

Markus Tiwald (ed.)

# Q in Context I

The Separation between the Just and the Unjust  
in Early Judaism and in the Sayings Source

Bonn University Press

V&R Academic

# Bonner Biblische Beiträge

Band 172

herausgegeben von

Ulrich Berges und Martin Ebner

Markus Tiwald (ed.)

## **Q in Context I**

The Separation between the Just and the Unjust in  
Early Judaism and in the Sayings Source

Die Scheidung zwischen Gerechten und Ungerechten  
in Frühjudentum und Logienquelle

V&R unipress

Bonn University Press



Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

ISBN 978-3-8471-0322-6

ISBN 978-3-8470-0322-9 (E-Book)

**Veröffentlichungen der Bonn University Press  
erscheinen im Verlag V&R unipress GmbH.**

Dieser Band wurde gedruckt mit Fördermitteln der Fakultät für Geisteswissenschaften der Universität Duisburg-Essen.

© 2015, V&R unipress in Göttingen / [www.vr-unipress.de](http://www.vr-unipress.de)

Alle Rechte vorbehalten. Das Werk und seine Teile sind urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung in anderen als den gesetzlich zugelassenen Fällen bedarf der vorherigen schriftlichen Einwilligung des Verlages.

Printed in Germany.

Druck und Bindung: CPI buchbuecher.de GmbH, Birkach

Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem Papier.

---

## Contents

Markus Tiwald	
“Get Away From Me, You Who Do Lawlessness” (Q 13:27). Introduction to the Volume . . . . .	7
<b>Part I: The Separation between the Just and the Unjust in Early Judaism</b>	
Johann Maier	
Die Mittel der Darstellung der Geschichte Israels in Texten aus Qumran und ähnlichen Schriften. Zwischen Protologie und Eschatologie. . . . .	19
Loren T. Stuckenbruck	
Eschatologie und Zeit im <i>1 Henoch</i> . . . . .	43
Armin Lange	
Intra- und extrajüdische Polemiken. Ein Vergleich von Essenern und Urchristen . . . . .	61
<b>Part II: The Separation between the Just and the Unjust in the New Testament</b>	
Markus Tiwald	
Verborgene Weisheit – Wahres Israel. Die eschatologische Scheidung zwischen Gerechten und Ungerechten in Logienquelle und frühjüdischer Apokalyptik . . . . .	85
Christopher Tuckett	
Apocalyptic – in Q? . . . . .	107
John S. Kloppenborg	
A “Parting of the Ways” in Q? . . . . .	123

Daniel A. Smith	
“But You Will Be Thrown Out” (Q 13:28). The Spatial Dimensions of Q’s Apocalyptic Rhetoric . . . . .	145
Giovanni Bazzana	
Q 22:28–30. Judgment or Governance in the Sayings Gospel Q? . . . . .	169
Christoph Heil	
Die Zukunft Israels in der lukanischen Redaktion von Q . . . . .	185
Konrad Huber	
Die Zukunft Israels in der Logienquelle und in der Offenbarung des Johannes. Skizze eines Vergleichs . . . . .	201
<b>Part III: The Separation between the Just and the Unjust in the Theology of Rabbis and Church Fathers</b>	
Günter Stemberger	
„Ganz Israel hat Anteil an der kommenden Welt“. Rabbinische Vorstellungen der Scheidung zwischen Gerechten und Ungerechten in Israel . . . . .	223
Joseph Verheyden	
Israel’s Fate in the Apostolic Fathers. The Case of 1 Clement and the Epistle of Barnabas . . . . .	237
Contributors . . . . .	263
Index of Ancient Sources . . . . .	265

## **“Get Away From Me, You Who Do Lawlessness” (Q 13:27). Introduction to the Volume**

### **1. Q in Context I and II – Project Overview**

The two volumes “Q in Context I and II” form a diptych of two theologically aligned conferences that were held in Mülheim (Essen) in February of 2014 and in Werden (Essen) in September of 2014. The first conference, *The Separation of Just and Unjust in Early Judaism and the Sayings Source – A New Look at the “Parting of the Ways”* (February 17–19, 2014), focused on the assumption that the Sayings Source Q forms some sort of “missing link” between early Judaism and early Christianity. The origins of Q are most probably still embedded in the matrix of early Judaism. If the Sayings Source antedates the “parting of the ways” between Jews and Christians, Q has to be considered a document of early Judaism even more than a document of early Christianity. Particularly since the title Χριστός is missing in Q, the authorities behind this document should be considered *Jewish followers of Jesus* and not “Christians” in the strict sense of the word.

In this case, the question of polemics becomes crucial: Polemic imagery is rampant in the Sayings Source – as can be seen in the introductory quote: “Get Away From Me, You Who Do Lawlessness (Q 13:27)” is directed against Jews who do not believe in Jesus. Nevertheless, the polemical language in Q does not necessarily have to be interpreted as responding to a past rupture between Q people and Jews. Apocalyptic groups in early Judaism adopted a very polemical language of judgment, exclusion and condemnation of rival Jewish competitors and highlighted the conception of the eschatological damnation of a part of Israel. Thus, polemics in Q can also be interpreted as an inner-Jewish struggle for the true eschatological interpretation of the Torah rather than as a sign of an already completed “parting of the ways.” The conference therefore focused on the rhetoric of exclusion in an interdisciplinary exchange between scholars of early Judaism and New Testament exegesis.

After identifying early Judaism as the theological matrix of the Sayings Source, the second conference, *The Social Setting of the Sayings Source Q – New Evidence from Archaeology and Early Judaism* (September 15–17, 2014), highlighted the



sociological backdrop against which the Sayings Source Q could develop. It was especially the interplay between biblical archaeology and a sociologically oriented exegesis of the New Testament that constituted the *leitmotiv* of the conference. The question arises as to which extent the Jesus-movement was influenced by socio-political and socio-economic factors.

Both volumes thus try to redefine the context of the Sayings Source. The first volume focuses on the religious matrix that gave birth to Q, the second volume highlights sociological prerequisites for the development of Q.

Both conferences were made possible through funds from the DFG (*Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft*). I would also like to express my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Martin Ebner for accepting these volumes for publication in the series *Bonner Biblische Beiträge*, and to the Faculty of Humanities of the University Duisburg-Essen making their publication possible through a grant.

## 2. Preliminary Works

The present two volumes continue the trajectory begun at a previous conference that was held in Mülheim (Essen) in February of 2012; its proceedings were published as: *Tiwald, Markus (ed.), Kein Jota wird vergehen. Das Gesetzesverständnis der Logienquelle vor dem Hintergrund frühjüdischer Theologie (BWANT 200), Stuttgart 2012*. Here the focus lay on the pluriformity of early Judaism and the place that Q may have occupied in this vast landscape. The present volume continues to pursue this strategy by focusing on the rhetorical function of inner-Jewish polemics and the rhetoric of exclusion. These three volumes can thus be seen as a triptych dealing with the same topic (Sayings Source and early Judaism), but accessing it from different perspectives.

## 3. The Contributions in this Volume

This volume has a threefold structure. The first part deals with the topic of a separation between the just and the unjust in early Judaism, the second part focuses on the New Testament, and the last section examines the position of the Rabbis and of the church fathers.

Part I: The Separation between the Just and the Unjust in Early Judaism

If the Sayings Source has to be considered a Jewish document, early Jewish theologumena and the way of arguing are crucial for the right understanding of

this text. In early Jewish literature, polemics occur frequently, so it is worth examining the rhetorical function behind such statements.

This is especially the aim of the first contribution: *Johann Maier: Die Mittel der Darstellung der Geschichte Israels in Texten aus Qumran und ähnlichen Schriften* focuses his attention on the scribal elites in the Second Temple period. Their importance can be seen in the book of Jesus Sirach, but also in the Enochic literature. The group behind the Qumran manuscripts consisted of descendants from priestly-scribal elites who engaged in a fight for power and influence in the Second Temple period. Hereby the figure of Enoch is functionalized for the mediation of esoteric knowledge revealed only to a small group of “elects” with whom the Qumran group identified itself. All the other groups lacking this knowledge were portrayed as having gone astray. Eschatological expectations in particular led to a metaphorical elevation of reality. Even if the use of metaphors is widespread in such polemical texts, it is not easy to distinguish between the metaphorical use of standard accusations and the reality behind these texts. In consequence, such polemics were not perceived as an exclusion of the rivals for all times, but rather as an exhortation to accept the doctrines of one’s own group.

The trajectory of diverging groups in early Judaism and Jewish in-group polemics is drawn upon by *Loren T. Stuckenbruck: Eschatologie und Zeit im 1 Enoch*. Stuckenbruck starts with a thorough examination of 1 Enoch: The “book” clearly is composite and consists of about 20 originally independent parts that developed in a time span of 400 years. The oldest Aramaic manuscripts from the late third century until the first century BCE indicate that many of these originally independent sections formed a unity already early in time. One can reckon with an *unbroken Enoch-tradition* over a time span of 400 years – the process of rewriting Enoch material lasted until the first centuries of Christianity. However, this does *not* indicate an *unbroken line of social continuity* behind the groups rewriting this material. Even the opposite can be proven: Sometimes opposing groups adapted the Enoch material for their own means. Thus, for example, The Book of the Watchers (1 Enoch 1 – 36) prophesied a “plant of righteousness and truth” (10:16) for the end of times. This plant refers to the ideal part of Israel that keeps God’s commandments. In the Apocalypse of the Weeks (1 Enoch 93:1 – 10; 91:11 – 17) this motive is continued. Here this plant refers to a special community of the elect *inside of Israel* and *in opposition to the rest of Israel*. Only this group will receive sevenfold wisdom concerning God’s creation (1 Enoch 93:5.10). It seems quite possible that the community behind this text identified with the pious groups in Israel that preceded the Maccabean revolt in 167 BCE. Finally, the Epistle of Enoch (1 Enoch 92:1 – 5; 93:11 – 14; 94:1 – 105:2) further adapted such ideas. Here suppression and persecution no longer are connected with “external” powers, but are located within Israel: Enoch’s Epistle reflects inner-Jewish tensions. The reason for this can be seen in social inequity within the Jewish pop-

ulation and in diverging theological concepts. The richer and more powerful classes justified their social opulence by quoting the book Deuteronomy, explaining their wealth by the blessings of God for the righteous. Enoch's Epistle does not invalidate this theology, but opens up a wider horizon. The eight Woe Oracles (94:6–95:2; 95:4–7; 96:4–8; 97:7–10; 98:9–99:2; 99:11–16; 100:7–9; 103:5–8) are directed against politically and theologically influential Jews; here a new interpretation of the blessings and curses of Deuteronomy is developed. In these texts inner-Jewish polemics lead to a separation between righteous and sinners within Israel.

*Armin Lange: Intra- und extrajüdische Polemiken. Ein Vergleich von Essenern und Urchristen.* Lange examines criteria that enable us to distinguish between inner-Jewish and extra-Jewish polemics. Here he exemplarily compares the anti-Pharisaic polemics of the Qumran manuscripts with anti-Jewish passages in the New Testament. In the Qumran manuscripts, he focuses special attention on the Nahum Peshet (4QpNahum). According to this text, the Qumran community considered the Pharisees to be sons of darkness who belonged to the world of Belial. In this text, only the Essene community represents the true and real Israel, the Pharisees are excluded and part of the “*massa damnata*.” However, all this still remains an inner-Jewish conflict. From this point of view, the polemics in the Sayings Source against Jews who do not believe in Jesus can also be interpreted as an inner-Jewish conflict. The picture changes with the Gospels of Mark, Matthew and Luke. According to Lange, especially the use of the word Ἰουδαίος – which is missing in Q – indicates that the perspective meanwhile has become an extra-Jewish one. Lange then examines 1 Thess 2:13–16 and poses the question as to whether this text can be seen as reflecting inner-Jewish conflict or not. He shows that the crucial point resides in the missionary activity of Paul. The Roman government responded very negatively to attempts to convert non-Jews to Judaism. Therefore Paul's activities led to understandable fears among the Thessaloniki Jewry. In return, Paul answered with stereotypes of pagan and Christian anti-Jewish literature: A pagan stereotype might be seen in the accusation of “hostility towards humankind,” a Christian stereotype in the accusation of having “murdered Jesus.” By adapting such anti-Jewish stereotypes – thus the conclusion of Lange –, Paul has already left the inner-Jewish discourse. Even if the Essene polemics against Pharisees are as harsh as Paul's accusation against “the Jews”, Lange nevertheless sees a difference here: Essenes regarded themselves as the only authentic Jews and criticized other Jews. In opposition to this, Paul – so Lange – condemns all the Jews *in toto* and thus already has broken with his Jewish background.

Part II: The Separation between the Just and the Unjust in the New Testament

In this second section, *Markus Tiwald: Verborgene Weisheit – Wahres Israel. Die eschatologische Scheidung zwischen Gerechten und Ungerechten in Logienquelle und frühjüdischer Apokalyptik* tries to bridge the gap between early Jewish and early Christian literature. Here the Sayings Source appears to be a “missing link” of sorts. By drawing parallels between Enoch’s Epistle (1 Enoch 92:1–5; 93:11–105:2), the Apocalypse of Weeks (1 Enoch 93:1–10; 91:11–17), *Musar leMevin* (a text found in Qumran, consisting of: 1Q26, 4Q415–418, 4Q423), the fourth book of Ezra, and the Sayings Source, Tiwald tries to show that the rhetoric of exclusion and the theologoumenon of an eschatological separation between the just and the unjust were widespread in early Judaism. These patterns follow two different schemes: a *direct exclusion* through the condemnation of sinners and an *indirect exclusion* by way of the exclusive possession of revealed wisdom that sets the chosen and elect apart from the rest of Israel. These two patterns are present in a large stream of early Jewish literature; the “*Jubelruf*” in Q 10:21–24, the woe oracles in Q 10:13–15, and the judgment against those who do ἀνομία in Q 13:28 f. fit perfectly in this context. The claims in Q thus functioned like the Enochic (cf. the article by Stuckenbruck in the present volume) and Qumranian claims (cf. the contribution by Maier in this book). Therefore, the rhetoric of exclusion in Q is not a sign of an already consummated “parting of the ways”, but is indicative of a continuing inner-Jewish struggle over the right interpretation of the Law.

The contribution by *Christopher Tuckett: Apocalyptic – in Q?* tries to define what can or should count as “apocalyptic”, whether it is sensible to talk about “apocalypticism”, and what the relationship between “apocalyptic” and “eschatology” is. After an attempt to provide such a definition, Tuckett discusses the “apocalyptic” nature of Q. He comes to the conclusion that Q itself is certainly not an “apocalypse” according to almost any definition of what an “apocalypse” might be. Nevertheless, “apocalyptic” patterns of some kind may be present in Q. If an essential feature of an “apocalypse” constitutes the idea of the revelation and mediation of divine secrets, then there is one reference in Q to such an idea: the so-called “*Jubelruf*” of Q 10:21–22, with the claim that “these things” have been hidden from the “wise and understanding” but have now been revealed to “infants”, who presumably include the members of the Q group. “Apocalyptic” conceptions might also be behind Q 22:28.30, where the disciples (and perhaps then derivatively the Q followers of Jesus) are promised that they will sit on thrones to judge the twelve tribes of Israel. In this case, a model by which the saying functions to provide hope and encouragement for the hearers does indeed fit in well with the content of the saying. After examination of some other “apocalyptic” patterns in Q, Tuckett concludes that Q was not written in a situation in which there has been an irreparable division. If there has been some

“parting of the ways”, the aim of the Q Christians is to seek overcome those divisions and to break down any boundary lines. There is therefore an appeal still going to whole of Israel, the rupture is not yet final.

The article by *John S. Kloppenborg: A “Parting of the Ways” in Q?* fits in perfectly at this point. Certainly the threat of judgment is a major editorial theme of Q. This in turn raises a critical question: does Q’s composition and its strong featuring of the judgment of specific Israelite towns and the desolation of Jerusalem and its temple indicate that nothing awaits Israel but final judgment? Kloppenborg examines the texts thoroughly and concludes that Q freely engages in a shaming technique that can already be found at various points in the Tanak, especially Isa 3:9–17 and Ezek 16. Neither of these prophets thought that Israel had been abandoned by God, but both were willing to invoke the worst comparisons possible in order to shame their addressees into a change of heart. Accordingly, we should also read Q’s polemic as a kind of rhetorical exaggeration that one encounters in intramural disputes against competitors, and as language that articulates a claim for Q and its partisans as being the most authentic representatives of Israelite identity. Such rhetorical techniques should not be seen as blanket rejections of the role of Israel in the economy of salvation. They are rhetorical constructions intended to create a space *within* Israelite discourse for Q’s particular brand. The framers of Q were most likely low-level scribes who suffered under a shift in the organization of power from rural to urban centers and who stood in competition to other, more successful groups in early Judaism (such as the Pharisees and other scribes). Although they were prepared to condemn their co-ethnic group, there is no evidence that they had fundamentally turned away to embrace non-Israelites. Here, actual and hypothetical Gentiles are invoked as counterexamples, designed to shame the (imagined) addressees of Q into what is called “repentance,” apparently simply meaning recognition of Q’s practices and message.

The contribution of *Daniel Smith: “But You Will Be Thrown Out” (Q 13:28): The Spatial Dimensions of Q’s Apocalyptic Rhetoric* follows the trajectory of Tuckett and Kloppenborg in demonstrating the socio-political aims that are immanent in apocalyptically oriented polemics. In an overview, he shows that from 1970 scholars began turning their attention to the persuasive purposes and strategies of apocalyptic literature and of apocalyptic *topoi* employed in other genres. More recently, advocates of the socio-rhetorical method of Vernon Robbins have studied the rhetorical dimensions of apocalyptic discourse. Robbins has noted that often there is less attention to the rhetorical effects of apocalyptic discourse on *space* than perceptions of *time*. Here Smith’s efforts come in by demonstrating that space sometimes is constructed socially and imaginatively. Early Jewish documents in particular often reflect a political strategy of resistance that effectively creates an alternatively lived space in re-

action to the ideological constructions of space of both other Jewish groups and the Roman occupation. Now Smith tries to adapt these theories to the Sayings Source. Like Tuckett, he correctly points out that Q in general is not an apocalyptic text, but that it undeniably includes some argumentative *topoi* found elsewhere in apocalyptic literature. When we consider imagery in Q, which evokes enclosed, built space (domestic or agricultural) in the service of apocalyptic rhetoric, three patterns emerge: first, houses under threat of destruction or invasion; second, separations within elite households; and third, separations within enclosed agricultural space. Jesus conquers this space and also bests his opponents – but do the polemics reflect “real-world” debates and rivalries, or are they directed more to the formation of the identity and ethos of an in-group operating under the radar of dominant out-groups? Smith concludes that the spatial constructions of Q’s apocalyptic rhetoric, whether pertaining to domestic space, village, city, cultivated agricultural space, or mythic space, serve the larger purpose of group identity formation with reference to a coming separation mirrored by a present separation.

*Giovanni Bazzana: Q 22:28–30. Judgment or Governance in the Sayings Gospel Q?* Most probably Q 22:28.30 (“You who have followed me will sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel”) constituted the ending of Q. According to some scholars, this would imply that the entire Sayings Gospel ended with an outright rejection of Israel. Nevertheless, it is not easy to establish the appropriate meaning of κρίνειν in Q 22:28.30. The semantic range of κρίνω is in itself much broader than “judging” understood as a synonym of “condemning.” Hellenistic documentary papyri show that the occurrences of κρίνω are so ossified within bureaucratic terminology that they *do not carry any forensic nuance*, but indicate the *exercise of sovereign authority* not only by kings and emperors, but also by prefects and other lower-ranking officials. As such, while the saying certainly conveys the idea of Israel’s ultimate restoration (judging the twelve tribes obviously means a restoration of the lost tribes), its main theme is the participation of Jesus’ disciples (and of the Q people) in the exercise of divine sovereignty in the end-time. Hence, the “judging” of Q 22:30, while entailing “condemnation”, cannot be reduced to its negative aspect only. As the other constitutive elements of ancient government and of ideal sovereignty, the activity of “judging” is both beneficial and threatening at the same time. Thus Q 22:28.30 provides us no hint that the “parting of the ways” between the Q-group and other Jews had already taken place.

*Christoph Heil: Die Zukunft Israels in der lukanischen Redaktion von Q* refers to the once existing consensus among scholars that the final redaction of Q looked back on an already failed mission to Israel. This failure – so the position of Lührmann and Hoffmann – would have led to a rejection of “whole Israel” (seen as “this generation”). In recent publications, this consensus has been challenged

more and more frequently. Theißen, for example, sees Q as a document of Christian Jews; the woes against Jewish cities are interpreted here as a last chance to repent, but not as a definite statement of a “parting of the ways” that has already occurred. Heil, for his part, takes a closer look at these woe oracles (Q 10:13–15), then examines Q 11:31 f. and Q 11:49–51 (the condemnation of “this generation”). Hereby he not only reads the text of Q thoroughly, but also compares it with the Lukan Redaction. He also focuses his attention on the “κρίσις of Israel” in Q 13:24–27; 13:29.28; 13:34 f.; the judgment of Jerusalem (Q 13:34 f.) and the judgment of the twelve tribes of Israel (Q 22:28.30). He comes to the conclusion that Q still has an inner-Jewish point of view. The polemics against other Jews follow the same pattern that we find in the similitudes of 1 Enoch. Nevertheless, for Q Jews who do not believe in Jesus will be condemned – as also in 1 Enoch the unbelieving majority of Israel becomes subject to condemnation. This scheme is adopted, but also adapted by Luke, who already writes his gospel after the “parting of the ways.” The third evangelist proposes a “separation in Israel” between believers and non-believers in Jesus. The person of Jesus himself leads to this κρίσις of Israel.

*Konrad Huber: Die Zukunft Israels in der Logienquelle und in der Offenbarung des Johannes. Skizze eines Vergleichs* tries to compare the Sayings Source and the Revelation of John. Juxtaposing these two texts makes sense, for the author of Revelation most seemingly comes from Palestine, has Jewish roots, and is influenced by prophetic traditions – all these are parallels to the authors of the Sayings Source. One could even go a step further in drawing parallels between the itinerancy of John (who shuttled between Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamum, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, and Laodicea) and the itinerant lifestyle of Q prophets (cf. Q 10:4–11.16). Some scholars would even go so far as to interpret John as one of the itinerant charismatics, as were the authorities behind the Sayings Source. K. Huber acknowledges all of these parallels, but he also points out the differences. First, there is the time span of nearly 40 years that lie between the composition of Q and Rev (which he dates under Domitian’s reign). In the same way, there is also closeness and distance in some striking theological parallels between Q and Rev. For example, there is widespread use of the eschatological judgment metaphors in Q and in Rev, but in Q this imagery is directed against Israel and “this generation,” whereas in Rev it is aimed at Roman imperial structures. Regarding the question of Israel’s fate, it is remarkable that John identifies Jews as the “synagogue of Satan” (Rev 2,9; 3,9). Does this already indicate a “parting of the ways” between Jews and Christians or is this *intra-muros*-polemic? We do not know, but in any case the theology of John remains “Israel-bound” (cf. the “Israelbestimmtheit” that Klaus Wengst mentions): The author of Rev sees the Christian community in continuity to “Israel” and claims to be the “true Israel.”

Part III: The Separation between the Just and the Unjust in the Theology  
of Rabbis and Church Fathers

In this third section, *Günter Stemberger: Rabbinische Konzepte einer Scheidung in Israel?* offers a profound overview of Rabbinic conceptions concerning the question as to who in Israel will have part in the coming world. In this regard, the most prominent saying in rabbinic literature is: “All Israel has a share in the world to come.” This saying is normally attributed to Mishna Sanh. 10:1 and precludes the concept of a separation between the just and the unjust in Israel. Nevertheless, Stemberger meticulously demonstrates that this sentence was *not* present in the best versions of the Mishna (e.g., Codex Kaufmann); it only occurs in Codex Parma 138 and in the Leiden manuscript. Furthermore, this saying is not mentioned in the Tosefta, but there we encounter an extensive discussion concerning which groups will *not* have part in the world to come. The same goes for Talmud Yerushalmi. Only in Talmud Bavli can the sentence “All Israel has a share in the world to come” be found in all manuscripts. Even though this saying is restricted by some exceptions, the threat of exclusion no longer serves as a criterion regarding who belongs to Israel and who does not, but is only operative as a means of exhortation. B. Sanh. 44a even goes a step further: When Israel has sinned, it still remains Israel! Nobody in Israel – not even the apostate – can, in principle, lose his status as part of the elect people. Thus at least at the level of Bavli the concept of a general separation between the just and the unjust in Israel is precluded by the Rabbis.

*Joseph Verheyden*, for his part, sheds light on *Israel’s Fate in the Apostolic Fathers. The Case of 1 Clement and the Epistle of Barnabas*. First of all, it must be emphasized that there is no such thing as “the Apostolic Fathers.” Therefore, we can only examine the positions of certain scriptures from the so-called “time of Apostolic Fathers.” Verheyden thus exemplarily focuses on *1 Clem.* and *Barn.* since the two writings mention the term “Israel” by name and as a concept. While the differences between these two texts cannot be ignored, when it comes to dealing with “Israel” they are in some respects relatively close to one another. For both, Israel’s fate is assumed to be known by the intended readership and is presented as such. Both treat and make use of it as if the case were settled, resolved, and closed. The verdict has already been spoken. There is no discussion, only a monologue. As a consequence, Israel’s fate is formulated from the perspective of the authors and the group to which they belong, stating that “we” are the elect and the chosen ones who assume the place once occupied by the “old Israel.” Between *1 Clem.* and *Barn.* there may be some differences in the form by which this is expressed, but the result is the same: a transfer has taken place, the “old Israel” is abandoned and the connotation of exclusiveness that is attached to the whole concept of a chosen people or nation prevents arguing that two or more parties could make this same claim. There is only one. Some may feel inclined to call it a case of identity theft.





---

**Part I: The Separation between the Just and the Unjust  
in Early Judaism**



## Die Mittel der Darstellung der Geschichte Israels in Texten aus Qumran und ähnlichen Schriften. Zwischen Protologie und Eschatologie.

### 0. Einleitung

Die Eschatologie der Qumranschriften war seit deren Publikation Gegenstand zahlreicher Untersuchungen.<sup>1</sup> Die Diskussion ist allerdings stark von Fragestellungen bestimmt, die dem Verhältnis von Eschatologie, Apokalyptik und Weisheit gelten.<sup>2</sup> Ein weiterer, die Forschung überproportional in Anspruch nehmender Komplex ist ein sogenannter „Messianismus“. Auch die Vorstellungen vom Gericht bzw. Tag des Gerichts haben stets Aufmerksamkeit auf sich gezogen.<sup>3</sup>

In der neueren orientalistischen und bibelwissenschaftlichen Forschung sind zwei Bereiche stärker ins Blickfeld geraten, die auch für das Verständnis der Qumrantexte und ihre eschatologischen Aussagen von Bedeutung sind. Der eine

---

1 Aus den letzten Jahren s. v. a.: A. Yarbro Collins, *Apocalypse Now: The State of Apocalyptic Studies Near the End of the First Decade of the Twenty-First Century*, in: HThR 104 (2011), 447–457; G. Macaskill, *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (JSJ.S 115), Leiden 2007; L. A. Hogeterp, *Expectations of the End. A Comparative Traditio-Historical Study of Eschatological, Apocalyptic and Messianic Ideas in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*, Leiden (STDJ 83) 2009; C. Werman, *ʿharit ha-jamim ba-h-gūt ʿdat Qûmraʿn. Eschatology at Qumraʿn*, in: M. Kister (ed.), *M<sup>e</sup>gillôt Qûmraʿn: m<sup>b</sup>ôʿôt û-mâhqarim, The Qumran Scrolls and Their World. Between Bible and Mishnah*, vol. II Jerusalem 2009, 529–549; D. Hamidovič, *L'eschatologie essénienne dans la littérature apocalyptique: Temporalités et limites chronologiques*, in: RÉJ 169 (2010) 37–55; F. J. Murphy, *Apocalypticism in the Bible and Its World: A Comprehensive Introduction*, Grand Rapids 2012; R. Bergmeier, *Die Qumran-Essener* (BThSt 133) Neukirchen 2013, 210–240.

2 Vgl. L. L. Grabbe/R. D. Haak (ed.), *Knowing the End from the Beginning. The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic, and their Relationship*, London/Sheffield 2003; B. G. Wright/L. Wills (ed.), *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism*, Atlanta 2005; M. J. Goff, *Discerning Wisdom. The Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (VT.S 116), Leiden 2007.

3 Vgl. K. Müller, *Gott als Richter und die Erscheinungsweisen seiner Gerichte in den Schriften des Frühjudentums. Methodische und grundsätzliche Vorüberlegungen zu einer sachgemäßen Einschätzung*, in: H.-J. Klauck (Hrsg.), *Weltgericht und Weltvollendung. Zukunftsbilder im Neuen Testament*, Freiburg 1994, 23–53; A. Hultgård/S. Norin (ed.), *Le jour de Dieu. Der Tag Gottes*, Tübingen 2009.

betrifft die Funktion der „Schreiber“ als maßgebliche Bildungsträger mit hohen Prestigeansprüchen.<sup>4</sup> Der zweite Bereich sind die zur Verfügung stehenden rhetorischen Mittel und Konventionen bzw. die Metaphorik.<sup>5</sup> Dass an Königshöfen Schreiber eine wichtige Rolle spielten, ist zur Genüge bekannt. In der nachexilischen jüdischen Gesellschaft konnten sich aber außerhalb des kultischen Bereichs Schreibertraditionen nur mehr begrenzt halten oder etablieren. Folglich wurde die Geschichte der Literatur fortan bis zur Zerstörung des 2. Tempels vorrangig durch die priesterlich-levitischen Institutionen und von den in ihnen wirkenden Schreiberspezialisten bestimmt.<sup>6</sup> Was sie schrieben, war in der Regel zweckbestimmt, sei es für den internen Gebrauch etwa des Kultpersonals, sei es für öffentliche Belange. Ein beträchtlicher Teil der Qumrantexte dürfte für den internen Gebrauch im Kultpersonal bestimmt gewesen sein.

Über die organisatorische Struktur der Schreiberschaft am Tempel zu Jerusalem ist allerdings wenig überliefert.<sup>7</sup> Angesichts der Bedeutung der Kultorganisation ist aber eine hierarchische Ordnung und eine weitreichende Spezialisierung vorauszusetzen. Die Texte aus Qumran stammen wohl zum guten Teil aus priesterlich-levitischen Schreiberkreisen, in denen sogenannte *maskîlîm* etwas wie eine höhere Lehrfunktion wahrnahmen.<sup>8</sup>

In der Regel handelte es sich weitgehend um Familientraditionen, wobei im kultischen Bereich sowohl der institutionelle wie der familiäre Hintergrund infolge der stammesmäßigen Definition des Kultpersonals als „Levi“ stärker ins Gewicht fiel, so dass nach dem Untergang des Königreiches Juda trotz der Tempelzerstörung die Kultorganisation die höfischen Institutionen überdauerte

4 Vgl. M. J. Goff, Hellenistic Instruction in Palestine and Egypt: ben Sira and Papyrus Insinger, in: JSJ 36 (2005) 147–172; A. Livingstone, Mystical and Mythological Explanatory Works of Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars, Winona Lake 2007; M. Rutz, Bodies of Knowledge in Ancient Mesopotamia. The Diviners of Late Bronze Age Emar and their Tablet Collection, Leiden 2013.

5 Vgl. Harrison S./M. Paschalis/S. Frangoulidis (ed.), Metaphor and the Ancient Novel (Ancient Narrative Supplementum 4), Groningen 2005; T. Cohen, Thinking of Others: On the Talent for Metaphor, Princeton 2012.

6 Vgl. J. van Seters, The role of the scribe in the making of the Hebrew Bible, in: Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions 8, 2008, 99–129; R. A. Horsley, Scribes, Visionaries, and the Politics of Second Temple Judea, Louisville/London 2007; H. Drawnel, Some Notes on Scribal Craft and the Origins of the Enochic Literature, in: Henoah 31 (2009), 66–72; ders., Between Akkadian *tupšarrûtu* and Aramaic *spr*. Some Notes on the Social Context of the Early Enochic Literature, in: RdQ 24/95 (2010) 373–403; L. I. Grabbe, An Introduction to Second Temple Judaism, London 2010 (mit Hervorhebung der priesterlichen Komponente).

7 Vgl. A. Schenker, Gab es im 7. Jahrhundert in Jerusalem einen Tempelschreiber? Die einzige Erwähnung eines Tempelschreibers in der Bibel (2 Kön 22,3 LXX), in: A. Vonach (Hrsg.), Horizonte biblischer Texte. Festschrift für M. Oesch, Fribourg 2003, 39–46. Die LXX-Übersetzung von 2 Kön 22,3 macht aus dem königlichen Schreiber Saphan den „Schreiber des Hauses Jhwhs“.

8 Vgl. T. Elgvin, *maskîl*, Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten, II (2013) 802–806.

und an Bedeutung bei Weitem überrundete. In Israel verloren die höfischen Institutionen und Traditionen mit dem Ende der monarchischen Herrschaft ja ihre Verankerung in der Gesellschaft, auch wenn in der Administration der Provinz sicher auch weiterhin Betätigungsmöglichkeiten für Schreiber gegeben waren.<sup>9</sup> Die Bedeutung der Schreiber innerhalb der Kultorganisation wurde durch die politische Entwicklung ausgeweitet, nachdem gegen Ende der Perserzeit die Funktion des Statthalters fortgefallen und dem Hohepriester die Doppelfunktion als Haupt der Kultorganisation und der Provinzverwaltung zugefallen war. Das Selbstbewusstsein dieser Eliteschreiber, das im Sirachbuch eindrucksvoll beschrieben wird,<sup>10</sup> gipfelte darin, sich in der Figur des Henoch repräsentiert zu sehen.<sup>11</sup> Damit meldeten sie Einblick in überirdische Sachverhalte an, sozusagen einen Offenbarungsanspruch, und das der Gründung des Kultes vor- und übergeordnet.<sup>12</sup>

Dennoch wird in den Publikationen zur frühjüdischen Literatur dieser Bildungselite verhältnismäßig wenig Beachtung geschenkt. Das erstaunt, denn ihr Werk steht, als „Weisheit“ deklariert, sehr wohl mit im Zentrum des Interesses.<sup>13</sup> Wahrscheinlich ist die Ursache dafür in einer von den realen Verhältnissen und Möglichkeiten zu stark abgehobenen, vorrangig geistesgeschichtlich-theologischen Konzeption der „Weisheit“ zu suchen, ein Umstand, der auch für die

- 
- 9 Vgl. D. S. Vanderhoof, *el-mēdinā û-mēdinā kiktābāh: scribes and scripts in Yehud and in Achaemenid Transeuphratene*, in: O. Lipschits/G. N. Knoppers/M. Oeming (Hrsg.), *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period. Negotiating Identity in an International Context*, Winona Lake 2011, 529 – 544.
- 10 Vgl. M. J. Goff, *Discerning Wisdom: The Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (VT.S 116), Leiden 2007; F. V. Reiterer, *The Sociological Significance of the Scribe as the Teacher of Wisdom in Ben Sira*, in: L. G. Perdue (ed.), *Scribes, Sages and Seers: The Sage in the Eastern Mediterranean World*, Göttingen 2008, 219 – 243; F. Ueberschaefer, *Weisheit aus der Begegnung: Bildung nach dem Buch Ben Sira* (BZAW 379), Berlin 2007.
- 11 Vgl. J. A. Waddell, *Enoch and the Enoch Tradition: A Bibliography, 2000 – Present*, in: G. Boccaccini/J. J. Collins (ed.), *The Early Enoch Literature* (JSJ.S 121), Leiden 2007, 337 – 347; H. S. Kvanvig, *Enoch: From Sage to Visionary Apocalyptist*, in: *Enoch* 30 (2008) 48 – 51; A. A. Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition* (TSAJ 107), Tübingen 2005; *ders.*, *The Learned Savant who Guards the Secrets of the Great Gods: Evolution of the Roles and Titles of the Seventh Antidiluvian Hero in Mesopotamian and Enochic Traditions. Part II: Enochic Traditions*, in: B. Lourie (ed.), *Universum Hagiographicum: Memorial R. P. Michel van Esbroeck*, S. J., St. Petersburg 2006, 165 – 213; G. H. van Kooten, *Enoch, the „watchers“, Seth’s descendants and Abraham as astronomers: Jewish applications of the Greek motif of the first inventor* (300 BCE-CE 100), in: A. Brenner/J. W. van Henten (ed.), *Recycling Biblical Figure*, Leiden 1999, 292 – 316.
- 12 Laut 4Q227 Frg. 2 wurde der entrückte Henoch durch 6 Jobelperioden von Engeln unterrichtet. Weiteres: G. Macaskill, *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (JSJ.S 115), Leiden 2007.
- 13 Vgl. C. Hempel/A. Lange/H. Lichtenberger (ed.), *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (BETHL 159), Leuven 2002.

Vorstellungen von der „Apokalyptik“ und der „Prophetie“ zutrifft.<sup>14</sup> Weitere Vorstellungskomplexe, die den Zugang zu den frühjüdischen Gegebenheiten behindern, sind der christlich-theologische Kanonbegriff, der – anachronistisch verwendet – für das Judentum einen tatsächlich nur sehr begrenzt vergleichbaren Sachverhalt ergibt, und der Begriff der „Gemeinde“, sofern dieser – wie weithin üblich – durch das Bild von der christlichen Urgemeinde vorbestimmt wird.<sup>15</sup> Ebenfalls problematisch ist die Verwendung des Begriffs „Sekte“, weil er eine bestimmte Ausformung von Judentum als Hintergrund voraussetzt, von dem sich die „Sekte“ abgrenzt.<sup>16</sup> Dieser Hintergrund wird aber meist nur postuliert, nicht beschrieben. Daher ist es vielleicht sinnvoller, in erster Linie von den nachweisbaren soziologischen Gegebenheiten auszugehen, also v. a. von den Funktionen und internen Interessen bzw. Interessenkonflikten des Kultpersonals.

Sowohl für die Bewahrung wie für die kreative Weiterentwicklung von Überkommenem kommt allgemein der Metaphorik eine maßgebliche Bedeutung zu, und das gilt auch für die biblische und außerbiblische jüdische Literatur der Antike.<sup>17</sup> In besonderem Maß sind davon natürlich poetische Texte betroffen.<sup>18</sup> Aber auch prophetische Schriften weisen einen beachtlichen Reichtum an metaphorischen Formulierungen auf, deren Verwendung in apokalyptischen Texten durch Besonderheiten der Geschichtsdarstellung noch erweitert wird.<sup>19</sup> Mit

14 Zur Prophetie im Frühjudentum s. J. Verheyden etc. (ed.), *Prophets and Prophecy in Jewish and Early Christian Literature*, Tübingen 2010; A. P. Jassen, *Prophecy after „the Prophets“: The Dead Sea Scrolls and the History of Prophecy in Judaism*, in: A. Lange etc. (ed.): *The Dead Sea Scrolls In Context: Integrating the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Study of Ancient Texts, Languages, and Cultures*, vol. II Leiden 2011, 577 – 593; D. Dimant, *From the Book of Jeremiah to the Qumranic Apocryphon of Jeremiah*, in: DSD 20 (2013) 452 – 471; D. Kipp, *Prophets of Exile: 4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C, Apocryphal Baruch, and the Efficacy of the Second Temple*, in: 44 (2013) 497 – 529.

15 Vgl. Brooke G. J., *The Dead Sea Scrolls and New Testament Ecclesiology*, in: ed. K. E. Brower /A. Johnson (ed.), *Holiness and Ecclesiology in the New Testament*, Grand Rapids 2007, 1 – 18

16 Zur Problematik s. E. Regev, *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective* (RS 45), Berlin 2007; J. Jokiranta, *Social Identity and Sectarianism in the Qumran Movement* (StTDJ 105), Leiden 2012.

17 Vgl. P. Macky, *The Centrality of Metaphors to Biblical Thought. A Method for Interpreting the Bible*, Lewiston 1990. Siehe ferner die Beiträge in: R. Bishops/J. Francis (ed.), *Metaphor, Canon and Community. Jewish, Christian and Islamic Approaches*, Bern 1999; G. Braulik, *Die Mittel deuteronomischer Rhetorik erhoben aus Deuteronomium 4,1 – 40*, Rom 1978.

18 Vgl. W. Brown, *Seeing the Psalms. A Theology of Metapher*, Louisville 2003. Weiters s. die Beiträge in: van Hecke/A. Labahn (ed.), *Metaphors in the Psalms*, Leuven 2010; H.-P. Müller, *Vergleich und Metapher im Hohenlied* (OBO 56), Freiburg/Schw./Göttingen 1994; A. R. Gray, *Psalm 18 in Words and Pictures. A Reading Through Metaphor* (Biblical Interpretation Series 127). Leiden 2014.

19 Vgl. K. Koch, *Vom prophetischen zum apokalyptischen Visionsbericht*, in: D. Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism*, Tübingen 1983, 413 – 446. J. R. Lundbloom, *Jeremiah: a study in ancient*

der Verwendung von Metaphern geht meist eine Tendenz zur Dramatisierung Hand in Hand. Das gilt besonders für biographisch-historische Komponenten und rückt diese in ein Zwielficht zwischen Fiktion und Realität. Ein für Metaphorik recht anfälliger Bereich ist schließlich auch die Polemik. Es gibt eine Reihe von Vorwürfen, die durch die Jahrhunderte hindurch in den interreligiösen Auseinandersetzungen gewohnheitsmäßig gegeneinander verwendet wurden, v. a. die Unterstellung von Abtrünnigkeit, Unzucht und Magie. Die Unterscheidung zwischen Verwendung von Standardvorwürfen und tatsächlich existenten Angriffspunkten ist dabei nicht immer möglich und darum ist eine historiographische oder biographische Auswertung nur mit Vorbehalt durchführbar. Das gilt nicht zuletzt für angebliche oder tatsächliche Gründe für eine Separation. Bemerkenswert ist nämlich, dass in 4QMMT eine Reihe von Differenzen ohne polemische Rhetorik aufgelistet wurde, Differenzen, die man unter einem einsichtigen Hasmonäerherrscher beseitigen zu können meinte.<sup>20</sup> Die polemisch-rhetorische Zuspitzung solcher Differenzen bedeutet also schwerlich eine Festlegung für immer, es ging um zeit- und situationsgebundene, aktuelle Probleme. Im Kontext der allgemein verbreiteten Enderwartung freilich stand dergleichen unter dem Vorzeichen der Endgültigkeit und wurde entsprechend heftig diskutiert. Die konkreten Differenzen im Recht und Ritual waren nicht so sehr für sich von Belang, sie markierten Separationstendenzen im Rahmen von Kompetenz- und Machtkämpfen zwischen konkurrierenden priesterlich-levitischen Richtungen.

Polemische Rhetorik hat einen besonders prominenten Platz in der Beschreibung des Verhältnisses zur jeweils herrschenden Großmacht.<sup>21</sup> In den Qumrantexten tritt dies vor allem in den Aussagen über die „Kittim“ in Erscheinung. Auch die hellenistische Herrscherideologie mit ihren Vergottungsansprüchen wird als befremdliche Anmaßung angesprochen.<sup>22</sup> Auf's Ganze ge-

---

Hebrew rhetoric, Missoula 1975; K. M. Hayes, „The Earth Mourns“. Prophetic metaphor and oral aesthetic, Leiden 2002; H. E. Kragelund, Metaphers in Prophetic Literature, in: SJOT 17 (2003) 1–88.

20 Näheres bei C. Hempel, The Context of 4QMMT and Comfortable Theories, in: dies. (ed.), The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context, (StTDJ 90), Leiden 2010, 275–292.

21 Vgl. A. E. Portier-Young, Apocalypse against Empire: Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism, Cambridge 2011.

22 4Q246 = 4QApocalypse Daniel ar. Dieser sog. Gottessohnstext wird oft, aber wohl zu Unrecht, als messianischer Text gedeutet. Dazu s. A. Steudel, The Eternal reign of the People of God – Collective Expectations in Qumran texts (4Q246 and 1QM), in: RdQ 17,65–68 (1996) 507–525; vgl. zuletzt: A. Justness, The Time of Salvation. An Analysis of 4QApocryphon of Daniel ar (4Q246), 4QMessianic Apocalypse (4Q521 2), and 4QTime of Righteousness (4Q215a) (EHS.T 23/893), Frankfurt am Main 2009; D. Stökl Ben Ezra, Messianic figures in the Aramaic texts from Qumran, in: K. Berthelot/D. Stökl Ben Ezra (ed.), Aramaica Qumranica (StTDJ 94), Leiden 2010, 515–544; D. J. Joseph, His Wisdom Will Reach All Peoples: 4Q534–536, Q17: 26–27,30), and 1 En. 65:1–67:3, 90, in: DSD 19 (2012) 71–105; A. J. Tomasino, An Aramaic



sehen dominiert in den Qumrantexten aber die innerjüdische Polemik, selbst die Krise unter Antiochus IV. und die angebliche Bedrohung durch den Hellenismus haben nicht den Stellenwert, der ihnen in der Forschung in der Regel zugeschrieben wurde.

## 1. Individuelle Erfahrung von Gut und Böse, Recht und Unrecht. Natur-Metaphorik und personalisierte Krisenmetaphorik

Wo immer individuelle Erfahrungen geschildert werden, stellt sich neben der Verwendung von Metaphern auch eine Tendenz zur Dramatisierung ein. Das gilt besonders für biographisch-historische Komponenten und rückt diese in das Zwielficht zwischen Fiktion und Realität. Für die Gegenüberstellung von Recht und Unrecht und die Aussonderung von Gerechten und Frevlern war vorrangig die alltägliche Erfahrung von Unrecht maßgeblich, das Bewusstsein, nicht zu seinem Recht gekommen zu sein, wegen ungleichgewichtiger Verhältnisse in der Sozialstruktur, wegen der Willkür Reicher und Mächtiger, und nicht zuletzt infolge der Erfahrung einer mangelhaften Rechtsprechung, Rechtsbeugung und Bestechlichkeit wurden traditionell scharf gerügt und strafrechtlich geahndet.<sup>23</sup> Und in solchen Kontexten begegnet auch eine polemische Rhetorik, die den Widerspruch zwischen Recht und Unrecht bzw. Gerechten und Frevlern bzw. Feinden drastisch illustriert.

Die Erfahrung einer übermächtigen Wirklichkeit stellt jedoch auch ein grundsätzliches Problem zur Debatte, nämlich die Theodizeefrage.<sup>24</sup> Wird das erlittene Ungemach einer übermenschlichen Macht angelastet, bewirkt dies eine dualistische Einfärbung der Gegensätze und die Schilderung irdischer Auseinandersetzungen werden um eine kosmologische und transkosmische Dimension erweitert, was in der Folge auch die Frage nach Ursprung und Ende des Problems aufwirft.<sup>25</sup> Eine systematisch durchdachte Lehre kann man daraus aber

---

Apocalypse (4Q246) and the Perils of Premature Consensus, in: J-L: Kraemer/M:G. Wechsler (ed.), *Peshar Nahum: Texts and Studies in Jewish History and Literature from Antiquity through the Middle Ages Presented to Norman (Nahum) Golb (SAOC 66)*, Chicago 2012, 223 – 236.

23 Vgl. *P. Terbyuken*, Bestechung, in: JAC Suppl.-Bd. 1, 2000/1, 1052 – 1056.

24 Vgl. *J. H. Charlesworth*, Theodicy in Early Jewish Writings; A Selected Overview, in: A. Laato/J.C. de Moor (ed.), *Theodicy in the World of the Bible*, Leiden 2003, 470 – 508; *J. L. Crenshaw*, *Defending God. Biblical Responses to the Problem of Evil*, New York/Oxford 2005.

25 Vgl. *B. Nitzan*, Evil and its Symbols in the Qumran Scrolls, in: H. Graf Reventlow/Y. Hoffman (ed.), *Problem of Evil and its Symbols in Jewish and Christian Tradition (JSOT.S 366)*, London 2004, 83 – 96; *M. Segal*, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology (JSJ.S 117)*, Leiden 2007; *A. Annus*, *The antediluvian origin of evil in the Mesopotamian and Jewish traditions: a comparative study*, T. Kulmar/R. Schmitt (ed.). *Ideas of*

schwerlich erschließen. Zudem kam das Motiv auch in anderen Kontexten zum Tragen, etwa bei schöpfungsgeschichtlicher Argumentation in einer gesetzlichen Frage wie der Ehescheidung und dergleichen.<sup>26</sup> Das Einzelschicksal tritt dabei gegenüber den herrschenden Verhältnissen, dem Zustand der Gesellschaft, der eigenen Gruppe in den Hintergrund. Der Einzelne wird in erster Linie als Bundesmitglied betrachtet und daher geht es letztlich stets um das Volk Israel als einem dem offenbarten Gotteswillen verpflichteten Erwählungskollektiv. Die Häufung von Metaphern führt also manchmal geradezu zwangsläufig über die Illustration eines Einzelschicksals hinaus zu einer dramatischen Schilderung übergreifender, geschichtlicher und kosmologischer Vorgänge, die vereinzelt in protologische und eschatologische Szenarien ausufern.

## 2. Das repräsentative „Ich“: Selbstverständnis und Funktion eines *maškil* und das Geschick seiner Gruppe

Was innerhalb der Bildungselite literarisch produziert wurde, galt – abgesehen vom griechischsprachigen, hellenistisch-jüdischen Schrifttum – nicht als schöpferische Leistung eines Individuums, es stand im Dienst der Gemeinschaft und wurde für konkrete Verwendungszwecke geschaffen.<sup>27</sup> Diese Schreiber vermeinten, das Geschick der Gemeinschaft und ihrer Mitglieder zu kennen, sie entsprechend belehren und leiten zu sollen. Darüber hinaus verstanden sie sich auch als Experten in Belangen, die das Menschlich-Irdische transzendieren. So laut 1QS III,13 f.:

Für den Unterweiser (*maškil*), um zu unterweisen und zu belehren alle Lichtsöhne in Bezug auf die Werdegänge (Ursprünge/Geschichte) aller Mannessöhne (14) nach allen Arten ihrer Geister, in den Anzeichen für ihre Taten in ihren Generationen, und in Bezug auf die Heimsuchung ihrer Plagen samt (15) den Zeiten ihres Wohlbefindens.

---

Man in the Conceptions of the Religions. Das Menschenbild in den Konzeptionen der Religionen, Münster 2012, 1–43.

26 Vgl. M. Tiwald, ΑΠΟ ΔΕ ΑΡΧΗΣ ΚΤΙΣΕΩΣ ... (Mk 10,6): die Entsprechung von Protologie und Eschatologie als Schlüssel für das Tora-Verständnis Jesu, in: U. Busse/M. Reichardt/M. Theobald (Hrsg.), Erinnerung an Jesus; Kontinuität und Diskontinuität in der neutestamentlichen Überlieferung. Festschrift für Rudolf Hoppe zum 65. Geburtstag, Göttingen 2011, 367–380.

27 Vgl. S. D. Eichhorn, Gott als Fels, Burg und Zuflucht, Bern 1972; C. A. Newsom, The Case of the Blinking I: Discourse of the Self at Qumran, in: Semeia 57 (1992) 13–23; J. P. Weinberg, Authorship and Author in the Ancient Near East and in the Hebrew Bible, HebStud 44 (2003) 157–169; J. A. Hughes, Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot (StDJ 59), Leiden 2006, 233 f.; J. Wyrick, The Ascension of Authorship: Attribution and Canon Formation in Jewish Hellenistic and Christian Traditions, Cambridge, Mass. 2004. Für die Hymnenrolle (1QH) s. A. K. Harkins, Reading with an „I“ to the Heavens, Berlin 2012, doch die Verbindung mit Visionsliteratur ist fragwürdig.