip Davies, *In Search of “Ancient Israel:” A Study in Biblical Origins* (The Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies; London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 1991); Thomas Thompson, *Early History of the Israelite People from the Written & Archaeological Sources* (*Studies in the History of the Ancient Near East*; Leiden: Brill, 1992).

¹⁰⁵ As I specify in chapter one, I recognize the problematic and potentially anachronistic use of the term ‘Jew’ before the Persian period, the first period in which the term was applied to those who lived in Judea. I use it here for the sake of consistency in my narrative. In addition, Mullen uses this term unabashedly and so I employ the term in a like manner here, noting its problematic usage; cf. E. Theodore Mullen Jr., *Narrative History and Ethnic Boundaries: The Deuteronomistic Historian and the Creation of Israelite National Identity* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993). For further comparison, see James Miller, “Ethnicity and the Hebrew Bible: Problems and Prospects,” *Currents in Biblical Research* 6, 2 (2008): 170-213.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Deut 4:34; 18:19; 26:16-19.

For what other great nation has a god so near to it as the LORD our YHWH is whenever we call to him? And what other great nation has statutes and ordinances as just as this entire law that I am setting before you today?

These identity markers define the Judean exiles over and against all other nations.

This source provided an 'ideological base' through narrative types for Joshua-2 Kings that establish a narrative to deal with loss.¹⁰⁷ Modeled after Moses, Joshua faithfully leads the people into the 'promised land,' obediently following the tradition: "This book of the law shall not depart out of your mouth; you shall meditate on it day and night, so that you may be careful to act in accordance with all that is written in it. For then you shall make your way prosperous, and then you shall be successful" (Josh 1:7-8). The Davidic monarchy and the tribe of Judah are central to DtrH's revisionist history. While YHWH is the leader of the people, the relationship is mediated by a royal agent. Deut 17:14-15 exemplifies this fact:

When you have come into the land that the LORD your YHWH is giving you, and have taken possession of it and settled in it, and you say, "I will set a king over me, like all the nations that are around me," you may indeed set over you a king whom the LORD your YHWH will choose. One of your own community you may set as king over you; you are not permitted to put a foreigner over you, who is not of your own community.

This injunction placed in the mouth of YHWH creates an ideal manner and age in which the people maintain relationship. Like Moses and Joshua, the king is intended to be a paragon of faithfulness who is responsible for correctly mediating the relationship and the law. Thus, the success or loss of well-being and prosperity imagined in Joshua 1 is directly tied with maintaining the covenantal relationship with YHWH. DtrH presents a narrative for the "present community, so apparently separated from that past, might reincorporate and recreate its identity in a new, yet continuous form."¹⁰⁸

Joseph Blenkinsopp demonstrates through an intertextual study of Isaiah that all three parts of Isaiah orientates (or re-orient) readers around known theological concepts from the

¹⁰⁷ Mullen, *Narrative History*, 55.

¹⁰⁸ Mullen, *Narrative History*, 210.

Deuteronomistic writings.¹⁰⁹ Other central themes of Isaiah are the call to remember the redemption from Egypt (e.g., Deut 5:15; 24:9; Isa 43:18; 46:8), Israel's election (e.g., Deut 4:37; 10:15; Isa 41:8-9; 44:1-2), monotheism (Isa 41:1; 46:4; 47:13; 48:12),¹¹⁰ as well as the prophetic servant. Blenkinsopp notes that the prophetic servant motif is common in Deuteronomistic writings (1 King 15:29; 2 King 9:36; 14:25; 2 King 17:23; 24:2; Jer 7:25; 29:19; 44:4), and appears in a "religiously significant rather than purely sociological sense" in Isa 40-66, but is absent in Isa 1-39. Furthermore, Isaiah's themes and literary framework imitate other Deuteronomistic texts that date to the years following the decline of Jerusalem through the early Persian period, including the parts of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah (1:1-6; 6:15-8:23). Blenkinsopp highlights that these texts are marked by consistent declarations to return to YHWH (Deut 4:29; Jer 29:13; Isa 51:1; 55:6) and remain committed to the ancestral traditions (Deut 3:21; 4:3, 9; 7:19; Isa 42:20).¹¹¹ One of the most overt references is to the Lord's favor in Isa 61:1 to grant liberty to captives, which is frequently linked to Lev 25:10 based on similar phrasing.¹¹² I propose that Isaiah deploys messianic discourse as a means to further define these central issues. The references to Judah and the Davidic monarchy become the means by which Isaiah continues the argument.

The reemphasis of David during the return of the exile calls to mind images of promise (Deut 17 and 2 Sam 7) and prosperity that those who returned from exile sought to reestablish. For example, Isaiah 22:21 states,

I [YHWH] will commit your authority to his [Eliakim son of Hilkiyah's] hand, and he shall be a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and to the house of Judah. I will place on his shoulder the key of the house of David; he shall open, and no one shall shut; he shall shut, and no one shall open. I will fasten him like a peg in a secure place, and he will become a throne of honor to his ancestral house.

¹⁰⁹ Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40-55: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Anchor Bible Commentaries; New York: Double Day, 2002), 30-34.

¹¹⁰ Blenkinsopp refers to this not as monotheism but as the "incomparability of the God of Israel" (Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40-55*, 52).

¹¹¹ Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40-55*, 54.

¹¹² For Jerome, this passage is most succinctly linked with Ps 51. See Robert Louis Wilken, *Isaiah* (The Church's Bible; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 475-76.

Isaiah pronounces, due to the sin of Israel, the rule of the house of Judah will be given to another servant. The ancestral traditions associated with David are solidified and static, but through the projection of the past onto the present, the community affirms its covenantal relationship with YHWH. Christopher Seitz rightly claims, “Isaiah’s closest counterpart is probably the prophet Nathan, who likewise had access to the royal house, wielding direct authority over the Davidic line.”¹¹³ The success or failure of Judah and David were inextricably bound together in PrIsa, and this theme carried into DtIsa and TrIsa.

Isaiah’s own identity within the tradition reflects this projection of the Davidic covenant. Unparalleled among his imagined contemporaries, such as Hosea, Micah, and Zephaniah, the ‘presentation of the prophet’ Isaiah is depicted within the text as one of high social status and authority based on his relationship with the ‘royal house’ and Jerusalem.¹¹⁴ The author uses distinctive royal imagery to further the narrative, like a throne room within a temple (6:1-8:23), and the antagonists of his narrative are the world powers that neighbor Judah: tales involving the northern kingdom (7:1–17b; 8:1–13; 9:8–21; 11:12–16; 17:1–14; 28:1–6), Syria (7:1–9; 8:5–8; 17:1–14), and Babylon (39:1-8), as a backdrop to demonstrate the YHWH of Israel is the god of the cosmos. Isaiah, as von Rad described, operates out of a distinctive framework that focuses upon YHWH’s establishment of Zion and the Davidic house within these larger nations.¹¹⁵ This is only possible through the association with the elite class, a position that views the world through power relationships. The identity of Isaiah is unknown and surely doesn’t represent a single entity. However, it cannot be overlooked that all three parts of Isaiah project the character at the forefront of state events.

Isaiah 1-2:4: An Accusation of Sin and a Future Hope

Thus far, I have argued that Isaiah’s projection of the past into his present was a means to align with the ancestral traditions, most notably the DtrH associated with the priesthood. Isaiah’s combined references to Jerusalem and Judah intertwine the location and the people group so that the disasters or prosperity are intertwined – the sin of Judah is localized in Jerusalem, and when

¹¹³ Christopher Seitz, “First Isaiah,” *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, 3:478.

¹¹⁴ Peter Ackroyd, “Isaiah I-XII: Presentation of a Prophet,” *VTSup* 29 (1978): 16-48.

¹¹⁵ Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), 2.155-58.

Jerusalem fails it is the people of Judah who suffer. The central claim of this chapter is that the messiah is incited to resolve the problem of evil plaguing Judah and Jerusalem, and in so doing, defines who is a part of Judah. But what is the concept of evil in Isaiah?

The introduction of PtIsa (1-2) serves to contextualize the source of evil within the individual. I agree with Francis Landy and Hugh Williamson that Isaiah 1 likely represents a post-exilic reframing of the entire text of Isaiah.¹¹⁶ The opening line, “the word which Isaiah ...saw” (הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר הִזָּה יִשְׁעִיָּהוּ) stands out as an uncommon opening among prophets (e.g., Jer 14:1; Ezek 13:1, Mic 1:1; Zeph 1:1; Joel 1:1), but makes it clear that Isaiah understands a direct relation between what happens in reality, in locales such as Jerusalem, and YHWH’s action. Isaiah 1:4 marks the nation as sinful (חַטָּא), a designator used elsewhere to describe not only broken relationship with YHWH (Exod 32:30) but of covenantal disobedience (Lev 4:3). Isaiah 1:12-1:27 frames the iniquity in two capacities: failure to properly maintain the religious ceremonies relating to the Jerusalem temple (1:10-14) and covenantal practices of purity (1:15-16). These subcategories stand out in Isaiah’s narrative on Judah and Jerusalem, as the topic is not named again. This makes it impossible to contextualize the denunciation, to point to specific abuses relating to calendrical misappropriation or procedures of sacrifice. The basic form of the admonition (v. 10, a call to hear; vs. 11-15, admonition; vs. 16-17, instruction) indicates the issue is not the *act* of sacrifice, ceremonies, prayers, or concerns with purity, but with their misunderstanding and abuse of these acts. It should not be overlooked that the base accusation in verse 10 is not listening to the Torah: “Hear the word of the LORD, you rulers of Sodom! Listen to the teaching of our god, you people of Gomorrah!” While there is little indication here that further defines the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (cf. 13:9), a singular comparison between Judah and Jerusalem verses Sodom in 3:9 highlight Judah’s culpability. The author uses Sodom’s instantaneous judgment as a picture of Israel’s judgment:

For Jerusalem has stumbled and Judah has fallen, because their speech and their deeds are against the LORD, defying his glorious presence. The look on their faces bears witness against them; they proclaim their sin like Sodom, they do not hide it. Woe to them! For they have brought evil on themselves.

¹¹⁶ Francis Landy, “Torah and Anti-Torah: Isaiah 2:24-1:10-26,” *Biblical Interpretation* 11, 3/4 (2003): 317-334; Cf. Hugh Williamson, *The Book Called Isaiah* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 153-54.

This additional reference suggests the author of 1:10 is re-narrating the destruction of the locales as a motif relating to the lack of Torah observance.

The asymmetrical relationship between Isa 1:1-20 and 2:1-4 furthers the defiance of Torah observance as sin. While Isa 1 envisages a message to the heavens, Isa 2 pronounces a new word against Judah and Jerusalem. Close contextual references to Jacob (2:3, 5, 6) and Israel (4:2) suggest that the political state is not the sole enterprise of Isaiah's vision. References to sin and iniquity collapse distinctions between the religious, political, and social life of Judah with the operations of Jerusalem. Isaiah 1:2 charges the father has sinned against son where 2:2-3 relates YHWH to the nations.

1:2- I reared children and brought them up,
but they have rebelled against me.
2:3- For out of Zion shall go forth instruction,
and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem.

The warning to not be like Sodom and Gomorrah who rebuffed the Torah are contrasted with Zion and Jerusalem formulated in an AB-A'B' structure in 2:3, imposing a positive instead of a negative image mentioned above. Isaiah 1:4 depicts movement away from YHWH due to sin while 2:3 invites readers to move forward and up the mountain of YHWH.

Isaiah 1:18-20 stands in sharp contrast to 2:4 in that the first proclamation is against Judah while the second is about the nations. Based on parallel references, the material stained red as scarlet has just as much to do with opulence as it does a metaphorical stand-in for sin (2 Sam 1:24; Jer 4:30). The second portion reorganizes the AB-A'B' comparison to an AA'-BB' comparison through contingent clauses introduced with prepositions (ὅτι; ἐάν), which effectively parallels obedience with prosperity and rebellion with devastation. The comparison with 1:18-20 breaks down with 2:1-4, which leaves no solution to disobedience except by intervention – it is YHWH who intercedes on behalf of Israel. Most importantly, through the correction of Jerusalem and Judah, the nations will be righted, forsaking their weapons of war for tools of growth, another ABA'B' comparison. As a subscription immediately following the introduction in chapter one, 2:1-4 marks a transition from a proclamation of judgment and destruction to one

of hope and peace which frames YHWH's redemption of Jerusalem as the means by which sin will be removed from the nations.¹¹⁷

The final element of difference between these two sections is the framing of Isa 2:2 in 'the days to come' (וְהָיָה בְּאַחֲרַיִת הַיָּמִים; ἔσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις). The prophetic speech creates a definitive break in the timeline of judgment forewarned in chapter 1 that propels the forthcoming 'visions' and 'words' into time unmarked. The difference in time is made through the consistent use of verb tenses that draw attention to the current moment. Isaiah 1:5, for example, uses hophal and hifil forms of יָסָה and נָכָה to indicate a past action with continued significance, which is reflected in the LXX by aorist verbs with present participles. As literature, Isaiah's visions displace time as a means of addressing the current issues. Framed with the introduction of chapter one, those visions primarily address the issue of sin and its future resolution. This framing, John Oswalt notes, "demands that the materials found in chs. 40-66 be included both for the sake of completeness and for the validity of Isaiah's message."¹¹⁸

Reconceptualizing the Davidic Monarchy as Messianism

King David is referenced in Isaiah on a few occasions (7:2; 9:7; 37:35; 55:3), with other references in relation to Jerusalem as the city of David (7:13; 22:9; 29:1) or Judah as the house of David (16:5; 22:22). Isaiah's introduction pairs the current failing to obey the Torah to a future, eschatological horizon, fulfilling the promises addressed in 2 Sam 7 and Deut 17 that combines a Davidic heir with the continued relation with YHWH. I take up three examples of messianic discourse in Isaiah as well as parallel contextual passages that reconceptualize the Davidic monarch as an eschatological figure who, through the resolution of evil conceptualized in Isaiah's introduction, reestablishes identity markers relating to Judah, a shifting of cultural capital. There is no question that all three parts of Isaiah build upon each other, reflecting an interrelated tradition, but the differences in the use of messianic discourse should give us pause before assuming a unified or static understanding of David in relation to messianism. Despite this hesitancy, the three visions of fulfillment surrounding the Davidic prophecy function in a

¹¹⁷ David Stacey (*Isaiah: 1-39* (London: Epworth Press, 1993)) suggests this movement as a processional up to the holy mountain. "In the unmapped and dangerous terrain in which the Hebrews lived, *ways* and *paths* provide a certain security and so gave grounds for confidence" (17). While I'm less certain about this theological interpretation, this language does nicely parallel the movement out of Babylon (52:11-12) and the remaking of Jerusalem (65:17-23).

¹¹⁸ John Oswalt, *Isaiah: 1-39* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 27.

similar capacity, in that they take an increasingly more focused role on issues relating to the identity of Israel.

Isaiah 11-12: ‘Shout aloud and sing for joy, O royal Zion’

In its final form, the textual tradition of 11:1-16 appears more like a patchwork cloth than an intricate silken scarf. The chapter break at 10:33a (הנה) suggests that the division between chapters 10 and 11 is misplaced.¹¹⁹ The announcement of YHWH’s judgment upon Jerusalem is phrased in metaphorical terms of cutting down a forest. The language of a ‘shoot of Jesse’ in 11:1 and 10 therefore grounds the impending judgment by YHWH’s future servant within the new growth of Jesse. As with the introduction, there is a strong movement from the circumstances of the present into the future.

Previous redactional studies of 11:1-10 argue that vs. 1-5 are likely from an earlier oracle while vs. 6-9 represent a post-exilic redactional layer.¹²⁰ However, this is less than certain. Isaiah 11:1-5 cannot be accurately historized in any certain terms, but within the larger context vs. 1-5 demonstrate a dissolution of the house of David in ideological terms (1:9 and 22 above; cf. 5:1-4). This aligns with Isaiah’s project to display political entities within a divine framework. The promise of a royal heir in chapter 9 appears to be in the context of the Assyrian conquest in northern Israel; no such context is identified for 11:1-16. Van Ruiten is likely correct that perspectives of Isa 65 are grafted into the original oracles of 11:1-16, projecting a new vision of eschaton into pre-exilic, Isaianic traditions. That being said, I agree with the consensus that the ‘root’ (שרש) does indeed imply a descendent of David, but its metaphorical description as root and the double usage should alert us to a formulaic usage.¹²¹ The metaphor of a new growth is

¹¹⁹ Greg Goswell, “Messianic Expectation in Isaiah 11,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 79 (2017): 123-35, 124.

¹²⁰ Hermann Barth, *Die Jesaja-Worte in der Josiazeit* (WMANT 48; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1977), 58-76; Joachim Becker, *Isaias – der Prophet und sein Buch* (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 30; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1968), 61-62.

¹²¹ Jacob Stromberg, “The Root of Jesse” in Isaiah 11:10,” *JBL* 127, 4 (2008): 655-669, argues convincingly that שרש is commonly used in the Ancient Mesopotamia (Ugaritic and Aramaic cognates) to reference descendent (Prov 12:3; 7; cf. Isa 27:6; Stromberg builds upon P. Joachim Becker, “Wurzel und Wurzelsproß: Ein Beitrag zur hebräischen Lexikographie,” *BZ* 20 (1976): 22-44, here 36). See Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1-39*, 267; Kirsten Nielson, *There is Hope for a Tree: The Tree as Metaphor in Isaiah* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 140-43; Marvin Sweeney, “Jesse’s New Shoot in Isaiah 11: A Josianic Reading of the Prophet Isaiah,” in *A Gift of G-d in Due Season: Essays in Scripture and Community in Honor of James A. Sanders* (Ed. Richard D. Weis and David M. Carr, JSOTSUP 225; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 103-18, here 107.

common in other post-exilic texts (Ezek 17:31; Dan 4), but its linkage with David's father is unique.¹²²

The formulaic expression of David's heir in Isaiah 11:1-3 gives form to the promise depicted in the texts numerated in the introduction. Contrasted with Assyria described in 10:33-34, the new growth comes from the stump of Jesse, signaling the heir is connected to the Davidic promise, but a new growth (1:1): the Davidic messiah is not a new creation, but the restoration of the old.¹²³ As Childs states, "The prophetic picture is not a return to an ideal past, but the restoration of creation by a new act of God through the vehicle of a righteous ruler."¹²⁴ This figure is a created being, not angelic in nature. The repetitive, tripartite emphasis upon the spirit (רוּחַ יְהוָה; πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ) in 11:2 highlights that he will be set as an authority figure on behalf of YHWH. The emphasis upon wisdom and knowledge imputed upon the individual suggests that, like other authorized leaders, the individual has received external support from YHWH (Jud 3:10; 1 Sam 10:10; 16:13). This imputation shows once again that what might have once been an oracle about the hope for a righteous king was here set in a context that connects with, yet separates it from the past. Most English Bibles separate 3a from 3b, indicating a possible break between the spirit that the shoot of Jesse received from YHWH and the judgment from which the character will act. However, this separation wrongly divides the task of the Davidic character from his authorization.

The expression is again modeled in 11:10-12:1. Isa 11:10 clearly projects the hope for the future glorification of David through the 'root' of Jesse:

וְהָיָה בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא שְׂרֵשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל עֹמֵד לְגַם עַמִּים אֲלֵיו גּוֹיִם יְדַרְשׁוּ וְהָיְתָה מִנְּחָתוֹ כָּבוֹד

Καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἡ ῥίζα τοῦ Ἰεσσαὶ καὶ ὁ ἀνιστάμενος ἄρχειν ἐθνῶν, ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν, καὶ ἔσται ἡ ἀνάπαυσις αὐτοῦ τιμὴ.

On that day the root of Jesse shall stand as a signal to the peoples; the nations shall inquire of him, and his dwelling shall be glorious.

¹²² David Stacey takes the metaphor of tree too far, arguing that the author implied the Davidic king was like a tree; when it is cut from the stump and dies, seeds and reproduces (*Isaiah: Chapters 1-39*, 86-87).

¹²³ I disagree with Childs who assumes the shift from specific Davidic language to metaphor already dismisses the Davidic king here. See Childs, *Isaiah*, 100.

¹²⁴ Childs, *Isaiah*, 104.

The difference between the two versions is significant. The Hebrew text emphasizes the offspring of David as a *signal* (סֵנִי) or warning, to the nations. Signals are most usually a sign of promise and renewal. For Jeremiah especially, the signal is a visible object raised in a military conflict: Jer 4:6 imagines the standard standing against Zion for their wronging while Jer 50:2 employs the language of signal to indicate the fall of Babylon and Zion's eventual conquest (e.g., 51:12) as well as other nations (51:27). The same meaning holds true in Ps 60:4, which depicts the banner as a point in which people might gather and take hope (cf. Ge'ez Ps 59:4). The LXX imagines a similar role as the foreseen ruler upon who the nations will hope. LXX Isa 11:10 utilizes ἐλπίζω for יְדַרְשֵׁוּ here, which is an unusual word choice, suggesting either a different Hebrew *Vorlage* or a heavy-handed interpretive move, because within PrIsa ἐλπίζω frequently carries a neutral sense (e.g., waiting; cf. קוּה – 25:9; 26:8; קַשְׁקַשׁ- strive for) or a definitive negative sense (אִירָא – fear; exception: שָׁבַר – Isa 38:18; יַחַל- 42:4). In both texts, the root of Jesse is projected as the access point by which Jews will claim the place of importance on the national stage, but LXX 11:10 uses the motif as a claim of power and dominance.

Isa 11:12a defines the role of the Davidic figure in 11:10. The root of Jesse is not the sign himself, but will raise (בָּשָׂא; ἀΐρω) the sign.

וַיָּשָׂא נֶס לְגוֹיִם וְאָסַף נְדָחֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְנִבְצָרוֹת יְהוּדָה יִקְבֹּץ מֵאַרְבַּע כְּנָפּוֹת הָאָרֶץ:

καὶ ἀρεῖ σημεῖον εἰς τὰ ἔθνη καὶ συνάξει τοὺς ἀπολομένους Ἰσραὴλ καὶ τοὺς διεσπαρμένους τοῦ Ἰουδα συνάξει ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων πτερύγων τῆς γῆς.

He will raise a signal for the nations, and will assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth.

Both Hebrew and Greek Isaiah 11 agree on the slight difference in that the root of Jesse will bring about the definitive factor by which Israel will once again be unified. While the dual mention of the root of Jesse (11:1, 12) draws readers' attention to the figure, the parallel structure of 11:6-9 and 11:11-16 indicate a reapplication of the messianic discourse that breaches the present and the eschatological future: 11:6-9 uses contrasting animal images to depict the reversal of reality under the messiah (wolf, lamb; calf, lion; cow, bear; infant, asp), which is then paralleled through the national relationships involving Judah against Ephraim, Philistines, Edom, Moab, Egypt, and Assyria. The symmetry of the two passages, framed by the root of Jesse,

repeats the rhetorical strategy of chapters one and two, in which the eschaton becomes the means to address the author's concern for injustice among the national leadership of Judah.

The pericope ends with a very short chapter 12. Isaiah 12:1 summarizes this immediately preceding oracle and section (cf. 7:2-9), and locates YHWH's action in the future. The same recurring formulae, 'in that day' (ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ; יוֹם־בָּ), leaves no doubt that the coming of YHWH's agent remains in the future. However, the switch between second-person (הָרַמְדָּי; ἐρεῖς) and first-person subjects (אָרִיז; Εὐλογήσω) frame a prescriptive command to praise YHWH for restoring Judah (cf. 11:12-14), and rhetorically collapses the speaker and the reader: I/We becomes you, YHWH's salvation of the individual (12:2) is made known among the nations (12:3), signifying that the range of influence of the shoot of Jesse will indeed be settled upon the national stage.¹²⁵ Isaiah 12:6 reinforces the social location for the intercession of the Davidic heir is Zion: both the Hebrew and Greek texts utilize a masculine, plural participle (תִּצְוִי; οἱ κατοικοῦντες) to describe those who rejoice upon YHWH's action. English versions have failed to describe this well (e.g., NRSV translates תִּצְוִי as royal), yet reinforces what I identified above – at the core of Isaiah's vision is a restoration of the priesthood associated with the temple, not a historical Judah.

We find parallel notions in 9:1-7 and 14:1-2, which follow the same pattern of placing the new Israel at the top of the social ladder. The meaning of 9:1-7 is plagued with redactional and interpretive problems.¹²⁶ The editorial comments in Isa 9:1 contrast the present with the future,

¹²⁵ As Oswalt suggests, "...the hearer and reader are no longer spectators or objects of instruction. Now they are participants involved on the emotional and volitional levels as well as the cognitive one" (*Isaiah: 1-39*, 291-92).

¹²⁶ Most arguments are based on Christological readings of Isa 9; cf., Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah*, 250-51; Walter Brueggemann, *Isaiah 1-39* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1989), 82-83; Joseph Klausner, *The Messianic Idea*, 64-65; Stacey, *Isaiah: Chapters 1-39*, 72-73. Walter Brueggemann describes this announcement as a course for "great celebration—partly authentic joy, partly royal propaganda" (83). Stacey struggles to make sense of the Hebrew; concerning תִּצְוִי, he states "nobody can be certain what the Heb. word means, so [symbol of dominion] this is an acceptable, if vague, translation" (71). Lester Grabbe suggests this passage conceived of restoration "as being headed by David *redivivus*, a king in the image of David with all his good attributes magnified" (*Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period: Belief and Practice from the Exile to Yavneh* (New York: Routledge, 2000), 272). J. J. M. Roberts reads Isa 9 and 11 as one agent throughout ("The Old Testament's Contribution to Messianic Expectation," in *The Messiah. Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (ed. James Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 43-45). Richard Horsley suggests this sentiment (more prevalent in 11:1-10) represents the popular hope for the Davidic heir, though he offers no material or archeological data to support this claim (*Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs*, 99-100). Collins claims, "While the king was not to be confused with the Almighty, he was evidently exalted above the common rank of humanity" (*The Scepter and the Star*, 26). Collins doesn't elaborate what this means; is this, for example, a titular, metaphysical, or royal distinction? Kenneth E. Pomykala rightly draws out the differences between the figure described in the oracle, YHWH, and the Davidic heir (*The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1995), 19-20). For Pomykala, the reference to the character in 9:1-7 is different than the Shoot of Jesse in 11:1-12.

which is explained in more detail in the subsequent oracle. However, the subject of the pronouncement in verse 2 is a collective noun for ‘people’ (עַמִּי; ὁ λαός), and then moves to a second-person singular subject for the verbs. The author has little hope for this people: in the preceding section (8:19-22), he accuses them of misunderstanding YHWH’s revelation, looking to the dead for teaching/Torah (תּוֹרָה) and confirmation (תְּעִידָה). The English translation obfuscates the character of the individual. Born a human being among ‘the people,’ the author elevates this human to the highest position. The author forecasts one upon whom ‘dominion’ or ‘rule’ (מְשָׁרָה – Isa 9:5; cf. 1QM 13:4 of Belial) will sit. קָרָא (to call – Isa 9:5) is read as a present-tense, complimentary to-be verb (הִיהִ) rather than as a waw-consecutive within the prophetic context of the oracle. This future name includes a description of his abilities – mighty strength (אֶל גְּבוּרָה – Isa 9:5; cf., Mic 2:1; Deut 28:32) – a term that draws a strong parallel to Nehemiah 5. While the author of Nehemiah 5:5 uses the negative לֹא to describe the lack of the people’s strength, PrIsa applies the title to the child born among the community. Parallels with Ezra-Nehemiah in Isaiah are significant and will be explored further below. The significance of this figure within the pericope is that he shall reestablish the throne of David. Similar to 11:1-12 above, the Davidic kingdom however is separate from the heir himself; the MT 9:6 carries over the subject from the previous verse, making ‘the throne of David’ (כִּסֵּא דָוִד) and ‘his kingdom’ (עַל-מַמְלַכְתּוֹ) the object (עַל) of several verbless clauses. This agent will sustain Israel with justice and righteousness (cf., Isa 56:1). LXX 9:6 bypasses the potential confusion of the divine name by overemphasizing the figure as a messenger upon who rule was set:

καλεῖται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Μεγάλῃς βουλῆς ἄγγελος· ἐγὼ γὰρ ἄξω εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας, εἰρήνην καὶ ὑγίαιαν αὐτοῖς

His name will summon great council of advisors, for I will bring peace upon the rulers.

Many who find a divinely appointed messiah suggest that literary context defines the motif, finding a definitive difference between references in the monarchical settings and apocalyptic settings. Gershom Sholem, for example, assumes Isaiah (as well as Hosea and Amos) represent a different kind of messianism than apocalyptic texts, such as 1 Enoch: “Their [Isaiah, Hosea, Amos] eschatology is a national kind: it speaks of the re-establishment of the House of David, now in ruins, and of the future glory of an Israel returned to God: also of everlasting peace and the turning of all nations toward the one God of Israel and away from heathen cults and images. In contrast, apocalypticism produced a different doctrine of the two aeons which follow one another and stand in antithetical relationship: this world and the world to come, the reign of darkness and the reign of life” (*The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality* (New York: Schocken Books, 1971, 6). A central proponent of this view is Joseph Klausner, *The Messianic Idea in Israel*. For more recent support, see Andrew Chester’s review in *Messiah and Exaltation*, 209-30.

In practice, interpreters frequently end the oracle after the promise of the reinstatement of the Davidic kingdom, overlooking the setting of judgment against the elders, dignitaries, and prophets of Jacob and Israel (קִנְיַת יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת תַּעֲשֶׂה-זֶה תֵּאֵסֵף) for leading people away from YHWH (9:13). In contrast to Isaiah 11, it is not the Davidic heir that leads Jacob into growth and peace.

In 14:1-2, YHWH again declares compassion for Israel and Jacob, which equates to the reacquisition of homeland and people groups. However, verse two makes the prophecy more specific to exile:

וְהִתְנַחֲמוּ בְּיַד יְהוָה עַל אֲדָמָתָא לְעַבְדֵי יְהוָה לְשִׁפְחוֹת וְהָיוּ שְׂבִיִּים לְשִׁבְיָהֶם וְרָדוּ בְּגִישֵׁיהֶם

καὶ κατακληρονομήσουσιν καὶ πληθυνθήσονται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς δούλους καὶ δούλας· καὶ ἔσονται αἰχμάλωτοι οἱ αἰχμαλωτεύσαντες αὐτούς, καὶ κυριευθήσονται οἱ κυριεύσαντες αὐτῶν.

And the nations will take them and bring them to their place, and the house of Israel will possess the nations as male and female slaves in the LORD'S land; they will take captive those who were their captors, and rule over those who oppressed them.

The wording of Hebrew and Greek in Isa 14:1-2 are very comparable with a few exceptions. The double use of προστίθημι (to put, to add to) in verse 1 clarifies the single use of וָהַ (to join) applied to both clauses. We would expect the same duplication in Greek of a single Hebrew verb in verse 2, but נָחַל is replaced by κατακληρονομέω (to possess; to divide by lot) and πληθύνω (to multiply). This subtle change extends Jacob's possession of land from Israel alone to the national stage, staking claim upon the Babylonians (cf., 13:19-20). This projects the assumption that Israel's plight and YHWH's machination is foreseen. The current order of the oracle further supports this assumption. Isaiah 14:1 depicts Israel and Jacob as receiving the land and slaves. Israel and Jacob become the implied subject in 14:2, in which the nations successfully take control of YHWH's chosen group and whisk them away to the foreign lands. In each stage, Jacob and Israel are joined together with foreigners or 'sojourners' but these groups are not on the same level of participation, and so not inheritors. The status of these groups plays a central role in qualifying Torah obedience in TrIsa. In contrast to Isaiah 11, however, it is not the Davidic heir that ushers Israel into this stage of success.

This first section demonstrates three elements of the messianic discourse. First, through prophetic vision, PrIsa's hope for the Davidic messiah is transposed from historical restoration to

eschatological fulfillment. Isaiah 9, 11, and 14 show a complexity of redaction in which several oracles are woven together that set the root of Jesse as either YHWH's agent or the sign of YHWH. Second, the nobility of Jerusalem has sinned and so dispersed, but the messiah "will raise the signal of the nations, and will reassemble the outcasts of Israel" (11:12). When set within the context of Isaiah's introduction, Judah's narrative of repatriation redefines the order in priestly rather than royal terms. The few passages studied above suggest this is especially true in Greek Isaiah, a trend that we will see more in the coming sections. Third, the switching from a political to a religious field suggests the redactor of PtIsa intentionally repurposes royal messianism. The messiah is tied with a specific understanding of Torah that places at the foreground human error. Through the illumination of sin, we can see the thin thread tied to each of these distinct parts.

The Problem of Cyrus: A Different Type of Messiah

If Isaiah 9, 11, 14 were the only occurrences of messianic discourse within Isaiah, we could potentially pass it by as a fragment of pre-exilic Israelite tradition. However, Isaiah 44-45 records the only occurrence in Second Temple texts in which a non-Jew is named as YHWH's messiah. The stark use of the term is no accident or haphazard literary reference.¹²⁷ In this section, I draw out parallels between the multiple accounts of Cyrus to illuminate that Isaiah utilizes Cyrus to claim an end of the Davidic monarchy, but not to the priestly order established through David. The naming of Cyrus the Great (45:1) as a messiah demonstrates messianic discourse serves an important function within identity formation in Isaiah.

Son of Cambyses, Cyrus the Great founded the Achaemenid dynasty that ruled the Persian empire. In addition to minor references, Cyrus' life and deeds are recorded in Herodotus (*Histories* 1.46-216), Aeschylus (*Persians* 308-309), Xenophon (*Cyropaedia* 8.8.1-2, 27), the *Nabonidus Chronicle*, Behistun Inscription, and the Cyrus Cylinder.¹²⁸ These accounts provide valuable information concerning the figure of Cyrus: he succeeded his father in 559 BCE and claimed political power through an alliance between his tribe, the Pasargadae, and other regional groups; the alliance permitted him to quickly take control of neighboring areas (Media, Lydia,

¹²⁷ The instance of Cyrus's title of anointed challenges those who only want to see מָשִׁיחַ as a special type of king (Meir ben Shazar, "'Anointed' and 'Messiah: A New Investigation into an Old Problem" *JSOT* 42,4 (2018): 393-413).

¹²⁸ It should not be overlooked that Alexander the Great claimed to be Cyrus's successor – a great general and king. It was for this reason that Cyrus restored Alexander's tomb (cf., Strabo, *Geography* 15.3.7; Arrian, *Anabasis* 6.29.4-11).

Parthia, India). His most widely known act was the conquest of Babylon in 539 BCE, which the *Nabonidus Chronicle* and the Cyrus Cylinder (17) indicate was a peaceful transition.

Fragment A of the cylinder records the narrative of Cyrus's election by Marduk, a Babylonian god, and fragment B describes Cyrus's postwar efforts in his empire. According to Fragment A, Nabonidus had failed to properly rule the people and interfered with cultic and sacred centers (6-7). Nabonidus "did away with the worship of Marduk." In response, Marduk unified the people against Nabonidus and searched for a replacement king. He chose Cyrus, a righteous king, 'his favorite' and 'took him by the hand' (12). Those who were conquered have no voice in this narrative, but the cylinder frames the conquest in terms of people groups – the inhabitants of Akkad (Babylonia) and Sumer, Gutium and the Umman-manda (Medes). Although full of lacunae, the narrative recorded on the cylinder perpetuates Marduk as the supreme god of gods. The touch between god and king (12) suggests a very intimate bond, like a father grasping the hand of his son. Marduk set Cyrus 'on the road to Babylon' and when Cyrus enters Babylon, Marduk enters with him 'like a companion and friend' (15). The intimacy between Cyrus and Marduk continues: Cyrus abides in the royal palace and Marduk abides in the near-by sacred centers of Babylon (cf. 23). A switch from narrated voice to Cyrus's first-person singular voice in line 20 moves the reader from a report of fictionalized history of conquest to a more specific purpose that explains Cyrus's support of temples: in response to the command of Marduk, Cyrus repatriates prisoners in Babylon to their homes, and restores their divine images and temples around the empire.



Figure II.1: The Cyrus Cylinder.¹²⁹

The parallels with DtrIsa suggest the author was in some way familiar with Cyrus' declaration recorded on the cylinder. For example, YHWH 'aroused' Cyrus (העיר־תהו; ἤγειρα) and made his paths straight (45:13; line 15). Cyrus, who was on an eternal line of kingship (22), carried out YHWH's purposes (44:28; line 25). Even the sense of intimacy is reduplicated in DtIsa: similar to Marduk, YHWH takes the hand of Cyrus to lead him (45:1; line 12) and is named by YHWH (45:4). One of the most striking parallels is the position of YHWH and Marduk. The Cyrus cylinder depicts Marduk as the supreme god, "the ex[alted, the lord of the gods]" (10; cf., 17), while through the voice of the Isaiah YHWH (e.g., 45:5, 18) claims also to be the absolute god.

The relation between these passages is disputed. Charles Torrey argues that these references to Cyrus are later corruptions and should be outrightly disregarded.¹³⁰ The language

¹²⁹ "Babylon: The Cyrus Cylinder," *The Land of Israel / Palestine: Image Database*, accessed March 26, 2020, <https://ancient-world-project.nes.lsa.umich.edu/image-database/items/show/120>.

¹³⁰ Charles C. Torrey, *The Second Isaiah* (New York: Scribner's, 1928), 3-52; Torrey, "Isaiah 41," *HTR* 44 (1951): 121-36. See also James D. Smart, *History and Theology in Second Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 35, 44-66* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964), 115-34.

and message of the text does not align with the focus of the prophet. This claim is problematic because the evidence does not support that conclusion – all of our textual traditions preserve the name Cyrus. Others would assert that the reference to Cyrus is original to DtrH, but would debate the meaning of “anointed” (מָשִׁיחַ; χριστός). The act of anointing in the ancient world is a process of setting apart, most frequently to assert marriage claims and publicly selecting vassal kings.¹³¹ This procedure was a regular part of ancient Israelite tradition: the priestly writings indicate a prophet anoints the high priest (Lev 4:3, 5, 16; 6:15) or king upon the ascension of his public role (1 Kings 19:15-16).¹³² Lisbeth Fried highlights that variants of this phrase (“my anointed one,” מְשִׁיחִי – Ps 132:17; “the anointed one of the god of Jacob,” מְשִׁיחַ אֱלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב – 2 Sam 23:1) occur 30 times in the Second Temple Hebrew texts, and half of those references stem from DtrH.¹³³ The term is applied to Saul (1 Sam 12:3, 5; 24:7, 11; 26:9, 11, 16, 23; 2 Sam 1:16), David (1 Sam 16:6; 2 Sam 19:22; 23:1), and to Judah (1 Sam 2:35).¹³⁴ In each of these

¹³¹ Stephanie Dalley, “Anointing in the Ancient Mesopotamia,” in *Oil of Gladness: Anointing in the Christian Tradition* (ed. Martin Dudley and Geoffrey Rowell; London: SPCK, 1993), 19-25; Daniel Fleming, “The Biblical Tradition of Anointing Priests,” *JBL* 117 (1998), 401-14; Mahri Leonard-Fleckman, “Utterance of David, the Anointed of the God of Jacob (2 Sam 23:1-7),” *JBL* 137, 2 (2018): 667-83; against Daniel Fleming, “The Biblical Tradition of Anointing Priests,” *JBL* 117 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1998), 401-14. In actual practice, it’s unlikely that Judahite kings who succeeded their fathers were anointed at their enthronement. Adela Yarbro Collins and John J. Collins indicate that ancient Jewish anointing rituals were likely borrowed from other neighboring cultures, in which the divine blessing upon the father who rose to power would likely carry over to their offspring (*King and Messiah: Son of God: Divine, Human, and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 5-10). Exceptions to this is 2 Kings 9 (Jehu Son of Nimshi) and 2 King 23:30 (Jehoahaz son of Josiah). See also *t. Sanh.* 4:11: “They anoint kings only on account of civil strife: Why did they anoint Solomon? Because of the strife of Adonijah. And Jehu? Because of Joram. And Joash? Because of Athaliah. And Jehoahaz? Because of Jehoikim, his brother, who was two years older than he. A king requires anointing, [but] a son of a king does not require anointing” (Jacob Neusner (trans.), *The Tosefta* (6 vols.; New York: Ktav, 1981), 1V: 210). As Shemaryahu Talmon states, “The image of the anointed king, scion of a dynastic line, as realized in the Davidic house, contained two essentially contradictory principles: the concept of inspired leadership deriving its power from personal charisma, which by definition is non-consecutive, coalesced with the idea of an automatically continuous government drawing its strength from an institutionalized charisma of office. The principle of election by divine spirit was grafted onto the system of dynastic government, which in essence is void of any religious and ideological dimension” (*King, Cult, and Calendar in Ancient Israel: Collected Studies* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1986), 9-38, here 37). It is possible that two people might be simultaneously anointed as king: Solomon is portrayed as king while David is still alive, suggesting a co-regency. See Edward Ball, “The Co-regency of David and Solomon (1 Kings 1),” *VT* 27 (1977): 268-79; Alex P. Jassen on the metaphorical sense of anointing (*Mediating the Divine: Prophecy and Revelation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism* (STDJ 68; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 88-90). It was also possible that a king might be anointed on more than one occasion – David in 1 Sam 16:1-13, 2 Sam 2:4 and 5:3; see Sung-Hee Yoon, *The Question of the Beginning and the Ending of the So-Called History of David’s Rise: A Methodological Reflection and its Implications* (BZAW 462; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014), 150-53.

¹³² Trygve Mettinger highlights that not every anointing was performed by a priest, but sometimes by a public representative (*King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of The Israelite Kings* (London: Coronet Books Inc, 1976), 185-232, here 190).

¹³³ Hermann Gunkel, *An Introduction to the Psalms* (trans. James D. Nogalski; Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998 (German Original, 1933), 99-120; Sigmund Mowinckle, *Psalms in Israel’s Worship*, 1:61-65).

¹³⁴ Lisbeth Fried, “Cyrus the Messiah? The Historical Background to Isaiah 45:1,” *HTR* 95, 4 (2002): 373-93, here 379. For more on David’s depiction in DtrH, see also A. Graeme Auld and Erik Eynikel (eds), *For and Against David: Story and History in the*

references, the marker ‘anointed’ applies to the legitimate king, “appointed and protected by YHWH” (1 Sam 24:7, 11; 26:9, 16, 23).¹³⁵ Other discrete references outside of DtrH similarly refer to this institution (Lam 4:20; Hab 3:13; Prayer of Hannah, 1 Sam 2:10). The hesitancy to apply this meaning to Cyrus is likely two-fold. On one hand, there is an assumption that the Persian king’s reign is not interpreted as propagating Judah. But this assumption only stands when viewed from the advantage of historical reflection – those in the past would not have known that the Cyrus and his dynasty would be decimated by the Greeks, the Hasmoneans, and then later, the Romans. On the other hand, this response embodies a historical assumption that a non-Jew could never hold the office.

These two approaches to Isa 44-45 obfuscate the context behind the rhetorical task of DtIsa. Klaus Baltzer argues that when understood within a larger context, the claim of a newly anointed figure outside of the Davidic lineage indicates a greater rhetorical goal to displace David as the heir of divine promise. There is no vision here for the renewal of the Davidic dynasty that other exilic texts (Ezek 34:23-24; 37:24-25) and post-exilic texts (Hag 2:20-23; Zech 4:1-4) assume. To label someone as ‘anointed’ abides within the categories of leadership with the history outlined in DtrH but creates a distinctive break.¹³⁶ Cyrus’s anointing indicates that the social and political power was successfully transferred to the Persian king.

Baltzer comes to this conclusion from the direct context. He dates Isa 44-45 very late (fifth century BCE) and locates it in a hypothetical literary or cultural context. More importantly, he frames Isa 44-45 as a dramatic telling of a trial scene.¹³⁷ The ‘but now’ (הַעַתָּה; νῦν δὲ) at 44:1 introduces a new section that goes until 48:16, when the scene shifts yet again to describe this new reality of Jacob’s redemption. Mention of Jacob in verses 1 and 5 links “the remembrance of guilt...with a new promise of salvation,” that YHWH will pour out YHWH’s spirit upon the

Books of Samuel (BETL 232; Leuven: Peeters, 2010), esp. Shimon Bar-Efrat, “From History to Story: The Development of the Figure of David in Biblical and Post-Biblical Literature,” 47-56), and Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty*.

¹³⁵ Fried, “Cyrus the Messiah?” 380.

¹³⁶ Most kings, but not all, received a public charge at the time of their anointing. Saul, for instance, was charged with delivering the Israelites from the Philistines (i.e., LXX 1 Sam 10: 1 - σὺ σώσεις αὐτὸν ἐκ χειρὸς ἐχθρῶν αὐτοῦ κυκλόθεν). See Bruce C. Birch, “The Development of The Tradition on the Anointing of Saul in 1 Sam 9:1-10:16,” *JBL* 90 (1971): 55-68.

¹³⁷ Cf. Claus Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969), 133-34.

descendants of Jacob.¹³⁸ The plural servants (שְׂפָרְדִּים; τὰ τέκνα σου; cf., the collective noun: שְׂפָרְדִּים; τὸ σπέρμα σου) indicates a problematic change in the recipient, from the individual to the larger group. This is further complicated by 26a in which the Masoretic, 1QIsa^a, and 1QIsa^b that describe a single servant, but the LXX and Targum describe a plural. The tradition appears to be unsettled whether the servant was an individual or if it pointed to a collective.

Baltzer further postulates that belonging to Judah was “an ethnic or political description;” however, the title “‘Jacob/Israel’ was not a political entity” in post-exilic Judea, but “rather a program” not confined to ethnicity.¹³⁹ As a result, when Isa 44:9-20 makes the accusation of idolatry through the production of idols, Baltzer presumes that this is a judgment upon religious diversification of returned exiles. Any person “who used this name for himself was making a confession of faith.”¹⁴⁰ The proof of this development is the intertextual use of the title ‘redeemer’ (לֹאֵל).¹⁴¹ Isa 44:21-28 declares YHWH to be Jacob’s Redeemer, which primarily appears in the noun form in DtIsa and TrIsa.¹⁴² DtIsa intentionally does not permit the attendees of this dramatic reveal to speak, Baltzer suggests. YHWH is the primary participant and by permitting only YHWH to speak, DtIsa makes claim about YHWH and the nature of creation that no other human might claim - YHWH is outside of creation and may adapt creation as YHWH sees fit. The claim over the initial act of creation as well as the world’s continued maintenance, the fate of Jerusalem and Judah, and even Cyrus as shepherd (44:28), are all strict claims of power that further the vision of the world identified in Isa 1-2 and 11-12. Jacob/Israel is the microcosm that maintains the divine connection to the world. DtIsa clearly did not need another Davidic monarch to continue the vision of YHWH.¹⁴³

¹³⁸ Klaus Baltzer, *Deutero-Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 40-55* (trans. by Margaret Kohl; ed. by Peter Machinist; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 184.

¹³⁹ Baltzer, *Deutero-Isaiah*, 187.

¹⁴⁰ Baltzer, *Deutero-Isaiah*, 187.

¹⁴¹ In addition to ‘king,’ several other terms came to reflect a redemptive figure – מֶלֶךְ (1 Sam 10:1), רֹעֵה (Ezek 34:23; Zech 11:16), and נֹשֵׂא (Ezek 44). In Isaiah, רֹעֵה is applied to both YHWH (40:11), Cyrus (44:28), and Moses (63:11), supporting my claim that it became a regular moniker in messianic discourse. Cf. Daniel Block, “Bringing Back David: Ezekiel’s Messianic Hope,” in *The Lord’s Anointed: Interpretation of Old Testament Messianic Texts* (ed. Phillip E. Satterthwaite et al.; Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995), 167-88.

¹⁴² Isa 41:14; 43:14; 44:6, 22, 23, 24; 47:4; 48:17; 49:7; 54:4, 8; 59:20; 60:16; 62:12; 63:16; cf. Jer 50:34.

¹⁴³ As Patricia T. Willey states, “...the prophet repeatedly identifies the servant of YHWH with Israel and Jacob, and never identifies the servant by any other name, thus repeatedly not answering the question ‘who is YHWH’s servant?’ but ‘who is

The title of ‘anointed’ makes little contextual sense when interpreted in religious terms. Most interpreters miss the contextual import of this section by conflating the meaning of ‘anointed’ with ‘redeemer.’ While royal rulers were anointed, it was the high priest who authorized and confirmed the leader on behalf of YHWH. It does not appear that Cyrus was actually anointed by any prophetic person associated with the Judeans, so the title “YHWH’s anointed” has more of a sense of figurative selection for the right to rule. Focusing on the meaning of this term distracts from what this discourse rhetorically accomplishes. DtIsa exalted Cyrus as the founder of the temple.

Neither does Baltzer’s understanding of ethnicity function well in this context. Baltzer suggests a narrative shift in Isa 44:24-28 in which YHWH addresses Jacob/the servant from the throne room and reveals Cyrus’s primary task – to reconstruct the temple (esp. 44:28). But because DtIsa references the temple on so few occasions, Baltzer, among others, dismisses concern for the temple and posits a much later date for this pericope.¹⁴⁴ Isa 43:22-29 leads Baltzer to conclude that DtIsa is critical of the practice of sacrifice because the priests took advantage of the offerings.¹⁴⁵ These verses do not reject sacrifice but the problem of sin: “But you have burdened me with your sins; you have wearied me with your iniquities” (43:22). Indeed, had Judah obeyed the priestly precedents to sacrifice and followed them properly, Isaiah denotes, YHWH would never have punished Judah (Isa 1-2). Baltzer’s dismissal of Isaiah’s priestly background provides a questionable position by which to interpret Cyrus. As a result, DtIsa’s problematic reference to Cyrus is a matter of resolving latent conflict over the foreign rule in Judah.

A better literary context for Cyrus’s ascension to power is Isa 44:9-20, the longest portion of this section. The section lambastes the ‘makers of idols’ (לְפָצְרֵי־הַלֵּל; οἱ πλάσσοντες καὶ γλύφοντες). It does not dismiss the possibility there are other divine figures, but casts doubt on their effectiveness. “Who would fashion a god or cast an image that can do no good?” The ambiguity in the MT Isaiah 44:9 leaves unclear whether the witnesses (עֵד) refer to the idols, the

Israel in relation to God?” Over and over Second Isaiah asserts that Israel is YHWH’s servant” (*Remember the Former Things: The Recollection of Previous Texts in Second Isaiah* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 209-10).

¹⁴⁴ For example, Blenkinsopp finds the restoration of the temple a central element of later Isaianic redactions (cf. 63:18; 64:11), “from which time the scribal additional, v. 28b, probably derives” (*Isaiah 40-55*, 247).

¹⁴⁵ Baltzer shows his theological investment in this passage: “Thus in DtIsa form and content coincide: the text demands men and women who know this, and that applies especially when DtIsa confesses his faith in ‘the living God’” (*Deutero-Isaiah*, 180).

product of those who make them, or those who support idolatry (idol-making) but aren't a part of the group. Through Isaiah, 77 are described as faithful priests or those who attest to this specific understanding of YHWH (cf., 8:2; 43:9-10; 43:12; 55:4). Belief in YHWH, as expressed here, is incompatible with belief in idols (Exod 20:4, 23; Deut 5:8; 34:17; Dan 3), though there are some instances of carved images which remained a part of Israel's social history (Gen 31:34). As reviewed above in Mullen and Blenkinsopp, belief in one god is considered as one of the central elements constituting Israel's character as YHWH's people.¹⁴⁶ DtIsa reinforces this belief through the repeated declaration, "I am YHWH" (44:24; 45:3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 18, 19, 21). The text is intentionally hostile towards those who attempt to blur this reality: the ones who make things (יִצְרָר; οἱ ποιοῦντες) are contrasted with their lifeless creations (תְּהוֹר; μάταιοι). It would not be lost on readers that Isaiah frequently uses תְּהוֹר to describe desolation and destruction as well as chaos.¹⁴⁷ For example, 24:10 reads, "The city of chaos is broken down, every house is shut up so that no one can enter." This linguistic link creates a relationship between image makers and desolation.

However, the imagined relationship is not with individual makers but those in a guild. חֶבְרִי is frequently rendered as 'comrades' or 'association,' a collective that can be spatial, spiritual, or financial in nature. Psalm 122 depicts Jerusalem as the center of such an association. After expressing joy to again enter Jerusalem, the petitioner describes Jerusalem as a city "firmly bound together" (הֶבְרִיָה; ἡ μετοχῆ), the home base of the tribes of Israel. This association contains a direct link to YHWH: "For there the thrones for judgment were set up, the thrones of the house of David" (Ps 122:5). DtIsa expands the previous link between people and the temple to include associations. It is unclear whether this proclamation of judgment is original to DtIsa or an adjudication incorporated from elsewhere.

The detailed nature of the description suggests the initial author was intimately familiar with this guild. I question whether these associations under attack were only non-Jewish. When incorporated into the judgment scene of DtIsa against segments of the Judean community (44:1-2), the incisiveness seems personal, suggesting these are known co-workers in support of the religious life of Jerusalem. This critique falls squarely upon the economics of ritual and this guild in specific. Like Psalm 122, DtIsa does not appear to simply take aim at a particular craft (iron

¹⁴⁶ Cf. Baltzer, *Deutero-Isaiah*, 191.

¹⁴⁷ 24:10; 29:21; 34:11; 40:17; 40:23; 41:29; 45:18-19; 49:4; 59:4.

worker - בְּרִנָּל תָּרַשׁ; carpenter - תָּרַשׁ עֲצִים), but through the critique of these associations challenges those who are not following the strictures relating to monotheism. This becomes more prominent when DtIsa contrasts the makers of images with YHWH, the maker of all of creation. Isa 44:21 draws this parallel directly, “I formed you” (יִצְרַתִּיךָ). Isa 44:11 makes clear that the makers are human. The formative power of YHWH is set against not only the objects created by the guilds, but the associations as well. Isaiah 44:25-28 intensifies this sentiment by expanding the arbitration to other professional religious practitioners. The three participles followed by sentences in the imperfect suggest action that is ongoing or continual, not past action. Those who prophesy, interpreters of visions and teachers, are displaced in lieu of the aforementioned vision established in Isaiah. As a post-exilic statement projecting into the past, DtIsa thus labels Cyrus a ‘shepherd’ and ‘anointed’ for the reestablishment of the temple and associated practices. Cyrus’s anointing cannot be separated from the declaration of Israel’s sin (44:21-22). The polemic against religious guilds exemplifies a dispute of business practices as well as beliefs.

A further connection might be found in Cyrus’s ‘anointed’ title itself. The only high priest to be anointed with a king in the Second Temple Hebrew texts was Zadok in 1 Chron 29:22. The two-day festive ceremony begins with David addressing the people of Israel to keep faith in YHWH, and the people respond with obeisance to YHWH and the king. On the second day, the royal servants perform a massive sacrifice, combining the enthronement ceremony with a cultic act. However, the greater significance of the narrative is the subtle inclusion of Zadok as an anointed leader. While other high priests in the Jewish texts from the early Second Temple period are anointed, coterminous anointment of Zadok with Solomon sets the stage for dual anointed figures that frequently appear in the other Second Temple texts, like those now collected in the Dead Sea Scrolls. This evidence is important within the context of this argument because it places the priests on the same level of authority as the king: both are anointed, and both are enthroned in power. Cyrus’s anointing harmonizes the two roles. However, the diversification of the concept of ‘servant’ described below shatters any prequalifying need for this figure to be royal; rather, the royal is temporarily made priestly.

This historical and ideological setting for Cyrus’s appointment as “YHWH’s anointed” removes the ambiguity between Isaiah and the Cyrus Cylinder and explains why a foreign non-Jew was named as YHWH’s agent. Cyrus is a royal figure who reestablished the Babylonian temple and its practices. In this sense, Cyrus is the heir of the Davidic promise and a royal

messiah. The literary-historical character of the text must give way to the role of the literary context. He serves the needs of the priestly authors to dispel polytheism without reinstating the requirement of a king. Isaiah 46 turns again towards the false Babylonian deities, and Isaiah 47 compares Babylon with a woman who was excised from her throne. The exaltation of Cyrus as ‘anointed’ is messianic discourse that frames the solution but does not imply YHWH extended Jacob’s covenant to Babylon (48:14-15).

Furthermore, DtIsa’s announcement of Cyrus as YHWH’s agent displaces the need for a Davidic heir. The subjugation of Babylon to Persia fulfills the promise of repatriation. This highlights again the issue with messianism as both a temporal and atemporal act by YHWH. Placed within a prophetic vision, Cyrus, a human elevated to the position of messiah, is anointed outside of creation. Isaiah 45:8 lends support to Cyrus from the power of heaven: “Shower, O heavens, from above, and let the skies rain down righteousness; let the earth open, that salvation may spring up, and let it cause righteousness to sprout up also; I the LORD have created it.” The atemporal actions in heaven are manifest on earth. This contrasts the work of guilds who create formless things with no life (cf., 45:16). Restoration of Judah is not a true or full restoration, in which the capital city, the temple precinct, and all religious and political leaders are restored to their previous positions of greatness. Restoration through the messiah reaffirms a priestly declaration about the nature of humanity and Israel. Here again, the contrast between judgment (sin) and restoration (Cyrus) breaches the bounds of reality to further define the identity markers of Jacob. As 45:17 states, “But Israel is saved by the LORD with everlasting salvation; you shall not be put to shame or confounded [like those in our group who make false images] to all eternity.” The past and future collapse into the present through messianic discourse.

Context Matters: DtIsa’s Servant Songs

Cyrus’s narrative is frequently abstracted from its context. Duhm was the first to suggest that Cyrus’s identification as messiah was set within four servant ‘songs’ (42:1-4; 49:1-6; 50:4-11; 52:13-53:12) that stem from a single, post-exilic work, that was redacted into DtIsa.¹⁴⁸ Due to early Christian engagement of Duhm’s textual divisions, the so-called “suffering” servant of

¹⁴⁸ This identification of separate ‘songs’ is more of a hindrance than help in interpreting DtIsa’s context and purposes. However, I use them here to interact with a vast amount of secondary literature on messianism. For a treatment of the form-critical elements of these 4 songs within Isaiah, see Roy E. Melugin, *The Formation of Isaiah 40-55* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1976).

Isaiah 52:15–53:12, for example, was labeled by scholarship as a ‘messiah,’ which birthed a subfield of its own, separate of Isaiah.¹⁴⁹ This permitted some interpreters to read Isa 44-45 in a different manner than Isa 52-53.¹⁵⁰ It is likely these researchers took their cue from the authors of the early Christian texts that imagined Jesus as the fulfillment of Isaiah’s proclamation, reading the character of the ‘servant of Israel’ and ‘servant of Jacob’ intertextually as a paradigm for a messiah. This imagined interpretation, however, takes us far afield from Isaiah. The Servant Songs, to follow the scholarly moniker, evidence a conscious understanding of messianic discourse. I demonstrate below that we should interpret the servant contextually as the fulfillment of Isaiah 1-2. The Songs re-narrate conceptions of Judah and Israel through the language of a ‘servant’ that frames the inheritors of the covenant as a priestly group.

DtIsa’s Servant is never called a messiah or a son of YHWH. The noun for servant (עֶבֶד) appears in 12 verses of DtIsa. In four verses, the noun modifies Jacob (44:2; 45:4; 48:20) and in two other verses, it modifies Israel (43:9; 44:2, 21; 44:26); in two additional verses, the term applies to both Jacob and Israel (41:1, 8-9). The Servant hymns are passages that detail the punishment and exaltation of an unnamed servant (42:1; 42:19; 43:10; 44:26; 49:5, separate from Jacob and Israel; 49:6; 50:10; 52:13; 53:11). Although consistently debated, the identity of this servant remains unclear.¹⁵¹ The servant in 52:13 and 53:11 includes the pronominal suffix indicating possession – ‘my’ (עַבְדִּי), suggesting this servant is like other previous idealized leaders: Moses (Exod 4:10; Josh 1:2), Joshua (Josh 5:14), and David (1 Sam 23:10), among a host of others.¹⁵² The purpose and action of the figure vary based on the hymn. For instance, the first song (42:1-2) exalts the servant by placing the spirit of YHWH upon him (נָתַתִּי רוּחִי עָלָיו),

¹⁴⁹ The earliest reference to four servant songs stems from Duhm’s thesis. The earliest review of research most commonly cited is Christopher North, *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah: An Historical and Critical Study* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1948). North’s research does not even begin to brush the surface of research on this subject. See also the bibliographies in Israel Knohl, *The Messiah Before Jesus*; William Bellinger Jr. and William Farmer (ed), *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 1998); Kristin Joachimsen, *Identities in Transition: The Pursuit of Isa. 52:13-53:12* (Vetus Testamentum, Supplements, Volume 142; Leiden: Brill, 2011); and Marc Brettler and Amy-Jill Levine, “Isaiah’s Suffering Servant: Before and After Christianity,” *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 73, 2 (2019): 158-73.

¹⁵⁰ As Christopher Seitz states, “The language of Second Isaiah is precisely language tied to a critical decision to extract a portion of the canonical book and attach to it a personality and an independence of thought—even one judged to be exhilarating in its appeal and power to convict” (“‘You are my Servant, You are the Israel in whom I will be glorified’: The Servant Songs and The Effect of Literary Context in Isaiah,” *CTJ* 39 (2004): 117-34).

¹⁵¹ Cf., Harry Orlinsky, *The So-Called ‘Servant of the Lord’* (Leiden: Brill, 1967), 15-51, argues that the servant in Isa 52:13 is Israel, but Isa 53:1 describes an individual.

¹⁵² Brettler and Levine, “Isaiah’s Suffering Servant,” 160.

that will enable him to execute true judgment upon the nations. The immediate context hints at the irony of this exaltation, in that, the servant will endure great challenge and suffering. The LXX does not find an issue with the personification of this figure in Jacob and Israel, naming the servant (Ἰακωβ ὁ παῖς μου, ἀντιλήμψομαι αὐτοῦ· Ἰσραὴλ ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου). Despite these textual elements, Duhm and others separate verses 1-2 and 3-10 because of the assumption that exaltation and suffering of YHWH's agent cannot coexist, and so must represent different sources; the purpose, to enact judgment, and the means to do it – suffering – are at odds.

This is especially notable in the fourth Servant Song (Isa 52:13-53:13), which overtly alludes to the Davidic promise from Isa 11-12. Identified as a human, the servant suffers real or metaphorical disfigurement, infirmity, and was despised and rejected, even by the unnamed audience (53:3). Despite the severity of this, depictions of violence and sickness do not mean the figure died. The simile in Isa 53:7 (“like a lamb that is led to the slaughter”) stops short of condemning the servant to actual death, but emphasizes the severity of judgment.¹⁵³

καὶ δώσω τοὺς πονηροὺς ἀντὶ τῆς ταφῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς πλουσίους ἀντὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ· ὅτι ἀνομίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν, οὐδὲ εὐρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ.

They made his grave with the wicked and his tomb with the rich, although he had done no violence, and there was no deceit in his mouth.

53:2 utilizes a similar metaphor in relation the Servant's origin, a root (שֹׁרֶשׁ; ῥίζα) reminiscent of Isa 10:11. The root grew up before YHWH, suggesting an intimate closeness and yet distinct differentiation from YHWH (cf. 49:7). The dryness in this case does not mean death to the root, but like the simile relating to slaughter, it highlights the severity of the servant's experiences.

Neither does this portion of DtIsa insinuate that abuse and disfigurement nullifies the covenantal relationship between YHWH and Israel and Jacob. The summary at the end of the section solidifies the transposition of the identity of the servant to Israel and Jacob by mixing metaphors and language previously associated with the royal monarchy. Isaiah 55:3-5 states,

¹⁵³ David Clines, *I, He, We, & They: A Literary Approach to Isaiah 53* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1976), 27-28. Cf. Brettler and Levine, “Isaiah's Suffering Servant,” 160.

Incline your ear, and come to me; listen, so that you may live. I will make with you an everlasting covenant, my steadfast, sure love for David. See, I made him a witness to the peoples, a leader and commander for the peoples. See, you shall call nations that you do not know, and nations that do not know you shall run to you, because of the LORD your god, the Holy One of Israel, for he has glorified you.

The proclamation, framed by an unusual number of imperatives in this section, places the covenantal responsibility upon the recipients of the oracle (cf. 60:21-22). Neither does this rhetorical climax utilize the same language of the previous portions, which explicitly use the language of servant, suggesting to some that this portion is an editorial framing of DtIsa. DtIsa does not specifically address a “servant of YHWH” until 54:17, which becomes pluralized in TrIsa (54:17; 56:6; 63:17; 65:8-9; 65:13). This reinforces Beuken’s theory that Isaiah 55-66 employs aposiopesis to identify “servants of YHWH” as an extension of DtIsa’s re-narration of ‘servant’ as Israel.¹⁵⁴

The framing of Isa 52:1-2 depicts the Servant in priestly terms that unambiguously parallel concerns raised in Cyrus’ narrative. Based on Isa 52:1, those who depart from captivity are Jerusalem and Zion, and in the following verses the narrator switches to second person plural verbs (finite and imperatives) as synonyms for these addresses, which continues through Isa 52-53. This suggests further that the Servant Songs are fully integrated within DtIsa. The naming by YHWH in these verses has two notable effects. First, it is an oracle that identifies the uncircumcised and unclean as that which makes it impure. The declaration ‘do not touch any unclean thing’ (אלֹא-תִגְעוּ אֶת-הַטְּמֵאָה; ἀκαθάρτου μὴ ἅπτεσθε) is a familiar phrase throughout Isaiah to declare something impure or unclean before YHWH (6:5; 35:8; 52:1; 52:11; 64:6), but the combination of Jewish and non-Jewish referents only appear here. This resonates with Cyrus’s narrative (Isa 45), in which the author issued a critique for those who made false objects that based on linguistic and contextual cues, could not be lodged against non-Jews alone. In addition, the phrases of 52:1-2 couples Jerusalem’s holiness with the people of Zion. Gen 17:14 makes clear that to be uncircumcised is a clear violation of YHWH’s covenant. Moses uses this language metaphorically in Exod 6:12 as a plea to indicate to YHWH that he was unfit for duty. Jeremiah 6:10 imagines ears that are עֲרֵלָה (uncircumcised) as in shut off from God. In the poetic

¹⁵⁴ W.A.M. Beuken, “Isaiah chapters 1xv-1xvi: Trito-Isaiah and The Closure of the Book of Isaiah” in *Congress Volume Leuven 1989* (Leiden: Brill, 1991), 204-221.

lines of Ezekiel 28:10, the uncircumcised are those who are foreigners. Things and people labeled as uncircumcised are declared unclean, a real or metaphorical identity marker among Jews (cf. Exod 12:48; Lev 26:41; Judg 14:3; 1 Sam 14:6; 17:26, 36; 31:4; 2 Sam 1:20). The consolidation of Jerusalem – the holy city – and Zion, creates a hard boundary between not only Jews and non-Jews, but also among circles of Jews.

This provides an important interpretive lens for the language of sin within Isa 52:11-53:13. The Servant's suffering is thrust upon his own generation for their lawlessness (τῶν ἀνομιῶν τοῦ λαοῦ μου); the evil and the rich are alluded to as those perverting the land, while the Servant himself is free from corruption (53:9). With the second person plural form of δίδωμι combined with ἡ ψυχὴ modified by ὑμῶν, it becomes clear that, especially for Greek Isaiah, DtIsa intended to craft the servant after Jacob and Israel.¹⁵⁵ If so, this disparity of 53:10 frames the Servant's actions as a sacrifice for sin, which harkens back to the introductory chapters of Isaiah (ἀνομία – 1:5, cf. 3:8; נַפְשָׁךְ – only Isa 53:5, 8). Attempts to view the Servant's experiences as vicariously redemptive misread the context.¹⁵⁶ The suffering and exaltation of YHWH's agent – Israel and Jacob – becomes the needed solution to the problem of sin.

The setting of exaltation in Isa 52:11-53:13 also sheds light upon the contextual usage. The idolatry of Isa 44-45 and the oracle against the people – that is, Judah and Israel – in 49:22-50:1 are finally rebuffed here at the conclusion of this long court scene. YHWH's declaration for judgment is fulfilled in the commissioning of the servant. Prior to the description of the eternal covenant in Isa 55, the servant's fate is described from the heavenly realm (vs. 2-3 and 7-10). Similar to the introduction to Isaiah, these declarations are made outside of time and creation, which collapse the future and the present time: the judgment upon the servant happened in the

¹⁵⁵ The use of personification should not assume a specific historical referent. As Sheldon H. Blank states: "A personification is both a fiction, a figment, a figure of speech, and a reality, a fact. And a writer employing the device of personification may slip intentionally or unintentionally from fiction into fact" (*Prophetic Faith in Isaiah* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1967), 102).

¹⁵⁶ Hermann Spieckermann argues that the experiences of Isaiah's Suffering Servant vicariously redeems Israel, but this act has no parallels in the HB ("The Conception and Prehistory of the Idea of Vicarious Suffering in the Old Testament," in *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources* (ed. Bemd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher; trans. Daniel P. Bailey; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 1-15). Walther Zimmerli reads the actions of the servant in relation to Leviticus 16 (*Studien zur attestamentlichen Theologies und Prophetie*, TB 51 (Munich: Kaiser, 1974), 213-21. See also Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40-55*, 351; David Allen, "Substitutionary Atonement and Cultic Terminology in Isaiah 53," in *Gospel according to Isaiah 53* (ed. Darrell Block and Mitch Glaser; Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2012), 171-89; Marvin Sweeney, *Isaiah 40-66. The Forms of the Old Testament Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), 209-215. Joachimsen (*Identities in Transition*, 386-90) and North (*Suffering Servant in Duetero-Isaiah*, 147) argue the text is just too corrupt to establish clear lines of intertextuality.

past and the present, rhetorically pushing the reader to future result clauses. For instance, Isa 53:11 claims:

Out of his anguish he shall see light; he shall find satisfaction through his knowledge.
The righteous one, my servant, shall make many righteous, and he shall bear their iniquities.

This is immediately followed by the result clause,

Therefore I will allot him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he poured out himself to death, and was numbered with the transgressors; yet he bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.

The servant suffered anguish in his soul (נַפְשׁוֹ), not in his body. The shift in verb tenses creates a chaotic monologue in which YHWH describes the past action within the present. The affect of this rhetorical structure emphasizes the return of the temple cultic objects from Babylon (2 King 24:13-17) through the servant. Within the context of DtIsa's declaration of Cyrus as messiah, the Servant assumes both a royal and priestly role.

As mentioned above, interpreters generally agree that TrIsa moves away from the servant as an individual character and instead applies this term to Judah, specifically and, Israel more generally. Marvin Sweeney cogently draws attention to this interpretive move: "Given the demise of the Davidic dynasty and the subsequent rise of the Persian empire articulated in the book of Isaiah, the people of Israel will continue to represent YHWH's eternal covenant in the world at large as a priestly people who serve YHWH at Zion."¹⁵⁷ DtIsa accomplishes this representation through the personification of the servant, that is, Judah and Israel. The songs provide an important context for the Cyrus narrative that continues the reconstitution of Judah as YHWH's select people. This people, however, are recast in priestly terms: they are the ones who stand against idolatry, they are the ones who have suffered for the sins of the people, and they are the ones bearing the objects of YHWH back to Jerusalem. This is especially influential in Isa 60-62 and 65-66. Particularly notable is 61:8-9:

¹⁵⁷ Sweeney, "The Reconceptualization of the Davidic Covenant in Isaiah," 42. Cf. also Sweeney, *Isaiah 1-4*, 27-95.

For I the LORD love justice, I hate robbery and wrongdoing; I will faithfully give them their recompense, and I will make an everlasting covenant with them. Their descendants shall be known among the nations, and their offspring among the peoples; all who see them shall acknowledge that they are a people whom the LORD has blessed.

Judah assumes the mantle of the Davidic promise and the covenant is extended to them into the post-exilic period.

Immediately following the last Servant Song, TrIsa has a strong statement that further delineates the servants from others. Where DtIsa opens with a declaration to hear the injunctions of YHWH, Isaiah 65:1-8 proclaims a summons to act, an indication to most interpreters that this is a logical break in the text.¹⁵⁸ Furthermore, 1Qisa^a adds an additional כִּיָּא, that links chapter 55 with chapter 56. However, in line with Isaiah 1-4, that action – justice – is spelled out in terms of obedience to Torah. The English translations that render שְׁמְרוּ מִשְׁפָּט as ‘maintain justice’ or ‘keep justice’ (e.g., NRSV, ASV, NET) miss the intertextual play of this language. Isaiah 1:17 commands that people ‘do good, seek justice,’ which parallels ‘defend the orphan, plead for the widow.’ Isaiah 1:21 identifies this as the source of Jerusalem’s (and by consequence, Judah’s) sin: “How the faithful city has become a whore! She that was full of justice, righteousness lodged in her— but now murderers!” The only means of restoration is the rededication of justice. In DtIsa, this is the task of the servant: “He will not grow faint or be crushed until he has established justice in the earth; and the coastlands wait for his teaching” (42:3-4). Justice is paralleled with specific interpretation of knowledge.

TrIsa seems to confront this issue with the language of law (מִשְׁפָּט), which establishes a conceptual link to Lev 24:22 that makes a legal distinction between Israel and others. In this scene, YHWH reveals the Torah to Moses as a further specification to the Decalogue (24:13-23). “You shall have one law for the alien and for the citizen: for I am the LORD your God.” Leviticus’s injunction upon the daily life of Israel intends to separate the covenanted people from those in the land which they will soon enter. TrIsa opens the stopgap so that foreigners and eunuchs may enter Judah through obedience to the priestly law.¹⁵⁹ Isaiah 56:3-5 reads:

¹⁵⁸ Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66*, 309.

¹⁵⁹ Ulrich Berges, “*Trito-Isaiah and the Reforms of Ezra-Nehemiah: Consent or Conflict?*” *Bibl* 98,2 (2017): 173-190; Andreas Schuele, “Who is the True Israel?: Community, Identity, and Religious Commitment in Third Isaiah (Isaiah 56-66),” *Interpretation* 73, 2 (2019): 174-184.

Do not let the foreigner joined to the LORD say, “The LORD will surely separate me from his people”; and do not let the eunuch [סְרִיס] say, “I am just a dry tree.” To the eunuchs who keep my sabbaths, who choose [וַיִּבְחָרוּ] the things that please me and hold fast my covenant; I will give, in my house and within my walls, a monument and a name better than sons and daughters; I will give them an everlasting name that shall not be cut off.

These verses create a chiasmic structure with verses 1-2, which lists the foreigner-eunuch and then the solution for the eunuch-foreigner. In Isa 56, respect for the sabbath, for example, means inclusion of the people, invalidating the previous distinction. In addition to Lev 24, it is likely the author alludes here to Deut 23:2-3:

No one whose testicles are crushed or whose penis is cut off shall be admitted to the assembly of the LORD. Those born of an illicit union shall not be admitted to the assembly of the LORD. Even to the tenth generation, none of their descendants shall be admitted to the assembly of the LORD. No Ammonite or Moabite shall be admitted to the assembly of the LORD. Even to the tenth generation, none of their descendants shall be admitted to the assembly of the LORD...

The reversed fortune of the foreigner is similar to the eunuch. Both of these categories of people are offered the choice to join into this group, creating a play on words with בַּחַר that is used throughout Isaiah to describe YHWH’s preference for Judah and Israel (e.g., 14:1; 41:8; 43:10; 44:1; 49:7). The designation of eunuch can have multiple meanings, like servant or an administrator; however, these two meanings are frequently muddled or synonymous in post-exilic texts. Daniel 1 uses סְרִיס to describe high officials (Dan 1:3, 7, 18), while Nehemiah 1:11 is unclear whether the servants are indeed castrated (cf. Jer 39:3, 13; Isa 39:7; Sir 30). In these examples, eunuchs are retainers, servants, and military leaders under emperors and kings. This fits well with Isaiah’s reinterpretation of Judah and Israel as the chosen people who displace the royal monarchy. Like a king speaking to underlings, TrIsa extends the hand of fellowship with other upper class servants. This act brings about the image of a transition of power when a new ruler invites former servants or enemies into his imperial vision. The claim of Isaiah 56:5-8 is

that those who chose to follow the sabbath laws and offerings (v. 7) will be received within the temple, allowing the foreigners to fully participate in Judaic society.¹⁶⁰

The welcoming of ‘those who were cut off’ (literally or metaphorically) stands in contrast to the reconstitution of Judah and Israel in Ezra-Nehemiah. The “ritual ethnicity” of Ezra-Nehemiah seeks to reinterpret the expulsion of the Ammonites and Moabites in Deut 23:2-3 to all foreigners.¹⁶¹ This refinement in the application of the law led to immediate expulsions. The members of the *הַלְוִיִּם* group expelled all those of mixed descent (Ezra 6:20-21), utilizing the same language of division and separation from Lev 20:24-26: “You shall be holy to me; for I the LORD am holy, and I have separated you from the other peoples to be mine” (v. 26). Ezra-Nehemiah likewise uses the language of ‘servant’ to describe Jews as a collective, but only for his associates rebuilding the Jerusalem wall (Neh 2:20; cf. 1:6, 10). The vehemence by which Ezra-Nehemiah cut off those who were on the periphery of the community – proselytes or polytheists connected through marriage – establishes the identity markers of the community as interpreted by the *הַלְוִיִּם*, where TrIsa opens the community for those who follow the sabbath regulations.¹⁶²

But is the *הַלְוִיִּם* group from Ezra-Nehemiah targeting those who follow the teachings represented by TrIsa?¹⁶³ Can a direct correlation be made between these texts that would suggest an internecine debate? Both texts have an affinity for the temple. As I described above, there is a common identity shared by Judah and Jerusalem – to speak of one was to speak of another. TrIsa projects Jerusalem as the residence of YHWH (58:8; 60:1-7; 66:20), similar to the mount of YHWH explored in section two above (cf. 2:1-5). The temple of YHWH, according to TrIsa, is a beautiful and glorious house (60:7, 13; 64:11), a footrest for YHWH (60:13), the location through which Judah maintains its relationship with YHWH. Ezra-Nehemiah says surprisingly

¹⁶⁰ Cf. Bernard Gosse, “Sabbath, Identity and Universalism Go Together after the Return from Exile,” *JSOT* 29,3 (2005): 359-370, who parallels this passage with Ezek 20.

¹⁶¹ While not a technical term, I am borrowing the phrase ‘ritual ethnicity’ from Joseph Blenkinsopp, “Trito-Isaiah (Isaiah 55-66) and the *gôlāh* group of Ezra, Schecaniah, and Nehemiah (Ezra 7-Nehemiah 13): Is There a Connection?” *JSOT* 43,4 (2019): 661-677, here 667.

¹⁶² The critique of TrIsa against corrupt leaders should not be overlooked. In the words of Blenkinsopp, “Isa 56:9-12 condemns corrupt leaders, including priests and prophets, whose leadership will lead to disaster; 57:1-2 laments the death of a *saddiq* and of *hāsīdīm* (*‘ānšē hesed*) associated with him; and 57:3-13, together with 65:1-7 and 66:3-5, 17, condemns practitioners of non-Yahwistic cults. None of this was on the agenda of Ezra and his group as set out in Ezra-Nehemiah” (“Trito-Isaiah and the *gôlāh*,” 669).

¹⁶³ Cf., Berges, “Trito-Isaiah and the Reforms of Ezra-Nehemiah.”

little about the temple itself. However, similar to Isaiah, the temple is the backdrop in Ezra-Nehemiah by which the Jews rededicate themselves to the Torah. Ezra pleads for forgiveness from the steps in front of the temple (10:1, 6), but the public reading of the Torah at the Water Gate (Neh 8:1-12), the celebration of Sukkot (Neh 8:13-18), and the associated festival (Neh 9:1-37), all happen outside of the temple. Both texts highlight the importance of the temple, but neither go as in-depth as Leviticus 1-7 or 11QTemple Scroll^a in describing ritual practices or administrative functions of the temple. In this sense, both have a positive view of the temple as the spiritual and economic center of Jerusalem and the people.

The differences between these two texts appear unified rather than weakened through an analysis of Isaiah and Ezra-Nehemiah's respective ideal groups. Those who tremble before YHWH's pronouncement (הַמִּתְרַדְדִים, οἱ τρέμοντες – 66:5) will not sacrifice again, but assume a humble and contrite heart (66:2). After the poem describing the servants (66:1-16),¹⁶⁴ the editorial comments make clear that despite the injunction against sacrifices they are to remain pure: "Those who sanctify and purify themselves to go into the gardens, following the one in the center, eating the flesh of pigs, vermin, and rodents, shall come to an end together, says the LORD" (66:17). Purity is clearly important to TrIsa. These defenders of proper order are not in contest with non-Jews but with fellow compatriots (אֶחָדֵינוּ). Likewise, Ezra 9:4 reports that some officials (הַשָּׂרִים) claimed repatriated members of Judah who accompanied Ezra had taken wives from local women and women of other descent (Canaanites, Hittites, Perizzites, Jebusites, Ammonites, Moabites, Egyptians, and Amorites). There is no law requiring an Israelite to divorce his foreign wife and send away the wife and children, so Ezra's judgment represents a restrictive interpretation of Deut 23:2-9. It was not lexical carelessness to make room for the foreigner (הַגֵּר) and the eunuch (לְפָרִיטִים) in Isa 56. Also, TrIsa does not conceal the socioeconomic disparity of the servants – they are in need of financial means: "For thus says the LORD: I will extend prosperity to her like a river, and the wealth of the nations like an overflowing stream;" in contrast, the גִּילָה in Ezra are the elites who benefit from royal patronage. The opponents of the servants in TrIsa are those priests who continue to sacrifice without understanding the consequence of their actions. Assuming Ezra-Nehemiah was written after

¹⁶⁴ The end of the poem is unclear for both vs. 16 and 17 begin with כִּי, suggesting either an homeoteleuton or homeoarchy mistake by a copyist.

TrIsa, this suggests that Ezra-Nehemiah declares an injunction against what appears to the גִּזְלָה as a relaxation of the law.

DtIsa and TrIsa's similarity to Ezra-Nehemiah in foreigner/eunuch terminology and purity ideology suggests that these texts represent one people group, or groups that are at least ideologically related. However, where Ezra-Nehemiah banished foreigners in their midst for the sake of purity, DtIsa and TrIsa aim to incorporate eunuchs and foreigners with the conditions of purity. This makes sense within the context of Isaiah's messianic discourse. Daniel 1:3 suggests that the royal family taken to Babylon was כְּרִי־סִי, castrated. If DtIsa and TrIsa used כְּרִי־סִי as a synonym for royal leaders stemming from the Davidic tradition, this instance of messianic discourse serves to recruit the returning Davidic elites. The concept of kingship and David are displaced as a historical reference, while obedience to law and purity become the defining identity marker among the people. This is especially clear in Isa 66:20-21:

They shall bring all your kindred from all the nations as an offering to the LORD, on horses, and in chariots, and in litters, and on mules, and on dromedaries, to my holy mountain Jerusalem, says the LORD, just as the Israelites bring a grain offering in a clean vessel to the house of the LORD. And I will also take some of them as priests and as Levites, says the LORD.

Those who repatriate are to be of a priestly mind. The strategy that first lamented the plight of the people suffering under sin now regulates the identity markers for those trying to repatriate to Judah.

This historical context provides us a social context for the messianic discourse that links the Servant Songs and TrIsa. TrIsa reconstitutes the identity of Judah and Israel through the figure of the servant. The promises once imagined for the Davidic heir are now applied to the exiles who suffered. They are imagined as inheritors of the covenant and are relabeled as the Servant. TrIsa builds upon DtIsa's messianic discourse to further define who can participate within the post-exilic community. This conclusion stands in contrast with Ezra-Nehemiah's understanding of the priestly community who sought to extend priestly rule with an even more restrictive interpretation of the participation of foreigners.

Evaluation of Messianic Discourse

Isaiah is an apropos study in which messianic discourse is used to clarify identity markers. As I identify above, the debate continues on how Isaiah might be divided. It is unclear whether section markers are Isa chapters 1-39, 40-54, 55-66 relating to the pre-exilic, exilic, and post-exilic traditions respectively, or what is more likely, Isa 1-39 represents traditions from Babylonian exile while 40-66 represents a post-exilic tradition, a framework that reinterprets the decimation of Judah in light of the concept of sin. Messianic discourse serves as the means to redistribute and explain the concept of sin and the shifts of boundary markers within the Isaiah tradition. In the act of reinterpreting the Davidic promise of 2 Sam 7, the new priestly community takes shape without a king.

The book of Isaiah deploys royal messianic discourse in a variety of ways. I have highlighted three examples and their surrounding contexts. PrIsa describes a new shoot from the ‘stump of Jesse.’ This figure will cast judgment upon the entire earth as God’s agent (11:4-9). The poetics in 11:1-12 raise a competing interpretation that seems to express hope for an heir of David to assume leadership while also projecting this figure into the future. The hoped-for king will reunite Judah/Israel with YHWH and begin repatriation. The figure is a human being existing within creation who is raised up within Judah to serve as God’s agent. PrIsa focuses especially upon human error as the cause of sin. Walter Brueggemann says this well, “[In relation to Isa 11:1-16] The distortion of human relationships is at the root of all distortions in creation.”¹⁶⁵ However, with the added introduction in 1:1-2:4, sin is framed within cultic terms – malpractice of sacrifices, misunderstanding of the cultic calendar, and disobedience to Torah. DtIsa and TrIsa pick up on these themes and expand the role of the royal messiah to resolve these issues.

DtIsa labels Cyrus as messiah (מָשִׁיחַ), the only occasion in the Second Temple Jewish texts a non-Jew receives the honorific title. The title is not intended necessarily to shower the foreign ruler with fondness within the post-exilic community, but elevate him as a defender of monotheism. A comparison with the Isaiah and the Cyrus Cylinder indicates that Cyrus was remembered as an agent of Marduk. When Cyrus entered Babylon, he conquered the rulers who limited participation in local temples and reinvigorated sacrificial practices. While an outlier

¹⁶⁵ Brueggemann, *Isaiah 1-39*, 102.

compared to David's tales in 1-2 Samuel, Cyrus reflects a physical and emotional closeness to YHWH that alludes to the closeness of the divine agent found elsewhere, including the Servant Songs. DtIsa adapts this tradition to rhetorically rebuff those who proffer and prosper from alternative means of revelation and interpretation of monotheism. This comparative lens illuminates DtIsa's contextual deployment of messianic language aimed at delineating the industry related to temple practices.

The collection of pericopae labeled as Servant Songs do not, when redacted in Isaiah, depict a single individual but a new collective. This 'servant' suffered on behalf of the sin of Judah. While there are overtones within the third and fourth songs that the personification of Judah suffered, there is nothing to indicate that this suffering itself uprooted sin, but it alleviated the ramifications of previous actions. The Servant Songs represent an important move to set Judah as the inheritor of the Davidic lineage. Isaiah 54-56 then reimagines again the identity markers of the servant around obedience to Sabbath practices. Additional allusions in Isa 55:1-8 suggest the author wished to reinterpret Deut 20 and Lev 20. Brettler and Levine are correct in claiming, "...Within Deutero-Isaiah, the servant is not a messianic figure."¹⁶⁶ However, if the task of messianic discourse is to shift the seat of cultural capital, the Servant, or rather the discourse that deploys the figure, should indeed be labeled as messianic.

It remains unclear how Isaiah was received in post-exilic Judaism. A comparison with Ezra-Nehemiah suggests that the interventions of TrIsa were accepted and practiced. The *הַגֵּרִים* found the welcoming of outsiders unacceptable and dispelled them. From this perspective we can hypothesize that Isaiah's perspective represents an early, elite, priestly perspective that sought to reconstitute Judah as the inheritors of Jerusalem.

The Role of Royal Messianism: Restoration as Idealization and Transformation

This study leads us to two final conclusions. A central strength of TrIsa's messianic discourse is that there is no messiah. A segment within the repatriation narrative of Isaiah, messianic discourse revises and reasserts hope for a central politico-religious figure – the scion of David – but shifts the position of privilege from the individual to the collective. As Matthew Novenson rightly claims, "...not all Jewish leaders are messiahs, not all messiahs are royal, not

¹⁶⁶ Brettler and Levine, "Isaiah's Suffering Servant," 160.

all royal messiahs are Davidic, and not all Davidic messiahs are sons of David.”¹⁶⁷ This abides by the genre limitations of prophecy, that is present and future-oriented social and political criticisms. The act of framing in Isa 1-2 and the social criticism listed above both point to a sub-elite priestly group behind the construction of Isaiah. The messianic discourse leverages the common identity in Judah among its proposed audience to shift or strengthen the core identity markers of this group – monotheism and law observance, particularly concerning the Sabbath. With its several redactive layers, Isaiah represents the competing points of view in which the authors of the respective sections draw upon the subtle conflicts of language to shift emphasis upon these markers. The combined force of DtIsa and TrIsa places the ‘Servant’ within a specific orientation to the temple and the post-exilic leadership, one that stands at odds with Ezra-Nehemiah. The messianic discourse in Isaiah creates a circumstantial sphere of influence that necessitates the imitation of action for participation as a ‘servant of YHWH.’ The discourse shifts around the socioreligious field that one gains access to through a messiah.

¹⁶⁷ Novenson, *Grammar of Messianism*, 111.

Chapter 3: Enoch's Chosen One: An Apocalyptic Messiah

Introduction

Rodney Werline's article "Ritual, Order and the Construction of an Audience in '1 Enoch 1-36'" cogently sets out how the authors of the Book of Watchers set out to draw people into the imagined world.¹⁶⁸ "The authors do not simply present a set of ideas that they wish the audience to comprehend; rather, the text seeks to place the audience within the narrative by socially constructing a role in that world for the audience."¹⁶⁹ The authors, he contends, accomplish this rhetorical goal through the use of ritualized speech, such as blessing and curse, that affirm the relationship between YHWH and the chosen community. The interjection of 'blessings' and 'curses,' which pepper 1 Enoch, likely arose from the tradition of the community, suggesting it was a common manner of exchange for social and cultural capital. Each generation following the one addressed in the book assumed the tradition for itself, and further ritualized aspects of the narrative. Members were culturally formed by the language and relational dynamics established by these rituals.

This chapter further extends Werline's intervention by focusing upon how (re)constructions of evil and messianism shift the values of the community. The several parts of 1 Enoch represent a reception and projection of a malleable tradition around the seventh antediluvian patriarch at different points during the Second Temple period. Only two parts of this collection categorically refer to a messiah – the Animal Apocalypses and the Similitudes of Enoch. The Animal Apocalypses relates the events of Jewish history until the time of the Hasmonean Revolt (second century BCE). It uses symbolical animals to describe various people groups. The messianic figure, depicted as a white bull, will intercede at the end of history. The Similitudes of Enoch describe the messiah through four epithets - the Chosen One, Righteous

¹⁶⁸ Rodney A. Werline, "Ritual, Order and the Construction of an Audience in 1 Enoch 1-36," *DSSD* 22 (2015): 325-341.

¹⁶⁹ Werline, "Ritual, Order and the Construction of an Audience," 326.

One, Anointed, and Son of Man. The Similitudes, composed of three parables, relate the enthronement of the messiah in the heavens and conclude with Enoch's realization that he is the Son of Man which he saw through vision. Analysis of these two texts suggest that the messianic discourse in 1 Enoch functions to define the collective of the Chosen, those who follow the appointed agent of YHWH. Encoded within the relationship of Chosen One, YHWH's agent, and the Chosen Ones, the righteous community, are Jewish identity markers that acknowledge all of humanity under the power of evil pronounced prior to the reception of the Law. Forgiveness of sins by the eschatological judge to the repentant offers a new mechanism for Jews and non-Jews alike to join the righteous community. Messianism in 1 Enoch reverberates between the dual poles of protology and eschatology, as Enoch's visions report the corruption of the world in primordial time and its solution through the messiah at the end of time. This symbolic language resists the limiting of the Chosen to a small subset of Jews.

This chapter will begin with a brief review of the textual status of 1 Enoch. There is no critical edition to 1 Enoch. The Similitudes of Enoch only survives in Greek and Ethiopic manuscripts. Despite this lack, structural analysis of the text reveals that 1 Enoch is a heavily redacted text. As a result, the second portion of this chapter will focus upon the shared relation between the Book of the Watchers, Animal Apocalypses, and Similitudes, with a focus on the character of Enoch. I pay special attention to how the authors reformulate the concept of evil and offer the messiah as a solution. The last portion will compare the Similitudes with Isaiah and 1QS, to hypothesize that the Similitudes were penned in part as a corrective to the reception of Isaiah at Qumran.

“Enoch, Where are You?” The Status of 1 Enoch

The text of 1 Enoch divides into five major sections or – to use the traditional language – books, followed by two appendices: the Book of the Watchers (chs. 1-36; hereafter, BW); the Similitudes of Enoch (chs. 37-71; SE); the Book of the Luminaries (chs. 72-82; hereafter, BL); the Dream Visions (chs. 83-90; hereafter, DV); the Epistle of Enoch (chs. 91-105; hereafter, EE); the Birth of Noah (chs. 106-107); and the Book of Enoch (chs. 106-107). While there has yet to be a critical commentary published on 1 Enoch, two recent surveys of manuscripts by George Nickelsburg, and by Loren Stuckenbruck and Ted Erho, suggest that the earliest ‘complete’ manuscript—that which contains all five portions of 1 Enoch—is from the fourth to sixth

centuries CE and preserved in Ethiopic (Ge'ez) manuscripts alone.¹⁷⁰ The preservation of these manuscripts in Ethiopia was likely due to a large project to preserve the early Christian canon under the Christian Axumite Kingdom in Ethiopia during the fourth century.¹⁷¹ The few extant Greek witnesses we possess (e.g., Codex Panopolitanus with the BW; Chester Beatty–Michigan Papyrus XII with the EE) present 25% of 1 Enoch and were preserved with other Christian material. As Michael Knibb points out, “the fact that extracts from the Enochic corpus were copied with other Christian works shows that they were thought to be consonant with Christian beliefs and were part of the Christian tradition.”¹⁷² The Ethiopic text likely comes from a Greek translation of an Aramaic original.¹⁷³ Both Knibb and Edward Ullendorff argue that the Ethiopic editors knew of both Greek and Aramaic versions, but they are unclear to what degree the Ethiopic editors are dependent upon the two textual traditions.¹⁷⁴ I agree with Nickelsburg that the chain of transmission was that 1 Enoch was composed in Aramaic, translated into Greek, and then in turn rendered into Ethiopic, based upon the close word order of some Greek and Ethiopic manuscripts.¹⁷⁵ We have no Greek texts or fragments of the SE (only 1:1-32:6; 97:6-107:3). The 11 manuscripts and fragments of 1 Enoch found at Qumran were penned in Aramaic, and suggests that the BW, EE,¹⁷⁶ BL, and DV, were at least known by the first century CE and

¹⁷⁰ Nickelsburg here builds upon Edward Ullendorff's list in *Ethiopia and the Bible: The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1967* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968). The designator 'Ethiopic' and 'Ge'ez' are used interchangeably throughout this chapter. Ethiopic words and expressions are transliterated according to the principles in W. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez: Ge'ez-English/English-Ge'ez* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1989) and Leslau, *Concise Dictionary of Ge'ez (Classical Ethiopic)* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1989).

¹⁷¹ Pierluigi Piovaneli, “Ethiopic” in *A Guide to Early Jewish Texts and Traditions in Christian Transmission* (ed. Alexander Kulik, Gabriele Boccaccini, Lorenzo DiTommaso David Hamidovic, Michael Stone; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 35-48. Concerning efforts to preserve the Enochic canon, see George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 15-17.

¹⁷² Michael Knibb, *Essays on the Books of Enoch and Other Early Jewish Texts and Traditions* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 62.

¹⁷³ Cf. Erik Larsen, “The Translation of Enoch: From Aramaic into Greek” (PhD Dissertation; New York: New York University, 1995), 198-203.

¹⁷⁴ Edward Ullendorff, *Ethiopia and the Bible*, 61-62; Michael Knibb and Edward Ullendorff, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (2 vol. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 2:27-46. See also James VanderKam, *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature* (SJSJ 62; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 380-95.

¹⁷⁵ See Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 16, n. 61, for a comparison of several manuscripts to Bl. Or. 492 and Bodleian Or. 531. Although I agree with Nickelsburg, I recognize this remains under question. For a classic piece on the contest, see Andrew Caquot and Pierre Geoltrain, “Notes sur le texte éthiopien des Paraboles d’Henoch,” *Sem* 13 (1963): 39-54.

¹⁷⁶ Chapter 108 is missing from the Qumran manuscripts, suggesting it was added later. Nickelsburg assumes that ch. 108 was added approximately at the time of the Parables, suggesting a distinctive change of the format from a ‘Pentateuch’ to a Testament of 1 Enoch (cf., Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 16).

probably circulated together.¹⁷⁷ That the group or groups at Qumran and those who penned 1 Enoch were ideologically related is demonstrated by the sheer number of Enochic fragments preserved and the allusions of this literature in the sectarian documents. I will return to the relation between 1 Enoch and Qumran literature below.

References to the SE in Greek texts, such as Jude (14-15), the *Letter of Barnabas* (16:5), and Tertullian (*De cultu feminarum* 2:294), indicate a clear *terminus ad* in the first century CE, but the precise dating of the SE (36-71), the latest portion, remains difficult to define. Most specialists agree that the 1 Enoch was complete by ca. 40 BCE based on the reference to the Parthian battle in 1 En. 56:5 and veiled references to the Herodian period in DV.¹⁷⁸ Ted Erho raises the concern that dating the SE upon this historical allusion is methodologically suspect.¹⁷⁹ His concern is that “if the passage [1 En. 56:5] is based on history to any perceptible effect, then

¹⁷⁷ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 9-20. The portions represented by the Qumran fragments include chapters 1-36, 72-82, 85-90, and 91-107. See also George W. E. Nickelsburg and James VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A Translation* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), for summary information on the fragmentary evidence. As an example, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar and F. Garcia Martinez, “4Q Astronomical Enoch-a-b” in *Qumran Cave 4 – XXVI: Cryptic texts And Miscellanea, Part 1. In consultation with James VanderKam and Monica Brady* (DJD 36. Ed. S. J. Pfann et al. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 95-172. As James VanderKam and William Adler (eds., *Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996, 34)) and others highlight, it is significant that several pieces of Enochic material were recorded on single scroll (these designations were changed to match the designations used in this project):

4QEnc: BW, BG, BL, EE
4QEnd: BW, BL
4QEnc: BW, BG, BL

It is intentional that I do not define 1 Enoch as a Pentateuch. For the issues surrounding this classification, see Jonas C. Greenfield and Michael E. Stone, “The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes” in ‘Al Kanfei Yonah: Collected Studies of Jonas C. Greenfield on Semitic Philology (ed. Shalom M. Paul, Michael E. Stone, and Avital Pinnick; vol. 2; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 2:595-609, and Devorah Dimant, “The Biography of Enoch and the Books of Enoch,” *BT* 33 (1983): 14-29; cf. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 172-73.

¹⁷⁸ For arguments concerning the dating of 1 Enoch, see Richard Laurence, *The Book of Enoch the Prophet* (2nd ed.; Oxford: J. H. Parker, 1833), xxiv-xxx; J. C. Hindley, “Towards a Date for the Similitudes of Enoch,” *NTS* 14 (1968): 551-65; Michael Knibb, “The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review,” *NTS* 25 (1978-79): 344-59; Christopher L. Mearns, “Dating the Similitudes of Enoch,” *NTS* 25 (1979): 360-69; George Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction* (2nd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 254; Paolo Sacchi, “Qumran and the Dating of the Parables,” in Gabriele Boccaccini (ed), *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Parables* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 377-96; Leslie W. Walck, “The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and the Gospels,” Boccaccini, *Enoch and the Messiah*, 299-337; Pierluigi Piovaneli, “A Testimony for the Kings and the Might who Possess the Earth’: The Thirst for Justice and Peace in the Parables of Enoch,” in Boccaccini, *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 369-79; Michael Stone, “Enoch’s Date in Limbo, or, Some Considerations of David Suter’s Analysis of the Book of Parables,” in Boccaccini, *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 444-49; Hanan Eshel, “An Allusion in the Parables of Enoch to the Acts of Matthias Antigonus in 40 BCE?,” in Boccaccini, *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 487-91.

¹⁷⁹ Erho responds to Paolo Sacchi’s bold statement: “I think that after the [2005 Enoch Seminar] Camaldoli meeting the adjective ‘tentative’ [applied to the dating of the Similitudes of Enoch] should be dropped, given the impressive amount of evidence given in support of pre-Christian origin of the document. The burden of proof has shifted to those who disagree with the Herodian date. It is now their responsibility to provide evidence that would reopen the discussion” (Sacchi, “The 2005 Camaldoli Seminar on the Parables of Enoch: Summary and Prospects for Future Research,” in Boccaccini, *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 499–512, here 511).

its contents should generally reflect the historical chronicle.”¹⁸⁰ This is a problematic conclusion for it assumes that any historical reference must be used in a historically accurate way, which does not prove true for most ancient works, let alone historiography. The depiction of Parthians in the several histories appear idealized and wrapped within the concerns of the authors. More specifically, the reference in the 1 En. 56:5-8 depict the Parthians as participants in the eschatological battle, agitated to battle by the angels. This passing reference implies that the author assumed the Parthians were an active group, but does not make a claim concerning its prowess or its magnanimity in relation to the Romans, Josephus’ central concern. Taking into account Erho’s concerns, we can still safely date the *terminus ante* of the SE in the first century BCE.

The Ethiopic manuscript tradition suggests that the SE is not itself a Second Temple Jewish text. Stuckenbruck draws attention to this point.¹⁸¹ However, such a late dating of the most complete manuscript evidence does not mean that we should dismiss it, for as Stuckenbruck argues, “the extant Ethiopic version, more or less better than the existing Greek evidence, at best approximates what existed during the Second Temple Period, probably being nearly identical in some places, subtly changed in others, and wildly divergent elsewhere.”¹⁸² The Ethiopic tradition represents our closest witness to this tradition that was known in the first century CE, until such a time when a critical edition is available.¹⁸³

¹⁸⁰ Ted Erho, “Historical-Allusional Dating and the Similitudes of Enoch,” *JBL* 130, 3 (2011):493-511, here 496. Erho raises seven astute concerns that presses upon the reader to not date the text within a minute timeframe, a convincing argument that encourages caution. However, his overall thesis does not displace the dating of the Similitudes.

¹⁸¹ Stuckenbruck, August 2019 IOSOT Presentation. Larry Hurtado posted quotes this presentation on his blog (<https://larryhurtado.wordpress.com/2019/10/06/1-enoach-an-update-on-manuscripts-and-cautionary-notes-on-usage/>). The collation of the manuscript tradition is forthcoming. Stuckenbruck’s research will be further detailed in the Proceedings of the IOSOT meeting in Aberdeen in due course. Stuckenbruck confirmed this quote and course of research through personal conversation.

¹⁸² Hurtado, <https://larryhurtado.wordpress.com>.

¹⁸³ The English translations of 1 Enoch in this work reflect George Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam’s *1 Enoch: The Hermeneia*, but compared with Knibb and Ullendorff, *1 Enoch*. For earlier versions, Laurence, *Book of Enoch the Prophet*, and idem, *Mashafa Henock Nabiyy, Libri Enoch prophetae versio Aethiopica* (Oxford: Oxford Press, 1838); August Dillman, *Liber Henoch, aethiopice ad quinque codicum fidem editus cum variis lectionibus* (Leipzig: Fr. Chr. G. Vogel, 1851); Johannes Flemming, *Das Buch Henoch: Äthiopischer Text. TUGAL 7/1* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1902); Robert H. Charles, *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1906).

Our diverse evidence suggests that many Jews and early Christians accepted the book's pseudepigraphic origins and held it as a sacred text.¹⁸⁴ Western scholars too frequently downplay or outright ignore the text because of its lack of canonical status or cite it as evidence without attention to the exegetical significance internal to 1 Enoch. However, the central themes of 1 Enoch – origin of evil, calendar, corruption of the priesthood and temple – become hyper-focused through the lens of messianism in the Similitudes. As alluded to in Chapter One, the history of research relating of messianism has focused quite closely on the relation of the Similitudes to the Gospels because of the common appellation of the 'Son of Man,' firmly setting the tale by the antediluvian hero within the framework of early Christian theology.¹⁸⁵ I draw attention below to the messianic discourse in the DV and SE by defining how they adapt conceptions of evil from the BW (chs. 1-36).

The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly (Their Offspring)

Before exploring the messianism in the DV and the SE, I turn to the monikers of the main two groups – the Unrighteous and the Righteous. The BW never addresses the antagonists or protagonists by name, nor should we expect to see that distinction. 1 Enoch is frequently categorized as apocalyptic literature,¹⁸⁶ a genre that relies upon obfuscation through metaphor

¹⁸⁴ Cf. Annette Yoshiko Reed, *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity*, esp. 9, and James VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995). For lexical references, see also John Reeves and Annette Yoshiko Reed, *Enoch from Antiquity to the Middle Ages, Volume I: Sources From Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018).

¹⁸⁵ As further examples, see Antonio Pinero, "Enoch as Mediator, Messiah, Judge and Son of Man in the Book of the Parables: A Jewish Response to Early Jewish-Christian Theology?" *Henoah* 35, 1 (2013): 6-49; Simon Joseph, *The Nonviolent Messiah* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2014); Crispin Fletcher-Louis, "Jesus as the High Priestly," 57-79; Max Botner, "The Messiah is the 'Holy One': As a Messianic Title in Mark 1:24," *JBL* 136, 2 (2017): 417-433.

¹⁸⁶ There are many important works that consider the meaning and definition of 'apocalypse' and 'apocalyptic': Klaus Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic* (Naperville: Allenson, 1972; translation of *Ratlos vor der Apokalypitik*. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1970); Paul Hanson, *Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Augsburg Fortress, 1979); idem, "Apocalypse, Genre" and "Apocalypticism," in *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible Supplement Volume* (ed. Keith Crim; Nashville: Abingdon, 1976), 27-34; Adela Yarbro Collins, *The Combat Myth in the Book of Revelation* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976); idem, *Early Christian Apocalypticism: Genre and Social Setting* (Semeia 36; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1986); David Hellholm (ed), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings for the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983); Paolo Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History* (trans. by William J. Short; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990; original, *L'apocalittica giudaica e la sua storia* (Brescia: Paideia editrice, 1990)); John J. Collins and James Charlesworth (eds.), *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Conference* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991); Carol Newsom, "Spying Out the Land: A Report from Genology," in *Seeking Out the Wisdom of the Ancients* (ed. by R. L. Troxel, K. G. Friebel, and D. R. Magary; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 437-50; Lorenzo DiTommaso, "Apocalypse and Apocalypticism in Antiquity (Part I)," *CBR* 5, 2 (2007): 235-86.

There remains disagreement surrounding the classification of literature as apocalyptic. The first initial classification of apocalyptic literature by Gottfried Christian Friedrich Lücke in 1832 attempted to contextualize the Apocalypse of John within

and analogy. I don't propose to challenge the qualifications of 'apocalypticism' or 'apocalyptic' here, but highlight that within apocalyptic 1 Enoch the protagonists (the Righteous) are defined as such in comparison to the antagonist (the Watchers and their offspring). In this sense, the author defines righteousness through the condemnation of evil. Revelation and divine election remain at the center of this differentiation.

The ancient Near East has a plethora of stories that describe non-human beings entangled in affairs that make them, in the eyes of the author, categorically evil. The Shedim (שְׁדִיִּם) are only mentioned twice, both times in relation to Israel's worship of foreign beings (Deut 32:16-17; Ps 106:34). In these two cases, the beings themselves are not implicitly evil, but are considered evil because they drew worshipers away from YHWH. We cannot deduce an ideological origin for these characters. These spirits appear at the periphery of the Israelite population, associated with foreign groups. They are less powerful and menacing than YHWH and not outside YHWH's control. In Judges 9, YHWH sends unnamed evil spirits (רוּחַ רָעָה) upon the leaders of Shechem and Abimelech as revenge (דָּמָם לְשׂוֹנֵי) for killing members of his father's house. These spirits make him blood thirsty and his warmongering leads to his own demise, being critically wounded when a woman dropped a rock on his head. YHWH sends forth a similar spirit to Sennacherib (2 Kings 19:7; Isa 37:7) that leads the Assyrian leader to abandon

other like literary works, like Daniel, 1 Enoch, 4 Ezra, and the Sibylline Oracles (Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannis und in die gesammte apokalyptische Literatur. Bonn: Weber, 1832). While interest in this loose classification of texts continued to grow in the twentieth century, the parameters that defined the classification were uncertain. The finding of the Dead Sea Scrolls further challenged the classification: texts in the find represented an apocalyptic perspective, but did not have overlapping qualities with other previously known apocalyptic literature. This challenge is exemplified in J. T. Milik's publication of the Aramaic fragments of 1 Enoch from Qumran, which brought additional attention to the conversation (Jozef T. Milik (ed) with Matthew Black, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976)). In Milik's introduction, he identifies several elements that are common among the Enochic tradition, such as a 364-day solar calendar, protology, eschatology, cosmology, and angelology, though his goal was not to create a systemic framework for apocalyptic literature. It was not until the 1970s that groups attempted to define the genre in definitive terms. For example, as a representative of the SBL's Apocalyptic Group, John J. Collins published a succinct definition and morphology of the genre, defining apocalypticism as: "An apocalypse is a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial, insofar as it involves another, supernatural world" (*Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre* (Semeia 14; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1979); compare Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 2-9). This definition has achieved wide acceptance, though it has had its critics (Cf. John J. Collins' review article, "What is Apocalyptic Literature" in *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature* (ed. John J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford Press, 2014); DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199856497.013.001). The most significant elements include the possibility of divine revelation from divine beings, judgment of the wicked, cosmic transformation, and other forms of afterlife. However, Collins's intervention goes beyond defining a genre to make a connection to a mental framework, indicating a conceptual structure or view of the world. In this view, he states, "the world is mysterious and revelation must be transmitted from a supernatural source, through the mediation of angels; there is a hidden world of angels and demons that is directly relevant to human destiny; and this destiny is finally determined by a definitive eschatological judgment" (Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 8). Collins connects the genre of apocalypse with the notion of a worldview that centers upon the unworldliness of divine revelation. Anthea Portier-Young has continued this work, approaching apocalypticism within the framework of psychology as well as geopolitical history (*Apocalypse Against Empire: Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011)).

his campaign (Cf. Saul, 1 Sam 18). Although these evil figures are frequently rendered in Greek as δαιμόνιον, they are not necessarily implicitly evil but are cast as evil because of their effect upon certain characters.

References to Satan hold a similar function. In Job 2, Satan (שָׂטָן) serves as an advocate for YHWH who tests Job's faithfulness through the destruction of his family and assets. The spiritual being is permitted within the inner sanctum of the divine court, suggesting this is not a common spiritual being but one with significant authority and high placement within the divine entourage. Translators of the Second Temple Hebrew texts most frequently translate the term as an 'adversary,' a spirit being who works on behalf of YHWH to either test people to call forth obedience (Num 22:32; 1 Chron 21:1; 1 Kings 22:19-23) or to punish for sin (1 Kings 5:4; Zech 3:1). There are other occasions when people are depicted in a like manner to indicate their role as challengers (1 Sam 29:4, 22; 1 King 11:23; Ps 71:13). These 'accusers' are defined by their function or role rather than some intrinsic characteristic or state of being.¹⁸⁷

The BW represents an expansion to this tradition. The myth in the BW attributes the origin of evil to a group of disobedient angels. The antagonists are the Watchers, or Watchers of heaven,¹⁸⁸ the divine entourage referred to elsewhere as the sons of YHWH (Gen 6:2, 4; Job 1:6; 2:1; cf. 1 Enoch 6:2; 13:8). These heavenly beings exist prior to creation of the world. 1 Enoch 6 describes the Watchers' crime as an act of fornication. Looking down from heaven, the angels lusted after the earthly women. They abandoned their heavenly position with the express purpose of descending to earth to rape the women. While Shemihazah, the leader of the 'fallen' angels, promises to take responsibility for the angels' corporate action in 6:3, the bond between evil angels in 6:5 signifies that all angels take equal measure of accountability. The leaders of the fallen angels are listed in chapter 6 with no description. The fornication of the fallen angels birthed Giants or Nephilim, (גִּבּוֹרִים, ἑγγήγοροι; Gk: 1:5; 10:7, 9, 15; 16:2; c.f., 91:15; cf. CD 2:18), who freely roamed the earth.¹⁸⁹ 1 Enoch 8 offers a truncated list of the respective angels'

¹⁸⁷ Due to this fact, Ryan Stokes refers to the character as either 'the Satan,' to emphasize the character's role as God's agent of accusation, or 'Satan,' a development of the character that manifested later in the Second Temple period and which embodied evil. See Ryan E. Stokes, *The Satan: How God's Executioner Became the Enemy* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2019), xiv, n. 2.

¹⁸⁸ 1 Enoch 1:2, 5; 10:7; 12:3, 5; 14:1 (2x); 15:2; 16:2.

¹⁸⁹ Nickelsburg highlights that the Watchers are described with the analogous phrase Sons of Heaven (6:2; 14:3) and Watchers of heaven (12:4; 13:10; 15:2), which emphasize the origin of the characters. See also, Deborah Dimant, "The Fallen Angels" in *the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphic Books Related to Them* (Diss.; Hebrew University: Jerusalem), 1974.

infractions, which focus on revealed knowledge instead of the act of fornication. This latter list only includes nine of the 20 angels numerated in chapter 6. This indictment took different forms, including the knowledge of warfare and weapons, magic, and astrological secrets. Reference to the Watchers’s sexual sin, such as the derogatory term ‘bastards’ in 10:9, suggest the Enochic tradition coalesced the two stories in the latter stages of redaction.

Table III.1: Cross references of Fallen Angels in 1 Enoch with Titles and Brief Descriptions

Name	Ref. & Characteristic	Name	Ref. & Characteristic
Shemihazah	6:3 - Chief of the sons of heaven; 8:3 - Taught spells and cutting of roots	Hermani	6:3; 8:3 - Taught sorcery for the loosing of spells and magi and skill
Arteqoph	6:3; 8:3 - Taught signs of the earth	Matarel	6:3
Remashel	6:3; 8:3	Ananel	6:3
Kokabel	6:3; 8:3 - Taught signs of the stars	Setawel	6:3
Armumahel	6:3	Samshiel/ Shamshiel	6:3; 8:3 - Taught the signs of the sun; 9:7; 10:11 - Bound by Michael
Ramel	6:3	Sahriel	6:3; 8:3 - Taught the signs of the moon
Daniel	6:3	Tummiel	6:3
Ziqel	6:3; 8:3 - Taught the signs of the shooting stars	Turiel	6:3

Asael	6:7; 8:1 - Maker of weapons, shields, breastplates, and every instrument of war; 9:6 - Revealed the eternal mysteries; 10:8 - “over him, write all the sins”; 13:1	Yamiel	6:3
Baraqel	6:3; 8:1 - Taught the signs of the lightning flashes	Yehadiel	6:3

Scholars have struggled to articulate the background of this material. Murry claims that the Aramaic derivative עִיר (keeper) might refer to the guardian gods from Semitic antiquity, but does not present definitive evidence for the claim.¹⁹⁰ While angels are depicted as only spirit and humans are depicted as only flesh, the Nephilim are a combination of spirit and flesh;¹⁹¹ such limitations in power would be an anomaly of ancient divine figures and represents corruption.¹⁹² As Nickelsburg states, “Violence and bloodshed resulted from this transgression, because the fathers bred their rebellious nature (spirit) into their giant offspring.”¹⁹³ Helge Kvanvig understands the Watchers as renewed depictions of ancient warrior-kings.¹⁹⁴ Mining Akkadian sources, Kvanvig understands the mythological figures to represent superhumans who were created at the origin of time. While he draws interesting parallels, the Watchers are never referred to as kings nor are they ever granted royal comeuppance. Likewise, Henryk Drawnel presents cuneiform evidence that overlaps with the Watcher Myth to suggest that the story was modeled after the destructive activity of the *utukkū*, demons from Akkadian, exorcistic

¹⁹⁰ Robert Murray, “The Origin of Aramaic, ‘ir, Angel,’ *Oriental* 53 (1984): 302-17.

¹⁹¹ Ronald Hendel states it this way: “This duality of divine breath and human flesh recalls Yahweh’s creation of the first human out of the earth’s dirt and the enlivening divine breath (Gen 2:7). This is a ‘soft duality’ of body and life-spirit that is characteristic of biblical anthropology” (“The Nephilim were on the Earth: Genesis 6:1-4 and Its Ancient Near East Context” in *The Fall of the Angels* (ed. Christopher Auffarth and Loren Stuckenbruck; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 11-34, here 14).

¹⁹² A key parallel example that appeared in Greek culture is the Titans, corrupt offspring between the Greek gods.

¹⁹³ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 46.

¹⁹⁴ Helge Kvanvig, *Primeval History: Babylonian, Biblical, and Enochic: An Intertextual Reading* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 149; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 413-26.

literature.¹⁹⁵ Drawnel offers a potential background for the Watchers, but his brief presentation does not explain how the origin itself changed so dramatically.¹⁹⁶ The Watcher Myth remains unquestionably monotheistic, framing the world under the single authority of YHWH, so any polytheistic origin may be lost in its final form.

Depending on the origins, a counter argument might be raised based on the etymology of Asael (אסאל), sometimes also rendered as ‘Azazel’ (עזאזל). The difference in spelling further suggests a compilation of traditions. Bernd Janowski and Gernot Wilhelm argue that עזאזל is likely a compound of עזז, ‘to be strong,’ and אל, ‘god,’ and most likely represents the historical-ritual aspect of the process of atonement from South Anatolia-North Syria.¹⁹⁷ The only usage of the term appears in Leviticus 16:10, 21-22 (cf. 11QTemple 26:11-13) in which a he-goat is selected and sent into the wilderness as a sin sacrifice on behalf of the Israelites. The author of Leviticus does not appear to describe עזאזל as an independent figure. Strobel’s claim that this reference in Leviticus represents a pre-Israelite tradition may stand up to scrutiny,¹⁹⁸ but as the name עזאזל is only used impersonally in Lev 16:10. To read עזאזל as a sacrifice presented to an individual being (לְעִזָּאזֵל) as a parallel to God as direct object (לַיהוָה), misreads the grammatical structure. There are no other references to עזאזל and such a claim creates agency and personhood in a figure with no supporting evidence.¹⁹⁹ While the meaning of the Leviticus reference is unclear, עזשאל is clearly an antagonist in the Watcher Myth. Nickelsburg is likely correct that the reference in 1 En. 13:1-3 to Asael is due to a later interlocutor, possibly harmonizing the Animal

¹⁹⁵ Henryk Drawnel, “The Mesopotamian Background of the Enochic Giants and Evil Spirits,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 21, 1 (2014): 14-38. Cf. Manfred Dietrich and Oswald Loretz, *Der biblische Azazel und AIT*, 126 *UF* 25 (1993): 99-117. Ronald Hendel also offers a similar argument concerning origin (“The Nephilim were on the Earth: Genesis 6:1-4 and Its Ancient Near East Context” in *The Fall of the Angels* (ed. by Christopher Auffarth and Loren Stuckenbruck; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 11-34). Hendel argues the canonical Genesis account, specifically the ‘J’ source, is clear insight and so whatever the origins might have been, they are over overshadowed by the socio-religious context from which the Watcher Myth was written. For a parallel argument, see Devorah Dimant, “1 Enoch 6-11: A Fragment of a Parabiblical Work” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 53 (2002): 223-37, here 232).

¹⁹⁶ Furthermore, he appears to overlook manuscript evidence when it fits his argument. See Drawnel, “Mesopotamian Background,” 19, n. 17.

¹⁹⁷ Bernd Janowsky and Gernot Wilhem, “Der Bock, der die Sünden hunausträgt. Zur Religionsgeschichte des Azazel-Ritus Lev. 16:10-21f” in *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien und dem Alten Testament* (Ed. Bernd Janowski; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 106-169. See also Dominic Rudman, “A Note on the Azazel-goat Ritual,” *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 116, 3 (2004): 396-401.

¹⁹⁸ A. Strobel, “Das jerusalemische Südenbock-Ritual. Topographische und landskundliche Erwägungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte von Lev 16, 10.21f,” *ZDPV* 103 (1987): 141-168.

¹⁹⁹ Contra Milik, *Enoch*, 313, who bases his comparisons on analogy.

Apocalypse with the Watcher Myth.²⁰⁰ 4QEnGiants^a bears witness to the collapse of the two traditions, in which Azazel is read in place of Asael: “Then he (YHWH) punished, not us, but Azazel, and had made him ...[...], the sons] of the Watchers, the giants, and all [their] beloved ones will not be spared [...] ... he has imprisoned us and he has subdued.”²⁰¹ Grabbe suggests the transition from 4QEnGiants^a, in which the figure of the devil was combined with Asael, appeared in the late second century BCE due to the spread and use of the Greek Septuagint. If the time frame of adaptation is correct, any assumption about pre-exilic literature origin reaches too far back in time and assumes a different understanding of divine power.

According to the BW, the corruption of humanity by the Watchers affected their offspring and, as a consequence, the entire world. In their corrupt state, “the giants began to kill men and devour them. And they began to sin against the birds and beasts and creeping things and the fish, and to devour one another’s flesh. And they drank the blood” (7:4-5). As punishment, YHWH bound the evil angels and annihilated their offspring, binding their spirits to a half-life among the ‘sons of men’ until the end of time. SE presents the spirits’s existence on earth as the root cause for continued sin on earth. The abandonment of the heavenly realm and the revelation of secret knowledge represents a violation of divine boundaries. Other key figures who affect this evil are spirits (19:1), evil spirits (15:8, 9 (3x)), angels (21:20), Nephilim (7:2), Elioud (7:2), stars of heaven (21:5), and Sirens (19:1 - wives of transgressing angels). This violation of boundaries is further reflected in the symbolism of signs and stars.²⁰²

Those who are affected by the Watchers’s offspring are considered sinners (1:9; 5:6; 22:13). The evil spirits obey YHWH, just as the evil spirits described elsewhere (1 King 22:23; Mark 5:1-20), reinforcing a monotheistic authority over the world. We cannot overlook that, in this instance, revelation is both a gift as well as a burden: a gift that gives humanity additional knowledge to confront illness and death, which challenges divine authority, and also a burden for tools of war symbolically mark conflict and the infringement of divine boundaries set on protecting life. There is no further explanation or commentary concerning the meaning of the Watchers or their offspring within 1 Enoch, presumably because the original audience knew the

²⁰⁰ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 172.

²⁰¹ Lester Grabbe, “The Scapegoat Tradition: A Study in Early Jewish Interpretation,” *JSJ* 18, 2 (1987): 152-167.

²⁰² Jackie Wyse-Rhodes, *Reading the Cosmos in Second Temple Jewish Literature: Nature as Model, Sign, Punishment, Witness, and Mystery* (Unpublished diss.; Emory University, 2018).

mythology. While this language is reminiscent of Psalm 53:1-3 that all have turned away (כָּל־אֲדָמָה) from YHWH, the descent of the angels into the world corrupted the right order of creation, shifting focus away from individual acts to the Watchers as a cause of corruption.²⁰³ Where Psalm 53:6 holds out the hope for deliverance for Zion, 1 Enoch 1-5 expresses no such hope for Israel specifically, but for those who are obedient to God’s commandments.²⁰⁴

The author dedicates considerably less space to the protagonists of the narrative. The supreme being is described as God (1:2, 4, 8; 2:2; 5:8; 13:7; 19:6; 20:8; 25:5), God of glory (25:7), Holy One (1:2, 4; 10:1; 12:3; 14:1), Great Holy One (25:3), Most High (9:2; 10:1), God of the Ages (9:4), Lord (9:4; 12:3; 18:15; 27:2), Lord of lords (9:2; 9:4), God of gods (9:4), King of ages (9:4; 12:3), King of kings (9:4); Great glory (14:20), Lord of glory (23:14; 25:3; 27:5; 36:4), Lord of majesty (23:14), and the King of eternity (25:3; 25:5, 7; 27:3). These epithets closely align with other references to YHWH in the Second Temple period. When included within direct address, these titles always appear in groups of two or three. The use of the divine name is also shaped by narrative location: when in the throne room, speakers usually describe YHWH in terms related to glory. The delineation of these titles further highlights the complexity of sources utilized in the BW. While the earlier portions – chapters 1-11 – mostly rely upon God, Lord, or a variation, the latter portions – chapters 12-36 – highlight ethereal adjectives/titles, though this is not a steadfast rule.

The other protagonists appear in the form of named and unnamed heavenly beings. The presentation of righteous angels mirrors the lists and brief descriptions of the evil angels. While Michael, Raphael, Gabriel, and Phanuel surround YHWH in the heavenly temple (9:1; 40; 54:6; 71:8-9; Cf. 1QS 9:14-15), the larger group of seven angels appear within Enoch’s visions of the eschaton (Tobit 12:15; Rev 8:2; Apoc. Mos. 40:2).

²⁰³ Miryam T. Brand says it this way: “The inclusion of this type of knowledge in the Watchers myth achieves a dual purpose: it delegitimizes and demonizes this knowledge while also accounting for its perceived effectiveness. According to the redactor of *BW*, both the sinfulness and the effectiveness of magical and divinatory practices originate from the same source: the evil Watchers and their sin in transgressing the boundaries between human and divine. These evil otherworldly forces provide the power that enables these illicit practices” (“*At the Entrance Sin is Crouching*”: *The Source of Sin and Its Nature as Portrayed in Second Temple Literature*” (Unpub. Diss.; New York: New York University, 2011), 302).

²⁰⁴ Outliers, such as Corrado Martone (“The Enochic Tradition and the Diversity of Second Temple Judaism,” *Henoch* 30 (2008): 51-55), who argue that it was doubtful that the Enochic corpus was ‘Jewish,’ do not appreciate the complexity of the Enochic literature. In contrast, see David Jackson, *Enochic Judaism: Three Defining Paradigm Exemplars* (London: T&T Clark, 2004).

Table III.2: Cross References of Angels in 1 Enoch with Titles and Brief Descriptions

Name	Ref. & Characteristics	Name	Ref. & Characteristics
Michael	9:1; 10:11; 20:5 – Overseer of good people; 24:6 – leader of righteous angels; Enoch’s guide of the holy mountain & Tree of Life	Ruel	20:4 – Avenger against the world of luminaries; 22:4
Sariel	9:1; 10:1; 20:6 – Overseer of the spirits human spirits who sin against the spirit(W/C); 27:2 – Enoch’s guide of eternal torture	Remiel	20:8 – Overseer of the resurrected
Raphael	9:1; 10:4 – Binds Asael; 20:3 – Overseer of the spirits of humans; 22:3 - Enoch’s guide	Uriel	20:2 – Overseer of world and Tartarus; 21:9 (missing in Grk); 33:3
Gabriel	9:1; 10:4 – Destroyer of the Watchers; 20: 7 - Overseer of paradise, the serpents, and Cherubim; 23:6 – Enoch’s guide of paradise	Cherubim	14:18; 20:7
Spirits of Heaven	15:10	Holy Angels	22:6

The counter revelation of the angels serves as a corrective to the revelation from the evil angels: rather than spreading violence, the righteous scribe Enoch meets the angel Gabriel, the heavenly being responsible for correcting the problem of the Watchers and protecting the gates of paradise; rather than revealing secret knowledge that leads to death, Enoch meets Remiel who supervises the resurrection; rather than Azazel’s false collaboration to commit evil, Enoch meets Michael who unites the righteous angels together, a pact to preserve life instead of consuming it. These holy angels intercede on behalf of humanity to YHWH: “the earth, devoid (of inhabitants),

raises the voice of their cries to the gates of heaven. And now to <us>, the holy ones of heaven, the souls of humans make a suit.” As a result, YHWH commissions these angels to absolve sin.

The author’s use of Michael as the lead angel is another significant tie in with the identity of Israel. For Daniel, the primary role of Michael was as the patron and protector of Israel (Dan 10:21). Alongside Gabriel, Michael fights against the prince of Persia, though within the narrative the identity of the Prince is ahistorical and cast into the eschaton. Other texts report a similar eschatological function. 1QM 17:6-8 marks Michael as a majestic angel who wields eternal power and will sustain the covenant of YHWH with Israel (cf., 4Q529 1:1). Daniel and 1QM 17 share a common element in which the protagonists are imagined as priests or people set apart from the general populace, a select group. Michael serves as the avenger of the righteous who were wronged by evil angels and their offspring. The destruction of the wrong-doers is not immediate, but they will be bound until the end of time: “And everyone who is condemned and destroyed henceforth will be bound together with them until the consummation of their generation. And at the time of the judgment, which I shall judge, they will perish for all generations” (10:14). Michael is YHWH’s sword of destruction. The destruction of the sinful creates space for the righteous to grow in stature and increase in number.

The protagonists on earth, the ‘Righteous’ or ‘Sons of Men’ are mentioned only rarely within this retelling of primordial time, both references within the section involving Michael (10:17, 21). These earthly figures are clearly distinct from the righteous angels mentioned elsewhere (14:25; 15:10; 22:6). The lack of specific reference can easily be attributed to the subject of the Watcher myth that relates sin as an evil corrupting power. While present on earth, all humans are subject to this force. Michael’s key task is to ‘destroy all perversity on earth’ (10:16). The cleansing of the earth is reminiscent of the divine promise in Genesis. However, this vision is similar to Jubilees or Genesis Apocryphon, in which the origins of Early Judaism are rewritten to emphasize differing values of revelation and evil to name but a few.²⁰⁵ The Righteous are not named nor numbered, and express no agency within the divine setting.

The Watcher Myth presents the story of fallen angels as the origin of sin, and YHWH’s intervention to pass judgment to resolve the on-going effects of evil on earth. The specific mention of key angels illuminates the interconnectedness of the Watcher Myth with other origin

²⁰⁵ Cf. Molly Zahn, *Genres of Rewriting in Second Temple Judaism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020).

stories, such as messianism, in the Second Temple period. The protagonist and antagonist are reinterpreted in the SE.

The World through the Eyes of Enoch

The BW is notable for its roughly connected parts that develop non-linearly in the narrative: Enoch's visions frequently portray a similar point in time or location seen within the final judgment of creation. Names of key characters appear with different spellings (Azazel, Asael); the central cause of sin is complex (breaking of sexual boundaries; revelation of hidden knowledge). Editorial comments that open or close sections offer interpretations that appear at first glance as a distraction from the main point of the story. Several distinct literary features bind the BW together and highlight an intersecting social context as a preparatory step for further analysis.

The exact writing and rewriting process is lost to us. 1 Enoch 1-6, 6-11, and 12-16 are thought to be distinct portions, with 6-11 being the earliest portion and 1-6 a later introduction. In contrast to chapters 1-6 and 12-16, chapters 6-11 do not even mention the character of Enoch and are written from a third-person perspective.²⁰⁶ The formative element of the BW is the Myth of the Watchers (6-11), which describes an expansion of the narrative in Genesis 6:1-4: "When humans began to multiply over the face of the ground and the daughters were born to them. And the sons of god (בְּנֵי־הָאֱלֹהִים) saw that the women were attractive; and they took for themselves women from all which they chose." In Genesis, this event happens immediately prior to the flood. The *raison principale* that necessitates God's action is a concern that God's spirit (רוּחַ; τὸ πνεῦμα μου) within these creatures will last forever upon the earth (Gen 6:3). The Hebrew and Greek Second Temple traditions present Genesis 6:4 as an origin story for renowned warriors (אֲנֹשֵׁי הַשָּׁמַיִם), as if to explain that the effects of encroachment by angels left a mark of divinity upon the earth. Allusion to this story in Num 13:33 and a scant reference in Ezek 32:27 implies that it was not uncommon to assume these figures survived the flood.²⁰⁷

²⁰⁶ Reed, *Fallen Angels*, 25. Chapters 17-19 and 20-36 contain descriptive reports of Enoch's journeys and are not reinterpreted in the same way in the SE, so I will set aside analysis of these sections.

²⁰⁷ Loren Stuckenbruck, "The Origins of Evil in Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition: The Interpretation of Genesis 6:1-4 in the Second and Third Centuries B.C.E" in *The Fall of the Angels: Themes in Biblical Narrative, Jewish and Christian Traditions* (ed. Christopher Auffarth and Loren Stuckenbruck; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 87-118.

The Myth of the Watchers expands this pericope as a primordial event and origination of all sin. The prologue (chs. 1-5) reveals the eschatological outcome of the Watchers, yet the story of their infraction does not come until chapters 6-7. The vision frames reality in relation to YHWH's theophany in which YHWH will remove or destroy all enemies (10:7). The sin of the first man and woman so central to later Jewish and Christian narratives is only alluded to in passing (32:6). The oracle in 1:1-9 establishes a tripartite framework in which (a) judgment is announced, (b) YHWH and the divine entourage enact judgment upon the rebellious angels and (c) judgment upon humans who perpetrate their crimes:

And he took up his discourse and said, "Enoch, a righteous man whose eyes were opened by God, who had the vision of the Holy One and of heaven, which he showed me. From the words of the watchers and holy ones I heard everything; and as I heard everything from them, I also understood what I saw. Not for this generation do I expound but concerning one that is distant I speak. And concerning them I take up my discourse."

The form of pronouncement varies within the collection of 1 Enoch but appears consistent in the BW and SE. Enoch's throne vision and heavenly journeys are shifted to an eschatological period when YHWH judges the wicked and saves the chosen ones. As I describe below, this is a central connection to the SE.

1 Enoch 1:3-9 and 2:1-5:9 are important at this outset. The two portions, which repeat the same three-fold process, define Enoch's wisdom revealed to him through vision. 1 Enoch 1:3-9 can be divided in the following way: YHWH's appearance (3-4); Reaction of Watchers and Cosmos (5-7); Blessing to the righteous and chosen (8); Judgment upon evildoers (9).²⁰⁸ The theophany appears to reinterpret Moses's final blessing upon Israel before his death (Deut 33:1-5). Deuteronomy 33:3-5 declares that the holy ones, YHWH's favorite of all peoples, accept YHWH's direction, that is the Torah of Moses (תּוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה לְבָנָיו מִשָּׁמַיִם):

This is the blessing with which Moses, the man of God, blessed the Israelites before his death. He said: The LORD came from Sinai, and dawned from Seir upon us; he shone forth from Mount Paran. With him were myriads of holy ones; at his right, a host of his own.

1 Enoch 1 slightly alters the description and location of YHWH.

²⁰⁸ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 143.

The Great Holy One will come forth from his dwelling, and the eternal God will tread from thence upon Mount Sinai. He will appear with his army, he will appear with his mighty host from the heaven of heavens. All the watchers will fear and quake, and those who are hiding in all the ends of the earth will sing.

Through a parallel literary structure in 1:4, 1 Enoch reports that the Holy One comes forth from the Holy One's dwelling and the eternal God will forever walk upon Mount Sinai, coordinating images between heaven and earth: that which happens in heaven also happens on earth.

In addition, the passing allusion to Mount Sinai serves to locate the Torah within the inner sanctum of YHWH, making the Torah revealed wisdom that is a part of the primordial makeup of the world. 1 Enoch 1 also depicts the judgment of the Watcher narrative and the choosing of the Holy Ones as the binding of the community in place of the Torah.

He will bless (them) all. Light will shine upon them, and he will make peace with them. Look, he comes with the myriad of his holy ones, to execute judgment on all, and to destroy the wicked, and to convict all humanity for all the wicked deeds that they have done, and the proud and hard words that wicked sinners spoke against him.

1 Enoch 1 eliminates the reference to the twelve sons of Israel in Deut 33, and instead foreshadows the judgment of the Watchers. The judgment against the Watchers serves the dual purpose of condemning the Watchers and uplifting the Righteous. While the Watchers are imagined as spread throughout all of creation ("those who are hiding unto the ends of the earth"), the Holy Ones are a smaller, select group. The new theophany of 1 Enoch 1:3-9 creates a new origin story for revelation, related to but separate from the Torah that retools the narrative of election to incorporate the theme of judgment. This bridges protology and eschatology, with the effect that emphasizes the conflict between the Watchers and the Righteous as a point of revelation.

The chapter division between 1:9 and 2:1 creates a false sense of division that disconnects the imperative of 'look' (1:9) from the imperatives that follow (contemplate: 2:1, 3:1; 5:1; observe: 2:2, 3; 4:1, 4:3). The section is complicated by textual problems making it difficult to affirm a consistent tradition.²⁰⁹ When taken as a whole, the pericope reads as a summary of divine law that guides the Holy Ones. It establishes the proper order of creation that follows regular seasons. The concluding portion in 1 En. 5:1-2 equates the passing of the seasons

²⁰⁹ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 2*, 150-51.

with instruction: “Contemplate all these works, and understand that he who lives for all the ages made all these works. And his works take place from year to year, and they all carry out their works for him, and their works do not alter, but they all carry out his word.” Instead of the law written on tablets, the divine law is imprinted into creation. The verdict moves from analogy to accusation in verse 4, which draws the pericope to a conclusion and completes the parallel section of 2:1-5:3:

all the deeds... they have done (1:9)
you have not acted... (5:4)
the proud and hard words... they spoke against him (1:9)
you have spoken proud and harsh words against his majesty (5:4)

The focus upon word and deed further indicates this relation of the seasons is not completely abstract, but still a law.

The question about whether 1 Enoch as a whole is supportive or dismissive of the Mosaic Torah remains an active question.²¹⁰ 1 Enoch never directly quotes from the Torah, though it is likely that the authors were familiar with the Torah based on paraphrases and allusions. The nature of the relationship remains varied. Enoch’s wisdom does not lend itself to a displacement of the Mosaic Torah, in that it does not attempt to *replace* the Torah with a new one but conveys an earlier, more universal law. Reformulating the guiding laws of creation suggests that the author is intending to redress the wider subject of authority and its abuses, but not displace the

²¹⁰ This debate is significant, and the diversity of opinion can be formulated into three positions: those who argue the Enoch literature displaces the Mosaic Torah as the highest authority, those who believe the Enochic literature does not displace the Torah, and those who think there was an ambiguous or neutral relationship. For example, Nickelsburg argues that the Mosaic Torah is not a central issue of 1 Enoch. Although, he maintains, an eternal covenant is mentioned in 99:2, the global scale of judgment – that which affects Jews and non-Jews – implies a broader, universal understanding of law, such as the Noahic covenant (Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 50, 489). Andreas Bedenbender argues that “what was central in the Mosaic concept was only marginal in the Enochic one,” that the paradigm between the Enochic group and other Jews was inherently different (“The Place of the Torah in the Early Enoch Literature,” in *The Early Enoch Literature* (ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins; JSJSup121; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 65–79). John J. Collins agrees, in that the absence of direct integration represents a “deliberate modification” of the Deuteronomistic tradition (“How Distinctive was Enochic Judaism,” *Merghillot* 5-6 (2007): 17-34). Kelly Coblenz Bautch surveys several attempts by scholars to detect particular legal concerns within the text. In this regard, she states “sinful behavior, especially as exemplified by the Watchers, is noted, but not explicitly associated with the Torah” (*A Study of the Geography of 1 Enoch 17–19: ‘No One Has Seen What I have Seen’* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 298). See also, “[g]enerally speaking, the text is concerned with lawful behaviour, but it is difficult to determine what constitutes law for the author” (20). James Vanderkam takes a more definitive stance: “The Enochic Tradition... finds its cornerstone not in the Sinaitic covenant and law but in events around the time of the flood” (“The Interpretation of Genesis in 1 Enoch” in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; ed. by Peter Flint; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 129-148, here, 142). Alternatively, Paul Heger believes that the Torah is a central concern of 1 Enoch, but assumed by its recipients; thus, “the absence of biblical citations in matters of halakhic reasoning and polemics demonstrates that knowledge of these sources was taken for granted” (*Challenges to Conventional Opinions on Qumran and Enoch Issues* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 194). It should be noted that Heger’s central concern here more broadly focuses on refuting the concept of Enochic Judaism.

Torah. Neither does the imposition of a superhuman origin of evil displace the Mosaic Torah, but rather renders humanity as an object of external violence: within the Watcher Myth, humanity is victim to the power of evil as an unrelenting, external force, most clearly embodied in Azazel. Although the Watcher Myth describes Azazel as an instigator for the group of angels who disregarded the divine boundaries of heaven, the single figure represents the collective action. The symbolic action of rebellion was irrevocable outside of divine oversight. By placing the narrative chronologically before the giving of the Torah, the myth undercuts that which holds power over those under the Torah. In this way, arguments that the Torah was a ‘secondary concern’ or that Enochic literature was only ‘marginally concerned’ with Jewish law is a misstep that removes the Enochic literature from its historical context. The issue of Torah obedience and (Enochic) revelation are linked.

1 Enoch 5:5-9 appears to expand the pattern of judgment and blessing to focus the reader’s attention on Enochic wisdom. 1 Enoch 5:5-9 returns to the poetic style seen prior to 2:1, suggesting that 2:1-5:4 was inserted to clarify the revelation of 1:4-9. The primary substance of Enoch’s wisdom is the impending judgment upon the Watchers, which again elaborates upon the two groups defined in a converse relationship. 1 Enoch 5:5 stands as a verdict against those who do not follow the indictments of 2:1-5:4: “Then you will curse your days, and the years of your life will perish, and the years of your destruction will increase in an external curse; and there will be no mercy or peace for you!” The passage has two significant literary elements. First, the curse exemplifies the dynamic of time within the Enochic view of creation in relation to the two groups. Those who sinned as a result of the Watcher’s corruption will be subject to death because of their actions, bringing the immediacy of the future eschaton upon the present (cf. 12:6). The Chosen will experience the forgiveness of sins, indicating that they, too, have sinned but will still inherit a blessing (cf. Isa 57:13). The switching between third-person plural and second-person plural verbs suggests that the author pointed this address at the sinners. This dimension creates two separate groups - sinners and the righteous.

Immediately following YHWH’s judgment, the Chosen Ones receive wisdom.

(5:8a) Then wisdom will be given to all the chosen; and they will all live, and they will sin no more through godlessness or pride. (5:8b) In the enlightened man there will be light, and in the wise men, understanding. (5:8c) And they will transgress no more, nor will they sin all the days of their life, nor will they die in the heart of God’s wrath.

While it's unclear whether the wisdom in 5:8a will be the cause of their continued life and sinlessness or a result of their identity as chosen ones, 5:8b indicates the wise are privileged to understanding with which they will not sin, making a causal relationship more probable. The differences between the two pericopae are striking but in both occurrences, Wisdom serves an important role for the Righteous as a refining source.

Chapters 12-16 shift to a first-person report by Enoch. The editorial introduction of 12:1-2 reflects 1 Enoch 1:3, which highlights Enoch as a mediator of the Watchers and companion of the Holy Ones. The opening line indicates Enoch is transposed as a human into the heavenly realm: "before these things, Enoch was taken; and no human being knew where he had been taken, or where he was, or what had happened to him." There is no indication that Enoch is transformed into an angel, though a parallel pericope in 1 En. 71, which I return to below, does suggest a transformation in which Enoch is identified as the Son of Man. In the ensuing narrative of 12-16, the Watchers communicate YHWH's divine judgment for the fallen angels to Enoch, Enoch communicates that message to the Watchers on earth, and Enoch documents their response and meditates on it until he falls asleep. He then communicates it to the Watchers through vision. The designation as a scribe and righteous are his only two qualifications as mediator – he is not ascribed any superhuman ability.

In chapter 14, Enoch describes his ascent into the heavenly temple, which is simultaneously aflame and cold as snow. Enoch reports:

And I saw in my vision, and look, another open door before me: and a house greater than the former one, and it was all built of tongues of fire. All of it so excelled in glory and splendor and majesty that I am unable to describe for you its glory and majesty. Its floor was of fire, and its upper part was flashes of lightning and shooting stars, and its ceiling was a flaming fire. And I was looking and I saw a lofty throne; and its appearance was like ice, and its wheels were like the shining sun, and the sound of the voice of the cherubim, and from beneath the throne issues rivers of flaming fire. And I was unable to see. The Great Glory sat upon it; his apparel was like the appearance of the sun and whiter than much snow.... Flaming fire encircled him and a great fire stood by him, and none of those about him approached him. Ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him, but he needed no counselor; his every word was deed.

The repeated use of seeing verbs indicate that this thick description of the throne room is mediated by Enoch's sight, pointing to vision and sense as the source of revelation over a text or tradition. The absence of a solid roof permits Enoch to look upon the heavens and stars, the very

elements of nature. This combines the throne of the heavenly sanctuary with the revelatory signs discussed throughout 1 Enoch (esp., 79:1-6; 82:9-20). While Enoch is permitted into the heavenly temple, a right hitherto unknown to humans, he is not permitted to actually look upon the Great Glory. The view of the heavenly temple elevates Enoch to the same position as the heavenly entourage.

YHWH addresses Enoch directly in the following oracle, 14:24-16:4, which expands the judgment upon the Watchers (cf., 9:1-11:2) to detail the result for their offspring. YHWH commands that Enoch should again respond to the Watchers that their petition should have been on behalf of humanity rather than their own offspring. Their sin is described as two-fold, “forsaking the high heaven, the eternal sanctuary” and defiling themselves with blood – the blood of women, the lust of blood, and the letting of innocent blood (cf. 7:5). This passage differs from the previous narrations of this pericope in that YHWH allows the Watchers to enter women because of their desire, altering the cause and effect of the punishment: “Therefore I gave them women, that they might cast seed into them, and thus beget children by them, that nothing fail them on the earth.” This protects YHWH from the incrimination of sin itself. Judgment upon the Watchers and their offspring is necessary because of the eternal consequence of their actions. By preserving the freedom of the individual heavenly beings, the author protects YHWH from the problem of evil while still acknowledging the entire corruption of the world.

We see from these several examples a complicated understanding of sin, including lust, the transgression of the boundary between heaven and earth, revelation of secret knowledge, disobedience of the laws of nature, and the encountering of blood. The patch-work narrative, which appears on the surface to relate similar pericopae, interweaves protological and eschatological positions in time to critique the actions of the Watchers. While Enoch is the clear protagonist of the story, he is not central to every part. The shift between first-person and third-person narrative and the long sections in which he does not play a part focus the attention of readers upon the antagonists, the Fallen Angels and their offspring, and the protagonists, the heavenly entourage and the Chosen on earth.

As many others have suggested, the several allusions to ancient Jewish religious themes suggest that this narrative stands as a critique against the Jewish priestly elite. While it is unclear whether or not 1 Enoch fully supports the Torah, one can perceive that obedience to the one god

YHWH is in the immediate background. If it is true that the author alludes to Moses' final address from Deut 32, the author projects a new revelation into the primordial time.

Dream Visions

This long preamble is necessary because messianism within 1 Enoch is an eschatological solution to the problem of evil I have delineated above. The author of the BW describes the origin of sin as evil angels who have shattered divinely set boundaries. However, the two portions of DV – the Flood Vision (hereafter: FV), chapters 83-84; and the Animal Apocalypse (hereafter: AA), chapters 85-90 – respectively struggle with the role of human responsibility and who might be defined as the Righteous. Both of these short stories continue the process of writing ideology and history together, interweaving the rehearsals of real or fictitious events to instruct a particular audience.²¹¹ The FV offers a petition from Enoch to YHWH requesting a remnant to endure judgment; the AA focuses upon Israel's history that culminates in that remnant. The significant element of this narrative for this argument is that even within the metaphorical world of the AA, the messiah appears as a confirmation of the Righteous and the only manner through which they can remain within the collective. In this case, the messiah also dissolves any national or ethnic distinction.

The two visions offer slightly different understandings of evil. The Flood Vision is recorded as a vision Enoch recounts to his son Methuselah. The timing of the vision appears just as important as its content: Enoch reports that the first vision happened when he was learning to write and the second before he took wife (83:3). As mentioned above, this indicates that Enoch's ability to experience heavenly visions is tied to his role as mediator and scribe for the Fallen Angels. The vision itself is brief and Enoch retells it to his son as he initially retold it to Mahalalel, his grandfather, who woke him from the vision.

Heaven was thrown down and taken away, and it fell down upon the earth. And when it fell upon the earth, I saw how the earth was swallowed upon the great abyss. Mountains were suspended upon mountains, and hills sank down upon hills; tall trees were cut from their roots, and were thrown away and sank into the abyss.

²¹¹ E.g., Neh 9, 2 Bar 36-40; T. Moses 2-10. The order of the visions seems just as important as its content: the introductory explanation in 85:1 makes a clear connection with the preceding narrative but interjects into the plot. The fatherly invitation in 85:2 substantiates a relational connection with those who desire to follow Enoch's wisdom. The bond between the first and second vision is further cemented in 90:41-42 when Enoch remembers both dreams together.

The vision borrows several common geographical elements from the BW (e.g., mountains, 22:1-4; tree, 24:5; 31:2), but does not provide in-depth detail or ideological commentary on the importance of these elements. Slight lexical differences, such as the place of judgment imagined here as an abyss compared to chapter 21 that describes it with adjectives as a chaotic and terrible place, suggests that author was familiar with the tradition but did not seek to duplicate it.

Enoch's petition glorifies YHWH while at the same time acknowledging the sin of the Watchers. YHWH is addressed in extreme terms of deference: "Blessed are you, O Lord, King, great and mighty in your majesty. Lord of all creation of the heavens, King of kings and God of all eternity. Your power and your reign and your majesty abide forever and forever and ever, to all generations and dominion" (84:2). The author of the FV does not cast doubt upon YHWH's authority but neither does he hold YHWH responsible for the sin of the Watchers. In his supplication, the author requests YHWH "leave me a remnant on the earth, and not obliterate all human flesh, and devastate the earth, that there be eternal destruction. And now, my Lord, remove from the earth the flesh that has aroused your wrath, but the righteous and true flesh raise up as a seed-bearing plant forever" (84:5). This plea requests that a select few endure the eschatological judgment, which upholds YHWH as the supreme being and shifts attention from the fallen to a select subgroup. This short petition is the only mention of the Righteous, defined as true flesh, a unique phrase in 1 Enoch. However, this sentiment is reflected in 1 Enoch 1:1 and 1:8-9, and especially 1 Enoch 10-11. Though the Flood Vision stands in parallel with the Book of the Watchers in relation to sin and redemption, the eschaton condemns and resolves the all-pervasive evil introduced by the Fallen Angels while also carving out space for the Righteous.

The AA emphasizes the role of the eschatological messiah to Israel's history. The AA is a re-narration of Israel's chronicle, from creation to the Maccabean Conflict in the second century BCE. The narration divides time into the far past, present, and idealized future, and describes Israel through an allegory of animals. A number of commentaries have dealt with interpretations of specific symbols.²¹² Lydia Gore-Jones has compiled the raw data:²¹³

²¹² Patrick Tiller's 1993 commentary (*A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 1993)) offers a review of major studies on the Animal Apocalypse. See also Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*; Daniel Olson, *Enoch: A New Translation: The Ethiopic Book of Enoch, or 1 Enoch, Translated with Annotations and Cross-References* (North Richland Hills: BIBAL Press, 2004), and idem, *A New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch: 'All Nations Shall Be Blessed'* (Leiden: Brill, 2013); Matthew Black in consultation with James VanderKam, *The Book of Enoch, or 1 Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes* (SVTP 7; Leiden, Brill, 1985).

²¹³ Lydia Gore-Jones, "Animals, Humans, Angels and God: Animal Symbolism in the Historiography of the 'Animal Apocalypse' of 1 Enoch," *JSP* 24,4 (2015): 268-87, here 270-71.

Table III.3: Human Figures and Their Animal Metaphors in the Animal Apocalypse

Human Figures and their Animal Metaphors	
<i>Beginning to Flood</i>	
Adam and Eve Cain and Abel Seth and other descendants of Adam and Eve	bulls, heifers, and calves (white, red, black)
Offspring of evil angels with humans	elephants, camels, and donkeys
<i>Flood and afterwards</i>	
Noah and sons	bulls (white, red, black)
Abraham and Isaac	bulls (white)
Jacob (Israel), son of Isaac	sheep
Ishmael, son of Abraham	wild ass
Esau (Edom), son of Isaac	wild boar
Leaders of Israel: Saul, David, Solomon, and Judas Maccabee	rams with large horns
Nations from Fertile Crescent: Babylonians, Assyrians, Egyptians, Philistines, Arameans, and Ammonites	lions, leopards, wolves, dogs, hyenas, foxes, and pigs
Nations from outside of Fertile Crescent: Macedonian, Ptolemaic, and Seleucid Greek powers	vultures, kites, eagles, and ravens
<i>End Time</i>	
messiah figure	white bull with large horns

humankind	white bulls
<i>Angels and God and their metaphors</i>	
evil angels from heaven who bred with humans	fallen stars
archangels	white men
evil angels in charge of the sheep but giving them up to be destroyed	seventy shepherds
God	Lord of the Sheep

By reinterpreting Israel's history, the AA rewrites history with an alternative to primordial history compared to Genesis, while still using the same central characters. Adam and Eve are not described with details of creation or the garden, but just come forth in creation. Phillip L. Tite is partially correct that this rewritten history addresses the concern of Hellenization during the Maccabean period and the success of the Maccabean revolt. However, the narrative also squarely places blame for Israel's continued suffering on the Fallen Angels (seventy shepherds; cf. Deut 32:8; Dan 10:13, 21-22).

The messiah is defined by four distinct qualities. First, the messiah is an eschatological figure. Although the eschatological judgment is initiated by the Lord of Sheep and indicts the fallen stars for evil released upon the earth, the archangels oversee the books in which the names of the evil angels are written and help the Lord of Sheep carry out judgment. The messiah only appears *after* the eschaton within the perfected state. Second, the messiah is born as a white ram with black horns (90:37). The symbolic color white matches the symbolic purity of the angels and contrasts the other figures described as non-white (red, black) and unclean or vulgar animals (donkeys, pigs).²¹⁴ That the messiah is white and an animal suggests the figure is created, metaphorically of human origin, and elevated to the position of authority; as Enoch reports, "I saw how a white bull was born, and its horns were very large" (1 En. 90:37). Casting the figure

²¹⁴ Cf. Olson, *Enoch*, 190.

as a bull creates a connection with the previously listed Abrahamic offspring, also bulls, making a clear arch across time. Third, born in a state of purity the messiah serves as the progenitor of the new race. All remaining people are transformed into white cattle and serve the white bull. Gore-Jones cogently claims that the author of the AA has a very teleological view of history: “The author sees human history on the whole as a process of gradual deterioration... history will end with a restoration of human kind to its original state, and this restoration concerns all human races, not just Israel.”²¹⁵ By transforming the bull into a new progenitor, the messiah removes all traces of ethnicity and race and sets creation upon a new course without the detriment of sin from the fallen angels. Lastly, the remaining portion of creation fears the white bull and makes a petition to it (90:37), in language normally, though not exclusively, reserved to entreat YHWH (Dan 6:8). Because this vision has so little literary context or detail, it is difficult to determine whether this event is happening, for example, in the throne room or a heavenly temple, to shed light on the meaning.

Unlike Isaiah or SE, the messiah of the DV is an eschatological figure who appears at the end of time. As a concentrated messianic discourse, the messiah unifies the remnant who survive the eschatological judgment. The individual does not play a direct role in the Lord of Spirit’s distribution of judgment upon evil beings.

The Similitudes of Enoch: A Messianic Reinterpretation

Identifying these initial characteristics in the BW and DV permits a parallel investigation into how the SE adapted the Watcher Myth against its antagonist. The Watcher Myth is the starting point for the SE, assuming that ‘evil kings and landowners’ is an extension or result of the fallen angels. I agree with Pierluigi Piovanelli that the SE functions as a midrash or expansion of the Watcher tradition.²¹⁶ A comparison of four parallels illuminates how the SE both assumes the ideological validity of the Watcher Myth and yet reconstructs the narrative within the messianic framework to address the issue of abuse of power surrounding land conquest.

²¹⁵ Gore-Jones, “Animals, Humans, Angels and God,” 285-85.

²¹⁶ Piovanelli, “A Testimony,” 363-64.

The preamble in 1 En. 1:1-3 reflects the opening statements in ch. 37. Both record that Enoch’s vision is for the benefit of those who will come after the proposed point in time, framing the visions in an apologetic tone. Where 1 En. 1:2-3 indicates Enoch’s knowledge of divine action outside of earth comes from his role as mediator between the Holy Ones and the fallen angels, the subscription of 37 indicates the seer received direction revelation. 37:2 reads: “Listen, O ancients, and look, you who come after – the words of the Holy One, which I speak in the presence of the Lord of Spirits.” Enoch’s revelation represents the words of YHWH’s messiah, the Holy One. Several manuscripts attempt to clarify this ambiguity by changing the Holy One with ‘the holy words.’ This textual variant shifts attention to the wisdom that Enoch reports rather than suggesting Enoch was the messiah. While the content of the Watcher Myth is framed as several successive visions (e.g., 13:1-3, 4; 14:1-4; 19:3), the SE is framed as parables (38:1), which places greater emphasis on Enoch as the source and interpreter of revelation. This change brings the preamble into alignment with 48:7 instead of chs. 70-71, a later addition in which Enoch is identified as the Son of Man. The SE emphasizes that the righteous have received the correct wisdom from the Lord of Spirits. Despite the potential textual change, the preamble of SE makes explicit that the wisdom of Enoch reflects the wisdom of God, albeit with different perpetrators in mind.

The Watcher Myth and the SE project a similar form of divine mediation that shields the Lord of Spirits from directly encountering any part of sin within creation. As servants within the holy temple and in close proximity to the Most High, the angels are holy beings, and yet they do not convey sinfulness. Enoch sidesteps this problem by encountering the divine beings – angels and Watchers alike – through Animal Apocalypses.²¹⁷ This is made explicit through verbs or participles of seeing,²¹⁸ experiencing,²¹⁹ communicating,²²⁰ and movement,²²¹ that serve to reveal the glory and vastness of YHWH to the audience and yet sustain a critical distance. In the SE,

²¹⁷ E.g., 13:1-3, 4; 14:1-4; 19:3.

²¹⁸ ‘Seeing’ from either Enoch’s point of view or his guide – 12:6; 14:14, 18; 17:3; 18:1-6, 12-13; 21:2-3, 7; 22:1, 5; 23:2; 24:2; 25:3; 26:2, 3; 29:2; 32:1; 33:1-2; 34:2; 35:1; 36:1, 24. ‘Marveled at sight’ – 26:6. Passive viewing, ‘shown’ – 31:2.

²¹⁹ ‘Summoning,’ 14:8; ‘emotion enveloping,’ 14:13, esp., ‘terrible and fearful,’ 21:8, 9.

²²⁰ e.g., Enoch ‘speaking,’ 12:3; 13:1, 4; 14:24; 15:1; 21:5; 27:1; Enoch ‘writes,’ 33:3-4.

²²¹ ‘Go,’ 12:4 13:1, 3; 15:2; ‘took and led,’ 17:1; passive, ‘led,’ 17:2, 4; ‘came,’ 17:5; ‘traveled,’ 21:1; 22:1; 23:1; ‘proceeded to the center of the earth,’ 26:1; ‘went,’ 29:1; ‘departed,’ 30:1; 31:1; ‘proceeded,’ 32:2; 33:1; 34:1; 36:1, 2; ‘passed,’ 32:3.

Enoch's interactions with the Lord of Spirits is channeled through YHWH's mediator, the Chosen One. The tradition describes the same sense of separation and mediation through verbs of seeing, experiencing, communicating, and movement.

Table III.4: Comparative References of 1 Enoch 1-16 and 31-71

Watcher Myth	Similitudes of Enoch
1:1-3	37
1:3-9	38
Chs. 6-11	39:1
Ch. 14	39:2-14; ch. 40
Chs. 6-11, 17-21	52:1-56:4

Chapter 39 summarizes and reinterprets chs. 6-11. 1 Enoch 39:1 contextualizes Enoch's vision within the action of the Watchers, though the transcendence of divine boundaries, the rape of women by angels, or the revelation of secret knowledge, are no longer the central focus. The SE redirects the judgment for the Watchers against sinners (*'abasā*),²²² identified as the 'kings,' 'mighty,' and 'possessors of the land' who oppress the righteous with evil deeds (53:2, 7). The sinners are guilty of denying the Lord of Spirits (38:2; 41:2; 45:1, 2) and sinning against the unrighteous. The 'kings'²²³ and 'mighty,'²²⁴ those in the highest positions of power within society, deny YHWH's power and messiah (46:7; 48:10; 67:8, 10). Instead of pursuing righteousness, they are lustful (67:8, 10, 13) and persecute the righteous (46:8; 62:11). When the

²²² The sinners: 1 En. 38:2, 3; 41:2; 43:8; 45:2, 6; 50:2; 53:2 (2x); 53:7; 56:8; 60:6. The wicked: 1 En. 38:3; the ones who error: 1 En. 45:5; the strong and the sinners: 1 En. 46:4; the sinners and the unrighteous: 1 En. 62:2, 13.

²²³ The kings: 48:8; 55:4.

²²⁴ 38:4; 46:4; the mighty who possess the earth: 38:4; with the kings: 38:5; 53:5; 54:2; 63:1; 62:1, 3, 6, 9; 63:1, 12; 67:8-12.

Son of Man arrives, these individuals will be humiliated and shamed (46:6; 62:10; 63:11), and punished (62:11).

These individuals are never overtly named nor can their identity be pieced together through these references.²²⁵ The identity of the kings of the earth (*nagasta medr*), mighty (*'azizan*), and the exalted (*le 'ul*) remain one of the challenging interpretive issues of 1 Enoch.²²⁶ Anthony Keddie proposes these unnamed figures are from “any other Parthian or Roman client-kings (such as Herod) who inevitably would become involved in a way at the strategic crossroads of empires in Palestine.”²²⁷ The diverse and nondescript terms suggest that perpetrators are from a broad class of elites and should not be rendered with any greater specificity; the author takes care not to name them. Rather, they are grouped together as a class “socially, culturally, and economically.”²²⁸ What is more important is their descriptions as ‘sinners’ (e.g., 46:4-6), which has two notable consequences. First, the identification of the kings and mighty with ‘sinners’ points to a shift in context. The kings and the mighty are never said to be the direct offspring of the Watchers, but remain guilty for utilizing weapons of war and misinformation against the righteous. At the eschaton Enoch imagines their destruction (1 En

²²⁵ Contra Nickelsburg, “Apocalyptic and Myth in 1 Enoch 6-11,” *JBL* 96 (1977): 383-405.

²²⁶ See Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 2. Hermeneia Critical Commentary Series* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), 103-106, on the possible meaning of these terms.

²²⁷ G. Anthony Keddie, *Revelations of Ideology: Apocalyptic Class Politics in Early Roman Palestine* (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 143.

²²⁸ Keddie, 155. Keddie reflects here upon a long line of historians who seem to misunderstand the use of historicism in the Enochic literature. As an example, he states, “Instead of the sudden crisis of Proletarianization, the Parables refract the changing schemes of land tendency as *de facto* private landowners came into control of resources that were previously governed by the Crown. The text distinguishes landowners from kings because private land ownership became increasingly widespread under Herod as the kingdom’s Judean and non-Judean elites grew in wealth and power” (155). He posits a date for composition in the Herodian age is likely, but not absolutely certain (Cf., Charlesworth, “The Date of the Parables of Enoch (1 En. 37-71),” *Henech* 20 (1998): 93-98 and *idem*, “Can We Discern the Composition Date of the Parables of Enoch?” in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*, 450-68; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 2*, 63-64). There are many historical situations in which the margin between the rich and poor expanded quickly, giving rise to this analogy. For example, Josephus reports in Ant. 12 that a dispute arose between Onias and King Ptolemy Euergetes as well as Antiochus. This conflict was resolved by Joseph, Onias’ nephew, through the institution of tax farming. The pertinent passage is as follows: “So Joseph sent to his friends at Samaria, and borrowed money of them; and got ready what was necessary for his journey; garments, and cups, and beasts for burden; which amounted to about twenty thousand drachmæ; and went to Alexandria. Now it happened that at this time all the principal men and rulers went up out of the cities of Syria and Phenicia, to bid for their taxes” (12.3). If we set aside for a moment the dating of 1 Enoch based on the Parthian war (mid-first century BCE), this historical context of the ‘kings’ and ‘mighty’ is just as probable as Herod’s land conquest. The establishment of tax farming instituted a repressive economic system that would rob individuals of their livelihood and, ultimately, their land. One of the central underlying assumptions of this chapter is that the Enochic texts appropriate or build upon the previous narratives concerning evil to redirect the religious and political critique to new entities. If so, the reference to the ‘kings’ (always in the plural) and the ‘mighty’ might refer to the earliest strata of the SE, while the messianic solution to evil represents a later injunction. Because of the vagueness of the descriptions associated with the ‘kings’ and the ‘mighty,’ I do not think the SE is attempting any type of historicism; rather, the author’s focus is the criticism and resolution of the narrowing of the Chosen manifest in some parts of ancient Judaism during the first century BCE. See below for more specific details.

54:2-5): “And they brought the kings and the mighty and threw them into that deep valley. And there my eyes saw them making their instruments, iron chains of immeasurable weight...” [And the guide reported]...“these are being prepared for the host of Azazel, that they might take them and throw them into the abyss of complete judgment, and with jagged rocks they will cover their jaws, as the Lord of Spirits commanded.” Simultaneously masking their identity while pairing them with Azazel makes the terms ‘king,’ ‘mighty,’ and ‘sinners,’ abstract and applicable to other cultural figures who are viewed as wrong and outsiders of the community. David Suter rightly points out that this represents a shift in social context to highlight political injustice:

The kings and the mighty are seen as part of a cosmic rebellion against the power of God, while the present sufferings of the righteous servants of an omnipotent God are sanctioned by reference to the eschatological reversal that will take place. The symbolism of the Parables functions as a means of integrating the present experience of the righteous of a world that does not seem to be structured according to the laws of their God with their belief in a God who, as the divine lawgiver, rewards in concrete ways the community of his chosen ones when it is faithful to his law. While a collective representation of a social order generally functions as a means of sanctioning the structure and authority of that order, in an apocalyptic system such a representation must sanction the overthrow of all of the oppressive order and the establishment of a new society.²²⁹

Placing the kings and mighty within the eschatological judgment of 1 Enoch destines them for destruction and the installation of new leadership. It cannot be overlooked, however, that the evil ones are framed as elites who wrongly took control of land and resources. This statement implies that the Righteous Ones possessed the resources at the outset. The apocalyptic vision does not seek to renew the current order, but supersede it with a new order.

Second, Suter does not draw attention to the fact that the SE alters the pronouncement of judgment to include a third group. Similar to chapter 14, Enoch reports in 39:2-14 and chapter 40 that the divine council makes preparations for the judgment. The pronouncement is composed in a hymn formulated around the name ‘Lord of Glory’ or ‘Lord of Spirits,’ emphasizing an uncompromising monotheism. The four speakers in the hymn replicate the four angels in chapters 9-11. However, rather than words of judgment, the speakers bless and comfort the weary. The hymn concludes in chapter 41 to indicate that all of humanity will be judged. This

²²⁹ David Suter, *Tradition and Composition in the Parables of Enoch* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1979), 163-64.

points the audience forward to the new revelation. This new wisdom is fully revealed in chapter 50 of the SE, which appears to expand the binary of righteous and unrighteous portrayed in chapter 14. The SE is unique among apocalyptic texts that envisage the destruction of the oppressors and yet offers a select few the potential hope of redemption through repentance. Through the Righteous One, the Righteous Ones gain authority to open the small community to others. I will expand on this point below in relation to the messiah.

Messianic Terms in the Similitudes

Having contextualized the SE within the conceptions of eschatological judgment and sin, I now turn to SE's messiah. At the heart of Enoch's vision is the impending eschatological judgment performed by the Chosen One. There is a diversity of terms used to describe the Enochic messiah(s), yet these epithets are united in their description of the character and positionality in relation to the supreme God.²³⁰ In his now classic treatment, James VanderKam draws attention to four different terms used within 1 Enoch to describe the messiah.²³¹ While each vision is told from the perspective of the righteous community (e.g., 38:1-2; 45:1-6; 58:1-6), the epithet Chosen One (*x/heruy*) is most commonly used as an abstract noun to describe the messianic figure. This figure will reveal righteousness to those on earth (e.g., 38:2; 49:3-4), pass judgment most fiercely upon the wicked (e.g., 45:4; 48:10; 50:4-5; 55:4; 61:8), and rule over creation after the eschaton (e.g., 39:6; 53:6; 62:10). 1 Enoch 61 embodies this complex role:

And all who are in the heights of heaven received a command, and power and one voice and one light like fire were given to him. And that one, before anything, they blessed with (their) voice, and they exalted and glorified with wisdom; and they were wise in speech and in the spirit of life. And the Lord of Spirits seated the Chosen One upon the throne of glory; and he will judge all the works of the holy ones in the heights of heaven, and in the balance he will weigh their deeds.

Once enthroned, the Chosen One enacts judgment over all of creation, including the Righteous. The title appears in all three parables, though noticeably absent after chapter 62.

A second primary epithet is the 'son of a human,' which appears in three varied forms.

²³⁰ Cf. Joshua Scott, *The "Human One" and Social Theory* (Unpublished Th.M Diss., Duke Divinity School, 2014).

²³¹ James C. VanderKam, "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37-71," in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (ed. James Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 2009), 161-91.

(1) *Walda sab'* (46:2, 3, 4; 48:2) appears in parable 2 alone, and vividly reflects the vision of Daniel 7, in which the Ancient of Days will destroy the foreign imperial powers:

As I watched, thrones were set in place, and an Ancient One took his throne, his clothing was white as snow, and the hair of his head like pure wool; his throne was fiery flames, and its wheels were burning fire. A stream of fire issued and flowed out from his presence. A thousand thousands served him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood attending him. The court sat in judgment, and the books were opened.

And from 1 Enoch 46:

There I saw one who had a head of days, and his head was like white wool. And with him was another, whose face was like the appearance of a man; and his face was full of graciousness like one of the holy angels. And I asked the angel of peace, who went with me and showed me all the hidden things, about that son of man, who he was and whence he was (and) why he went with the Head of Days. And he answered and said to me, "this is the son of man who has righteousness, and righteousness dwells with him, and all the treasures of what is hidden he will reveal, for the Lord of Spirits has chosen him, and his lot has prevailed through truth in the presence of the Lord of Spirits.

It is clear the author alludes to the vision from Daniel: the figure's close proximity to the Head of Days shows his importance in the eschatological vision as well as his authority. The reference to the appearance of the figure as gracious explains his place within the heavenly court.²³²

The author explains the positionality of the Son of Man through a description of his origins. The Son of Man is first among creation, a superhuman being.²³³

At that hour, that Son of Man was given a name, in the presence of the Lord of the Spirits, the Before-Time; even before the creation of the sun and the moon, before the creation of the stars [i.e., the angels], he was given a name in the presence of the Lord of the Spirits. He will become a staff for the righteous ones in order that they may lean on him and not fall. He will be the light of the gentiles and he will become the hope of those who are sick in their hearts. . . . He was concealed in the presence of (the Lord of the Spirits) prior to the creation of the world, and for eternity. (1 En 48:2–6)

Through the enthronement of the Son of Man, the SE creates an intellectual bridge with Daniel 7. As the Lord of Spirit's 'staff for the righteous,' the figure is worthy of veneration. "All who

²³² Cf., esp. P. Maurice Casey, *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7* (London: SPCK, 1979).

²³³ I depart from James VanderKam here who argues that this doesn't explicitly state that the Son of Man was preexistent, but rather that the figure was simply hidden without a specification of time (VanderKam, "Righteous One," 181). That the Son of Man was given a name indicates to me, creation. Whether or not the figure existed ontologically or as a future possibility misses the point of the passage – just as there was primordial sin there was also a primordial messiah.

dwell upon the earth shall fall and worship before him; they shall glorify, bless and sing the name of the Lord of spirits” (1 En 48:5).²³⁴

(2) *Walda be’si* occurs four times in parable 3 and once in the concluding chapter (1 En. 62:5; 69:29 (2x); and 71:14). While the previous reference makes direct allusion to Daniel 7 and the figure’s coming, 1 Enoch 69:29 utilizes *walda be’si* when describing the eschatological rule of the figure:

And from then on there will be nothing that is corruptible; for the Son of Man has appeared. And he has sat down on the throne of his glory, and all evil will vanish from his presence. And the word of that Son of Man will go forth and will prevail in the presence of the Lord of Spirits.

Here, the Son of Man is in an idealized state and succeeds in his claim of glory. The last reference in 1 En. 71:14 stands in sharp contrast to 1 En. 69:29, when Enoch is named as the Son of Man: “You are the Son of Man who was born for righteousness, and righteousness dwells on you, and the righteousness of the Head of Days will not forsake you.”

(3) The third variant, the son of the offspring of the Mother of the Living, *walda ‘eg’āla ‘mma-heyāw* (62:7, 9, 14; 63:11; 69:26, 27; 70:1; 71:17), is used in parable 3 and the concluding chapter, and appear as a direct translation of forms representing Son of Man (כָּבֵר אֱנִי, υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου). The author deploys the term to describe the hiddenness of the Son of Man. Once revealed, the ‘kings and the mighty and their exalted and those who rule the land will fall on their faces in his presence’ (1 En. 61:12) though their pleas will have no effect on him (62:7, 9); the Lord of Spirits will deliver the evil beings to the angels for punishment. 1 Enoch 69:26-27 indicates that those to whom the Son of Man is revealed rejoice while the sinners lament and the Lord of Spirits destroys.

The two less frequently used epithets are the *Righteous One* (*sādeq*) and the *Anointed One* (*mas/ših-with dot/h*). The Righteous One appears in four passages, though as VanderKam and others point out, two references are probably employed in a collective sense – the Righteous (47:1, 4) – while another is complicated by text-critical issues (38:2). The one undisputed reference is 1 En. 53:6: “And after this, the Righteous and the Chosen One will cause the house of his congregation to appear; from then on, they will not be hindered in the name of the Lord of

²³⁴ Gabriele Boccaccini, “How Jesus Became Uncreated,” in *Sibyls, Scriptures, and Scrolls: John Collins at Seventy* (ed. Joel Baden, Hindy Najman, and Eibert Tigchelaar; Leiden: Brill, 2016), 185-209.

Spirits.” This is a rare occurrence in which two titles are used together; as Vanderkam states, the “‘righteous one’ in the Similitudes never alone refers to the eschatological leader.”²³⁵

The epithet *Anointed One* only appears on two occasions (48:10; 52:4) that expands the theme of dominion of the mediatorial figure. 1 Enoch 48:10 records that while their faces are down cast, the kings of the earth and possessors of the land, will suffer punishment for denying the Lord of Spirits and his champion. 1 Enoch 52:4 offers an interpretation of a small segment of Enoch’s vision in which he views all of the hidden things of heaven that will take place at the eschaton. This vision is significant because Enoch sees several mountains that contain precious metals previously harvested for riches as well as weapons. As the angel recounts to Enoch, “all these things that you have seen will be for the authority of his Anointed One so that he may be powerful and mighty of the earth.” The ascension of the Chosen One to power signifies an acquisition of the resources used to corrupt the world.

These four epithets together present a coordinated depiction of the Enochic messiah. The terms all represent an enthroned mediator, created at the beginning of time, that serves on behalf of the Lord of the Spirits. VanderKam, along with Hooker and Theisohn, draw attention to the grouping of the titles.²³⁶

38-45: The Chosen One
46-48: The Son of Man
49-62:1: The Chosen One
62:2-71: The Son of Man

The epithets rarely appear together and the only epithet to appear in all three parables is the “Chosen One.” That the Chosen One appears in all three parables and serves as a moniker for the ‘in-group’ suggests it was the most important epithet for the original recipients of the work. There remains one other important contribution 1 Enoch makes to messianism. Daniel’s Son of Man is enthroned to judge all of humanity. False kings and sinners will be destroyed, and their ruined kingdoms given to the holy ones where the holy ones will endure. Both categories of people – sinners and righteous – must endure judgment for their deeds. 1 Enoch describes the

²³⁵ VanderKam, “Righteous One,” 171.

²³⁶ VanderKam, “Righteous One”, 175; Cf. Mona Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark: A study of the background of the term "Son of Man" and its use in St. Mark's Gospel* (Montreal: McGill University Press, 1967), 34-37; Johannes Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter: Untersuchungen z. traditionsgeschichtl. Ort d. Menschensohngestalt d. Bilderreden d. Äthiopischen Henoch* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1975), 47-49.

eschaton in similar terms: “The wisdom of the Lord of Spirits revealed to him the holy and the righteous; for he has preserved the lot of the righteous. For they have hated and despised this age of unrighteousness; Indeed, all its deeds and its ways they have hated in the name of the Lord of Spirits, for in his name they are saved, and he is the vindicator of their lives.” All of humanity will be judged for their actions. 1 Enoch differs from the Danielic tradition, however, by creating a third category of person – the repentant. 1 Enoch 50:2-4 recounts:

On the day of distress, evil will be stored up against the sinners, and the righteous will conquer in the name of the Lord of Spirits. And he will show (this) to the others, so that they may repent and abandon the works of their hands. They will have no honor in the presence of the Lord of Spirits, yet in his name they will be saved; and the Lord of Spirits will have mercy on them, for great is His mercy. But he is righteous in his judgment, and in the presence of his glory unrighteousness will not stand; at his judgment the unrepentant will perish in His presence.

The eschaton allows for one last opportunity for repentance of sinners. As the passage continues, it is clear that the righteous and the repentant become the focus, they are the inheritors of the renewed creation. Gabriele Boccaccini makes this point clear: “the righteous will be saved according to God's justice and mercy, and the sinners will be condemned according to God's justice and mercy, but those who repent will be justified by God's mercy even though they should not be saved according to God's justice. Repentance makes God's mercy prevail on God's justice. No reference is made to the traditional means of atonement related to the Temple or good works.”²³⁷ The author of the SE utilizes repentance as a mechanism to open a path to the righteous community.

But who are these ‘others,’ the repentant? There are two dominant opinions. The first possibility is that the repentant ‘others’ are non-Jews outside of the (Jewish) Righteous, unassociated with the monotheistic revelation of the Lord of the Spirits. Olson argues for this interpretation based on the assumption that this judgment scene of the eschaton includes the whole world: “This chapter presupposes a time of relief and prosperity for the righteous during which the Gentiles may repent and convert.”²³⁸ Similarly, Nickelsburg and VanderKam propose that the text is not entirely clear: “Given the references to the righteous and their oppressors in

²³⁷ Gabriele Boccaccini, “Eschatology in the Enochic Traditions,” in *Protology and Eschatology in the Enochic Traditions* (ed. Hilary Marlow, Karla Pollmann, and Helen Van Noorden; ebook; Oxfordshire: Routledge, 2021).

²³⁸ Olson, *Enoch: A New Translation*, 94.

vv. 1-2b, ‘the others’ mentioned in this action must be either the non-Jews not included among the oppressors of the righteous or other Israelites not included among the righteous, the holy, and the chosen.”²³⁹ The reference in verse 2d to the ‘works of their hands’ draws Nickelsburg and VanderKam back to 46:7, an initial indictment against the ‘stars of heaven’ who put “their faith in the god they have made with their hands, and they deny the name of the Lord of Spirits.” From this perspective, the ‘others’ are non-Jews not included within the elite kings and the mighty. The second possibility is that the ‘others’ are Righteous who remain sinful despite being a part of the select Chosen. Chialà, following the majority tradition, renders verse 3 as “they will have no honor,” referencing the state of the Righteous before the Lord of Spirits. According to Chialà, the messiah judges by *mercy*, insinuating that even the Chosen have not attained a high enough level of righteousness.

Gabriele Boccaccini proposes a third option based on context and syntax that better explains the text. That everyone will experience judgment is assumed here: both the righteous and the sinner are condemned by YHWH’s justice and mercy. But those who recognize the lordship of the Lord of Spirits will be saved from the destruction imagined in Enoch’s visions. While the kings and mighty are destined for destruction, the other sinners are offered one last opportunity for repentance. The act of repentance, according to Boccaccini, “makes God's mercy prevail on God's justice.”²⁴⁰ This reversal is consistent with other parts of 1 Enoch. Enoch attempts to intervene for the Watchers on several occasions, but their violation disbars them from YHWH’s mercy. Their pleas fall on deaf ears (i.e., 13:1-3). This scene is again rescripted for the kings and mighty, who petition the Lord of Spirits through the Chosen One for mercy but without success: “But the Lord of the Spirits will press them that they shall hastily go forth from His presence, And their faces shall be filled with shame, And the darkness grow deeper on their faces. And He will deliver them to the angels for punishment, to execute vengeance on them” (62:10-11). In the context of universal judgment and all-corrupting evil, the ‘others’ are repentant sinners. The context infers that this group includes both Jews and non-Jews alike. They witness the judgment on the kings and mighty, and are afforded by mercy the opportunity to repent. The messiah of the SE not only reveals the eschatological moment, but he becomes the

²³⁹ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2*, 182.

²⁴⁰ Gabriele Boccaccini, “Eschatology in the Enochic Traditions.”

gatekeeper for all of humanity. This aligns with the role of the messiah in the Animal Apocalypses.

Searches for a single intellectual background or a single source for this tradition quickly go awry.²⁴¹ The contributions of 1 Enoch to the study of messianism are as numerous as their sources and contemplating a piecemeal collection of sources does not note how the discourse actually functions. The debates concerning the meaning and usage of the phrase ‘Son of Man,’ for example, are long and largely remain unresolved without further evidence.²⁴² Sabino Chialà offers an important reconstruction of the expression of Son of Man within 1 Enoch that highlights the evolution of the term:²⁴³

1. The colloquial Hebrew or Aramaic expression ‘adam/enash’ with or without the addition ben-/bar are “synonyms for men.”
2. The expression interacts with and gains additional meaning in reference to Daniel 7, which functions as “a symbol for the holy people of the most high.”
3. As seen from the comparison above, where Daniel’s messiah represents a concealed reality, 1 Enoch’s messiah has become a character. Daniel’s Ancient of Days initiates the eschatological judgment and then installs the Son of Man; in contrast, the messiah in 1 Enoch is created first in creation but revealed as the judge during the eschaton, serving as the decider over the kings and mighty.

²⁴¹ Cf., Matthew Black, “The Messianism of the Parables of Enoch: Their Date and Contribution to Christological Origins,” in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (ed. James Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 145-168.

²⁴² Already in 1906, Albert Schweitzer stated, “Broadly speaking . . . the Son-of-Man problem is both historically solvable and has been solved” (*Von Reimarus zu Wrede* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck)), 1906; English translation (New York, MacMillan, 1968), 283). Important historical overviews include Geza Vermes, “The Use of bar-nash/bar-nasha in Jewish Aramaic” in *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Ed. by Matthew Black and Patrick Alexander; Oxford: Clarendon, 1967), 310-328; Casey, *Son of Man*; Walck, Leslie W. “The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and the Gospels.” in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (Ed. by Gabriele Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 299-337; Larry Hurtado and Paul Owen (eds.), “‘Who Is This Son of Man?:’ The Latest Scholarship on a Puzzling Expression of the Historical Jesus” (Bloomsbury: T&T Clark, 2012); John J. Collins, “The Son of Man in First-Century Judaism.” *NTS* 38, 3 (1992): 448-466; Vermes, “The Son of Man Debate Revisited (1960-2012)” in *Parables of Enoch: A Paradigm Shift* (Ed. by Darrell L. Bock and James H. Charlesworth. New York: Bloomsbury, 2013), 3-17; Charlesworth, “Select Bibliography on ‘The Son of Man’ and the Parables of Enoch” in *Parables of Enoch: A Paradigm Shift* (Ed. by Darrell L. Bock and James H. Charlesworth; New York: Bloomsbury, 2013), 373-391; Sabino Chialà, “The Son of Man: The Evolution of an Expression” in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (Ed. by Gabriele Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 153-178.

²⁴³ This summary is an adapted summary from Klaus Koch’s review of Chialà (“Questions regarding the So-Called Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch: A Response to Sabino Chialà and Helge Kvanvig” in *Parables of Enoch: A Paradigm Shift* (Ed. by Darrell L. Bock and James H. Charlesworth. New York: Bloomsbury, 2013), 228-237) with special attention to the concepts pertinent to this essay.

4. The SE initiates a break with the messianic discourse, that is followed by Early Christian texts, Testament of Abraham, and other historiographical works (i.e., Josephus), in which the messiah receives the name of a historical individual (Enoch, Jesus, Abel, Menahem, Simon Bar-Giora).

5. Around 100 CE, the expression ‘Son of Man’ begins to disappear.

While Chialà focuses specifically on the Son of Man term, these conclusions are true as well of the other terms in 1 Enoch: when the respective terms become associated with specific individuals they fall out of vogue. The nuances of this messianic discourse, however, cannot be overlooked. The association with a specific figure creates a closeness between the figure, their followers, and divine powers. The eschatological figure is set upon the throne prior to the judgment and becomes an advocate for the group bearing the figure’s central characteristic (Righteous Ones) or formal name. This moment of advocacy represents the revelation of the Lord of Spirits into the current age to dispel the manifestation of evil, which in this case, the author identifies only through titles (kings, mighty, individuals who as a collective have forcibly taken land from the righteous).²⁴⁴

Likewise, another difficulty is determining whether a certain messianic reference is original or a later emendation. 1 Enoch 70-71 is frequently labeled as an epilogue of SE, marked as a later addition. In this way, the epilogue represents a separate reception of the Enochic messiah. Daniel Olson argues that based on a variant in the minority manuscript tradition, 1 Enoch 70:1-2 represents an intentional elevation of Enoch’s name to the position of the Son of Man. Olson renders the passage in the following manner:²⁴⁵

²⁴⁴ Arguments concerning the background of the messiah, such as that by J. R. Daniel Kirk and Adam Winn, who find that the Enochic Son of Man should be understood as an idealized form of wisdom, modulate the eschatological significance of judgment upon the evil doers (kings and mighty) and creation of a path for repentant sinners to participate within the group, to focus more on the relation of the mediatorial figure to wisdom. Cf. Winn, “Identifying the Enochic Son of Man as God’s Word and Wisdom,” *JSP* 6 (2019): 290-318; Kirk, “Mark’s Son of Man and Paul’s Second of Adam,” *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 37, 2 (2015): 170-195.

²⁴⁵ Olson’s translation comes as a concession in a long scholarly conversation about the meaning and textual development of 1 Enoch 70-71. This translation comes from his later, 2009 rebuttal to Knibb. See Daniel Olson, “Enoch and the ‘Son of Man’ Revisited: Further Reflections on the Text and Translation of 1 Enoch 70:1-2,” *JSP* 18, 3 (2009): 233-240; idem., “Enoch and the Son of Man in the Epilogue of the Parables,” *JSP* 18: 27-38; Michael Knibb, “The Translation of 1 Enoch 70.1: Some Methodological Issues,” in *Biblical Hebrews, Biblical Texts: Essays in Memory of Michael P. Weitzman* (ed. A. Rapoport-Albert and G. Greenberg; JSOTSup, 333; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001): 340-54. Reprinted in Michael A. Knibb, *Essays on the Book of Enoch and Other Early Jewish Texts and Traditions* (SVTP, 22. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2009); Cf., Maurice Casey, “The Use of Term [sic] ‘Son of Man’ in the Similitudes of Enoch,” *JSJ* (1976): 11-29.

Afterwards it came to pass that the living name of that Son of Man was exalted by the Lord of Spirits above all those who live on the earth. He was raised aloft on a chariot of wind, and his name became well-known among them.

This vision brings to completion the mounting drama of the eschatological judgment while also building upon the narrative of Genesis 5:21-24, in which Enoch defies death through the elevation to heaven. The central difference between the majority and minority traditions is the appearance of the preposition *baxaba/baxabēhu*, meaning ‘unto (him).’ If the preposition is included, it separates “*semu heyāw* (‘his living name’) from *lawe’etu walda ’egwāla ’emmaheyāw* (of/to that son of man)” adding a directional orientation to the phrase: ‘his living name unto that son of man.’²⁴⁶ In comparison, Nickelsburg and VanderKam, following the majority tradition, translate the text thus:

And after this, while he was living, his name was raised into the presence of that Son of Man and into the presence of the Lord of Spirits from among those who dwell on the earth. He was raised on the chariots of the wind, and his name departed <from among them>.

If the variant from the minority tradition is correct, the intention of the author to elevate Enoch to this position is clear, for Olson’s rendering of 70:1-2 stands in alignment with 1 Enoch 71:14, “You are the Son of Man who is born to righteousness, and righteousness rests upon you,” though his translation of the minority tradition was challenged from many corners. Olson admits that “differences over how to translate the passage cannot be resolved through an easy appeal to the relative strength of manuscript support.”²⁴⁷ In a more recent article, Olson also points to the Coptic Enoch apocryphon as an important clue in that it follows the sequence of 1 Enoch 71 while also providing additional details. It reads:

my [
[God]
[will bestow]
upon you a [name] [more] famous
than (that of) any man. You will be taken to heaven in your
body, and you will
be placed in the midst [of the] store-house [...]

²⁴⁶ Olson, “‘Enoch and the Son of Man’ Revisited,” 235.

²⁴⁷ Olson, “‘Enoch and the Son of Man’ Revisited,” 235.

This witness implies that “(1) God gives Enoch a name above that of any other, (2) Enoch is taken up bodily into heaven, and (3) Enoch is placed in the midst of at least one storehouse.”²⁴⁸ But for many, this reliance upon a later tradition does not resolve the quandary. Nickelsburg and VanderKam propose that 1 Enoch 70:1-2 are likely the original conclusion of the SE, and 70:3-71:1 is (are) later addition(s) that represent an appendix that attempts to bring together the SE with the Book of the Watchers.²⁴⁹ Knibb, likewise, proposes that all of 70-71 are likely later additions, and as such may retain inconsistencies.²⁵⁰ That the textual evidence supporting the variant reading remains unclear should not take away from the significance of the added narrative for the text.

The framework of messianic discourse provides at least one possible outlet - Enoch is elevated as the Son of Man as an authorizing authority of the respective group. Loren Stuckenbruck argues for this position, noting that Enoch is frequently described as a holy scribe, given the authority to annotate the book of life that contains the names of every human: “Would, for example, the judgment scene involving a man-like, possible enthroned, scribe in chap. 90 (v. 20), in the Animal Apocalypse, have inspired a redactor to identify this figure with Enoch, who as a scribe in the Book of Watchers carries our God’s command to pronounce judgment against the fallen angels...?”²⁵¹ Stuckenbruck’s proposal of an inner-Enochic dynamic rings true. As I demonstrated above, the strong connection between the BW and SE suggests that author(s) of the SE crafted the three parables to address the consequence of sin by the evil angels, the focus set upon the kings and the mighty. The description of Enoch as a righteous scribe and mediator casts a unifying image of the seventh patriarch here, the BW, and the AA, that mediates judgment on behalf of the Lord of Spirits. The connection of 1 Enoch 71:13-17 offers another connection point. The closing of the enthronement scene reads:

²⁴⁸ Olson, “‘Enoch and the Son of Man’ Revisited,” 237.

²⁴⁹ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 315.

²⁵⁰ Michael Knibb, “‘Enoch and the Son of Man’ Revisited: Further Reflections on the Text and Translation of *1 Enoch* 70.1-2,” *JSP* (2009): 233-240.

²⁵¹ Loren Stuckenbruck, “The Parables of Enoch according to George Nickelsburg and Michael Knibb: A Summary and Discussion of Some Remaining Questions,” in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (ed. Gabriele Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 65-71; here, 69. On the roles and titles of Enoch in the early Enochic literature, see Andrei A. Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition* (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 40-85.

And that Head of Days came with Michael and Raphael and Gabriel and Phanuel, and thousands and tens of thousands of angels without number. And he came to me and greeted me with his voice and said to me, “You (are) that Son of Man who was born for righteousness, and righteousness dwells on you, and the Head of Days will not forsake you.” And he said to me, “He proclaims peace to you in the name of the age that is to be, for from there peace has proceeded from the creation of the age, and thus you will have it forever and forever and ever. And all will walk on your path since righteousness will never forsake you; with you will be their dwelling and with you, their lot, and from you they will not be separated forever and forever and ever. And thus there will be length of days with that Son of Man, and there will be peace for the righteous, and the path of truth for the righteous, in the name of the Lord of Spirits forever and ever.

The presence of the angels with the Head of Days further illuminates 1 Enoch 46 listed above, as well as 9:1-11:2, which focuses upon judgment for the sake of purifying the world from sin. In comparison to Asael who revealed the path of sin (9:6 - “taught iniquity on the earth and has revealed the eternal mysteries that are in heaven”), Enoch reveals the path of righteousness. Enoch himself witnessed the Son of Man, “who has righteousness, and righteousness dwells with him,” to which is now applied to Enochian wisdom.²⁵² The enthronement of Enoch as the Son of Man offers a narrative unity between the several epithets and images of the messiah, whose primary feature is the forgiveness of sin and the revelation of hidden wisdom. While this approach does not resolve the textual quagmire of 1 Enoch 70-71, it provides a possible reasoning for the messianism contained therein.

Before contextualizing the SE in the Second Temple period, I summarize these conclusions concerning messianic discourse in 1 Enoch.

1. There are four primary epithets relating to the messiah: the *Chosen One*, *Anointed*, *Righteous One*, and *Son of Man*. That the epithets are grouped into specific chapters suggests the author redacted together or was at least familiar with several texts containing a messiah figure. Without access to additional sources, it is impossible to determine the nature of these sources and their relationships. I offer one possible interpretation in the following section below.

2. The central mediator is a created being elevated to the position of messiah. The various epithets do not indicate a relational or substantive equality with the Lord of Spirits, but establishes an authoritative equality once placed within the role.

²⁵² Many have noted the interesting tension that exists between the figure of Wisdom and Enoch. See, for example, Randal A. Argall, “Competing Wisdoms: 1 Enoch and Sirach,” *Henoah* 24 (2002): 169–178.

3. There is no prerequisite lineage to become the Chosen One, but all creation assumes the figure's lineage after the eschatological judgment. The messiah in both the AA and SE directly relates to the Chosen Ones, the select righteous. The figurative messiah in the AA manifests as the same species as Abraham, but it is unclear whether that represents a familial or qualitative connection, and without further details I am inclined to assume the latter. The ram is transformed as a new progenitor, removing all traces of ethnicity and race, and sets creation upon a new course without the detriment of sin. Likewise, the Chosen One in the SE becomes the leader of the Righteous Ones. This suggests that lineage is not necessarily a defining factor prior to placement in the role of messiah.

4. Messianism is a balance between protology and eschatology.²⁵³ In the words of Paolo Sacchi, "Eschatology and protology are two sides of the same coin," and as such, "the things that happened in the beginning are the cause of the life we live now, and at the same time they are the things to be put right at the end of time."²⁵⁴ A central element of the Enochic framework of the world is the problem of evil and sin. The BW reveals that the world was corrupted by angels who transcended the boundaries of creation by absconding from heaven to earth, raped women and revealed secret knowledge, and as a result corrupted creation. Building upon this narrative, the authors of AA and ES describe their antagonists as a result of the initial corruption of creation, a likeness in quality rather than genealogical to the Fallen Angels: AA sees all of humanity continue to degenerate as a result of the angels; the SE portrays the kings, mighty, those who have unlawfully taken the land of the righteous, as an extension of the original corruption. Readers of the SE are prepared for this revelation from the beginning; the text identifies itself as "a vision of wisdom" (1 En. 37:1). This suggests that the attribution of evil might be as abstract as the messianic title, applicable to new specific threats. The messiah resolves the issue of protological sin through judgment at the eschaton.

5. The forgiveness of sin is a mechanism for change. The Enochic messiah resolves the problem of sin for the righteous and repentant alike, Jew and non-Jews alike, judging with justice and mercy the intrusion of the Watchers and those who were corrupted by their actions. The qualifications for joining the community are not limited to a specific ethnicity, geographical

²⁵³ I cannot help but remember Nickelsburg's statement that eschatology "expresses the heart and essence of 1 Enoch's religious thought" (Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 55).

²⁵⁴ Paolo Sacchi, "The Theology of Early Enochism and Apocalyptic: The Problem of the Relation between Form and Content of the Apocalypses; the Worldview of the Apocalypses," *Henoch 24* (2002): 77-85, here 80.

location, or law. The vision of eschatological fulfillment in both AA and SE describe the Righteous Ones as an extension of the messiah, indicating that the community values at its core the divine revelation, associated with Enoch. Because these details are explicit, the text does not require the reader to contribute much to the theological reflection.

6. The SE attacks the abuses of the elites, openly pointing to antagonists by their positions. Although the identity of these perpetrators would surely have been known to the original recipients of the work, their identities are lost to historians. Concealing their identity, however, has the effect of creating an abstract discourse against the abuse of power. The claim that “the kings and powerful will perish and be given into the hand of the righteous and holy” (1 En. 38:1-6) is a reversal of power that is only hopeful for the righteous, but still reflects a positive view of the world (cf. 1 En. 51: 4, 5b). The apocalyptic format eliminates the distance between heaven and earth, revealing YHWH’s direct involvement in the world against those who have abused their positions of power. We can infer from this that the Righteous Ones are not outsiders of this group, but somehow connected - either through economic, religious, or political relationships. That they are communicating through text and expanding themes also represented in the Second Temple Hebrew texts, suggests that they are at least educated and connected to the religious life of ancient Judaism.

Similitudes and Isaiah: A Literary Relationship?

It has long been assumed that Isaiah influenced the development of 1 Enoch. Among others, Nickelsburg has consistently drawn attention to the SE’s reshaping of the Servant figure from Isaiah: in both of these texts, authors point to the Anointed One as the mediator of divine judgment and revelation; in both texts, the Anointed One resolves the issue of sin and reconstitutes the Righteous Community, establishing new ethnic markers of the community (e.g., sin, wisdom, forgiveness for repentant). But is it happenstance that they adapt a messianic figure with similar qualities who acts within similar literary tropes? Is the relationship between Isaiah and 1 Enoch only linguistic in nature? In this final section, I expand Nickelsburg’s argument to hypothesize that the SE are penned in part as a response to the Anointed One in Second and Third Isaiah, as represented in the manuscripts found at Qumran.²⁵⁵

²⁵⁵ I originally presented this research as a conference paper titled, “Delineation of the Politics of Identity: The Textual Transmission of Isaiah’s Enthronement Scenes in the Parables of Enoch,” at the 2020 Society of Biblical Literature (Virtual; 21-24 November). Thank you to the online participants who challenged me to review these findings.

The thematic and literary parallels between 1 Enoch and Isaiah are legion. The following list offers a brief and incomplete parallel pairing, which demonstrates only a few of the literary connections.

Table III.5: Comparative References of 1 Enoch and Isaiah

Common Themes	Isaiah Passages	1 Enoch Passages
Intro: Revelation of Wisdom	Isaiah 1:1-3	1 En. 37:1-5
Future Glory of Righteous	Isa 4:2-6. Those who remain will be planted in Zion	1 En. 38:1-6
Righteous Remnant	Isa 6:13	1 En. 10:3; 65:12; 67:3
Vision of Temple	Isa 6	1 En. 39:12 – 40:10 those within the temple worshipping the Lord of Spirits
Judgment upon Earth	Isa 24:1-23	1 En. 62:1-8
No Peace for the Wicked	Isa 48:22; 57:21	1 En. 5:4; cf. 13:3; 16:4
Exaltation	Isa 25:1-12	1 En. 39:12 – 40:10; 61:1-2
Judah's song	Isa 26	1 En. 61:11
Judgment upon the leaders	Isa 28; 30: 8-17	1 En. 62:9-12
Judgment for idolatry	Isa 44	1 En 46:7-8
Cyrus, God's Instrument	Isa 45	1 En. 47:1, 4; 38:2; 53:6; 48:10; 52:4

Two important thematic and literary points of contact emerge in this data that indicates the use of a common tradition. The exaltation scenes in Isaiah and 1 Enoch share parallel literary structures. The exalted figures are created beings, raised to their position of authority by YHWH (Isa 45:1; 1 En. 48:2–6). The figures are placed on their throne *prior* to the eschaton (Isa 52:13; 1 En 45:3). The figures are surrounded by the heavenly entourage who offer praise, and the sinful who confess their sin and befuddlement at the exaltation of YHWH’s servant (Isa 52:13-53:3; 1 En. 48:8-9). The sinful elite specifically plead before the enthroned figure (Isa 49:7, 23; 1 En. 62:9). The exalted figures are both described in terms of sin and salvation in relation to YHWH, which brings into focus the teleological nature of the pronouncement (Isa 53:1-9; 1 En. 62:13-16).

On a narrative level, both Isaiah and 1 Enoch employ a sense of progressive revelation, in that their respective stories develop linearly through a visionary process that repeats or reinterprets portions. For Isaiah, a heavenly court of law is assumed in the Day of the Lord in which those who have sinned will experience ‘pangs and agony’ (13:8-11; 14). In Isaiah 52-53, the kings and the mighty are known to the Servant, and the Servant’s humility and sacrifice surprises them. (52:13-15). In the introductory oracle of 1 Enoch, the Great Holy One will descend from Sinai to execute judgment upon the Watchers and all the wicked (1 En 1:8-9). On the Day of Judgment, ‘pain’ and ‘terror’ will come upon them when they see the Son of Man (1 En 62:4-5). The Holy One of 1 Enoch will reveal sin to sinners in hopes of drawing them into repentance. However, the kings and the mighty do not know the Son of Man and their confession will not be accepted (1 En 63). As the narrative develops, the Day of the Lord, the moment of eschatological judgment, comes into greater clarity.

As I demonstrated in chapter two, Cyrus the Great, the Persian ruler who released the Jews from Babylonian exile, is described in Isaiah 45 as the Anointed One. Cyrus is not a part of the Righteous community reconstituted through Isaiah’s dictums, but a servant of YHWH that brings about divine justice. Through the voice of Isaiah, YHWH proclaims: “I have aroused Cyrus in righteousness, and I will make all his paths straight; he shall build my city and set my exiles free, not for price or reward, says the LORD of hosts.” Cyrus, as a messiah, is imputed righteousness by YHWH, a mark of his leadership that sets the standard for the new community. The Righteous One in 1 Enoch performs a similar function for the Righteous Ones at the eschaton, “the Righteous and Chosen One will cause the house of his congregation to appear.”

Both figures are associated with righteousness based on their relationship to YHWH, which then extends to the communities they liberate.²⁵⁶

Comparing the exaltation scenes in SE to Hebrew Isaiah demonstrates a parallel orientation to a common motif, but the choice of adapting Isaiah's language of the Anointed One seems to go beyond a thematic or theological similarity. Rather, it offers a corrective to the reception of Isaiah. Isaiah's vision for the eschaton is all consuming: "And they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks: Nation shall not take up sword against nation; they shall never again know war" (2:4). A much closer parallel to SE is preserved in the Isaianic traditions of the Dead Sea Scrolls, which intensified the eschatological role of the messiah. For instance, the Community Rule V, 13-17 reads:

. . . for one is not cleansed unless one turns away from one's wickedness, for he is unclean among all the transgressors of his word. No-one should associate with him in his work or in his possessions in order to encumber him with blameworthy iniquity; rather he should remain at a distance from him in every task for thus it is written "You shall remain at a distance from every lie" (Exod 23:7). None of the men of the Community should acquiesce to their authority in any law or regulation. No-one should eat of any of their possessions, or drink or accept anything from their hands, unless at its price, for it is written "Shun the man whose breath is in his nostrils, for how much is he worth?" (Isaiah 2:22).

The reference here to Isaiah 2 excises the passage from its context about the eschaton and applies it to current dealings with those outside of the community. I agree with Shani Tzoref that this interpretive step intentionally brings the Isaiah passage in line with the eschatological perspectives of the community:²⁵⁷ the Yahad shall remain separate from the general populace as well as the leaders in Jerusalem. Another example from the Community Rule is the citation of Isaiah 40:3 in 1QS VIII, 14, which necessitates Torah study as an element of separation from larger populace:

²⁵⁶ Anthony Keddie raises a similar point of comparison between Isaiah and the SE through class distinction. He states, "...the Parables interposes the eschatological imagery of the Isaiah Apocalypse, which imprisons the 'kings of the earth' in a pit for punishment on an impending day of the Lord... Just as Deutero-Isaiah is clear that money would not afford redemption (Isa 52:3), the Parables specify that salvation could not be gained through gold or silver (1 En. 52:7)" (*Revelations of Ideology*, 152). Keddie goes on to make many connections that orientate the textual relation of the SE and Isaiah around class politics. His comparison is incredibly illuminating, but without the guiding categories of sin and redemption that run through Isaiah and 1 Enoch, the comparison relation between the two texts continues to be obscure.

²⁵⁷ Shani Tzoref, "The Use of Scripture in the Community Rule," in *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism* (ed. Matthias Henze; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), 203-34.

When these become the Community in Israel in compliance with these arrangements they are to be segregated from within the dwelling of the men of sin in order to open there his path; as it is written: “In the wilderness prepare the way of ****,²⁵⁸ strengthen in the step a roadway for our God.” This is the study of the Torah which he commanded through Moses, in order to act in compliance with all that has been revealed from age to age, and according to what the prophets have revealed through his holy spirit.

George Brooke is surely correct that this abscondence from society is both physical and metaphorical.²⁵⁹ The author excises Isaiah 40 and recontextualizes it as a means to justify and authorize Torah learning for the community as the mode of revelation, but separation is a necessity to receive YHWH’s revelation. A similar sentiment is expressed in *Pesher* Isaiah, “And it will come to pass at that time, [that the remnant of Israel and the refugees of] Jacob’s house [will no longer] rely upon the one who hurts them, but shall rely on the Lord, the Holy One of Israel, in Truth” (4Q163 II, 10-11). A similar phenomenon happens with the messiah within the reception of the Isaiah tradition. 4QpIsa^a (4Q161 frag. 8-10) cites Isaiah 11:1-5 and then offers the following interpretation:

Its interpretation concerns the Shoot of David who will arise at the end of days... his enemies, and God will sustain him with the Law... throne of glory, a holy crown, and garments of variegated stuff... in his hand, and over all the Gentiles he will rule, and Magog²⁶⁰... all the peoples shall his sword judge. And as it says, ‘not... or decide by what his ears shall hear:’ its interpretation is that ... and according to what they teach him so shall he judge, and according to their command.

In 4QpIsa^a, the Shoot of David is explicitly an eschatological figure who will judge all of humanity on a throne of glory. The messiah enforces the Torah upon all of creation, including non-Jews. Although the manuscript is damaged by several lacunae, there is no opportunity of repentance for either Jew or non-Jew.

²⁵⁸ The Tetrapunta was used in Qumran texts as a way of preserving the sacredness of YHWH’s name. See Kristen De Troyer, “The Pronunciation of the Names of God: With some Notes Regarding the Nomina Sacra,” in *Gott Nennen: Gottes Namen und Gott als Name* (ed. I. U. Dalferth and P. Stoellger; Religion in Philosophy and Theology 35; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 143–72; Herman Lichtenberger, “The Divine Name in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in New Testament Writings” in *The Religious Worldviews Reflected in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 28–30 May, 2013* (ed. Ruth Clements, Menahem Kister, Michael Segal; Leiden: Brill, 2018), 14-44; Joëlle Lake, “YHWH, the ineffable name: Avoidance, Alternations and Circumventions in the Non-biblical Manuscripts at Qumran” (Unpub. Diss., Trinity Western University; 2014).

²⁵⁹ George J. Brooke, “Isaiah 40:3 and the Wilderness Community,” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992* (ed. George Brooke and Florentino García-Martínez; STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 117-32.

²⁶⁰ Cf. 1QM 11:16.

Another reference to the Shoot of David and the eschatological war is in 4Q285. The manuscript details a portion of the eschatological battle between the forces of evil (the Kittim) and the Chosen Community. The text is heavily broken, for the manuscripts survived in poor condition. Fragment 10 names the angels listed in judgment described in 1 Enoch (Michael, Gabriel, Sariel, and Raphael), though their exact role is unclear. Fragment 5 (also 11Q14 I, 1) quotes Isaiah directly:

[...as] the Prophet Isaiah [said]: And they shall cut [the most massive of the]...[forest with Iron and Lebanon, with its magnificence, will fall. A shoot will emerge from the stump of Jesse [...] the bud of David. And they will go into battle [Blank space] with [...] and the Prince of the Congregation will kill him, the bu[d of David... and with wounds. And [the High] Priest will command [... the s]lai[n of the] Kitti[m...]²⁶¹

This fragmentary narrative historicizes the messiah as a human born on earth and identifies him as the Prince of the Congregation, the leader of the sect.²⁶² The community imagines its struggle with the Romans as the powers of evil that have corrupted the kings and the mighty in 1 Enoch. These passages indicate a close ideological network with 1 Enoch and the reception of Isaiah at Qumran, but it is clear that these two texts could not co-exist: the SE offers redemption for those who confess their sin, Jew and non-Jew alike, at the eschatological judgment.

Although the traditions of Isaiah and the SE are related, it is clear they are not ideologically in sync. Gabriele Boccaccini has convincingly argued that the Qumran literature and Enoch documents stem from the priestly class that separated in the mid Second Temple period.²⁶³ The central tenets are (a) the corruption of humanity by external forces and (b) the election of the righteous community. 1 Enoch and Isaiah preserved at Qumran both embrace this theological trend. In both texts, the messiah becomes a mechanism that marks the group boundary within the eschatological vision. However, in the example of the reception of Isaiah, the messiah, an eschatological figure of wisdom and revelation who mediates between the

²⁶¹ The Kittim were initially foreigners who came from Cyprus to ancient Israel (cf. Isa 23:1-12), but in later Jewish sources refers more broadly to any foreigners from the West, like the Romans (Dan 11:30; 1 Mac. 1:1); see Benjamin Scolnic and Thomas Davis, "How Kittim became 'Rome': Dan 11:30 and the Importance of Cyprus in the Sixth Syrian War," *ZAW* 127, 2 (2015): 304-319. Cf. Yigael Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962), 23-26.

²⁶² Florentino García Martínez and Julio Trebolle Barrera, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (trans. Wilfred G.E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 1995).

²⁶³ Gabriele Boccaccini, *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 66-67.

community and YHWH, is identified with the Teacher of Righteousness. Other examples provide a much broader understanding of the apocalyptic messiah (i.e., 1QSa II, 11-12; 1QSb V, 20-29; 4Q174, frag. 1, 10-13; 4Q252 V, 2-5b; 11Q13 II, 14b-19), but one that takes on a similar eschatological role. Thus, the reception of Isaiah at Qumran opens a window into the selection of the righteous, a small select group among the inheritors of the community. Although Isaiah and 1 Enoch have these tendencies of unifying the righteous around the messiah, these select examples indicate that the reception of Isaiah at Qumran expanded the roles of the eschatological messiah in setting apart and unifying an even smaller righteous community.

It's unclear when the ideological split between Qumran and the SE was initiated. Although not the only rule found in the DSS, the Community Rule clearly sets those who follow the rule as a 'sect,' in the words of Collins, "in measured terms of difference, antagonism, and separation."²⁶⁴ If the Community Rule, an exemplar of this perspective, can be dated to 100-75 BCE based on paleographic data, and the SE confidently dated to the late first century BCE, this suggests that the SE might have been an ideological response to the limited imagined Righteous community in the documents preserved at Qumran. This conclusion crosses over into the realm of conjecture. What can be certain is that the messianism in 1 Enoch represents an adversarial textual relationship with the reception of Isaiah and ideology associated with the community at Qumran.

Conclusion: An Apocalyptic Messiah

The Enochic messiah is an apocalyptic figure who intervenes on behalf of those wronged by the kings, mighty, and possessors of the land. As Piovanelli claims, "the intended audience to whom the Book of Parables addresses its message of solace and hope is but the ensemble of the Jewish people fallen under the domination of a new and merciless dynasty."²⁶⁵ However, the reliance upon the messiah goes much deeper than a distant and unknown superhuman figure. In the threads of Enoch's apocalyptic visions, we see the reliance upon a discrete discourse that simultaneously authorizes the righteous community and the wisdom of Enoch while dislodging the on-going effect of the sin of the Watchers. The apocalyptic narrative defines the messianic

²⁶⁴ John J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 7.

²⁶⁵ Pierluigi Piovanelli, "Was the Book of Parables a Sectarian Document?" in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 363-379, here 374-75.

discourse by encompassing protology and eschatology, setting the messiah before and after the event of sin. The distinct contribution of Enochic messianism in the Similitudes is the act of mercy upon those who repent of their sin. Aimed at both Jews and non-Jews alike, the messiah becomes a mechanism by which new members might join the righteous community. While difficult to historically contextualize, the AA and the SE offer a strong corrective to the closed boundary markers represented by the reception of Isaiah at Qumran.

Chapter 4: “From Now on You Will See the Son of Man:” Messianic Discourse in the Gospel of Matthew

Introduction

The figure of Jesus of Nazareth is likely the most well-known messiah-figure from Second Temple Judaism.²⁶⁶ The earliest nucleus of Jesus’ group began in and around the Galilee region during the middle and second half of the first century CE. While we have no textual or non-textual evidence from Jesus himself, Matthew’s biography of Jesus represents one of several first-century CE narratives that depicts the itinerant preacher as a predicted Jewish messiah. I argue that Matthew, employing the themes of the Son of Man and Son of David, weaves together competing forms of messianic discourse to settle conflict between three competing groups - Matthew’s community, the Pharisees, and the community of John the Baptist. By reframing the world as at the brink of the eschaton, Matthew correlates his opponents with evil and Jesus as the solution to evil. Matthew’s messianic discourse reimagines his community around Jesus as the messiah and ultimate authority over the Pharisees.

The nuances of Matthew’s messianic discourse become apparent when set in relationship to the other early Jesus narratives and other Second Temple apocalyptic narratives. Thus, I will proceed by first briefly introducing the literary relationship between the earliest proposed sources

²⁶⁶ Jesus’ messianism was the subject of several detailed studies, not least limited to: Geza Vermes, *Jesus the Jew: A Historian’s Reading of the Gospels* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1973), 130-40; Paul D. Hanson, “Messiahs and Messianic Figures in Proto-Apocalypticism,” in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (ed. James Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992): 67-75; Michael Schiffman, *Return of the Remnant: The Rebirth of Messianic Judaism* (Clarksville: Lederer Messianic Pub., 1992); Shemaryahu Talmon, “The Concepts of Mishnah and Messianism in Early Judaism,” in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (ed. James A. Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992): 79-115; William Schniedewind, “King and Priest in the Book of Chronicles and the Duality of Qumran Messianism,” *JJS* 45 (1994): 71-78; Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition*, 127-264; Mark Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* (JSNTSup, 110; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 35-57; Harris Lenowitz, *The Jewish Messiahs*, 31-32; William Horbury, “Messianism in the Old Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,” in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (ed. John Day; JSOTSUp, 270; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press): 402-33; George Brooke, “Kingship and Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls;” Oegema, *The Anointed and his People*; Knohl, *The Messiah before Jesus*; see the extended bibliography for other works referenced in this research project.

relating to Jesus of Nazareth. Second, I analyze Matthew's conception of evil. Previous research, such as that from Judith Stack, does not take into account how Matthew situates his notion of sin within his protological and eschatological outlook. I show that Matthew's notion of evil is more closely related to apocalyptic literature, such as the book of Jubilees, rather than sapiential literature. In the third section, I contextualize Matthew's two major contributions of the narrative that mark Jesus as a messiah, namely the application of the terms Son of David and Son of Man. Lastly, I combine this research to demonstrate how Matthew employs messianic discourse in tension with the Pharisees, with special attention to Matthew 23-24.

This case study is framed as an intertextual and intersocial positioning of Matthew within the burgeoning early Jesus movement and internecine conflicts of the late first and early second century CE. It contributes to the study of messianic discourse in four ways. First, it exemplifies how the Son of Man and Son of David conceptions of messianism are integrated into a singular concept in the writings relating to Jesus. Second, Matthew's messiah is envisioned as connected to both the time of creation and the eschaton. While this phenomenon appears in other Second Temple texts (e.g., 1 Enoch), its application to Jesus is unique. Among Early Christian texts, Matthew's narrative is the only text to describe the resurrection of Jesus in eschatological terms (e.g., earthquakes, zombies rising from the dead). Third, Matthew's messianic discourse in chapter 23-24 decries the Pharisees. These chapters in particular demonstrate that messianic discourse is primarily used as an internal rhetorical tool for group formation.²⁶⁷ I draw attention to the passages in which Matthew compliments the Pharisees for their reading of the law and their dedication. Balancing these passages with my reading of chapters 23-24, I suggest that the application of messianic discourse, even in its harshest forms, does not necessitate a splintering of a group into two or more parts.

The Gospels: A Shared Narrative

The Gospel of Matthew is one of several first-century CE biographies. Due to political and religious reasons, this text was preserved with other Early Christian texts, which have benefited from a place of prominence in Western culture. As a result, Matthew was preserved in

²⁶⁷ As I loudly declare below, this passage historically has been wrongly interpreted in antisemitic ways: some would claim that this marks a division between the Jesus followers and other Jews. I outrightly reject this interpretation and refuse to cite these poor interpreters.

the oldest textual evidence of the Early Christianity.²⁶⁸ This evidence is conserved in multiple languages, including Greek, Syriac, Latin, Ethiopic, and Arabic. References and quotations of Matthew in other Early Christian texts, such as the Didache, the letter of 1 Clement, the Epistle of Barnabas, and the letters of Ignatius of Antioch, indicate that the book had reached a stable form by the end of the first century or early second century CE.

The preservation of Matthew within this collection provides an important interpretive context. The history of research offers three important starting points for this inquiry into Matthew's messianic discourse. First, there is a consensus that the moniker 'The Gospel of Matthew' is arbitrarily connected to a first century disciple. Reception of the text within the earliest communities attributed the text to Jesus' disciple Matthew (Mark 3:18; Luke 6:15; Acts 1:13). Most notably, Papias (ca. 60-130 CE), a bishop of Hierapolis, states he compiled a collection of Jesus' sayings titled Λογίων Κυριακῶν Ἐξήγησις, collaborating with Jesus' earliest followers to verify its authenticity. It is unclear whether this collection of sayings functioned like a biography about the figure of Jesus or a collection of sayings from Jesus.²⁶⁹ Although the name Matthew appears in the earliest manuscript colophons, there is no historical record of Jesus' disciple Matthew penning a narrative.

Second, despite the diversity of tradition, the earliest preservation of the historical Jesus' sayings remains elusive. All critical scholars recognize the textured nature of the gospels. While considered a discrete genre, a gospel represents a composite narrative formed upon several subgenres, a characteristic shared across all examples.²⁷⁰ However, the similarities go beyond

²⁶⁸ For list of witnesses, see the data from Institut für Neutestamentliche Testforschung: <http://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/liste>.

²⁶⁹ The earliest proposal for this reading is from Friedrich Schleiermacher, "Ueber die Zeugnisse des Papias von unsern beiden ersten Evangelien," *ThStKr* 5 (1832): 735-68. Cf., Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), ch 9. According to Bauckham, there are only six other books that carry such a title, so we have little data to compare to speculate about the content of this lost work.

²⁷⁰ Ch. Hermann Weiss (*Die evangelische Geschichte kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet*. 2 vols. Leipzig, Breitkopf and Hartel, 1838) first argued for the existence of a separate document that informed Matthew, Mark, and Luke. Heinrich Julius Holtzmann (*Die synoptischen Evangelien: ihr Ursprung und geschichtlicher Charakter* (Leipzig : Wilhelm Engelmann, 1863)) offered that the solution to the shared components between Gospels was a Two-source theory, that Matthew and Luke used Mark and Q to write their narratives about Jesus. Although not universally accepted, the proposal has gained a place of prominence in Early Christian studies. As Horsley and Draper state, "[S]ince Q, as the source of Jesus' sayings for Matthew and Luke, apparently originated before the great Jewish Revolt of 66-70 C.E., which supposedly precipitated the separation of Jesus' followers from nascent 'Judaism,' it brings the modern historian and believer a giant step closer to the circumstances of Jesus' ministry and the earliest stages of the movement in which Jesus traditions took form" (Richard Horsley, with Jonathan A. Draper, *Whoever Hears You Hears Me: Prophets, Performance, and Tradition in Q* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1999), 150.).

The genre of the hypothesized document became important as a lens by which to interpret the Synoptics. The pursuit attempted to uncover Matthew and Luke's source to understand the nature of Matthew's additions to the narrative surrounding

strictly formal distinctions. The shared components of Matthew, Mark, and Luke are generally agreed upon as one of the oldest known common strata of the Jesus tradition.²⁷¹ This course of inquiry was already prevalent in the 18th century when the German scholar Johan Jakob Griesbach produced a *Synopsis* of the Gospels, which set out the parallel accounts of the Gospel tradition, and since has expanded into a field of inquiry in its own right.²⁷² Most attribute the shared components to a hypothetical source labeled as *Quelle* or the “Q” source.²⁷³ I agree with Sara Parks’ assertion based on a comparative analysis of “Q” that the community represented by “Q” was knowledgeable of Jewish literature and traditions.²⁷⁴ Many of these interrelated themes appear interwoven and dependent upon Matthew’s messianic discourse.

Jesus. As Kloppenborg highlights, prophetic or apocalyptic texts would frequently employ sapiential themes and form, as wisdom texts would employ prophetic or apocalyptic themes and form (Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis: 1517 Media, 2000), 380.). Yet this tendency did not collapse the apocalyptic/prophetic genre distinctions with the sapiential genre (Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1987), 37; *Excavating Q*, 181). In 1971, Robinson described Q as the “sayings of the wise,” casting the document as a sapiential text (Robinson, *Four Voices – One Gospel* (Wheaton: Quest Publishing, 1992), 371). Labeling the document as a Sayings Gospel (Lewellyn Howes) further confuses the genre distinction, combining this sapiential referent with the fuller narrative containing the birth, life, death, and resurrection of the character Jesus (On the complexity of Q’s genre, see Jävinen, “Jesus as a Community Symbol in Q,” in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (ed. Andreas Lindeman; BETL 158 Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001), 512-21, here 520).

Alan Kirk argues that Q is a saying source, a separate genre than gospel, that carries its own ethical formulation outside of narrative (Kirk, *The Composition Saying Source* (Leiden: Brill, 1998); see also Kirk, “Q” in *The Reception of Jesus during the First Three Centuries* (ed. Chris Keith, Helen Bond, Christine Jacobi, and Jens Schröter; London: Bloomsbury, 2020), 73-107). As with the larger debate about the genre of Gospel, some chose to prioritize Q’s imminent eschatology while others advocated for ethical/sapiential features, attempting to make clear antithetical distinctions in ancient texts in form and function (Charles E. Carlston, “Wisdom and Eschatology in Q,” in *Logia* (ed. Joel Delobel; Leuven: Peeters and Leuven University Press, 1982), 101-19, here 103; Horsley, *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs*, 77; Frey, “New Testament Eschatology; An Introduction: Classical Issues, Disputed Themes, and Current Perspectives” in *Eschatology of the New Testament and Some Related Documents* (ed. Jan G. van der Watt; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 201), 2-32, here 22; Ronald Piper (ed), *The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q* (Leiden: Brill, 1989), 159). However, Dale C. Allison, among others, makes the point that ancient authors did not make the same distinction between genres (cf., Dale Allison, *The Tradition of Jesus in Q* (Trinity Press International: Harrisburg, 1997), 41). For us to do so overlays modern literary divisions that were not strongly represented in the ancient world. As counter evidence, Theissen and Merz pull support from 4 Maccabees 1:16: “‘Wisdom, I submit, is knowledge of things divine and human, and of their causes.’ First-century Judaism represents the heyday of both apocalypticism and wisdom” (Gerd Theissen and Annette Merz, *The Historical Jesus: A Comprehensive Guide* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 373).

Because Q is reconstructed through statistical analysis of the texts, especially Luke, I will set aside the specific analysis about how Q and its many layers of redaction might have shaped Matthew’s narrative of Jesus. Matthew’s messianic discourse shines when compared, even though Q and Mark are Matthew’s sources.

²⁷¹ Cf., James Robinson, “The Critical Edition of Q and the Study of Jesus,” in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (ed. Andreas Lindemann; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001), 27–52.

²⁷² Johann J. Griesbach, *Synopsis Evangeliorum Matthei, Marci et Lucae* (Halle, 1776). Cf. Kurt Aland, *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum: Locis parallelis evangeliorum apocryphorum et partium adhibitis edidit* (Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 1996).

²⁷³ Kirk, *Composition Saying Source*, 1-86 has a concise summary of the history of scholarship on Q.

²⁷⁴ I am deeply indebted to the work of Sara Parks and her reflections on Q in helping me think about the roles of gender and gendering within Q and the Gospel tradition: *Gender in the Rhetoric of Jesus: Women in Q* (Minneapolis: Fortress Academic, 2019). Her analysis finds similarities such as reference to Isaiah (Q 7:22), comparison of towns (Sodom, Tyre, Sidon, Q 10:14), references to Jewish antecessors (Jonah, Q 11:29-30; Solomon, Q 11:31-32; Abel and Zechariah, Q 11:51; Noah, Q 17:26-27; and the twelve tribes of Israel), and concerns also central to Jews (law observance, Q 16:73; Jerusalem temple, Q 13:34-35; synagogues, Q 12:11).

Third, this context places the following study in Matthew on intertextual and intersocial axes. Assuming the hypothetical source theory is correct, the history of reception suggests that Matthew and Luke used Q and Mark to formulate their narratives about Jesus. Because Q is primarily compiled from an analysis of Luke, I will focus my study on the three synoptic Gospels because they are more closely aligned in genre and content. I will proceed to draw out Matthew's understanding of evil and messianic discourse through comparison with these sources. This theory of redaction reveals that Matthew's contribution to the discourse of messianism is found in his unique addition to the Jesus traditions, most notably, his conception of evil and conception of messianism. The last section will address how the messianic discourse of Matthew is employed within the socioreligious divisions between Matthew's community and the Scribes, the followers of John the Baptist, and the Pharisees, with special attention shown to the last.

The Corrupted World: The Legacy of Evil in Matthew

Matthew frames his socioreligious opponents as a source of evil through several metaphors and similes. My first step to define Matthew's messianic discourse is to understand Matthew's understanding of evil. In what follows, I introduce the work of Judith Stack who argues that Matthew's understanding of evil is both personal and universal: he simultaneously upholds that people commit wrongdoing intentionally and unintentionally. While I find Stack's observations helpful, I argue that Matthew's conception of sin is closer to that in the Book of Jubilees. I show this by inspecting two pericopes: Jesus' birth narrative and Jesus' farewell speech in Matthew 23-24. The data in this section will set up an analysis of the Pharisees who Matthew rhetorically depicts as a source of evil, dissociating his community from the Pharisees, but not from Judaism as a whole.

Matthew's narrative exemplifies evil through a multitude of lexemes and metaphors. Judith Stack offers one of the few book-length studies of Matthew's engagement with the themes of evil and sin.²⁷⁵ She approaches the task through the study of metaphor. For Stack, metaphors function as signifiers for ideology. The meaning of the signifiers is determined locally and cannot be fully translated into another language or culture. Stack acknowledges that despite

²⁷⁵ Judith Stack, *Metaphor and the Portrayal of the Cause(s) of Sin and Evil in the Gospel of Matthew* (Biblical Interpretation Series, 182; Leiden: Brill, 2020).

having a local point, metaphors can have a multiplicity of meanings: “because words themselves are more or less arbitrary placeholders for communally attributed meanings, those attributed meanings can change and multiply.”²⁷⁶ A metaphor is an interanimation of terms that happens when several semantic fields overlap. While the terms used to describe the metaphor might overlap, Stack recognizes that a similar meaning might be expressed through similar or competing terms or terms that are wholly different. Thus, I will proceed by engaging Stack’s lexical study of sin and evil, and then redirect our attention to themes Stack has overlooked.

Stack proposes that Matthew utilizes four kinds of metaphors to describe the notion of sin: (1) metaphors based on general cognates relating to sin; (2) metaphors relating to forcing oneself or another to sin;²⁷⁷ (3) metaphors based on familial or genetic language; and (4) metaphors relating to external forces (e.g., διάβολος). These metaphors are the means to the end, but not the end. “The metaphors,” Stack claims, “do not simply operate descriptively, they also organize our thinking about the subject of the metaphor.”²⁷⁸ Scholars would agree with her conclusions that “attempts to simplify the picture in order to arrive at a single, non-metaphorical answer to the theological question of the cause (singular) of sin according to Matthew will be unrepresentative of the diversity of the text and untrue to the vital dynamics inherent in the original metaphors.”²⁷⁹

²⁷⁶ Stack, *Metaphor*, 9.

²⁷⁷ Stack frequently frames sin and repentance in terms of ‘inward’ and ‘outward’ experiences. However, these categorizations seem to impute a substantial inner sense to the individual that doesn’t appear within the evidence. Just as there are differing degrees of sinfulness conveyed through metaphor, so also there are differing perceptions of the sinner. Metaphor certainly conveys a sense of transference: that which is said in image is meant to describe the experience of humans in some way. Stack goes too far though in assuming the dynamic of metaphor in relation to the body, assuming a dynamic between things such as body parts in relation to the body. For instance, Stack states, “the ‘heart’ becomes a metaphor for the ‘inner person’ in general” (*Metaphor*, 169). This combines or extends the understanding of soul (ψυχή; ψυχή) and mind (νοῦς) to the heart that applies an inner dynamic not representative in the text. Stack acknowledges this (170, n.106), but does not seem to allow this conclusion to set her categories for analysis.

²⁷⁸ Stack, *Metaphor*, 205.

²⁷⁹ Stack, *Metaphor*, 204.

Matthew uses three common words in metaphor to define sin and its influence: sin (ἁμαρτία),²⁸⁰ enticement or temptation (σκάνδαλον), and deception (πλανάω).²⁸¹ Of these three referents, temptation is the most common.²⁸² For Matthew, a temptation is external to oneself: something that entraps a person or causes them to stumble, catching them unaware, and is outside of a person's control. Σκάνδαλον also localizes the cause of sin. Following Dale Allison, Stack finds that pre-modern cultures did not understand the eye as a window into the person, but a window that leads out to the world; for example, "the eye was a channel, but it was a channel out of which flowed the internal 'fire' of life within creatures."²⁸³ The body part itself is not bad but serves a negative purpose. This base assumption crossovers to other bodily metaphors relating to illness and infirmity as the cause of sin. Matthew's use of this metaphor assumes sin is both "physical and generalized rather than localized" in a specific part of the body.²⁸⁴ This use of the metaphor stands in line with other commandments from Second Temple Jewish texts (e.g., Exod 20:17) that extends body parts as a site of sin (cf., 6:22-23). Matthew's deployment of the

²⁸⁰ Sin, ἁμαρτία, occurs infrequently in Matthew, suggesting that the word became a "dead metaphor" for Matthew and/or his community. Stack highlights that Matthew uses the noun form of ἁμαρτία in a few pericopae concerning the process of forgiveness of sin (Matt 1:21; 3:6; 9:2; 9:5; 12:31; 26:28). Matthew 3:6, 9:2, 5 and 12:31 are all paralleled in Mark and Luke; Matt 26:28 is the only unique passage. However, variances do exist in the deployment of the tradition within each Gospel.

Stack notes that Matthew's three uses of the verbal form of ἁμαρτάνω are limited to wrongdoings within the local community. Two uses of ἁμαρτάνω appear in Matthew 18. While the passage opens with a statement about the Kingdom of Heaven, Jesus' instruction is more broadly concerned with the life of the local Jewish community. Through Jesus' instruction, Matthew subverts what seem to be several commonly held propositions in the community, relating to who is in an elevated social position (people with child-like faith) and how to interact with one another. The latter appears as a doublet: where the first occurrence of ἁμαρτάνω (18:15) in the aorist subjunctive focuses upon the method by which conflict should be resolved, the second occurrence (18:21) in the future indicative spotlights the need for repetitive action. This potentially signals that the infighting was a noteworthy frame of relationship within the community. To commit sin, ἁμαρτάνω, according to Stack, is an action performed outside of oneself done to another.

²⁸¹ Matt 18:12; 22:29; 24:4; 24:11; 24:24; cf., Stack, *Metaphor*, 199ff.

²⁸² E.g., metaphors of body parts that cause sin – 5:29-30 and 18:8-9.

²⁸³ Stack, *Metaphor*, 141. Although Stack does not address it, Allison draws attention to the role of hyperbole within these stories (Allison, *The Sermon on the Mount, Companions to the New Testament* (New York: Crossroad, 1999), 76).

²⁸⁴ Stack, *Metaphor*, 147. Eg., Matthew 9:10-13 portrays Jesus after calling Matthew to be a disciple, eating dinner with tax-gathers and sinners. "And as he sat at dinner in the house, many tax collectors and sinners came and were sitting with him and his disciples. When the Pharisees saw this, they said to his disciples, 'Why does your teacher eat with tax collectors and sinners?' But when he heard this, he said, 'Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick. Go and learn what this means, 'I desire mercy, not sacrifice.' For I have come to call not the righteous but sinners.'" Furthermore, Stack posits a connection between sin and illness as a 'traditional' part of Judaism; Deuteronomy 28:58-61 provides "numerous examples" where sickness is a consequence of "sin or the result of unrighteousness." Stack suggests that sin as illness is a common metaphor for Matthew and based on other pericopae pairing illness and sin, Matt 9:10-13 should be understood as 'tax-gathers and the sick.' As support, Stack points to a number of Second Temple texts that parallel sin and illness. 1 Enoch 10:7 reports that God instructs Raphael to "heal the earth" after the desolation of the Watchers. In 4 Ezra, sin is plainly called an illness and related to Adam. God in Jeremiah 3:22 declares "Return, O faithless sons, I will heal your faithlessness." In response to Ephraim's corruption, God promises in Hos 14:4 to heal their 'faithlessness.' This metaphor implies that the source of sin exists within the created body.

metaphor leaves no room for misunderstanding – there is no fracturing between the inner and outer self, between “intention and act.”²⁸⁵

Another classification of metaphor for Matthew relating to sin is familial or genetic metaphor. Matthew frequently uses a genetic relationship to show how sin permeated people. It is noticeable in four primary forms: the metaphor of a tree and its fruit, animals and familial metaphors, and botanical metaphors. The tree-fruit metaphor in 7:17-18 parallels in form to 12:31-37, though with different words about the criterion of judgment. In 12:31-37, Matthew uses the adjectives *καλός* and *σαπρός* to characterize the trees, language that parallels the fish in the Parable of the Net (13:48) and Parable of the Heart (15:10-20). In 7:17-18, Matthew uses the more explicit adjectives *ἀγαθός* and *πονηρός* to parallel God and Satan. “The parallelism of the adjectives thus tends to link these terms,” Stack notes, “such that *καλός* becomes associated with *ἀγαθός* and thus also with God and righteousness, and *σαπρός* with *πονηρός* and thus with Satan and sin.”²⁸⁶ This data suggests that according to Matthew people have a “fundamental nature” that manifests in their actions.²⁸⁷ Matthew interweaves animal and botanical metaphors together with little explanation to demonstrate that one’s character will result in judgment.

The last classification of metaphor in Matthew is ontologically-embodied evil powers – Satan,²⁸⁸ the devil,²⁸⁹ and demons.²⁹⁰ Everyone within Matthew, according to Stack, is influenced by temptation, the *σκάνδαλον*. This applies not only to Matthew’s audience, or specific groups, but also to those who are closest to Jesus. When in the Garden of Gethsemane, the weakness of Jesus’ disciples shows that they are just as subject to the power of temptation as others (26:41). Peter’s confession serves as a pertinent example. “In Jesus’ rebuke, Peter is portrayed not simply as having inadvertently become a *σκάνδαλον* to Jesus, but rather, in putting before Jesus the temptation to avoid the suffering and death of the cross, Peter in this moment

²⁸⁵ Stack, *Metaphor*, 142.

²⁸⁶ Stack, *Metaphor*, 173.

²⁸⁷ Stack, *Metaphor*, 173. Matthew invokes a similar image in John the Baptist’s exhortation in 3:7-10. John’s warning is directed at the Pharisees and Sadducees, but the audience from Jerusalem and the Galilean region appear to be in greater view. The tree that does not produce good fruit will be subject to fire.

²⁸⁸ Matt 4:10; 12:26; 16:23.

²⁸⁹ Matt 4:1, 5, 8, 11; 13:39; 25:41.

²⁹⁰ Matt 7:22; 9:33-34; 10:8; 11:18; 12:24; 12:27-28; 17:18.

embodies the Tempter himself.”²⁹¹ The figure of Satan causes even Jesus’ closest compatriots to abandon their commitment to him.

Matthew refers to Satan and the devil (or Devil) on very few occasions. Matthew’s ὁ διάβολος tempts Jesus in the wilderness (4:1, 5, 8, 11), but otherwise has little direct bearing on the narrative. There is no physical description of the character, no origin story, or allusions to how the embodied character interacts with the world. Stark observes that Matthew more frequently refers to the διάβολος through metaphor, such as the Parable of the Wheat and the Tares. The author describes those who are not receptive to the teachings of Jesus as a part of the embodied evil. In Matt 13, Jesus instructs the crowds from a boat about the consequences of not accepting the secrets of the Kingdom of Heaven through metaphor. The separation of physical distance should not be lost on interpreters: Jesus teaches on a different plane than those who are listening. The distance and space further add to the rhetorical effect of the passage, which mandates a level of separation from evil.

This approach foregrounds the complex issue of sin in Matthew’s narrative. Matthew utilizes a multitude of agricultural and familial metaphors and lexemes to describe the extent of sin in the world and its effect upon humanity. The limitation of Stack’s lexical analysis is that it too strongly disconnects Matthew from his Jewish milieu. Stack appears to read the text from the level of the individual, thereby subjugating elements of the narrative to named lexemes relating to sin. From that starting point, the only logical conclusion the reader might come to is that sin is both obligatory and accidental.

Stack demonstrated this in her analysis of 1 Enoch. The activity of the Watchers, the Fallen Angels, is “portrayed as the primary source of sin and evil in the world,” Stack claims.²⁹² As I argued in chapter three, the transgression of boundaries between heaven and earth by the angels in 1 Enoch introduced depravity into the world. As the archangel Michael confirms, the Watchers “have gone into the daughters of the men of the earth, and they have lain with them, and have defiled themselves with women” (1 En. 9:7-8). Stack points to 1 Enoch 65:6-10 as proof that demonstrates both the humans and the Watchers are responsible for sin:

²⁹¹ Cf. 16:21-23. Stack, *Metaphor*, 192.

²⁹² Stack, *Metaphor*, 36.

A command has gone forth from the presence of the Lord against the inhabitants of the earth that their end if accomplished, for they have learned all the secrets of the angels, and all the violence of the satans, and all their powers, the hidden secrets, and all the powers of those who practice sorcery, and the powers of spells, and the power of those who cast molten images in all the earth... Because of their iniquity judgment has been accomplished and will not be <withheld> in my presence; because of the <sorceries> that they have searched out and learned, the earth will be destroyed, and those who dwell on it.

The text focuses upon the end-time drama that resolves the problem of sin on earth. It should be noted though that the context of this passage is not the same as the Myth of the Watchers, which specifically addresses the question of the origin of sin. For instance, the Watcher Myth has two categories of created beings (i.e., humans and angels) – those who are righteous and those who are wicked (e.g., 1:7-8) — where the Similitudes of Enoch has three categories of created beings – sinners, righteous, and the repentant (1 En. 50). This detail alludes to the different rhetorical purposes of the redacted text. What is noticeable is that within this apocalyptic text, the difference in degree among created beings revolves around the messianic discourse.²⁹³

The authors of the Gospels never identify the Fallen Angels with the evil spirits that Jesus encounters, likely because this etiology was already assumed among readers. Archie Wright, among others, draws a stronger connection between the demonology in the Gospels and the Watcher Myth.²⁹⁴ Wright highlights that the ‘evil spirits’ of the Gospels can be linguistically connected to the Greek^{Syn} in 1 En. 15:8-9 and the ‘unclean spirits’ relates to Jub. 10.²⁹⁵ Humans in the Gospels always ‘have’ a demon; demons do not ‘possess’ people.²⁹⁶ As an example, Luke 4:33-36 describes an individual plagued by an unclean demon. The demon causes the person to

²⁹³ Stack concludes her analysis of 1 Enoch by reprising the theme of human responsibility in the Epistle of Enoch (92-107). There is not enough space here to take up this argument; however, I point out the same critique- assuming a universal interpretation of evil across such a heavily redacted text does an injustice to the text itself. Discussion of the ‘two opposing paths’ does not indeed focus upon an origin but on the ramifications of sin.

²⁹⁴ There are several works that have focused upon the issue of Satan and demons in the Second Temple period, not least of them include: Archie Wright, *The Origins of Evil* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005); Richard H. Bell, *Deliver us from Evil: Interpreting the Redemption from the Power of Satan in New Testament Theology* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007); Miryam T. Brand, *Evil Within and Without: The Source of Sin and its Nature as Portrayed in Second Temple Literature* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013); Loren Stuckenbruck, *The Myth of Rebellious Angels*; Ryan Stokes, *The Satan*.

²⁹⁵ Archie Wright, “The Demonology of 1 Enoch and the New Testament Gospels” in *Enoch and the Synoptic Gospels: Reminiscences, Allusions, Intertextuality* (ed. Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Gabriele Boccaccini; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014), 215-244, here 235.

²⁹⁶ This language stems from a response from Robert Hall on Wright’s presentation during an Enoch Seminar meeting. Hall’s response was never published, so this comment represents Wright’s recollection of the encounter. See Wright, “Demonology,” 237, n. 80.

cry out in a loud voice, an act of torment that echoes the Watchers in 1 En. 15:11-12. A similar instance of torment is found in Luke 9:42, in which an evil spirit throws a young boy on the ground. Mark 5:7 likewise seems to indicate that an evil spirit attempts to limit Jesus' power of exorcism by addressing him with the language of oath, "Jesus Son of the Most High God." Wright highlights, "The use of the divine name appears to be the common practice of incantation prayers against demons; it may be that the spirit is attempting to reverse the roles in this situation."²⁹⁷ This practice is echoed in other Second Temple Jewish texts (e.g., 11Q1; 11Q5 XIX;4Q444 1 i 8). In their many diverse forms, the evil and unclean spirits in the Gospels invade and inflict pain on human bodies, similar to the Watcher myth.

The reliance upon metaphorical understandings of sin and evil in the Gospel of Matthew suggests that the author is not interested in positing a non-metaphorical origin of evil. The fact that he never addresses it directly pushes interpreters to seek to understand how these metaphors and literary nuances function within the narrative. I draw attention to the opening and closing of Matthew's narrative – the pericope of Jesus' birth and death, respectively – to challenge Stack's emphasis on specific metaphors and lexemes. In so doing, I contend that Matthew has entwined his messianic discourse within apocalyptic elements more common to 1 Enoch and Jubilees.

Origin over Effect: Jesus' Birth Narrative

Stack's research into Matthew's many terms relating to sin is immensely helpful to observe an ethical dualism within the text: the community is exhorted in metaphor and exhortative speech to abandon sinful practices and resist sin. However, I desire to push beyond Stack's pursuit of a non-metaphorical origin of sin and rather analyze Matthew's *metaphorical* etiology of sin: his community has inherited a world that is dominated by evil from primordial time. This evil has influenced all people, including Jews. Matthew frames humans and external spiritual forces as mutually responsible for sin. However, to separate Matthew's implied or overt sources of evil (corrupt world) from his rhetorical strategies (do not sin!) creates a less than fruitful field for understanding messianic discourse. I turn now to Matthew's lineage of Jesus as a counterpoint, for here we see that all members of Jewish history were in a way corrupt.

Matthew and Luke begin their Jesus narratives with a detailed list of his family. Ancient Judaism marked its familial relations through paternal lines. Where Luke lays out Jesus' lineage

²⁹⁷ Wright, "Demonology," 240.

from his parents to Adam, the progenitor of the human race according to Genesis, Matthew lists the origins of Jesus' lineage to Abraham.

Table IV.1: Comparison of Matthew 1:2-17 and Luke 3:23-38

<p>Matthew 1:2 Ἀβραὰμ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰσαὰκ, Ἰσαὰκ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰακώβ, Ἰακώβ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰούδαν καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ, ³ Ἰούδας δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Φάρες καὶ τὸν Ζάρα ἐκ τῆς Θαμάρ, Φάρες δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἑσρῶμ, Ἑσρῶμ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἀράμ, ⁴ Ἀράμ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἀμιναδάβ, Ἀμιναδάβ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ναασσών, Ναασσών δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Σαλμών, ⁵ Σαλμών δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Βόες ἐκ τῆς Ῥαχάβ, Βόες δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰωβὴδ ἐκ τῆς Ρούθ, Ἰωβὴδ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰεσσαί, ⁶ Ἰεσσαί δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Δαυὶδ τὸν βασιλέα.</p> <p>Δαυὶδ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Σολομῶνα ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Οὐρίου, ⁷ Σολομών δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ῥοβοάμ, Ῥοβοάμ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ῥαβιά, Ῥαβιά δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ῥασάφ, ⁸ Ῥασάφ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰωσαφάτ, Ἰωσαφάτ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰωράμ, Ἰωράμ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ὀζιαν, ⁹ Ὀζίας δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰωαθάμ, Ἰωαθάμ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἀχάζ, Ἀχάζ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἐζεκίαν, ¹⁰ Ἐζεκίας δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Μανασσῆ, Μανασσῆ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἀμώς, Ἀμώς δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰωσίαν, ¹¹ Ἰωσίας δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰεχονίαν καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς μετοικεσίας Βαβυλῶνος.</p> <p>1:12 Μετὰ δὲ τὴν μετοικεσίαν Βαβυλῶνος Ἰεχονίας ἐγέννησεν τὸν Σαλαθιήλ, Σαλαθιήλ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ζοροβαβέλ, ¹³ Ζοροβαβέλ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἀβιούδ, Ἀβιούδ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἐλιακίμ, Ἐλιακίμ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἀζώρ, ¹⁴ Ἀζώρ δὲ ἐγέννησεν</p>	<p>Luke 3:23 Καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Ἰησοῦς ἀρχόμενος ὥσει ἐτῶν τριάκοντα, ὧν υἱός, ὡς ἐνομίζετο, Ἰωσήφ τοῦ Ἠλὶ ²⁴ τοῦ Μαθθαὶ τοῦ Λευὶ τοῦ Μελχὶ τοῦ Ἰανναὶ τοῦ Ἰωσήφ ²⁵ τοῦ Ματταθίου τοῦ Ἀμῶς τοῦ Ναοῦμ τοῦ Ἑσλι τοῦ Ναγγαὶ ²⁶ τοῦ Μάαθ τοῦ Ματταθίου τοῦ Σεμεῖν τοῦ Ἰωσήφ τοῦ Ἰωδὰ ²⁷ τοῦ Ἰωανὰν τοῦ Ῥησὰ τοῦ Ζοροβαβέλ τοῦ Σαλαθιήλ τοῦ Νηρι ²⁸ τοῦ Μελχὶ τοῦ Ἀδδὶ τοῦ Κωσάμ τοῦ Ἑλμαδάμ τοῦ Ἡρ ²⁹ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ἐλιέζερ τοῦ Ἰωριμ τοῦ Μαθθαὶ τοῦ Λευὶ ³⁰ τοῦ Συμεὼν τοῦ Ἰούδα τοῦ Ἰωσήφ τοῦ Ἰωνάμ τοῦ Ἐλιακίμ ³¹ τοῦ Μελεὰ τοῦ Μεννὰ τοῦ Ματταθαὶ τοῦ Ναθάμ τοῦ Δαυὶδ ³² τοῦ Ἰεσσαὶ τοῦ Ἰωβὴδ τοῦ Βόος τοῦ Σαλὰ τοῦ Ναασσών ³³ τοῦ Ἀμιναδάβ τοῦ Ἀδμὶν τοῦ Ἀρνὶ τοῦ Ἑσρῶμ τοῦ Φάρες τοῦ Ἰούδα ³⁴ τοῦ Ἰακώβ τοῦ Ἰσαὰκ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ τοῦ Θάρα τοῦ Ναχώρ ³⁵ τοῦ Σεροῦχ τοῦ Ραγαὺ τοῦ Φάλεκ τοῦ Ἑβερ τοῦ Σαλὰ ³⁶ τοῦ Καϊνὰμ τοῦ Ἀρφαξὰδ τοῦ Σὴμ τοῦ Νῶε τοῦ Λάμεχ ³⁷ τοῦ Μαθουσαλὰ τοῦ Ἐνώχ τοῦ Ἰάρετ τοῦ Μαλελεήλ τοῦ Καϊνὰμ ³⁸ τοῦ Ἐνῶς τοῦ Σὴθ τοῦ Ἀδάμ τοῦ θεοῦ.</p>
--	---

<p>τὸν Σαδὼκ, Σαδὼκ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἀχίμ, Ἀχίμ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἐλιοῦδ, ¹⁵ Ἐλιοῦδ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἐλεάζαρ, Ἐλεάζαρ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ματθάν, Ματθάν δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰακώβ, ¹⁶ Ἰακώβ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰωσήφ ‘τὸν ἄνδρα Μαρίας, ἐξ ἧς ἐγεννήθη Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός.</p>	
--	--

The lineages are not the same, each author tracing the lineage of Jesus back through different relations. Matthew’s regularly repeated phrase ‘begat’ (γεννάω; cf. 1 Chron 2:1-15) is a common marker of relation in genealogies (Gen 5:3-32; 11:10-28; Ruth 4:18-22; 1 Chron 1-9). Where Matthew uses the full phrase, Luke uses the shorter Genitive of Relation to describe sonship from parent to child. Matthew’s tripartite division in v. 17 offers readers a literary division that frames the genealogy: there were 14 generations between Abraham and David, 14 generations from David to the Babylonian deportation, and 14 generations from the Babylonian deportation to Jesus. Luke’s lineage begins with Jesus and traces relations back to Adam. Luke refers to Jesus’ grandfather as Heli while Matthew names him Jacob. Luke lists 43 names while Matthew lists 28 names, extending the average length of life.

The difference between Luke and Matthew’s respective lists captivated early interpreters who assumed that the two lists should correspond. Codex D (5 cent. CE) solved the quandary by copying Matthew’s genealogy in place of Luke’s list, reversing the order to match Matthew. Julius Africanus (2/3 cent. CE) found the differences to be minor between Jesus’ grandfather in both Matthew and Luke. He solved the issue by making the distinction between biological and legal paternity, Matthew according to birth and Luke according to adoption. Eusebius, who conveys Julius’ report (*Hist. Eccl* 1.7.1-16), does not recognize Jesus as Joseph’s biological son, and, therefore, he has no claim to the Davidic line. In place, Eusebius, who is unwilling to dismiss Jesus’ connection to David, assumes that Mary must also have descended from David: “since every man in Israel was obligated to marry a woman out of the same tribe, Mary must have come from the same lineage as Joseph” (1.7.17).²⁹⁸

²⁹⁸ For the exploration of this view in the patristics, see Marckus Bockmuehl, “The Son of David and his Mother,” *JTS* 62 (2011): 476-93.

The question of lineage has taken center stage among modern interpreters.²⁹⁹ Yigal Levin argues that Jesus could not have had two respective lineages: “How could Jesus be both the physical son of God, born of a virgin, and be descended from David through his father?”³⁰⁰ From the point of view of the texts, “the establishment of Jesus the Messiah as ‘Son of God’ did not necessitate his being born of a virgin.”³⁰¹ Levin’s answer is that adoption was not a Jewish concept. The many examples of adoption in Jewish texts were within the existing family, and most by women, “and in no one case can it be shown that such an ‘adoption’ had any legal consequences.”³⁰² If true, Matthew and Luke must have relied upon Roman understandings of sonship and inheritance. This placement outside of Judaism, Levin wagers, allowed Matthew and Luke to combine the parallel traditions. This means that both Matthew and Luke were unfamiliar with Jewish traditions and suggests a non-Jewish provenance.

This argument does not have sufficient support from our ancient sources. There are no examples of legal adoption in ancient Judaism. As Caleb Friedeman points out, “Levin’s case against Jewish adoption is an argument from silence. Levin presents no evidence that adoption *did not exist* in early Judaism; he simply argues *there is no evidence for it*.”³⁰³ Friedeman’s counter argument is based on several examples. In Genesis 21:10, Sarah tells Abraham that Isaac will not share his inheritance with Ishmael. In Exod 2:11, Pharaoh’s daughter adopts Moses. Levirate marriage, the marriage of a widow to a remaining brother of the former spouse, passes on the lineal status of the new husband to her original children. This procedure was encoded in law (Deut 25:5-6) and accepted as practice in Second Temple Judaism. There are numerous other examples.³⁰⁴ Friedeman demonstrates that adoption in ancient Judaism was not only legal but an acknowledged practice. This background suggests that ancient Jews would have read this

²⁹⁹ For a history of research, see Sébastien Doane, “Experiencing a Biblical Self-Consuming Artifact: Jesus’ Genealogy (Matt 2:1-17)” *J. Bible and Its Reception* 7, 2 (2020): 115-146.

³⁰⁰ Yigal Levin, “Jesus, ‘Son of God’ and ‘Son of David:’ The ‘Adoption’ of Jesus into the Davidic Line,” *JSNT* 28 (2006): 415-42; here, 418.

³⁰¹ Levin, “Jesus,” 419.

³⁰² Levin, “Jesus,” 423.

³⁰³ Caleb Friedman, “Jesus’ Davidic Lineage and the Case for Jewish Adoption,” *NTS* 66 (2020): 249-267.

³⁰⁴ I.e., Ahiqar 14-22; Brooklyn papyrus; 2 Enoch 71:13; Jub. 12:30; Sib. Or. 3.253-4; Mos. 1:19.

narrative as historically probable. According to the tradition, Jesus was not the legitimate son of Joseph; however, Matthew's lineage through Joseph connects Jesus back to Abraham and David.

Listing Abraham as a point of prominence in the lineage draws attention to Jesus' familial connection with the first patriarch (Exod 2:24; Ezek 33:24; Mic 7:20). Genesis 12-25 records the tale of Abraham's travels from ancient Palestine to Egypt. Abraham's call story serves as a promise to him and his offspring. Genesis 12:2-3 states, "I will make of you a great nation, and I will bless you, and make your name great, so that you will be a blessing. I will bless those who bless you, and the one who curses you I will curse; and in you all the families of the earth shall be blessed." YHWH's declaration is unsolicited and not as a reward for any action. This stands in contrast to the account in Jubilees, in which Abraham is already a fierce advocate of monotheism (11-12; c.f., Apoc. Abram 17) over and against his family.³⁰⁵

The inclusion of King David within Matthew's lineage (1:6) affirms the author's declaration that Jesus is a messiah in the tradition of David. The promise from 2 Samuel 7 reverberates throughout the text:

יְהִי־הָיָה נִכּוֹן עַד־עוֹלָם כִּסֵּאָךָ וְנֹאמָן בֵּיתְךָ וּמִמְלַכְתְּךָ עַד־עוֹלָם לְפָנַי

Your house and your kingdom shall be made sure forever before me; your throne shall be established forever

As I show in previous chapters, this is frequently interpreted as a messianic promise for the Davidic heir. The success of Solomon, David's immediate offspring who sustained the united kingdom, might be viewed as the confirmation of the promise. However, the annals of Israelite history record that David's lineage quickly declined immediately following Solomon, with Rehoboam and Jeroboam initiating a tribal war that separated the northern and southern kingdoms. Matthew's lineage does not reference this division.

³⁰⁵ Abraham's concern for his progeny stands in contrast to his treatment of his wife. Abraham's decision to give his wife away to Pharaoh places YHWH's promise at risk. Abraham instructs Sarah to tell Pharaoh that she is Abraham's sister. In exchange for his wife, Pharaoh grants Abraham passage in Egypt as well as a multitude of livestock. YHWH, Genesis relates, punished Pharaoh for the misdeed, despite that it was Abraham who brought about the indiscretion. Pharaoh declares, "What is this you have done to me? Why did you not tell me that she was your wife?" (וַיִּקְרָא פַרְעֹה לְאַבְרָם וַיֹּאמֶר מַה־זֹּאת עָשִׂיתָ לִּי לָמָּה לֹא־הַגַּדְתָּ לִּי כִּי אִשְׁתְּךָ) (הָיָה). The phrase again duplicates YHWH's incrimination of wrongdoing from Gen 3:13. Like Matthew, the author of Genesis does not hold Abraham culpable for his actions. Despite his error, Abraham is credited with righteousness for trusting YHWH's promise (Gen 15; Jub 14).

Like the story of Abraham, David's lineage is marked by sexual deviation. David had four wives and several unknown concubines, which produced 21 children. Solomon was David's fifth child with Bathsheba (1 Chron 3:5). David's conquest of Bathsheba is detailed in 2 Samuel 11:2-27. That King David took many wives is not abnormal, but the manner in which David acquired Bathsheba is notable; David had Uriah placed on the front lines during an offensive attack in which David knew Uriah would be killed. In this sense, David orchestrated Uriah's murder. The narrative of David's lust for Bathsheba reflects other acts of wrongful breaking of boundaries. David gazes upon Bathsheba from a far and takes possession of her, calling her to the palace, having intercourse, and impregnating her. David resolves the incident by making an agreement with one of his commanders to arrange Uriah's death. Matthew skirts around this overt sin by naming David as father to Solomon through the wife of Uriah rather than naming Bathsheba. The connection to David mirrors the Abrahamic promise as a major touch point in ancient Jewish history, but comparatively represents a pattern of sin.³⁰⁶

Amy Richter convincingly argues that this same pattern plays out in Matthew's unusual inclusion of female characters in the genealogy. Richter highlights that there are four general arguments for the inclusion of the female characters: 1) the women were all non-Jews, indicating Matthew's Jesus was dedicated to the inclusion of non-Jews into the early followers of Jesus; 2) the women were all sinners, that is, confessors of sin, showing Jesus to be merciful to sinners; 3) all four women engaged in deviant sexual behavior, thus foreshadowing and alluding to social dynamics surrounding Jesus' birth; and 4) these four women play a key role in Matthew's understanding of salvation history.³⁰⁷ Each woman, Richter finds, was portrayed within an Enochic template, transgressing "at least one kind of boundary, whether ethnic, social or legal" utilizing the very skills that the Watchers revealed to humanity, such as beautification and seduction.³⁰⁸ Also, in three of the four cases, the women suffered legal issues relating to the legitimacy of their offspring.³⁰⁹ The four women do not use the illicit arts to further corrupt, but

³⁰⁶ Stephen Carlson misses the mark but doubles the lifespan of David to compensate for the difference in length ("The Davidic Key for Counting the Generations in Matthew 1:17," *CBQ* 76, 4 (2014): 665-683.

³⁰⁷ This list is summarized from Amy Richter, *The Enochic Watchers Template and the Gospel of Matthew* (Ph.D. Diss., Marquette University, 2010).

³⁰⁸ Richter, *Enochic Watchers Template*, 143.

³⁰⁹ Richter, *Enochic Watchers Template*, 143.

to seek righteousness and produce hope. Ritcher boldly claims, “The evangelist Matthew, in naming these four women as ancestors to Jesus, makes use of the Enochic template, but subverts its elements so that the descendent of these transgressive women will be the cause of Matthew’s hope and the subject of his Gospel.”³¹⁰

This reading of Jesus’ birth narrative reformulates the duality of sin to a focus on origin and effect. In agreement with several interpreters, I have proposed that Matthew’s understanding of evil has significant parallels with 1 Enoch. Although only sampled here, this reading of Jesus’ lineage introduces an etiology of evil that shapes the presentation of Jesus within the birth narrative, and this reimagines the extent of evil: humans are victims of evil as a part of living within the fallen world. Even Jewish forefathers were under the power of sin. Matthew’s messiah entered the world to help those who are victims of this illness.

Origin over Effect: Jesus’ Farewell Speech

Jesus’ birth narrative clues his readers to sin as a protological issue. Matthew placed Jesus at the end of a long line of characters from ancient Judaism that were known for their sin. I argue that while the beginning of the narrative foregrounded protological concerns, the ending of the narrative casts Jesus’ messianism as an eschatological concern. By doing this, Matthew insinuates that the Pharisees are evil. In this section, I compare Jesus’ farewell speech in Matthew 23-24 to Abraham’s farewell speech in Jubilees 20-21. Reading these two texts together suggests a common framing of evil in relation to the eschaton. My objective in making this comparison is to show that while Matthew does not quote from Jubilees, Matthew 23 contains several genre and thematic similarities to Jubilees 20-21 that illuminate how Matthew’s diatribe against the Pharisees functions within his narrative.

I begin with an analysis of Jubilees 20-21, a second century BCE text. Jubilees is a retelling of Genesis and part of Exodus.³¹¹ John J. Collins points out that the genre of Jubilees most likely falls under the heading of ‘rewritten bible.’³¹² Some common trends shared between Jubilees and this genre are: a retelling or reinterpretation of a previously dated tradition, that

³¹⁰ Ritcher, *Enochic Watchers Template*, 147.

³¹¹ John J. Collins, “The Genre of the Book of Jubilees,” in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James VanderKam* (ed. Eric Mason; Brill, 2012), 737-755, here 742.

³¹² John J. Collins, “The Genre of the Book of Jubilees,” 742.

replicates in some way the form and function of the material on which it is based; the original or older traditions are interwoven and integrated into a newer tradition; the reinterpretation is not intended necessarily to supersede the original, but present a fuller, more ‘doctrinally advanced’ form of ‘scripture.’ The nature and manner of expansion has been noted by many interpreters, especially James VanderKam.³¹³ By retelling or reinterpreting large portions of these texts, VanderKam claims, Jubilees succeeds in accomplishing several shifts to the tradition. By re-narrating part of the Jewish origin stories important to some Jews, the author can ground different aspects of Jewish priestly culture within the basic fabric of creation, such as notions of evil (Jub. 5), halakha (Jub. 49), and of course, calendar. The added portions to the narratives are dispersed throughout the text, and are frequently disconnected from the narrative. They are most noticeable in the expanded monologues and dialogues of the protagonists.

The patriarch Abraham offers several end-of-life or farewell speeches in Jubilees to his family – Ishmael, Isaac, and their respective sons. Each address is marked by the date of the presentation, name of the addresses, and summary statements about the meaning of his command. Abraham’s speech in Jubilees 20 begins thus:

And he told them the judgment of the giants and the judgments of the Sodomites just as they had been judged on account of their evil. And on account of their fornication and impurity and the corruption among themselves with fornication they died.

The address that follows has three parts. In 20:6, Abraham’s offspring are, in everything they do, to worship the Most High God and not lesser divine beings or created idols. Verses 7-9a, he exhorts, ‘Love the God of Heavens, and be joined to all of his commands.’ However, the commands are not listed here but are further detailed in chapter 21, to which I will return to below. Verses 9b-10 contain a series of result clauses: if Abraham’s descendants follow these guidelines, their lands, food, livestock, and wombs will be blessed, which are allusions to Deut 27-28. These farewell narratives invite ancient readers to sustain their covenant with YHWH by following appropriate guidelines for behavior.

The opening warning sheds light on the author’s perspective that encompasses a dual understanding of sin and corruption. Beyond subtle and not-so-subtle allusions to the Watcher Myth, the author of Jubilees stresses, like 1 Enoch 1-16, that evil stems from superhuman

³¹³ James VanderKam, *Jubilees: Hermeneia Commentary Series* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2018).

sources that broke YHWH's proper order. Abraham, for example, experienced this firsthand – it is Mastema, not God, that instructs Abraham to sacrifice Isaac. Under this orientation, humans reflect the duality of good and evil represented by the angelic retinue. Those who serve lesser divine beings or attempt to create idols represent this corruption, for they trust in nothing.³¹⁴

This sense of corruption stands in tandem with the following chapter that details the commands for offerings and sacrifices. These ordinances include four key topics:

1. *appropriate sense of self* – Abraham emphasizes he has offered his heart and spirit to YHWH;
2. *God is the judge of all people* – Abraham accepts that it is not his responsibility to judge those who transgress the laws;
3. *Cultic Propriety* – how to properly encounter blood during a sacrifice or avoid it completely. A bulk of the passage contains directions on how to sacrifice correctly, what meats, grains, and spices are to be offered and in what ways;
4. *The Proper Order of Days* – these addresses are offered within a specific week of jubilee, and sacrifices and offerings are only valid for so many days.

I will return to this list below, for Matthew repeats these injunctions against the Pharisees.

This address in Jubilees 21 concludes in a similar way to chapter 20, with the same three-part warning: every deed of mankind is evil, defiled and corrupt. If Abraham's children walk in humankind's ways, their deeds, family, and possessions will not be blessed. However, this farewell address adds a promise that if Abraham's offspring turn aside from evil and defilement, God will raise a righteous plant from them for all the generations of the earth. This is surely an allusion to the stump of David that appears in several places in Second Temple literature, most clearly in Isaiah 11. This prophetic word creates a breach in the original prophetic pronouncement – although humanity is corrupt, according to the author of Jubilees, individuals might still turn aside by following the ordinances of God. These decisions have eschatological consequences.

The farewell speeches in Jubilees 20-21 present humanity in a desperate situation. Due to the superhuman forces of evil, every deed of humanity is evil, corrupt, and contaminated: there is no one righteous among them. The expansion of the halakha indicates, however, that those who follow the law (that is, Israel) might sustain their covenant. The address spans all of time, from

³¹⁴ See also Jubilees 10, 15.

creation to the eschaton, showing readers that following the covenant leads to eschatological fulfillment or destruction.

I now compare Jubilees 20-21 with Matthew 23-24.³¹⁵ My intention with making this comparison is to offer a corrective to our approach to the Seven Woes: rather than trying to find parallel halakhic material, I argue we should focus more on how this pericope functions within the eschatological pronouncement of Matthew's messianic discourse.

Matthew 23-24, frequently labeled as the Seven Woes, lodges a blistering conviction against the Pharisees and Scribes for their failure to fulfill the law. Each woe is marked by Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, 'woe to you.' 5 of the 7 woes then name the recipients, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, the Scribes and Pharisees, with the pejorative, ὑποκριταί, hypocrites. There is little to be gained by comparing Matthew's woes among NT texts. The parallel passage in Luke 11:39-54 is clearly different in scope and purpose, presenting different offenses in a different tone. Nor does this type of indignation appear elsewhere in the first-century CE Christian texts.

Yair Furstenberg recently argued that the Matthean Woes represents a regular pattern of anti-Pharisaic argumentation common in early Judaism. Based on a comparison with the Mishnah tractate Yadayim, Furstenberg believes that the pre-Matthean Jesus utilized this argumentation to signal a stricter observance of the commandments.³¹⁶ I agree with Furstenberg's position. Matthew 5 already supports this conclusion; in Matthew's message on the mount, Jesus instructs his followers that their righteousness must supersede that of the Pharisees and Scribes. However, I question why we must look so far past the Second Temple Period to find potential parallels in argumentation and form. In addition, Furstenberg's removal of Matthew's Seven Woes from the eschatological, messianic framework that proceeds and follows the pericope leaves interpreters wondering how the priestly circles of Matthew and Yadayim 4:6-7 are ultimately connected. Based on the context, I think the insistence that Pharisees have failed to fulfill the law carries greater significance for Matthew than just a public

³¹⁵ This research stems from "Apocalyptic Pharisees? Messianic Discourse in Matthew 23," a conference paper I presented at the EABS Symposium, Prague, Czech Republic. 30 March-1 April, 2022. I express my thanks to the many colleagues who critiqued my presentations. While I do not cite it directly in this chapter, my thinking around this topic was shaped by *The Pharisees* (ed. by J. Sievers and AJ Levine; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2021) and the Reviews of the Enoch Seminar event that reviewed the title.

³¹⁶ Yair Furstenberg, "Jesus against the Laws of the Pharisees: The Legal Woe Sayings and Second Temple Intersectarian Discourse," *JBL* 139, 4 (2020): 769-788.

rebuke. For Matthew, the Pharisees represent the Fallen Angels from the Myth of the Watchers, those who led humanity astray.

The language and attitude towards the Pharisees in Matthew 23 are representative of Matthew's other references to the Pharisees. Almost all of Matthew's 26 references to the group are within dialogue about human agency and law observance.³¹⁷ Matthew 9 exemplifies the tension between Jesus and the Pharisees. The Pharisees continually question Jesus about his actions, attempting to pass judgment whether Jesus is abiding by halakha. In Matt 9:32-34, a mute demoniac is brought before Jesus and Jesus heals him. The Pharisees' objection that Jesus can cast out demons because he is the ruler of demons, attempts to locate Jesus in the diabolical hierarchy. Their response suggests that the Pharisees and the early Jesus movement held to a similar understanding of superhuman powers and origins of evil.

I argue Matthew's Seven Woes are better illuminated through a comparison with the farewell speeches in Jubilees that focus upon halakic obedience within an apocalyptic understanding of the world. Matthew's Seven Woes covers five key topics.

1. The Pharisees are guilty of an *inappropriate sense of self*. They, who Mathew describes as being on the periphery, assume they have the power to lock people out of the kingdom of heaven. Matthew goes as far as to say that even their converts are twice as much as children of hell as they are. The insults cut the Pharisees both by equating them with non-Jews who do not observe the covenant, as well as throwing into doubt their lineage through Abraham. For Matthew, I think they represent an example of total corruption.
2. Matthew chastises the Pharisees for binding their oaths to the temple rather than to YHWH. This displaces YHWH as the highest authority.
3. Matthew charges that the Pharisees have misunderstood the sacrificial system – they offer the appropriate spices, but, Jesus accuses, they have not understood the key principles of justice and mercy, a function of the eschaton.
4. The Pharisees have failed to accurately apply the purity laws: they focus on external purity, but not internal purity.
5. Matthew charges the Pharisees with an obsession of those who are dead rather than those who are alive. The simple interpretation of this charge is that they are more concerned

³¹⁷ Matt 3:7; 5:20; 9:11, 14; 9:34; 12:2; 12:14, 24, 38; 15:1, 12; 16:1, 6, 11; 19:3; 12:45; 22:15, 34; 22:41; 23:2, 13, 15, 23, 25, 27, 29; 27:62.

with ancient tradition than with those that are living. While this point of argument may be true, I also suspect that we have here a pun within the narrative: a few chapters later, Jesus will rise from the tomb; in Matthew 27, the chief priests and the Pharisees meet with Pilate to convince him to guard the tomb. That the Pharisees are duped along with the non-Jews, reinforces Matthew's subtle argument that the Pharisees are evil and corrupt.

We must observe that Abraham's testimony to Isaac in Jubilees 21 addresses the same categories of issues addressed in Matthew 23. According to Jubilees, humans retain a perilous agency over their actions. However, properly following the ordinances allows Jews to maintain their status. This proposed reading of these two stories together suggests that where Abraham's message is a warning to his 'offspring,' Matthew's message proclaims judgment and points readers to the eschaton in the following chapter.

This insight informs our thinking about the remaining portion of the narrative. Matthew 23-25 might be organized under three overarching headings:

- Matt 23:1-39 – Warning of false teachers (Pharisees); judgment upon a generation based in Jerusalem.
- Matt 24:1 – 25:30 – Prediction of the destruction of the temple; warnings of false messiahs, wars and rumors of wars as a sign of the end of time.
- Matthew 25:31-46, the fulfillment through the Son of Man.

This tripartite structure of Matthew also reflects Jubilees 20-21. Matthew repeats the structure again in the closing chapters where this narrative plays out in the death and resurrection of Jesus. Rather than the death of Abraham and the dispersal of new wisdom, as in Jubilees, Matthew employs this subgenre to mythologize the Pharisees. Based on this comparative reading with Jubilees 20-21, Matthew uses the conflict with the Pharisees to critique their authority as interpreters of the Torah and to elevate Jesus as a messiah. I will return to this passage again below, for Matthew 23:10 is one of the strongest examples of messianic discourse in early Christian literature.

Matthew's Messianism

That Matthew sets Jesus as messiah to resolve both the unclean spirits inhibiting people as well as to relieve human culpability is, for Matthew, a messianic issue that overlaps in a complex textual relationship. The terms explored above expand their lexical meanings, while also localizing the concept within his unique community. These broad understandings of sin in Matthew can be mapped onto two views of the messiah – the Son of David and the Son of Man. It will become clear that Matthew reinvents the Son of David title with metaphors and practices associated with the Son of Man.

Son of David Title

Matthew employs the title Son of David in two different contexts. The primary use of the title is within a dire call for mercy from those who are suffering illness or deformity. Matthew 9:27 reports that while Jesus was traipsing around Galilee and performing random miracles for those in the countryside, two men called upon Jesus to have mercy upon them: ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, υἱὸς Δαυὶδ. A strong connection is drawn between physical ailments and the problem of sin; the blind men do not ask for forgiveness but rather for the return of their vision. Based on their faith, Jesus heals the two men. He then commands them to tell no one of their healing, echoing Mark's emphasis to hide Jesus' identity. Matthew 9:27-31 is a shortened form of Mark 10:46-52 and Matthew 20:29-34. As Matthew was prone to set aside Mark's desire for messianic secrecy, the reduction is likely due to the needs of the context. These latter portions locate the narrative outside of Jericho where those who are healed immediately spread the word. Mark and Matthew's longer versions both include a silencing of those who are calling out for help, though the accounts differ on who censures them (unnamed crowd, Mark 10:48, Matt 20:31; Jesus, Matt 9:30). All three pericopae pivot on a question posed to the individual.

Likewise, Jesus answers the call for mercy in Matt 15:22 from a Canaanite woman who pleads on behalf of her daughter suffering from a demon (δαίμονιζομαι). To my knowledge, this is the only time in which David is evoked to confront a non-human force.³¹⁸ That the designation

³¹⁸ There is not enough reliable textual evidence (e.g., Pss Sol 17; *Ant.* 6.8.1) to support Berger's argument of a healing Davidic messiah tradition from Solomon (Klaus Berger, "Die königlichen Messiastraditionen des Neuen Testaments," *NTS* 20 (1973) 1–44, here 3-9). Neither does Baxter's connection between Ezek 34 and this healing pericope provide a convincing literary correlation (Wayne Baxter, "Healing and the 'Son of David': Matthew's Warrant," *Novum Testamentum* 48, 1 (2006): 36-50). C.f., also Kim Paffenroth, "Jesus as Anointed and Healing Son of David in the Gospel of Matthew," *Biblica* 80, 4 (1999): 547-

of ‘Canaanite’ might be considered anything else but another title of a Jewish native is a misstep that dismisses the porous religious boundaries among Jews.³¹⁹ Matthew’s unwillingness to name the woman paired with her short plea for an modicum of mercy in 15:26 suggests that the character serves as a plot point rather than as a main character, drawing attention to her confession, “It is not fair to take the children’s food and throw it to the dogs” (ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· οὐκ ἔστιν καλὸν λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων καὶ βαλεῖν τοῖς कुναρίοις). Like the blind men in Matt 9:27-31 and 20:29-24, the woman’s confession is proclaimed in affirmation of Jesus as a messiah.

Matthew’s second use of the Son of David appellation more overtly affirms Jesus’ role as a messiah. The crowds in the first Gospel, like the disciples throughout, shape the reader’s understanding of Jesus through rhetorical questions. After healing a blind and deaf demoniac, the crowds proclaimed, “Could this be the Son of David?” (μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς Δαυίδ’), a question that based on μήτι expected a negative answer.³²⁰ The crowd’s response is juxtaposed with the Pharisees who accuse Jesus of casting out evil spirits by Beelzebub; the crowd does not contribute again until v. 45. While the Pharisees are not permitted any additional speaking role, Matthew 12:26-37 builds upon this scene in greater detail than the doublet in Matt 9:32-34. As a loosely connected syllogism, each line builds upon the former:

- (a) Satan cannot cast out Satan (v. 26);
- (b) If Jesus does not cast out Satan by Satan, then it must be the Spirit of God;
 - (b2) If Jesus casts out Satan by the Spirit of God, then the Kingdom of God has already been initiated (v. 28);
 - (b3) Analogy supporting the proposition of the theory: a strong man cannot be robbed unless previously bound (v. 29);
 - (b4) Whoever is not with Jesus is against Jesus (v. 30);

554; Dennis C. Duling, “Solomon, Exorcism, and the Son of David,” *HTR* 68, 3-4 (1975): 235-52; Brian Nolan, *The Royal Son of God: The Christology of Matthew 1-2 in the Setting of the Gospel* (Göttingen Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 158-215. The reconstructed reference in 11Q5 27:10 might suggest that David composed psalms that would have been used for exorcism, but it is unclear. Likewise, 4Q161 f8 10:15 might be one possible witness to a Davidic, eschatological king but this context is elaborating the figure’s reign, not a healing.

³¹⁹ ‘Dogs’ is not a common moniker for non-Jews in the ancient world; see Luz, *Matthew 8-20* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 341.

³²⁰ The paradox between a Son of David who is a healer is more fully explored in Lidija Novakovic, *Messiah, the Healer of the Sick: A Study of Jesus as the Son of David in the Gospel of Matthew* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; 2003). While Novakovic and I agree that Matt 1:21 is programmatically important for the entire Gospel, as I state above, Novakovic places emphasis on the passage as literary foregrounding to declare that Jesus will forgive sins through his atoning death and his healing ministry.

- (c) Every evil thing spoken against the Spirit of God and the Son of Man will stand forever, except those who speak against the Spirit of God (v. 32);
- (d) A tree is known by its fruit (v. 33; cf. Matt 7:16-20);
 - (d1) You (Pharisees) have chosen poorly, so you must be bad fruit (vs. 34-37).

The Evangelist follows Mark 3:7-12 and Q/Luke 11:14-23, following the literary order of Q. Luz argues that, although all independent, verses 25-26, and most likely verses 28-29, go back to Jesus in its original form. Matthew's employment of the Son of David title here situates Jesus against the Pharisees.

The Son of David title functions similarly as Jesus enters Jerusalem (Matt 21:9; 21:15). The Davidic title is woven into Jesus' entrance into Jerusalem. After acquiring a donkey *and* a colt from a nearby village,³²¹ Matthew records that Jesus entered Jerusalem surrounded by onlookers waving palm branches chanting, "Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord! Hosanna in the highest heaven!" (ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαβὶδ· εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου· ὡσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις). The terminology sounds the gong of a royal decree, announcing the coming of a king. A comparative passage appears in 1 Kings 1. At the transition between the rule of David and Solomon, David instructs Solomon to enter Jerusalem upon Solomon's own donkey and accompanied by David's servants. David authorizes Solomon to sit on his throne and rule in his stead (1 Kings 1:33-35). In accordance with the tradition of authorization, the high priest Zadok is to anoint Solomon as the king. This same tradition is deployed in 1 Maccabees 13:49-53 when Simon Maccabeus successfully reclaimed Jerusalem. In so doing, Simon expelled from the citadel those who 'polluted' the city. Matthew appears to have borrowed different elements of this rich tradition to strengthen the claim that Jesus is a messiah.

Matthew uses this allusion to foreground the conflict with the Pharisees. Unlike Solomon and Simon and Luke (19:28-40), Jesus is met by the Pharisees. Luke's Pharisees appear to recognize how this scene affects the crowds and demands that Jesus correct the crowd (19:39). Luke's Jesus responds that 'even the stones will shout out,' if he silenced the crowd, an

³²¹ Cf., Zech 9:9. Against the assumption that Matthew misunderstood the Zech 9:9 reference, David Instone-Brewer insists, with Barnabas Lindars, that Matthew did not honor the parallelism due to his understanding of the prophet's words as scripture. He states, "This was Scripture, after all, and therefore it was correct in every detail. Zechariah's witness was more weighty than that of Mark, so if Zechariah said there were two animals, it was safe for Matthew to record the fact" ("Two Assess," *Tyndale Bulletin* 54, 1 (2003): 87-98, here 97). It seems much more likely that Matthew incorporated the image of Jesus having two animals to build upon the depiction of power of a king entering the city.

acknowledgment of the universal significance of Jesus' reign. The opponents of Matthew's Jesus only respond to his entrance into Jerusalem after he clears those selling items from the outer courtyard of the temple. The discrepancy within the pericope is that the opponents only take notice of Jesus when the crowd cries out, "Hosanna to the Son of David!" (Matt 21:15), not for the destruction of property or the potential disruption of the sacrificial system.³²²

Matthew's last reference to the Davidic title comes shortly after Jesus' entrance into Jerusalem and cleansing of the temple area. Matthew, Mark, and Luke all record Jesus' response to a question about the distinction between David and the messiah. The dialogue has two distinct features that on their own do not define Matthew's messianic discourse; together, however, these small features point Matthew's readers to a broader understanding of the Davidic title that leads to the Son of Man discourse in Chapter 24.

Where Mark's editorial introduction suggests that Jesus is simply teaching in the temple, Luke places the pericope within a long segment of dialogue with the Pharisees, Scribes, and Sadducees that curtails, reinterprets, or displaces their respective teachings. In contrast, Matthew targets specifically the Pharisees with the interpretive question, "What do you think of the Messiah? Whose son is he?" (22:43). The Pharisees' response, that David's son will be the messiah, establishes a direct lineage from Israel's greatest king. Where Mark emphasizes that Jesus' audience – the people in the temple – take great delight in Jesus' teaching, Matthew and Luke's respective audiences (Pharisees; chief priests, scribes, and Sadducees) are dumbfounded leaders in the temple area that have no response.

The lack of knowledge on behalf of Jesus' opponents in Matthew leads to a fiercer diatribe against the Scribes and Pharisees who sit on the seat of Moses. This pericope, I submit, is Matthew's strongest use of messianic discourse. Spoken to the unnamed crowds and disciples, Matthew 23:1-12 claims that the scribes and Pharisees are good teachers of the tradition and should be listened to; the faithful, however, are not to replicate their actions: "do whatever they

³²² Interpreters, such as Andrew Nelson, are right to amplify Matthew's use of the psalms in 21:10-17 as Matthew's means of clarifying Jesus' identity ("Who Is This?" Narration of the Divine Identity of Jesus in Matthew 21:10-17," *JTI* 7, 2 (2013): 199-211): "The stories of Jesus signifying the temple's destruction and receiving hosannas after healing the blind and lame call for further questions about who Jesus is, especially in view of the quoted Scripture texts that make implicit claims about his identity" (206). Nelson goes too far, however, in emphasizing the titular 'son' in reference to Jerusalem, overemphasizing a theological reading of Jeremiah 7 and Isaiah 56 within Matthew's entrance scene. I do not doubt the connection between a conflated reading of the passages, but Nelson fails to understand the passage within the context of argument with the Pharisees in the temple, failing to probe, why is the Son of David title even invoked at this point in the narrative? What does it mean that, for Matthew, "Jesus is both the Son of David and the Son of God in Matthew" (209).

teach you and follow it; but do not do as they do, for they do not practice what they teach.” Jesus’ claim is that these leaders live falsely and seek false affirmation from fellow Jews. Unlike the Scribes and Pharisees, Jesus’ disciples are to honor God alone and follow the messiah above all else (23:10). Jesus’ charisma draws all [Jews] who will listen away from the precepts of the Scribes and Pharisees, but not from the tradition of Judaism. Matthew’s Jesus claims, unique to the Gospel tradition, “you have one instructor, the Messiah.”

It is clear from this varied use of the Son of David title that it cannot be categorized by or for a single purpose.³²³ This evaluation of the Son of David title demonstrates Matthew’s conscious decision to deploy it in the conflict of other Jewish leaders, primarily against the Pharisees. Mark and Luke’s varied use keep in mind these conversation partners, but Matthew’s conflict is direct and bitter. Matthew’s messianic discourse sets the messiah above all else.

Son of Man Title

Matthew’s twenty-nine references to the moniker ‘Son of Man’ (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) is likely the most commented on element of the work.³²⁴ These references are sometimes allusions to other previous ancient Jewish literature,³²⁵ but are often unique to first-century CE literature. These occurrences likely stem from the earliest tradition of Q.³²⁶ Beginning with Rudolph

³²³ Against, for example, Günther Bornkamm, "Enderwartung und Kirche im Matthäusevangelium," *Ueberlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium* (WMANT 1; 2d ed.; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag; 1961), 30-31.

³²⁴ Matt 8:20; 9:6; 10:23; 11:19; 12:8, 32, 40; 13:37, 41; 16:13, 27, 28; 17:9, 12, 22; 19:28; 20:18, 28; 24:27, 30 (2x), 37, 39; 24:44; 25:31; 26:2, 24, 45, 64.

Mark 2:10, 28; 8:31, 38; 9:9, 12, 31; 10:33, 45; 13:26; 14:21, 41, 62.

Luke 5:24; 6:22; 7:34; 9:22, 26, 44, 58; 11:30; 12:8, 10, 40; 17:22, 24, 26, 30; 18:8, 31; 19:10; 21:27, 36; 22:22, 48, 69; 24:7.

John 3:13, 14; 5:27; 6:27, 53, 62; 8:28; 9:35; 12:23, 24; 13:31.

For the purpose of being succinct, this chapter sets aside other references to Son of Man in other Early Christian texts (Acts 7:56; Eph 3:5; 2 Thes 2:3; Heb 2:6; 7:28; 1 John 5:9; Rev 1:3; 14:14) and other texts depicting personified Wisdom and other the enthroned heroes, who in some degree embody the similar characteristics, but are not described with the Son of Man title (the “messiah,” 2 Bar 36-39; Adam and Abel, *T. Abr.* 11; Job, *T. Job* 33.3; the righteous, *Apoc. El.* 1:8).

³²⁵ For example, Numbers: 23:19; Job: 16:21; 25:6; 35:8; Jeremiah: 49:18, 33; 50:40; 51:43; Isaiah 51:12; 56:2; Psalms: 8:5; 80:18; 144:3; 146:3; Ezekiel: 2:1; 25:2; 26:2; 27:2; Daniel 2:38; 5:12; 7:13; 8:17; 10:16, 18; *1 Enoch* 38:2, 3; 39:1, 6, 7; 40:5, 6; 45:3, 3, 4, 5; 48:10; 49:2, 4; 51:3, 4; 52:4, 5, 6, 9; 53:6; 55:4; 56:3; 61:5, 8, 10.

³²⁶ Chris M. Tuckett succinctly argues that the Son of Man moniker appeared on three occasions in Q: Luke 6:22/Matt 5:11 was original to Q (Tuckett, “The Son of Man and Daniel 7: Q and Jesus” in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (Anders Lindemann, ed.; Leuven: University Press, 2001), 373, n. 12); Luke 7:34/Matt 11:19 and Luke 9:58/Matt 8:20 were from the first redactional stage (Tuckett, “The Son of Man and Daniel 7,” 386, 386, respectively). See Tuckett for a conservative approach to Q’s influence on the tradition. See Richard A. Edwards for a stronger position; he states the Son of Man “tradition does originate in the Q community and is based upon the pesher interpretation of a very early *Mar* christology” (*The Sign of Jonah in the Theology of the Evangelists and Q* (Studies in Biblical Theology; London: SCM Press, 1971), 99 (italics original)).

Bultmann, New Testament scholars divided the Gospel occurrences of the Son of Man in three categories of sayings: on Jesus' earthly ministry, on his passion and resurrection, and on eschatology.³²⁷ Commentators, such as Luz, use the Son of Man occurrences to divide the text of Matthew into three parts, matching Bultmann's divisions (1-7, 8-20, 21-28).³²⁸ It is well noted that Jesus himself never claims to take the title of Son of Man, but the appellation is applied to Jesus through several fulfillment passages.³²⁹ Interpreting the Son of Man passage as a discrete discourse rather than within a theological concept of salvation history reveals that Matthew employs the Son of Man title primarily within three types of situational conflict to reveal Jesus' character: conflict with followers (crowds and disciples), conflict with evil and sickness, and conflict with opponents.

Matthew's crowds frequently pose questions to Jesus about the nature of discipleship. Robert Cousland argues that the crowds surrounding Jesus are regularly astonished (e.g., 7:28 - ἐκπλήσσω), amazed (e.g., 15:31 - θαυμάζω), afraid (9:8 - φοβέω), and glorify God because of Jesus' actions (e.g., 9:8 - δοξάζω). The crowd is never named except by a general regional designation. Only on two occasions do the crowds respond in *Oratio Recta*: 9:32-34; 12:22-24.³³⁰ In both contexts, Jesus' opponents rejoin with hostility. Matthew uses the Son of Man title within the addresses to these crowds. When surrounded by the crowds in Matthew 8:20, Jesus openly acknowledges that the Son of Man and those that follow him will have no home (cf. Luke 9:57-62). Those who go forth to do ministry on Jesus' behalf will suffer oppression (10:23). This is a sign for Matthew that the eschaton is drawing nigh (contr. Luke 21:12-19 and Mark 13:9-13). The crowds, however, do not all respond positively; they are also a central force behind Jesus' crucifixion (Matt 27:25). As Cousland states, "Just as Moses presented the people of Israel with a choice between the way of life and the way of death, so too does Matthew depict the

³²⁷ Rudolph Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1968), 30.

³²⁸ Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1-7: A Hermeneia Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007).

³²⁹ The history of interpretation on this issue is vast. Recent works that analyze this issue include Larry Hurtado and Paul Owen (ed), *Who Is This Son of Man?: The Latest Scholarship on a Puzzling Expression of the Historical Jesus* (London: Bloomsbury, 2011), in which Hurtado claims, "Simply put, there is no instance of the singular or plural form of this construction, anarthrous or articular, in extant Greek literature outside of the LXX, the NT, Philo...and subsequent texts that show the influence of the LXX and/or NT" (160).

³³⁰ J. Robert C. Cousland, *The Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew* (Leiden: Brill; 2002), 136-40.

people of Israel choosing first the way of life and then the way of death.”³³¹ Through the interactions with the crowds, Matthew further differentiates the nature of Jesus’ messianism.

Unlike the Davidic title observed above, Matthew references the Son of Man in only one healing scene. In his own hometown, Jesus heals a paralytic man who was brought to him by the man’s friends (9:1-8). Because of the friends’ faith, Jesus forgives the paralytic. As with several other passages, neither the individual nor his friends ask Jesus for forgiveness. Jesus’ healing of the man is performed in response to open conflict with compatriots. Because of his opponents’ doubt in his powers, Jesus commands the man to walk. Matthew and Mark (2:1-12) identify the opponents as Scribes with a false heart, while Luke (5:17-26) takes aim at both Scribes and Pharisees. While Matthew usually follows Mark and Luke’s admonition of the Pharisees, here he parts company with them. Of his expansions, Matthew 12:8 proves the most difficult: “When the crowds saw it, they were filled with awe, and they glorified God, who had given such authority to human beings” (ιδόντες δὲ οἱ ὄχλοι ἐφοβήθησαν καὶ ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεὸν τὸν δόντα ἐξουσίαν τοιαύτην τοῖς ἀνθρώποις). The dative, plural indirect object is unclear. It is unlikely that Matthew intended to include the Scribes in this collective. The declaration in some ways limits the power of the messiah (ἐξουσία – 28:18; 6:12) to God’s oversight while simultaneously elucidating a belief of the messiah as human. The reversal of the immediate need (healing) and the spiritual need (forgiveness) serves to mark Jesus as the Son of Man.

Matthew also utilizes the Son of Man title in direct instruction to his disciples. Just as Mark’s disciples prove to be foils for Jesus’ messianism, Matthew’s disciples voice doubt and faithlessness. When Jesus enters the district of Caesarea Philippi in Matt 16:13, he asked his disciples, “Who do people say that the Son of Man is?” Mark (8:27) and Luke’s (9:18) versions both pose the question with a first-person pronoun, “Who do people say that I am?” Matthew’s alteration of the text presents Jesus as having self-awareness about the use of the messianic title, which highlights the first Gospel’s literary characterization of Jesus as the apocalyptic figure. Peter answers in the affirmative in Matthew by stating, “You are the Messiah, the Son of the living God.” While the messianic claim is common in Mark (8:23) and Luke (9:20), Matthew again augments the text to focus on Jesus by adding ‘son of the living God’ (σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ

³³¹ Cousland, *Crowds in Matthew*, 265.

υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος.). Furthermore, Matthew’s expansion elevates Simon Peter to a high position with authority over the church. Jesus declares:

And I tell you, you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of Hades will not prevail against it. I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven.

κάγω δέ σοι λέγω ὅτι σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ πύλαι ᾧδου οὐ κατισχύσουσιν αὐτῆς. δώσω σοι τὰς κλεῖδας τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ ὃ ἐὰν δήσης ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, καὶ ὃ ἐὰν λύσης ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται λελυμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

The play on Peter’s name (rock) creates a metaphorical place of strength to found the ἐκκλησία committed to following Jesus. This has two consequences within the narrative. First, it connects the titular χριστὸς with the son of God and Son of Man designations that are separate and distinct titles, but for Matthew reverberate to a resounding cacophony since the opening of the narrative. Second, it alters Peter’s positionality within the community. His authority, like the messiah’s, crosses between heaven and earth. The movement flows in two ways. As Kari Syreeni claims, there is “a primary movement ‘from above’ to this world, and a secondary movement ‘from below’ to heaven. Jesus has been given by God all authority in both worlds, so he can further lend his authority to Peter and the community to the effect that—as a secondary movement—things settled on earth will be valid in heaven as well.”³³² The authorizing statement from Jesus ends any expressed or implicit debate about the inheritor of his authority.

Matthew’s most prominent use of the Son of Man title in relation to Jesus’ disciples are those that explicate this movement between heaven and earth. The breach of heaven and earth are made palpable for Jesus’ disciples in Matthew 16:27, which for Matthew makes clear the expression of God’s power in relation to people: “For the Son of Man is to come with his angels in the glory of his Father, and then he will repay everyone for what has been done. Truly I tell you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom” (μέλλει γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεσθαι ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ, καὶ τότε ἀποδώσει ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὴν πράξιν αὐτοῦ.). Matthew, Mark,

³³² Kari Syreeni, “Between Heaven and Earth: On the Structure of Matthew’s Symbolic Universe,” *JSNT* 40 (1990): 3-13.

and Luke all place this warning within terms of obedience to Jesus as messiah, though Mark frames this as an address to crowds while Matthew focuses it specifically at his disciples (cf., Matt 19:28). In the second part of the admonition, Luke takes a harsher tone by casting shame (ἐπαισχύνομαι) upon those who might be ashamed of their obedience to Jesus. In slight contrast to Luke and Mark, the disciples serve the literary purpose of explaining the function of the messiah.

This pericope and those alike highlight Jesus as an eschatological judge. In a treasure trove of imagery from former traditions, Matthew relates that the Son of Man will appear in lightning that illuminates the sky (24:27), arriving on a cloud (24:30), unexpectedly like Noah's flood (24:37-39, 44). The pinnacle arrives in 25:31-32, placed immediately prior to the murder of Jesus, it raises the Son of Man to glory:

When the Son of Man comes in his glory, and all the angels with him, then he will sit on the throne of his glory. All the nations will be gathered before him, and he will separate people one from another as a shepherd separates the sheep from the goats.

Ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ, τότε καθίσει ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ.³² καὶ συναχθήσονται ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, καὶ ἀφορίσει αὐτοὺς ἀπ' ἀλλήλων, ὥσπερ ὁ ποιμὴν ἀφορίζει τὰ πρόβατα ἀπὸ τῶν ἐρίφων.

While Mark (8:38) and Luke (9:26) convey a warning that the Son of Man will judge the adulterous and sinful generation, Matthew's messiah is fully enthroned in heaven. As Adela Yarbro Collins states, Matthew likely borrowed this scene from 1 Enoch; "the link between the epithet 'Son of Man' and the precise phrase 'the throne of glory' in Matt 19:28 and 25:31 probably derives from 1 En. 62:5, 69:27, and/or 69:20."³³³ For Hans Moscicke, this pericope represents a universal purgation of the cosmos. Matthew's division between the sheep and the goats harkens back to Lev 16:7-8, claims Moscicke: "He shall take the two goats and set them before the LORD at the entrance of the tent of meeting; and Aaron shall cast lots on the two goats, one lot for the LORD and the other lot for Azazel." The animals themselves are assigned a

³³³ Adela Yarbro Collins, "The Secret Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and the Gospel of Mark: A Response to Leslie Walck" in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 338-51, here 339.

representative role.³³⁴ Moscicke believes that the separation between sheep and goats is a universal judgment. Enlarging the forthcoming judgment to all the world serves as a mechanism to purge all evil from the world. Matthew, Moscicke cogently argues, relies upon the imagery of Leviticus 16 and Second Temple Yom Kippur traditions that expand the Son of Man tradition to a living person. Thus, “Matthew has apparently assimilated aspects of Asael/Azazel's profile to that of the devil in Matt 25:41.”³³⁵

Matthew chapter 24 depicts this judgment on a universal scale. The metaphor and imagery clearly place the Son of Man over all of creation. Moscicke does not appreciate how the Son of Man title is deployed in direct conflict with others. Matthew’s eschatology sets the Pharisees and scribes as the perpetrators of evil. Matthew foreshadows Jesus’ death by the religious leaders several times using phrases to describe suffering (πάσχω, 17:12) and betrayal (παραδίδομι, 17:22), going so far as to identify the manner (σταυρόω, 26:1-2; c.f., 20:18) and duration (17:22-23) of his death. That these figures are named within the cosmic framework as the ones who kill the Son of Man highly suggests that they take on a mythical role within the narrative. Individual Pharisees and Scribes are not named within Matthew’s narrative, but they play a pivotal part within Matthew’s construction of authentic leadership within his community, often functioning as a ploy (23:13, 15, 16, 23, 25, 27, 29). Neither does Matthew carefully distinguish between the Pharisees and the Scribes, as Luke does in his narrative (i.e., 11:37-52). As Ian Duffield observes in Matthew: “As part of his socio-religious critique of the religious establishment of his day, Jesus unmask[s] the illusions by which leaders perpetuate their status and position.”³³⁶ These figures, who are responsible for the death of the Son of Man, are for Matthew an extension of sinfulness.

This rehearsal of the Son of David and Son of Man titles demonstrates several unique traits about Matthew’s redactional logic. (1) While the Son of David title appears early in the narrative, the Son of Man title becomes more frequent and prominent towards the end. The contrast of the lineage of Jesus to the expanded temptation pericope sets Jesus as the correction

³³⁴ Andrei Orlov makes a similar argument. He emphasizes that the goats play an important physical role: “[t]he transference of this imagery of the two lots onto humankind is significant here, as the cultic functions of the lots are assigned not merely to eschatological or human characters, but to the social bodies themselves.” (*Atoning Dyad*, 91).

³³⁵ Hans M. Moscicke, “The Final Judgment as Ritual Purgation of the Cosmos: The Influence of Scapegoat Traditions on Matt 25:31-46,” *NTS* 67 (2021): 241-59, here 258.

³³⁶ Ian Duffield, “Difficult Texts: Matthew 23,” *Theology* 123, 1 (2020):16-19.

of that which came before him. We can infer from this that Matthew is not interested in positing a non-metaphorical definition of sin, but rather relies on abstraction and metaphor to detail a complex idea. (2) Both the Son of David and Son of Man titles are reinvented in Matthew's Gospel to highlight the eschatological role of the messiah. Even in the healings of the messiah, Matthew's messiah more regularly forgives than just heals infirmities. The resolution of sin is the process by which Matthew's messiah is enthroned in power. The interweaving of the Son of David imagery associated with the entrance into Jerusalem and the foreshadowing of Jesus' imminent suffering at the hands of Pharisees suggests Matthew's synchronizing of the terms. (3) When read as a synthesized piece of evidence, Matthew's messianism is directed at the internal community. The focus of Matthew's messiah is revealed in confrontation. If delivered in person, his vitriolic critique of opponents might cause them to recalculate their positions; however, as a text the document shores up the boundaries between the respective groups. From questioning dialogue with Peter to open hostility with the Pharisees, Matthew uses questioning and open hostility between disciples and his opponents to elevate the messiah in authority, a trait not foregrounded in Luke or Mark.

A Conflict Among Siblings: A Pattern between John the Baptist, the Pharisees, and Early Jesus Followers

Stack's study conclusively draws attention to Matthew's metaphorical innovations relating to sin. The common terms for sin (i.e., ἁμαρτία) are statistically not used frequently. Rather, the author of the first Gospel primarily relies upon a diverse set of metaphors to accentuate the messiah as a response not to the on-going practices that cause sin, but the origins of sin itself. I have argued above that the undercurrent of his narrative focuses upon the origin of sin as something that happened in primordial time, outside of any individual's purview, and the conclusion of sin that is developing in the death of Jesus. This is also reflected in Matthew's messianic discourse. Through conflict with others, namely the Pharisees and John the Baptist, Matthew shows that the messiah will resolve the problem of evil. In this final section, I turn more intently to Jesus' relationship with these two respective groups. Both groups make similar claims to authority and social power; both groups have a large following. I propose that we might read Matthew's synchrony of the messianic terms and allusions as a resolution to his

opponents' claim to authority. Messianic discourse, for Matthew as well as these others, serves as a means of defining the socioreligious boundaries of his group.

Already in the 18th and 19th century, scholars proposed a competition hypothesis between John the Baptist and Jesus. For example, Wilhelm Baldensperger's work on the Prologue to the Gospel of John popularized the notion that the interactions between the two leaders were based in conflict.³³⁷ Although Josephus acknowledges the Baptizer's rhetorical abilities (*Ant.* 18.11), the Gospels, and the Gospel of John in particular, present John in a secondary and subordinate role as a means of making space for his disciples after the beloved leader's death, Baldensperger proposed. The Gospel of John diverts from his vision of Logos as a primordial part of creation to proclaim John's role as witness to Jesus as the true light. The insertion of John the Baptist material sets oddly within the narrative, breaking the flow of the prologue. The Gospel of John records that John the Baptist is neither the messiah, nor Elijah, nor a prophet (1:19-23), that he is unworthy to untie the messiah's sandle (1:27), and that Jesus must increase while he decreases (3:30). Baldensperger also draws attention to John's statements about the meaning of baptism. The Gospels go to great lengths to minimize the meaning of John's baptism (e.g., 3:1-8). The Gospel of John shows the limited effectiveness of the Baptizer's baptism with water and even places in the mouth of the Baptizer a public acknowledgement that he is unable to recognize the messiah at his coming. Matthew 3 makes the contrast that although John's baptism is imagined as an imputation of the spirit of God, Jesus' baptism imparts the spirit and fire.³³⁸ The references to John the Baptist stand separate from the rest of the Gospel narrative, suggesting that the traditions concerning John were known by the authors but were not necessary for the plot. These statements definitively limit the memory of John the Baptist within the early Jesus movement.

³³⁷ Wilhelm Baldensperger, *Der Prolog des vierten Evangeliums. Sein polemisch-apologetischer Zweck* (Freiburg: Mohr Siebeck, 1898). See also, Martin Stowasser, *Johannes der Täufer im Vierten Evangelium: eine Untersuchung zu seiner Bedeutung für die johanneische Gemeinde* (Institut für Bibelwissenschaft: Austria, 1992), who argues a similar point, though the contention is not inherently confrontational. A helpful summary is available in C. W. Rishell, "Baldensperger's Theory of the Origin of the Fourth Gospel," *JBL* 20, 1 (1901): 38-49.

³³⁸ Daniele Mansini's recent conference 'Was John the Baptist an Apocalyptic Preacher? Some Enochic Remarks' (paper presented at the Enoch Seminar's 2021 "John the Baptist" Virtual Conference, January 11-14) draws out this dichotomy to argue that John the Baptist represents an Enochian form of apocalypticism. The language John uses to describe his baptism, namely immersion, more closely alludes to the Enochic characterization of refinement by fire (1 En. 48, 50, 52). Daniele states, "The connection of water for immersion and the unquenchable fire of judgment really seems to me to be an indication of the closeness of this text to the preaching of the Baptist" (6). That Matthew emphasizes this focus instead of the other synoptic Gospels suggests that the author of the first Gospel's belief is Jesus most likely follows this same apocalyptic Judaism.

This data, for Baldensperger, points to a separate group who followed John the Baptist that later integrated into the Jesus movement by the second century CE.

More recently, Joel Marcus argues that John the Baptist and Jesus had a ‘sibling rivalry.’ Like Baukhaus before him, Marcus finds that the Baptizer tradition functions as a means of emphasizing Jesus’ role.³³⁹ In addition to dealing with the passages above, he notes that Pseudo-Clementine *Recognitions* 1.54.8 records an earlier tradition about John the Baptist and his leadership:

But some also of the disciples of John, who imagined they were great, separated themselves from the people and proclaimed their master as the Christ.

And *Rec.* 1.60.1:

And behold, one of John’s disciples asserted that John was Christ, and not Jesus.

Marcus concisely argues, “this text concerns a subset of the Baptist group—‘some of the disciples of John,’ presumably in comparison with other Baptists who acknowledge the primacy of Jesus.”³⁴⁰ The denunciation of some members of the group is “probably designed to cover up the independence of the Baptist movement and allay the suspicion that John’s original followers preferred him to Jesus.”³⁴¹ I agree with Marcus that the Pseudo-Clementine tradition illuminates the complex passages from the New Testament highlighting that even within the early Jesus movement, there were competing understandings of who might be the messiah.

A similar competition hypothesis is assumed between Jesus and the Pharisees. Noel Rabinowitz analyzes Matthew 23 to suggest that Jesus affirms the Pharisees as teachers of the law. Jesus rebukes the Pharisees for dismissing God’s teaching (Matt 15:1-7), labeling them fools (23:17), hypocrites (15:6; 23:29), and blind guides (15:14; 23:16, 24).³⁴² The “Moses’ seat”

³³⁹ Cf., Knut Backhaus, *Die "Jüngerkreise" des Täufers Johannes: Eine Studie zu den religionsgeschichtlichen Ursprüngen des Christentums* (Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1991), 155

³⁴⁰ Joel Marcus, *John the Baptist in History and Theology* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2018), 14.

³⁴¹ Marcus, *John the Baptist*, 15.

³⁴² Noel Rabinowitz, “Matthew 23:2-4: Does Jesus Recognize the Authority of the Pharisees and Does He Endorse Their Halakhah?” *JETS* 46,3 (2003): 423-47.

they claim is likely a reference to a position or seat within the synagogue,³⁴³ though no real physical chair, stone or otherwise, has been found to substantiate this claim. The difference, for Rabbinowitz, is that Jesus can support their authority, but not condone their individual teaching. Anthony Saldarini similarly argues that Matthew “acknowledges the authority of the scribes and Pharisees, but then undercuts it with attacks on their titles, laws, and intentions, and proposes an alternative model of community leadership.”³⁴⁴ Wink and Brian Dennert both argue that the Baptist’s disciples are at greater odds with the Pharisees than with Jesus’ disciples. Reflecting on the conflict in Matt 9, Dennert draws attention that John’s disciples “are confused as to why their practices are closer to those of a group that their teacher rebuked (Matt 3:7) rather than those of a teacher who spreads the same message as their master (Matt 3:2; 4:17).”³⁴⁵ Dennert does not take this element of the text to its logical conclusion: if John the Baptist, Jesus, and the Pharisees are all set within the same level of authority, debating the same issues by means of the messianic titles, might they not all be using the same form of discourse?

The question of whether John’s disciples and the Pharisees actually made these arguments are beyond the possibility of proof. Nor is this ultimately a profitable pursuit. In his now famous exploration of *Jesus & Judaism*, E. P. Sanders argues that Jesus saw himself as God’s messenger to initiate restoration for Israel:

In the new order the twelve tribes would be reassembled, there would be a new temple, force of arms would not be needed, divorce would be neither necessary nor permitted, outcasts - even the wicked - would have a place, and Jesus and his disciples - the poor, meek and lowly - would have the leading role. He had devoted followers who accepted his expectation, made it their own, and remained committed to a transformation of it after his death and resurrection.³⁴⁶

Sanders’ work belies the challenges of reconstructing the sociological and ideological context of a leader like Jesus, whose mission was recorded by his followers. Although most historians agree there was a person named Jesus who grew up in ancient Palestine, created a following, and died a torturous death at the hands of the Romans, the records of his teaching are not first-person

³⁴³ Rabbinowitz, “Matthew 23:2-4,” 429.

³⁴⁴ Anthony Saldarini, *Matthew’s Christian-Jewish Community* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994) 47-48.

³⁴⁵ Brian Dennert, “John the Baptist and the Jewish Setting of Matthew” (PhD diss, Loyola University Chicago, 2013), 262.

³⁴⁶ E. P. Sanders, *Jesus & Judaism* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1985), 319.

accounts; the memories preserved therein represent the needs of those who accepted his expectations. Despite this challenge, Sanders goes on to conclude that there was a “firm context of agreement, and within that context there was conflict.”³⁴⁷ Sanders’ perspective suggests that the constant switching between varied imagery relating to a messiah as the Son of David and the Son of Man makes subtle movements for Matthew within his ideology. Sanders’ conclusion that Jesus can only be rightly understood within the socio-political and ideological context of Judaism is undeniable. The Son of David and Son of Man titles are not used indiscriminately, but precisely to create differentiation within the agreement.

I propose that we read the John the Baptist and Pharisaic conflicts as independent messianic discourses that Matthew deploys to bolster Jesus’ claim to messianism within competing association synagogues. The incorporation of the Baptizer and the Pharisees, as many others have addressed, serve to elevate Jesus to a higher position. It is my contention that the messianic discourse, for Matthew, is centered upon the resolution of the problem of evil. Matthew portrays the claim to authority of these respective groups as mediated through the messianic titles. John the Baptist is diminished to the role of forerunner in Matthew’s Gospel, but Matthew uses the prophet from the wilderness to define Jesus’ apocalyptic role that foreshadows the conclusion of his narrative. That the early Jesus movement contrasted John and Jesus’ baptisms momentarily places John and Jesus on the same level of authority but ultimately dismisses John’s authority. Likewise, the Pharisees are perceived as the preservers of the Son of David tradition. When the audience welcomes Jesus as the Son of David, the Pharisees reinforce their authority to recognize the messiah. The touchpoint that incited the conflict with the Pharisees in Matt 23-24 was the questioning of the identity of the Son of David. The Pharisees’ use and protection of the title may or may not have been historical; for Matthew, the exchange devolves into open hostility that diminishes the authority of the Pharisees and leads to Jesus’ suffering.

We see a number of common patterns in Matthew between references to John the Baptist, the Pharisees, and Jesus and/or his followers. All three discourses make a claim of authority to address the problem of sin (Baptizer: immersion; Pharisees: confession; Jesus: forgiveness of sins through the enthronement of the Son of Man); the three discourses are crafted upon inherited

³⁴⁷ Sanders, *Jesus & Judaism*, 339.

traditions (Baptizer: Isaiah, Enoch; Jesus: Enoch, Daniel; Pharisees: 1 Sam, Psalms); and all three discourses claim the right to lead an associated group, placing discipleship at the center of the debate between compatriots. These observations suggest that we should read Matthew's deployment of messianic terms as a part of the post-temple reformation of Judaism rather than an early first-century biography. By tying the origin and/or resolution of sin to Jesus' opponents, Mathew raises Jesus heavenward above the others. In so doing, we can see that Matthew utilizes competing forms of messianic discourse to resolve the political tensions for his community.

Conclusion: Jesus as Eschaton

Who's to blame? According to Matthew, humans are culpable for their actions. However, I have shown that Matthew employs messianism to address the etiology of evil in the world. Judith Stack draws our attention to the fact that Matthew relies upon several different keywords (ἁμαρτία, σκάνδαλον, and πλανάω) and metaphors to explain the sin and its influence. Matthew's ingenuity is his use of metaphor to explore primordial sin, which highlights the *cause and effect* of sin the world.

I analyzed how Matthew alludes to the beginning and end of all things through his messianic discourse. Following Archie Wright and Amy Ritcher, I argue that Matthew's Gospel was influenced by 1 Enoch, in that, it assumes the world fell victim to the power of evil in an earlier time. This conclusion is evident in the Matthean Jesus' lineage, miracle stories, and prophecy of the eschatological judgment. Jesus' farewell speech in Matthew, however, points us to the eschaton. Through a comparison with Jubilees 20-21, I highlighted that Matthew relies on the subgenre of farewell testament to impart wisdom to his followers. Unlike Jubilees, Matthew focuses on Jesus as the messiah, the one who displaces the Pharisees in authority.

Matthew deploys the two strands of messianic discourse, Son of David and Son of Man, to resolve the problem of sin. However, his discourse manifests in competition with others: the crowds, disciples, the Pharisees and Scribes, and among John the Baptist and his followers. In distinction to Mark and Luke, Matthew weaves a narrative in which the Son of David and the Son of Man open the door to those who need forgiveness. In so doing, his messianic discourse focuses upon those within his community at the cost of those outside. Understanding this discourse as a means of separation helps us better locate the dialogue in the late first century and

early second century CE. In this way, Matthew utilizes messianic discourse to welcome his community and define his opponents.

Chapter 5: Bar Kosiba and the *Yetzer Hara*: Messianic Discourse in Rabbinic Literature

I do not quite understand the trend in much of the relevant scholarship to distinguish neatly between merely a ‘down-to-earth’ [ancient Jewish] military leader/warrior on the one hand and a utopian figure with ‘divine and supernatural qualities’ on the other... It seems to be that the distinction between the ‘religious’ and the ‘political’ here is misguided.³⁴⁸

Introduction³⁴⁹

Simeon Bar Kosiba was a freedom fighter³⁵⁰ who led an armed revolt in Judea during the second century CE. The tales that describe his brazen leadership are enveloped in lore. The two brothers of Kefar Haruba claimed that Kosiba was linked to the Davidic dynasty: “A King can only be the King-Messiah of the lineage of the house of David,” and “We shall bring the crown of Hadrian and place it on the head of Simeon.”³⁵¹ The numismatic evidence presents Kosiba as the inheritor and progenitor of Jewish identity, connecting him through symbolism and allusion to Israelite and Second Temple Jewish traditions. Correspondence between Kosiba and his generals from the Cave of Letters portray him as a charismatic and domineering military leader.

³⁴⁸ Peter Schäfer, “Bar Kokhba and the Rabbis,” in *The Bar Kokhba War Reconsidered: New Perspectives on the Second Jewish Revolt against Rome* (ed. Peter Schäfer; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 1-22, here 17.

³⁴⁹ This chapter is my first foray into research on the Bar Kokhba Revolt. Due to the challenges of COVID-19, I was unable to study modern Hebrew as intended. Thus, I recognize at the outset that a good deal of important research published in modern Hebrew is not accessible to me and this chapter is all the weaker for it. Before I move to publication, I will include these important voices.

³⁵⁰ I am conscious that antisemitism is encoded in the descriptors of Kosiba’s failed revolutionary movement within secondary research. Continuing to reference the character as ‘Bar Kokhba’ rather than his proper name, ‘Simeon Bar Kosiba,’ concretizes a Christian narrative about a failed revolution rather than recognizing him as a freedom fighter against a ‘Jewish’ ‘ruffian.’ I do not mean to substantiate these historical claims from a Christianized history that Kosiba was a ‘failed messiah,’ but rather highlight how this language is a part of messianic discourse within rabbinic Judaism. I will return to this point in my conclusion.

The leader of the revolt’s name was clearly attested as Simeon Kosiba in P. Yadin 59: Σιμων Χωσιβα. To displace the dominant narrative of Kosiba as a failed leader, I will refer to the character as ‘Bar Kosiba’ or the shortened form ‘Kosiba,’ but describe the uprising as the Bar Kokhba Revolt, so as not to break completely with the literature on the subject.

³⁵¹ Lamentations Rabba, ii, 2:19; j. Taoanot, iv 69a.

What is most striking about Kosiba is how the preservation of his memory served to establish or express social boundaries within some rabbinic literature.

The main intervention of this chapter is that some Jewish texts, reviewed below, attribute the revolt's failure due to Kosiba's inability to control himself. Rabbinic literature refers to this ethical quandary as a struggle with one's *yetzer hara* (evil inclination). Those accusations of success or failure are entangled in assumptions about what marks a messiah, leadership, and more importantly, Judaism's position under an empire. These reactions were not issued during nor immediately following the Second Revolt, but at least a generation later. Wrapped in these declarations of failure are statements that express and define the normative ethics and values of a group or groups within rabbinic Judaism.

Due to the broad and diverse nature of evidence for this argument, this chapter will proceed in a different manner than previous chapters. I will first survey the primary literature relating to the character of Kosiba. While we possess more primary evidence from Kosiba than any other Jewish charismatic leader in the ancient world, the evidence is surprisingly small. I will argue that the evidence does not permit us to posit with certainty whether Kosiba understood himself as a messiah. The closest parallels we can draw are from the prophetic texts, most notably Ezekiel, the Maccabean literature, the texts found at Qumran, and numismatic remains.

Second, I will explore conceptions of one's *yetzer* in Rabbinic Judaism. The Rabbis believe every person has both good (*hatov*) and evil (*hara*) inclinations (*yetzer*). I analyze stories about David in which the rabbis described the problem of inclinations specifically in relation to leadership. This analysis will set the stage for a later comparison with Kosiba, who loses control of his temper, states in prayer his independence from YHWH, and demonstrates disdain for the priestly leadership by beating a priest to death. The redactors of rabbinic literature appear to have used the Kosiba mythology of a 'failed revolutionary' to repress insurrection and elevate the authority of the leaders who follow Kosiba, namely Jehudah HaNasi.

This chapter contributes to the study of messianic discourse in three ways. First, this chapter shows that the use of messianic discourse prevalent in Second Temple Judaism (435 BCE – 135 CE) extends far past the destruction of the second temple in 70 CE. Second, this research relating to Kosiba affirms that messianism is an internal discourse. Third, some elements of the discourse are still in play despite a drastically different social context. Rabbinic literature affirms that the trope of a messiah from King David's lineage remains an important

element for some. However, these traditions are reinterpreted by different textual and social traditions. For instance, we see the conflict between Kosiba and the Patriarch, a new title for Jewish leadership, take center stage within second century CE reflection on messianism. Lastly, while previous definitions of the messiah were formulated in relation to external sources of evil, rabbinic literature frames this tension in relation to the self.

Simeon Bar Kosiba and the Jewish Heritage

With these introductory matters in place, I turn to Simeon Bar Kosiba. The ‘Bar Kokhba’ Revolt lasted from the spring of 132 to approximately the early fall of 135 CE. Historians and scholars of religion have struggled to fully understand the causes of the revolt and the geographical involvement of the revolution.³⁵² This problem is frequently attributed to the paucity of resources: the extant primary evidence from the revolutionaries includes 26 documents found in caves from the Judean desert between 1950 and 1965, and a relatively small sampling of numismatic evidence.³⁵³ References in secondary works such as the Greek and Latin histories (Appianus; Xiphilinus; Pausanias; Apollodorus of Damascus; *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*; Cassius Dio) and later Jewish and Christian texts (b. Sanh. 93b; j. *Ta’an.* iv 68d–69b; *Lam. Rab.* ii 4; b. *Git.* 57a–58a; Ecclesiastical History 4.6.1-4; Apology 1.31.6; *Natural History* 5.70) include some tales and geopolitical details not preserved in the revolutionaries’

³⁵² Significant works on the subject include, but is not limited to: Dvir Raviv and Chaim ben David, “Cassius Dio’s Figures for the Demographic Consequences of the Bar Kokhba War: Exaggeration or Reliable Account?,” *JRA* 34 (2021): 585-607; Eran Almagor, “Jerusalem and the Bar Kokhba Revolt Again: A Note,” *Electrum* 26 (2019): 141-157; Michaël Girardin, “*leherut Yerushalayim*: The Temple on The Coins Of The Bar Kokhba War,” *Electrum* 26 (2019): 159-176; Miriam ben Zeev, “New Insights into Roman Policy in Judea on the Eve of the Bar Kokhba Revolt,” *JSJ* 49 (2018): 84-107; Joseph Geiger, “The Bar-Kokhba Revolt: The Greek Point of View,” *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 65, 4 (2016): 497-519; Menahem Mor, *The Second Jewish Revolt: The Bar Kokhba War, 132-136 CE* (Leiden: Brill, 2016); Hanan Eshel and Boaz Zisu (eds.), *Innovations in the Research on the Bar Kokhba Revolt. 21st Annual Conference of the Martin Szusz Department of Land of Israel Studies, March 13, 2001* (Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 2001); Werner Eck, “The Bar Kokhba Revolt: The Roman Point of View,” *JRS* 89 (1999): 76-89; see Eck’s expanded arguments in *Rom herausfordern: Bar Kochba im Kampf gegen das Imperium Romanum. Das Bild des Bar Kochba-Aufstandes im Spiegel der neuen epigraphischen Überlieferung* (Roma: Unione internazionale degli istituti di archeologia, storia e storia dell’arte, 2007); Peter Schäfer, *Der Bar Kokhba-Aufstand* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981); Albert Baumgarten, “The Role of Jerusalem and the Temple in ‘End of Days’ in Speculation in the Second Temple Period” in *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality* (ed. L. I. Levine; Continuum Intl Pub Group: New York, 1999), 77–89.

³⁵³ Michael Wise, *Language and Literary in Roman Judaea*. Brook W. R. Pearson says it this way: “One of the most frustrating things about this new evidence, however, is the very fact that, though it is so tantalizingly primary, it allows us only a dim glance into the events of the revolution, and an even more poorly-lit glance into the beliefs of the revolutionaries” (“The Book of the Twelve, Aquiba’s Messianic Interpretations, and the Refuge Caves of the Second Jewish War,” in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans; Sheffield: Sheffield Press, 1997), 221-239).

evidence.³⁵⁴ Inscriptions, court records, and architecture (e.g., tunnels used by revolutionaries) provide ancillary details about the events. This collection of evidence does not present a consistent or detailed narrative concerning the revolt, such as Herodotus' *Histories* or Joseph's *War*, but it provides historians with Kosiba's historical context and broad conception of the movements of the war.

As a result, it is difficult to affirm anything about Kosiba's historical origins or heritage since there is so little reliable information about the leader. The extant evidence casts Kosiba as a charismatic Judean leader of a revolt. The manuscripts from the Judean desert and the coinage stamped during Kosiba's short reign present the revolutionary with messianic titles and symbols, but the evidence is too sparse to definitively assert the leader's understanding of self or if he sought to claim a specific element of heritage over another. Based on this evidence, I find it unlikely that Kosiba presented himself as building upon one specific past tradition, and so intentionally distances himself from previous failed attempts.

Prior to the publication of the Judean Desert manuscripts, Samuel Yeivin suspected that Bar Kokhba was a nickname or epithet linked to Simeon's potential place of origin, Kokhava in Netofa Valley.³⁵⁵ Based on reports that Vespasian and Domitian persecuted families of Davidic origins in the region (*Lam. Rabba* ii, 2) and Rabbi Akiba's declaration of support for the revolutionary as a king-messiah (Ta'anot 4:6, 68d-69a), Yeivin assumed that Kosiba descended from Davidic origins. In addition, the report of the siege of Bethar describes Rabbi Eleazar Hamoda'i as Kosiba's uncle. This priest is frequently identified with Eleazar Hacoen, the priest listed on the coins associated with the revolt. If other common sources are correct in locating Eleazar's hometown in Modi'in, the city of priests and the house of the Hasmoneans, this familial connection potentially links Kosiba with the Hasmoneans; from the point of view of the reader, Rabbi Akiba's declaration would then be true. However, Yeivin's assumptions do not stand up to scrutiny for the familial connections are unverified. In addition, the publication of the

³⁵⁴ The most significant debate in this literature is *who* started the conflict (Jewish (Bar Kosiba) or Romans (Hadrian)) and *when* the revolution started (before or after Hadrian outlawed circumcision and/or when he renamed the Aelia Capitolina). Mordechai Gichon says it well, "the dearth of detailed, coherent, and reasonably unbiased sources does not enable us to answer some of the most basic questions, both as to the causes and the origins of this way and as to its conduct. The situation has not changed basically even after the breathtaking discovery of the letters that emanated from Bar Kokhba's headquarters, which were discovered in sundry caves in the Judaeen desert" ("New Insights into the Bar Kokhba War and a Reprisal of Dio Cassius 69.12-13," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 77, 1 (1986): 15-43, here 15; cf., Shimon Applebaum, *Prolegomena to the Study of the Second Jewish Revolt* (A.D. 132-135) (Oxford: British Archaeological Reports, 1976).

³⁵⁵ Mor, *The Second Jewish Revolt*, 404.

letters from the Judean desert demonstrate that Bar Kokhba is a moniker itself and does not tie Kosiba to the region. Without a clear lineage, we cannot confidently assert Kosiba's family of origin.

The texts from the Judean desert, although in a broken state, present Kosiba as a domineering and direct leader, consistent with other ancient Jewish practices. The letters to Yehonathan, son of Ba'ayan and Mesabala, Kosiba's military commanders at Ein Gedi, show that Kosiba directly oversaw operations and did not shy away from threats of punishment.³⁵⁶

Penned in Hebrew, P. Yadin 49 reads:

1. From Shim'on, son of Kosiba', to the men of 'Ein Gedi:
2. to Mesabala' and to Yehonathan, son of Ba'yan: Peace! In good (circumstances)
3. you are dwell[i]ng, eating and drinking of the property of the House
4. of Israel, but showing no concern for your brothers in any manner.
5. And (as regards) the boat(s) *which they have inspected* at your place—you have not done any
6. thing at all. However, be informed that your case is (under consideration) by me. And regarding the fruit
7. that is with you—you are to handle them carefully, and you are to bale them quickly
8. from off the boat that is with you, and (which is) at the port. You are to...

The letter breaks off in the middle of a series of commands that threaten Kosiba's underlings to heed his warnings. As benefactors of the land, they are to remain attentive to the products shipped to them by sea. The charge that they are 'eating and drinking' (אָכּוּל וְשָׁתוּה) is a common phrase to describe inaction. Isaiah 21:5 uses the same phrase as a qualifier in an oracle against Babylon, Edom, and Arabia, to indicate that the perpetrators are defective and open to attack. David attacked the Amalekites in 1 Sam 30:16, who were said to have been eating, drinking, and delighting in their spoils of war.³⁵⁷ For Kosiba to make such an accusation of his own men, suggests he ruled by stringency rather than mercy, a domineering mantle of leadership.

Another important element of this text is the collective 'property of the House of Israel' (אֲכוּל וְשָׁתוּה - lines 3-4). In the original publication of the manuscript, Yadin rightly draws attention that the Hebrew/Aramaic term describes 'property' (Josh 22:8; Qoh 5:18), but the meaning of the term is unclear. Genesis 31:30 records נָכַס in the niph'al form to describe longing

³⁵⁶ For information on Ein Gedi's strategic usefulness, see Hannah Cotton, "Ein Gedi between the Two Revolts," *Scripta Classica Israelica* 20 (2001): 139–154.

³⁵⁷ cf. Job 1:13, 18; 1 Kings 4:20.

while 1QIsa^a 32:17 uses נכס to describe Hezekiah's storeroom of armor and precious things. To my knowledge, nowhere else in the relevant literature, including the Kosiba literature, is נכס qualified by בית ישראל. In addition, the 'house of Israel' is a relatively common caption in the Second Temple traditions, which most commonly appear in moments of historizing past traditions or during and after David's reign of the united kingdom.³⁵⁸ The usage in the revolutionary's extant literature is unique. Based on this singular occurrence, one must wonder how this phrase operated for Kosiba: was this a moniker for Kosiba's newly imagined empire? Did Kosiba understand his revolution as a reconstitution of the House of Israel? I will return to this concern below with the numismatic evidence. I argue that the scant evidence of the phrase is not numerous enough for us to claim with any certainty Kosiba's understanding of his revolution.

While the threat of punishment is partially implied in this context,³⁵⁹ P. Yadin 50, penned in Aramaic, exacts the threat in more direct verbiage:

1. Shim'on, son of Kosiba,
2. to Yehonathan, son of Ba'yan,
3. and to Mesabalah, son of Shim'on:
4. You are to deliver to me 'El'azar,
5. son of HTH, immediately, before
6. the Sabbath. And exercise care with his products,
7. and the remainder of all of his fruit. And whoever
8. raises a clamor against you on this sort of matter,
9. dispatch him to my side, and I will exact punishment.
10. And (as regards) the cattle – they must not destroy the
11. trees. And should anyone raise a clamor – punishment
12. will be exacted from you, in great (measure). And as regards the *ladanum*/spice (garden)
13. let no person come near it.
14. Shi'mon, son of Yehudah;
15. He issued it.

In this communication, Kosiba threatens direct punishment to those who disobey his command. This punishment is echoed in other Judean desert communications (P. Yadin 55; 56 on Romans;

³⁵⁸ Lev 10:6; 17:3, 8; 22:18; Num 20:29; Josh 21:25; 1 Sam 7:2, 3; 2 Sam 1:12; 6:5, 15; 2 Sam 12:8; 16:3; 1 Kings 20:31; Hos 1:6; Ps 98:3; 115:12; 135:19; Isa 5:7; 14:2; Jer 2:6; 3:20; 5:11; 5:15; 9:26; 10:1; 11:10; 11:17; 13:11; 18:6; 23:8; 31:27; c.f., Mic 1:13, 3 Macc 2:10; Ps. Sol. 9:11; 10:8, 17:47. For an interesting study on this topic, see Andrew Tobolowsky, *The Sons of Jacob and the Sons of Herakles: The History of the Tribal System and the Organization of Biblical Identity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck: 2017).

³⁵⁹ Implied or indirect threats of violence (do this, or else!) can also be found in P. Yadin 53.

63, though very broken). P. Yadin 54 records Kosiba's command to maintain order: should any thieves be captured, they are to remain under guard and be sent to him; should foreigners be found among the people, they are to be seized and sent to him, while the homes of those who shielded the foreigners are to be burned to the ground. This practice is in line with other ancient near eastern traditions (Ezra 6:11; Dan 2:5; 3:29). P. Yadin 56 uses the same language for punishment for his comrades as he does for the Romans (a form of פור - פרענושהא), a drastic severity that suggests Kosiba expected absolute obedience.

While these letters display Kosiba's jurisprudence, other letters display him as an observant Jewish leader. Penned in Aramaic, P. Yadin 57 chronicles Kosiba's request that his commanders send elements for Sukkot:

1. Shim'on to Yehudah, son of Menasheh, at Qiryat 'Arabayyah: I have delivered to you donkeys (in order) to dispatch
2. along with them two men to Yehonathan, son of Ba'yan, and to Mesabalah (in order) that they pack up
3. and deliver to the camp, to you, palm branches and citrons. And you are to send additional persons from your place
4. and let them bring you branches and willows. And prepare them, and deliver them to the camp because
5. the population is large. Fare well!

This communication from Simeon to his subordinate indicates that he himself did not travel to the camp, but sent the message with the donkeys to clarify his desires. This message implies that Kosiba controlled the region, or at minimum, the passageways between his location and the camp. Since there is no date or circumstances by which we can date the message, it is unclear when in the revolt this letter might have been sent.

The four elements listed above (branches, willows, palm branches, and citron) match those described in Leviticus 23:39-44, which are used for Sukkot.³⁶⁰ The holiday is remembered in the first temple period as a celebration of God's benevolence while Israel traversed through the wilderness.³⁶¹ Kosiba's letter is brief and focuses on the delivery of the necessary elements of the festival rather than on the practices itself, so it is not clear what the celebration of the holiday

³⁶⁰ Jeffrey L. Rubenstein, *The History of Sukkot in the Second Temple and Rabbinic Periods* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995); Cf., Jub. 16:20-21; 32; Exod 23:16; Num 29:12-38; John 7:37-39.

³⁶¹ Rubenstein, *The History of Sukkot in the Second Temple and Rabbinic Periods*, 13-25.

meant to the revolutionaries. While earlier scholarship suggested that the Maccabean leadership stamped these same symbols relating to Sukkot on their coins, the consensus is now that the four elements were only used on Jewish coins after Kosiba used the images on coins during the Second Revolt.³⁶² A parallel passage on Hanukkah in 2 Maccabees provides a much more striking purpose to the holiday for the revolutionaries in the desert than the context of Leviticus 23. 2 Maccabees 10:6-8 blends the meaning of Sukkot with the reclamation of the temple:

And they celebrated it for eight days with rejoicing, in the manner of the feast of booths, remembering how not long before, during the feast of booths, they had been wandering in the mountains and caves like wild animals. Therefore, bearing ivy-wreathed wands and beautiful branches and also fronds of palm, they offered hymns of thanksgiving to him who had given success to the purifying of his own holy place. They decreed by public ordinance and voted that the whole nation of the Jews should observe these days every year.

The author of 2 Maccabees relocates the origins of Sukkot in both the act of settling the land and the purification of the temple in Jerusalem. 2 Maccabees 1:7-9 offers an abbreviated account in which Jason revolted against their overlords and took control of the temple. One must wonder if, like the author of 2 Maccabees, the revolutionaries held a complex understanding of Sukkot that was tied with revolution and rededication of the Jerusalem temple. Besides the shared emphasis on the holiday, there is no means to understanding Kosiba's use of the symbols.

Kosiba also sets himself apart from others through the moniker prince (הַנְּסִי).³⁶³ P. Yadin 54, the only letter to include the moniker, records the title in the address:

1. Shim'on, son of Kosiba, the Premier (הַנְּסִי) over Israel,
2. To Yehonathan, and to Mesabalah: Peace! You are ordered to examine...

In the original publication of the collection, Yadin rightly highlights that it is potentially the most significant element of the letters. He renders הַנְּסִי as 'premier' in an attempt to recognize Kosiba's broader role as leader. Following Goodblatt on the etymology of הַנְּסִי, Yadin understands the use of the honorific to mean one of 'high position,' a notion of "leadership in a

³⁶² For an example of the traditional perspective, see Fredrick W. Madden, *History of Jewish Coinage and of Money in the Old and New Testament* (ed., H. Orlinsky; New York: Ktav, 1967), 47-49; the counter perspective is already vocalized in Erwin R. Goodenough and Jacob Neusner, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989).

³⁶³ Cf. Schäfer, *Der Bar Kokhba-Aufstand*, 67.

broader sense.”³⁶⁴ *Nasi* or *Nasah* (נשא), in its root form connotes, ‘raised up, elevated.’³⁶⁵ Yadin finds comparative Pa’il passive participles in Isa 3:2-4 and 2 Kings 5:3 of Na‘aman, the Aramean general, as examples of those who were elevated to leadership. The prophet Ezekiel, however, provides a more specific example in which מלך is replaced with נשא. Yadin lifts up Ezek 34:24, 37:25 and 44:3 as key examples.

In the first two Ezekian examples, David is equated with a prince, a significant difference in terminology compared to the messianic language in previous texts.³⁶⁶ Ezekiel 34:24 recasts the eschatological figure of David as God’s prince rather than the king or messiah; YHWH declares, “And I, the YHWH, will be their God, and my servant David shall be prince among them; I, the LORD, have spoken.” It is Ezekiel 44:3 that broadens the conception of prince to include a priestly element that is significant for Yadin’s perspective. After departing from the renewed, eschatological temple, YHWH declares to Ezekiel that only the Divine’s prince may walk in the places YHWH has walked, only the prince may reenter the heavenly temple. Ezek 44:3b records some fascinating imagery in which, rather than marching into Jerusalem and the temple from outside, the prince already serves in the temple:

הוא ישב-בו לְאֶכּוֹל-לֶחֶם לְפָנַי יְהוָה מִדֶּרֶךְ אֵלֶם הַשַּׁעַר יָבוֹא וּמִדֶּרֶכּוֹ יֵצֵא

Only the prince, because he is a prince, may sit in it to eat food before the LORD; he shall enter by way of the vestibule of the gate, and shall go out by the same way.

Ezekiel’s journey through the heavenly temple reimagines David’s role as YHWH’s emissary. For Goodblatt and Yadin, this emphasizes a combined priestly and kingly role for YHWH’s prince.

Yadin argues that it is very likely that this perspective in Ezekiel was viewed through the eschatology of the Dead Sea Scrolls and fully adopted by Kosiba and his revolutionaries.

³⁶⁴ Yadin, *Documents from the Bar Kokhba Period*, 369. When Yadin presented the findings of the ‘Cave of Letters,’ into a packed hall of political and religious leaders, including then Israeli President Ben-Zvi, he stated, ‘Mr. President, I have discovered letters from the last known president of Israel’ (Wise, *Language and Literacy in Roman Judaea*). This story is as much about the modern appropriation of Kosiba as it is about the meaning of the terminology from the ancient manuscripts. Yadin, who was surely being grandiose and verbose for the public audience, mutually elevates Bar Kokhba as a mythic role model of leadership while at the same time elevating the President of Israel. It is an excellent example of messianic discourse in modern sociopolitical discourse.

³⁶⁵ HALOT, 724.

³⁶⁶ See the introduction and chapter 2 for other examples.

Following Goodblatt, Yadin reads CD 7:20 as a reinterpretation of Num 24:17.³⁶⁷ The context of the chapter is an exposition on purity regulations of the community: all members must separate from every kind of ritual impurity. This level of regulation matches and in some cases supersedes the rules of the priesthood. In 7:9 and following, the author centralizes the eschaton in the ‘here and now’ through commentary on several prophetic texts, including Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Amos, and Numbers. 7:15b-8:1a reads:

הוא <נשיא> הקהל. המלך כאשר אמר והקימותי את סוכת דוד הנופלת. [] המלך ספרי התורה הם סוכת אשר בזה ישראל את דבריהם. [] והכוכב הוא דורש {וכיניי הצלמים} וכיון הצלמים הם ספרי הנביאים מישראל. השבט הוא נשיא כל העדה ובעמדו הבא דמשק כאשר כתוב דרך כוכב מיעקב וקם שבט התורה והנסוגים הסגירו לחרב את כל בני שת. אלה מלטו בקץ הפקודה הראשון וקרקר

The books of Law are the tents of the king, as it says, “I will re-erect the fallen tent of David” (Amos 9:11). The “king” (4Q266: the images) is the congregation and the “foundation of your images” is the books of the prophets whose words Israel despised. The star is the Interpreter of the Law who comes to Damascus, as it is written, “A star has left Jacob, a staff has risen from Israel” (Numbers 24:17). The latter is the Leader of the whole nation; when he appears, “he will shatter all the sons of Sheth” (Numbers 24:17). They escaped in the first period of God’s judgment, but those who held back were handed over to the sword.

The manuscript tradition has several lacunae, but there is enough text available to see that the author frequently quotes from known texts and then offers an interpretation of the text.³⁶⁸ The interpretive commentary of Numbers 24:17 places Israel’s eschatological military leader as one who is the primary interpreter of the Law. For Yadin, this role positions the leader as both the military and religious leader.³⁶⁹ I will return to this quandary below when analyzing the reception of Kosiba in rabbinic literature. The indirect comparison between Kosiba and David shows Kosiba to be an inferior interpreter of the scriptural traditions.

³⁶⁷ Cf., 4Q174, frag. 1, 10-13.

³⁶⁸ John Collins points out the authors of the Qumranic texts frequently rely upon this methodology as a means of reinterpreting the traditions (Collins, *Scepter and the Star*, 61-109). On the manuscript tradition, see Steven D. Fraade, *The Damascus Document: Oxford Commentary on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022).

³⁶⁹ The division between the military and religious leaders at the end of time is a common distinction; see for example CD I, 7-17; 1QSa II, 17-22; 4Q161 frag. 8, 18-21. For secondary research, John M. Allegro, “Further Messianic References,” 174-87; Karl G. Kuhn, “The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel,” in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. Krister Stendahl; New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1957), 54-64, here 54; John Liver, “Two Messiahs,” 151, and for a similar analysis, see Morton Smith, “What is Implied,” 66-72. Whether or not this might include the Teacher of Righteousness as one of these figures, see Michael Knibb, “Teacher of Righteousness – A Messianic Title?” in *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History* (ed. by Phillip R. Davies and Richard T. White; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), 51-65.

We should not assume that Kosiba's deployment of the title 'nasi' implies messianic overtones. Goodman argues that by the second century CE, the term nasi meant nothing more than an important rabbi.³⁷⁰ Only under Judah ha-Nasi (135-217 CE) did the term take on an administrative role (Chagigah 2:2). Judah's success was likely attributed to the power vacuum left at the end of the Second Revolt and continued to grow with the loosening of Roman control over Israel/Palestine. Thus, Goodman conservatively dates the stabilized authority of the Patriarch (*Nasi*) to approximately 390 CE. In contrast, Mantel's history of research on the nasi suggests that the title, though likely related to the Ezekian prophecy, was used for the president of the Sanhedrin in pre-Hasmonean period and continued through the Second Revolt.³⁷¹ Hillel, the ancestor of the house of Gamaliel, for example, was already designated as the *Nasi* (Mishnah Hagigah 2:2; Tosefta Pisha 4:13-14). Contrarians abound. Likewise, Goodblatt offers a more historically grounded perspective. Since *nasi* appears prior to Kosiba's use, Goodblatt argues that Kosiba's rule set a standard for administrative authority: Kosiba organized the general population, leased land held in common, and attempted to refocus cultic activities in Jerusalem.³⁷² Whether Kosiba's deployment of the title itself was anachronistic is uncertain.

Kosiba's non-textual evidence gives us further reason to question this assumption about his use of this title. Some have posited that numismatic evidence from Kosiba alludes to a shared leadership structure.³⁷³ Similar to Roman coins, the Kosiba coins were stamped with one or more of the following inscriptions: the year of Kosiba's rule (e.g., 'year one,' 'year two'), 'For the freedom of Jerusalem' (134/135 CE), Kosiba's formal title ('Simeon, prince of Israel'), or 'Eleazer the priest' (Figs. 8-10).³⁷⁴ Several coins also included religiously significant symbols,

³⁷⁰ Martin Goodman, *State and Society in Roman Galilee A.D. 132-212* (2nd ed.; London: Vallentine Mitchell, 2001), 111-18; David Goodblatt, *The Monarchic Principle: Studies in Jewish Self-Government in Antiquity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 176-231.

³⁷¹ Hugo Mantel, *Mehqarim Betoldot Ha-Sanhedrin* (Tel Aviv: Devir, 1969). See also Ephrat Habas (Rubin), "Rabban Gamaliel of Yavneh and his Sons: the Patriarchate before and after the Bar Kokhba Revolt," *JJS* 50,1 (1999): 21-37, and Schäfer, "Bar Kokhba and the Rabbis."

³⁷² David Goodblatt, "'The Title Nasi' and the Ideological Background of the Second Revolt" in *The Bar-Kokhva Revolt: A New Approach* (ed. A. Oppenheimer and U. Rappaport; Jerusalem, 1984), 113-122.

³⁷³ Victoria Efremov, *Motifs and Symbols (Associated with the Temple in Jerusalem) on the Coins of the Jewish Wars Against the Romans and the Bar Kokhba War* (M.A. Thesis; Haifa: University of Haifa, 2000); Y. Meshorer, *Jewish Coins of the Second Temple Period* (trans. I. H. Levine; Tel Aviv: Am Hassefer, 1967).

³⁷⁴ For an interpretation of the temple in apocalyptic eschatology, see Al Baumgarten, "The Role of Jerusalem," 77-89.

including a depiction of the temple surrounded by the Jerusalem inscription,³⁷⁵ palm trees, wreath, the lulav, amphora, vine leaf, and harp.³⁷⁶ That Eleazer is mentioned by name on Kosiba's coins suggests that the military leader had, at one time, the support of a priest if not also the Jerusalem priesthood. This reference alone, however, should not imply the movement framed ideal leadership as dual messianic rulers. Eleazer does not appear as the subject in any of Kosiba's letters. Because the scant extant evidence does not allude to a shared power structure, it seems unlikely that it was the case. The absence of references may mean nothing, but their presence may be significant; thus, an argument from silence cannot be substantiated.



Figure V.1
Kosiba coin. Commemorating year 1 of the revolution. Bronze, 19 mm, 6.49 g. Obverse: Bunch of grapes. *šnt 'ht lg 'lt yšr 'l*. Reverse: Harp. *'l'zr hkhn*.



Figure V.2
Kosiba coin. Commemorating year 2 of the revolution. Silver, 24 mm, 12.61 g. Obverse: Tetrastyle façade with an unidentified motif in the middle. *yrwšlym*. Reverse: Beam of lulavim, etrog left. *šblhr yšr 'l*.



Figure V.3
Kosiba coin. Commemorating year 3 of the revolution. Silver, 18.5 mm, 3.24 g. Obverse: the Grape bunch on vine, surrounded by the name "Sim'on". Reverse: A palm branch surrounded by the phrase "to the freedom of Jerusalem."

³⁷⁵ Michaël Girardin, "Leherut Yerushalayim: The Temple on the Coins of the Bar Kokhba War," *Electrum* 26 (2019): 159-176.

³⁷⁶ Patricia E. Mottahedeh, *The Coinage of the Bar Kokhba War* (Los Angeles: Numismatic Fine Arts Intl, 1984), and Y. Meshorer, *Jewish Coins*. These symbols are common on other coins in the Second Temple Period; cf., Aaron J. Kogon, Jean-Philippe Fontanille, *The Coinage of Herod Antipas: A Study and Die Classification of the Earliest Coins of Galilee* (Leiden: Brill, 2018); Goodenough and Neusner, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*; Leo Kadman, *The Coins of the Jewish War* (Berlin: Schocken Publishing, 1960), 84.

The coins of John Hyrcanus (134-104 BCE) provide an important point of comparison to the Kosiba coins. Stamped with the permission of Antiochus VII, Hyrcanus and his son, Alexander Jannaeus, stamped several coins declaring themselves the high priest and leader of the Sanhedrin.³⁷⁷ All of these coins are bronze chalcus and dichalcus, and frequently contain images of anchors (Fig. V.4), cornucopia (Fig. V.5), and sun-wheels (Fig. V.4). The coins are usually more oval-shaped than round, inconsistent in shape, making inscriptions difficult to read. It should be noted that the symbols and inscriptions stamped in Kosiba's coins do not overlap with the Maccabean coins. These details make it difficult to support the theory that Kosiba fashioned himself after the Hasmoneans.³⁷⁸



Figure V.4
Hyrcanus coin. Late second or early first century BCE. Bronze, 18.5 mm. Obverse: Anchor. Reverse: Sun-wheel.



Figure V.5
Hyrcanus coin. Late second or early first century BCE. Bronze, 18mm. Obverse: Cornucopia. Paleo-Hebrew: Yehoḥanan the High Priest and Head of the Council of the Jews. Reverse: Helmet.

The hopeful tone of Kosiba's numismatic evidence relating to Jerusalem suggests that the revolutionaries idealized Jerusalem but never conquered the city.³⁷⁹ Our sources support this assumption, for they allude to Kosiba being at such places as Bethar, Herodian, Arbaia, Ein Gedi, and Gophna, but never entering Jerusalem. Some argue that lulavs with an etrog or

³⁷⁷ Vasile Babota, *The Institution of the Hasmonean High Priesthood* (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 35-64.

³⁷⁸ One troubling piece of evidence that contradicts this conclusion is P.Yadin 52, which was penned in Greek. This manuscript suggests that Kosiba and his leadership did not write or communicate in Hebrew as their primary language. Some anachronistically assume that such a confession might imply that Kosiba was thoroughly Hellenized and so Jewish or non-halakic, if one can even make a distinction. However, as Wise states, "the general social movement [Hellenism] would have shaped everyone simply by virtue of being the milieu of their daily lives. A greater receptiveness to Greek therefore would have characterized even the devout" (Wise, *Language and Literacy*, 18). Thus, this position can no longer withstand criticism.

³⁷⁹ However, Emil Schürer, *History*, still claims, "Jerusalem also was certainly beset by rebels" (42).

depictions of the Jerusalem temple that appear on Kosiba's coins might be the same as those images referenced in later midrashim. Beyond sharing common symbols, however, it is difficult to ascertain whether the meaning of the symbols were understood as the same or were simply shared artifacts of Judaism's long history.³⁸⁰

While not conclusive, this biographical sketch provides a foundation by which we might analyze how authors incorporated Kosiba in messianic discourse. The extant evidence is a rare treasure in the end of the Second Temple period and leads me to several conclusions. The letters, coins, and archeological remains of the revolutionaries demonstrate that outside of the title *nasi*, Kosiba did not claim a messianic title. That other non-messianic leaders claim the same title leads me to conclude that Kosiba sought to restore Israel within the ideological conceptions of political leadership rather than claiming an overt form of messianism. Nor do his letters and coins demonstrate the eschatological perspectives found in the textual remains of Second Temple Judaism or represent the dual sense of political and priestly leadership seen in the Dead Sea Scrolls. There is not enough evidence to claim that Kosiba modeled himself after the Hasmoneans. The numismatic evidence from the respective regimes, for example, claim different symbols relating to the region. The closest connection is the shared practice of Sukkot that itself may have focused upon the reconstitution of the temple. However, there is not enough evidence to suggest the festival meant the same for each group.

Evil in Rabbinic Judaism

In the rabbinic literature reviewed below, Kosiba is represented as a liar, uncontrolled, and an overly aggressive and brutal leader who ignores the wisdom of the rabbis. I argue that the rabbis chose to depict Kosiba as captivated by his evil inclinations to explain the failed revolution. The problem of evil in post-Second Temple Judaism is too broad to describe as a solitary or single notion. Because it is never clearly defined in rabbinic literature, I use an inductive approach to the topic. By analyzing several examples from across rabbinic literature, I demonstrate the problem of evil in rabbinic Judaism is not primarily due to an outside spiritual force but to the metaphorical corruption of the heart (לב). I argue in subsequent sections that the

³⁸⁰ Goodenough, *Symbols*, 4:145-46.

rabbis use this qualification to show that while David overcame his yetzer and so was worthy of leadership, Kosiba fell victim to his yetzer and so was unworthy of leadership.

I recognize at the outset that we know very little about the production and redaction of the rabbinic traditions – the Mishnah, Tosephtah, the Babylonian and Palestinian Talmuds and the many Midrashim. Many of the traditions are attributed to specific named rabbis or political figures from times and places, are unverifiable. Even if the figures themselves are well known on the historical stage, rabbinic literary traditions within individual portions reflect layers of redaction that stem from the Second Temple period through the Talmudic periods. By grouping these texts together, I do not assume a monolithic understanding of any given topic. However, smaller discrete units are quite often identified through linguistic and historical studies and may be grouped. This is the case with passages that reference the *yetzer hara*, the evil inclination.

The concept of one's inclination (*yetzer*, יצר) appears infrequently in narratives of the Second Temple period.³⁸¹ It appears in noun form on seven occasions,³⁸² and several more times in verbal expressions. In verbal forms, the term denotes 'creating,' 'fashioning,' or 'designing' things. YHWH and humans alike can create and fashion at will; however, this same language is primarily used by YHWH in the act of creation (e.g., Gen 2:7; Isa 43:7; Ps 33:11). In Genesis 6:5, after Adam and Eve are banished from the garden, the noun form is deployed to indicate that YHWH can see into every being's *yetzer*: "YHWH saw that the wickedness of humankind was great in the earth, and that every inclination of the thoughts of their hearts was only evil continually." For this indiscretion, YHWH punished humanity. Genesis 8:21 reports YHWH's lament for humanity's action and promises to never again annihilate the whole of humanity and every living creature: "I will never again curse the ground because of humankind, for the inclination of the human heart is evil from youth; nor will I ever again destroy every living creature as I have done." This passage suggests that humanity's evil stems not from external forces or a war between body and mind, but primarily within oneself. Similarly, Deut 31:21 affirms that this inclination is not outside of YHWH's purview: "For I know what they are inclined to do even now, before I have brought them into the land that I promised them on oath." In 1 Chronicles 28:29, David prays for the inclination of Solomon and the Jewish people to

³⁸¹ For the sake of consistency with scholarship, I will continue the practice to refer to the concept as *yetzer*, the transliterated term from Hebrew.

³⁸² Gen 6:5; 8:21; Deut 31:21; Isa 26:3; 1 Chron 28:9; 29:18; HALOT, 429.

remain faithful to YHWH: “for the LORD searches every mind, and understands every plan and thought. If you seek him, he will be found by you; but if you forsake him, he will abandon you forever.” These passages suggest that the *yetzer* is not located or attributed to a physical origin. As Frank Porter points out, “the seat of the good and evil impulses alike is neither body nor soul in distinction from each other, but rather...the heart, - not, of course, the physical organ, but the thinking and willing subject, the moral person, the inner self.”³⁸³

In rabbinic literature, the terminology becomes static. The overlapping uses create a broad semantic meaning, which, according to Ellis, includes “the ideas of formed substances, human inclination, disposition, instinct, council, and desire.”³⁸⁴ The ability of one’s inclination to do good is potentially equal or greater to one’s ability to do evil. Rosen-Zvi highlights this: the *yetzer* is “unlike Mastema and Satan, it is not a cosmic being but a fully internalized entity that resides inside the human heart.”³⁸⁵ *Mishnah Berekot* 9:5 demonstrates this principle:

Man is bound to bless [YHWH] for the evil even as he blesses [YHWH] for the good, for it is written, And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy might. With all thy heart (*lebab*) – with both thine impulses, thy good impulse and thine evil impulse; and with all thy soul – even if he take away thy soul; and with all thy might – with all thy wealth.

The *yetzer* is neither the source of evil or the center for all good, but the basis by which one makes decisions.³⁸⁶ According to b. Berakoth 61b, the righteous are guided by the good inclination: “It has been taught: R. Jose the Galilean says, The righteous are swayed by their

³⁸³ Frank Porter, *The Yeçer Hara: A Study in the Jewish Doctrine of Sin* (New York: Scribner, 1901), 110. Likewise, George Foot Moore suggests “the word ‘heart’ itself is often used in a sense entirely equivalent to *yetzer* especially when the text of Scripture suggests a bad connotation” (Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries*, 1:486).

³⁸⁴ Nicholas Ellis, *The Hermeneutics of Divine Testing* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 49.

³⁸⁵ Ishay Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desire: Yetzer Hara and the Problem of Evil in Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), 33. See also Van der Horst, “A Note on the Evil Inclination and Sexual Desire in Talmudic Literature” in *Jews and Christians in their Graeco-Roman Context: Selected Essays on Early Judaism, Samaritanism, Hellenism, and Christianity* (Ed P. W. van der Horst; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 60: “According to the rabbis, the good inclination induces humankind to keep God’s commandments, but the evil one is the source of rebellion against God. But it is important to add that the good one never resides solely in the soul and the evil one only in the body; the seat of both of them is thought to be in the heart (*levab*).”

³⁸⁶ *Zohar* II.174a reads concerning the heart: “the word *lebab* (heart) alludes to two hearts, the good and the evil inclination, both of which dwell in man; for one must thank the Holy One for all things, not only with one’s good, but also with one’s evil inclination. For from the side of the good inclination good comes to man, so he has to give thanks to Him who is good and who does good. From the evil inclination, again, comes seduction, and one must give thanks and praise the Holy One for all that comes to him, whether it be from one side or from the other. (H. Sperling and M. Simon, *The Zohar* (5 vols.; London and New York: Soncino, 1933), 4:102.

good inclination, as it says, My Heart is slain within me.” The tendency within rabbinic literature is to label the heart as the location of competing desire.

The challenge of one’s *yetzer* applies to all ages of humans. Based on Genesis 8:2, the rabbinic tradition understood the evil inclination to begin as a child. This force is tempered by the appearance of the good *yetzer*. Avot of Rabbi Nathan 16 states that, “When an infant still in his cradle puts his hand on a serpent or scorpion and is stung, it is brought on only by the evil impulse within him. When he puts his hand on glowing coals and is scorched, it is brought on only by the evil impulse within him. For it is the evil impulse which drives him headlong.” However, the same text reads, “by thirteen years is the evil impulse older than the good impulse. . . . Thirteen years later the good impulse is born. When he profanes the Sabbath, it reprimands him: ‘Wretch! lo it says, Everyone that profaneth it shall surely be put to death.’”³⁸⁷

In addition, the good and evil *yetzer* manifests itself differently according to gender.³⁸⁸ Susanna Towers argues that the *yetzer hara* becomes a focal point in rabbinic discourse at the intersection of sexual desire.³⁸⁹ Several parables (e.g., b. Yoma 69b; b. Kiddushin 81b) exemplify the issue surrounding the *yetzer*. Women in general are viewed as wayward and powerless to control their sexual desire. *Mishnah Sotah* 3:4 describes a female predilection for sexual satisfaction: “A woman wants a *qab* with sexual satisfaction more than nine *qabs* with abstinence.” When unsupervised, *Genesis Rabbah* 8:12 assumes a woman will lose her way: “A man restrains his wife so that she does not go to the market, for every woman who goes out to the market is destined to fall.” In contrast, literature from rabbinic Judaism in general portray men as in control of themselves. For example, ‘Abodah Zarah 19 states:

Happy is the man that feareth the Lord: Does it mean happy is the ‘man’ and not the woman? —Said R. Amram in the name of Rab: [It means] Happy is he who repents whilst he is still a ‘man’. R. Joshua b. Levy explained: Happy is he who over-rules his inclination like a ‘man.’

³⁸⁷ This division by age is not consistent throughout the rabbinic texts; cf., Jonathan Schofer, “The Redaction of Desire: Structure and Editing of Rabbinic Teachings Concerning ‘Yeşer’ (‘Inclination’),” *JJS* 12 (2003): 19–53, here 29–30.

³⁸⁸ Gender studies is one of the fastest growing approaches to rabbinic Judaism. A few important studies relating to the definitions and rolls of gender include Bernadette Brooten, *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2020); Charlotte Fonrobert, *Menstrual Purity: Rabbinic and Christian Reconstructions of Biblical Gender* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000); Daniel Boyarin, *Carnal Israel: Reading Sex in Talmudic Culture* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993); Michael L. Satlow, “‘Try to be a Man:’ the Rabbinic Construction of Masculinity,” *HTR* 89, 1 (1996): 219-44.

³⁸⁹ Susan Towers, “The Rabbis, Gender, and the Yetzer Hara: The Origins and Development of the Evil Inclination,” *Women in Judaism: A Multidisciplinary Journal* 15, 2 (2018): 1-20.

This passage highlights that the inclinations of evil are not permanent. According to this perspective, men are idealized over women and have a greater ability to deny their *yetzer hara*. *Yetzer* is also qualified as masculine, reflecting a view of masculine dominance, which supplants and overcomes the feminine. The body and mind are the location in which evil and righteousness battle.

The *Yetzer* of David

This succinct summary of the *yetzer* sets the framework for an analysis of King David and Kosiba. The reference to the Kefar Haruba brothers in the introduction suggests that the claim that the messiah will come from David's lineage was still common in discourse among some,³⁹⁰ despite the complex lineage of the David: David of the book of Psalms and Chronicles is almost equal to Moses in piety and knowledge of Torah, while the David of the books of Samuel contentedly served in the Philistine army, committed sin (adultery and murder), and failed to properly raise his three sons. Despite this complexity, David is said to have overcome their *yetzer hara* in most rabbinic traditions. Some interpreters, including Cohen and Shimoff, suggest that the tendency of the rabbis to protect David's tradition likely stems from the second century leader, Judah HaNasi, who claims David as his model of leadership and forefather. A literary comparison of David and Kosiba in rabbinic literature highlights that, in contrast to David, Kosiba fails to control himself. At the center of their distinction is the *yetzer hara*. The references to David from rabbinic literature below are not meant to be comprehensive, but focus on the reception of the Davidic tradition in relation to his *yetzer hara* and perceived authority.

As YHWH's selected leader and defender of Israel, the Rabbis imagined David as predestined for leadership. Commentary within rabbinic literature reinterpret David's lineage by viewing his birth, life, and death through the lens of the promise he received in 2 Samuel 7.³⁹¹ Yalkut Shimoni on Torah 41, for example, connects the lives of Adam and David. After the break in relationship between Adam, Eve, and YHWH, but before Adam and Eve are cast out of the Garden, Adam is permitted to see a book of his descendants. David's life is notably short.

³⁹⁰ Further research needs to be done on this passage about whether this belief was an assumption against Rome or meant as an insult to Jehudah HaNasi.

³⁹¹ For David's strength and greatness upon his impending death, see b. Shabbat 30a.

Knowing who David will become, Adam initiates a conversation with YHWH to extend David's life:

"Master of the World, this should not be decreed! A thought has come to me." He [Adam] said to him, "How many are my years?" God said, "1,000 years." Adam said, "Can I give some as a gift?" God said, "Yes." Adam said, "I will give him [David] 70 years to be his fate." What did Adam do? He brought a contract and wrote on it a contract of gift; and it was executed by God, Metatron, and Adam. Adam said, "Master of the World, good looks are his, kingship, and songs of praise have I given him in my gift of 70 years of his life; and he will sing before you. And this is written where it says "behold I have come" in the book I have written [2 Sam 5:4-5].

This connection between Adam and David functions in two ways. Practically, before he was born, David receives an extended life to become king. On a deeper level, a connection is created between David and the progenitor of humanity. Even in Adam's state of separation, the 'First Human' gifts David the close relationship that he and Eve enjoy with YHWH. The contract between Adam, Metatron, and YHWH ensures David's long life and success.

Another example of YHWH's divine favor upon David is preserved in Exodus Rabbah 2:2. Even before David was anointed as king, YHWH sets upon him the mantle of leadership:

'The Lord tries the righteous' (Ps 11:5) – By what does He try him? By tending flocks. He tried David through sheep and found him to be a good shepherd, as it is said: 'He chose David His servant and took him from the sheepfolds' (Ps 78:70)... He (David) used to stop the bigger sheep from going out before the smaller ones, and bring smaller ones out first, so that they should graze upon the tender grass, and afterwards he allowed the old sheep to feed from the ordinary grass and lastly he brought forth the young, lusty sheep to eat the tougher grass. Whereupon God said: He who knows how to look after sheep, bestowing upon each the care it deserves, shall come and tend my people, as it says: 'from following the ewes that give suck He brought him, to be shepherd over Jacob His people' (Ps 78:71).

The description of the land casts the image of an unruly or uncontrolled grazing pasture without barriers. The combined reading of several psalms is laid over the narrative of David's childhood to show him as not only a good shepherd but God's chosen leader. Even before receiving the promise to be king, David's act of care for and feeding of the sheep at different times according to their age shows his responsibility and ingenuity, thus affirming the ability to care for the

people of Jacob. By linking the several passages together, the redactor also links good leadership with righteousness.³⁹² This link appears again in relation to Kosiba, though in a negative fashion.

David, like Moses, is aggrandized and preserved in the rabbinic Jewish imagination as an idealized figure. Rabbinic literature preserves the memory that David observed all the commandments, prayed fervently at every opportunity,³⁹³ and only ate food that was received as tithes according to halakha.³⁹⁴ Israel's greatest king was also remembered as a scholar, poet, and interpreter of the law who superseded his need for sleep to study Torah.³⁹⁵ In a discussion about the number of watches at night, b. Berakhot 3b compares David's reflections in Psalms 119:62 ("At midnight I rise to give thanks for Your righteous laws") and 119:148 ("My eyes forestall the watches"). R. Yehuda HaNasi combines the two passages to suggest that David rose at midnight, two hours before dawn, in order to study Torah.

While David's position is elevated within the preserved traditions, he always remains on equal footing or slightly below the position of Moses. *Midrash Psalms* 24:5 preserves a tradition that divides the heavenly and earthly realms between Moses and David:

R. Azariah, R. Nehemiah and R. Berechiah told the parable of a king who had two stewards, one in charge of the house and the other in charge of the fields. The one in charge of the house knew all that happened in the house and all that happened in the fields, but the one in charge of the field knew only what happened in the fields. Just so, Moses, who had gone up to heaven, knew the upper as well as the nether worlds, and with the names of both praised the Holy One, Blessed be He, as it said "Behold the heaven and the heaven of heavens is the Lord's, thy God's, the earth also with all that therein is" (Dt 10:14), but David, who had not gone up to heaven, praised the Holy One, Blessed be He, only with what he knew, as it is said: "the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof" (Ps 24:1) (*Midrash Ps* 24:5).

This parable sets Moses, united with the Holy One, above David. By analogy, David's knowledge is shown to be limited. However, the text is not disparaging of David for he remains YHWH's faithful servant and manager over creation.

³⁹² The same trope appears in relation to Moses (cf. Ex. 3:1–2).

³⁹³ Pesikta Rabbati 31b–32a.

³⁹⁴ Pesikta De Rab Kahana 10:6. Cf. Avigdor Shinan, "King David of the Sages," *Nordisk Judaistik* 24, 1-2 (2003): 53-78.

³⁹⁵ See also, *Midrash Hagadol* to Exodus 35:1.

This lopsided relationship between Moses and David is a consistent theme. Moses was also spiritually superior to David. *Midrash Psalm 119:9* preserves a setting in which the two patriarchs are praying together:

David said to God: “Master of the universe, Thy will is that I keep Thy words, so Unveil Thou mine eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of Thy law (Ps 119:18). For if Thou dost not unveil mine eyes, how will I know Thy words? ... Yet though mine eyes are open I still know nothing ...and wherefore do I call upon Thee? Because such knowledge is too wonderful for me ... I cannot attain unto it (Ps 139:6), the wonderful knowledge being the Torah” ... so David said: “Knowledge of the Torah is too wonderful.” But Moses said: “it is not too wonderful, as it is written ‘It is not too wonderful except for thee’ (Dt 30:11), that is: Knowledge of the Torah is too wonderful for thee, because thou has not labored in it.”

David and Moses’ respective act of prayer and knowledge of Torah are juxtaposed. David relies upon YHWH for the revelation of Torah, yet David self-deprecates his ability to grasp it. However, Moses’ reply shows that Moses has a better understanding of YHWH’s identity and the purpose of Torah. While Moses is shown to be superior to David, the chastisement is not laid solely at the feet of David; it might equally apply to Moses as well.

Those who preserved David’s memory struggled to account for his sin. Some passages acknowledge that he followed *yetzer hara* but that does not mean that he sinned. B. Shabbat 56a overtly states the struggle with balancing David’s honored position in Jewish literature as well as his sinfulness:

However, how then do I establish the meaning of the rebuke of the prophet Nathan: “Why have you despised the word of the Lord, to do that which is evil in My sight? Uriah the Hittite you have smitten with the sword, and his wife you have taken to be your wife, and him you have slain with the sword of the children of Ammon” (II Samuel 12:9), indicating that David sinned? The Gemara answers: David sought to do evil and have relations with Bathsheba while she was still married to Uriah but did not do so.

Rav said: Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, who descends from the house of David, seeks to teach the verse in favor of David. With regard to that which is written: “Why have you despised the commandment of the Lord to do evil,” Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said: This evil mentioned with regard to David is different from all other evils in the Torah; as with regard to all other evils in the Torah, it is written: And he did evil, and here it is written: To do evil. This unique phrase indicates that David sought to do evil but did not actually do so. His intentions were improper; however, his actions were proper.

This passage suggests that David wanted to commit adultery with Bathsheba but did not do so. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, who claims to be descended from the Davidic lineage, protects David's honor at the cost of Bathsheba. Yehuda separates action from intention. 2 Samuel 12 is reinterpreted by changing the classification of sin that frees David of the responsibility for Uriah and Bathsheba's fate.³⁹⁶

Avigdor Shinan argues that rabbis' forgiveness of David's misdeeds is a regular practice for the patriarchs.³⁹⁷ In the desire to preserve the tradition, the rabbis purge the patriarchy of sin. "The defects or sins described in the Bible often get reinterpreted in rabbinic literature in a way that upholds the dignity of the nation's founders and forefathers, even if at times these interpretations appear to deviate from the biblical story or even to contradict it."³⁹⁸ In so doing, the rabbis created a literary tradition that could withstand criticism from parts of Judaism on the periphery that dismissed the progenitors of Early Judaism, such as Hellenistic or Enochic Judaism, as well as external skeptics of Judaism. In this way, the rabbis recreated figures who were guilty of halakhic irregularities at best and outright atrocities at worst, but were irreproachable in the Mishnah and Talmuds.

This is especially important in relation to David. The Second Temple and rabbinic tradition designate David and his descendants as the legitimate rulers and caretakers of Israel in perpetuity as well as the progenitor of the messiah. In the rabbinic memory, the promise to David from YHWH in 2 Sam 7 reinterprets every aspect of David's life. Shinan asserts, "This explains the lengths to which various Israelite groups – such as the followers of the Patriarch's family in the Land of Israel, the Exilarch in Babylonia, and those of Jesus – have gone in an effort to

³⁹⁶ Associated passages provide additional details. B. Baba Metzia 59a records that Uriah the Hittite left a *get*, a legal document dissolving the marriage in case he didn't return. While the passage implies this was a regular practice, it was not common for soldiers to leave a certificate of divorce (Deut 24 - ספר כריתת) when leaving for battle; see also Jastrow, *Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli, and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*, 233. B. Sanhedrin 107a goes one step forward to suggest that YHWH tested David's faithfulness and he failed, but that it was not David's fault. A midrash from the Cairo Genizah blames Bathsheba for the adultery (Louis Ginzberg and Israel Davidson, *Genizah Studies in Memory of Doctor Solomon Schechter* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1928), 166). B. Avodah Zarah 4b-5a links David's sin of Bathsheba with Israel's sin with the golden calf in Exodus. In this way, B. Avodah Zarah presents David as a model: "David was not the kind of man to do that act, nor was Israel the kind of people to do that act. David was not the kind of man to do that act, as it is written: 'my heart is slain within me' (Ps 109: 22), nor were the Israelites the kind of people to commit that act... why then did they act thus? In order to teach thee that if an individual has sinned he could be referred to the individual [i.e. to David who sinned, repented and was forgiven] and if a community commits a sin they should be told: Go to the community [i.e. to the people who sinned by worshipping the golden calf, repented and were forgiven]."

³⁹⁷ Shinan, "King David of the Sages," 67.

³⁹⁸ Shinan, "King David of the Sages," 67.

establish the descent of their leaders from the house of David.”³⁹⁹ The rabbis preserved the tradition of David and so held on to the hope of connection with the inherited tradition.

These passages relating to the Davidic tradition are immediately relevant to the study of Kosiba. The evidence I reviewed above affirms that the rabbis reinterpreted the tradition of David to maintain continuity with his leadership and lineage. Through this process, they assert and reassert their own claim to this lineage. In the most striking example, Rab unabashedly claims Judah HaNasi is descendent of David. This interweaving of the rabbis’ claim to authority with the past also suggests that the issues preserved within these stories are central to rabbis and are not just illustrative parables for precedent sake. The rabbis imagined David as being predestined by YHWH even before his birth to shepherd the people of Jacob. In his adulthood, David is remembered as a teacher of Torah, engaged in prayer, and ate foods tithed to the temple. Despite the sin in relation with Bathsheba, the rabbis preserve David as one who can overcome his evil inclinations and control his actions. In his life and memory, David is fashioned as an ideal patriarch. This research stands in direct contrast to Kosiba.

Bar Kosiba in Messianic Discourse

Kosiba is the *primum exemplum* of ancient Jewish messianism. Unlike every other example in the Second Temple period, we have his letters, numismatic, and archeological remains to understand his broad movements and the nature of his group. What is striking is that the evidence of Kosiba’s revolution contrasts with the messianic discourse extant in Jewish literature. The rabbis imply that Kosiba’s downfall is due to his uncontrolled evil or sinfulness. Building upon the above analysis, I will evaluate five passages from rabbinic literature to demonstrate how authors utilized Kosiba’s failed political coup to define the meaning of messianism and the succession of authority following the Kosiba revolt. Passages from the Mishnah and the Jerusalem Talmud suggest that rabbinic Judaism likely celebrated Kosiba’s initial revolution, but after the devastating outcome, the texts underwent explicit redaction to negatively recast Kosiba. In each example, I show that Kosiba is shown to be misguided and evil. This stands in contrast to King David, a paragon of leadership. In this way, the messianic discourse surrounding Kosiba defines social boundaries in relation to structures of authority in second century CE Jewish imagination and beyond.

³⁹⁹ Shinan, “King David of the Sages,” 68.

The most famous passage concerning Kosiba is Rabbi Aqiva's pronouncement that Kosiba is the 'messiah.'⁴⁰⁰ Y. Ta'anit 68d details an exchange between R. Shimon b. Yohai and R. Yohanan b. Torta:⁴⁰¹

- (1) R. Shimon b. Yohai taught: "My teacher Aqiva (רבי עקיבה) used to expound: 'A star shall step forth from Jacob' (Num. 24:17) [in this way:] Kozeba (כוזבא) steps forth from Jacob."
- (2) When R. Akiva beheld Bar Kozeba, he exclaimed: "This one is the King Messiah (הוא מלכא משיחא דיו)."
- (3) R. Yohanan b. Torta said to him: "Aqiva, grass will grow between your jaws and still the son of David will not have come."

Through the mouth of R. Yohai, Rabbi Akiva, one of the most learned leaders of the first-third centuries CE, identifies Kosiba as the one foretold from Numbers 24.⁴⁰² Peter Schäfer draws attention to three inconsistencies in the passage. The attribution to R. Akiva by R. Shimon b. Yohai is structured exactly as the preceding unit, which reads, 'It has been taught: R. Yehuda ben R. Elair said: My teacher Barukh (ברוך רבי) used to expound...'. The reliance on unknown teachers (R. Yehuda ben R. Elair & R. Shimon b. Yohai) in two simultaneous passages is questionable. In the Yerushalmi fragment, Darmstadt has a shortened name: בהלך. This cognomen makes no sense as a name; hence, the text is likely corrupt. The most likely reading, Schäfer suggests, is the "Rabbi used to expound."⁴⁰³ If true, 'Rabbi' might refer to Akiva or as the proper name of R. Yehuda HaNasi.

There are also strong linguistic reasons to question the authenticity of the passage. Rabbi Akiva's declaration concerning Bar Kozeba is in Aramaic, while portions one and three – the exegesis of Num 24:17 and Yohanan b. Torta's critique of Akiva's judgment – are in Hebrew. I

⁴⁰⁰ For secondary literature on this passage, see Matthew Novenson, "Why Does R. Akiba Acclaim Bar Kokhba as a Messiah?," *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 40 (2009): 551–572.

⁴⁰¹ For detailed differences in the manuscript tradition, see Peter Schäfer, "Bar Kokhba and the Rabbis."

⁴⁰² Martin McNamara goes too far in assuming a direct connection between this passage and the Zealot movement during the Second Temple period; "Early Exegesis in the Palestinian Targum (Neofiti I) of Numbers Chapter 24," *Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association* 16 (1993): 57–79. Furthermore, Marilyn Collins ("Messianic Interpretation of the Balaam Oracles" (PhD diss. Yale University, 1978), 125–27) draws attention to the fact that the Targums renders the 'star' in 24:17c as 'king,' and the 'scepter' of 24:17d as 'anointed one' (*Onqelos, Pseudo-Jonathan*) or 'redeemer' (*Neofiti, Fragmentary Targum*). Cf. Stefan Beyerle, "A Star Shall Come out of Jacob: A Critical Evaluation of the Balaam Oracle in the Context of Jewish Revolts in Roman Times" in *The Prestige of the Pagan Prophet Balaam in Judaism, Early Christianity and Islam* (Ed. George H. van Kooten and Jaquest van Ruiten; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 163–188.

⁴⁰³ Schäfer, *Bar Kokhba and the Rabbis*, 3. This passage is the most commonly referred to when debating whether Kosiba might be labeled as a messiah. Thus, the secondary literature is substantial.

agree with Schäfer's logic, that the earlier portion is likely a positive reflection upon Kosiba and the later Aramaic portion is a denigration. Schäfer reconstructs the development of the text as the following:

- 1) The earliest stage, likely dating to around the time of the revolt, was a positive reading of Num 24:17 in reference to Bar Kosiba with the warning of Yohanan b. Torta.
- 2) After the revolt failed, this tradition was negatively reinterpreted by Yehuda HaNasi.
- 3) During a time when 'Rabbi' was still interpreted as a title, R. Yehuda's interpretation provoked another layer of redaction that included the positive statement by Yohai and his teacher Akiva.
- 4) The last insertion was the Aramaic part that emphasizes Kosiba's role as messiah.⁴⁰⁴

This reconstruction is further supported by other textual traditions that preserved the pericope. The version of this pericope in Ekha Rabba 2:4 eliminates Akiva:

R. Yohanan said: "Rabbi/my teacher used to expound: 'A star shall step forth from Jacob' (Num 24:17) [in this way:] don't read 'star' (כוכב) but 'liar' (כוזב)."

This teaching is attributed to Rabbi Yohanan rather than Shimon b. Yohai, and based on the context, the author is certainly Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. In distinction to the first passage, the second passage reflects the negative approach of the rabbis to Kosiba after the revolt.

This complex tradition of Akiba and Kosiba offers a definitive example of messianic discourse. The two points of the connection in the texts are the word play relating to Kosiba in Num 24:17 and Yehuda HaNasi. Together, the two texts unmistakably claim Kosiba as the messiah-king, but as a historically-static medium the readers are aware of Kosiba's failure. Due to Akiva's well-known death and torture, Akiba, the most popular and greatest leader in the generation immediately following the destruction of the Second Temple, shared in Kosiba's downfall and suffered dearly.⁴⁰⁵ Despite the inclusion in both texts of Num 24:17, an accepted scriptural text, the revolutionaries are admonished and Yehuda HaNasi is proven correct. When placed in relation with the Davidic traditions reviewed above, Y. Ta'anit 68d and Ekha Rabba 2:4 appear as a concerted effort to dismiss a non-Davidic messiah.

⁴⁰⁴ Schäfer, *Bar Kokhba and the Rabbis*, 4.

⁴⁰⁵ Barry W. Holtz, *Rabbi Akiva: Sage of the Talmud* (New Haven: Yale University Press); Peter Schäfer, "Rabbi Akiva and Bar Kokhba," in *Approach to Ancient Judaism* (vol. 2; ed. by William Scott Green; Ann Arbor: Scholars Press, 1980), 121-24. David Goodblatt argues that Akiva's notoriety and authority stems from the fact that the Sanhedrin was disbanded following the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 CE (*The Monarchic Principle*, 236-37).

Another tradition, also recorded in both y. Ta'anit 68d and Ekha Rabba 2:4, reflects a more positive relation between the rabbis and Kosiba.

Ben Kozeba (כּוּזְבָה) was there [at Bethar], and he had 200,000 [soldiers] with amputated fingers. The Sages sent him the message: 'How long will you continue to mutilate Israel?' He said to them, 'How else is it possible to trust them?' They said to him: 'Anyone who cannot uproot a Lebanese cedar while riding on his horse shall not be enlisted in your army.' And he had 200,000 of these [with amputated fingers] and 200,000 of those [who had uprooted a Lebanese cedar].

This tradition is similarly wrapped in legend. Despite reports from Cassius Dio that 580,000 Judeans died and 50 fortresses and 985 villages were razed (*Roman History*, 69:12.1-14.3), the size of Kosiba's army is still uncertain. Menahem Mor suggests that the Romans had 275,000 soldiers in country while Kosiba must have had at least 12,000 soldiers with greater numbers besides.⁴⁰⁶ The tradition alludes to the siege of Bethar (Khirbet al-Yahud) in 135 CE in which Kosiba is said to have 400,000 men.⁴⁰⁷ At first glance, y. Ta'anit 68d demonstrates a positive relationship between Kosiba and the Rabbis. Rather than outright dismissal, the tale paints Kosiba as a brutal but firm leader who demanded his soldiers demonstrate their loyalty to him by cutting off a finger. The rabbis offer criticism against this prerogative for it physically disables the man and tests his will, not his strength as a soldier. In addition, if any of the military leaders are priests, this act would preclude them from serving. Instead, the rabbis propose that soldiers demonstrate their fortitude by uprooting Lebanese cedar trees.⁴⁰⁸ The mythologized tradition suggests that at least initially, Kosiba's revolt benefited from popular support as well as the support of the sages.⁴⁰⁹

⁴⁰⁶ Geiger is likely correct in the claim, "The Jewish revolt was exceptional in that it must have aroused strong aversion also among the surrounding peoples" ("Bar-Kokhba Revolt," 501).

⁴⁰⁷ C.g., Raz Mustigman, *From the Mount of Olives to Immer: The Historical Significance of a Collection of Traditions on Destruction from the Sugya and Bethar was captured" in the Palestinian Talmud* (Ph.D diss.; Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 2006).

⁴⁰⁸ A cedar of Lebanon supposedly can reach 40 feet in girth and 90 feet in height. Schäfer characterizes this as an aggadic motif without historical value (*Der Bar Kokhba-Aufstand*, 170ff). However, there are no models in scripture and rabbinic literature for a test such as ripping out trees. See Richard Marks' comments immediately following (Marks, *The Image of Bar Kokhba in Traditional Jewish Literature* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University, 1994), 32).

⁴⁰⁹ Adele Reinhartz, "Rabbinical Perceptions of Simeon Bar Kosiba," *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period* 20 (1989): 171-194, here 182.

However, to read the text positively does not honor the complexity of the dialogue within the passage. Kosiba's authority and wisdom are doubted by the rabbis. The answer Kosiba offers does not align with the question posed to him – 'when will you stop mutilating Israel?' The question, while may be inspired by the test of fortitude, is not about Kosiba's practices as a general. The response is just as glaring – the only way Kosiba can prove his army is worthy of their work is by uprooting and destroying the countryside: the mutilation of Israel applies not just to Kosiba's army, but to the land itself. In contrast to David, the textual tradition that invokes Kosiba's memory in the second and third century CE depicts him as a poor leader by destroying both the land and the bodies of Israel.

Another comparison between Kosiba and David is through the act of prayer. Immediately before the battle at Bethar, Kosiba offers a prayer to YHWH:

"Master of the Universe, do not help and do not embarrass us. Did you, God, not loathe us? And do not go out against our armies."

Kosiba's prayer stems from Psalm 60:10, 12, though the shift in wording offers a different interpretation. In the context of Psalm 60:10, 12, the prayer is a lament of YHWH's abandonment and plea for intervention. Presented in a jumbled order and placed on the lips of Kosiba, it demonstrates that Kosiba does not have a mind for Torah and functions as a request for YHWH's non-involvement in the conflict between Israel and Rome. There is no direct comment from the rabbis on Kosiba's prayer. However, both the Second Temple and rabbinic traditions affirm that YHWH's intervention is necessary for success.⁴¹⁰ The passage portrays Kosiba as a faulty and arrogant leader who has followed his own will over YHWH. This depiction of Kosiba stands in direct contrast to David reviewed above. Where David fervently comes to YHWH and through self-deprecation humbles himself, Kosiba goes to the extreme in raising himself above God and takes control of Israel's fate himself.

Richard Marks proposes that Kosiba's acts of strength and valor are associated with the mighty men in the Second Temple Jewish traditions.⁴¹¹ Kosiba, for Marks, is modeled after other men who have such "extraordinary strength" that they "tended to become boastful and

⁴¹⁰ E.g., Joshua 11:11 b. Berakhot 54b.

⁴¹¹ A similar perspective is argued G. S. Aleksandrov, "The Role of 'Aqiba' in the Bar-Kokhba Rebellion," *Revue des études juives* 132 (1973): 65-77.

overconfident, forgetting that his [their] strength depended upon the will of God.”⁴¹² According to Marks, Sennacherib, for example, exhibits some of the same faults as Kosiba (e.g., 2 Kings 19:21-28; Isaiah 10:12-15). Isaiah 10:13 in particular reads:

By the strength of my hand I have done it, and by my wisdom, for I have understanding; I have removed the boundaries of peoples, and have plundered their treasures; like a bull I have brought down those who sat on thrones.

If true, the rabbis present Kosiba as a warrior of old, reconstituting the image of a wayward *gebbor* (Dan 3:20). The above analysis does not contrast with Marks’ conclusion, but more precisely locates Kosiba within the social tensions of the second century CE. Without the mirroring of David, the rabbinic depiction of Kosiba remains incomplete. Although not comprehensive, this brief comparison of David and Kosiba illustrates the formation of identity around their respective abilities to control their inclinations. Marks’ theory accounts for visions of the failed *gebbor*, but creates no model for positive examples and how the nuances of each play out in the word play and literature of the rabbis.

The brief examples above suggest that the rabbinic literature was revised to benefit Jehudah HaNasi, as the claimant to the Davidic lineage and cultural head after the Kosiba revolt.⁴¹³ In the above study, I have focused on how Kosiba relates to his context. The primary evidence we possess from the revolutionaries do not reflect overt messianic emphases, as some interpreters have argued to the detriment of the evidence. The minimization of revolutionaries (Kosiba and Akiba) and the magnification of politically submissive rulers (Jehudah) set a new standard of leadership during the late second century CE and beyond. As the first leader in a long line of leaders to take the title ‘HaNasi,’ “The Rabbi” used his massive wealth and his command of halakah and multiple languages (Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek) to serve as an intermediary with the Roman authority and begin the process of codifying the oral tradition for the Mishnah.⁴¹⁴ In contrast to Kosiba, Jehudah HaNasi more closely aligns with the practice and principles of the Hasmonean priests in seeking the reconstitution of Jewish identity. The political and religious vacuum following Kosiba’s revolution initiated a new form of Judaism that

⁴¹² Marks, *Bar Kokhba*, 33.

⁴¹³ Genesis Rabbah 98:8; Shabbat 56a; Ketuvot 62b.

⁴¹⁴ For Jehudah HaNasi’s command of various languages, see Sotah 49b and Rosh Hashanah 26b.

continues to endure in diverse forms. Kosiba, mythologized as a victim to his *yetzer hara*, is integral to this heritage.

Kosiba's letters do not represent a strong example of messianic discourse. However, the rabbis' interpretation of the second century CE revolutionary clearly uses messianic discourse to shape the formation of the origins of Rabbinic Judaism. Painting Kosiba as a failed revolutionary who suffered his appropriate outcome, realigns social, economic, and cultural capital. The Mishnaic and Talmudic evidence depict him as one who is disobedient to his teachers and his actions as too far beyond the norms and values of proper Jewish leadership from the second century to remain within the fold. While any war will displace economic, social, and cultural capital, the retelling of Kosiba's memory in the Jewish annals appear to focus on social and cultural capital: to remain faithful to the nature and established covenant of Judaism, Jews are not to rebel or forsake the inherited traditions. Jehudah, as a Davidic claimant, reinforces the sociopolitical narrative of ancient Judaism at the cost of Kosiba's memory.

Conclusion: Kosiba or Koziba?

Simeon Bar Kosiba was a charismatic and domineering leader in the second century CE. I have argued here that his memory is wrapped in messianic discourse from rabbinic literature. The exploration above is not intended to be comprehensive but demonstrates a consistent manner in explaining his behavior. When compared with the memory of David in rabbinic literature, we find that the rabbis – if we can even speak of this group as a singular entity – attribute Kosiba's failure was due to his inability to control himself, the *yetzer hara* that impacts every person. The rabbinic response to Kosiba represents messianic discourse in that the language of messianism is used to address the social tensions with the burgeoning leadership of rabbinic Judaism. I agree with Yadin who, at the end of his career, argues that searching for “Bar Kokhba” is to pursue a myth. Yadin writes:

...When all the fragmentary tales and traces of Bar Kokhba were assembled they amounted to no more than the lineaments of a ghost. He figured in Jewish folklore more as a myth than a man of flesh and blood, as impersonal as a Hercules or a King Arthur. It was centuries of persecutions of the Jews and their yearning for national rehabilitation that turned Bar Kokhba into a people's hero—an elusive figure they clung to because he

had demonstrated, and was the last to demonstrate, that the Jews could fight to win spiritual and political independence.⁴¹⁵

Authors and redactors in the second and third centuries CE used Kosiba's memory within messianic discourse to shape the origins of Rabbinic Judaism.

⁴¹⁵ Yadin Yigael, *Bar-Kokhba: The Rediscovery of the Legendary Hero of the Last Jewish Revolt against Imperial Rome* (Jerusalem: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971), 27.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

Introduction

Messianic discourse continues to influence today's culture and politics. On August 21, 2019, former president Donald Trump spoke to the media on the West Lawn concerning the impending trade conflict with China.⁴¹⁶ He boldly claimed,

We are winning against China. They have lost 2.5 million jobs in a very short period of time. They want to make a deal. It's got to be a deal that's good for the United States. We want to make a deal, probably we will make a deal, but if I didn't do that, I'm not doing that... Someone said this is Trump's trade war – this isn't my trade war; this is a trade war that should have taken place a long time ago by a lot of other presidents. Over the last five or six years, China has made 500 billion dollars, five hundred billion; ripped it out of the United States. And not only that, if you take a look, intellectual property theft, add that to it and add a lot of other things to it. So somebody had to do it, I am the Chosen One, somebody had to do it.

At the moment when he claimed he was 'the Chosen One,' Trump paused and dramatically turned away from the cameras to look to the sky. Without skipping a beat, he began his rant again.

Conservative political commentator Wayne Allyn Root affirmed Trump's claim to be the Chosen One and expanded it. Root waxed poetically:

like he's the King of Israel. They love him like he is the second coming of God...But American Jews don't know him or like him. They don't even know what they're doing or saying anymore. It makes no sense! But that's OK, if he keeps doing what he's doing, he's good for...

⁴¹⁶ Donald Trump. Interview with Associated Press. Recording and transcript by BBC. August 21, 2019. <https://www.bbc.com/news/av/world-us-canada-49429661>.

Root's original comment as well as Trump's retweet of Root's comment were removed by Twitter. However, news stations repeated it and so it was preserved in the public record.⁴¹⁷ Furthermore, Rev. Franklin Graham, son of popular the Baptist preacher Rev. Billy Graham, gave an interview shortly after Trump's declaration to call his supporters to stand with Trump: "I just have to think that God, in some reason, put him there for a purpose. I don't know what that is, but we need to get behind him and support him."⁴¹⁸ Trump's claim was never publicly disavowed by conservative religious leaders, despite Trump's poor ethical patterns of leadership and verbal abuses lobbed indiscriminately at all who crossed him. I suspect that, similar to Kosiba, Trump's following of his *yetzer hara* would at some point disqualify him from leadership in the eyes of conservative Christians, to whom Root and Graham are members.⁴¹⁹ However, the mantle of leadership bestowed on him in the 21st century cannot be ignored. It is an understatement to say that Trump's presidency will shape the course of politics and religion in the United States for years to come.

Trump's combination of politics and religion serve as a prime example of modern messianic discourse. Trump knowingly used a title that has a long lineage stemming from ancient Jewish messianism.⁴²⁰ The dramatic pause to look toward the sky suggests that he intentionally positioned himself in relation to the divine. His unstated but implicit claim to socioreligious authority was further bolstered by the outspoken religious leaders who supported his claim, affirming his call by God to lead the United States. Both commentators used images and language common in American conservative Christianity to locate Trump within the

⁴¹⁷ "Donald Trump: 'I am the Chosen One.'" <https://premierchristian.news/en/news/article/donald-trump-i-am-the-chosen-one>

⁴¹⁸ The original post on Graham's website has since been removed, but his comments are still accessible through other outlets, such as the religious news report: <https://premierchristian.news/en/news/article/donald-trump-i-am-the-chosen-one>. See also, <https://www.cnn.com/2019/08/21/i-am-the-chosen-one-trump-proclaims-as-he-defends-china-trade-war.html>

⁴¹⁹ I recognize that the analogy between Trump and Kosiba definitely breaks here: Trump and the political party that supports him are not primarily Jewish, but rather might be characterized as Christian nationalists, some of whom actively participate in antisemitism. My objective with this statement is to hypothesize that at some point in the future, Trump's actions are likely to be viewed less favorably, suffering a similar fate to Kosiba.

⁴²⁰ There are several other cultural references to the 'Chosen One' as a messianic trope, so I am not claiming that Trump himself is familiar with 1 Enoch referenced above or the literature in general. Other known cultural examples include the protagonist of Alanna of Trebond ('Chosen of the Goddess') from Tamora Pierce's series, *The Song of the Lioness Quartet* (see *In the Hand of the Goddess* (New York City: Simon & Schuster, 2018)); Harry Potter is consistently referred to as the 'Chosen One' throughout the Harry Potter series by J. K. Rowling (see *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix* (New York City: Scholastic Paperbacks, 2005)); in a mighty example of messianic discourse within young adult novels, Roran Stronghammer presents himself as the 'Chosen One' to lead the families of Palancar Valley to safety in Christopher Paolini's *Inheritance Cycle* (see *Eldest* (New York City: Alfred A. Knopf Publisher), 2005).

Christian narrative (e.g., ‘second coming;’ ‘God put him’ in a position of power). By claiming to be YHWH’s Chosen One, Trump tapped into a sociolinguistic way of claiming authority.

Trump is one example among many modern Christian messianic claimants. Yahweh ben Yahweh, another self-proclaimed Christian messiah, describes himself as a black nationalist and separatist from Miami. He founded the ‘Nation of YHWH’ movement. Although he took a vow of poverty, his church raised approximately 250 million dollars to support his work. At the core of their community’s belief is that black people are true Israelites while white people are evil or satanic. Yahweh ben Yahweh’s leadership and judgment are absolute. There are several reports that he coordinated the murders of several leaders within his own circle who challenged his leadership. Through his teaching and preaching, Yahweh ben Yahweh shifts or affirms the social, ethnic, and political boundaries of his community.

Neither is this discourse unique to contemporary, American Christianity. In the 14th century CE history, *Kitāb al-‘Ibar*, philosopher and sociologist Ibn Khaldun notes there were several people who claimed to be the *Mahdi*, a term meaning ‘divine guidance,’ but which also serves as an epithet in some circles of Islam for a hoped-for messiah. Most notable figures include Muhammad Shirazi, Muhammad Ahmad, and Wallace Fard Muhammad, all who claimed to be or were described by their followers as messiah figures. Each of these leaders established a following and claimed control over a geographical area for a short time. Due to the constant rise and fall of leaders, Khaldun doubted that these charismatic leaders would fulfill the vision(s) for the messiah in Islam. Similar to the rabbinic response to Kosiba, Khaldun reflects negatively upon the occurrence of previous messiah figures, but he personally does not appear to give up hope for an apocalyptic intervention through a divine agent.

In the 17th century, Sabbatai Zevi, a Sephardic Jew by tradition, claimed to be the Jewish messiah.⁴²¹ Sabbatai initiated a religious reform movement that spread quickly. However, later in life he converted to Islam. His followers remained committed to the understanding that he was a messiah and splintered from rabbinic Judaism. His followers adopted his name for their title – they are known as the Sabbateans.

These examples demonstrate that messianic discourse is not unique to Second Temple Judaism and continues to influence our social, ethnic, and political environments today. In each

⁴²¹ Gershom G. Scholem, *Sabbatai Ševi: The Mystical Messiah, 1626–1676* (Trans. by R. J. Zwi Werblowsky; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016).

case, the individual claimed to be or were described by their followers as a messiah through terms or actions that breach social, religious, and political realms of society. Through their charismatic leadership, they wielded power that authorized them to affirm or shift the social, economic, and cultural capital of the people around them. If we move ourselves away from the framing of ancient and modern messianism conceptually as genre or religious concern, or as a methodological approach limited by specific phonemes, we are better able to engage it as an ongoing discourse of power. This allows us to interpret messiahs and messianism anew.

Four Messianic Discourses: A Review

Jewish messianic discourse from Second Temple Judaism is organically related to the modern examples above, but stands apart due to differences in their respective messianic terms, conceptions of evil, and social context. This research project presented four test cases of messianic discourse from ancient Judaism. Each test case illuminates how an author(s) deployed messianic discourse to affirm or shift the social, ethnic, and political boundaries of their particular group.

In comparison to previous studies of messiahs that focus on specific lexemes or attempt to map messianism within a larger construction of history from a religious perspective, I draw on Pierre Bourdieu's theory on sociolinguistics to argue that some ancient Jewish authors employed messianism when (re)establishing internal boundary markers. Bourdieu's emphasis upon language as a dialectical process helped me to hypothesize in chapter one that an author's claim to be a messiah, or a community in direct relationship with a messiah, has powerful rhetorical effects. As a work of historical and anthropological reflection, the intention of this project was not to significantly advance Bourdieu's theoretical musings in relation to the history of religions, but to focus upon how authors (a) referred to messianism in relation to other ideologies, mainly focusing upon conceptions of sin and evil, and (b) how this complex understanding of messianism appears in social conflict as documented or alluded to in our literary witnesses of the Second Temple period. In each test case, I draw out how an author changed the cultural, social, and economic capital through messianic discourse.

In the first test case, I analyze the 'book' of Isaiah. Likely compiled in the sixth or fifth century BCE, Isaiah invoked the messiah in relation to priestly practices. The second portion of Isaiah labels the Persian ruler Cyrus as messiah (מָשִׁיחַ), the only occasion in the Second Temple

Hebrew texts that a non-Jew receives the honorific title. The title does not represent an acceptance of Cyrus as a ruler, but within the narrative elevates him as a defender of monotheism. The second and third portions of Isaiah shift cultural capital by highlighting the abuses of guilds or associations relating to the temple in Jerusalem and social capital by emphasizing a different set of boundary markers for participation in the post-exilic Jewish community.

In the second test case, I highlight that only two parts of 1 Enoch, the Similitudes of Enoch and the Animal Apocalypse invoke a messianic figure. Penned between the fourth and first century BCE, 1 Enoch presents a perspective of the world that spans from primordial time through the eschaton and was completely corrupted through the myth of Fallen Angels. Evil is manifest in all people, but especially pungent in the corrupt elite who abuse their positions of power. The respective authors of the Similitudes of Enoch and the Animal Apocalypse invoke the Son of Man through title and analogy to critique those abuses and forecast punishment for those responsible. Through the authority of the Son of Man, the authors shift social and economic capital by reconstructing the socio-religious boundaries between Jews and non-Jews to allow the repentant to join the community. I also postulate that through a brief analysis of the texts found at Khirbet Qumran, this ideology potentially caused a rift between ancient Jews who were a part of the desert community. This postulation provides a potential answer as to why the Similitudes, which so closely ideologically aligns with the collection, was not preserved in the cache.

In the third test case, I analyze the Gospel of Matthew. This first century CE biography of Jesus offers a rich story about the itinerant preacher from ancient Galilee. Through conflict with the Pharisees, Scribes, and the followers of John the Baptist, Matthew's Jesus proposes a corrective to several ideological issues. I argue that Matthew, influenced by the conception of evil in 1 Enoch, elevates the Pharisees to a mythological level and recasts them by analogy as the Fallen Angels that reveal debunk wisdom to their followers. Matthew's messianic discourse elevates Jesus' authority above that of the Pharisees and John the Baptist through Jesus' farewell speech in Matthew 23-25. A comparison with Abraham's farewell speech in Jubilees 21-24 highlights not only some thematic connections in the subgenre of the speech, but strong ideological connections. Deployed at various points to shift cultural, social, and economic

capital, Matthew's messianic discourse is best understood within a competition hypothesis in the first century CE.

In the fourth test case, I analyze the literature relating to Sim'eon Bar Kosiba. A second century CE revolutionary, his epistles present him as a charismatic and domineering leader. I argue that we do not have enough evidence to confidently claim Kosiba saw himself as a messiah. What is interesting about Kosiba's case is that the messianic title was assigned to him by interpreters of a later time. In the aftermath of the 132-135 revolt, the rabbis who supported Kosiba, most notably Rabbi Akiba, were shown to be wrong. Later rabbis disparaged Kosiba's leadership and depicted him as wayward and lacking an ability to control himself. A comparison with the reception of King David in rabbinic literature indicates that rabbinic texts depict Kosiba as having fallen victim to his *yetzer hara*. This distinction allows some contemporary leaders, such as Jehudah HaNasi, to reaffirm that any appropriate leader will descend from David's lineage and will not rebel against overlords, however harsh they might be. Coming at least a generation after Kosiba's death, the messianic discourse around the revolutionary shifts social and cultural capital in favor of Jehudah HaNasi.

From this collective evidence, I posit that messianic discourse was a discrete type of discourse in the Second Temple period. In each text, the authors state or imply that certain behaviors or groups were not acceptable by depicting them as evil or sinful. By either claiming the authority of the messiah or presenting a narrative containing a messiah, these authors reformulate their community's relationship with that which is considered evil. In so doing, they create or reaffirm their community's respective boundary concerning that issue or group.

Results of this Study

The in-depth study of these four test cases leads me to three conclusions. First, each example of messianic discourse described here is enmeshed in some sort of conflict. The examples I have drawn on do not appear to speak negatively of outsiders: they address members of the community who pushed against or shattered the established or perceived norms and values. While the authors define each insider group anew, they share a common relationship to what are known as ancient Jewish traditions: geographical relationship to ancient Palestine, relationship to YHWH as a divine figurehead, and similar ethnic practices, among other traits. An outsider, for instance, would not necessarily find the value in a narrative about the

redemption of Judah. Any argument that messianism's primary literary purposes are conversion literature or evangelistic in nature (outward facing), misunderstands the nature of Second Temple Jewish messianism.

Second, I presented these test cases in a particular order. While they are all within the same (heuristic) time period and may be read separately, I have set them in a proposed historical order because the texts represent the ideological development of the Second Temple Period. For example, the Gospel of Matthew quotes the Isaiah tradition, and the religious holidays referenced in Kosiba's letters are compared with the traditions in 2 Maccabees to identify changes. While stated in varying degrees, all messianic discourse interacts with and shapes cultural capital. Placing sources in a historical order further clarifies how authors are interacting with received culture or traditions.

Third, research on messianism based on genre, philology, or authoritative collections (e.g., canon) are more likely to hinder than illuminate our understanding. While I have shown that the messianic trope most frequently appears in eschatological or apocalyptic literary settings, it did not remain bound to those settings as it was broadly employed. These four test cases demonstrate that authors employed messianism across a wide variety of genres and subgenres. The knowledge of this distribution of literature reinforces what many now claim: while genre classifications are helpful for taxonomical divisions, they can shield important elements of texts from interpreters. Similarly, a study of messianism within a specific collection of ancient Jewish literature minimizes the number of occurrences and diversity of the available messianic discourse.

Future Studies

This framework and foundational study open several fresh avenues of research. As a conclusion to this study, I propose four potential areas of research.

(a) *Messianism in Non-textual Evidence*- The study of Isaiah, for example, is a small sampling of royal messianism that explores how the intertextuality within Isaiah creates a symbolic collective. This example of the change of social capital would not be possible without the preservation of the tradition through writing. This raises an important question concerning the medium of messianic discourse. Does messianic discourse function in the same capacity in non-textual evidence? Do the three parts of messianic discourse identified above (a messianic

title; conception of evil and sin; local context) still manifest in a similar way? Ancient physical objects, such as coins, signatory rings, imagery on mosaic floors, and monumental archeology, function as active social agents that interact with and develop the messianic traditions. Like manuscripts, these everyday objects were mostly created and used by the elite. If true, this assumption poses some fascinating research questions: How did ancient religious objects cross axis with sociopolitical ideology? In a mostly illiterate ancient culture, what didactic role did objects have in relation to Second Temple Judaism?

(b) *Habitus versus Worldview* - I stated in introduction that I moved away from the lens of 'worldview' due to my doubts about whether it is possible to enforce obedience to a particular ideology in the ancient world. I do not believe we can speak of a societal understanding of 'worldview' unless there is an authority that can enforce it. This shift also led me to abandon *habitus*, for the meaning of the respective words significantly overlap. I think it would be correct to posit a *habitus* of respective communities that center around certain perspectives and messianism might even serve as a central component. However, the pitfalls of addressing a messianic *habitus* would unfortunately fall into the same pitfalls as the language of worldview: we do not have the evidence to speak of a single messianic worldview throughout the texts just as we do not have the ability to speak of messianism in the singular. This project argues strictly against that perspective.

However, I think it is possible to articulate a messianic *habitus* or worldview when universally enforced by an imperial or military force, an authoritative body that can command obedience to an ideology. At first glance, it may only be appropriate to speak of a Christian worldview(s) or *habitus* after the adoption of Christianity by Rome as the state-authorized religion. This sentiment is reinforced on the most basic level through the group's name that is formed on the group's namesake. More work needs to be done on this intersection between populism and messianism within the history of religions.

(c) *Gendering and Jewish Messianism* – This project has focused upon a description and brief analysis of messianism in four test cases. The advantages and findings of this approach can now be applied to subsets of characters within individual narratives. One future application of messianic discourse is in terms of gender studies. How do gender norms shape the depiction of a messiah? Do authors cast messiahs in masculine or feminine terms? And how do messiahs curate gender for those with whom they interact? Is this application of gender equal upon all social

classes? Are these concepts used to reinforce hegemonic gender norms, or do they subvert them? If not subversive, then might we confidently claim that messianism in the ancient world is male normative? If so, what does that mean when an author feminizes a messiah or someone through the word or deed of a messiah?

(d) Non-Jewish Messianism – I have labored in this project to demonstrate how messianism was employed in ancient Jewish social, religious, and ethnic conflict. The term ‘messianism’ is native to ancient Judaism and does not easily transfer into other socio-religious settings. However, I would argue that messianic discourse abounds in the ancient world. Many leaders, such as Hellenistic kings, claimed divine parenthood and so asserted divine authority to lead. Octavian Augustus in particular boldly claims this divine authority in his reforms. From a Roman perspective, the early Christian community probably looked similar to other Roman mystery cults. Such a comparison of messianic discourse across ancient Mediterranean religions would open new understanding about the nature of religious discourse in the ancient world.

Conclusion

Several authors in Second Temple Judaism employed messianic discourse to affirm or shift the social, ethnic, and political boundaries of their communities. I have shown that the real or hoped-for messiah figures served as a helpful trope to reimagine the power structures that played an important part for some authors in defining ancient Judaism. This approach and the four test cases demonstrate the power of dynamic language within social contexts and lays a foundation to analyze messianic discourse anew in other ancient and modern contexts.

Bibliography

- Abegg, Martin G. "1QSB and the Elusive High Priest." Pages 3-16 in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov, vol. 1*. Edited by Shalom Paul, et al. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Ackroyd, Peter. "Isaiah I-XII: Presentation of a Prophet." *VTSup* 29 (1978): 16-48.
- Aland, Kurt. *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum: Locis parallelis evangeliorum apocryphorum et partum adhibitis edidit*. Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 1996.
- Aleksandrov, G. S. "The Role of 'Aqiba' in the Bar-Kokhba Rebellion." *Revue des études juives* 132 (1973): 65-77.
- Alexander, Phillip S. "The Parting of the Ways' from the Perspective of Rabbinic Judaism." Pages 1-26 in *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways AD 70 to 135*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992.
- Allegro, John M. "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature." *JBL* 75 (1956): 174-87.
- Allen, David. "Substitutionary Atonement and Cultic Terminology in Isaiah 53." Pages 171-89 in *Gospel according to Isaiah 53*. Edited by Darrell Block and Mitch Glaser. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2012.
- Allison, Dale C. *Companions to the New Testament: The Sermon on the Mount: Inspiring the Moral Imagination*. New York: Crossroad, 1999.
- _____. *The Tradition of Jesus in Q*. Trinity Press International: Harrisburg, 1997.
- Almagor, Eran. "Jerusalem and the Bar Kokhba Revolt Again: A Note." *Electrum* 26 (2019): 41-157.
- Applebaum, Shimon. *Prolegomena to the Study of the Second Jewish Revolt (A.D. 132-135)*. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports, 1976.
- Argall, Randal A. "Competing Wisdoms: 1 Enoch and Sirach." *Henoch* 24 (2002): 169-178.
- Auld, A. Graeme, and Erik Eynikel (eds). *For and Against David: Story and History in the Books of Samuel*. BETL 232. Leuven: Peeters, 2010.
- Babota, Vasile. *The Institution of the Hasmonean High Priesthood*. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- "Babylon: The Cyrus Cylinder," The Land of Israel / Palestine: Image Database, accessed March 26, 2020, <https://ancient-world-project.nes.lsa.umich.edu/image-database/items/show/120>.
- Backhaus, Knut. *Die "Jüngerkreise" des Täufers Johannes: Eine Studie zu den religionsgeschichtlichen Ursprüngen des Christentums*. Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1991.

- Baldensperger, Wilhelm. *Der Prolog des vierten Evangeliums. Sein polemisch-apologetischer Zweck*. Freiburg: Mohr Siebeck, 1898.
- Ball, Edward. "The Co-regency of David and Solomon (1 Kings 1)." *VT* 27 (1977): 268-79.
- Baltzer, Klaus. *Deutero-Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 40-55*. Translated by Margaret Kohl. Edited by Peter Machinist. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- Bar-Efrat, Shimon. "From History to Story: The Development of the Figure of David in Biblical and Post-Biblical Literature." Pages 47-56 in *For and Against David: Story and History in the Books of Samuel*. Edited by A. Graeme Auld and Erik Eynikel. BETL 232; Leuven: Peeters, 2010.
- Baras, Z. *Messianism and Eschatology*. Jerusalem: The Historical Society of Israel, 1983.
- Barth, Hermann. *Die Jesaja-Worte in der Josiazeit*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 48. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1977.
- Bauckham, Richard. *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Bauer, Walter. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Third edition. Revised and edited by Frederick William Danker. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957. Repr., Chicago: University of Chicago, 2000.
- Baumgarten, Albert. "The Role of Jerusalem and the Temple in 'End of Days' Speculation in the Second Temple Period." Pages 77-89 in *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality*. Edited by L. I. Levine. New York: Continuum Intl Pub Group, 1999.
- Baumgartner, Walter, Ludwig Köhler, and Johann Stamm. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. 2 volumes. Leiden: Brill, 1993.
- Baxter, Wayne. "Healing and the 'Son of David: Matthew's Warrant.'" *Novum Testamentum* 48, 1 (2006): 36-50.
- Becker, Joachim. *Isaias – der Prophet und sein Buch*. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 30. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1968.
- _____. *Messianic Expectation in the Old Testament*. Translated by David E. Green. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.
- _____. "Wurzel und Wurzelproß: Ein Beitrag zur hebräischen Lexikographie." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 20 (1976): 22-44.

- Bedenbender, Andreas. "The Place of the Torah in the Early Enoch Literature." Pages 65-79 in *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. JSJSup121. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Bell, Richard H. *Deliver us from Evil: Interpreting the Redemption from the Power of Satan in New Testament Theology*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Bellinger, William (Jr). and William Farmer (ed). *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 1998.
- Berger, Klaus. "Die königlichen Messiastraditionen des Neuen Testaments." *NTS* 20 (1973): 1-44.
- Berges, Ulrich. *Jesaja 40-48*. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2008.
- _____. "Trito-Isaiah and the Reforms of Ezra-Nehemiah: Consent or Conflict?" *Bibl* 98, 2 (2017): 173-190.
- Beuken, W. A. M. "Isaiah Chapters LXV-LXVI: Trito Isiah and the Closure of the Book of Isaiah." Pages 204-221 in *Congress Volume Leuven 1989*. Leiden: Brill, 1991.
- Beyerle, Stefan. "'A Star Shall Come out of Jacob:' A Critical Evaluation of the Balaam Oracle in the Context of Jewish Revolts in Roman Times." Pages 163-188 in *The Prestige of the Pagan Prophet Balaam in Judaism, Early Christianity and Islam*. Edited by George H. van Kooten and Jacques van Ruiten. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Birch, Bruce C. "The Development of The Tradition on the Anointing of Saul in 1 Sam 9:1-10:16." *JBL* 90 (1971): 55-68.
- Black, Matthew. "The Messianism of the Parables of Enoch: Their date and Contribution to Christological Origins." Pages 145-168 in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by James Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- _____. *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*. New York: Scribners, 1961.
- Black, Matthew in consultation with James VanderKam. *The Book of Enoch, or 1 Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes*. SVTP 7. Leiden, Brill, 1985.
- Blank, Sheldon H. *Prophetic Faith in Isaiah*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1967.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Isaiah 1-39: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible Commentary. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.

- _____. *Isaiah 40-55: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible Commentary. New York: Double Day, 2002
- _____. “Trito-Isaiah (Isaiah 55-66) and the gôlâh group of Ezra, Schecaniah, and Nehemiah (Ezra 7-Nehemiah 13): Is There a Connection?” *JSOT* 43, 4 (2019): 661-677.
- Block, Daniel. “Bringing Back David: Ezekiel’s Messianic Hope.” Pages 167-88 in *The Lord’s Anointed: Interpretation of Old Testament Messianic Texts*. Edited by Phillip E. Satterthwaite, Richard S. Hess, and Gordon J. Wenham. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995.
- Boccacini, Gabriele (ed). *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- _____. “Eschatology in the Enochic Traditions.” In ebook *Protology and Eschatology in the Enochic Traditions*. Edited by Hilary Marlow, Karla Pollmann, and Helen Van Noorden. Oxfordshire: Routledge, 2021.
- _____. “How Jesus Became Uncreated.” Pages 185-209 in *Sibyls, Scriptures, and Scrolls: John Collins at Seventy*. Edited by Joel Baden, Hindy Najman, and Eibert Tigchelaar. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- _____. *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E.* Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1991.
- _____. *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- Bockmuehl, Marckus. “The Son of David and His Mother.” *JTS* 62 (2011): 476-93.
- Bornkamm, Günther. “Enderwartung und Kirche im Matthäusevangelium.” Pages 30-31 in *Ueberlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium*. WMANT 1. Second Edition. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961.
- Botner, Max. “The Messiah is the ‘Holy One’: As a Messianic Title in Mark 1:24.” *JBL* 136, 2 (2017): 417-433.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. “The Forms of Capital.” Pages 241-258 in *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. Edited by J. Richardson. Westport: Greenwood, 1986.
- _____. *Language & Symbolic Power*. Intro and edited by John B. Thompson. Translated by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- _____. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Boyarin, Daniel. *Carnal Israel: Reading Sex in Talmudic Culture*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993.

- _____. *The Jewish Gospel: The Story of the Jewish Christ*. New York: New Press, 2012.
- Brand, Miryam T. “*At the Entrance Sin is Crouching*”: *The Source of Sin and Its Nature as Portrayed in Second Temple Literature*. Unpublished dissertation. New York: New York University, 2011.
- _____. *Evil Within and Without: The Source of Sin and its Nature as Portrayed in Second Temple Literature*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.
- Brettler, Marc and Amy-Jill Levine. “Isaiah’s Suffering Servant: Before and After Christianity.” *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 73, 2 (2019): 158-73.
- Breuninger, Kevin. NBC report of Donald Trump Interview:
<https://www.cnbc.com/2019/08/21/i-am-the-chosen-one-trump-proclaims-as-he-defends-china-trade-war.html>
- Brooke, George J. *Exegesis at Qumran. 4QFlorilegium in Its Jewish Context*. JSOT 29. Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, 1985.
- _____. “Isaiah 40:3 and the Wilderness Community.” Pages 117-32 in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992*. Edited by George Brooke and Florentino García-Martínez. STDJ 15. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- _____. “King and Messiah in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 435-455 in *The King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceeding of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*. Edited by John Day. Sheffield: Sheffield Press, 1998.
- Brooten, Bernadette. *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2020.
- Brueggemann, Walter. *Isaiah 1-39*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1989.
- Bultmann, Rudolph. *Theology of the New Testament*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1968.
- Caquot, Andrew and Pierre Geoltrain, “Notes sur le texte éthiopien des Parables d’Hénoch.” *Sem* 13 (1963): 39-54.
- Carlson, Stephen. “The Davidic Key for Counting the Generations in Matthew 1:17.” *CBQ* 76,4 (2014): 665-683.
- Carlston, Charles E. “Wisdom and Eschatology in Q.” Pages 101-19 in *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus; The Sayings of Jesus*. Edited by Joël Delobel. BETL 59. Leuven: Peeters and Leuven University Press.
- Casey, P. Maurice. *The Solution to the ‘Son of Man’ Problem*. New York: T&T Clark, 2009.

- _____. *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7*. London: SPCK, 1979.
- _____. "The Use of Term [sic] 'Son of Man' in the Similitudes of Enoch." *JSJ* (1976): 11-29.
- Chapman, M., M. McDonald, and E. Tonkin. "Introduction--History and Social Anthropology." Pages 1-21 in *History and Ethnicity*. Edited by E. Tonkin, M. McDonald, and M. Chapman. ASA Monographs. London: Routledge, 1989.
- Charles, Robert H. *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1906.
- Charlesworth, James. "Can We Discern the Composition Date of the Parables of Enoch?" Pages 450-68 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- _____. "The Date of the Parables of Enoch (1 En. 37-71)." *Henoch* 20 (1998): 93-98.
- _____. "From Messianology to Christology: Problems and Prospects." Pages 3-35 in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by James Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- _____. "Select Bibliography on 'The Son of Man' and the Parables of Enoch." Pages 373-391 in *Parables of Enoch: A Paradigm Shift*. Edited by Darrell L. Bock and James H. Charlesworth. New York: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- Chester, Andrew. *Messiah and Exaltation*. WUNT. Tübingen; Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Chialà, Sabino. "The Son of Man: The Evolution of an Expression." Pages 153-78 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Childs, Brevard. *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress: 2011.
- _____. *Isaiah*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Clark, Elizabeth. *History, Theory, Text: Historians and the Linguistic Turn*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Clines, David. *I, He, We, & They: A Literary Approach to Isaiah 53*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1976.
- Coblentz Bautch, Kelly. *A Study of the Geography of 1 Enoch 17-19: 'No One Has Seen What I have Seen.'* Leiden: Brill, 2003.

- Cohen, Shaye. *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Collins, John. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. Second edition. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- _____. *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*. Semeia 14. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1979.
- _____. *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- _____. *The Bible after Babel: Historical Criticism in a Postmodern Age*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- _____. "Early Judaism in Modern Scholarship." Pages 1-19 in *The Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Edited by John J. Collins and Daniel Harlow. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- _____. "The Genre of the Book of Jubilees." Pages 737-755 in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James VanderKam*. Edited by Eric Mason. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- _____. "How Distinctive was Enochic Judaism?" *Merghillot* 5-6 (2007): 17-34.
- _____. *The Scepter and the Star: Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Second edition. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids: 2010.
- _____. "The Son of Man in First-Century Judaism." *NTS* 38, 3 (1992): 448-466.
- _____. "What is Apocalyptic Literature?" *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature*. Edited by John J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford Press, 2014. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199856497.013.001.
- Collins, John J. and Craig A. Evans (eds). *Christian Beginnings and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006.
- Collins, John J. and James Charlesworth (eds). *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Conference*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- Collins, Marilyn. *Messianic Interpretation of the Balaam Oracles*. PhD dissertation, Yale University, 1978.
- Cotton, Hannah. "Ein Gedi between the Two Revolts." *Scripta Classica Israelica* 20 (2001): 139-154.
- Cousland, J. Robert C. *The Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

- Dalley, Stephanie. "Anointing in the Ancient Mesopotamia." Pages 19-25 in *Oil of Gladness: Anointing in the Christian Tradition*. Edited by Martin Dudley and Geoffery Rowell. London: SPCK, 1993.
- Davies, Philip. *In Search of "Ancient Israel: A Study in Biblical Origins. The Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies*. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 1991.
- De Troyer, Kristen. "The Pronunciation of the Names of God: With some Notes Regarding the Nomina Sacra." Pages 143-72 in *Gottes Namen und Gott als Name*. Edited by I. U. Dalferth and P. Stoellger. Religion in Philosophy and Theology 35. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Dennert, Brian. "John the Baptist and the Jewish Setting of Matthew." PhD diss, Loyola University Chicago, 2013.
- Dietrich, Manfred and Oswald Loretz, "Der biblische Azazel und AIT 126." *UF* 25 (1993): 99-117
- Dillman, August. *Liber Henoch, aethiopice ad quinque codicum fidem editus cum variis lectionibus*. Leipzig: Fr. Chr. G Vogel, 1851.
- Dimant, Devorah. "The Biography of Enoch and the Books of Enoch." *BT* 33 (1983): 14-29.
- _____. "The Fallen Angels" in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphic Books Related to Them. Diss., Hebrew University: Jerusalem, 1974.
- _____. "1 Enoch 6-11: A Fragment of a Parabiblical Work." *JJS* 53 (2002): 223-37.
- DiTommaso, Lorenzo. "Apocalypse and Apocalypticism in Antiquity (Part I)." *CBR* 5, 2 (2007): 235-86.
- Doane, Sébastien. "Experiencing a Biblical Self-Consuming Artifact: Jesus' Genealogy (Matt 2:1-17)." *J. Bible and Its Reception* 7, 2 (2020): 115-146.
- "Donald Trump: 'I am the Chosen One.'" <https://premierchristian.news/en/news/article/donald-trump-i-am-the-chosen-one>.
- Dosse, François. *History of Structuralism: The Sign Sets, 1967-Present*. 2 vol. Translated by Deborah Glassman. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.
- Drawnel, Henryk. "The Mesopotamian Background of the Enochic Giants and Evil Spirits." *DSD* 21, 1 (2014): 14-38.
- Drummond, James. *The Jewish Messiah: A Critical History of the Messianic Idea Among the Jews from the Rise of the Maccabees to the Closing of the Talmud*. London: Longman, 1877.

- Duffield, Ian. "Difficult Texts: Matthew 23." *Theology* 123, 1 (2020): 16-19.
- Duhm, Bernhard. *Das Buch Jesaia*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck Ruprecht, 1914.
- Duling, Dennis C. "Solomon, Exorcism, and the Son of David." *HTR* 68, 3-4 (1975): 235-52.
- Eck, Werner. "The Bar Kokhba Revolt: The Roman Point of View." *JRS* 89 (1999): 76-89.
- _____. *Rom herausfordern: Bar Kochba im Kampf gegen das Imperium Romanum. Das Bild des Bar Kochba-Aufstandes im Spiegel der neuen epigraphischen Überlieferung*. Roma: Unione internazionale degli istituti di archeologia, storia e storia dell'arte, 2007.
- Edwards, Richard A. *The Sign of Jonah in the Theology of the Evangelists and Q*. Studies in Biblical Theology. London: SCM Press, 1971.
- Efremov, Victoria. *Motifs and Symbols (Associated with the Temple in Jerusalem) on the Coins of the Jewish Wars Against the Romans and the Bar Kokhba War*. M.A. Thesis. Haifa: University of Haifa, 2000.
- Ellis, Nicholas. *The Hermeneutics of Divine Testing*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.
- Erho, Ted. "Historical-Allusional Dating and the Similitudes of Enoch." *JBL* 130, 3 (2011): 493-511.
- Eshel, Hanan. "An Allusion in the Parables of Enoch to the Acts of Matthias Antigonus in 40 BCE?" Pages 487-91 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Eshel, Hanan and Boaz Zisu (eds.). *Innovations in the Research on the Bar Kokhba Revolt. 21st Annual Conference of the Martin Szusz Department of Land of Israel Studies, March 13, 2001*. Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 2001.
- Esler, Philip. *The Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.
- Evans, Craig A., ed. *The Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity: Studies in Language and Tradition*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Evans, Craig E. "Qumran's Messiah: How Important is He?" Pages 135-149 in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by John J. Collins and Robert A. Kugler. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Fischer, Johann. *In welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaias den LXX vor? Eine textkritische Studie*. BZAW 56; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1930.

- Fleming, Daniel. "The Biblical Tradition of Anointing Priests." *JBL* 117 (1998): 401-14.
- Flemming, Johannes. *Das Buch Henoch: Äthiopischer Text*. TUGAL 7, 1. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1902.
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin. "Jesus as the High Priestly Messiah: Part 2." *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* (2007): 57-79.
- _____. "Wisdom, Christianity, and the Parting of the Ways Between Judaism and Christianity." Pages 52-68 in *Christian-Jewish Relations through the Centuries*. Edited by Stanley Porter and Brook Peason. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Fonrobert, Charlotte. *Menstrual Purity: Rabbinic and Christian Reconstructions of Biblical Gender*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000.
- Fraade, Steven D. *The Damascus Document: Oxford Commentary on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022.
- Freedman, David Noel. *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Frey, Jörg. "New Testament Eschatology; An Introduction: Classical Issues, Disputed Themes, and Current Perspectives." Pages 3-32 in *Eschatology of the New Testament and Some Related Documents*. Edited by Jan G. van der Watt. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Fried, Lisbeth. "Cyrus the Messiah? The Historical Background to Isaiah 45:1." *HTR* 95, 4 (2002): 373-93.
- Friedman, Caleb. "Jesus' Davidic Lineage and the Case for Jewish Adoption." *NTS* 66 (2020): 249-267.
- Friedrich, Paul. "Language, Ideology, and Political Economy." *American Anthropologist* 91 (1989): 295-312.
- Furstenberg, Yair. "Jesus Against the Laws of the Pharisees: The Legal Woe Sayings and Second Temple Intersectarian Discourse." *JBL* 139, 4 (2020): 769-788.
- Gal, Susan. "Language and Political Economy." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 18 (1989): 345-367.
- Garrett, Susan R. *No Ordinary Angel: Celestial Spirits and Christian Claims About Jesus*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Geiger, Joseph. "The Bar-Kokhba Revolt: The Greek Point of View." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 65, 4 (2016): 497-519.

- Geischen, Charles A. *Angelmorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Gesenius, Wilhelm. *Der Prophet Jesaia*. 3 volumes. Leipzig: F. C. W. Vogel, 1820-21.
- Giardin, Michaël. "Leherut Yerushalayim: The Temple on The Coins of the Bar Kokhba War." *Electrum* 26 (2019): 159-176.
- Gichon, Mordechai. "New Insights into the bar Kokhba War and a Reprisal of Dio Cassius 69.12-13." *JQR* 77, 1 (1986): 15-43.
- Gillingham, Susan E. "The Messiah in the Psalms: A Question of Reception History and the Psalter." Pages 209-37 in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by John Day. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- _____. "Psalms 90-106: Book Four and the Covenant with David." *European Judaism* 48, 2 (2015): 83-101.
- Ginzberg, Louis and Israel Davidson. *Genizah Studies in Memory of Doctor Solomon Schechter*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1928.
- Goodblatt, David. *The Monarchic Principle: Studies in Jewish Self-Government in Antiquity*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.
- _____. "'The Title Nasi' and the Ideological Background of the Second Revolt." Pages 113-122 in *The Bar-Kokhba Revolt: A New Approach*. Edited by A. Oppenheimer and U. Rappaport. Jerusalem, 184.
- Goodenough, Erwin R. and Jacob Neusner. *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.
- Goodman, Martin. *State and Society in Roman Galilee A.D. 132-212*. Second edition. London: Vallentine Mitchell, 2001.
- Gore-Jones, Lydia. "Animals, Humans, Angels and God: Animal Symbolism in the Historiography of the 'Animal Apocalypse' of 1 Enoch." *JSP* 24,4 (2015): 268-87.
- Gosse, Bernard. "Sabbath, Identity and Universalism Go Together after the Return from Exile." *JSOT* 29,3 (2005): 359-370.
- Goswell, Greg. "Messianic Expectation in Isaiah 11." *Westminster Theological Journal* 79 (2017): 123-35.
- Grabbe, Lester. *Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period: Belief and Practice from the Exile to Yavneh*. New York: Routledge, 2000.

- _____. "The Scapegoat Tradition: A Study in Early Jewish Interpretation." *JSJ* 18, 2 (1987): 152-167.
- Graetz, Heinrich. *History of the Jews*. 6 vols. Edited by Bella Löwly. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1891-1898.
- Green, Adam. *King Saul: The True History of the First Messiah*. Cambridge: Lutterworth, 2007.
- Greenfield, Jonas C. and Michael E. Stone. "The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes." Pages 595-609 in volume 2 of *'Al Kanfei Yonah: Collected Studies of Jonas C. Greenfield on Semitic Philology*. Edited by Shalom M. Paul, Michael E. Stone, and Avital Pinnick. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Griesbach, Johann J. *Synopsis Evangeliorum Matthei, Marci et Lucae*. Halle, 1776.
- Gunkel, Hermann. *An Introduction to the Psalms*. Translated by James D. Nogalski. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998 (German Original, 1933).
- Habas (Rubin), Ephrat. "Rabban Gamaliel of Yavneh and his Sons: the Patriarchate before and after the Bar Kokhba Revolt." *JJS* 50, 1 (1999): 21-37.
- Hamilton, Victor. "Judah." *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 3:1032.
- Hanson, Paul. "Apocalypse, Genre" and "Apocalypticism." Pages 27-34 in *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible Supplement Volume*. Edited by Keith Crim. Nashville: Abingdon, 1976.
- _____. *Dawn of Apocalyptic*. Philadelphia: Augsburg Fortress, 1979.
- _____. "Messiahs and Messianic Figures in Proto-Apocalypticism." Pages 67-75 in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by James Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- Hayot, Eric. *The Elements of Academic Style: Writing for the Humanities*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2014.
- Heger, Paul. *Challenges to Conventional Opinions on Qumran and Enoch Issues*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Hellholm, David (ed). *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings for the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.
- Hendel, Ronald. "The Nephilim were on the Earth: Genesis 6:1-4 and Its Ancient Near East Context." Pages 11-34 in *The Fall of the Angels*. Edited by Christopher Auffarth and Loren Stuckenbruck. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

- Henderson, Ian H. and Gerbern S. Oegema, with the help of Sara Park Ricker (eds). *The Changing Face of Judaism, Christianity, and Other Greco-Roman Religions in Antiquity*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2006.
- Hengel, Martin. "Christology and New Testament Chronology." Pages 30-47 in *Between Jesus and Paul*. London: SCM, 1983. Repr., Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2003.
- _____. *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.
- Herr, Moshe David. "The Identity of the Jewish People Before and After the Destruction of the Second Temple: Continuity or Change?" Pages 211-36 in *Jewish Identities in Antiquity: Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern*. Edited by Lee Levine and Daniel Schwartz. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. *Jewish Messiahs in a Christian Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2017.
- Hindley, J. C. "Towards a Date for the Similitudes of Enoch." *NTS* 14 (1968): 551-65.
- Holtz, Barry W. *Rabbi Akiva: Sage of the Talmud*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017.
- Holtzmann, Heinrich Julius. *Die synoptischen Evangelien: ihr Ursprung und geschichtlicher Charakter*. Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann, 1863.
- Hooker, Mona. *The Son of Man in Mark: A study of the background of the term "Son of Man" and its use in St. Mark's Gospel*. Montreal: McGill University Press, 1967.
- Horbury, William. "The Messianic Associations of 'The Son of Man.'" *JTS* 36 (1985): 34-55.
- _____. *Messianism Among Jews and Christians: Biblical and Historical Studies*. Second edition. New York: T&T Clark, 2016.
- _____. "Messianism in the Old Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha." Pages 402-33 in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by John Day. JSOTSup, 270. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Horsley, Richard. *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs: Popular Movements in the Time of Jesus*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1985.
- Horsley, Richard with Jonathan A. Draper. *Whoever Hears You Hears Me: Prophets, Performance, And Tradition in Q*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1999.
- Hurtado, Larry and Paul Owen (eds.). "'Who Is This Son of Man?': The Latest Scholarship on a Puzzling Expression of the Historical Jesus." London: Bloomsbury, 2011.

- “‘I am the Chosen One,’ Trump Proclaims as He Defends Trade War with China.”
<https://www.cnbc.com/2019/08/21/i-am-the-chosen-one-trump-proclaims-as-he-defends-china-trade-war.html>
- Idel, Moshe. *Messianic Mystics*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.
- Institut für Neutestamentliche Testforschung. <http://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/liste>
- Instone-Brewer, David. “Two Assess.” *Tyndale Bulletin* 54, 1 (2003): 87-98.
- Irvine, Judith T. “Language Ideology.” Oxford Bibliographies Online (2012).
 doi:10.1093/OBO/9780199766567-002.
<https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199766567/obo-9780199766567-0012.xml?rskey=kdfiR&result=2&q=Language+Ideology#firstMatch>
- _____. “When Talk Isn’t Cheap: Language and Political Economy.” *American Ethnologist* 16 (1989): 248-267.
- Jackson, David. *Enochic Judaism: Three Defining Paradigm Exemplars*. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Janowsky, Bernd and Gernot Wilhelm. “Der Bock, der die Sünden hunausträgt. Zur Religionsgeschichte des Azazel-Ritus Lev. 16:10-21f.” Pages 106-69 in *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien und dem Alten Testament*. Edited by Bernd Janowski. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.
- Jassen, Alex P. *Mediating the Divine: Prophecy and Revelation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism*. STDJ 68. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Jastrow, Marcus. *Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli, and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. London: Trüber & Co., 1886.
- Jävinen, Arto. “Jesus as a Community Symbol in Q.” Pages 515–521 in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*. Edited by Andreas Lindemann. Leuven, Paris and Sterling. BETL 158. Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters.
- Joachimsen, Kristin. *Identities in Transition: The Pursuit of Isa. 52:13-53:12*. Vetus Testamentum, Supplements. Volume 142. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Joseph, Simon. *The Nonviolent Messiah*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2014.
- Juel, Donald. *Messianic Exegesis: Christological Interpretation of the Old Testament in Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- Kadman, Leo. *The Coins of the Jewish War*. Berlin: Schocken Publishing, 1960.

- Katz, Steven. "Issues in the Separation of Judaism and Christianity after 70 CE: A Reconstruction." *JBL* 103 (1984): 43-76.
- Keddie, G. Anthony. *Revelations of Ideology: Apocalyptic Class Politics in Early Roman Palestine*. Leiden: Brill, 2018.
- Kirk, Alan. *The Composition Saying Source*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- _____. "Q." Pages 73-107 in *The Reception of Jesus during the First Three Centuries*. Edited by Chris Keith, Helen Bond, Christine Jacobi, and Jens Schröter. London: Bloomsbury, 2020.
- Kirk, J. R. Daniel. "Mark's Son of Man and Paul's Second of Adam." *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 37, 2 (2015): 170-195.
- Klausner, Joseph. *The Messianic Idea in Israel from its beginning to the completion of the Mishnah*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1955.
- Kloppenborg, John. *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel*. Minneapolis: 1517 Media.
- _____. *Q: The Earliest Gospel: An Introduction to the Original Stories and Sayings of Jesus*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008.
- _____. *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1987.
- Knibb, Michael. "Eschatology and Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 379-402 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years, vol. 2*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- _____. "'Enoch and the Son of Man' Revisited: Further Reflections on the Text and Translation of 1 Enoch 70.1-2," *JSP* (2009): 233-240.
- _____. *Essays on the Books of Enoch and Other Early Jewish Texts and Traditions*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- _____. "The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review." *NTS* 25 (1978-79): 344-59.
- _____. "Teacher of Righteousness – A Messianic Title?" Pages 51-65 in *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History*. Edited by Phillip R. Davies and Richard T. White. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.
- _____. "The Translation of 1 Enoch 70.1: Some Methodological Issues." Pages 340-54 in *Biblical Hebrews, Biblical Texts: Essays in Memory of Michael P. Weitzman*. Edited by

- Ada Rapoport-Albert and Gillian Greenberg. JSOTSup, 333. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001. Reprinted in *Essays on the Book of Enoch and Other Early Jewish Texts and Traditions*. SVTP 22. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Knibb, Michael and Edward Ullendorff, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*. 2 volumes. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.
- Knohl, Israel. *The Messiah Before Jesus: The Suffering Servant of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
- Koch, Klaus. "Questions regarding the So-Called Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch: A Response to Sabino Chialà and Helge Kvanvig." Pages 228-37 in *Parables of Enoch: A Paradigm Shift*. Edited by Darrell L. Bock and James H. Charlesworth. New York: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- _____. *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*. Naperville: Allenson, 1972; translation of Ratlos vor der Apokalyphtik. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1970.
- Koenig, Jean. *L'herméneutique Analogique Du Judaïsme Antique D'après Les Témoins Textuels D'Isaïe*. Leiden: Brill, 1982.
- Kogon, Aaron J. and Jean-Philippe Fontanille. *The Coinage of Herod Antipas: A Study and Die Classification of the Earliest Coins of Galilee*. Leiden: Brill, 2018.
- Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Psalms 60-150*. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1990.
- Kuhn, Karl G. "The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel." Pages 54-64 in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. Edited by Krister Stendahl. New York: Harper, 1957.
- Kutscher, Edward Y. *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa)*. STDJ 6. Leiden: Brill, 1974
- Kvanvig, Helge. *Primeval History: Babylonian, Biblical, and Enochic: An Intertextual Reading*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 149; Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Laato, Antii. *A Star is Rising: The Historical Development of the Old Testament Royal Ideology and the Rise of the Jewish Messianic Expectations*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Lake, Joëlle. "YHWH, the ineffable name: Avoidance, Alternations and Circumventions in the Non-biblical Manuscripts at Qumran." Unpublished Diss., Trinity Western University, 2014.
- Landy, Francis. "Torah and Anti-Torah: Isaiah 2:24-1:10-26." *Biblical Interpretation* 11, 3/4 (2003): 317-334.

- Larsen, Erik. "The Translation of Enoch: From Aramaic into Greek." PhD Dissertation. New York: New York University, 1995.
- Laurence, Richard and Mashafa Henock Nabi. *The Book of Enoch the Prophet*. 2nd edition. Oxford: J. H. Parker, 1833.
- _____. *Mashafa Henock Nabi. Libri Enoch prophetae versio Aethiopica*. Oxford: Oxford Press, 1838.
- Lemche, Niels. *The Canaanites and Their Land*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- Lenowitz, Harris. *The Jewish Messiahs: From the Galilee to Crown Heights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Leonard-Fleckman, Mahri. "Utterance of David, the Anointed of the God of Jacob (2 Sam 23:1-7)." *JBL* 137, 2 (2018): 667-83.
- Leslau, Wolf. *Concise Dictionary of Ge'ez (Classical Ethiopic)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1989.
- _____. *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez: Ge'ez-English/English-Ge'ez*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1989.
- Levenson, Jon. "The Davidic Covenant and its Modern Interpreters." *CBQ* 41 (1979): 205-19.
- Levin, Yigal. "Jesus, 'Son of God' and 'Son of David': The 'Adoption' of Jesus into the Davidic Line." *JSNT* 28 (2006): 415-42.
- Levine, Amy-Jill. *The Misunderstood Jew: The Church and the Scandal of the Jewish Jesus*. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 2006.
- Lichtenberger, Herman. "The Divine Name in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in New Testament Writings." Pages 14-44 in *The Religious Worldviews Reflected in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 28-30 May, 2013*. Edited by Ruth Clements, Menahem Kister, and Michael Segal. Leiden: Brill, 2018.
- Liver, John. "The Doctrine of the Two Messiahs in the Sectarian Literature in the Time of the Second Common Wealth." *HTR* 52 (1959): 149-185.
- Longnecker, Richard. *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity*. London: SCM, 1970.
- Lucas, Shirley. *The Concept of the Messiah in the Scriptures of Judaism and Christianity*. LSTS 78. London: T&T Clark, 2011.

- Lücke, G. C. Friedrich. *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannis und in die gesammte apokalyptische Literatur*. Bonn: Weber, 1832.
- Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew 1-7: A Hermeneia Commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.
- _____. *Matthew 8-20: A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- Macrae, George. "Messiah and Gospel." Pages 169-186 in *Judaisms and their Messiahs and the Turn of the Christian Era*. Edited by Jacob Neusner, et al. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Madden, Fredrick W. *History of Jewish Coinage and of Money in the Old and New Testament*. Edited by H. Orlinsky. New York: Ktav, 1967.
- Maier, Johann. "Messias oder Gesalbter? Zu einemübersetzungs-un Deutungs-problem in den Qumrantexten." *Revue de Qumran* 17 (1996): 585-612.
- Mansini, Daniele. "Was John the Baptist an Apocalyptic Preacher? Some Enochic Remarks." Paper presentation at the Enoch Seminar's 2021 "John the Baptist" Virtual Conference, January 11-14.
- Mantel, Hugo. *Mehqarim Betoldot Ha-Sanhedrin*. Tel Aviv: Devir, 1969.
- Marcus, Joel. *John the Baptist in History and Theology*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2018.
- Marks, Richard. *The Image of Bar Kokhba in Traditional Jewish Literature*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University, 1994.
- Martínez, F. García. "Messianische Erwartungen in den Qumran-schriften." *Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie* 8 (1993): 171-208.
- Martínez, Florentino García and Julio Treballe Barrera. *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Translated by Wilfred G.E. Watson. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Martone Corrado. "The Enochic Tradition and the Diversity of Second Temple Judaism." *Henoch* 30 (2008): 51-55.
- Mason, Eric F. *'You are a Priest Forever': Second Temple Jewish Messianism and the Priestly Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Boston: Brill, 2008.
- Mason, Steve. "Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History." *JSJ* 38, 4 (2007): 457-512.

- McGrath, James. *The Only True God: Early Christian Monotheism in its Jewish Context*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2009.
- McNamara, Martin. "Early Exegesis in the Palestinian Targum (Neofiti 1) of Numbers Chapter 24." *Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association* 16 (1993): 57-79.
- Mearns, Christopher L. "Dating the Similitudes of Enoch." *NTS* 25 (1979): 360-69.
- Melugin, Roy E. *The Formation of Isaiah 40-55*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1976.
- Mermelstein, Ari. *Power and Emotion in Ancient Judaism: Community and Identity in Formation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021.
- Meshorer, Y. *Jewish Coins of the Second Temple Period*. Translated by I. H. Levine. Tel Aviv: Am Hassefer, 1967.
- Mettinger, Tryggve. *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of The Israelite Kings*. London: Coronet Books Inc, 1976.
- Milik, Jožef T. (ed) with Matthew Black. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
- Miller, David. "Ethnicity Comes of Age: An Overview of Twentieth-Century Terms for Ioudaios." *CBR* 10, 2 (2012): 293-311.
- Miller, James. "Ethnicity and the Hebrew Bible: Problems and Prospects." *CBR* 6, 2 (2008): 170-213.
- Miller, Merrill. "The Anointed Jesus." Pages 375-416 in *Redescribing Christian Origins*. Edited by Ron Cameron and Merrill P. Miller. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004.
- Miller Jr., Patrick D. *Interpreting the Psalms*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- Mithun, Marianne. "Discourse and Grammar" Pages 11-41 in *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Edited by Deborah Tannen, Heidi E. Hamilton, and Deborah Schiffrin. Second edition. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2018.
- Moore, G. F. *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era*. 3 vol. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1924. Repr., New York: Schocken, 1971.
- Mor, Menahem. *The Second Jewish Revolt: The Bar Kokhba War, 132-136 CE*. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Moscicke, Hans M. "The Final Judgment as Ritual Purgation of the Cosmos: The Influence of Scapegoat Traditions on Matt 25:31-46." *NTS* 67 (2021): 241-59.

- Mottahedeh, Patricia E. *The Coinage of the Bar Kokhba War*. Los Angeles: Numismatic Fine Arts Intl, 1984.
- Mowinkle, Sigmund. *He That Cometh*. Translated by W. G. Anderson. New York: Abingdon Press, 1954.
- _____. *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*. Translated by D. R. Ap-Thomas. 2 volumes. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962.
- Mroczek, Eva. *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Mullen, E. Theodore Jr. *Narrative History and Ethnic Boundaries: The Deuteronomistic Historian and the Creation of Israelite National Identity*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.
- Murray, Robert. "The Origin of Aramaic, 'ir, Angel.'" *Oriental* 53 (1984): 302-17.
- Mustigman, Raz. *From the Mount of Olives to Immer: The Historical Significance of a Collection of Traditions on Destruction from the Sugya and Bethar was Captured in the Palestinian Talmud*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 2006.
- Nelson, Andrew. "Who Is This?": Narration of the Divine Identity of Jesus in Matthew 21:10-17." *JTI* 7, 2 (2013): 199-211.
- Neusner, Jacob. "Preface." Page xiii in *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. Edited by W.S. Green and E. Frerichs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- _____. *The Systematic Analysis of Judaism*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.
- _____. (trans). *The Tosefta*. 6 vols. New York: Ktav, 1981.
- Newsom, Carol. "Spying Out the Land: A Report from Genology." Pages 437-50 in *Seeking Out the Wisdom of the Ancients*. Edited by R. L. Troxel, K. G. Friebel, and D. R. Magary. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005.
- Nickelsburg, George. "Apocalyptic and Myth in 1 Enoch 6-11." *JBL* 96 (1977): 383-405.
- _____. *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction*. 2nd edition. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.
- _____. *1 Enoch 1. Hermeneia Critical Commentary Series*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. and James VanderKam. *1 Enoch 1: The Hermeneia Translation*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012.

- _____. *1 Enoch 2. Hermeneia Critical Commentary Series*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012.
- Nielson, Kirsten. *There is Hope for a Tree: The Tree as Metaphor in Isaiah*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
- Nolan, Brian. *The Royal Son of God: The Christology of Matthew 1-2 in the Setting of the Gospel*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.
- North, Christopher. *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah: An Historical and Critical Study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1948.
- Novakovic, Lidija. *Messiah, the Healer of the Sick: A Study of Jesus as the Son of David in the Gospel of Matthew*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Novenson, Matthew. *Christ Among the Messiahs: Christ Language in Paul and Messiah Language in Ancient Judaism*. New York: Oxford, 2012.
- _____. *The Grammar of Messianism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- _____. "Why Does R. Akiba Acclaim Bar Kokhba as a Messiah?" *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 40 (2009): 551-572.
- Oegema, Gerbern. *The Anointed and His People: Messianic Expectations from the Maccabees to Bar Kochba*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998.
- _____. "Messianic Expectations in Qumran Writings: Theses on Their Development." Pages 53-82 in *Qumran-Messianism*. Edited by James Charlesworth, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Gerbern S. Oegema. Tübingen: Mohr & Siebeck, 1998.
- Oliver, Isaac. *Torah Praxis after 70 CE: Reading Matthew and Luke-Acts as Jewish Texts. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.*
- Olson, Daniel. *A New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch: 'All Nations Shall Be Blessed.'* Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- _____. *Enoch: A New Translation: The Ethiopic Book of Enoch, or 1 Enoch, Translated with Annotations and Cross-References*. North Richland Hills: BIBAL Press, 2004.
- _____. "Enoch and the Son of Man in the Epilogue of the Parables." *JSP* 18: 27-38.
- _____. "Enoch and the 'Son of Man' Revisited: Further Reflections on the Text and Translation of 1 Enoch 70:1-2." *JSP* 18,3 (2009): 233-240.
- Orlinsky, Harry. *The So-Called 'Servant of the Lord.'* Leiden: Brill, 1967.
- Orlov, Andrei A. *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

- _____. *The Atoning Dyad: The Two Goats of Yom Kippur in the Apocalypse of Abraham*. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Oswalt, John. *Isaiah: 1-39*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Paffenroth, Kim. "Jesus as Anointed and Healing Son of David in the Gospel of Matthew." *Biblica* 80, 4 (1999): 547-554.
- Paolini, Christopher. *Eldest*. New York City: Alfred A. Knopf Publisher, 2005.
- Parks, Sara. *Gender in Rhetoric of Jesus: Women in Q*. Minneapolis: Fortress Academic, 2019.
- Partner, Nancy. "'There is No Verb for History': Practicing Historians and Postmodern Theory." *Graduate Faculty Philosophy Journal* 37 (2016): 325-340.
- Paul, Shalom. *Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary*. Eerdmans Critical Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.
- Pearson, Brook W. R. "The Book of the Twelve, Aquiba's Messianic Interpretations, and the Refuge Caves of the Second Jewish War." Pages 221-239 in *The Scrolls and Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans. Sheffield: Sheffield Press, 1997.
- Pierce, Tamora. *In the Hand of the Goddess*. New York City: Simon & Schuster, 2018.
- Pinero, Antonio. "Enoch as mediator, messiah, judge and son of Man in the Book of the Parables: A Jewish Response to Early Jewish-Christian Theology?" *Henoch* 35, 1 (2013): 6-49.
- Piovanelli, Pierluigi. "'A Testimony for the Kings and the Might who Possess the Earth': The Thirst for Justice and Peace in the Parables of Enoch." Pages 369-79 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- _____. "Ethiopic." Pages 35-48 in *A Guide to Early Jewish Texts and Traditions in Christian Transmission*. Edited by Alexander Kulik, Gabriele Boccaccini, Lorenzo DiTommaso, David Hamidovic, Michael Stone. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- _____. "Was the Book of Parables a Sectarian Document?" Pages 363-79 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Pomykala, Kenneth E. *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism: Its history and Significance for Messianism*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1995.

- Porter, Frank. *The Yeşer Hara: A Study in the Jewish Doctrine of Sin*. New York: Scribner, 1901.
- Porter, Stanley E., and Brook W. R. Peason (eds). *Christian-Jewish Relations through the Centuries*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Portier-Young, Anthea. *Apocalypse Against Empire: Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.
- Qimron, Elisha. *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa): Indices and Corrections*. Leiden: Brill, 1979.
- Rabbinowitz, Noel. "Matthew 23:2-4: Does Jesus Recognize the Authority of the Pharisees and Does He Endorse Their Halakhah?" *JETS* 46, 3 (2003): 423-47.
- Raviv, Dvir and Chaim Ben David. "Cassius Dio's Figures for the Demographic Consequences of the Bar Kokhba War: Exaggeration or Reliable Account?" *JRA* 34 (2021): 585-607.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko. *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko and Adam H. Becker (eds). *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- Reeves, John and Annette Yoshiko Reed. *Enoch from Antiquity to the Middle Ages, Volume I: Sources From Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Reinhartz, Adele. "Rabbinical Perceptions of Simeon Bar Kosiba." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period* 20 (1989): 171-194.
- Rendtorff, Rolf. *Canon and Theology: Overtures to an Old Testament Theology*. Translated by Margaret Kohl. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- Rishell, C. W. "Baldensperger's Theory of the Origin of the Fourth Gospel." *JBL* 20, 1 (1901): 38-49.
- Ritcher, Amy. *The Enochic Watcher Template and the Gospel of Matthew*. Ph.D. Diss, Marquette University, 2010.
- Roberts, J. J. M. "The Old Testament's Contribution to Messianic Expectation." Pages 39-51 in *The Messiah. Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by James Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- Robinson, James. *Four Voices - One Gospel*. Wheaton: Quest Publishing, 1992.

- _____. "The Critical Edition of Q and the Study of Jesus." Pages 27-52 in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*. Edited by Andreas Lindemann. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001.
- Rosen-Zvi, Ishay. *Demonic Desire: Yetzer Hara and the Problem of Evil in Late Antiquity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.
- Rowland, Christopher. "The Vision of the Risen Christ in Rev. 1:13ff: The Debt of an Early Christology to an Aspect of Jewish Angelology." *JTS* 31 (1980): 1-11.
- Rowling, J. K. *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*. New York City: Scholastic Paperbacks, 2005.
- Rubenstein, Jeffrey L. *The History of Sukkot in the Second Temple and Rabbinic Periods*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Rudman, Dominic. "A Note on the Azazel-goat Ritual," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 116, 3 (2004): 396-401.
- Runesson, Anders. "Inventing Christian Identity: Paul, Ignatius, and Theodosius." Pages 62-70 in *Exploring Early Christian Identity*. Edited by Bengt Holmberg; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- _____. "Re-Thinking Early Jewish-Christian Relations: Matthean Community History as Pharisaic Intragroup Conflict." *JBL* 127, 1 (2008): 95-132.
- Sacchi, Paolo. *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History*. Translated by William J. Short. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990. Original, *L'apocalittica giudaica e la sua storia*. Brescia: Paideia Editrice, 1990.
- _____. "Qumran and the Dating of the Parables." Pages 377-96 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- _____. "The Theology of Early Enochism and Apocalyptic: The Problem of the Relation between Form and Content of the Apocalypses; the Worldview of the Apocalypses." *Henoah* 24 (2002): 77-85.
- _____. "The 2005 Camaldoli Seminar on the Parables of Enoch: Summary and Prospects for Future Research." Pages 499-512 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Saldarini, Anthony. *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994.

- Samely, Alexander. *Rabbinic Interpretation of Scripture in the Mishnah*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Sanders, E. P. *Jesus & Judaism*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1985.
- _____. *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah*. Philadelphia: Trinity, 1990.
- _____. *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE – 66CE*. Philadelphia: Trinity, 1992.
- _____. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.
- Sandmel, Samuel. *We Jews and Jesus*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Satlow, Michael L. “‘Try to be a man’: the Rabbinic Construction of Masculinity.” *HTR* 89, 1 (1996): 219-44.
- Schäfer, Peter. “Bar Kokhba and the Rabbis.” Pages 1-22 in *The Bar Kokhba War Reconsidered: New Perspectives on the Second Jewish Revolt against Rome*. Edited by Peter Schäfer. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- _____. *Der Bar Kokhba-Aufstand*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981.
- _____. “Rabbi Akiva and Bar Kokhba.” Pages 121-24 in *Approach to Ancient Judaism*. vol. 2; Edited by William Scott Green. Ann Arbor: Scholars Press, 1980.
- Schiffman, Michael. *Return of the Remnant: The Rebirth of Messianic Judaism*. Clarksville: Lederer Messianic Pub., 1992.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich. “Ueber die Zeugnisse des Papias von unsern beiden ersten Evangelien.” *ThStKr* 5 (1832): 735-68.
- Schniedewind, William. “King and Priest in the Book of Chronicles and the Duality of Qumran Messianism.” *JJS* 45 (1994): 71-78.
- Schofer, Jonathan. “The Redaction of Desire: Structure and Editing of Rabbinic Teachings Concerning ‘Yeser’ (‘Inclination’).” *JJS* 12 (2003): 19-53.
- Scholem, Gershom G. *Sabbatai Sevi: The Mystical Messiah, 1626–1676*. Translated by R. J. Zwi Werblowsky. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016.
- _____. *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality*. New York: Schocken Books, 1971.
- Scholz, Anton. *Die Alexandrinische Übersetzung des Buches Jesaias. Rede zur Feier des 298. Stiftungstages der Kgl. Julius-Maximilians-Universität*. Würzburg: Woerl, 1880.

- Schuele, Andreas. "Who is the True Israel?: Community, Identity, and Religious Commitment in Third Isaiah (Isaiah 56-66)." *Interpretation* 73, 2 (2019): 174-184.
- Schürer, Emil. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*. Revised edition. Edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Black. 3 vol. Edinburg: Clark, 1973-87.
- Schweitzer, Albert. *The Quest for the Historical Jesus*. New York: MacMillan, 1968.
- Scolnic, Benjamin and Thomas Davis. "How Kittim became 'Rome:' Dan 11:30 and the Importance of Cyprus in the Sixth Syrian War." *ZAW* 127, 2 (2015): 304-319.
- Scott, Joshua. "Apocalyptic Pharisees? Messianic Discourse in Matthew 23." Paper presented at the EABS Symposium, Prague, Czech Republic. 30 March-1 April, 2022.
- _____. "Delineation of the Politics of Identity: The Textual Transmission of Isaiah's Enthronement Scenes in the Parables of Enoch." 2020 Virtual Society of Biblical Literature. 21-24 November, 2020.
- _____. The "Human One" and Social Theory: A Study of 1 Enoch and the Gospel of Matthew. Unpublished Th.M Dissertation, Duke Divinity School, 2014.
- _____. "The 'Messianic Worldview' in Second Temple Judaism: Problems and Promises." Paper presented at the Department of Middle East Studies Lecture Series, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor, December 2, 2019.
- Seitz, Christopher. "First Isaiah," *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, 3:478.
- _____. "'You are my Servant, You are the Israel in whom I will be glorified': The Servant Songs and the Effect of Literary Context in Isaiah." *CTJ* 39 (2004): 117-34.
- Shahar, Meir ben. "'Anointed' and 'Messiah: A New Investigation into an Old Problem." *JSOT* 42, 4 (2018): 393-413.
- Shinan, Avigdor. "King David of the Sages." *Nordisk Judaistik* 24, 1-2 (2003): 53-78.
- Sievers, Joseph and Amy-Jill Levine (eds). *The Pharisees*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2021.
- Silverstein, Michael. "Metapragmatic Discourse and metapragmatic Function." Pages 33-58 in *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics*. Edited by John A. Lucy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Sivertsev, Alexei M. *Judaism and Imperial Ideology in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

- Smart, James D. *History and Theology in Second Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 35, 44-66*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964.
- Smith, Morton. "What is Implied by the Variety of Messianic Figures?" *JBL* 78 (1959): 66-72.
- Snearly, Michael K. *The Return of the King: Messianic Expectation in Book V of the Psalter*. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016.
- Sperling, H. and M. Simon. *The Zohar*. 5 vols. London and New York: Soncino, 1933.
- Spieckermann, Hermann. "The Conception and Prehistory of the Idea of Vicarious Suffering in the Old Testament." Pages 1-15 in *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources*. Edited by Bemd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher. Translated by Daniel P. Bailey. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Stacey, David. *Isaiah: 1-39*. London: Epworth Press, 1993.
- Stack, Judith. *Metaphor and the Portrayal of the Cause(s) of Sin and Evil in the Gospel of Matthew*. Biblical Interpretation Series, 182; Leiden: Brill, 2020.
- Steck, Odil Jannes. *Studien zu Tritojesaja*. BZAW 203; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1991.
- Steck, Odil Hannes. "Tritojesaja im Jesajabuch." Pages 361-406 in *Le Livre D'Isaïe: Les Oracles et Leurs Relectures Unité et Complexité de l'Ouvrage*. Edited by Jacques Vermeylen. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989.
- Stephen, Em. *Christology Today*. New Delhi: Serials Publications, 2016.
- Stokes, Ryan E. *The Satan: How God's Executioner Became the Enemy*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2019.
- Stone, Michael. "Enoch's Date in Limbo, or, Some Considerations of David Suter's Analysis of the Book of Parables." Pages 444-49 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Stowasser, Martin. *Johannes der Täufer im Vierten Evangelium: eine Untersuchung zu seiner Bedeutung für die johanneische Gemeinde*. Institut für Bibelwissenschaft: Berlin, 1992.
- Strack, Hermann L. and Günter Stemberger. *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*. Translated by Marcus Bockmuehl. Revised edition. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- Strauss, Mark. *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology*. JSNTSup, 110; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

- Strobel, August. "Das jerusalemische Südenbock-Ritual. Topographische und landskundliche Erwägungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte von Lev 16, 10.21f." *ZDPV* 103 (1987): 141-168.
- Stromberg, Jacob. "The Root of Jesse" in Isaiah 11:10." *JBL* 127, 4 (2008): 655-669.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren. *Angel Veneration and Christology*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2, Reihe 70. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995.
- _____. *The Myth of Rebellious Angels: Studies in Second Temple Judaism and New Testament Texts*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- _____. "The Origins of Evil in Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition: The Interpretation of Genesis 6:1-4 in the Second and Third Centuries B.C.E." Pages 87-118 in *The Fall of the Angels: Themes in Biblical Narrative, Jewish and Christian Traditions*. Edited by Christopher Auffarth and Loren Stuckenbruck. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- _____. "The Parables of Enoch according to George Nickelsburg and Michael Knibb: A Summary and Discussion of Some Remaining Questions." Pages 65-71 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Suter, David W. *Tradition and Composition in the Parables of Enoch*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1979.
- Sweeney, Marvin A. *Isaiah 1-4 and the Post-Exilic Understanding of Isaianic Tradition*. *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 171. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1988.
- _____. *Isaiah 1-39: With Introduction to Prophetic Literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- _____. *Isaiah 40-66. The Forms of the Old Testament Literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016.
- _____. "Jesse's New Shoot in Isaiah 11: A Josianic Reading of the Prophet Isaiah." Pages 102-18 in *A Gift of God in Due Season: Essays in Scripture and Community in Honor of James A. Sanders*. Edited by Richard D. Weis and David M. Carr. JSOTSup 225. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996, 103-18.
- _____. "The Reconceptualization of the Davidic Covenant in Isaiah." Pages 41-61 in *Studies in the Book of Isaiah. Festschrift for Willem A.M. Beuken*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium; Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1997.
- Syreeni, Kari. "Between Heaven and Earth: On the Structure of Matthew's Symbolic Universe." *JSNT* 40 (1990): 3-13.

- Talmon, Shemaryahu. *King, Cult, and Calendar in Ancient Israel: Collected Studies*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1986.
- _____. “The Concepts of Mishnah and Messianism in Early Judaism.” Pages 79-115 in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by James A. Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- Theissen, Gerd and Annette Merz. *The Historical Jesus: A Comprehensive Guide*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998.
- Theisohn, Johannes. *Der auserwählte Richter: Untersuchungen z. traditionsgeschichtl. Ort d. Menschensohngestalt d. Bilderreden d. Äthiopischen Henoch*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1975.
- Thiessen, Matthew. *Contesting Conversion: Genealogy, Circumcision, and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Christianity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Thompson, Thomas. *Early History of the Israelite People from the Written & Archaeological Sources*. Studies in the History of the Ancient Near East; Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C. and F. Garcia Martinez, “4Q Astronomical Enoch-a.” Pages 95-172 in *Qumran Cave 4 – XXVI: Cryptic texts And Miscellanea, Part 1. In consultation with James Vanderkam and Monica Brady*. DJD 36. Edited by S. J. Pfann et al. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.
- Tiller, Patrick. *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch*. Atlanta: SBL Press, 1993.
- Tobolowsky, Andrew. *The Sons of Jacob and the Sons of Herakles: The History of the Tribal System and the Organization of Biblical Identity*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.
- Torrey, Charles C. “Isaiah 41.” *HTR* 44 (1951): 121-36.
- _____. *The Second Isaiah*. New York: Scribner’s, 1928.
- Towers, Susan. “The Rabbis, Gender, and the Yetzer Hara: The Origins and Development of the Evil Inclination.” *Women in Judaism: A Multidisciplinary Journal* 15, 2 (2018): 1-20.
- Trump, Donald. Interview with Associated Press. Recording and transcript by BBC. August 21, 2019. <https://www.bbc.com/news/av/world-us-canada-49429661>.
- Tuckett, Chris M. “The Son of Man and Daniel 7:Q and Jesus.” Pages 371-394 in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*. Edited by Anders Lindemann. Leuven: University Press, 2001.

- Tzoref, Shani. "The Use of Scripture in the Community Rule." Pages 203-34 in *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism*. Edited by Matthias Henze. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.
- Ullendorff, Edward. *Ethiopia and the Bible: The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1967*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- Ulrich, Eugene. "Biblical Views: Insertions in the Great Isaiah Scroll." *BAR* 37, 4 (2011): https://www.baslibrary.org/biblical-archaeology-review/37/4/13?ip_login_no_cache=eg%29%E9%B8%0Avv
- _____. *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXXII: Qumran Cave 1: II. The Isaiah Scrolls: Part 2: Introductions, Commentary, and Textual Variants*. Oxford: Oxford Press, 2011.
- Van der Horst, Pieter W. "A Note on the Evil Inclination and Sexual Desire in Talmudic Literature." Pages 59-65 in *Jews and Christians in their Graeco-Roman Context: Selected Essays on Early Judaism, Samaritanism, Hellenism, and Christianity*. Edited by P.W. van der Horst. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Van der Toorn, Karel. *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- VanderKam, James. *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995.
- _____. *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 62. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- _____. *Jubilees: Hermeneia Commentary Series*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2018.
- _____. "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37-71." Pages 161-91 in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by James Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 2009.
- _____. "The Interpretation of Genesis in 1 Enoch." Pages 129-148 in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation*. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Edited by Peter Flint. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- VanderKam, James and William Adler (eds). *Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.
- Vermes, Geza. *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1973.
- _____. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*. Second edition. Leiden: Brill, 1973.

- _____. "The Son of Man Debate." *JSNT* 1 (1978): 19-32.
- _____. "The Son of Man Debate Revisited (1960-2012)." Pages 3-17 in *Parables of Enoch: A Paradigm Shift*. Edited by Darrell L. Bock and James H. Charlesworth. New York: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- _____. "The Use of bar-nash/bar-nasha in Jewish Aramaic." Pages 310-28 in *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. Edited by Matthew Black and Patrick Alexander. Oxford: Clarendon, 1967.
- Von Rad, Gerard. *Old Testament Theology*. 2 volumes. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.
- Vorm-Croughs, Mirjam van der. *The Old Greek of Isaiah: An Analysis of Its Pluses and Minuses*. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 61; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014.
- Waddell, James. *The Messiah: A Comparative Study of the Enochic Son of Man and the Pauline Kyrios*. JCTC 10. London: T&T Clark, 2011.
- Walck, Leslie W. "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and the Gospels." Pages 299-337 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Weiss, Christian Hermann. *Die evangelische Geschichte kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet*. 2 vols. Leipzig, Breitkopf and Härtel, 1838.
- Werline, Rodney A. "Ritual, Order and the Construction of an Audience in 1 Enoch –36." *DSSD* 22 (2015): 325-341.
- Westermann, Claus. *Isaiah 40-66*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969.
- Wilken, Robert Louis. *Isaiah. The Church's Bible*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Willey, Patricia T. *Remember the Former Things: The Recollection of Previous Texts in Second Isaiah*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Williamson, Hugh. *The Book Called Isaiah*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- Wilson, Ian. "Isaiah 1-12: Presentation of a (Davidic?) Politics." Pages 50-71 in *Tzedek, Tzedek Tirdof: Poetry, Prophecy, and Justice in Hebrew Scripture*. Edited by Andrew Gow and Peter Sabo. Leiden: Brill, 2018.
- Winn, Adam. "Identifying the Enochic Son of Man as God's Word and wisdom." *JSP* 6 (2019): 290-318.

- Wise, Michael Owen. *The First Messiah: Investigating the Savior Before Christ*. San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1999.
- _____. *Language & Literacy in Roman Judea: A Study of the Bar Kochba Documents*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015.
- Wright, Archie. "The Demonology of 1 Enoch and the New Testament Gospels." Pages 215-244 in *Enoch and the Synoptic Gospels: Reminiscences, Allusions, Intertextuality*. Edited by Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Gabriele Boccaccini. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature Press, 2014.
- _____. *The Origins of Evil*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Wyse-Rhodes, Jackie. *Reading the Cosmos in Second Temple Jewish Literature: Nature as Model, Sign, Punishment, Witness, and Mystery*. Unpublished dissertation. Emory University, 2018.
- Xeravits, Geza. *King, Priest, Prophet: Positive Eschatological Protagonists of the Qumran Library*. STDJ 83. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Yadin, Yigael. *Bar-Kokhba: The Rediscovery of the Legendary Hero of the Last Jewish Revolt against Imperial Rome*. Jerusalem: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971.
- _____. *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Yadin, Yigael, et al. *The Documents from the Bar Kokhba Period in the Cave of Letters: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Nabatean-Aramaic Papyri*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2002.
- Yarbro Collins, Adela. *Early Christian Apocalypticism: Genre and Social Setting*. Semeia 36; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1986.
- _____. *The Combat Myth in the Book of Revelation*. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976.
- _____. "The Secret Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and the Gospel of Mark: A Response to Leslie Walck." Pages 338-51 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.
- Yarbro Collins, Adela and John J. Collins. *King and Messiah: Son of God: Divine, Human, and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Yoon, Sung-Hee. *The Question of the Beginning and the Ending of the So-Called History of David's Rise: A Methodological Reflection and its Implications*. BZAW 462. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014.

Zahn, Molly. *Genres of Rewriting in Second Temple Judaism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020.

Zeev, Miriam ben. "New Insights into Roman Policy in Judea on the Eve of the Bar Kokhba Revolt." *JSJ* 49 (2018): 84-107.

Ziegler, Joseph. *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias*. Münster: Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1934.

Zimmerli, Walther. *Studien zur attestamentlichen Theologies und Prophetie*. TB 51. Munich: Kaiser, 1974.