MESSIANIC FIGURES IN THE ARAMAIC TEXTS FROM QUMRAN

Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, CNRS, Aix-en-Provence

The messianic conceptions of the sectarian Qumran scrolls have been intensively researched from the beginnings of Qumran studies. They were an important addition to the scarce textual witnesses for non-Christian messianic conceptions in pre-Rabbinic Judaism.¹ For our comprehension of messianic conceptions in the Hellenistic and Roman era, however, the non-sectarian texts might be even more important than the sectarian texts. On the one hand, their conceptions were regarded as acceptable by those Qumranites who added these texts to the Qumran book collection(s).² On the other hand, they might attest to conceptions held in wider segments of the Jewish society outside Qumran if we accept the assumption that the Qumranites did not compose Aramaic texts.

If this assumption is true, we have at least four non-sectarian texts that possibly refer to messianic figures: 4Q246 (Aramaic Apocalypse, Apocryphon of Daniel ar or “Son of God” text), 4Q534 (Birth of Noah, Noah⁹ ar, olim Elect of God ar), 4Q541 (apocrLeviᵇ ar), 4Q558 (pap-Visionᵇ ar).³ These texts have been analyzed many times since their first fragmentary publication by Jean Starcky in 1963 and Jozef Milik in 1972.⁴ They have attracted considerable attention, because they mention

---

¹ The non-Qumranic sources are Psalms of Solomon 17, the Similitudes (1 Enoch 37–71), 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra.
³ 4Q580 could be another candidate for a possibly messianic figure. However, I became aware of its text only after having finished this article.
⁴ For the editions see below. The literature on the topic of Qumranic Messianism is legion. Let me just mention some of the most recent comprehensive studies that were available to me: H.-J. Fabry, “Die Messiaserwartung in den Handschriften von Qumran,”
several elements that some scholars regard as potentially messianic, elements that are remarkable, especially for ears used to hearing the New Testament: figures bearing titles such as “son of God,” “son of the most high,” “chosen one of God;” figures that are Davidic or priestly, with particular circumstances at birth, involved in judgment, effecting atonement, teaching divine wisdom, restoring peace, liberating or gathering the good, annihilating evil; Elijah as precursor; the use of Daniel 7 or the so called “Servant Songs” from Isaiah.

Yet, this list may also be deceptive. It is in fact a matter of dispute whether all texts indeed refer to messianic figures. We can state right away that none actually mentions מְשִיחַ, מְשִיחַ or מְשִיחַא, from which some methodological purists deduce that these texts do not attest to messianic conceptions. Especially with regard to 4Q246 and 4Q534 the opinions are rather diverse. Methodologically, it is important to remember at each step, whether we use a Jewish concept in order to understand ancient Jewish messianism or whether we have turned the tables by casting Christian concepts back on early Judaism. Does the figure analyzed called by this or that title fit a “job description” for a messiah or is a mere title that happens to be applied to Jesus the only element “turning” this figure into a messiah?


5 The only Aramaic Qumran text with מְשִיחַא is 4Q547 9 7 where this word has been restored. If the restoration is indeed correct it refers to the “historical” ointment of the Aaronic priests, not the expectation of a messianic figure (see Puech, *DJD* XXXI, 389–390). As far as I can see it, there are at most four texts referring to the word messiah in Aramaic before the Targumim and Rabbinic literature: *1 En. 48:10* and *52:4; 4 Ezra* (7:28f and 12:32), the Greek transcription of the Aramaic מְשִיחַ (or Hebrew מְשִיחַ?) in *John 1:41* and *4:25* and a Greek transcription of an Aramaic phrase in *Irenaeus, Adv. haer.* 1.21.3.

6 *Aramaic Levi Document* applies the messianic passages Gen 49:10 to Kohath and Isa 11 to Levi. However, Collins, *Scepter*, 88 rightly points out they are used as predictions of future protagonists.
We have to admit that theological issues often interfere with the scientific discussions of ancient Jewish messianism. Diminishing the uniqueness of nascent Christology by contextualizing it in Second Temple Judaism makes the emergence of Christianity from Judaism more plausible, more legitimate or less miraculous (or all three simultaneously). Vice versa, emphasizing the differences leaves the birth of Christianity in the realm of the implausible—or illegitimate—but more miraculous or unique. All scholars, Jewish, Christian and agnostic, have to submit to these metahistorical ramifications—willingly or subconsciously.

In the wake of scholars such as John Collins and Florentino García Martínez, I shall use a rather open definition and apply the definition suggested by Géza Xeravits: Messianic figures are human—or superhuman—positive eschatological protagonists.¹ The employment of the title messiah is indeed dispensable to understand the wider religious phenomenon of Second Temple Messianism.²

1. A Quick Tour of Four Scrolls (4Q541, 4Q558, 4Q246, 4Q534)

a) 4Q541 (Apocryphon of Leviᵇ? ar)

Let me begin with the paleographically oldest document, 4Q541 (Apocryphon of Leviᵇ? ar).¹⁰ The two larger fragments 9 and 24 are basically the only ones to permit a rudimentary appreciation of the text. They mention a future figure that shall transmit wisdom (ו֯י֯מ֯ס֯ר֯ךְוּרְוּן לַהוֹרְוָמָה), make atonement for “his generation” (ויכפר ל כול בני דרה), and speak with heavenly words a teaching like the will of God (מאמרה).

---

¹ Since non-Qumranic texts employ this title for preexistent transcendent figures of heavenly origin (1 En. 48:20, 52:4, 4 Ezra 7:28, 12:32), Florentino García Martínez, “Messianische Erwartungen,” is completely justified in allowing the inclusion of superhuman eschatological protagonists under the category messiah.

² See the subtitle of Xeravits King, Priest, Prophet. Positive Eschatological Protagonists.


There will be slander against him (שגיאן מלין ﬠלוהי יאמרון, cf. 9 5) and according to other fragments perhaps also physical violence (חמס, cf. cf. in 6 1 and המכה in 6 3, דמכה in 4 ii 4) though it is not clear whether the protagonist is the victim. He seems to appear prior to a problematic era, since the fact that his people will go astray is mentioned only at the end of fragment 9 (i 7). The eschatological color of the text becomes clear through the mentioning of an eternal sun of the protagonist whose warmth will make the darkness disappear universally (9 i 4–5). All scholars agree that the protagonist of this text is priestly. While none of the arguments forwarded is conclusive on its own, the cumulative weight makes this point very probable. Most important is an impressive list of similar expressions and traditions contained in both 4Q541 and 4Q542 Testament of Qahat and Testament of Levi 18, assembled by Émile Puech. The atonement in 4Q541 differs from that in the other Aramaic Qumran texts, in that it concerns directly the people, not the altar or the land. Yet, how exactly is the atonement effected? Many deduce from the priestly character of the protagonist that the atonement is effected by sacrifice. However, we should remember that ancient Judaism knows many more means of atonement than sacrifice and that even priests can atone also by other means, e.g. prayer (as the high priest Onias for Apol-
Two other Qumran scrolls, 11Q13 Melchizedek and the Damascus Document, mention eschatological atonement effectuated by a messianic figure. How atonement is achieved in both cases remains ambiguous. Joseph Baumgarten has proposed an interesting reading for the Damascus Document that would imply a use of non-sacrificial means.

Might an answer to the question how the author of 4Q541 conceived of the means of atonement lie in the strange expression ‘ישתלח לכול בני מ֯ה (he will be sent out to all his people)’ that immediately follows ‘ויכפר (he will atone)?’ The verb שלח hitp. is very rare in biblical and Second Temple parlance. It does not appear in the Bible or in Qumran Aramaic texts elsewhere. In Qumran Hebrew it appears only once for the one expelled from the community for sinful behavior.

Readers of Rabbinic Hebrew will immediately think of its prevalent use in tannaitic literature: the technical term for the scapegoat שֶׁפֶר. I suggest that the author of 4Q541 uses this rare verb שלח hitp. as an allusion to the scapegoat. In other words, the protagonist achieves atonement by being sent out like the scapegoat.

The notion of a (positive) human being functioning as scapegoat is known from other ancient Jewish texts. This is explicitly attested in

\[4Q266 (4QDa) 11:8, 14.\]


\[18\] 11Q13 II 7–8 (Melchizedek), CD XIV 19=4Q266 10 i 12–13 (משיח ההיו בריאו). J. M. Baumgarten (reading ממנחה וחטאת) has argued that the atonement might have been achieved by ways superior to sacrifice: ‘Messianic Forgiveness of Sin in CD 14:19 (4Q266 10 i 12–13),’ in The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues (ed. D. W. Parry and E. C. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 537–544. Atonement is mentioned also in 11Q13, with Melchizedek, an angelic figure, as protagonist, but the verb is in the infinitive and it is unclear who actually performs the atonement. It may even be the day itself as in rabbinic literature: see 11Q13 II (1, 2i, 3i, 4) 7–8: מֹשֵׁה וְרַבִּיקְיָה לַאֲדוּנִים. Of course, שלח hitp. can refer to all kinds of other people sent out, but the prevalent use is for the scapegoat (or for the bird sent out in the sacrifice of Lev 14 (םִשְׁפַּרְו) which is strongly parallel to the scapegoat).

\[20\] Other ancient Jewish texts apply the imagery of the scapegoat to negative figures, especially the Asael layer in I. En 10 and the Apoc. Ab. 13: see D. Stökl Ben Ezra, The
the Babylonian Talmud, and possibly also in Josephus. In addition, the very early and very “Jewish” traditions in Barnabas 7 (explicitly) bear witness to the application of scapegoat imagery in Jewish messianic ideology as well as Galatians 3–4 (implicitly, and cf. Matthew 27:15–26). Trying to explain the strange idea of Galatians 3–4 how a curse of someone may be salvific for others, Daniel Schwartz builds his interpretation on the peculiar use of ἐξαποστέλλω in the phrase ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱόν αὐτοῦ (Gal 4:4, cf. 4:6). Paul uses this unusual composite verb only here. Elsewhere he always employs ἀποστέλλω or πέμπω. Interestingly, in the LXX this rare verb is used only once in a context similar to that in Galatians: the sending out of the scapegoat in Leviticus 16:21–22. Like the use of the rare ἐξαποστέλλω in this context by Paul, so too the exceptional הָלַשׁ htp. in juxtaposition to atonement alludes to the scapegoat.

In addition to the use of the uncommon verb in 4Q541, the sequence atonement–sending agrees with Leviticus 16. Here, too, the general

Impact of Yom Kippur. The Day of Atonement from Second Temple to the Fifth Century (WUNT 163; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2003), 85–90 and 92–94 and the earlier literature quoted there.


25 Schwartz’ suggestion has been corroborated by two further philological observations: See Stökl Ben Ezra, The Impact of Yom Kippur, 175.

26 Let me respond here to a challenge raised by John Collins in the discussion, viz. that whereas in Leviticus 16, the scapegoat is sent into the desert, in 4Q541 the protagonist is sent out “to all his people.” It is rare for allusions or metaphors to take over the whole imagery. After all, the scapegoat had to make his way through the people (who mistreated him) when he was sent into the desert. In Galatians 4 the son is sent out without specifying the destination (but implying the world or the people) and the Spirit is sent out explicitly into the hearts of the people. In Matthew 27, Barabbas is released (meaning sent to rejoin the people). The crucial point is the use of the unusual term for “sending” which is very common in the context of atonement and then always applies to the scapegoat, one of the best-known rituals of the Second Temple—in antiquity and in modern times, comparable, in the age of globalization, to the lighting of the Olympic fire.
statement about the atonement (16:20a) precedes the sending out of the scapegoat (16:20b–22). Thus, both the exceptional diction and the order of the text converge in suggesting that the author is alluding to the scapegoat, one of the most central means of atonement in Second Temple Judaism. Rather than explaining the atonement by a regular priestly temple sacrifice which is absent from the extant text of fragment 9, or by the sufferings of the protagonist, which are not explicitly mentioned as having an atoning effect, I would therefore suggest that we see in the explicit and juxtaposed sending out the action achieving this aim. By directly juxtaposing ויכפר with וישתלח, the author alludes to the scapegoat, one of the means of atonement in Second Temple Judaism.

b) 4Q558 (4QpapVision ar)

The second oldest Aramaic text from Qumran with a potentially messianic figure is 4Q558 with the “telling” title 4QpapVision ar. Fragment 51 ii mentions Elijah as one whom the speaker (God?) will send in

27 An additional connection between 4Q541 and the scapegoat imagery might be the possible suffering of the protagonist in 4Q541 which might relate to the abuse of the scapegoat by the people as described in m. Yoma 6:4 and Barn. 7:6–9. This is, however, completely hypothetical.

28 Also in the passage from the Damascus Covenant mentioned above, the sending out of the culpable person may have an atoning effect on the community.

The previous line refers to “the eighth to/for the chosen one” (משנייה לבחיר, l. 3). Due to the fragmentary character, it is unclear whether the last reference is connected to Elijah or somebody else. It is equally uncertain whether the “chosen one” belongs to the eschatological protagonists. The cryptic reference to the eighth has been identified with David, the eighth son of Jesse and with Noah, the preacher of uprightness, the eighth according to 2 Peter 2:5. I may add another hypothesis: תمينיה ל can be translated as “the eighth to (=after).” Then the “chosen one” is followed by seven subsequent generations until the appearance of a newly significant figure. Testament of Levi 17 mentions seven different priesthoods for each jubilee followed by an eighth eschatological priest (T. Levi 18:1ff) who rectifies this situation. In this case, we would have another argument for understanding 4Q558 against a messianic background. But since we lack the context of 4Q558, this remains hypothetical.

The next line (5) mentions lightning (ברכה) and meteors/comets (וזי), elements typical of theophanies. Other fragments mention

30 As restored in Cook’s edition, where this fragment bears the number 54. Previous studies frequently read the last latter as ד, but a close examination of PAM 43.583 makes a ש (as suggested by Cook) at least as probable as ד (read by Puech).
31 In view of 2 Pet 2:5, where Noah is the eighth to have been preserved (καὶ ἀρχαῖον κόσμον ὅν ἔφεισατο, ἀλλὰ ὅδεν ἑκάστη ὑπὸ δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα ἐφέλαξεν, κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ ἀπεβίωσεν ἐπάξ), Fitzmyer, “The Aramaic ‘Elect of God’ Text,” 371 (footnote) suggested Noah as in 4Q534. He is followed by e.g. Xeravits, King, Priest, Prophet, 121; Puech, Croyance, 677; and Zimmermann, Messianische Texte, 414, prefer to endorse Starcky’s suggestion ("Les quatres étapes,” 498): David is a chosen one according to Ps 89:4 and has seven older brothers who are not chosen (1 Sam 16:10–13).
32 Starcky, “Les quatre étapes.”
34 The first priest is presumably Levi or Aaron who speaks with God like his father. The seventh and last priest is the most corrupt. Cf. also T. Reu. 6:10–11 where God has chosen someone to rule all peoples. The Greek ἐκλέγω εὖ points to an underlying Hebraism בחר בו: A. van der Woude, Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran, (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1957), 196. The ambiguous phrase could refer to either Levi or Judah, but it is usually understood as referring to Judah. Is it possible that Judah is a gloss in the passage 7–12, which deals almost exclusively with Levi?
35 Reading לתי is more plausible than לתי. The roof differs considerably from the other א海水, א海水 אלולב higher two rows higher or in שולח ה to one line higher.
without any given context: the time of the end (frag. 26: בַּעַדּ קָץ),\(^{37}\) atonement effected by a collective (angels?, priests?, people?) (frag. 27: כָּפָר),\(^{38}\) the cutting off of branches (frag. 33 ii: שִׁיחְוָי מַתַּכְצַצ),\(^{39}\) but also the kingdom of Uzziah (frag. 29; Cook: frag. 33), Adam and someone sent to Egypt (frag. 62; Cook frag. 65).

Besides the valuable Second Temple reference to the sending of Elijah in this clearly eschatological text,\(^{40}\) and the hypothetical combination of a prophetic and a priestly eschatological protagonist, regretfully little can be said about his actual actions or the concomitant circumstances or consequences of his mission.

c) 4Q246 (Apocryphon of Daniel ar)

The third Aramaic Qumran text potentially mentioning a messianic figure is 4Q246 (Apocryphon of Daniel ar), the sole remaining fragment of a once much longer text.\(^{41}\) The text speaks of a possibly royal\(^{42}\) figure

---

\(^{37}\) Cook, fragment 28. This makes Beyer’s view that this text is a collection of Prophetengeschichten due to the references to Uzziah, Horev, Egypt, Elijah etc., rather unlikely (Die aramäischen Texte, 93).

\(^{38}\) Reading according to Cook where the fragment bears number 30. The fragment number on the DSSEL photo is wrong. This fragment is the unnumbered one to the left of frag. 28. Puech reads כָּפָר.

\(^{39}\) Cook: fragment 37.


\(^{41}\) Ex psDan\(^d\) ex psDan A\(^e\) ex “Son of God.” First excerpts were made public by Milik in a lecture at Harvard in 1972; when he did not proceed with the publication, Fitzmyer did in “The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament,” NTS 20 (1973): 382–407 (repr. in ibid., A Wandering Aramean. Collected Aramaic Essays [SBL Monograph Series 25; Chico: Scholars Press, 1979]), 85–107; first full publication É. Puech, “Une apocalypse messianique (4Q521),” RB 99 (1992): 98–131; the official publication is Puech, DJD XXII (1996), 475–522 (with a text slightly corrected); a new reading and an English translation can be found in DSSEL by E. Cook. According to É. Puech, “Some Remarks on 4Q246 and 4Q521 and Qumran Messianism,” in The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls [ed. D. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999], 545–565, here 546), the text was composed before 150; Scriptio plena (Puech, DJD XXII, 166). Paleographical date of copy: around 25 BCE (ibidem)—not the first half of the first century CE as noted in F. Garcia Martinez and J. Trebolle Barrera, The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Their Writings, Beliefs, and Practices (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 174 which is probably a (modern) scribal error. When he published his 1963 article, Starcky must have known this fragment bought by Milik in 1958, but he does not refer to it. It would be interesting to know why!
who appears in times of tribulations in which the kings of Assyria and Egypt are somehow involved and who “is called” (יהוה) “son of God” (ברה) and “son of the Most High” or “most high son” (ברלע),. In view of the fragmentary state of the text, especially of its first column, it is impossible to reach a clear-cut decision about whether the text envisages a historical or an eschatological situation and in the latter case whether the bearer of the titles “son of God” and “son of the Most High” is regarded as a positive or a negative figure, a Messiah or a pretender. The positive messianic reading seems to me the more persuasive option. After the mentioning of the titles, again tribulations and war follow until the arrival of a turning event. The identity of the subject of the following sentences is open since the late-Herodian hand makes it difficult to distinguish between yod and waw, between hif’il and pe’al. In the first case, it may be the one called “Son of the Most High” or God. In the second case it may be the people of God. In the first case, which I regard as the more probable, the eschatological protagonist will establish (יקום) the people of God, his reign will be eternal, and—his ways being truthful—he shall judge the earth. Then there shall be peace and he will be venerated by all nations (מדינתא). If God (יהוה) is the subject these actions are divine. According to the third possibility, the people of God will rise (יקום) as a kind of collective eschatological protagonist—not unlike the collective interpretations of the figure resembling a son of man in Daniel 7. One of the most interesting subjects with regard to this text is its relation to Daniel 7 to which we shall come back below.

---

42 If i 7 וּלְהוָה יִרְבָּ ה refers to this figure.
43 In addition, he will be called something ending perhaps in great, but it is unclear how to fill the lacuna. Of the suggestions great [King] or holy one of God and [son of the] Great (God), the former two are too long and the latter doubles the next line: Puech, *DJD* XXII, 173, who suggests הָרָא יִרְבָּ. Among the supporters of the historical interpretation are e.g. Milik and Cook.
44 Introduced by סְעָ (ii 4).
45 Supported by e.g. Fabry, “Die Messiaserwartung.”
d) 4Q534 (4QMessianic ar)

The protagonist of the very fragmentary 4Q534 text, first called 4QMess ar by Starcky and then Birth of Noah² ar⁴⁸, treats the birth⁴⁹ of a future figure called “Chosen One of God” (הỞורה אלוהא).⁵⁰ This figure has unsurpassed wisdom of the secrets of all living.⁵¹ His wisdom shall come to all peoples (4Q534 1 i 6–8). The following phrase may possibly mention conspiracies by his adversaries against him (השבטתי), which he will eventually survive (9). Other lines and fragments mention a war including the destruction of altars (1+2 ii 12–13), waters (14), Watchers (15), sin, iniquity, curse (16–17), a holy one (17), suffering (17), joy (18) and death (19). In a seminal article, Fitzmyer has convinced most scholars that this scroll belongs to the same text as 4Q535 and 4Q536⁵² and that the protagonist is Noah.⁵³ Even today, however, some still

⁴⁸ First preliminary publication by J. Starcky, “Un texte messianique araméen de la Grotte 4 de Qumrân,” Mémoire du cinquantenaire de l’École des langues orientales de l’Institut Catholique de Paris (Paris: Bloud et Gay, 1964), 51–66; official publication by É. Puech in DJD XXXI (2001) with a brief excellent overview of the history of research with its different opinions (117–120). It has been dated paleographically to the last third of the first century BCE (Puech, DJD XXXI, 131); scriptio plena.

⁴⁹ His birth and the spirit of his breath have some unknown eternal effect, whose specification is hidden by a lacuna (10–11).

⁵⁰ 4Q534 1 ii 10. ה턴 הבוחר appears in 2 Sam 21:6; הבוחר for the Servant Isa 42:1, Israel in Isa 43:20 and 45:4, David in Ps 89:4, Moses in Ps 106:23; הבוחר אלוהא for the community members in 1QpHab X 13 (cf. Rom 8:33, Col 3:12, Tit 1:1); הבוחר appears several times in 4Q580 an eschatological figure of unidentified function (4Q580 1 i 10: הבוחר ולעשות, cf. I En. 39:6; 4Q580 2 1–2; המתייתו הבוחר in 4Q558 (messianic figure, see below); the elect (sg.)—throned Messiah? (I En. 45:3–4); Enoch (I En. 92:1), Abraham (I En. 93:5, cf. Apoc. Ab. 20:5); ἐκλεκτός τοῦ θεοῦ in Luke 23:35, John 1:34 mss; T. Ben. 11:4; Ezra in Gr. Apoc. Ezra 1:8 (Tischendorf 24:17).


⁵² Due to a possible (?) overlapping of 4Q534 7 1–6 with 4Q536 2 ii 11–13; and 4Q536 1 i 3 with 4Q535 3 4–6.


concur with Starcky’s original opinion that this text speaks of a future savior figure or Messiah.

In fact, these opinions do not have to exclude each other entirely. Maybe both, Starcky and Fitzmyer are right. Already André Caquot suggested that the text describes an Enoch redivivus, a mythological figure from the past projected into the future. But more than Enoch it is Noah who in the biblical narrative fulfills the functions of a universal savior figure. Noah saves a remnant of humanity and animals from the deluge, the first cataclysm (supposedly also the last total destruction before the eschaton). The step from being a mythological savior figure in the past to becoming the prototype of an eschatological figure is small. In mythological schemes, Urzeit and Endzeit are closely related.

For example, the Similitudes relate the deluge in the future (54:7) and God’s subsequent repentance in the past (55:1). In 2 Peter 2:4–5, the author mentions the punishment of the fallen angels, and calls Noah “herald of righteousness” (δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα) and in 3:1–7 he contrasts two worlds, of which the first of which was destroyed by water in Noah’s time while the second will be destroyed by fire. Yet, while 4Q534 uses intriguing imagery and terminology to describe its protagonist and may have influenced messianic conceptions as expressed in the Similitudes, there is nothing undisputably eschatological in the text


55 Caquot, “4QMess ar,” tries to unite the arguments by Fitzmyer, Grelot and Dupont-Sommer: “Si l’on se rappelle qu’aux termes mêmes de cette partie de 1 Hénoch le personnage appelé ‘Élu’, ‘Fils d’homme’ ou ‘Messie’ n’est autre qu’Hénoch lui-même, on pourrait penser, en effet, que le héros dont parle 4QMess Ar, au moins en son début, n’est autre qu’Hénoch, que les ‘Paraboles’ présentent comme un détenteur et un révéléur de mystères divins (46, 3 ; 51, 3). Mais est-il sûr que l’Élu de Dieu’ dont on parle au futur soit un personnage du passé ? Avons-nous affaire à un midrash aggadique sur l’histoire sainte ou à une prophétie concernant l’avenir ? Le texte annonce plutôt la venue d’un personnage qui sera peut-être un Henoch redivivus mais qu’il s’agit de reconnaître à des signes (que le début de 4QMess Ar devait énumérer) et dont on prévoyait la carrière de devin”). See Puech’s comment on this proposal, DJD XXXI, 119.
itself\textsuperscript{56} which accordingly does not seem to attest a messianic conception in the proper sense.

In brief, I understand 4Q246 as probably referring to a royal ruling and judging figure who reestablishes an eschatological people of God and introduces a peaceful eternal era. 4Q541 describes a priestly eschatological protagonist suffering some verbal and possibly physical abuse. He transmits divine wisdom and effects atonement by having been sent out like a scapegoat. 4Q558 attests the expectation of the eschatological coming of Elijah and perhaps also an eschatological priest. 4Q534 is probably not messianic.

What can we deduce from these texts to help us understand the wider phenomenon of eschatological protagonists in Second Temple Judaism, Qumran and early Christianity? In the following preliminary thoughts, special attention shall be paid to other texts that were known before the discovery of Qumran as part of different Bible canons, Hebrew, Latin or Ethiopic, which might have been written in Aramaic and are sometimes understood to refer to messianic figures: Daniel 7;\textsuperscript{57} the book of the 

Similitudes (1 Enoch 37–71) though extant only in Ethiopic was probably composed in Aramaic; and 4 Ezra, whose language of composition might have been Aramaic (though most scholars opt for Hebrew), and especially 4 Ezra 13:1–13, which many regard as an earlier source.\textsuperscript{58}

2. Comparative Observations

a) Chronological Development

The dating of the Qumran texts should be regarded as an open question since we only have their paleographical dates as terminus ante quem: Only 4Q541 has to be older than 75 BCE.\textsuperscript{59} The other three manuscripts have been dated to ca. mid-first century BCE (4Q558), ca. 25 BCE (4Q246), and the last third of the first century BCE (4Q534). All these

\textsuperscript{56} However, see the expressions “days of the wickedness” ימי רשפא (4Q536 2 ii 11 cf. 4Q534 7 1) and “the era of the wicked will be snuffed out forever” עון רשעים ידיע לאライブ (4Q536 2 ii 13 cf 4Q534 7 6).

\textsuperscript{57} Daniel 7 has been frequently mentioned as messianic, though many scholars would still doubt whether we can actually speak of a messianic figure in this chapter.


\textsuperscript{59} Taking a rather narrow error margin of ± 25 years around 100 BCE into account.
scrolls were written in the first century BCE. I am not convinced that all four texts were indeed composed in the second century BCE as is sometimes suggested by scholars who argue for a non-sectarian authorship. Even if these scrolls are of non-Qumranic authorship I see no reason why non-sectarian texts could not have been brought to Qumran after the foundation of the site. In any case, the later copies were written during the existence of the Qumran settlement. If we can trust the keen eyes of Ada Yardeni, we find Hebrew and Aramaic texts among the copies of one of the most prolific Qumran scribes working towards the end of the first century BCE. Starcky placed 4Q541 in the Hasmonean era, 4Q558 in the Roman pre-Herodian period and 4Q534 in the Herodian period. Collins regards 4Q246 as having been composed in the first century BCE before Pompey’s arrival. García Martínez suggests an even later date for 4Q246. In the light of this divergence, I do not think that we are yet ready to develop a chronological estimation of how messianology developed. The only thing we can say is that they are most probably later than Daniel and older than their paleographical date, which predates the Similitudes and 4 Ezra in all cases, though this aspect is further complicated by the possible or probable use of sources, especially in the case of 4 Ezra 13.

A diachronic approach being impossible, a synchronic analysis, a typology, seems the only solution. In what follows, I shall work with three trajectories: terms applied to the protagonists, actions performed by them and the use of biblical inspiration/prooftexts. Regrettably, I cannot use numbers, the criterion of García Martínez’ lucid messianological typology. The Aramaic texts attest only one figure at a time. Still, they are too fragmentary to be used as proof against the existence of diarchic or triarchic messianism in Aramaic writing Judaism. (The Elijah expectations attested in 4Q558 might point to a diarchic messianism or a messiah with a precursor if our hypothesis with regard to the eighth to the chosen one proves true).

60 See footnotes 10, 29, 40, 47 above.
63 Collins, Scepter, 167.
64 García Martínez, “Messianische Erwartungen.”
65 Similarly Collins, Scepter, 94 with regard to 4Q541 not excluding a royal messiah.
b) **Terminology**

Because of the fragmentary character of the Aramaic texts, we usually cannot assess with certainty whether a word used in the Aramaic texts (בר ﬠליון, בעיקר בכתובות פאתיות) is actually a specifically messianic title or just an appellation for a protagonist who happens to be eschatological. The messianic terminology in the Aramaic texts differs greatly from the “sectarian” parlance. Hebrew equivalents to the Aramaic appellations do not appear in sectarian messianic speculations and vice versa. Non-Qumranic sources have closer parallels. In 4 Ezra 13:32.37.52, 14:9 and perhaps 7:28f the messiah is called “my son.” The closest parallel to “son of God” and “son of the Most High” with a verb of appellation in the passive and the reference to the eternal reign appear in Luke 1:32–35. Already before the discovery of the Qumran scrolls, scholars assumed that Luke was using older sources here. I would be hesitant, however, to argue that Luke 1 used 4Q246 as a source or that both relied on the same source. The differences in the immediate context are too important. In Luke 1, Jesus is not told to raise a people, to be the future judge or to cause peace. And there is nothing explicitly Davidic in 4Q246 apart from the fact that the protagonist is potentially a king.

I would not call the “Elect One (of God)” ( בחיר אלהא, ὁ ἐκλεκτός τοῦ θεοῦ) a messianic title, neither in 4Q534, nor in Qumran elsewhere.

---

66 If we take e.g. the investigation by Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet* as our starting point, there is no mention of נשים נשיאת התורה, נרות והרויות, הכנף, נ président, לשכת, or their Aramaic equivalents in the Aramaic texts.


68 Luke 1:32–35: οὗτος ἔσται μέγας καὶ υἱὸς υψίστου κληθήσεται, καὶ δώσει αὐτῷ κύριος ὁ θεός τὸν βρόντον Δαυὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ βασιλεύσει ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰακώβ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, καὶ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ σῶκ ἔσται τέλος, εἶπεν δὲ Μαρίαμ πρὸς τὸν ἄγγελον, Πῶς ἔσται τόσο, ἐπεὶ ἄνδρα οὐ γεννῶσώ; καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἄγγελος εἶπεν αὐτῇ, Πνεῦμα ἁγίου ἐπέλευσεν ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ δύναμις υψίστου ἐπισκίασε σοι: διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἄγιον κληθήσεται, υἱὸς θεοῦ. In addition, the words of the possessed Gerasene in Mk 5:7 (Ἰρσω ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ υψίστου) similarly mention both “high” messianic terms from 4Q246 in close juxtaposition. Cf. the antichrist as son of God in Did. 16:4.


70 In the Aramaic scrolls בחיר (4Q534 1 i 10 and in 4Q558 and (restored) in the *Visions of Amram*. It recalls 2 Sam 21:6 ה בחיר (which is perhaps a spelling mistake for ר הבחר; Ps 89:4 but LXX reads the plural),
nor in nascent Christianity. Instead, it seems to be used in titular form for a (not necessarily eschatological) savior figure (probably Noah) in 4Q534 and for an unknown, most probably not eschatological figure in 4Q558. The most frequent usage of “Elect” is in the Similitudes where it appears sixteen times for a protagonist who is indeed eschatological and messianic—however, never as ἐρωμένοι ἐκλεγμένοι Ἐβραῖοι 

Finally, we should note here the absence of one title, which is usually discussed against an Aramaic background: the “Son of Man.” While the earliest individual interpretations of Daniel 7:9–10, 13–14 and the earliest uses of “Son of Man” as a messianic title are the Similitudes, the early strata of the New Testament and 4 Ezra 13, the Aramaic Qumran.

Ps 106:23 (LXX reads Israel is …). In Qumran cf. 1QpHab V 4 (弛りの to be read in the plural), IX 12 (probably ditto), X 13 (弛り; 4Q174 1–219:弛り, 弛り, 弛り, 弛り, 弛り, 弛り, etc.

71 In the Christian tradition Jesus is called the chosen one, but rarely so: John 1:34 (the first hand of the Sinaiticus, the Cureton and Sinai Old Syriac Gospels, Ambrose and apparently Pap. 5, but other old papyri and the Vaticanus read differently). Luke 23:35: οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός τοῦ θεου ὁ ἐκλεκτός; cf. 1 Pet 2:4 (πρὸς ὃν προσερχόμενοι, Λίθου μόνον, ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων μὲν ἀποδεδομένου παρά δὲ θεο ἐκλεκτον ἐντυμον), Luke 9:35 (οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος). Its minor importance can also be discerned from the fact that it does not appear as one of the christological titles in the classic work by F. Hahn, Christologische Hoheitsstitel (2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964).


73 Both 4Q534 (including 4Q535–536) and 4Q558 should be explored further to possibly shed light on the background of the Similitudes. Not being acquainted with Polish, I have no access to M. Baraniak, “Wybrany spośród wybranych według 4Q534 [The elect from among the chosen according to 4Q534–536],” Studia Judaica 10/2 (2007): 201–214.


75 While a tradition describing Jesus as “Son of Man” belongs to the earliest strata of Christian texts and has been attributed to Jesus himself, i.e. in the early 30’s, nascent Christianity does not necessarily show an awareness of a titular use of this idiom. (No one asks Jesus whether he is the “Son of Man” or identifies him as such), cf. e.g. J. D. G. Dunn, “Son of God” as ‘Son of Man’ in the Dead Sea Scroll? A Response to John Col-
texts do not apply this title to a protagonist—at least in their extant fragments. Most interestingly, 4Q246, which plays on much of Daniel 7 does not allude to the Son of Man or the Ancient of Days. This is indeed remarkable and demands an explanation. Either the Son of God is a parody of the Son of Man or the author of 4Q246 knew a source similar to Daniel 7 without the verses on the Son of Man (see below).

In sum, I have to admit that I do not find the research into titles very rewarding on this specific topic. They often leave the impression of being empty clichés, rather than succinctly defined terms that would enable us to distinguish between different types of messianisms.

c) Actions

The actions performed by the Messiahs are perhaps more rewarding. Usually, investigations distinguish between prophetic, priestly and royal messianic traditions, and the Aramaic texts mention these three different “classic” types. Roughly speaking, we have a royal figure (4Q246), a priestly figure (4Q541) and a prophetic figure (4Q558). Yet, we should bear in mind that the distinction between these types may be more difficult than it seems. Among the regular tasks of eschatological protagonists are for example: teaching, exhorting to repentance, fighting, atonement, purification, judgment, rule, establishing peace, liberation, arrest, and punishment. While some of the actions performed by eschatological protagonists can be categorized quite easily within this tripartite typology, others are more ambiguous. Kings often rule, fight, or liberate and priests perform atonement or purification, yet, judgment can be done by both and both priests and prophets teach. In Hebrews 2:15–18 and in 11Q13 it is a “priestly” figure who atones and

---

76 John Collins has suggested that the “son of God” in 4Q246 plays on the “Son of Man” (Scepter, 158–160) without, however, convincing many. See, e.g., against Collin’s suggestion Dunn, “‘Son of Man’,” 206–207.

77 Note however the addition of a fourth “heavenly” type by Garcia Martinez, “Messianische Erwartungen” and Collins, Scepter. While the distinction into three types only corresponds conspicuously to the traditional Christian theologumenon of the triplex munus, the use of this tripartite distinction in some Qumran texts justifies its use as emic parlance.

78 Caquot (“4QMess ar,” 155: “Ce ne peut guère être un des personnages auxquels les écrits de Qumrân confèrent le titre de « messie », car il n’est pas question ici de royauté ou de sacerdoce”) clearly employs too narrow a definition.
liberates. If therefore a text mentions an eschatological protagonist performing atonement, we should not automatically jump to the conclusion that this figure is a priest. Elijah is not only a prophet. And a priest—or a king like David—can be described as being also a prophet. Psalms of Solomon 17 describe a Davidic messiah whose words of wisdom (17:37) judgment and leadership are purer than gold; and “his words are like words of the holy ones” (17:43), which recalls the prophetic interpretation of Torah and which is also relatively close to ("his speech is like the speech of heaven.") In addition, he will bless the people (17:35). These are functions usually attributed to priests.

If we start with the most fragmentary text, 4Q558, we do not know what actions Elijah should perform apart from, presumably, prophecy. In Sirach 48, for example, Elijah’s actions encompass a range much wider than prophecy. The Similitudes, Daniel, and 4 Ezra do not attest to a prophetic precursor Elijah. Many sectarian texts speak of the expectation of a future prophet, yet we do not have any clearly sectarian text mentioning a future Elijah. Émile Puech has convincingly established that the author of 4Q521 expected a future Elijah, but the sectarian origin of 4Q521 remains unproven. Therefore, early Christian and rabbinic traditions are closer to this tradition mentioned in 4Q558. All other actions mentioned in 4Q558, notably blessing (5) and possibly destruction (57:5; Cook: 58:5), are incomprehensible without context and cannot be attributed to a specific actor.

The atonement mentioned in 4Q541 and the parallels to Testament of Levi evoke a priestly nature of the protagonist, perhaps Levi. Eschatological atoning priests appear in the Damascus Document, 11QMelchizedek and the Epistle to the Hebrews (Jesus as non-Aaronic angelic
MESSIANIC FIGURES IN THE ARAMAIC TEXTS

In Testament of Levi 18, the text most closely related to 4Q541, the eschatological priest does not seem to have an atoning function. The only atonement mentioned in this text is performed by angels. The only atoning priestly protagonist who endured suffering is Jesus in Hebrews, yet Hebrews clearly differs widely from 4Q541. Collins has suggested that 4Q541 plays on the afflictions experienced by the Teacher of Righteousness. And above, I have briefly discussed the possibility that the atonement in 4Q541 alludes to the scapegoat with parallels in Galatians 3–4.

Another action typical of the Qumranic priestly messiah is teaching and interpreting the Torah. The basic theme of priestly instruction is shared by 4Q541, Testament of Levi and sectarian priestly messianic conceptions. 4Q541 mentions parables (3 2, 9 i 1), a book (2 i 6), books of wisdom (7 4), teaching (7 6, 9 i 3), speaking in riddles (2 i 7, 4 i 4) and transmitting wisdom (9 i 2). Yet, without a proper context we cannot be sure who is teaching, how, what and why and whether the biblical interpretations of the protagonist of 4Q541 would have borne the same color as those of Qumran’s דורש התורה. Teaching and wisdom are very prominent characteristics of the eschatological protagonist in the Similitudes. Another pivotal function of Qumran’s priestly messiahs is blessing, which is absent from the extant fragments of 4Q541. Finally, we are not told that the protagonist of 4Q541 will be involved in fighting or subduing or punishing others as propagated by the War Scroll.

Among the four texts in the center of our contribution, the only text to mention eschatological war and judgment (tasks often attributed to a Davidic messiah) is 4Q246. The subject of the phrases in 4Q246 ii 4ff

86 CD XIV 19 (Aaronic messiah), 11Q13 II 4–5 (the angelic figure Melchizedek). See also above, the discussion of 4Q541, above. Eschatological priests are absent from either the Similitudes or 4 Ezra.
87 There is no more sin (18:9).
88 T. Levi 3:5.
89 Collins, Scepter, 114–115.
90 Neither 4Q246 nor 4Q558 allude to this realm. 4Q534 does, but it is probably not eschatological.
91 E.g. 1 En. 46:3 (cf. 50:3), the Son of Man reveals all secret treasures; in ch. 49 he is wisdom incarnate.
92 Both teaching and blessing seem to be implied in the Davidic Pss. Sol. 17:35.37.43. Blessing is extraordinarily important in the eschatological battle of 1QM, see van der Woude, Die messianischen Vorstellungen, 185–186.
93 Cf. the high priest’s ordering of the army before the battle 1QM XV 5–6. In 4Q541, the protagonist’s supposed suffering of slander and possibly physical violence implies confrontation, but we do not know what part the protagonist played in it.
acts as a unifier of the people, eternal ruler, just judge, and establi-
sher of peace, yet he does so in the manner of modern pacifists: by laying
down swords (or causing swords to be laid down)—he is not a war-
rrior. Fighting is carried out only by God himself (ii 8). What makes
him potentially “special” is the possibility that he is called by God’s
name (i 9) and that he is worshipped (ii 7). Yet, even if the divine
names of i 9 and ii 1 are indeed attributed to the protagonist, the author
distinguishes rather carefully between him and the divine level, since he
is described as being called a Son of God and a Son of the Most High
(not as being one). Conceptually this is like the comparative Kaf in דב
ט of Daniel 7. There the figure is not a human but only similar to one.
Here, the author does not necessarily conceive of this figure as a son of
God by the author. I would hesitate to understand him as an antecedent
or parallel to heavenly eschatological protagonists such as Melchizedek
in 11Q13 or Enoch in the Similitudes. 4Q534 is closer to such a super-
human description of its protagonist, who is not necessarily messianic.

d) Biblical inspiration

Space does not permit me to investigate this question in detail. I will
therefore focus very briefly on three preliminary impressions. Firstly,
the most prominent messianic prooftexts for the Qumranites include
Genesis 49:10, Numbers 24:17, 2 Samuel 7, Isaiah 11 and 61 as well as
Psalms 2 and 110. Most of them figure prominently also in the Simil-
tudes, 4 Ezra, Psalms of Solomon and early Christian texts. Yet, it seems
to me that the only one that explicitly lent its language to the formul-
ation of the messianic conceptions in the Aramaic Qumran texts investi-

---

95 In 1 En. 45:3–5, the Chosen One sits on the throne of glory (rules) and chooses
among the works of the sinners (judges) before establishing a blissful place for his people
(the chosen ones).
96 Cf. 4 Ezra 13:9–12.27–28, where the messianic figure does not use the sword.
There, however, he annihilates his opponents—with fiery breath, before assembling a
peaceful crowd.
97 There is an almost verbatim parallel with regard to the universal conflict between
city and city, nation and nation between 4Q246 ii 3 and 4 Ezra 13:31. However, this
motif is quite common (Collins).
98 Cf. 1 En. 48:5; 63.
gated here is Isaiah 11, which stands clearly behind 4Q246.99 For the others, there are at most implicit allusions.100

Similarly, biblical verses which inspired the sectarians less frequently or not at all are indeed found in the background of the Aramaic texts: Malachi 3:23 appears in 4Q558 but apart from 4Q521 whose sectarian authorship is debated, it is not found in any sectarian text. It appears in the New Testament (Mark 9:11, Matthew 17:10–11) but not in the Similitudes nor in 4 Ezra.

Were the Aramaic texts from Qumran the first to use the Servant Songs as prooftext for an eschatological protagonist?101 If we read the hif’il in 4Q246 ii 4 (הימים אל), this may have been written under the influence of Isaiah 49:6 (ל(xhrים אל שבסו עיוּב).102 With regard to 4Q541, I would not speak of “light of the nations” (cf. Isa 42:6) as precisely describing the protagonist of 4Q541 nor do his verbal afflictions remind me of Isaiah 50 or 53. Yet, 4Q541 6 3 uses the rare מכאוביכה and might after all evoke Isaiah 53:3 (together with a group of other texts).103 Still, as Collins has stated time and again, the idea that the

99 E.g. judging in justice (Isa 11:4, 4Q246 ii 4–5); in Isaiah, the protagonist is fighting without weapons, but only with the mouth (Isa 11:5) before a paradisiacal time of peace for the whole creation, and in 4Q246 swords are put down; the people is assembled in Isa 11:11–16 or raised in 4Q246 ii 4. Even the mention of Assyria and Egypt in 4Q246 i may be an echo of their special mention in Isa 11:15 and 16. The opening verses of Isa 11 are frequently used as a messianic prooftext or have inspired messianic concepts in Qumran sectarian and related texts (1QSb V, 4Q285, 4QpIsα, T. Levi 3:2; 18:2–7), in Christian texts, in Pss. Sol. 17, 4 Ezra and the Similitudes.

100 Puech, DJD XXII, 173 suggests that 4Q246 i 8 (עַבְרָנוּ הָדָא יְשַׁמְשָׂה) might allude to Gen 49:10b (לוּ הַיָּהָה עַמֶּם הָעָם) interpreted in the Targum, cf. Dan 7:27 (לאוּ הַיָּהָה עַמֶּם הָעָם). Frequently, Ps 2:7, 2 Sam 7:14 and Ps 89:26–27 are seen as standing in the background to the messianic divine sonship in 4Q246 i 9 / ii 1. Yet, the scene is very different and none of the central themes of these texts is used in juxtaposition in 4Q246.

101 The “Servant Songs” are used in the Similitudes, yet without alluding to suffering: 1 Enoch. 48:4 takes up Isa 42:6; 49:6.


Servant Songs constitute a distinct unit dates after all from the nineteenth century and we do not have to assume that by using a word from one Servant Song the author of 4Q541 alluded to another Servant Song and understood the protagonist as an incarnation of the Suffering Servant.

Thirdly, Daniel 7 is very close to 4Q246 is very prominent in early Christology, the Similitudes and 4 Ezra but is strikingly low scale in sectarian messianic speculations. Loren Stuckenbruck has argued convincingly that the relation of Daniel 7 and 4Q246 is close but free.

Let us have a quick look:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daniel</th>
<th>4Q246</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:31</td>
<td>שלטנה שלטן עלם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:14</td>
<td>שלטנה שלטן עלם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:14</td>
<td>כל מ夥ת אמיה ומליה עלים שלטנה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:27</td>
<td>כל שלטנה עלים שלטנה וחמש</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:22</td>
<td>יד היה תעכט ימיה ורגוז הנק</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf.</td>
<td>יד שוה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:23</td>
<td>יד אש בן לפני רפמא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf. 7:7</td>
<td>יד שוה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf. 7:22</td>
<td>יד שוה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dead Sea Scroll), that Jews at the time of Jesus regarded Isaiah 53 as a prophecy of the Messiah.

104 L. Stuckenbruck, “The Book of Daniel and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in The Hebrew Bible and Qumran (ed. J. Charlesworth; The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls 1; Richland Hills, Texas: BIBAL, 2000), 135–172, here 167–171, has surveyed the use of Daniel in Qumran texts. Daniel 7 rates rather low if at all. The most important influences of Daniel on Qumranic literature are found in the War Scroll. Yet, ch. 7 does not seem to have made any significant impact of its own. The use of the horn as a symbol for the forces of evil (1QM I 4–5) could have been adopted from Daniel 7 or Daniel 8 (!). Mertens suggests that Dan 7:24 (Antiochus Epiphanes) stands behind 1QM I 13–14 and XVI 11. The expression קדישין כהנים (Dan 7:18.22.25.27) is found in its Hebrew form in Qumran, only once, at CD XX 8 (the holy ones of the Most High (= the priests or angels?) curse the excommunicated). The use of קדישין כהנים for a special group of people is not specific enough in my eyes. See A. Mertens, Das Buch Daniel im Lichte der Texte vom Toten Meer (SBM 12; Stuttgart: Echter, 1971), esp. 53–57. Cf. J. Carmignac “Les citations de l’Ancien Testament dans ‘La Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres’,” RB 63 (1956): 234–260 and 375–390 and G. K. Beale, The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of John (NY: University Press of America, 1984), 42–66.

105 The parallels in language and topic are so impressive that Puech suggests the unknown visionary might have been Daniel.
Verbal equations and echoes to 4Q246 are numerous, yet not evenly distributed. While Daniel 7:22 and especially 7:27 appear several times, 7:13 and the Son of Man and the Ancient of Days are notably absent (as in all Qumran literature)—at least from the extant parts of 4Q246. It strikes me that both links to Daniel 7:14 can be explained by referring to Daniel 7:27, which is quoted or paraphrased in its entirety, and Daniel 4:31. Is it possible that the author of 4Q246 knew the scene of Daniel 7 without verses 9–10 and 13–14? After all, some have argued that they are a distinct source inserted later into Daniel 7.106 On the other hand, these verses are one of the most important backgrounds in the Similitudes, 4 Ezra 13, 2 Baruch and Revelation.107 It is particularly the Son of Man and the Ancient of Days (“Head of Days” in the Similitudes) and Daniel 7:9–10.13–14 that have been used in these sources, and they may have used these verses independently of the rest of Daniel 7.

4Q246 is the only Qumran text with extensive parallels to Daniel 7 and probably in a messianic context. Among non-Christian pre-Rabbinic texts, Daniel 7 is used only in texts that might have been composed in Aramaic: the Similitudes, 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch. However, the apparent proximity of 4Q246 to these non-Qumranic Aramaic texts is deceptive. There is no direct line between 4Q246 and the other texts, since they play on those Danielic elements absent from 4Q246, viz. the Son of Man and the ancient of days.

106 E.g. Martin Noth, see the discussion in J. J. Collins, Daniel. A Commentary on the Book of Daniel (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress), 278–279. On ther other hand, the theme of peace which is so explicit in 4Q246 is absent or only implicit in Dan 7.

107 E.g. Beale, The Use of Daniel, 96–305, who also points out that these texts frequently combine Dan 2, Dan 7, Gen 49:9–10 and Isa 11 (here 325).

Conclusions and Implications

This article has proposed some new hypotheses or attempted to nuance existing interpretations. All of them are still in a preliminary state. The atonement of the protagonist of 4Q541 was explained against the background of the scapegoat ritual. Tentatively, the enigmatic expression תמיניא לבחיר in 4Q558 was linked to eight generations of priests in Testament of Levi 17–18. The absence of the Son of Man from 4Q246 might perhaps be explained by the author’s reliance on Daniel 7 without verses 9–10 and 13–14. And with regard to the interpretation of the protagonist of 4Q534, both Starcky and Fitzmyer could be right, so that we have here a text with Noah figuring as an (eschatological?) redeemer.

The four Qumran texts investigated here\textsuperscript{109} attest to divergent types of eschatological protagonists that happen to match the three classical types prophetic (4Q558), priestly (4Q541), royal (4Q246) (and perhaps heavenly: 4Q534). The elements in the extant fragments do not allow us to draw a close connection between these different texts. They may or may not come from different backgrounds and may or may not reflect related or varying messianologies.

While many further lines should be investigated more deeply, the brief and preliminary attempt to contextualize the concepts shows more differences than similarities between the typical sectarian messianic conceptions and those expressed in the Aramaic Qumran texts. This is especially true of 4Q558 with Elijah playing on Malachi 3, a passage that is unconnected to the prophet in the extant sectarian texts. Affinities in vocabulary have been mentioned between 4Q246 and the War Scroll, yet Daniel 7, the main inspiration of the former, is practically absent in the latter.\textsuperscript{110} 4Q541 with the abused priest differs from the descriptions of the sectarian concept of a Messiah of Aaron. Yet, the use of Isaiah 53 in self-descriptive hymns of the Teacher of Righteousness, whose image is closely related to the eschatological priest, might point to more convergence in this direction than would have been admitted fifteen years ago. The messianic conceptions expressed in the four Aramaic Qumran texts are grosso modo compatible with those of the sectarian texts. There are no contradictions in terms that clearly suggest that one of the

\textsuperscript{109} Another fragmentary text with an eschatological figure of possibly messianic connotations is 4Q580.

\textsuperscript{110} See Mertens in footnote 104, above.
four texts investigated could not under any circumstances have been authored by a member of the Qumran group.

It is still too early to come to a conclusion with regard to the relation of the Aramaic Qumran texts and the non-Qumranic texts. There is some contact, especially for 4Q246, less so for 4Q541 and 4Q558, yet, many differences and contrasts exist: For example, the non-Qumranic Aramaic texts exploit exactly those elements from Daniel 7 which are not used in 4Q246 (the Son of Man). 4 Ezra shows parallel elements to 4Q246, yet, also important differences. The same is true of the Similitudes. Further study is needed in this direction.

Early Christian messianic conceptions are often very close to the Aramaic Qumran texts. 4Q246 and Luke 1 point to some conceptual if not literary relationship. In the case of 4Q541 we note the use of Isaiah 53 and, independently of that, the use of scapegoat imagery related to Leviticus 16 for the description of a messianic figure who is suffering and also atoning. Both, Christians and the authors of 4Q541 could have arrived independently at these connections. The expectation of Elijah (4Q558) seems to point to shared traditions.

Had the texts been discovered in another place than Qumran, would anyone have suggested sectarian authorship? This is rather unlikely. I would argue that the messianic conceptions present in the Aramaic texts and their varying relationship to Qumran, Pseudepigrapha and early Christian texts suggests that they belonged to the larger world of Second Temple Judaism of which Qumran (and nascent Christianity) were parts.

Finally, what is the place of the “messianic” Aramaic Qumran texts in the library in general and in their Aramaic collection specifically? Does the majority of Aramaic texts found in Qumran focus on Urzeit (up to the Exodus) and Endzeit because these were the major topics Jewish

---

111 For 4Q534–536, please see the other papers of this volume.
112 The Messiah as Son, non-use of swords, assembling the people. The messiah participates only in a minor judgment, punishes the peoples by annihilation and liberates the remnant of his people before another, final judgment (12:32–34). Also in 4Q246 (after an announcement of his eternal kingdom ii 5), the judgment (ii 5–6) is followed by peace-making (6), another battle (8), transfer of dominion of peoples to the messiah (8) and again eternal rule (9)—does the order of sentences in 4Q246 ii indeed evoke the chronology of an eschatological scenario?
113 Most strikingly, in 4 Ezra the messiah does not rule as M. Stone has pointed out. The protagonist of 4 Ezra is explicitly Davidic (11:37; 12:31–32), in 4Q246 only implicitly so. In 4Q246, the people of God is raised / rises before the judgment (ii 4), in 4 Ezra 12:32–34 the order is inverse.
authors writing in Aramaic were interested in? I do not think so. Our perspective on Aramaic Judaism goes only through the lens and selection of the Qumran book collection. Aramaic texts on Urzeit and Endzeit are particularly frequent at Qumran, because the Qumranites were more interested in opinions on these topics than they were interested in Aramaic thought on Samuel, the kings, halakha etc. Neither Isaiah nor the Minor Prophets are totally absent from the Aramaic texts. The Qumranites decided to incorporate those texts in their collection that deal with their own favorite themes and are more or less compatible with their own thought and compositions.

RESPONSE: FLORENTINO GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ

Daniel Stökl opens his contribution with a lucid formulation of possible theological agendas behind our discussions of ancient Jewish messianism: are we looking at the texts in its historical context or are we projecting later (Christian) ideas into them? I think the question is completely legitimate, as long as we do not forget that the “Christian” concepts were formulated by Jews, and this before any “parting of the ways” whatever. And I do not think that any of us will apply “post-Nicaean” concepts to early Christianity.

Stökl has offered us a thorough analysis of four Aramaic texts (4Q541, 4Q558, 4Q426 and 4Q534) that possibly refer to messianic figures, according to the definition of Geza Xeravits, and he makes innovative suggestions about each one of them:

- that the atonement of the protagonist of 4Q541 can be explained on the background of the scapegoat ritual (which seems to me a very plausible interpretation),
- that the expression “the eighth to the elect” of 4Q558 may be an allusion to the eighth eschatological priest of Testament of Levi 18:1ff (which seems to me possible);

---

114 According to list C in DJD 39 by A. Lange and U. Mittman-Richert, the number of Hebrew books from Qumran dealing with the prophets (35) is not very big either (nevi'im rishonim [8], Jeremiah [9], Isaiah [9] Minor Prophets [8]). From a statistical point of view, where only about 12% of Qumran texts are Aramaic, we should expect only 3–4 texts dealing with prophets. And many Aramaic texts are too fragmentary to understand their genre, topic or biblical background.

115 4Q558 attests the use of Malachi and 4Q541 the use of Isaiah.
that the absence of reference to the Son of Man of Daniel 7 in 4Q246 may be due to the use of a copy of Daniel from which Daniel 7:9–10 and 13–14 are missing (which seems to me a way out of the problem without any serious foundation);

• and that the חַר אָלָה אֲלָה אֲלָה of 4Q534 (though probably not messianic) may refer at the same time to Noah and to an eschatological savior figure (a Noah redivivus) (which combines both of the current interpretations of the text, but leaves unsatisfied the defendants of both interpretations).

But beyond these interesting suggestions about the four texts he deals with, Stökl has posed some fundamental questions in the light of other Aramaic messianic texts (Daniel 7, the Similitudes of Enoch and 4 Ezra) and the “sectarian messianic texts in Hebrew” concerning the dating, the terminology used, the actions performed by the protagonists, and the biblical texts used as background. He has also put forward some conclusions and implications of his study. And I think our discussion would profit more by focusing on these questions than by discussing his concrete suggestions for interpretation of the four Aramaic texts. But you may think otherwise, of course, and the discussion is totally open. As a way to start the discussion, I put here some of the questions raised by the reading of the paper:

Dating: Stökl asserts that “The Aramaic texts attest only one figure at a time, yet they are too fragmentary to be used as proof against the existence of diarchic or triarchic messianism in Aramaic writing Judaism.” It is true that the argument a silentio is always delicate and dangerous, but we need to work with the data we have. And the reality is that in the preserved sections of the Aramaic messianic texts no diarchic or triarchic messianism is shown. Would not this element confirm the conclusion of Geza Xeravits (based on the fact that the only two manuscripts in which the triarchic messianism appears are from the hand of the same copyist) that this triarchism is a peculiarity of this scribe?

Terminology: What is the real difference between a messianic “title” and a messianic “appellation” for a protagonist who happens to be eschatological? In other words, when does an appellation become a title? Does this not depend heavily on the literary genre of the composition in which the designation is used? (Poetry transforms easily “appellations” to “titles,” it seems to me).

Actions: Although for Stökl this aspect is apparently the “most rewarding,” I think the fragmentary character of the evidence preserved
STÖKL BEN EZRA

does not allow any firm conclusion, and the same applies to the use of “biblical inspiration.”

Stökl concludes that the Aramaic texts “show more differences than similarities between the typical messianic sectarian conceptions and those expressed in the Aramaic Qumran texts,” (although he recognizes that they are grosso modo compatible) and that they are “often very close” to early Christian messianic conceptions. And this opens up, in my view, a most fruitful field for discussion in the light of my own previous presentation of the Aramaic Qumranica Apocalyptica. It is up to you to decide.

DISCUSSION

Daniel Stökl: Thank you so much for your perspicacious and kind response! With regard to the possible relation between 4Q246 and Daniel 7, I have been driven by three observations: 4Q246 shows many parallels with Daniel 7 with the exception of the most pertinent verses. Exactly these verses are those taken up in other early Jewish messianic texts without referring to the imagery taken up by 4Q246. And finally, for more than eighty years some exegetes of Daniel 7 have already been suggesting that the Son of Man verses come from a different source and/or were added later.

Xeravits’ observation about triarchic messianism as the idiosyncratic opinion of one scribe is interesting, yet, I think we should distinguish logically between “does not contradict” and “confirms.” The former would be more correct here. Concerning the transition from title to appellation, I completely agree on the issue of poetry. The status of an appellation as title depends on its context. I would also add a sociological aspect: When texts are transmitted from one textual community to another, the words therein may change their status and in any case, their intertextuality changes. This can have far reaching consequences. For example, the possibility to distinguish between an anointed and the Messiah can decrease when a text transits from a group acquainted with anointed priests to one without.

Émile Puech: Quelques remarques. Comme je l’ai rappelé plusieurs fois en ces jours, 4Q534 n’est pas messianique, mais il devrait faire allusion à la naissance mystérieuse de Noé, me semble-t-il. En publiant 4Q246, j’avais hésité entre une interprétation messianique, ma première intuition, et une figure négative pour suivre le point de vue de Hartmut Stegemann qui était fermement attaché à cette interprétation. Mais à présent, je reprends ma première intuition, une interprétation messianique du type Fils de l’homme de Daniel 7, comme je l’ai écrit dans les Mélanges offerts à Raymond Kuntzmann en 2004. En 4Q558 51 ii, la lecture אֲשֵׁרִיֵיתֶנָּה est impossible. Il semble qu’il y ait une allusion à un roi messianique, une figure davidique comme il en était avec le huitième fils de Jessé, et il ne peut s’agir que d’un roi eschatologique du peuple de Dieu, qui doit être davidique, et que précède la venue d’Elie redivivus, citant Malachie 3. En 4Q541, il est clairement fait allusion à un prêtre (est-ce une figure eschatologique ou un personnage futur ?), mais je ne peux y voir une figure correspondant au bouc émissaire, comme vous l’écrivez. Toutes ces compositions araméennes sont cer-
tainement antérieures au courant essénien qui les a recopiées comme un héritage reçu dont il doit prendre soin.

Daniel Stökl: With regard to 4Q558, after rechecking the photos, not the originals, I reckon reading shin as at least as probable as dalet. The upper hook of the fragmentary letter would have a strange angle for the downstroke of a dalet and matches better the bent at the end of the right arm of a shin. Another possibility could be sadek like in fragment 37 ii 3 of Cook’s edition. Then, I am not sure Malachi 3 necessarily alludes to a Davidic Messiah following the coming of Elijah. Malachi 3:3 speaks of a messenger who purifies the priesthood. We should not be led astray by retrojecting early Christian conceptions. So in my opinion the possibility that the eighth one refers to priesthood as in Testament of Levi 18 is at least as probable as the solution referring to the sons of Jesse. With regard to 4Q541, I agree that the protagonist is probably priestly, but this would not prevent him from also being depicted as being a scapegoat. Even without pointing to Christology, typology is very frequently multivalent and the very rare occurrence of השתלח demands an explanation.

As I pointed out in the paper, I do not think that we should assume that all Aramaic compositions found in Qumran are pre-sectarian. As you would agree, many copies if not most are clearly late Hasmonean and early Herodian. If people copied these texts in the time of the yahad, some Aramaic texts could have been brought to Qumran by people joining the group in the first century BCE or CE. These texts could therefore have been composed later than the origin of the yahad without breaking with the assumption that the yahad authored only in Hebrew.

John Collins: In the case of 4Q246, the “Son of God” corresponds functionally to the “one like a son of man” in Daniel 7. If those verses were missing from the form of Daniel 7 known to the author, there would be no counterpart to the “Son of God.” In the case of 4Q541, there is no other case in pre-Christian Judaism where an eschatological figure corresponds to the scapegoat.

Daniel Stökl: Regarding 4Q246, let me confess that I found your suggestion that the Son of God is a parody on the Son of Man in Daniel 7 very suggestive. Yet few scholars seem to have accepted it. I thought therefore that there is room for another hypothesis. The fact that on the one hand so much of Daniel 7 is present in 4Q246 but on the other hand, the Son of Man, quite a central aspect of the scene, is absent needs indeed an explanation. At this point I would say that it is either your suggestion (that 4Q246 is turning the Son of Man into a Son of God) or mine (that he did not yet know it) to explain this puzzling absence, tertium non (iam) datur.

Concerning 4Q541, if we do not want to subscribe to those who see scapegoat imagery and language used in the Isaianic Servant Songs, you are completely right that 4Q541 would be the only pre-Christian case of a positive eschatological figure described with scapegoat imagery. 1 Enoch 10 uses scapegoat imagery for the leader of the fallen angels playing a negative protological and eschatological role, and the above-mentioned passage in Josephus is post 70 and speaks of an historical rather than an eschatological figure. This does not alter the fact that the verb השתלח is highly unusual and that the proximity to the title of the scapegoat is very forceful for ears used to rabbinic terminology.

Moshe Bernstein: A quick remark; you have this cutting down of trees and it actually reminds me of that scene in Noah’s dream in the Genesis Apocryphon where there is cutting down of trees going on; I wonder whether it might be worth looking at. It oc-
curs in a number of other places. And here a question—you emphasize the prophetic aspect of Elijah, when does Elijah also become a priest? By the time you get to rabbinic literature, he is; the targumic epithet for Elijah is אליה כהנא רבא, “Elijah the high priest,” very often. I wonder whether it’s worth looking to see what the earliest attestation of it might be and whether there might be some sort of Qumran “dotted-line” for it or not.

Daniel Stökl: With regard to the first remark, I did not think of this passage. The completely fragmentary state of 4Q558 does not allow a precise interpretation. The language of cutting seems different in both instances, though: 4Q558 37 ii: שיחוהי מתקצב י֯ן vs. Genesis Apocryphon XIII 10: ואילנא הלאהן קצין. In 4Q558 something fills the whole land, a detail not extant in the Genesis Apocryphon. Concerning the second remark, I would refer you to the paper by Poirier who says all there is to say.

Dan Machiela: I suppose that what one includes in this sort of investigation depends upon one’s opinion of what constitutes a messianic figure, but I am wondering whether you considered the warrior figure in Noah’s dream in Genesis Apocryphon XIII–XV during your research? I am not sure that this would fall into any definition of a messiah, but perhaps it is worth a look?

Daniel Stökl: Again, I did not think of this passage, thank you. Fitzmyer has noted few verbal links with Daniel 7. It seems unclear whether we talk of an angelic or a human figure.

Samuel Thomas: On the first page of your paper you state that “the non-sectarian texts might be even more important than the sectarian texts as they attest to conceptions held in wider segments of the Jewish society outside Qumran,” and on the last page you remark that the focus on Urzeit and Endzeit was not a general topic of Jewish Aramaic writing but was of particular interest at Qumran. These are not necessarily mutually-exclusive statements, but I wonder if you could clarify your opinion about whether these texts reflect wider conceptions or particular interests.

Daniel Stökl: I do not want to be understood in the sense that Urzeit und Endzeit was not a principal topic of Jewish Aramaic writing in general, also outside of the texts attested in Qumran. It could very well have been the central focus. Yet, we simply do not yet have the means to know this. Our main information on Second Temple texts comes from Qumran or Christian libraries. Moshe David Herr once wrote an interesting article on the misleading perspective on Second Temple Judaism caused by the fact that until Qumran practically all texts were transmitted by Christian scribes. These Christian scribes were interested in copying a Christian selection of Second Temple Jewish texts as they gave this or that support for Christian ideas. The same selective perspective is true for Qumran. Qumran scribes were interested in copying that selection of Second Temple Jewish writings that support or align with ideas found in other Qumran texts. Of non-sectarian Jewish literature they preserved mainly (not exclusively) what seemed of more interest to the members of the yahad. The sectarian texts speak for a group whose size we do not know, but not necessarily for the rest of Judaism. While we should not commit the mistake to regard the selection of non-sectarian texts from Qumran as representative for non-yahad Second Temple Judaism, especially not statistically, the non-sectarian texts, to which the Aramaic texts from Qumran seem to belong, speak for Judaism also outside of Qumran.
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