

A STUDY OF THE REMNANT IN  
QUMRAN LITERATURE

THE UNDERSTANDING AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE "REMNANT"  
IN QUMRAN LITERATURE: INCLUDING A DISCUSSION OF  
THE USE OF THIS CONCEPT IN THE HEBREW BIBLE,  
THE APOCRYPHA AND THE PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

By

ROBERT WILLIAM HUEBSCH, A.B., M.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies  
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements  
for the Degree  
Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University

April 1981

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (1981)

(Religious Studies)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY

Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: The Understanding and Significance of the "Remnant"  
in Qumran Literature: Including a Discussion of  
the Use of this Concept in the Hebrew Bible, the  
Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha

AUTHOR: Robert William Huebsch, A.B. (Canisius College)  
M.A. (Canisius College)

SUPERVISOR: Professor E. P. Sanders

Number of Pages: xix, 501

שומר ישראל, שמור שארית ישראל,  
ואל-יאבד ישראל, האומרים שמע ישראל:

תפלת השחר

## ABSTRACT

The aim of this dissertation is to examine the Qumran covenanters' understanding of the remnant to test the common scholarly belief that the sectarians considered themselves to be the eschatological remnant. That the sectaries had a remnant understanding is a pre-supposition validated by the frequent remnant statements both explicit and implicit. Hence, the question becomes how they understood themselves vis-à-vis the remnant. This question, however, is not the only issue which must be discussed. The pre-Qumranian Palestinian understanding of the remnant must be examined because the sectarians' mind-set must be understood against the backdrop of their intellectual heritage.

Contrary to the opinion of most scholars, this study concludes that the Qumran sectaries understood themselves not as the eschatological remnant, but rather as its proleptic representatives. Thus the historical sect is not to be equated with the eschatological sect. Membership in the former did not guarantee membership in the latter and membership in the latter was attainable without membership in the former. On the one hand, although one who joined the historical sect and remained steadfast would become a member of the eschatological sect, the determination could not be assured until the end of time. On the other hand, the ranks of the eschatological sect would be increased by a final conversion to the sectarian covenant at the eschaton.

With respect to significance, this study clearly shows

that the concept of the remnant as understood at Qumran formed a major part of the sectarians' self-understanding.

In 1QS, CD and 1QH the remnant consciousness is focused upon the historical sect and consists in the realization that, as part of Israel and, therefore, as the children of the historical Israel, the sectarians understood themselves as descendants of numerous historical remnants saved by God from various catastrophes. At this time, the sect understood itself as a part of Israel. This is evident both from the fluidity of membership in the historical sect and from the sectarian designation of non-sectarians as Israelites. Although the sect did have a covenant which required that the adult make a conscious decision to join and within which was found salvation, it nonetheless remained true that the title Israel was not appropriated by the historical community.

In 1QM, 1QSa and other predominantly eschatological texts, the vision is of the eschatological sect. All non-sectarian Israelites who did not convert would be destroyed as would the Gentile. Those left would be definable, therefore, as both Israel and the remnant of Israel,--the former because they alone would be those entitled to be called Israel; the latter because they alone had been saved from Israel.

The remnant understanding of the Qumran sectarians is shown to be consistent with the understanding inherited by them. The correct understanding of the Qumran remnant lies, therefore, in a comparison with its Jewish heritage.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE.....x

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....xii

ABBREVIATIONS.....xv

INTRODUCTION.....1

    A. Problem.....1

    B. Methodology.....3

    C. Thesis.....9

CHAPTER I REMNANT IN THE HEBREW BIBLE: A SUMMARY.....12

    Introduction.....12

    A. Remnant in the Torah.....24

        1. Passages identified through  
           linguistic examination.....24

          a. Genesis: The salvation  
             of Noah from the deluge.....24

          b. Genesis: The intercession  
             by Abraham and the sparing  
             of Lot and his daughters....33

          c. Genesis: Esau's threat to  
             Jacob.....39

          d. Genesis: Recognition scene  
             in the Joseph story.....43

          e. Leviticus: Blessings and  
             Curses.....46

          f. Deuteronomy: Moses' threat  
             against Israel.....49

          g. Deuteronomy: Consequences  
             of disobedience.....52

          h. Summary.....55

2.	Passages illustrating the remnant motif without linguistic identification.....	56
a.	Exodus: The idolatry of the Israelites.....	56
b.	Numbers: The disbelief of the Israelites.....	61
3.	General conclusions regarding remnant in the Torah.....	66
B.	Remnant in the Nebiim.....	68
1.	Former Prophets.....	69
a.	Judges.....	69
b.	1 Kings.....	71
2.	Latter Prophets.....	76
a.	Isaiah.....	76
b.	Jeremiah.....	98
c.	Ezekiel.....	115
d.	Joel.....	125
e.	Amos.....	129
f.	Obadiah.....	137
g.	Micah.....	138
h.	Zephaniah.....	145
i.	Zechariah.....	149
j.	Malachi.....	151
3.	General conclusions regarding remnant in the Nebiim.....	155
C.	Remnant in the Kethubim.....	157
1.	Daniel.....	157



	2. Ezra.....	169
	Conclusions.....	173
CHAPTER II	REMNANT IN SELECT APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA.....	177
	Introduction.....	177
	A. Ben Sirach.....	182
	B. I Enoch.....	213
	C. Jubilees.....	237
	D. The Testament of Moses.....	298
	E. The Psalms of Solomon.....	316
	Conclusions.....	349
CHAPTER III	THE REMNANT UNDERSTANDING AT QUMRAN.....	351
	Introduction.....	351
	A. The Rule of the Community.....	355
	B. The Damascus Document.....	389
	C. The Thanksgiving Hymns.....	410
	D. The War Scroll.....	427
	E. The Messianic Rule.....	437
	F. The Blessings.....	441
	G. Commentary on Habakkuk.....	442
	H. Commentary on Micah.....	444
	I. Commentary on Isaiah.....	446
	J. Commentary on Isaiah.....	447
	K. Commentary on Nahum.....	448
	L. Commentary on Psalms.....	451

CONCLUSION.....454  
BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SYSTEM OF REFERENCES.....465  
    A. Texts, Translations and Tools.....465  
    B. Books and Articles.....471  
    C. System of References.....500

## PREFACE

During the nineteen sixties when nuclear holocaust seemed imminent, the cult of the fall-out shelter reflected man's belief that the destruction of the masses would be mitigated by the salvation of a few. Indeed, whenever annihilation has threatened, individuals have always taken solace in the belief that a remnant would survive. This belief has manifested itself in attempts to personalize that remnant by somehow assuring one's membership in the elect. It is man's basic quest for survival that unrelentingly drives him to attempt to ameliorate even the most dire of situations. Thus, to study the remnant is to study a significant facet of man's nature.

The remnant has traditionally been recognized as a constitutive part of both Judaism and Christianity. Both religions share the belief that God has selected a people to be earmarked for salvation by becoming uniquely His own. This, of course, does not eliminate the free will of those selected. Indeed, it is precisely because the people retain their free will that they are able to break the covenant of laws which define membership in God's select. As a result of their unfaithfulness the community is rendered impure, the covenant is abrogated and salvation is forfeited. God remains faithful, however, and the

entire community is not rejected by him; a remnant will be allowed to inherit the promised legacy. It is through the breaching of the covenant that the covenant is confirmed by the salvation of the remnant. Thus to study the remnant is to study a basic part of the Judaeo-Christian faith, for it permeates the salvation scheme of each religion.

There is, however, a more immediate reason for this particular study of the remnant. There have been numerous examinations of the remnant in the Hebrew Bible and in the New Testament, but the understanding of the remnant in the Qumran literature has been assumed: the covenanters assuredly understood themselves to be the remnant community. Unfortunately, there has been no systematic examination of the evidence to determine whether this assumption is indeed as accurate as scholars have heretofore assumed. It is the purpose of this dissertation to study in depth the Qumran understanding of the remnant within the context of the Qumran literature, history and milieu. It will then be possible to fill in some of the lacunae in remnant research and, in a small way, to further understand a basic part of the Judaeo-Christian faith as well as a basic part of man's nature.

R. W. H.

Niagara University

1 December 1980

## Acknowledgements

My graduate education has been immensely enriched by the many people whom I have met during those passing years.

The debt which I owe to Dr. Richard F. Zehnle is enormous, for it was he who first introduced me to the critical study of the New Testament and encouraged me to undertake doctoral studies.

My thesis supervisor, Dr. E. P. Sanders, magister et amicus, who introduced me to Judaeo-Christian scholarship, has been a continual source of guidance, constructive criticism and encouragement; it is my fondest hope the student will become like unto the master.

I would like to thank Drs. A. I. Baumgarten, B. F. Meyer and W. B. Shaffir, members of my thesis supervisory committee, for their guidance throughout the preparation of the dissertation. To Dr. Baumgarten I am especially appreciative for his trenchant criticism, particularly on Jewish issues, which kept me true to the tradition helping me to "make a fence around the Torah".

To my colleagues whose conversations helped me to clarify many issues, my sincere thanks. In particular, I would like to mention Mr. Wayne McCready, Dr. Benno Przybylski, and my confreres in the Religious Studies Department, Niagara University, especially Drs. Mary Minella and Rohan Adrian Dunuwila, scholars all, with whom I am proud to be associated.

I am deeply grateful to the people of Canada whose generosity enabled me to pursue graduate study at McMaster University.

Drafts of three of the sections in Chapter II were delivered as lectures at conventions and the valuable suggestions and comments of my colleagues have sharpened them significantly: "Remnant in the Book of Jubilees" and "Remnant in the Inter-Testamental Period: A Study of the Book of Enoch", both presented to the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies, May 1978 and May 1979 respectively; and, "Ben Sira's Teaching on Salvation: A Discussion of 'the Saved'", presented to the Eastern Great Lakes Biblical Society, Duquesne University, April 1980. My thanks to all who participated in the discussion of these lectures.

My family has also contributed to the success of my studies; to Ron, Tom, Flo, "P.B." and "J.P.", my thanks. One person must be especially mentioned. On 8 February 1967, at 77 years old, my "Aunt Carrie" died but her legacy to me, the fondest loving memories and the deepest respect for the wisdom of the ages, has shaped my life; this thesis and indeed my entire career bear her indelible mark. It is most difficult to thank one's parents. It is impossible to thank for years of sacrifice and myriad deeds of unselfish loving-kindness. Nonetheless, in profound gratitude, I dedicate this dissertation to my parents, Marion and Raymond, who have taught me to seek true wisdom and in themselves have given me the finest

examples of that quest.

Finally, but certainly not least, there is my wife, Patricia, who has been prima inter pares during the entire preparation of this dissertation and whose erudition has been tested time and again and never found wanting. She has encouraged, understood, prodded and cajoled during those seemingly endless years. She has acted as chief critic, typist, and personal secretary without in the least diminishing her roles as wife, lover and business executive.

To all these people and to all who must remain anonymous, I offer my deepest gratitude and thanks. It should be emphasized, however, that any errors of omission or commission which may be found in these pages are entirely my own responsibility.

## ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
ALGHJ	Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des Hellenistischen Judentums
An Bib	Analecta Biblica
<u>ASTI</u>	<u>Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute</u>
<u>AUSS</u>	<u>Andrews Univeristy Seminary Studies</u>
<u>BASOR</u>	<u>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</u>
BBB	Bonner Biblische Beiträge
<u>BDB</u>	<u>Francis Brown, S. R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament.</u>
<u>Bib</u>	<u>Biblica</u>
<u>BJRL</u>	<u>Bulletin of the John Rylands Library</u>
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
<u>BZ</u>	<u>Biblische Zeitschrift</u>
BZAW	Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBC	Cambridge Bible Commentary
<u>CBQ</u>	<u>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</u>
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CD	Damascus Document
<u>DJD</u>	<u>Discoveries In The Judaean Desert</u>
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls
<u>Égl Théol</u>	<u>Église et Théologie</u>
E.t.	English translation



<u>Eph Theol Lov</u>	<u>Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses</u>
<u>Frg Tg</u>	<u>Fragmentary Targum</u>
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
<u>Hastings</u>	<u>Dictionary of the Bible</u>
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
<u>HTR</u>	<u>Harvard Theological Review</u>
HTS	Harvard Theological Studies
<u>HUCA</u>	<u>Hebrew Union College Annual</u>
ICC	International Critical Commentary
<u>IDB</u>	<u>Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</u>
<u>IEJ</u>	<u>Israel Exploration Journal</u>
<u>JE</u>	<u>Jewish Encyclopedia</u>
<u>JBL</u>	<u>Journal of Biblical Literature</u>
<u>JBR</u>	<u>Journal of Bible and Religion</u>
<u>JJS</u>	<u>Journal of Jewish Studies</u>
JPS	Jewish Publication Society
<u>JQR</u>	<u>Jewish Quarterly Review</u>
<u>JSOT</u>	<u>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</u>
<u>JSS</u>	<u>Journal of Semitic Studies</u>
<u>JTS</u>	<u>Journal of Theological Studies</u>
LXX	Septuagint
Mek	Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael
MS	Manuscript
MSS	Manuscripts
MT	Massoretic Text

<u>NAB</u>	<u>New American Bible</u>
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NS	New Series
NT	New Testament
<u>NT</u>	<u>Novum Testamentum</u>
<u>NTS</u>	<u>New Testament Studies</u>
OT	Old Testament
OTL	Old Testament Library
<u>Oud Stud</u>	<u>Oudtestamentische Studiën</u>
P.	Palestinian Talmud
<u>PEQ</u>	<u>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</u>
PVTG	Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graeca
1QH	Thanksgiving Hymns
Qidd	Qiddushin
1QM	The War Scroll
1QpHab	Commentary on Habakkuk
1QpMic	Commentary on Micah
1QS	Manual of Discipline
1QSa	The Messianic Rule
1QSB	The Blessings
4QpIsa <sup>a</sup>	Commentary on Isaiah
4QpIsa <sup>d</sup>	Commentary on Isaiah
4QpNah	Commentary on Nahum
4QpPs <sup>a</sup>	Commentary on Psalms

R.	Rabbi
<u>RB</u>	<u>Revue Biblique</u>
<u>REJ</u>	<u>Revue des Études Juives</u>
<u>RHPR</u>	<u>Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses</u>
<u>RQ</u>	<u>Revue de Qumran</u>
<u>RSPT</u>	<u>Revue des sciences philosophiques et Théologiques</u>
RSV	Revised Standard Version of the Bible
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBIMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLSCS	Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SCS	Septuagint and Cognate Studies
Shir.	Shirata
Sifre Deut	Sifre on Deuteronomy
Sifre Num	Sifre on Numbers
<u>SJT</u>	<u>Scottish Journal of Theology</u>
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SPCK	Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
<u>Stud Theo</u>	<u>Studia Theologica</u>
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
Suppl.	Supplement
SVTP	Studia In Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha
TBC	Torch Bible Commentaries

<u>TDNT</u>	<u>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</u>
<u>TDOT</u>	<u>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</u>
T.	Tosefta
<u>TLZ</u>	<u>Theologische Literaturzeitung</u>
<u>Tg Onk</u>	<u>Targum Onkelos</u>
<u>Tg Ps-J</u>	<u>Targum Pseudo-Jonathan</u>
<u>Th A</u>	<u>Theologische Arbeiten</u>
<u>TRu</u>	<u>Theologische Rundschau</u>
<u>TSK</u>	<u>Theologische Studien und Kritiken</u>
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen, Berlin
<u>TZ</u>	<u>Theologische Zeitschrift</u>
<u>VT</u>	<u>Vetus Testamentum</u>
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament
<u>ZAW</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</u>
<u>ZNW</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</u>

## INTRODUCTION

### A. Problem

In the Hebrew Bible, the cornerstone of the Israelite religion is the doctrine of the election. God's covenant with Abraham and God's unconditional promise of favour to Abraham were the presuppositions and the points of departure which would be taken up in the revelation at the burning bush and the covenant at Sinai. At Sinai, Yahweh and Israel entered into a unique relationship: Israel became the people of Yahweh and Yahweh became the God of Israel.<sup>1</sup> The relationship of Yahweh and the children of Abraham was then formalized by the covenant through which reciprocal faithfulness was promised. Israel became subject to the mishpatim of the Lord; the Lord accepted Israel as His own people. Although Yahweh has always remained faithful to Israel, Israel has been repeatedly unable to remain faithful to the Lord; the existence of the remnant in Hebrew thought is predicated upon Yahweh's constancy and Israel's infidelity. The remnant doctrine would eventually be interpreted with eschatological overtones; in fact, the doctrine becomes

---

<sup>1</sup>H. H. Rowley, The Biblical Doctrine of Election (London: Lutterworth Press, 1950), pp. 15-16; cf. Edmond Jacob, Theology of the Old Testament, E.t. by Arthur W. Heathcote and Philip J. Allcock (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1958), pp. 206-207.

almost totally associated with the end times and the salvation of the righteous. The elect become the righteous who will be the remnant of Israel in the day of the Lord.

When the Qumran documents were discovered in 1947 and it was shown that the covenanters' truth-claim rested on their faithfulness to the covenant in contradistinction to the unfaithfulness of the Temple community, it was presumed that the doctrine of the remnant was integral to the self-understanding of the sect. "It is as the 'saved remnant' that the community constitutes the true relic of Israel, faithful to the Covenant."<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, it has been alleged that

the terms that the members used to designate themselves are very helpful in illuminating the self-understanding of the community as the "saved remnant." Feeling they are elected to salvation, they designate themselves as "the Elect" (CDC 4:3-4); "His Elect" (i Qp Hab. 9:12); "the Elect of Grace" (DSD 8:6); the "Congregation of His Elect, the men who do His will" (Commentary on Psalms 37 Frag. A: Col. i); "the Elect of Mankind" (DSD 11:16). As the members of the new covenant community they are: "men of the Community who

---

<sup>2</sup>William Richard Stegner, The Self-Understanding of the Qumran Community Compared With the Self-Understanding of the Early Church (unpublished PhD thesis, Drew University, 1960), p. 28.

hold firmly to the Covenant" (DSD 5:2-3); "the men of God's lot" (DSD 2:2); "the volunteers" or "dedicated ones" (DSD 5:8).<sup>3</sup>

This view of the remnant consciousness of the Qumran community is shared by a large number of scholars<sup>4</sup>. Not all have agreed but the issue, as such, has never been fully examined. It has been supposed that various Jewish groups of the period had the consciousness of being the remnant; hence the Qumran covenanters were one example among many. However, no thorough, comprehensive evaluation of the remnant consciousness of the covenanters has been attempted. It is the purpose of this thesis to rectify this situation.

#### B. Methodology

The study of the remnant consciousness of the Qumran community cannot begin with, nor be limited to, the Qumran writings; for, to do so could easily result in large-scale distortion and misinterpretation. To discover accurately

---

<sup>3</sup>Stegner, Self-Understanding, p. 29.

<sup>4</sup>Thus, for example, Annie Jaubert, La notion d'alliance dans le Judaïsme (Paris: Editions de Seuil, 1963), pp. 141-143; Ernst Käsemann, New Testament Questions of Today (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1969), p. 185; A. R. C. Leaney, The Rule of Qumran and Its Meaning: Introduction, Translation and Commentary (London: SCM Press, 1966), p. 74; Helmer Ringgren, The Faith of Qumran, E.t. by Emilie T. Sander (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963), pp. 137, 163; G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls In English (Baltimore: Penquin Books, 1962), p. 35.

and evaluate critically that remnant consciousness one must, first, understand the remnant meaning and significance which they inherited through the writings of their religious ancestors. This involves a thorough grounding in the meaning and the significance of the remnant idea in the Hebrew Bible<sup>5</sup> and in the relevant writings of the Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha. This grounding is not meant, however, to induce "manic derivativism" but will serve, rather, as a control and a means of contrast and comparison during the later study. The meaning and the significance of the remnant idea at Qumran must still emerge from the covenanters' sectarian writings.

In the first chapter of the thesis, the meaning and the significance of the remnant idea in the Hebrew Bible will be summarized. This task is possible because of the many scholarly examinations of this topic which have been written;<sup>6</sup> it is necessary because it is in the Hebrew Bible

---

<sup>5</sup>This thesis is concerned with the Qumran understanding of the remnant and, hence, all references will be to the Hebrew Bible rather than the Old Testament.

<sup>6</sup>Vide, J. C. Campbell, "God's People and the Remnant", SJT, 3 (1950), 78-85; R. deVaux, "Le 'Reste d'Israël' d'après les Prophètes", RB, 42 (1933), 526-539; Herbert Dittmann, "Der heilige Rest im Alten Testament", TSK, 87 (1914), 603-618; F. Dreyfus, "La doctrine du 'Reste d'Israël' chez le prophète Isaïe", RSPT, 39 (1955), 361-386; Georg Fohrer, "Neuere Literatur zur alttestamentlichen Prophetie", TRu, 19 (1951), 277-346; 20 (1952), 193-271, 295-361; Gernard Hasel, The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah (Berrien Springs, Mich: Andrews University, 1974); E.W.



that one finds the core of traditional material which has been inherited by later Judaism and upon which later teachings are based. Although an exhaustive examination of remnant in the Hebrew Bible lies outside the purview of this work,<sup>7</sup> a summary will, nonetheless, provide sufficient data to illuminate the background of the post-Biblical Jewish understanding of the remnant idea and provide some control for the examination of that later remnant concept. Further, the summary will enable us to delineate the similarities and differences between remnant in the Hebrew Bible and in later Judaism--a task which will prove invaluable in discussing the remnant consciousness of

---

Heaton, "The Root  $\text{רשׁוּׁת}$  and the Doctrine of the Remnant", JTS, NS3 (1952), 27-39; V. Hertrich, "λεῖμμα κτλ. The 'Remnant' in the Old Testament", TDNT, IV, 196-209; E. Jenni, "Remnant", IDB, IV, 32-33; L. Koehler, Old Testament Theology, E.t. by A. S. Todd (London: Lutterworth Press, 1957); Sigmund Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II: Das Thronbesteigungsfest Jahwäs und der Ursprung der Eschatologie (2nd ed.; Amsterdam: P. Schippers, 1961); Werner E. Müller, Die Vorstellung vom Rest im Alten Testament (Germany: Neukirchen Verlag, 1973); Gerhard von Rad, Old Testament Theology, E.t. by D. M. G. Stalker (2 vols.; New York: Harper and Row, 1962); U. Stegemann, "Der Restgedanke bei Isaias", BZ, NF 13 (1969), 161-186; D. M. Warne, The Origin, Development and Significance of the Concept of the Remnant in the Old Testament (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1958):

<sup>7</sup>Also outside the scope of this thesis lies the Ancient Near Eastern background of the remnant concept. Although such a study of the sources of the remnant is interesting and informative, it has no direct relevance for the delineation of the remnant idea which emerged from the Hebrew Bible. Hasel in The Remnant has thoroughly reviewed and evaluated all pertinent source theories (vide esp. Part II).

later authors. No claim is made that this summary will contribute any new or startling information. Heavy reliance will be placed upon the work which has already been done on remnant in the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament. The lengthiness of the chapter is a result of the need to re-arrange the previously accumulated data. In past studies the question posed has generally been concerned with the origin of the remnant idea, its evolution within the Hebrew Bible or possibly its relationship to another biblical theme. It is the intent in this chapter to ask what was the meaning and the significance of the remnant idea in the Hebrew Bible. This task will involve pinpointing the remnant passages, showing why and how they are such and discussing their significance within the Hebrew Bible. Thus, much of the data which has been obtained through modern critical scholarship regarding redactional theory, historical background, source theory and the like becomes, at best, tangential to the issue at hand.<sup>8</sup> We are singularly interested in the remnant concept or concepts which emerged from the Hebrew Bible, and with which later authors were forced to contend.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup>Source theory etc. was unknown in the period with which this investigation is concerned. The writers of the period assumed the unity of the stories. Cf. Jack P. Lewis, A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish And Christian Literature (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968), p. 5.

<sup>9</sup>The relationship between the Hebrew Bible and the Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha may be summarized thus:

In chapter two we shall turn our attention to the Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha. The question posed will be the same as in the chapter on the Hebrew Bible: what was the meaning and the significance of the remnant idea. It will not be necessary to examine all the works which scholarship has included within either the Apocrypha or the Pseudepigrapha;<sup>10</sup> some selectivity is possible because not all the documents are directly or indirectly relevant to a study of the remnant consciousness at Qumran. The first criterion is Palestinian origin. To date, no fragments of non-Palestinian materials have been discovered at Qumran. Further, it is extremely doubtful that any documents from outside Palestine could have had any substantive effect upon the scrolls. The second criterion concerns dating. Works dating from after the fall of Jerusalem and the

---

"When one turns from the Bible to the books of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha he immediately recognizes that he has moved into a new realm of interpretation differing from that seen even in the later books of the O.T. No unity of thought is to be assumed for the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Certain common trends are observable, but each writer writes out of his own situation. The non-canonical writer assumes without discussion the historicity of the Pentateuchal narrative. Men of the past are his heroes and examples; embellishments are freely used; biblical materials are reworked to furnish descriptions of different situations from that to which they originally applied; and current day theological beliefs are read back into biblical narratives." (Lewis, Noah and the Flood, p. 10)

<sup>10</sup>For a list of Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha vide James H. Charlesworth, The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research, SBLSCS 7 (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1976), pp. xi-xiv.

destruction of the second temple are unlikely prospects for relevant data. It is conceivable, however, that earlier traditions might be contained in later works, and, when applicable, I have attempted to note them. The norm, however, will be 70 C.E. The last criterion is the most obvious. Any document which has no expressed or implied remnant consciousness will not be considered. Only those writings which fulfill all three requirements will be examined in this study. Chapter two will differ from chapter one in that there is little, if any, relevant past scholarship regarding the remnant in the Apocrypha or the Pseudepigrapha. At times, therefore, the sections become rather lengthy because little can be presumed and most data must be generated within the thesis through original research and argumentation.

The final chapter will deal with the Qumran documents themselves. What was the covenanters' understanding of the remnant? How did they understand themselves vis-à-vis the remnant? Was there one pervasive understanding or were there a number of remnant understandings at Qumran? As noted in the previous section, scholars have been quick to conclude that the Qumran community believed themselves the remnant of Israel, the true Israel of the end times. It will be the aim of this chapter to examine the data and, thereby, test that assumption. To do this each of the relevant Qumran writings must be carefully and individually examined. This will involve a detailed analysis of the

remnant idea in the Scrolls as well as an examination of the use of inherited remnant texts in each of the Qumran documents. The result will be the determination of the meaning and the significance of remnant at Qumran and an evaluation of the remnant consciousness of the Qumran authors.

### C. Thesis

Based on the research generated by the methodology outlined above, it must be concluded the Qumran covenanters understood the historical sect as different from the eschatological sect. The difference is illustrated by membership: members of the historical sect could be considered proleptic representatives of the eschatological sect. The fluidity of membership, however, precluded a more definitive relationship, as did the belief that sectarian ranks would be increased by "last minute" conversions. Although they considered the sectarian covenant to be the true covenant, they recognized the non-sectarian Israelites as still part of Israel. The sectarians did not appropriate the title Israel to themselves--a characteristic which would have defined them as from Israel rather than as of Israel. In the historical period, Israel included both sectarian and non-sectarian Israelites; in the eschatological period, the only Israel, the true Israel, is identified with the eschatological sect.

The final results of this dissertation have been multifold. Most importantly, it has been possible to examine the assumption that the Qumran community understood themselves as the remnant of Israel, to test the presuppositions upon which that statement has been founded and, thereby, to test the assumption. Secondly, this study has, in a small way, furthered the understanding of remnant within Judaism and Christianity. Thirdly, as a result of the methodology adopted in this dissertation, it has also been possible to contribute to the study of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha by examining, for the first time, the remnant in select works. Finally, it is my hope that this study will point the way to further research--both to correct any misunderstandings on my part and to advance the study to which this dissertation contributes. It is abundantly clear from this introduction that many areas of remnant understanding have been left out of this study due to limitations of scope and/or relevance. Little or nothing has been said of the remnant consciousness of Hellenistic Judaism, the New Testament, the Tannaitic writings or the works of the apostolic church. All of these areas are vitally important to the understanding of remnant within the Judaeo-Christian tradition and they should be examined in depth and, when applicable, in the light of the Qumran documents and the covenanters' remnant

consciousness. The pivotal place of remnant in the Judaeo-Christian Tradition makes these inquiries vitally necessary.

It is my hope, therefore, in future studies such as this to continue the work of understanding the meaning and the significance of remnant in early Judaism and early Christianity by exploring remnant consciousness within these traditions.

## CHAPTER 1

### REMNANT IN THE HEBREW BIBLE: A SUMMARY

#### INTRODUCTION

The discussion of remnant in Qumran must begin with an understanding of remnant in the Hebrew Bible. The meaning and significance of this remnant idea is best summarized by focusing seriatim on the remnant in the traditional divisions of the Hebrew Bible: Torah, Nebiim, Ketubim; and, within each division, by examining those books within which the remnant idea is portrayed. This allows analysis and systemization of the material and yet reflects the state of the Hebrew Bible inherited by the authors of the Apocrypha, the Pseudepigrapha and the Qumran documents.<sup>1</sup> In both the Torah and the Ketubim, the remnant

---

<sup>1</sup>This is not meant to imply that the threefold division of the Hebrew Bible or the selection of the books was fully determined before the intertestamental period. Although the word "canon" appears never in reference to the Hebrew Bible in rabbinic literature and not in reference to the Old Testament until the fourth century C. E., the concept is nevertheless quite applicable at an early date. H. H. Rowley, in a discussion of the growth of the canon, points out that "As soon as books have attained such a position in the veneration of men that they are regarded as authoritative, and their text not to be changed, they are properly to be spoken of as a Canon" (The Growth of The Old Testament [1950; New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965], p. 169). The Torah, in the opinion of most scholars, reached authoritative acceptance



can best be understood through a passage by passage examination of the narratives employing the remnant idea because they consist of independent, relatively infrequent stories

---

by the time of Ezra; and, the Prophets by the early Hellenistic period (vide Neh 8.1ff.; Dan 9.2; Prologue to Sir; Sir 39.1; Sir 44-50 which alludes to all the books in the Hebrew Canon except Daniel, Ezra and Esther; 2 Macc 2.13; 15.9; Ludwig Blau, "Bible Canon", in JE, III, 140-150; Otto Eissfeldt, The Old Testament: An Introduction, E.t. by P. R. Ackroyd [New York: Harper and Row, 1965], esp. pp. 559-571; Madeleine S. Miller and J. Lane Miller, "Canon" in Harper's Bible Dictionary [New York: Harper & Row, 1973], 90-91; R. H. Pfeiffer, "Canon of the O T", in IDB, I, 498-520; H. E. Ryle, The Canon of the Old Testament [London: 1892]; Albert C. Sundberg, Jr., "The 'Old Testament': a Christian Canon", CBQ, 30 [1968], 143-155, repr. in The Canon and Masorah of The Hebrew Bible: An Introductory Reader, ed. Sid Z. Leiman [New York: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1974], pp. 99-111; Solomon Zeitlin, "An Historical Study of the Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures", Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research, 3 [1931-1932], 121-156, repr. in The Canon and Masorah, ed. Sid Z. Leiman, pp. 164-201; cf. F. H. Woods, "Old Testament Canon", in Hastings, III, 606-607). Scholars differ widely regarding the date of the "canonicity" of the Ketubim, but this does not affect the present study since the only books of the Writings with which we shall be concerned are Ezra and Daniel. The former is not one of the disputed texts (vide Blau, "Bible Canon", p. 145; Pfeiffer, "Canon", pp. 509-510); while the latter was certainly considered authoritative by the Qumran community (vide I. H. Eybers, "Some Light On The Canon of the Qumran Sect", Die Ou Testamentiese Werkgenootskap in Suid-Afrika, 1962; repr. in The Canon and Masorah, ed. Sid Z. Leiman, pp. 28-29). In any case, all of the Biblical books referred to in this chapter had reached general acceptance by about 130 B.C.E. (Eybers, p. 36). This is in spite of the talmudic passage (Hag 13a) which seems to recount the later attempt to remove the Book of Ezekiel from the canon (vide George Foot Moore, Judaism In The First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955], I, 246-247; also, Jack P. Lewis, "What Do We Mean By Jabneh?", JBR, 32 [1964], 128-129, repr. in The Canon and Masorah, ed. Sid Z. Leiman, pp. 257-258; cf. refutation by Solomon Zeitlin, "An Historical Study of the Canonization", 124-128).

whose individuality would be sacrificed by a book by book treatment which could also quite possibly lead to gross oversimplification and mis-representation of the remnant idea.

In the Nebim, however, a passage by passage examination would be extremely repetitious and unwieldy. Thus, each prophetic book will be treated separately, yet as a whole.

Methodologically, since the idea of the remnant is presented in the Bible in two ways,<sup>2</sup> the study of remnant in the Hebrew Bible must examine first, those passages identified through a linguistic examination of words meaning "remnant"<sup>3</sup> and, then, those passages in which the remnant motif is found without such linguistic identification. These two paths of inquiry are separate yet complementary.<sup>4</sup> It is the understanding produced from the

---

<sup>2</sup>G. Henton Davies, "Remnant", in Alan Richardson, ed., A Theological Word Book of the Bible (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1950), p. 188.

<sup>3</sup>Vide Solomon Mandelkern, Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae (2 vols.; Graz: Akademische Druck-U. Verlagsanstalt, 1955); Gerhard Lisowsky, Konkordanz zum Hebräischen Alten Testament (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1958).

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Heaton ("The Root", p. 27) who questions the use of the thematic, non-linguistic approach. "To use such phrases as 'the notion of the Remnant' and 'the concept of the Remnant' of oracles where the root does not occur is to run the risk of serious confusion." His point is well taken but only if one does not allow the linguistic to identify the thematic. If one proceeds from the linguistic to the thematic the danger of confusion is greatly decreased. Indeed, it is absolutely necessary that one examine the thematic in order to fully understand any concept. Linguistic identification is the beginning, not the end of an inquiry.

linguistic examination which highlights the occurrences of the remnant motif without linguistic identification; it is the resultant remnant data which then reflects back upon the terminological data and affects any tentative conclusions. This methodology does not preclude the possibility of multiple remnant understandings. In fact, it allows for them to emerge through the application of the hermeneutical circle of understanding.<sup>5</sup> Thus, the remnant idea in the Hebrew Bible ultimately will define itself in its own singularity or multiplicity. The assumption of this method is the identification of those roots that may mean "remnant".

Derivatives of six Hebrew roots express the idea of "remnant": אחר, יחר, מלט, פלט, שרד, שאר.<sup>6</sup> Although these roots and their cognates appear many hundred times<sup>7</sup> in the Hebrew Bible, many of their usages are tangential to the subject at hand.

The only derivative of אחר which has remnant

---

<sup>5</sup>Vide Bernard J. F. Lonergan, Method In Theology (New York: Herder and Herder, 1972), esp. pp. 208-214; Richard E. Palmer, Hermeneutics (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1969), esp. pp. 118-121; also, E. D. Hirsch, Jr., Validity In Interpretation (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967), pp. 76-77.

<sup>6</sup>Mandelkern, Concordantias, I, 39-40; 525-527; 675-676; II, 950, 1130, 1137-1138; Lisowsky, Konkordanz, pp. 50-51; 657-658; 803-804; 1155-1156; 1387; 1393-1395; Davies, "Remnant", pp. 188-189.

<sup>7</sup>Herrntrich (TDNT, IV, 196) has indicated that יחר with derivatives occurs 103 times; מלט with derivatives occurs 80 times; שרד with derivatives occurs 29 times; and, שאר with derivatives, occurs 220 times.

significance is אַחֲרָיִת. The basic meaning of this derivative is "what makes up that which comes after, as well as what results from a thing, a way, etc."<sup>8</sup> From this general meaning come specific applications such as future (Jer 29.11), posterity (Ezek 23.25a), end (Prov 25.8) and remnant (Amos 4.2). Five occurrences of אַחֲרָיִת have the meaning of remnant<sup>9</sup>. Only once (Jer 31.17) does the word connote a sense of hope; three other references refer to destruction of either Israel<sup>10</sup> or others<sup>11</sup>.

The word יָתֵר with its derivatives refers to left over or additional things. What the thing is can vary. It can be the acts or deeds of men (1 Kgs 11.41), sacrifices (Exod 12.10), or food (Lev 6.9), vessels (Jer 27.18), years (Lev 27.18), boundaries (Ezek 48.18) or other similarly

---

G. Hasel ("Remnant", in IDB, Supp., 735) notes there are derivatives of six roots which express the remnant idea. Hasel adds מִלֵּט and אַחֲרָיִת to Hertrich's list and reduces שָׂרֵי to its relevant noun "שָׂרֵי" (sic; the text of Hasel's article contains שָׂרֵי which should read שָׂרֵי; cf. Hasel's examples Josh 10.20 and Deut 3.3). מִלֵּט, according to Hasel, is derived from מִלֵּט and appears 89 times in the Hebrew Bible. He also notes that שָׂרֵי has 226 Hebrew and 10 Aramaic usages and that "at least 110 usages of 148 forms of derivatives" of יָתֵר contain the remnant idea. These numbers differ somewhat from Hertrich's count; Hasel is to be preferred.

<sup>8</sup>Horst Seebass, "אַחֲרָיִת", in TDOT, I, 207.

<sup>9</sup>Num 24.20; Jer 31.17; Ezek 23.25b; Amos 4.2; 9.1.

<sup>10</sup>Ezek 23.25b; Amos 9.1.

<sup>11</sup>Num 24.20

varied items.<sup>12</sup> The basic sense of the root is "to span" or "to surpass".<sup>13</sup> When meaning a "remnant" of people, the word can be used positively to express either an Israelite<sup>14</sup> or non-Israelite<sup>15</sup> remnant as well as negatively to indicate that no remnant has survived.<sup>16</sup>

The basic meaning of the root מלט<sup>17</sup> is "to slip away"<sup>18</sup> (1 Sam 20.29). In various forms, it can express, therefore, "escape" (1 Sam 19.10), "be delivered" (Job 22.30), "deliver" (Job 29.10), "save" (Jer 39.18) or even the

<sup>12</sup>Exod 28.10 (names); Num 31.32 (booty); 1 Kgs 15.18 (silver and gold); 1 Kgs 17.17 (breath); 2 Kgs 4.7 (money); Neh 6.1 (wall); Ezek 34.18 (bis) (pasture); Gen 30.36; 1 Sam 15.15; 2 Sam 8.4 (par 1 Chr 18.4); 1 Chr 18.4 (par 2 Sam 8.4) (animals).

<sup>13</sup>Hertrich, TDNT, IV, 196.

<sup>14</sup>Vide chpt. I, passim. Relevant passages would include: Gen 32.25 (LXX 24), 44.20; Lev 10.12, 16; Num 26.65; Deut 28.54 (bis); Josh 17.6; 18.2; 21.40; Judg 21.7, 16; 1 Sam 2.36; 1 Kgs 18.22; 19.10, 14; 1 Chr 24.20; Neh 6.14; Ps 31.24; 79.11; Isa 1.8, 9; 4.3; 7.22; 30.17; Jer 34.7; 52.15 (bis); Ezek 6.8; 12.16; 14.22; 34.14; Amos 6.9; Mic 5.2; Hab 2.8; Zeph 2.9; Zech 13.8; 14.2.

<sup>15</sup>Num 33.55; Deut 3.11, 13; Josh 12.4; 13.12; Judg 9.5; 2 Sam 21.2; 1 Kgs 9.21 (par 2 Chr 8.8); 1 Kgs 22.47; Neh 6.1; 2 Chr 8.8 (par 1 Kgs 9.21).

Vide, also, Josh 13.27; 17.2; 21.5, 20, 26, 34; 23.12-13; Judg 7.6; 8.10; 1 Sam 13.2; 30.9; 2 Sam 9.1; 10.10; 12.28; 1 Kgs 9.20; 12.23; 20.30 (bis); 2 Kgs 25.11 (bis); 1 Chr 6.46, 55, 62; 19.11; 2 Chr 8.7; Neh 2.16; 4.8, 13; Prov 2.21; Jer 29.1; Jer 39.9 (bis); Ezek 48.23; Zech 14.16.

<sup>16</sup>Josh 11.11, 22; 1 Sam 25.34; 2 Sam 13.30; 2 Sam 17.12; Ps 106.11; Jer 44.7; Ezek 39.28.

<sup>17</sup>מלט appears only in verbal forms (Hasel, "Remnant", IDB, Supp., p. 735).

<sup>18</sup>BDB, p. 572.

delivery of a child, letting him slip out (Isa 66.7), or the laying of an egg, letting it slip out (Isa 34.15).<sup>19</sup>

The derivatives of מלט, which may refer either to Israelites<sup>20</sup> or to non-Israelites,<sup>21</sup> usually denote a successful escape from threatening death,<sup>22</sup> although they may express total annihilation of a group, i.e. "no one escaped".<sup>23</sup>

Multiple meanings have been attached to the derivatives of the root מלט. Reference may be to leftover food<sup>24</sup> or animals,<sup>25</sup> and the root is frequently found in prayers to express hope of deliverance,<sup>26</sup> which is the word's basic meaning.<sup>27</sup> When meaning the remnant there is

<sup>19</sup>Ibid.

<sup>20</sup>Gen 19.17 (bis), 19, 20, 22; Judg 3.26 (bis); 1 Sam 19.10, 11, 12, 17, 18; 20.29; 22.1, 20; 23.13; 27.1 (3x); 2 Sam 1.3; 4.6; 19.6 (LXX 19.5), 10 (LXX 19.9); 1 Kgs. 1.12; 19.17 (bis); Esther 4.13; Job 1.15, 16, 17, 19; 6.23; 19.20; 22.30; 29.12; Isa 49.25; Jer 41.15; 51.45; Ezek 33.5; Dan 12.1; Joel 3.5 (LXX 2.32); Zach 2.11 (LXX 2.7).

<sup>21</sup>1 Sam 30.17; 1 Kgs 20.20; 2 Kgs 19.37; 2 Chr 16.7; Isa 20.6; 37.38; Jer 39.18 (bis); 48.6, 19; Dan 11.41.

<sup>22</sup>Georg Fohrer, "The Verb מלט", in TDNT, VII, 979-980. For examples, vide chpt. 1, passim.

<sup>23</sup>Judg 3.29; 1 Sam 30.17; 1 Kgs 18.40; Jer 48.8.

<sup>24</sup>Exod 10.5; Joel 2.3; Mic 6.14 (bis).

<sup>25</sup>Job 21.10.

<sup>26</sup>2 Sam 22.2, 44; Job 23.7; Ps 17.13; 18.3, 44, 49; 22.5, 9; 31.2; 32.7; 37.40 (bis); 40.18; 43.1; 55.9; 56.8; 71.2, 4; 82.4; 91.14; 144.2.

<sup>27</sup>Davies, "Remnant", p. 188.

an emphasis on the idea of an "escaped remnant".<sup>28</sup> Like רִמָּה, the word can express "the remnant" either positively<sup>29</sup> or negatively<sup>30</sup> and may, as a remnant, refer to either Israelites<sup>31</sup> or non-Israelites.<sup>32</sup>

The verb רָמַח and its relevant derivatives appear only twenty-nine times in the Hebrew Bible. The most prevalent meaning is to express the remnant negatively-- the group which has been utterly destroyed.<sup>33</sup> Reference is made to a non-Israelite remnant but these occurrences lack any gnomic significance since they explicitly refer to an historically limited event.<sup>34</sup> A number of occurrences refer to the remnant of Israel and will be discussed below.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>28</sup>Davies, "Remnant", p. 188; Hasel, "Remnant", IDB, Supp., p. 735; Georg Fohrer, "Nouns of the Stem רָמַח", TDNT, VII, 978-979.

<sup>29</sup>Israelite: vide infra chpt. I; Non-Israelite: Num 21.29; Isa 15.9; 45.20; Jer 51.50.

<sup>30</sup>Josh 8.22; 2 Kgs 9.15; 1 Chr 4.43; 2 Chr 20.24; Jer 50.29; Dan 11.42; Amos 9.1.

<sup>31</sup>Vide chpt. I, passim. Relevant passages are: Gen 14.13; 32.8; 45.7; Judg 12.4, 5; 21.17; 2 Sam 15.14; 2 Kgs 19.30, 31; 2 Chr 12.7; 30.6; Ezra 9.8, 13, 14, 15; Neh 1.2; Ps 70.6; Isa 4.2; 5.29; 10.20; 37.31, 32; 66.19; Jer 25.35; 42.17; 44.14 (bis); 44.28; 50.28; Lam 2.22; Ezek 6.8, 9; 7.16 (bis); 14.22; 24.26, 27; 33.21, 22; Joel 3.5 (2.32 LXX); Ob 14, 17.

<sup>32</sup>Vide n. 29.

<sup>33</sup>Num 21.35; Deut 2.34; 3.3; Josh 8.22; 10.28, 30, 33, 37, 39, 40; 11.8; 2 Kgs 10.11; Job 18.19; Jer 47.4; Lam 2.22; Ob 18.

<sup>34</sup>Josh 10.20 (bis).

<sup>35</sup>Vide chpt. I, passim.

The fourth root נקו and its derivatives primarily mean to "remain",<sup>36</sup> "leave",<sup>37</sup> "be left over"<sup>38</sup> or "keep over". Nominally, it means "rest",<sup>39</sup> "remnant",<sup>40</sup> "residue"<sup>41</sup> or "remainder".<sup>42</sup> It is used frequently to express the total destruction of a group from which no remnant remains.<sup>43</sup> It is also used with portions of animals,<sup>44</sup> food<sup>45</sup> as well as for "the rest" of a person's deeds.<sup>46</sup> It is found with trees<sup>47</sup> and gleanings<sup>48</sup> as well

---

<sup>36</sup>E.g., Exod 14.28; Num.11.26; Josh 13.1, 2; 1 Sam 16.11; 2 Kgs 25.22.

<sup>37</sup>E.g., Exod 10.26; Josh 8.17; Josh 23.7; Judg 4.16; Ruth 1.3; 1.5; 1 Sam 25.22; 2 Kgs 25.12; Job 21.34; Jer 38.4; 39.10, 40.6, 52.16; Zech 12.14.

<sup>38</sup>E.g., Exod 8.9; Deut 28.55; Ezek 36.36.

<sup>39</sup>E.g., Lev 5.9; Deut 19.20; 2 Kgs 25.11; 1 Chr 11.8; 12.38; 16.41; 2 Chr 24.14; Ezek 3.8; 4.3, 7; Neh 7.72; 10.29 (LXX 10.28); 11.1, 20; Esther 9.12; Jer 39.3; Ezek 25.16; 36.3, 5.

<sup>40</sup>E.g., Jer 25.20.

<sup>41</sup>E.g., Ps 76.11 (LXX 76.10).

<sup>42</sup>E.g., Lev 25.52; Isa 21.17.

<sup>43</sup>E.g., Josh 11.14; 1 Sam 14.36; 1 Kgs 15.29; 16.11; 2 Kgs 10.17; Jer 50.26.

<sup>44</sup>E.g., Exod 8.11, 27 (LXX 31); 10.19; Num 9.12; Deut 7.20; 2 Kgs 7.13; 10.14; 13.7; Isa 44.17.

<sup>45</sup>E.g., Exod 10.12; Deut 28.51; Judg 6.4.

<sup>46</sup>E.g., 2 Chr 9.29.

<sup>47</sup>E.g., Isa 10.19; 17.6.

<sup>48</sup>E.g., Jer 49.9; Ob 5.



as in passages expressing some aspect of the remnant of Israel,<sup>49</sup> many of which will be discussed below.<sup>50</sup> שְׂאֵרִית can even designate the whole without any loss of a part.<sup>51</sup>

שְׂאֵרִית is Isaiah's favorite word for remnant. When meaning the remnant, Hasel notes:

. . . derivatives of the root שְׂאֵרִית express the insignificance (Deut. 3:11), smallness (Deut. 4:27; Jer. 8:3), and meaninglessness or total loss of the remnant (Gen. 47:18; Exod. 8:31), but normally an intense, future-directed aspect is present, which underlines the inherent potentiality of renewal of the remnant, no matter what its size.<sup>52</sup>

The question at hand is the determination of relevant usages of these roots and their derivatives. It is obvious that all occurrences of these words which refer to inanimate objects, to animals or to the deeds of man are not germane. Generally this leaves the references to the total destruction of a people, the remnants of non-Israelite peoples

---

<sup>49</sup>E.g., Gen 7.23; Lev 26.36, 39; Deut 4.27; 28.62; Is 10.21-22; 11.11, 16; 14.22; 16.14; 28.5; 37.4; 46.3; Jer 6.9; 8.3; 15.9; 23.3; 24.8; 31.7; 42.2, 19; 44.12; 50.20; Ezek 6.12; 9.8; 11.13; 17.21; Amos 5.3, 15; Mic 2.12; 4.7; 5.6-7 (LXX 7-8); 7.18; Zeph 2.7; 3.12; Zech 8.6, 11, 12, 13; 9.7; Mal 2.15 (Heb).

<sup>50</sup>Vide chpt. I, passim.

<sup>51</sup>Gen 45.7.

<sup>52</sup>Hasel, "Remnant", IDB, Supp., p. 735.

and the remnants of Israel. Must all of these references be individually examined? If not, how may the relevant passages further be delineated? Relevant usages are best indicated by reference, first of all, to a sub-group which has survived or would survive some type of threat to the group in toto. This threat might, indeed, never materialize and, furthermore, the sub-group can in some cases be synonymous with the original group, that is, the remnant might consist of the whole. It is the fact of salvation from the threat which is definitive. Thus, that there would have been or will be a remnant becomes just as significant as there was a remnant. The second criterion for pin-pointing the relevant passages is significance for the history and faith of Israel. Thus, for example, the references to a non-Israelite remnant which merely recount a single event in history, one that does not have permanent historical and theological meaning, will not be considered.

The tradition will gradually attach écoutrement to the concept of the remnant and these refinements will, of course, result in greater definition but they will not be the "cutting edge" for the identification of the remnant idea. For example, in the eighth century, the remnant receives strong eschatological overtones which will drastically alter the understanding of the idea but will not change the primary identification mode: threat,

survival and historico-theological relevance.

## A. Remnant In The Torah

1. Passages identified through linguistic examination
  - a. Genesis: The Salvation of Noah From The Deluge (6-9)

It is in the story of Noah's salvation from the flood that one finds the earliest<sup>1</sup> explicit reference to the remnant motif in the Hebrew Bible. The outline of the flood story in Genesis is familiar to everyone: evil and the wickedness of man were so rampant throughout the world<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Hasel, The Remnant, p. 141. Cf. Davies, "Remnant", p. 189.

<sup>2</sup>The original significance of Gen 6.1-4 remains somewhat elusive and debatable (vide David J. A. Clines, "The Significance of the 'Sons of God' Episode [Genesis 6:1-4] in the Context of the 'Primeval History' [Genesis 1-11]", JSOT, 13 [1979], 33-46; David L. Petersen, "Genesis 6:1-4, Yahweh and the Organization of the Cosmos", JSOT, 13 [1979], 47-64) but its significance to the early interpreters of the Torah is quite clear. The author of the Book of Jubilees alters the order of the verses in Genesis 6 in such a way that the reader is forced to understand the actions of the angels of God (concerning the change from sons of God to angels of God, vide Philip S. Alexander, "The Targumim and Early Exegesis of 'Sons of God' In Genesis 6", JJS, 23 [1, 1972], 60-71; "angels of God" is also found in the LXX) and the daughters of men as illustrative of the corruption of all creation and, at least in part, causative of the ensuing destruction (Jub 5.1-8). In the Ethiopic Book of Enoch, these actions are "a great sin" (1 En 6.3) and are much more detailed than in either Genesis or Jubilees. Further, they are the cause of the flood (1 En 6.6; cf. Donat Poulet, "The Moral Causes of the Flood", CBO, 4 [1942], 293-303).

Unless otherwise noted, all English quotations from the Bible are from The Oxford Annotated Bible With The Apocrypha ed. Herbert G. May and Bruce M. Metzger (New York:

that God regretted having created man (6.5-6).<sup>3</sup> As a result, God vowed to "blot out ( מח ) man whom I have created from the face of the ground, man and beast and creeping things and birds of the air, for I am sorry that I have made them" (6.7).<sup>4</sup> The destruction, therefore, was intended to be all pervasive.<sup>5</sup> The evil of man was the catalyst for the punish-

Oxford University Press, 1965) and all Hebrew quotations are from the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia ed. K. Elliger and W. Rudolph (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1977).

<sup>3</sup>Vide also Gen 6.11-12.

<sup>4</sup>Later authors added an opportunity for repentance to the deluge story: Tg. Ps.-J. 6.3; Tg. Onq. 6.3; Mek., Shir. 5.37-39 (II, 39; 133 on 15.6).

At this point it is necessary briefly to indicate the reason for and the mode of the use of Rabbinic and Targumic literature in this study. I have no reason to disagree with the consensus of scholars which places the composition of these works well after the completion of the Hebrew Bible, but they may nevertheless be valuably employed to confirm the meaning and significance of the biblical passages, to help identify problem passages, to suggest possible solutions to these problems and to act as a control in avoiding Christian interpretation and pre-conceptions. It is important to stress, however, that these works will be cautiously consulted in order to prevent any misuse or misrepresentation.

<sup>5</sup> מח generally means to erase writing from a book (Num 5.23). Metaphorically, then, it is used for erasing from the book of the living (Ps 69.29 [LXX 69.28]; Exod 32.32, 33). One can also erase or blot out one's name from memory (Exod 17.14; Deut 9.14). Secondly, the word is also used for cleansing or purifying (2 Kgs 21.13). In Gen 6.7, as well as Gen 7.4, 23, therefore, the meaning is obviously "to expunge from the face of the ground, just as one rubs off writing from a book; or, generally one thing from another". (Umberto Cassuto, A Commentary on the Book of Genesis, E.t. by Israel Abrahams, Part I [Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, 1961], p. 305; vide also BDB, p. 562).

ment of God; God had created man so also could he destroy him.<sup>6</sup> Noah, however, found favor (III, 6.8)<sup>7</sup> in the eyes of God and God spared him; along with the rest of his family<sup>8</sup> and a nucleus of living things, Noah would begin again;<sup>9</sup> evil would indeed be punished, but mankind would not be obliterated:

He blotted out every living thing that was upon the face of the ground, man and animals and creeping things and birds of the air; they were blotted out

<sup>6</sup>Note the close connection between the creation and the destruction. That which God has created, he has the right to destroy. (Nahum M. Sarna, Understanding Genesis [New York: Schocken Books, 1972], p. 55).

<sup>7</sup>Cf. 18.19; 32.5; 33.8, 10, 15.

<sup>8</sup>The relationship between Noah's salvation and his family's is debatable. No relationship is endorsed by the Genesis text. Ezekiel will later note that Noah would be unable to save others (Ezek 14.12-20). The authors of Jubilees, however, understood that God saved the sons for Noah's sake (Jub 5.19) as did Ramban on Gen 6.9 (Ramban, Commentary On The Torah: Genesis, E.t. by Charles B. Chavel [New York: Shilo Publishing House, Inc., 1971], p. 107). Other authors traced the sons' salvation to their own righteousness (4 Ezra 3.11; 1 Clem 7.6). The Genesis text is unclear although I am inclined to understand here "the religious solidarity of the family" (John Skinner, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis, ICC [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912], p. 152).

<sup>9</sup>Vide Wis Sol 14.6:

"For even in the beginning, when arrogant giants were perishing,  
the hope of the world took refuge on a raft,  
and guided by Thy hand left to the  
world the seed of a new generation."



both God's favour and Noah's righteousness are equally important in the story.

In what did Noah's righteousness consist? The question is important not only for the understanding of the deluge story, but also for the proper understanding of the later occurrences of the remnant idea because righteousness is frequently associated with remnant. In the Hebrew Bible, righteousness is "the fulfilment of the demands of a relationship, whether that relationship be with men or with God".<sup>12</sup> Hasel has summarized it thus:

Every relationship brings with it certain claims, and the satisfaction of these claims, which issue from the relationship and in which alone the relationship can persist, is described by the term רצו.<sup>13</sup>

The salvation of Noah was indeed an act of God;<sup>14</sup> yet, Noah's righteousness qualifies him to be the recipient of that

<sup>12</sup>E. R. Achtemeier, "Righteousness in the O T", in IDB, IV, 80. Cf. N. H. Snaith, "Righteousness", in A Theological Word Book, ed. by Alan Richardson, 202-204, esp. p. 202; Skinner, Genesis, p. 159; Gerhard von Rad, Genesis, OTL, E.t. by John H. Marks (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1961), p. 116.

<sup>13</sup>Hasel, The Remnant, p. 144.

<sup>14</sup>Hasel (The Remnant, p. 145) has noted: "It is God's grace and mercy which bring Noah safely through the judgment of the flood". While true, one must be careful not to deny Noah's complicity in his own selection.



salvific action<sup>15</sup>. It is because Noah stands in proper relationship to God that God chooses him.<sup>16</sup>

In the threat to the existence of man, there is found the basis of a remnant theology.<sup>17</sup> God mitigates the

<sup>15</sup>Contra Hans Heinrich Schmid, Gerechtigkeit als Weltordnung, Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie 40 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1968), p. 106.

<sup>16</sup>Contra Josef Scharbert (Prolegomena eines Alttestamentlers zur Erbsündenlehre, Quaestiones Disputatae 37 [Freiburg: Herder, 1968], pp. 72-73) who points out that "An ihm ergeht darum das Heilswort: 'Dich habe ich mir als gerecht ersehen in dieser Generation' (7, 1). Damit soll keineswegs gesagt werden, dass Noe das Gericht nicht verdient hätte, weil er nicht unter der Gewalt der Sünde stünde. Später, nach der Flut, wo es keine anderen Menschen gibt als Noe und seine Familie, wird Jahwe sein Urteil wiederholen: 'Die Herzensgespinste des Menschen sind böse von Jugend an' (8, 21)." Die Gerechterklärung Noes ist reine Gnade, die ihm Jahwe nicht schuldig war." This view removes from Noah even the barest hint of complicity in his own salvation from the flood. Cf. Sanh 108a (Nez III, 741-742) where the understanding of Noah's righteousness is relative to his generation. In another generation, in comparison with other men, Noah might not have been as righteous, or righteous at all, as when compared to the depraved men of his own time.

<sup>17</sup>The remnant significance of Noah was recognized as early as Ben Sirach:

"Noah was found perfect and righteous;  
in the time of wrath he was taken in exchange;  
therefore a remnant was left to the earth  
when the flood came.

Everlasting covenants were made with him  
that all flesh should not be blotted out  
by a flood. (Sir 44.17-18)

Vide Th. C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology (Newton, Massachusetts: Charles T. Branford Co., 1958), p. 44. Cf. Gen Rab, Noach, 38.6 (Gen I, 305).

disaster and selects Noah as a remnant to survive the deluge and form the nucleus of a new creation.<sup>18</sup> Furthermore, even in this earliest remnant passage, the remnant is proleptically associated with the covenant between man and God.<sup>19</sup> Even before the flood, when God gave Noah the command to build the ark and foretold the imminent massa damnata, the remnant became interwoven with the covenant:

For behold, I will bring a flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy all flesh in which is the breath of life from under heaven; everything that is on the earth shall die. But I will establish my covenant with you; and you shall come into the ark, you, your sons, your wife, and your sons' wives with you. (6.17-18)

This covenant is further linked post facto with Noah as the remnant of the flood:

Then God said to Noah and to his sons with him,

<sup>18</sup>Eugene Fisher ("Gilgamesh and Genesis: The Flood Story In Context", CBQ, 32 [1970], p. 401) has pointed out that "a new creation and a new mandate to increase and multiply are needed and given by God". Although originally in a Eliadean-type statement, Fisher has correctly felt the thrust of the passage. A new beginning demands a new mandate.

<sup>19</sup>Herbert E. Ryle, The Book of Genesis, The Cambridge Bible For Schools and Colleges (Cambridge: The University Press, 1914), p. 103, n. on v. 18; S. R. Driver, The Book of Genesis, Westminster Commentaries (3rd ed.; New York: Edwin S. Gorham, 1905), p. 97, n. on vv. 8-17.

"Behold, I establish my covenant ( בריתי ) with you and your descendants after you, and with every living creature that is with you, the birds, the cattle, and every beast of the earth with you, as many as came out of the ark. I establish my covenant with you, that never again shall all flesh be cut off by the waters of a flood, and never again shall there be a flood to destroy the earth." (9.8-11)

This covenant, a unilateral promise of God, serves as a foreshadowing of the link between remnant and the bilateral covenant as well as between election and remnant.<sup>20</sup>

The salvation of the remnant in the deluge story is first and foremost from a present threat and yet the remnant holds some future guarantee implied in the Noachian covenant: "that never again shall all flesh be cut off by the waters of a flood, and never again shall there be a flood to destroy the earth" (9.11). How inclusive this promise is can be debated. The open question centres on the specific or general meaning of "a flood" but regardless of the meaning a promise concerning the future existence of the remnant is

---

<sup>20</sup>Cassuto (Genesis, II, 67-68) notes the difference between "making a covenant" and "establishing a covenant". He points out that the latter means not a bilateral agreement but a unilateral promise. In light of this, one must look upon these verses as foreshadowing the connection between remnant and the bilateral covenant. Cf. von Rad, Genesis, p. 130.

made by God.<sup>21</sup> Further, the fact remains that when faced with the option of the annihilation or salvation of man, God chose to spare a remnant and to perpetuate mankind.<sup>22</sup> Thus, one finds in the deluge story not only a remnant in Noah but also the juxtaposition of remnant and covenant, doom and hope, just judgment and salvation promise and remnant and righteousness.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup>In Gen Rab, Vayera, 49.9 (Gen I, 429), one finds support for this interpretation: "R. Aha said: [Abraham pleaded:] 'Thou hast sworn not to bring a deluge upon the world. Wouldst thou evade thine oath! Not a deluge of water wilt thou bring but a deluge of fire? Then thou hast not acted according to thine oath.'" This midrash interprets the statement to Noah in a gnomic sense to support Abraham's case.

<sup>22</sup>It is interesting to note that verse 7.3b indicates that the purpose of the pairs of animals was ". . . to keep their kind alive upon the face of all the earth. . .". There is no reason to doubt that this intent is also applicable to 7.1 which immediately precedes the animal selection and which directs Noah to "'Go into the ark, you and all your household, for I have seen that you are righteous before me in this generation. . . .'"

<sup>23</sup>Lewis has shown that the flood story is later adopted by poetic and apocalyptic writers as "a type of the end of the world in apocalyptic" (Lewis, Interpretation, p. 9):

Isa 24.1, 4-5	Gen 9.16
Isa 24.18	7.11; 8.2
Isa 26.20-21 (remnant saved)	
Dan 9.26	
Ps 18.16; 65.5-8; 69.1; 89.9; 93.3	

Vide Sheldon H. Blank; Prophetic Faith in Isaiah (N. Y.: Harper & Bros., 1958), pp. 165-166. The relationship between remnant and apocalyptic becomes stronger in the post-biblical period (vide chpt. II).

b. Genesis: The Intercession by Abraham and the Sparing of  
Lot and His Daughters (18.22-19.29)

Interpreters of the Hebrew Bible generally have recognized the existence of a remnant motif in the story of Abraham's intercession with God on behalf of Sodom and Gomorrah and the subsequent destruction of the cities.<sup>24</sup> The link between the intercession by Abraham and the Lot story is tenuous and scholars have rightly questioned the integrity of the passage.<sup>25</sup> Nevertheless, they are linked in the Hebrew Bible and they formed one coherent entity in later Judaism.<sup>26</sup> Thus we shall treat them as such.

In the story of the intercession, Abraham's question concerns the destruction of the righteous along with the wicked (18.23); how many righteous must be numbered among the evil before the destruction of the entire group would so pervert justice that the innocent and the guilty would be treated alike (18.25). Or, in other words, even if the

<sup>24</sup>Davies, "Remnant", p. 189; Hasel, The Remnant, pp. 147-152; Jenni, "The Remnant", p. 32; Müller, Die Vorstellung, pp. 52-53.

<sup>25</sup>Skinner, Genesis, pp. 304-305; Martin Noth, The History of Israel (2nd ed.; New York: Harper & Row, 1960), p. 121 n. 1; Hasel, The Remnant, pp. 147-148.

<sup>26</sup>Rashi (Pentateuch With Targum Onkelos, Haphtaroth And Rashi's Commentary: Genesis, E.t. by M. Rosenbaum and A. M. Silbermann [New York: Hebrew Publishing Company, n.d.], pp. 74-83) mentions no difficulty with the passage. There is also no difficulty noticed by the compilers of Gen Rab, Vayera, 49.7-51.11 (I, 425-450).

majority are evil, does not justice demand that the evil be spared lest their punishment condemn the righteous few? During the bargaining between God and Abraham, the justice of God,<sup>27</sup> "the Judge of all the earth" (18.25) is gradually tested as the number of righteous needed is reduced until only ten righteous men are sufficient to spare the entire group (18.32).<sup>28</sup> At this point, the dialogue ceases<sup>29</sup> but

<sup>27</sup>Gen 18.25c reads חֲשֵׁט כָּל-הָאָרֶץ לֹא יִרְעָה מִשֵּׁט . Von Rad, (Genesis, p. 213) contends that "Abraham is wrestling, as his appeal to the righteous Judge of the world clearly shows, with a new interpretation of the concept 'the righteousness of God'". Although "righteous" appears throughout this passage (Gen 18.22-33), it is never used with reference to God. Note that Gen 18.25c challenges God to do "right" ( מִשֵּׁט ). The point under discussion is the justice of God and how it is to be understood in this ambiguous situation. This is not to say, however, that the justice of God is not perhaps a manifestation of the righteousness of God but it is the former and not the latter which is being discussed.

<sup>28</sup>It is necessary to remember that the point at issue in this argument is the injustice of destroying the good with the evil and not any application of some type of "transferral of merit" from the righteous to the evil. On this, vide E. P. Sanders (Paul and Palestinian Judaism [London: SCM Press, 1977], pp. 183-198) who points out that "Statements to the effect that the world is saved from destruction by the 'merits' of the pious in each generation do not mean that such merits are transferred to other individuals, particularly not at the judgment. This is simply a way of emphasizing God's mercy, for he suspends his judgment against the world for the sake of a few. This sort of homiletical statement is probably based on such Biblical passages as Gen 18.22-23 ('for the sake of ten I will not destroy [Sodom]'), and implies no doctrine of, nor transfer of, merits" (pp. 190-191). Cf. Solomon Schechter, Aspects of Rabbinic Theology (New York: Schocken Books, 1969), p. 190.

<sup>29</sup>The number of righteous needed is reduced in

the key rubric has been established: justice must prevail and within that dictum it is more important that the righteous not be treated as if guilty than that the guilty be punished.<sup>30</sup> Collective thinking has been challenged, altered but not replaced; and, in a very embryonic way redemptive thinking has been suggested. It must be emphasized, however, that righteousness has not earned salvation for the group but rather that God, through His justice, spares the group for the sake of the righteous few. They occasion this act but they do not merit it.<sup>31</sup>

---

other passages to only one righteous person (Jer 5.1; Ezek 22.30). This may be rhetorical exaggeration, especially in Ezekiel.

<sup>30</sup>The argument pre-supposes that the righteous should not receive punishment and that, mutatis mutandis, the wicked should be punished. Yet, the answer is not sifting the former from the latter (contra Müller, Die Vorstellung, pp. 44-45). The answer retains a collective mentality and pivots on the determination of when justice is best served. The focus remains throughout the passage on the righteous as opposed to the wicked. (Contra Hasel, The Remnant, pp. 149-150).

<sup>31</sup>With Hasel (The Remnant, p. 149), contra Walther Eichrodt (Theology of the Old Testament, E.t. by J. A. Baker [Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967], II, 430 n. 1) who states that "The ascription of a late date to this passage overlooks the fact that it is not concerned with the post-exilic doctrine of individual retribution, but with the ancient view of collective liability, with the sole difference that the customary reckoning is turned upside down, and that instead of the sin of the few making the whole group culpable the righteousness of the few avails for the salvation of the whole." This view ignores the pivotal position held by God's justice. (Vide Bruce Vawter, A Path Through Genesis [New York: Sheed & Ward, 1966], p. 151)

One then expects the rubric to be invoked in the following story: the salvation of Lot and his family. This, however, is not the case; the hypothetical is not actualized. The cities are destroyed and all the inhabitants except Lot and his daughters perish. It is Lot's salvation which is the crux of the narrative<sup>32</sup> and this is obviously not an application of Abraham's plea for salvation of the group because of a righteous few. Lot's righteousness is not even mentioned<sup>33</sup> and, indeed, it is distinctly pointed out that he is saved due to God's mercy (19.16)<sup>34</sup> which is prompted

<sup>32</sup>Hasel, The Remnant, p. 151.

<sup>33</sup>It is obvious, however, that Lot is superior to the other inhabitants of the cities. To appreciate his upright character, one need only read the story of Lot's deportment when his guests were threatened by the Sodomites (Gen. 19.1-11). In the Hebrew Bible, Lot's righteousness is never an issue and it is always God's favour which is the raison d'être for Lot's salvation (Gen 19.13, 16, 19). By the time of the Talmud, however, it was Lot's righteousness which caused him to be saved (Ber 54b; Zera'im, p. 332).

<sup>34</sup>Although Sarna (Understanding Genesis, p. 150) agrees that Lot was not saved through his own merit, he believes that it was through the merit of Abraham. He bases his interpretation upon v. 19.29 which he understands as an application of the "doctrine of merit". This, however, is overstating the thrust of the verse (with Hasel, The Remnant, p. 151 n. 55). Sarna's position is based upon his desire to connect the plea of Abraham (18.22-33) with the salvation of Lot. "The patriarch had established the principle that the wrathful judgment of God could be averted through the merit of an innocent nucleus; so God delivered Lot from the catastrophe through the merit of Abraham". Sarna thus connects Gen 18.22-33 and Gen 19.29. This, however, shows a basic mis-understanding and mis-



by Abraham's righteousness (19.29). Lot, himself, indicates that it was not his merit which caused him to be saved:

. . . your servant has found favor in your sight,  
and you have shown me great kindness in saving  
my life. . . . (19.18)

Both Lot's sons-in-law and his wife rejected salvation; the sons-in-law because they thought Lot was "jesting" (19.14) and his wife because she disobeyed the angelic dictate not to look back upon Sodom (19.17). Lot and his daughters heeded the words of the messengers:

Flee (המלט) for your life; do not look back or  
stop anywhere in the valley; flee (המלט) to the  
hills, lest you be consumed.<sup>35</sup> (19.17)

And so

it was that, when God destroyed the cities of the valley, God remembered Abraham, and sent Lot out of the midst of the overthrow, when he overthrew the cities in which Lot dwelt. (19.29)

That God mitigated his judgment upon Sodom and

application of Abraham's plea. The point is not the merit of the righteous but the justice of God. (Vide Driver, Genesis, p. 196, note on vv. 23-33). Further, Abraham's plea never mentions Sodom and does not reduce the numbers sufficiently to be directly applicable to the Sodomite situation (vide Vawter, Genesis, p. 231).

<sup>35</sup>The story of the salvation of Lot uses only the remnant root מלט and this five times in six verses (19.17-22).

Gomorrah is obvious; Lot and his family were spared; a remnant remained. It should be noted, however, that this was not a threat of universal destruction nor a threat to the life of Israel. Indeed, it was not even a threat to the reigning patriarch. Au contraire, it was a threat to one group whose leader disappears from the scene almost immediately after being saved.<sup>36</sup>

What, therefore, are the operative facts? God, in His mercy, has saved a remnant from the righteous judgment of destruction. It must be pointed out that this judgment was delivered upon a non-Israelite group which introduces the element of universal judgment rather than God's judgment upon Israel alone. In addition, in this story two further notes are struck: one can reject one's place in the remnant as did Lot's sons-in-law (19.14) and, like Lot's wife, a disobedient member of the remnant will be purged from the group (19.17, 26). Furthermore, there is now the doctrine of the salvific effect of the righteous few upon the evil majority. And finally, just as Noah, the one to be saved, was informed of the impending disaster (Gen 6-9) so also, Lot, the one to be saved, was informed of the imminent destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah.

---

<sup>36</sup>Gen 19.36 is the last appearance of Lot. His children, however, are mentioned in Deut 2.9, 19 and Ps 83.8 and Ammonites and Moabites abound in Judges, Kings and the Latter Prophets.

c. Genesis: Esau's Threat to Jacob (25.24-30; 26.34-33.20)

The next remnant episode results from Jacob's less than laudable treatment of his elder brother, Esau.<sup>37</sup> Jacob obtained Esau's birthright<sup>38</sup> through questionable, if not underhanded, means (25.29-34) and then later, in league with his mother, deceived Isaac, his father, into giving him Esau's rightful blessing (27.1-40). Nevertheless, it is

---

<sup>37</sup>Even though the biblical story leaves little doubt that Jacob's methods were less than praiseworthy, (Vide Ryle, Genesis, p. 282, note on vv. 19, 20; Driver, Genesis, p. 255) the biblical author does lay the groundwork for the later exoneration of Jacob. According to the Genesis account, "Esau despised his birthright" (25.34b). This will be later emended in Tg. Ps. J. Gen 25.34 to include ". . . and the portion of the world that cometh" with another addition in Frg. Tg. ". . . and denied the resurrection of the dead" (Ms P.; vide also Tg. Neof. Gen 25.34). The exoneration of Jacob is accomplished through the vilification of Esau with the result that Jacob's actions seem less despicable. Esau is accused of the most heinous crimes: "And Esau came from the wilderness, exhausted; for in that day he had committed five transgressions: he had worshipped with strange worship, he had shed innocent blood, he had gone in unto a betrothed damsel, he had denied the life of the world to come, and had despised the birthright" (Tg. Ps. J. Gen 25.29). Esau is further accused in Gen Rab, Toledoth, 63.12 (Gen II, 567) of not only violating a maiden (based on Gen 25.29 and Deut 22.25) but also of murder (Gen 25.29 and Jer 4.31). In Gen Rab, Toledoth, 63.8 (Gen II, 562-563) the birth of Esau and Jacob receives new interpretation so that even Esau's primogeniture is an indication of his evil. "Why did Esau issue first? So that he might issue and all the offensive matter with him." This condemnation of Esau is even carried to the interpretation of his name which is, according to R. Abba B. Kahana, "Ruddy" because he was "Altogether a shedder of blood" (Gen. Rab., Toledoth, 63.8 [Gen II, 563]).

<sup>38</sup>vide Deut 21.15-17. The birthright carried with it honorific, financial and spiritual advantages.

Jacob and not Esau who is the chosen of God and the recipient of the promise; Jacob becomes the name-bearer as well as the promise-bearer of Israel:<sup>39</sup>

"I am the Lord, the God of Abraham your father and the God of Isaac; the land on which you lie I will give to you and to your descendants; and your descendants shall be like the dust of the earth, and you shall spread abroad to the west and to the east and to the north and to the south; and by you and your descendants shall all the families of the earth bless themselves. Behold, I am with you and will keep you wherever you go, and will bring you back to this land; for I will not leave you until I have done that of which I have spoken to you." (28.13b-15)

This commitment by God to Jacob and his descendants plays a crucial role in the subsequent encounter between the two brothers (32.3-33.17). After living for a time with Laban, Jacob decides to leave and return home with his family (31.1-5) but he is very distressed over the memory of his past dealings with Esau, Rebekah's warning to him about Esau (27.42b-45) and the anticipation of his brother's reaction to him. Jacob's deception imperils not only his own life

---

<sup>39</sup>Vide Gen 28.13-15; 32.28 (Heb 32.29). Also, Vawter, Path, p. 188.

but also that of his clan. He becomes even more fearful when his envoys to Esau return, saying: "We came to your brother Esau, and he is coming to meet you, and four hundred men with him" (32.6). As a result, Jacob

. . . was greatly afraid and distressed; and he divided the people that were with him, and his flocks and herds and camels, into two companies, thinking, "If Esau comes to the one company and destroys it, then the company which is left ( הַנּוֹשָׂאֵר ) will escape ( לִפְלִיטָה )."<sup>40</sup>

(32.7-8; Heb 32.8-9)

Having done this, Jacob then prays to God for deliverance:

"O God of my father Abraham and God of my father Isaac, O Lord who didst say to me, 'Return to your country and to your kindred, and I will do you good,' I am not worthy of the least of all the steadfast love and all the faithfulness which thou hast shown to thy servant, for with only my staff I crossed this Jordan; and now I have become two companies. Deliver me, I pray thee, from the hand of my brother, from the hand of Esau, for I fear him, lest he come and slay us all, the mothers with the children. But thou didst say, 'I will do you

---

<sup>40</sup>Ramban (on Gen 32.9, Genesis, p. 398) may have recognized the remnant intent in this passage:

"The intent of this is that Jacob knew that all his seed would not fall into Esau's hands. Therefore, in any case, one camp would be saved."

good, and make your descendants as the sand of the sea, which cannot be numbered for multitude.'"

(32.9-12; Heb 32.10-13)

Although the reference to the possible remnant is found in verse eight, it is necessary that the above passages be interpreted together. Jacob sees the four hundred horsemen as a real threat (v. 6; Heb v. 7) and fears Esau's total annihilation of his clan (v. 11; Heb v. 12). As a result, Jacob has initiated evasive action to insure the preservation of the clan (vv. 7-8; Heb vv. 8-9) but the prayer makes it obvious that it is only through God's assistance that the evasion will succeed. Furthermore, it is not because of Jacob's righteousness that God's favour is to be sought. Indeed, Jacob realizes that he is quite unworthy of such mercy. The plea is based, therefore, upon the promise of God to Jacob and his descendants. It is God's faithfulness to his promise (32.12) that is here the raison d'être for salvation; God's commitment to Jacob is the result of his election of Jacob and his promise to him. The end result is a very congenial meeting between the brothers, Esau and Israel (33.4-11):<sup>41</sup> "But Esau ran to meet him, and embraced him, and fell on his neck and kissed him, and they wept" (33.4).

---

<sup>41</sup>vide Gen 32.28 (Heb 32.29).

This is an extremely interesting and important occurrence of the remnant motif. God is not specified as the origin of the threat against Jacob; indeed, the threat, although real, in the end takes no one's life. The failure of the threat to materialize does not eliminate the remnant thrust; it does, however, mean that the group saved is identical to the original group. Thus, the salvation of Jacob is more nuanced than that of Noah. Furthermore, there is no hint of the judgment of God against either the pervasive evil of mankind or that of the clan. What is found is the crucial link between the election and the remnant.<sup>42</sup> A threat exists against God's elect, Jacob and his descendants, and, regardless of Jacob's past error, God remains true to his promise and preserves the clan.

Once again, the same themes as in the deluge story are here associated with the remnant: covenant, doom, hope and promise. The major differences centre about the lack of God's judgment upon the evil of men, the connection between election and remnant and the concept of the entire group as a remnant.

d. Genesis: Recognition Scene In The Joseph Story (41.25-46.7)

Another remnant sequence in Genesis occurs in the

---

<sup>42</sup>Hasel, The Remnant, p. 153.

Joseph story. A famine threatened to destroy all mankind (41.30-31)<sup>43</sup> and Joseph was selected by God to preserve a remnant of Israel:<sup>44</sup>

. . . for God sent me before you to preserve life.<sup>45</sup>

For the famine has been in the land these two years; and there are yet five years in which there will be neither plowing nor harvest. And God sent me before you to preserve for you a remnant ( שארית ) on earth, and to keep alive for you many survivors ( פליטה ).<sup>46</sup>

(45.5-7)

<sup>43</sup>Vide Gen 41.55-57.

<sup>44</sup>Hasel (The Remnant, p. 154) has noted that through Joseph's being sent "before you to preserve life" (45.56) the entire Joseph cycle has been given new meaning. All of the evil machinations of Joseph's brothers are now interpreted as under the guidance of God and as preparatory to the central thrust of the cycle: Joseph's salvation of the remnant. (Vide also, Donald B. Redford, A Study of the Biblical Story of Joseph, VT Sup XX [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970], pp. 170-171; Robert Davidson, Genesis 12-50, CBC [London: Cambridge University Press, 1979], p. 272)

<sup>45</sup>Davies ("Remnant", p. 190) points out the connection between the deliverance and life: "Joseph, for example, is described as a 'Mihyah', i.e. a place where life is to be found, a nucleus of life (Gen 45.5)."

<sup>46</sup>Skinner (Genesis, p. 487) questions the translation of שארית as remnant and prefers descendants (vide also Driver, Genesis, p. 362, note on v. 7; Ryle, Genesis, p. 402, note on v. 7) citing 2 Sam 14.7 and Jer 44.7. He further objects to translating פליטה as "escaped" since the entire tribe escapes the disaster. Müller (Die Vorstellung, p. 50), however, counters that the translation is appropriate because the tribe narrowly escapes destruction and is the bearer of the hopes for the future existence. Hasel (The



Once again, as in the story of Noah and in that of Jacob, one notes that the remnant is closely associated with the preservation of life (45.5b). Jacob has been sent "to preserve life". This duty is then interpreted to mean "to preserve for you a remnant, and to keep alive for you many survivors" (v. 7).<sup>47</sup> This remnant will be of the house of Israel (46.1, 7b); indeed, it will be the entire house. This feature is reminiscent of the Jacob story in which the remnant also consisted of the entire group.<sup>48</sup> The connection between the remnant and the election theme has been given new thrust in the Joseph story--here the preservation has been given the added explicit dimension of future orientation.<sup>49</sup> The remnant is more than the group

---

Remnant, p. 155) adds "that this term has such connotations is shown in the Jacob-Esau narrative in which a participle of  $\text{נִשְׁמַר}$  is used in a substantive-like sense in connection with the survival of the whole clan of Jacob. The use of this noun emphasizes the peril the tribe had escaped." Furthermore, as we noted in the introduction, it is not the actualized destruction that is definitive but the possibility of a remnant. Hence, the remnant may, and in this case does, equal the original group. Ryle (Genesis, p. 402, n. on v. 7), points out that v. 7a and v. 7b are "very nearly identical. In the first, the emphasis is on the fact of survival; in the second, on the act of preservation."

<sup>47</sup>The parallelism of the verses supports this interpretation.

<sup>48</sup>Vide supra, chpt. I, pp. 39-43.

<sup>49</sup>Although it may be said that linking the remnant with election in the Jacob story automatically implies a futuristic concern, this aspect of the remnant explicitly surfaces in the Joseph story.

which has been saved from the present threat; it is also the group which will be exalted in the future:

"I am God, the God of your father; do not be afraid to go down to Egypt; for I will there make of you a great nation. I will go down with you to Egypt, and I will also bring you up again; and Joseph's hand shall close your eyes." (46.3-4)

God will preserve his people with whom he has made a covenant and Joseph who will preserve the remnant of his people will be the bearer of the promise as he was the bearer of life.

e. Leviticus: Blessings and Curses (26)

After the enumeration of a number of commandments and statutes, the author of Leviticus concludes with the blessings and curses which will flow from the mitzvot. It is in the curses that the remnant motif is appealed to by the author. Numerous curses are threatened, each increasing in ferocity, beginning with "sudden terror" (26.16), including plagues, pestilence, desolation and devastation, and ending with utter destruction:

And as for those of you that are left (אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁאֵר ),  
I will send faintness into their hearts in the  
lands of their enemies; the sound of a driven leaf  
shall put them to flight, and they shall flee as  
one flees from the sword, and they shall fall when  
none pursues. They shall stumble over one another,

as if to escape a sword, though none pursues; and you shall have no power to stand before your enemies. And you shall perish among the nations, and the land of your enemies shall eat you up. And those of you that are left ( הַנּוֹשָׁאֲרִים ) shall pine away in your enemies' lands because of their iniquity; and also because of the iniquities of their fathers they shall pine away like them. . . ." (26.36-39)

The lot of the sinful nation is one catastrophe after another. Yet, from each disaster, there is always a remnant.<sup>50</sup> It seems that this group gradually declines but it is clear that there is no danger of complete destruction. Furthermore, the punishment of the forefathers will also be visited upon their descendants--another indicator that some will remain.<sup>51</sup> This, however, does not mean God and Israel are at peace. It is only confession which would bring placation so that God would once again remember His covenant with Jacob, Isaac and Abraham (26.40-42). The point must be made, however, that the penitance of the Israelites is totally overshadowed by the approachability of God which "subordinates even the severest punishment to

<sup>50</sup>Vide Lev 26.21, 25, 33.

<sup>51</sup>According to Siphra (Bechukkothai, Perek 5.2) this should be interpreted as meaning if they imitate their fathers. In either case, they are not destroyed; punished but not utterly destroyed.

the purpose of conversion and to the pardon which this makes possible".<sup>52</sup> God's judgment is not the rejection of his people but chastisement (26.28) to elicit atonement. It seems, further, that in spite of any sins, even if they do not confess, the Lord will not break the covenant and there will be a remnant:<sup>53</sup>

" . . . Yet for all that, when they are in the land of their enemies, I will not spurn them, neither will I abhor them so as to destroy them utterly and break my covenant with them; for I am the Lord their God, but I will for their sake remember the covenant with their forefathers, whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt in the sight of the nations, that I might be their God: I am the Lord." (26.44-45)

The remnant motif<sup>54</sup> is once again inseparably linked with election, covenant and the threat of complete annihilation. Furthermore, in extremis merit is not a question. Even

---

<sup>52</sup>Eichrodt, Theology, II, 459; Vide also, G. J. Wenham, The Book of Leviticus, NICOT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1979), p. 332.

<sup>53</sup>Martin Noth, Leviticus, E.t. by J. E. Anderson (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1965), pp. 200-201; Vide, also, Ramban on Exod 26.45, Commentary on The Torah: Leviticus, E.t. by Charles B. Chavel (New York: Shilo Publishing House, Inc., 1974), pp. 476-477.

<sup>54</sup>Vide Rashi on Lev 26.44 (Pentateuch with Targum Onkelos, Haphtaroth and Rashi's Commentary: Leviticus, E.t. by M. Rosenbaum and A. M. Silbermann [New York: Hebrew Publishing Company, n.d.], p. 130)

when there is no merit, God will not abandon Israel. Here it is the faithfulness of God that causes a remnant to remain and not the actions of the Israelite nation nor even of any particular member of that nation. This, however, does not mean that righteousness, hence merit, is not normally necessary. In addition, the pivotal role which is placed upon repentance in re-establishing a proper relationship between Israel and God is important to note. It does not seem to be a sine qua non for the existence of a remnant, but it is nevertheless essential for a proper relationship of righteousness between the covenantal partners.

f. Deuteronomy: Moses' Threat Against Israel (4.25-31)

In almost every chapter of the Book of Deuteronomy, one finds a unique concern for the law and for obedience to it; it is, therefore, not surprising to find both blessings and curses employed as means for encouraging compliance with the statutes and commandments of the Lord. At the conclusion of Moses' first address to Israel, after enumerating some of the blessings which the Israelites can expect if they adhere to the covenantal agreement, Moses proceeds to discuss the results of breaking the covenant; and, within this context, he has occasion to allude to the doctrine of the remnant. If the Israelites do "what is evil in the sight of the Lord your God, so as to provoke him to



Lord your God and obey his voice, for the Lord your God is a merciful God; he will not fail you or destroy you or forget the covenant with your fathers which he swore to them. (4.27-31)

Moses then concludes his speech with a rather lengthy discussion of Israel's privileged position as the elect of the Lord (4.32-40).

Thus, Israel will be punished but even in the depth of his sinfulness and his utter rejection of God, Israel will not be completely destroyed: a remnant will remain. It is obvious, furthermore, that this remnant has not merited salvation; it is only because of the mercy and faithfulness of God that Israel is saved. Although the remnant will be preserved in spite of his sinfulness, Israel will eventually return to the Lord and live in conformity

---

sion of rather frequent occurrence in the prophetic books, and denoting the final period of the future so far as it falls within the range of the speaker's perspective. The sense attaching to it is thus relative, not absolute, varying with the context. Here it is used of the period of Israel's return to God, forming the close of its history so far as contemplated by the writer; [in] 31.29 it is used of the antecedent period of Israel's rebellion: in Gn. 49.1 of the period of Israel's possession of Canaan; in Nu. 24.14 of the period of Israel's future conquest of Moab and Edom (see v. 17-18); in Ez. 38.16 of the imagined period of Gog's attack upon restored Israel; in Dan. 10.14 of the age of Antiochus Epiphanes. Elsewhere it is used of the ideal, or Messianic age, conceived as following at the close of the existing order of things, Hos. 3.5; Is. 2.2; (=Mic. 4.1); comp. Jer. 23.20; (=30.24); 48.47; 49.39; Dan. 2.28 [Verse notation altered for conformity]."

to the mishpatim of God.<sup>57</sup> Finally, it is important to note that this threat is a future prediction of what will befall an itinerant Israel.<sup>58</sup> It is not a statement of past or present reality. The underlying premise is, however, extremely clear-cut: God will not fail his people nor utterly destroy them. Here the remnant has been interwoven with the election, the mercy of God, the faithfulness of God and the covenant. The uniqueness of this passage is the return of an obedient Israel to God. In the end, Israel will be constant. One further point should be made: there is no indication who the members of this remnant will be nor how or whether one can insure one's membership in this group. This is a corporate promise to Israel and not to the Israelites as individuals.

g. Deuteronomy: Consequences of Disobedience (28.20-69)

In chapter twenty-eight, Moses again attempts to convince the Israelites to follow the dictates of the Lord. Just as in chapter four, he resorts to the enumeration of

---

<sup>57</sup>The return, although prophesied, is not further explained. The purpose of the passage seems to be to "try to make the people understand that the door through which they may return to Yahweh is still standing open" (Gerhard von Rad, Deuteronomy, E.t. by Dorothea Barton, OTL [Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1966], pp. 50-51).

<sup>58</sup>Most probably this refers to the exile. (von Rad, Old Testament Theology, I, 346)



various curses which disobedience will cause to be delivered upon Israel. These curses will be sent upon the people "until you are destroyed and perish quickly, on account of the evil of your doings, because you have forsaken me" (28.20). And furthermore: "All these curses shall come upon you and pursue you and overtake you, till you are destroyed, because you did not obey the voice of the Lord your God, to keep his commandments and his statutes which he commanded you" (28.45). Repeatedly, Moses returns to the dread prediction "until you are destroyed"<sup>59</sup> as he enumerates one macabre curse after another. In spite of this dire catalogue, the underlying theme is, however, one of hope and survival; there will be a remnant:<sup>60</sup>

Whereas you were as the stars of heaven for multitude, you shall be left (וְשָׂרְיָתָם ) few in number; because<sup>61</sup> you did not obey the voice of the Lord your God.

(28.62)<sup>62</sup>

Existence will be precarious but nonetheless Israel will

<sup>59</sup>Vide 28.20, 24, 45, 51, 61.

<sup>60</sup>The prophetic force of these verses refers to the exile (Driver, Deuteronomy, p. 317-318). Vide, also, E. W. Nicholson; Deuteronomy and Tradition (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1967), pp. 34-35.

<sup>61</sup> וְשָׂרְיָתָם , instead of its normal "because", means "instead of" as in Ezek 36.34.

<sup>62</sup>Cf. Deut 26.5

exist: "your life shall hang in doubt before you; night and day and you shall be in dread, and have no assurance of your life" (28.66).<sup>63</sup>

It is interesting that in this chapter the mitigation of the disaster is assumed rather than explained. This, of course, is not unexpected since the purpose of the chapter is to elicit compliance to the law and not to hold forth a hope that could spell self-righteousness and ego-centricity. Even though the danger of such over-excessiveness exists, there is still no denial of the doctrine. For Israel, "utter destruction" means drastic reduction; the many are to become the few. The reduction is the result of the disobedience of the Israelites--a fact reminiscent of the Noah story. Finally, it is also important to realize that these verses are all national in character and are not aimed at individual Israelites.<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup>Von Rad (Deuteronomy, p. 176) has apparently missed the hope in this passage. He is quite correct in his evaluation of the desperateness of the situation portrayed in vv. 58-68 but his interpretation of the final result is questionable: "Evidently Deuteronomy sees in these events something like a divine liquidation of the whole history of salvation brought about by Yahweh, that is to say, a termination of that road on which, according to the word of Yahweh, already referred to in Deut. 17.16, no return would ever again be made." This view ignores the theme of hope which is vital to the passage, although it would be quite correct to note the emphasis on the pessimism and the significant fact that the verses of hope do not conclude the passage. The passage ends on a dire note.

<sup>64</sup>Adam C. Welch, Deuteronomy: The Framework To The Code (London: Oxford University Press, 1932), pp. 129-130.

#### h. Summary

It is now helpful briefly to summarize our findings before proceeding to an examination of remnant passages in which the remnant root words do not appear. Thus far, the remnant in the Torah has referred to those who have escaped a past disaster as well as to those who will escape a future one. In either case, however, the survivors escape or would escape some type of threat to the existence of the original group. It is irrelevant whether the threat is actualized. The remnant's deliverance can result from God's justice, elsewhere from his mercy; but it is always a manifestation of his commitment to the preservation of life--in particular, the preservation of the life of his people. When referring to Israel, the remnant constitutes the Israel which has been elected by God, and is the recipient of God's covenantal promise. The relationship between election, covenant and remnant is integral--there will always be a remnant because there has been an election by a God who is perpetually faithful. Further, in the two deuteronomic passages one finds the remnant in conjunction with the concept of the "return"--the few will eventually become the pious few. The remnant also has, at times, an additional aspect of futurity in that the remnant is the seed of future life; but that futurity cannot be termed eschatological.

2. Passages Illustrating the Remnant Motif Without Linguistic Identification<sup>65</sup>

a. Exodus: The Idolatry of the Israelites (32.1-33.6)

Chapter 32 of Exodus contains the story of the Israelites' idolatry while Moses was on Mt. Sinai receiving the tablets of the law. According to this story, the Israelites

" . . . have corrupted themselves; they have turned aside

<sup>65</sup>Davies ("Remnant", p. 189) sees the remnant theme in the story of the Tower of Babel (Gen 11.1-9). I am not convinced by his argument which is slight and sketchy. According to Davies "There is an approach to the remnant idea after the dispersal from Babel (Gen 11). Here the 'second humanity' is not destroyed but scattered over the earth, and the story is concentrated in Shem, Eber and Abram. As interest centres in Abram to the neglect of other branches of the line of Shem and Eber, we see how the future is concentrated in Abraham (Gen 20.1-3). This narrowing process is probably part of J's theory of history (cf. Exod. 33.16), and certainly of P's." Davies' argument places the "second humanity" in greater danger than is evident from the text. There is no indication that the total destruction of the people was even contemplated. It is true that they were scattered but that seemed to be the original intent and not a mitigation of a more grievous punishment. There is, therefore, hardly an escape. Furthermore, it is difficult to imagine the function of the Tower of Babel story as a "narrowing process". There is no indication of this interest by the biblical author, although Davies is correct in seeing the future as concentrated in Abraham. (Vide, e.g. Midr. Rab., Vayera, 49.9 [I, 430]). His error is in his evaluation of the Babel story within that context. This view may be traceable to later Jewish interpretation which amplified the Babel Story (Louis Ginzberg, The Legends of the Jews, E.t. by Henrietta Szold [Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1968], I, 179-181).

quickly out of the way which I [Yahweh] commanded them; they have made for themselves a molten calf, and have worshipped it and sacrificed to it, and said, 'These are your gods, O Israel, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt!'" (32.7-8)

As a result of this corruption, the Lord was extremely angry with them and said to Moses:

"I have seen this people, and behold, it is a stiff-necked people; now therefore let me alone, that my wrath may burn hot against them and I may consume them; but of you I will make a great nation."

(32.9-10)<sup>66</sup>

Moses then pleads for the Lord to stay his anger against Israel. First, he appeals to the memory of the deliverance of Israel from Egypt in which he "includes the gentle reminder of 'thy people'".<sup>67</sup> He then wonders aloud what the Egyptians would say if, having saved His people from them, God would then vent His anger upon His people and destroy them. Finally, he asks God to remember the cove-

---

<sup>66</sup>Note that the pique of the Lord has even affected his nomenclature for Israel: they are here "this people" not "my people". Vide, also, Ramban on Exod 32.35 (Ramban, Commentary on the Torah: Exodus, E.t. by Charles B. Chavel [New York: Shilo Publishing House, Inc., 1973], p. 573).

<sup>67</sup>Brevard S. Childs, The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary, OTL (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1974); p. 568. Vide, also, Midr. Rab., Ki Thissa, 63.7 (Exodus, p. 501).

nant:<sup>68</sup>

"Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, thy servants, to whom thou didst swear by thine own self, and didst say to them, 'I will multiply your descendants as the stars of heaven, and all this land that I have promised I will give to your descendants, and they shall inherit it for ever.'" (32.13)

Moses does not attempt to appeal to Israel's righteousness but rather to God's faithfulness which is made operative by the election and the covenant. These passages present an example of the recurrent divine paradox: God decrees a just, although severe, punishment, generally total annihilation; and then he conditions it so that the people, in fact, plead for his mercy. Thus, here, God desires to "consume them" (32.10) but, after the imprecation by Moses, "the Lord repented of the evil which he thought to do to His people" (32.14).<sup>69</sup>

Although Moses was able to plead successfully for mercy upon Israel, he was not able to obtain complete forgiveness and Israel's punishment is but delayed.<sup>70</sup> The

<sup>68</sup>Childs, Exodus, p. 568.

<sup>69</sup>On the paradox, Vide Childs, Exodus, p. 567. According to the compilers of Midr. Rab. (Ki Thissa, 64.10 [Exodus, p. 515]), the mitigation is already present when, in Exod 32.10, God spared Moses: "Because Moses himself was of the house of Israel."

<sup>70</sup>Vide Exod 32.33, 35.

remnant intent of the Lord's original condemnation is not canceled, however, by Moses' successful plea and remains quite clear and significant. Even if the Lord had "consumed" the Israelites, there would have been a remnant in Moses from whom "a great nation"<sup>71</sup> would have come.

In order to appreciate the full significance of this remnant passage, it is necessary to understand the context within which the remnant appears. The apostasy of the Israelites<sup>72</sup> culminates with the encounter between God and Moses which began at Exod 24.12. The subject of this meeting was certain liturgical arrangements and procedures which the Lord expected from Israel, at the end of which the Lord gave to Moses "the two tables of the testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God" (31.18). This entire scenario is the working out of the election within the boundaries of the covenant; the apostasy of the Israelites can only be understood as a serious threat to that relationship. "Israel's election is surely at stake because God is now prepared to annihilate her completely (cf. Num

---

<sup>71</sup>Note that this is the same promise, in the same words, which was made to Abraham (cf. Gen 12.2). George A. F. Knight (Theology As Narration [Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1976], p. 187) notes that "God informs Moses that he will now make Moses' descendants his elect people, since all the others have broken the Covenant".

<sup>72</sup>Childs, Exodus, p. 567.

14.11f. and Ezek 20.13ff.)"<sup>73</sup> "The covenant has been shattered"<sup>74</sup> and the election has been threatened.

Returning to Moses' plea for mercy, we find that the remnant which was, according to Exod 32.10, to be Moses has now been re-defined. God will not destroy the whole race, nor even all, save Moses, but "Whoever has sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book" (32.33). In Exod 32.35, the punishment is effected:<sup>75</sup> "And the Lord sent a plague upon the people, because they made the calf which Aaron made".<sup>76</sup> The remnant consists, therefore, of those who have not partaken in the apostasy, the pure of Israel; and it is to Moses and those left that the promise of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob has passed (33.1).<sup>77</sup>

<sup>73</sup> Ibid.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. Ramban, on Exod 32.35; Exodus, p. 571.

<sup>76</sup> Vide Ramban on Exod 32.35 (Exodus, p. 571) and Tg. Ong. Exod 32.35 (Exodus, p. 422); Rashi on Exod 32.35 (Pentateuch With Targum Onkelos, Haftarah And Rashi's Commentary: Exodus, E.t. by M. Rosenbaum and A. M. Silbermann (New York: Hebrew Publishing Company, n.d.), p. 186.

<sup>77</sup> One further point should be made. The character of God has been integral to the understanding of the remnant and in Exod 34.6-7 we have a character sketch of God which especially reveals those traits which are most pertinent to our study. Moses has been granted permission to see the ways of the Lord (33.13) and God, therefore, "passed before him, and proclaimed, 'The Lord, the Lord, a God merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abounding in steadfast love and



Although bereft of linguistic identification, this passage certainly illustrates the remnant motif. A threat against Israel's existence has come from the Lord and is mitigated by Him. Furthermore, this remnant motif is integrally related to the election, the covenant and the mercy of God, a relationship which is now becoming customary in remnant passages. Finally, the remnant is here limited to those who have been faithful and it is through them that the promise of the Lord is passed.

b. Numbers: The Disbelief of the Israelites (14)

The only remnant related story in Numbers occurs in Chapter 14, when the Israelites, wishing that they had never left Egypt, are once again murmuring<sup>78</sup> because of their despicable lot. Indeed, they even threaten to stone Moses and Aaron (14.10) which infuriates the Lord and causes Him to tell Moses:

"How long will this people despise me? And how long will they not believe in me, in spite of all the

---

faithfulness, keeping steadfast love for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, but who will by no means clear the guilty, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children and the children's children, to the third and the fourth generation'" (34.6-7). Martin Noth (Exodus, E.t. by J. S. Bowden, Old Testament Library [London: SCM Press, Ltd, 1962], p. 261) notes that this description is "made up of customary, stereotyped phrases" which substantiates the claim that this represents the general conception of God in the Hebrew Bible.

<sup>78</sup>vide Exod 16.7, 8, 9, 12.

signs which I have wrought among them? I will strike them with the pestilence and disinherit them, and I will make of you a nation greater and mightier than they." (14.11-12)

God intends to destroy all of Israel except Moses, from whom will issue a new nation, which will dwarf the present one. The existence of Israel is thus threatened but the nation will survive through the remnant, Moses.<sup>79</sup> Moses then pleads for his fellow Israelites and is able to convince the Lord that such destructive action would not achieve laudable ends;<sup>80</sup> the judgment of the Lord, however,

<sup>79</sup>With Rashi on Num 14.12, Pentateuch With Targum Onkelos, Haptaroth and Rashi's Commentary: Numbers, E.t. by M. Rosenbaum and A. M. Silbermann (New York: Hebrew Publishing Company, n.d.), p. 66; contra Martin Noth, Numbers, E.t. by James D. Martin, OTL (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1968), p. 108. It is Noth's contention that "Yahweh intends to destroy Israel (v. 12a) and in their place to create from the descendants of Moses a new, 'greater and mightier' nation, . . . ." This, however, ignores the fact that Moses is an Israelite and any nation descended from him will obviously be of Israel. Vide, also, Midr. Rab. Shelach Lecha, 16.25; (Numbers, II, 695); Katherine D. Sakenfeld, "The Problem of Divine Forgiveness in Numbers 14", CBQ, 37 (3, 1975), 322, who points out "thus the punishment of total destruction of 'this people' who break faith with God (אֱלֹהִים) is in one sense not ultimately carried out, since 'the people' survives, the second generation enters the land"; George Buchanan Gray, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Numbers, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912), p. 156.

<sup>80</sup>Eichrodt (Theology, II, 449) correctly observes that "the way in which the intercession of an Abraham, a Moses, or a Samuel is described unambiguously subordinates their petition to God's saving dealings with his people, so that both in the acceptance and the refusal of the request the divine plan which dominates history comes to fulfilment."

still partially remains:

"I have pardoned, according to your word; but truly, as I live, and as all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord, none of the men who have seen my glory and my signs which I wrought in Egypt and in the wilderness, and yet have put me to the proof these ten times and have not hearkened to my voice, shall see the land which I swore to give to their fathers; and none of those who despised me shall see it.

(14.20-23)

Because of their lack of faith, the present generation of Israel will not see the promised land. The remnant motif in this passage is explicitly found in the exception to the original judgment of the Lord: Israel will exist through Moses and his descendants. The fact that the destruction of Israel is not accomplished is irrelevant. The intent is obvious. The mitigation of the judgment cannot be denied.

The residual punishment of Israel has resulted in a second application of the remnant motif. God has decreed that:

". . . not one shall come into the land where I swore that I would make you dwell, except Caleb the son of Jephunneh and Joshua the son of Nun. But your little ones, who you said would become a prey, I will bring in, and they shall know the land which you have

despised."

(14.30-31)<sup>81</sup>

The punishment is then summed up:

"I, the Lord, have spoken; surely this will I do to all, this wicked congregation that are gathered together against me: in this wilderness they shall come to a full end, and there they shall die." . . . (14.35)

God decrees total annihilation with the divine exception: Caleb, Joshua and the children, who, however, must atone for the faithlessness of their fathers by a forty year nomadic period.<sup>82</sup> The remnant is spared by the grace of God<sup>83</sup> and Caleb, Joshua and the children are the recipients of the promise. It is they who have been faithful to the covenant. Once again, the Lord, in His faithfulness, verified the election and the eternal covenant: Israel will

<sup>81</sup>Cf. Num 14.24.

<sup>82</sup>Noth (Numbers, p. 111) points out that "The period of forty years is, in the Old Testament conception, the life-span within which a man participates in the life of the community with full powers and full rights".

<sup>83</sup>Sakenfeld ("Divine Forgiveness", p. 325) notes "Israel is by definition unable to deliver herself (sic) when God's judgment is upon her (sic). Nor is any other power able to rescue her (sic). Since Yahweh alone is bringing smiting and disinheritance, he alone can set the punishment aside, give deliverance, grant forgiveness. Yahweh alone is in control and he is free to act or not to act. Moses' intercession is not a mechanical device by which God can be forced to respond favorably".

exist regardless of himself.<sup>84</sup>

In summary, the judgment of God (14.12), stayed in part by the love of God (14.18), will destroy the wicked (14.35) but the remnant (14.30-31) will insure the survival of the nation (14.12b).

---

<sup>84</sup>Although Sakenfeld ("Divine Forgiveness", p. 325) notes the principle of the continuity of Israel which is basic to this chapter of Numbers, she fails to link the hesed of God with the justice of God in the remnant. The conditional and the permanent are linked in the remnant. The conditional requires that Israel be punished; the permanent requires that he continue; the result is the marriage of both in the remnant which attests to God's justice (only the faithful are here preserved) but also to God's faithfulness (Israel will persist).

### 3. General Conclusions Regarding Remnant In The Torah

It is proper and necessary to pause and reflect, at this point, upon the remnant idea which has been examined in the Torah. Before beginning, however, I wish to reiterate an important, but easily forgotten, premise upon which this thesis is based. We are not concerned with the ultimate origin of the remnant idea, though that pursuit is both laudable and necessary; we are concerned with the final biblical construct of the remnant and to what that construct is traceable within the bible. This presupposition is the only entrance which we have to the information needed for the later stages of the inquiry.

Now, to the task at hand. It is quite obvious, looking back upon the data, that the remnant can be defined as a group which is saved from some catastrophe. That disaster can be either past or future and the group can be either the entire original group or a sub-group of it. This is, however, a bare bones definition which lacks the theological flesh that must be considered when dealing with the Hebrew Bible.

We have repeatedly emphasized that the remnant in the Hebrew Bible rises from the fact of the election, for it is because of the election that a covenant was "cut" between God and Israel. That covenant guaranteed Israel's perdurance because it had God's faithfulness to the covenant as

a cornerstone. Thus, from any disaster, regardless of origin, there would always be a remnant of Israel; and that remnant would encapsulate the essence and future of Israel so that the nation would always exist. Concomitantly, that remnant was also the vehicle of the promise so that the covenantal promises of God, insured by His faithfulness, would be passed on by the chosen of God.

Out of this theological matrix arose the paradox of the divine mitigation of righteous punishment. When Israel sinned, punishment was to be expected since the people of Israel had broken the covenant, but the Lord could not forsake Israel nor utterly destroy him and, hence, a remnant would always remain after any punishment. Even though the remnant would exist regardless because of God's faithfulness to the covenant, man is still expected to be righteous. Indeed, it is the righteous who are, whenever possible, singled out as the members of the remnant and who are held up for emulation. Israel is meant to be faithful and the remnant in addition to being the expression of the endurance of Israel is also meant to establish the faithful Israel.

One final point must be made--the remnant in the Torah, although at times associated with a future event, has no eschatological significance. For that interpretation, we must now turn to the prophets.

## B. Remnant in the Nebiim

The second section of the Hebrew Bible, the prophets,<sup>1</sup> has been traditionally recognized as most important for information on the remnant idea. It is here that one finds the prophet of the remnant, Isaiah, as well as the development of the relationship between the remnant as a past or present entity<sup>2</sup> and the eschatological remnant which becomes the password in later Judaism and in Christianity. The prophetic writings are riddled with the remnant motif and it is, therefore, most imperative that time be spent in dealing with their remnant understanding. The procedure will be to examine each of the prophets in whose writings the remnant motif appears. It is through such a careful examination that we will best develop a "feel" for the prophetic remnant and, indeed, for the apocalyptic remnant. Because of the proliferation of remnant passages, it would be too time consuming to examine each use of the remnant seriatim. Furthermore, the prophets are, for the most part, writing a unified piece of material and not individual

---

<sup>1</sup>In Section B of this chapter, as in Section A, we shall continue to follow the order of the books in the Hebrew Bible.

<sup>2</sup>Although the remnant had, at times, future application in the Torah, it cannot be termed eschatological.



stories as one finds frequently in the Torah.<sup>3</sup> Thus, to avoid an endless litany of passages and to appreciate properly the overall view of each prophet, we shall deal, whenever possible, with the entire message of a prophet.

## 1. Former Prophets

### a. Judges (20.18-21.24)

The story of the Israelites' defeat of the tribe of Benjamin is the first<sup>4</sup> mention of the remnant theme in the prophets. The Benjaminites had been so soundly defeated (20.46) that only six hundred men escaped from the fray of battle (20.47). This remnant ( לְנוֹתָרִים ; 21.7) of the Benjaminites was faced with ultimate extinction "since the women are destroyed out of Benjamin" (21.16). Furthermore, the other tribes had promised not to allow their daughters to marry the Benjaminites (21.1) which seemed to seal their fate. It was unthinkable, however, that one tribe would be cut off from Israel (21.6) and drastic measures were taken.<sup>5</sup> First of all, they gave to the remnant of Benjamin four

---

<sup>3</sup>This is not to deny that there are various strata within the prophets but, as we pointed out in Part A, it is the final redaction with which we are concerned and that redaction presents each prophet as a separate unity.

<sup>4</sup>Not chronologically but as per the Hebrew order of the prophetic books.

<sup>5</sup>George Foot Moore (A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges, ICC [2nd ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T.

hundred girls who had been saved when Jabesh-Gilead was leveled for disloyalty to the assembly of Israel (21.8-12).<sup>6</sup>

This, however, did not totally solve the problem:

Then the elders of the congregation said, "What shall we do for wives for those who are left ( לַנוֹחְרִים ),<sup>7</sup> since the women are destroyed out of Benjamin?" And they said, "There must be an inheritance<sup>8</sup> for the survivors ( פְּלִיטָה ) of Benjamin, that a tribe be not blotted out from Israel. . . ." (21.16-17)

This concern prompts the people of Israel to allow the Benjaminites to kidnap the daughters of Shiloh (21.20-21).

This remnant story does not involve any of the traditional themes but does point up that the preservation of the community was a dominant concern of the early Israelites. Furthermore, it also highlights the duality

Clark, 1903], p. 449) discusses the importance of tribal extinction: "The destruction of a tribe was not an issue to be contemplated with indifference. If the extinction of a family or a clan was a matter of serious concern, to prevent which every precaution was taken, much more that of a tribe".

<sup>6</sup>On the custom of sparing virgins as spoils of wars, vide Num 31.17-18; Deut 21.10-14; Judg 5.30.

<sup>7</sup>This refers to the two hundred men of Benjamin who were still without spouses.

<sup>8</sup>The inheritance seems to mean specifically the land (21.23).

of the remnant idea--as both spiritual and secular, a concern of God and one of man.

b. 1 Kings (18.17-40; 19.9-18)

The only significant occurrences of the remnant idea in the books of Kings are in connection with the Elijah cycle, specifically those events at Mt. Carmel and Mt. Horeb.<sup>9</sup>

The Mt. Carmel incident stems from the encounter between Yahwism and Baalism which is narrated in chapter 18 of 1 Kings.<sup>10</sup> Although there were other prophets of Yahweh who had escaped Jezebel's persecution (18.13), they, along with the majority of native Israelites (18.21),<sup>11</sup> chose not to partake in the struggle and Elijah stood alone against

---

<sup>9</sup>I am following Hasel (The Remnant, pp. 159-160) contra Müller (Die Vorstellung, pp. 55-58) in limiting my inquiries to the Mt. Carmel and Mt. Horeb incidents. Other possible occurrences (1 Kgs 19.3, 4; 2 Kgs 9.15; 10.11, 14, 17, 19, 21, 24, 25, 28) are "too vague to allow an inclusion in or discussion of the remnant motif in the Elijah tradition". Hasel is following O. Schilling ("'Rest' in der Prophetie des alten Testaments", Unpublished Th.D. Inauguraldissertation, Universität Münster, 1942) which was unavailable to me. Vide, also, Hertrich, "Remnant", IV, 202.

<sup>10</sup>It seems as though "in all likelihood 1 Kgs 18:20-40 rests upon actual historical facts" (Hasel, The Remnant, p. 161).

<sup>11</sup>For the history of this confrontation, vide John Bright, A History of Israel (2nd ed.; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1972), pp. 241-242; H. H. Rowley, Men of God (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1963), pp. 57-65.

the four hundred and fifty prophets of Baal. When the assembly of Israel had been gathered and the contest had begun, Elijah declares to the prophets of Yahweh:

"I, even I only, am left (וְיָחִידִי) a prophet of the Lord; but Baal's prophets are four hundred and fifty men. . . ." (18.22)<sup>12</sup>

It is obvious from this verse that even more than indicating the odds against which Elijah prevailed, he is pointing up the singularity of his stand.<sup>13</sup> He, of all Yahweh's prophets, was the only one who stood up in the face of the threat of death. Elijah thus declared himself to be the only remnant of the prophets of the Lord, a remnant of a past calamity.<sup>14</sup> There is no future application of the remnant idea.

Why was Elijah considered the remnant? He was the only prophet who remained faithful to God. Thus, in this case, his loyalty defined him as the remnant. Interestingly, this is the first time that we have seen the motif self-

<sup>12</sup>Vide, also, 19.14.

<sup>13</sup>Hasel, The Remnant, p. 164.

<sup>14</sup>Hasel (The Remnant, p. 164) points out that this passage, "follows the pattern which the early traditions of Genesis reflect, namely a remnant is left from a past calamity". I fail to see in the early Genesis traditions salvation from a past calamity. Noah was selected to be saved; Lot was designated for salvation etc.

applied. It was Elijah who understood himself to be the remnant through the application of his own criterion--loyalty to God.

The second occurrence of the remnant motif in the book of Kings is in the Mt. Horeb story. At Mt. Horeb, Elijah had a personal confrontation with Yahweh during which he lamented that Israel had forsaken the Lord and he alone had remained faithful, a remnant to the Lord:

"I have been very jealous for the Lord, the God of hosts; for the people of Israel have forsaken thy covenant, thrown down thy altars, and slain thy prophets with the sword; and I, even I only, am left (  $\text{אני}$  ); and they seek my life, to take it away." (19.14)

Elijah's lament refers to two distinct threats: one human, the other divine. On the one hand, Ahab and Jezebel threatened to kill Elijah (19.2); on the other hand, God threatened to destroy all unfaithful Israelites. Elijah was personally only in danger from the former. He despaired before God that the greatest sin of the people of Israel had been their disobedience to the covenant and that "the cause of Yahwism was utterly lost in Israel".<sup>15</sup> The importance of this

---

<sup>15</sup>Hasel, The Remnant, pp. 166-167.

passage lies in the threat to the very existence of Israel.<sup>16</sup> Elijah saw himself as the last faithful member of the people of Yahweh and, hence, as the remnant of Israel and, indeed, as Israel. Furthermore, because of his loyal stand, his life, the life of the last loyal Yahwist, had been threatened. When these facts are linked together, it becomes evident that Elijah understood the threat against himself to be a threat against the entire remnant of Israel and, therefore, against Israel himself. "Apparently the victory on Mt. Carmel had no lasting outward effect on the people of Israel, so that the entire future of Yahwism and of Israel as Yahweh's covenant people depends on the only loyal remnant Elijah".<sup>17</sup> The response which Elijah received from Yahweh is more than mere reassurance:

". . . Yet I will leave ( השארת ) seven thousand in Israel, all the knees that have not bowed to Baal, and every mouth that has not kissed him." (19.18)<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup>James A. Montgomery (A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Books of Kings, ICC [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951], p. 314) misses the significance of this passage when he notes: "With this pliant YHWH is not concerned; he has other errands for him".

<sup>17</sup>Hasel, The Remnant, p. 168.

<sup>18</sup>Joachim Jeremias ("Der Gedanke des 'Heiligen Restes' im Spätjudentum und in der Verkündigung Jesus", ZNW, 42 [1949], 184) states "das ist der locus classicus für die Verheissung des Restes". He is correct, although he does not indicate why it is so. Passing directly to Isaiah,

The judgment against Israel will indeed be limited; Elijah will not be left alone. Seven thousand have been faithful and, therefore, have merited salvation.<sup>19</sup> Though Elijah was unaware of these faithful (19.14), God knew who they were and that they deserved to be preserved from the coming wrath. Being faithful earns one salvation.

Thus, we find in this remnant passage, the themes of election, covenant, faithfulness and merit. The remnant is a future entity ("I will leave", 19.18)<sup>20</sup> whose existence

"der erste grosse Theologe des Restgedankens", he points out that "es ist Gottes Gnade" that causes the remnant. It seems he is implying that God's mercy is also the operative cause for the remnant in Kings. This is not the case.

<sup>19</sup>Contra von Rad (Old Testament Theology, II, 21), according to whom, Israel will ". . . only consist of a remnant. But it is to be noted that this is spoken of as if it already existed: there is no antecedent condition (a remnant will remain if some are found who have not bowed the knee to Baal). God appoints the remnant, and he already knows people of whom Elijah knew nothing. The remnant doubtless consists of those who had remained faithful: but their preservation had been decided even before the start of the coming troubles." Unfortunately, von Rad has read back into the material later Christian theology. The selection of the remnant is ultimately based not upon the appointment by God but upon merit. Also contra Jacob, Theology, p. 323.

<sup>20</sup>Hasel (The Remnant, p. 171) notes that "although there are certainly to be terrible judgments, nevertheless a remnant in Israel will survive to stand before Yáhwéh". He is over-emphasizing the futurity of the remnant. Although the remnant will be those left after the future destruction, that destruction is grounded in historical action (19.15-17). He is reading a gnomicism into 19.18 which the text cannot support.

is grounded in the election and the covenant and whose membership is merited by faithfulness. One also notes in this remnant example that it is the Lord who will bring about the catastrophe which will create the remnant (19.15-17)<sup>21</sup>--a catastrophe brought on by the apostasy of the Israelites.<sup>22</sup>

## 2. Latter Prophets

### a. Isaiah

The traditional representative of the remnant motif in the Hebrew Bible has been Isaiah<sup>23</sup> and not a little ink has been spilled in an attempt to understand his portrayal of the remnant.<sup>24</sup> Underlying the entire Isaianic prophecy

<sup>21</sup> von Rad, Old Testament Theology, II, 22.

<sup>22</sup> von Rad (Old Testament Theology, II, 21) points out that "from the remnant a new Israel will arise". I find it inconsistent with the textual evidence to declare that a "new" Israel will "arise". Perhaps one could say that the true Israel will be preserved in Elijah and the seven thousand--but a new Israel? The passage concentrates upon preservation not creation; the relationship between "the before and the after" is continuity not discontinuity.

<sup>23</sup> Jeremias, "Heiligen Restes", p. 184.

<sup>24</sup> No attempt will be made to discuss separately Isaiah, Deutero-Isaiah and Trito-Isaiah. As has been our established procedure, we will deal with the book as a unity, although it will become evident that the remnant is most prominent in chapters 1-39 and fades in importance thereafter.



is the ultimate belief in God,<sup>25</sup> in the covenant and, resultantly, in the perdurance of Israel. It is this belief that provides entrance into the complex remnant understanding of Isaiah.

As did the other prophets, Isaiah believed that the Israelites had forsaken their covenantal promises and that they were on a collision course with Yahweh:

Therefore, as the tongue of fire  
 devours the stubble,  
 and as dry grass sinks down in the  
 flame,  
 so their root will be as rottenness,  
 and their blossom go up like dust;  
 for they have rejected the law of the  
 Lord of hosts,  
 and have despised the word of  
 the Holy One of Israel.

---

<sup>25</sup>The character of God is essential to the understanding of Isaiah and the "concept of the majestic 'holiness' of Yahweh, which is closely connected with the ancient Jerusalemite tradition, holds a central position in the teaching of Isaiah" (Hasel, The Remnant, p. 220). For examples of this concept, see the titles for God, par exemple, 1.4, 9, 24; 3.1; 5.19, 24; 6.3, 5; 10.20; 30.11, 12, 15. Helmer Ringgren (Israelite Religion, E.t. by David E. Green [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966], p. 74) points out that "The holiness of God thus has a dual meaning. On the one hand, it signifies the unapproachability, the awesomeness, even the dangerousness of the God who is wholly other. On the other, it signifies beneficence: the Holy One is the kindly God who has chosen Israel and has mercy upon Israel".

Therefore the anger of the Lord  
 was kindled against his people,  
 and he stretched out his hand  
 against them and smote them,  
 and the mountains quaked;  
 and their corpses were as refuse  
 in the midst of the streets.  
 For all this his anger is not turned  
 away  
 and his hand is stretched out still.

(5.24-25)<sup>26</sup>

For Isaiah, it is lack of faith which constitutes the greatest sin of Israel (7.9).<sup>27</sup> As a result of this sinfulness, Israel must be judged; but the judgment is not for the sake

<sup>26</sup>For some of the specific crimes, vide 1.3, 23; 2.8, 11; 3.14-15; 5.21, 23; 6.3, et alia. Jerusalem, once faithful, has become a harlot. "Righteousness lodged in her but now murderers" (1:21). For other examples of the Lord's wrath vide 5.18-23; 9.14-19, 20. For a general condemnation vide 1.2-4.

Note, however, although in verse 24 the destruction seems to be complete, its continuation in verse 25 proves it to have been partial. A remnant, therefore, continues. (George Buchanan Gray, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah 1-27, ICC [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1972], p. 95)

<sup>27</sup>S. Paul Schilling, Isaiah Speaks (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1959), p. 61. Isaiah understood "that faith is not merely a matter of the inner room and of expectation, but that it is of decisive importance for present action" (Vriezen, Outline, p. 61). Vide, also, Hasel, The Remnant, p. 221.

of capricious punishment<sup>28</sup>, but rather to purge Israel and thereby save him:<sup>29</sup>

Beat upon your breasts for the  
 pleasant fields,  
 for the fruitful vine,  
 for the soil of my people  
 growing up in thorns and briers;  
 Yea, for all the joyous houses  
 in the joyful city.  
 For the palace will be forsaken,  
 the populous city deserted;  
 the hill and the watchtower  
 will become dens for ever,  
 a joy of wild asses,  
 a pasture of flocks;  
 until the Spirit is poured upon us  
 from on high,  
 and the wilderness becomes a

---

<sup>28</sup>Not only is the punishment not capricious, but it is accompanied by great sorrow (10.25; 30.18). The Lord is not vindictive; "God's affection for Israel rings even in the denunciations". (Abraham J. Heschel, The Prophets [Philadelphia: JPS, 1962], pp. 82-83)

<sup>29</sup>Hasel (The Remnant, p. 222) notes that "all his life Isaiah entertained the hope, repeatedly frustrated, that the judgments would serve as a purge, as a refiner's fire". Vide 5.14-15; 7.16-17; 32.9-14.

fruitful field,<sup>30</sup>

and the fruitful field is deemed  
a forest.

Then justice will dwell in the  
wilderness,

and righteousness abide in the  
fruitful field.

And the effect of righteousness will  
be peace,

and the result of righteousness,  
quietness and trust for ever.

My people will abide in a peaceful  
habitation,  
in secure dwellings, and in quiet  
resting places.

(32.12-18)

The punishment will last until Israel is cleansed; it will  
not last forever:

The Lord will have compassion on Jacob and will

---

<sup>30</sup>It is noteworthy that the author "thinks first of the new possibility of life bestowed by God and then of the new human society set up in the midst of a transformed nature, a society now characterized by righteousness. Only then does he turn to consider, in v. 17, the effects of righteousness, consisting of the free and untroubled existence and unhindered progress of men, animals and fields. . . ." (Otto Kaiser, Isaiah 13-39: A Commentary E.t. by R. A. Wilson, OTL [Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1974], p. 335).

again choose Israel, and will set them in their own  
land, and aliens will join them and will cleave to  
the house of Jacob. (14.1)

Indeed, God himself wishes to cease his anger:

Therefore the Lord waits to be  
gracious to you;  
therefore he exalts himself to show  
mercy to you.

For the Lord is a God of justice;  
blessed are all those who wait for  
him. (30.18)

It is this graciousness that is vivified in the remnant.  
The day of the Lord will certainly be a day of wrath for  
the unjust, but Isaiah "also reveals that it will be the  
means of salvation of the righteous remnant".<sup>31</sup> Just as  
assuredly as there will be severe punishment, there will  
also be a remnant:

Tell the righteous that it shall be  
well with them,  
for they shall eat the fruit of their  
deeds. (3.10)

And elsewhere:

Then I said, "How long, O Lord?"

---

<sup>31</sup>Bruce Vawter, The Conscience of Israel (London:  
Sheed and Ward, 1961), p. 203.

And he said:

"Until cities lie waste  
 without inhabitant,  
 and houses without men,  
 and the land is utterly desolate,  
 and the Lord removes men far  
 away,  
 and the forsaken places are many  
 in the midst of the land.

And though a tenth remain in it,  
 it will be burned again,  
 like a terebinth or an oak,  
 whose stump remains standing  
 when it is felled."

The holy seed is its stump.<sup>32</sup>

(6.11-13)

From this passage, it is evident that the remnant which will remain is to shrink more and more until an irreducible remnant is left.<sup>33</sup> The purpose of this reduction is not

<sup>32</sup>It is interesting to note that the Hebrew words וְיָרֵעַ קִרְיָת לְבַיִתָּהּ are not translated in the LXX. Hasel (The Remnant, p. 241) points out that this omission is probably due to a homoioteleuton (following K. Budde, "Über die Shranken, die Jesajas prophetischer Botschaft zu setzen sind", ZAW, 41 [1923], 154-203).

<sup>33</sup>This is an example of the negative sense of the remnant motif "to illustrate the magnitude of the disaster which will come over 'this people'" (Hasel, The Remnant,

utter destruction, however, but salvation. "Judgment and salvation can be pronounced together because both are radically united in the very 'holiness' of Yahweh. As the 'Holy One' Yahweh judges, as the 'Holy One of Israel' he does not turn from his people nor from his city."<sup>34</sup> In the last line, the remnant is called the "holy seed"; this indicates the kernal of a future entity, a holy group once again.

The "holy seed" is holy only after the cleansing experience brought about by a confrontation with the divine holiness analogous to the confrontation and cleansing experience of Isaiah. After the annihilation of the nation a holy people will sprout out of the remaining root stock. It will be holy, for it has experienced cleansing judgment. Because of this

---

p. 240). Cf. J. Lindblom, Prophecy In Ancient Israel (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), pp. 360-361. Yet, in its negativity, it contains paradoxically the positive promise of the remnant.

<sup>34</sup>Hasel, The Remnant, p. 223. Contra, Blank Prophetic Faith, p. 8, who believes that there must be a distinction between the historical Isaiah and the Isaiah of legend. "The first Isaiah looked to a day when God would be exalted though his people perish. Later Isaiahs looked to a day when God and Zion together would triumph. The first Isaiah conceived of man's defeat, the later Isaiahs of his victory. The first Isaiah spoke of doom, the later Isaiahs of salvation. The first Isaiah talked of death, later Isaiahs of life renewed and everlasting." Hasel, however, is agreed with by the majority of scholars. Wide e.g.: Vriezen, Outline, p. 61; Heschel, The Prophets, p. 95.

experience it will stand in the right relationship of faith and trust and obedience to Yahweh.<sup>35</sup>

The theme of purification by removal of the sludge is essential to the remnant understanding of Isaiah. An example of this view is found in the elegy on Jerusalem. The city began in purity and faithfulness (1.21) but had become impure by the intrusion of evil (1.21-2.3). As a result, Yahweh must "smelt the alloy from her" that Jerusalem may once again enjoy her pristine immaculateness:

". . . I will turn my hand against you  
and will smelt away your dross as  
with lye,  
and remove all your alloy.

And I will restore your judges as at  
the first,  
and your counselors as at the  
beginning.

Afterward you shall be called the  
city of righteousness,  
the faithful city." (1.25-26)

---

<sup>35</sup>Hasel, The Remnant, p. 247. Cf. Sheldon H. Blank, "The Current Misinterpretation of Isaiah's she'ar yashub", JBL, 67 (1948), 213. Vide, also, Blank, "Traces of Prophetic Agony in Isaiah", HUCA, 27 (1956), 81-92.



This process will leave but the purest and holiest remnant<sup>36</sup>--  
 a remnant which will be like the original people of Yahweh.<sup>37</sup>  
 "Isaiah measures the future era with the measuring stick of  
 the past epoch."<sup>38</sup> The judges will be restored "as at the  
 first" and the counselors "as at the beginning".

Isaiah believes that mankind has two chances for  
 salvation. "One is immediate, partial, historical: 'A  
 remnant will return!'; the other is distant, final, eschato-  
 logical: the transformation of the world at the end of  
days."<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup>The quest for a pure and holy nation can be traced, according to W. O. E. Oesterley and Theodore H. Robinson (Hebrew Religion: Its Origin and Development [2nd ed.; London: SPCK, 1961], p. 240), to Isaiah's insistence on the holiness of the Lord. "Since Yahweh was supremely good, it followed that anything or person set apart for Him must also be good, and the nation especially consecrated to Him must justify its position by a high moral standard". Furthermore, they point out that "It is characteristic of Isaiah that he seems to have thought of Yahweh as being 'holy' to Israel, as well as of Israel as being 'holy' to Yahweh. That is to say that the consecration was mutual. Israel could not dispense with Yahweh, but Yahweh needed Israel for His self-expression" (p. 241).

<sup>37</sup>Vide Hasel's discussion of 6.5-7, concerning which he concludes: "So the prophet himself may be considered the proleptic representative of the future remnant, because he was confronted by Yahweh's 'holiness' and emerged as a cleansed and purified individual" (The Remnant, p. 243).

<sup>38</sup>Hasel, The Remnant, p. 254. Vide esp. v. 26. Hasel elsewhere notes regarding this passage that: ". . . the future time of salvation is not envisioned as anything more than a return to the ideal past" (p. 255).

<sup>39</sup>Heschel, The Prophets, p. 94.

In some instances Isaiah sees the remnant as consisting of those who escape the judgment of God within time and live on as a purified group:

In that day the remnant ( שאר ישראל ) of Israel and the survivors ( פליטה ) of the house of Jacob will no more lean upon him that smote them, but will lean upon the Lord, the Holy One of Israel, in truth. A remnant will return ( שאר ישוב ), the remnant ( שאר ) of Jacob, to the mighty God. For though your people Israel be as the sand of the sea, only a remnant ( שאר ) of them will return. Destruction is decreed, overflowing with righteousness. For the Lord, the Lord of hosts, will make a full end, as decreed, in the midst of all the earth. (10.20-23)

Hasel has noted that "The decisive annihilation announced in vs. 23 points to the end of national existence, the end of the era, but not the end of life and existence for all Israelites".<sup>40</sup> Some will return in penitence.<sup>41</sup> Note that there is no self-righteousness to be found in being an Israelite. The key to membership in the remnant is faith

---

<sup>40</sup>Hasel, The Remnant, p. 330. Vide, also, Lindbloom, Prophecy, p. 367.

<sup>41</sup>E. W. Heaton, The Old Testament Prophets (Great Britain: R. & R. Clark Ltd., 1961), p. 145. Vide, also, John Mauchline, Isaiah 1-39, TBC (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1962), p. 125.



of judgment and by a spirit of burning. (4.2-4)  
 Here again, we see the cleansing aspect of the judgment. Israel will be destroyed so that a pure and holy remnant may remain as the recipients and inheritors of the covenantal promises. Hasel points out that "The 'survivors of Israel' are identified with the remnant in Zion/Jerusalem (4:3). They are not those who are left behind after the ruin of the city, but those who remain after the purifying judgment (1.21-26)." <sup>44</sup>

Isaiah's faith in the existence of the remnant did not waver in spite of Israel's faithlessness which made Israel "utterly estranged" (1.4). Indeed, he seems to have named his eldest son Shear-jashub (7.3) in anticipation that a remnant would be spared. <sup>45</sup>

<sup>44</sup>Hasel, The Remnant, p. 266.

<sup>45</sup>According to John Bright:

"This name can have either a threatening or a promising connotation depending upon which of the two Hebrew words that compose it one lays the stress. It can mean 'a remnant will return' (i.e. only a remnant will get back), or it can mean 'a remnant will return' (i.e. at least a few of the people will return to their God in penitence and trust). Both of these connotations are developed in the Isaiah book (cf. 10:20f., where it is a promise and vs. 22f., where it is a threat)." (Covenant and Promise [Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976], p. 106)

C. F. Hasel, however, argues that the correct interpretation of Shear-jashub is "'A-Remnant-Shall-Return!', placing emphasis on the italicized [underlined] 'remnant'". ("Linguistic Considerations Regarding The Translation of

The eschatological remnant will form the righteous nation after the judgments have served to cleanse the land:

". . .Open the gates,  
 that the righteous nation which  
 keeps faith  
 may enter in.

Thou dost keep him in perfect peace,  
 whose mind is stayed on thee,  
 because he trusts in thee.

Trust in the Lord for ever,  
 for the Lord God  
 is an everlasting rock.

For he has brought low  
 the inhabitants of the height,  
 the lofty city.

He lays it low, lays it low to the  
 ground,

---

Isaiah's Shear-Jashub: a Reassessment", AUSS 9 [1971], 36-46). He bases his conclusions on "linguistic and syntactical considerations" which make the proposed translation irrefutable but are too involved for a study such as this. This, however, does not abrogate Bright's conclusions, but only his method. Both of Bright's proposed meanings are included in Hasel's translation. There are still positive and negative aspects to the name's significance but these aspects are to be found through a consideration of the context rather than the name itself. This Bright does in his conclusion but his method relates the polarity in the name to the constitutive words rather than to their usage.

casts it to the dust.

The foot tramples it,  
the feet of the poor,  
the steps of the needy."

The way of the righteous is level;  
thou dost make smooth the path  
of the righteous.

In the path of thy judgments,  
O Lord, we wait for thee;  
thy memorial name  
is the desire of our soul.

My soul yearns for thee in the night,  
my spirit within me earnestly seeks  
thee.

For when thy judgments are in the  
earth,  
the inhabitants of the world learn  
righteousness.

If favor is shown to the wicked,  
he does not learn righteousness;  
in the land of uprightness he deals  
perversely  
and does not see the majesty of the  
Lord.

O Lord, thy hand is lifted up,

but they see it not.

Let them see thy zeal for thy people,  
and be ashamed.

Let the fire for thy adversaries  
consume them.

O Lord, thou will ordain peace for  
us,  
thou hast wrought for us all our  
works. (26.2-12)

The salvation of the remnant, though expected, depends, as we have seen, upon the decision of the people to return to faithfulness. "In other words, faith is the criterium distinctionis between the surviving remnant and the perishing masses. Isaiah realized that only a remnant would muster faith in Yahweh and thus secure salvation."<sup>46</sup> Thus, membership in the remnant is dependent upon faith, although the Lord's faithfulness to the covenant must be understood as ultimately the raison d'être for the remnant (48.9, 11).

---

<sup>46</sup>Hasel, The Remnant, pp. 284-285. Contra Dreyfus ("La doctrine", p. 367) who notes that faith is indispensable but that indispensability must be viewed in correct relationship to the divine action and grace of God: "Dans la vision du vision du chapitre 6, la purification du prophète n'est pas le fruit d'un effort humain, mais d'une initiative divine, d'une grâce. . . . Mais cela n'entraîne pas une que l'homme n'a aucune part à ce salut. Pour en bénéficier une condition indispensable est requise: la foi."

Destruction will be restricted to one segment of the nation. The other, God's servants, will have salvation. A remnant will endure and membership will be for the servant of God:

Thus says the Lord:

"As the wine is found in the  
cluster,

and they say, 'Do not destroy it,  
for there is a blessing in it,'  
so I will do for my servants' sake,  
and not destroy them all.

I will bring forth descendants from  
Jacob,  
and from Judah inheritors of my  
mountains;

my chosen shall inherit it,  
and my servants shall dwell there.

Sharon shall become a pasture for  
flocks,  
and the Valley of Achor a place for  
herds to lie down,  
for my people who have sought  
me.

But you who forsake the Lord,  
who forget my holy mountain,  
who set a table for Fortune



and fill cups of mixed wine for  
Destiny;  
I will destine you to the sword,  
and all of you shall bow down to  
the slaughter;  
because, when I called, you did not  
answer,  
when I spoke, you did not listen,  
but you did what was evil in my eyes,  
and chose what I did not delight  
in."

Therefore thus says the Lord God:  
"Behold, my servants shall eat,  
but you shall be hungry  
behold, my servants shall drink,  
but you shall be thirsty;  
behold, my servants shall rejoice,  
but you shall be put to shame;  
behold, my servants shall sing for  
gladness of heart,  
but you shall cry out for pain of  
heart,  
and shall wail for anguish of spirit.

(65.8-14)

The question arises as to whether Isaiah considered himself, or anyone else, to be already designated a member of

the eschatological remnant; and, furthermore, whether any other has been so designated.

Although the involved discussion of the Immanuel passage in Isaiah (7.10-17) lies predominantly outside the scope of this study,<sup>47</sup> there is one aspect which must be mentioned in order to discuss membership in the remnant. It seems probable that it is Immanuel who is referred to in Isaiah 9.1-6. Based on these verses, it has been suggested that Immanuel will rule the future remnant,<sup>48</sup> and, if this is true, as it seems to be, "then it would logically follow that Immanuel himself will be a member of the eschatological remnant".<sup>49</sup>

One cannot, however, consider Isaiah and his family and disciples as members of this community (7.17) but rather as a "proleptic representation of the future remnant".

Nowhere does Isaiah identify with clarity who will belong to the future remnant. Isaiah, his children, and his disciples are proleptic representatives of the eschatological remnant. They are a guarantee and pledge that everything the prophet has spoken will come to pass. They are a guarantee and pledge

---

<sup>47</sup>For a summary, vide Hasel, The Remnant, pp. 288-298.

<sup>48</sup>Vawter, Conscience, p. 205.

<sup>49</sup>Hasel, The Remnant, p. 298.

that Aram and Ephraim will experience destruction (8:1-4) and that Judah itself will not remain as a remnant after it had refused to return and believe in Yahweh (7:1-9). They are at the same time a guarantee and pledge that a remnant will emerge from the coming judgment. This eschatological remnant of the future will be composed of those who have returned to Yahweh in faith, from whom Yahweh has not hidden his face (8:17), but it will become an actual reality only during the purifying judgment of Yahweh which will sweep away all those who decided against faith and God. The remnant motif bridges two opposing aspects in Isaiah's proclamation, namely the conviction that Israel will be met with judgment and the expectation that after the judgment there will be salvation.<sup>50</sup>

This Isaianic message is encapsulated in the following verses:

---

<sup>50</sup>Hasel, The Remnant, pp. 300-301. This view contradicts Dreyfus ("La doctrine", pp. 382-383) who insists that, based upon Isa 8.16-18, Isaiah "en entreprend la formation en réunissant autour de lui un groupe de disciples qu'il fera depositaire de sa pensée (8, 16)." I agree with Hasel (The Remnant, pp. 300-301) that these verses cannot be interpreted as referring to a formation of a remnant community. Isaiah "is a proleptic representative of the future remnant". It is my opinion that Dreyfus was unfortunately misled by his attempt to relate these Hebrew Bible verses with later verses from the New Testament ("La doctrine", p. 383). For a radical example of this type of "scholarship", vide, Theophilus J. Gaehr, "Shear-jashub; or the Remnant Sections In Isaiah", B. Sac, 79 (1922) 363-371.

For thus said the Lord God, the Holy  
 One of Israel,  
 "In returning and rest you shall be  
 saved;  
 in quietness and in trust shall be  
 your strength."

And you would not, but you said,  
 "No! We will speed upon horses,"  
 therefore you shall speed away;  
 And, "We will ride upon swift  
 steeds,"  
 therefore your pursuers shall be  
 swift.

A thousand shall flee at the threat of  
 one,  
 at the threat of five you shall flee,  
 till you are left  
 like a flagstaff on the top of a  
 mountain,  
 like a signal on a hill.

(30.15-17)

How does one become a member of this remnant? One  
 must be:

He who walks righteously and speaks  
 uprightly,  
 who despises the gain of oppressions,

who shakes his hands, lest they hold  
 a bribe,  
 who stops his ears from hearing of  
 bloodshed  
 and shuts his eyes from looking  
 upon evil, . . .

(33.15)

"The historical usage of the remnant motif must not be confused with the eschatological remnant of the future. These are related but not identical aspects of the remnant motif as used by Isaiah of Jerusalem."<sup>51</sup>

The relationship between the eschatological remnant and the remnant of a past catastrophe is summarized by Isaiah:

"And this shall be the sign for you: this year eat what grows of itself, and in the second year what springs of the same; then in the third year sow and reap, and plant vineyards, and eat their fruit. And the surviving remnant ( פליטה ) of the house of Judah shall again take root downward, and bear fruit upward; for out of Jerusalem shall go forth a remnant ( שארית ), and out of Mount Zion a band of survivors ( פליטה ) . . ."

(37.30-32)

---

<sup>51</sup>Hasel, The Remnant, p. 376.

"The future remnant will emerge or go forth from the historical remnant of the decimated nation which will again undergo judgment."<sup>52</sup> Hasel further observes that based upon this passage, one can conclude that:

Isaiah knows that not all will even now turn to Yahweh in faith. But the hope of the future lies within the few faithful ones who will heed God's promptings. They will emerge from the escaped survivors of the house of Judah as the future remnant that will go forth from Zion/Jerusalem.<sup>53</sup>

In Isaiah, the remnant means the survivors of a past or future catastrophe as well as the eschatological remnant at the end of the world. Membership is determined by one's faithfulness to Yahweh. One cannot be certain of membership in the remnant until the end of time. Birth-right, in itself, is not sufficient.

#### b. Jeremiah

Jeremiah's message contained both a plea for God's people to return to the faithful execution of their covenant<sup>54</sup> promises and the assurance that the future would hold

<sup>52</sup>Hasel, The Remnant, p. 336.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., p. 337.

<sup>54</sup>Specific references to the covenant are infrequent (14.21; 31.32) but the covenant idea is nevertheless present (e.g., 7:23; 11.3-8; 24.7).

a new and even more rewarding relationship with the Lord.<sup>55</sup>  
 Inherent in the plea for the return to the covenant was a  
 tirade against the present despicable behaviour of the Jews  
 and the threat that continued disobedience would result in  
 dire punishments:

And I brought you into a plentiful  
 land  
 to enjoy its fruits and its good  
 things.

But when you came in you defiled  
 my land,  
 and made my heritage an  
 abomination.

The priests did not say, 'Where is  
 the Lord?'

Those who handle the law did not know me;  
 the shepherds transgressed against me;  
 the prophets prophesied by BaaI,  
 and went after things that do not  
 profit. (2.7-8)

---

<sup>55</sup>J. Muilenburg ("Jeremiah the Prophet", IDE, II, 829) notes that "Underlying all that Jeremiah has to say concerning Israel, whether in judgment, exhortation, or promise, is the memory of its election to be the people of Yahweh". And also, "permeating all the prophet's thought is the realization that Israel belongs to Yahweh and that her [sic] existence stands upon the foundation of an ultimate demand of obedience and service and with it the joyous expression of thanksgiving".

And elsewhere:

Like a basket full of birds,  
 their houses are full of treachery;  
 therefore they have become great  
 and rich,  
 they have grown fat and sleek.  
 They know no bounds in deeds of  
 wickedness;  
 they judge not with justice  
 the cause of the fatherless, to make  
 it proper,  
 and they do not defend the rights  
 of the needy.

Shall I not punish them for these  
 things? (5.27-29)<sup>56</sup>

Israel is like a domesticated animal that refuses to draw in the traces (2.20); he is a vine laden with putrid fruit (2.21); he has a stain which cannot be washed away (2.22); he is like an animal in heat as he runs after false deities (2.23-24).

As a result of these sins and of Israel's rejection of God, the Lord initiates a lawsuit against His people

---

<sup>56</sup> Wide, also, 5.21-26; 5.30-31; et passim. Jeremiah strikes a unique note "in the amount of obloquy he has heaped on the heads of the rulers of his land". (1.18) (Vawter, Conscience, p. 255)



(2.4-8) and punishment must surely follow. The question is the severity of that judgment. Originally, it was God's intention to purify Israel:

"Behold, I will refine them and test them,  
for what else can I do, because of my people?"  
(9.7)<sup>57</sup>

The attempt at refinement, however, was doomed to failure; the metal remained impure:

"I have made you an assayer and  
tester among my people,  
that you may know and assay  
their ways.  
They are all stubbornly rebellious,  
going about with slanders;  
they are bronze and iron,  
all of them act corruptly.  
The bellows blow fiercely,  
the lead is consumed by the fire:  
in vain the refining goes on,  
for the wicked are not removed.  
Refuse silver they are called,  
for the Lord has rejected them." (6.27-30)<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup>Heschel (The Prophets, p. 105) notes that "It was hard for God to deal harshly with His beloved people".

<sup>58</sup>Vide, also, 5.12-13.

Repeatedly Jeremiah proffered the merciful hand of God to Israel; and, repeatedly, Israel turned his back upon God and pursued a course leading to perdition. That call to return to faithfulness showed that "Jeremiah did not think that evil was inevitable. Over and above man's blindness stood the wonder of repentance, the open gateway through which man could enter if he would":<sup>59</sup>

'Return, faithless Israel,

says the Lord.

I will not look on you in anger,

for I am merciful,

says the Lord;

I will not be angry for ever. . . .'

(3.12)<sup>60</sup>

Israel remains adamant, however:

O Lord, do not thy eyes look for

truth?

Thou hast smitten them,

but they felt no anguish;

thou hast consumed them,

but they refused to take

correction. (5.3)<sup>61</sup>

<sup>59</sup>Heschel, The Prophets, p. 104.

<sup>60</sup>Vide, also, 3.13; 4.1; 25.5; 35.15.

<sup>61</sup>Vide, also, 8.5; 22.27; 44.5.

Indeed, there is in Jeremiah the fundamental question whether man is able to return to God. Man, like a panther, cannot change his spots and his propensity for evil eradicates his ability to do good (13.23).

We can see in these passages the tension which exists between the merciful and the just in the character of God. Israel deserves to be destroyed, yet how can the Lord destroy His people? The pendulum of Israel's fate swings to and fro as God oscillates between His natural mercy and just vengeance:

"How can I pardon you?

Your children have forsaken me,  
and have sworn by those who are  
no gods.

When I fed them to the full,  
they committed adultery  
and trooped to the houses of  
harlots.

They were well-fed lusty stallions,  
each neighing for his neighbor's  
wife.

Shall I not punish them for these  
things?

says the Lord;  
and shall I not avenge myself

on a nation such as this? . . ."

(5.7-9)<sup>62</sup>

Even though justice must prevail, there is some hope for a remnant (6.9). This hope, however, itself vacillates from a substantial future to complete annihilation. At one time, Jeremiah indicates that any remnant would be better off destroyed:

" . . . Death shall be preferred to life by all the remnant ( הַשְּׂאֵרִיּוֹת ) that remains ( הַנּוֹשָׁאֲרִים ) of this evil family in all the places where I have driven them, says the Lord of hosts. . . ." (8.3).

Indeed, the sins of Israel have been so great that, in another chapter, Jeremiah does not even allow for the possibility of a remnant (15.1-3). And, even when such a remnant does exist, they, themselves, are subject to punishment:

" . . . Afterward, says the Lord, I will give Zedekiah king of Judah, and his servants, and the people in this city who survive the pestilence, sword, and famine, into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon and into the hand of their enemies, into the hand of those who seek their lives. He shall smite them with the edge of the sword; he shall not

---

<sup>62</sup>Wide, also, 5.28-29, 9.8-9 (Heb 9.7-8).

pity them, or spare them, or have compassion. . ."

(21.7)

Jeremiah recognizes that their further punishment could result in total annihilation:

"But thus says the Lord: Like the bad figs which are so bad they cannot be eaten, so will I treat Zedekiah the king of Judah, his princes, the remnant (שארית) of Jerusalem who remain (הנשארים) in this land, and those who dwell in the land of Egypt. I will make them a horror (for evil) to all the kingdoms of the earth, to be a reproach, a byword, a taunt, and a curse in all the places where I shall drive them. And I will send sword, famine, and pestilence upon them, until they shall be utterly destroyed from the land which I gave to them and their fathers." (24.8-10)

It is interesting that the remnant designated in these verses is specified as that inhabiting Palestine and Egypt. The interdiction against Egypt is continued throughout Jeremiah and is uniquely interwoven with the Palestinian remnant. Those who inhabit other lands fare much better. They are promised the land (24.6) and "they shall be my people and I will be their God, for they shall return to me with their whole heart", (24.7).<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup>It is John Bright's contention (Jeremiah, AB

The connection between Jerusalem and Egypt is explored when the Israelites under Johanan were faced with the decision whether to remain in Palestine or flee to Egypt to escape the possible wrath of Nabuchadnezzar. They appeal to Jeremiah:

"Let our supplication come before you, and pray to the Lord your God for us, for all this remnant (  $\text{הַשְּׂרִיט}$  ) (for we are left [  $\text{וְשָׁרְיִינוּ}$  ] but a few of many, as your eyes see us), that the Lord your God may show us the way we should go, and the thing that we should do."  
(42.2-3)

Jeremiah seeks the guidance of the Lord who advises him that under no circumstances should the people leave Palestine for, if they go to Egypt, it will spell the destruction of the remnant:

". . . All the men who set their faces to go to Egypt to live there shall die by the sword, by famine, and by pestilence; they shall have no remnant (  $\text{שְׂרִיט}$  ) or survivor (  $\text{וְפֹלֵיט}$  ) from the evil which I will bring upon them. . . ."  
(42.17)

Although this command is dwelt upon at length (42.18-22),

---

[Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1965], p. CIV) that the Lord's rejection of the Jerusalemite remnant is due to their own self-righteousness, that they believed they were the righteous ones, the pure remnant, the inheritors of the promise. But, cf. 44.12 which contradicts Bright.

the people nevertheless disobeyed and went to Egypt (43.7).

And so:

" . . . Behold, I will set my face against you for evil, to cut off all Judah. I will take the remnant ( שארית ) of Judah who have set their faces to come to the land of Egypt to live, and they shall all be consumed; in the land of Egypt they shall fall; by the sword and by famine they shall be consumed; from the least to the greatest, they shall die by the sword and by famine; and they shall become an execration, a horror, a curse, and a taunt. . . ." (44.12)

Although the entire remnant is threatened with destruction, this threat is mitigated:

" . . . I will punish those who dwell in the land of Egypt, as I have punished Jerusalem, with the sword, with famine, and with pestilence, so that none of the remnant ( לשארית ) of Judah who have come to live in the land of Egypt shall escape ( פליט ) or survive ( ושריד ) or return to the land of Judah, to which they desire to return to dwell there; for they shall not return, except some fugitives ( פלטים )." (44.13-14)

The divine exception has been made, a remnant will remain as a testimony to God's supremacy:

" . . . And those who escape ( ופליטי ) the sword shall return from the land of Egypt to the land of Judah,

few in number, and all the remnant ( שארית ) of Judah, who came to the land of Egypt, shall know whose word will stand, mine or theirs. . . ." (44.28)

The remnant will exist but, according to this passage, it will be small and insignificant.

Israel, however, will not be condemned to perpetual insignificance and, in the end, the people of God will be restored:

". . . Then I will gather the remnant ( שארית ) of my flock out of all the countries where I have driven them, and I will bring them back to their fold, and they shall be fruitful and multiply. . . ." (23.3)

The remnant here does not seem to be those in Palestine nor possibly even in Egypt but those Jews who were in the diaspora and who would then be gathered back to the land.

"For behold, days are coming, says the Lord, when I will restore the fortunes of my people, Israel and Judah, says the Lord, and I will bring them back to the land which I gave to their fathers, and they shall take possession of it." (30.3)

At this time, the Lord will raise up "a righteous Branch" (23.5) who will reign as king over Judah. Then, God promises the renewal and restoration of Israel:

"The people who survived the sword  
found grace in the wilderness;



when Israel sought for rest,  
the Lord appeared to him  
from afar.

I have loved you with an  
everlasting love;  
therefore I have continued my  
faithfulness to you.

Again I will build you, and you shall  
be built,

O virgin Israel!

Again you shall adorn yourself with  
timbrels,  
and shall go forth in the dance of  
the merrymakers.

Again you shall plant vineyards  
upon the mountains of Samaria;  
the planters shall plant,  
and shall enjoy the fruit.

For there shall be a day when  
watchmen will call  
in the hill country of Ephraim:  
'Arise, and let us go up to Zion,  
to the Lord our God.'

For thus says the Lord:

"Sing aloud with gladness for Jacob,

and raise shouts for the chief of  
 the nations;  
 proclaim, give praise, and say,  
 'The Lord has saved his people,  
 the remnant of Israel.' . . ."

(31.2-7)

The Lord again saves his people, the remnant of Israel and they are cleansed and pure before the Lord (33.8). "There is hope for your future" (לְאִמְרֵיהֶם ; 31.17); the Lord will eventually "make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah" (31.31).

Though Jeremiah's prophecy and his remnant teaching are deeply interwoven in the historical rather than the eschatological, it is clear that Israel will endure to share that new covenant:

Thus says the Lord,  
 who gives the sun for light by day  
 and the fixed order of the moon  
 and the stars for light by night,  
 who stirs up the sea so that its waves  
 roar-  
 the Lord of hosts is his name:  
 "If this fixed order departs  
 from before me, says the Lord,  
 then shall the descendants of Israel  
 cease

from being a nation before me for  
ever."

Thus says the Lord:

"If the heavens above can be  
measured,  
and the foundations of the earth  
below can be explored,  
then I will cast off all the  
descendants of Israel  
for all that they have done,  
says the Lord."

(31.35-37)

Individual membership in the remnant is not per se a major topic for Jeremiah. He speaks to Israel more than to the Israelites. From his comments to and about Israel, however, some characteristics of the remnant can be gleaned. The members will be faithful. Israel has been judged for his "ways and doings" which have been faithlessness (3.20) and apostasy (5.7). Indeed, the importance of faithfulness in Jeremiah's view is evident from his approbation of the Rechabites' faithfulness to such extent that God will not destroy them "because you have obeyed the command of Jonadab your father, and kept all his precepts, and done all that he commanded you" (35.18).

Further characteristics are found, by implication, in the calls to return. Here, also, faithlessness must be

"healed" (3.22) and one must act "in truth, in justice, and in uprightness" (4.2) following the covenant (4.4). God's law must be accepted (6.19) and social injustices avoided (6.6, 13):

"For if you truly amend your ways and your doings, if you truly execute justice one with another, if you do not oppress the alien, the fatherless or the widow, or shed innocent blood in this place, and if you do not go after other gods to your own hurt, then I will let you dwell in this place, in the land that I gave of old to your fathers forever."

(7.5-7)

Righteousness lies in faithfulness to God, the covenant and the law. Certainly any remnant must possess this quality. It seems, however, that the restoration of Israel will be accompanied by the forgiveness of the remnant:

". . . In those days and in that time, says the Lord, iniquity shall be sought in Israel, and there shall be none; and sin in Judah, and none shall be found; for I will pardon those whom I have as a remnant  
(כִּי אֶסְלַח לְאַחַד אֲשֵׁרֶיךָ) . . . ." (50.20)

This, of course, does not abrogate the righteous qualities of the remnant but it does point up the depths of Israel's faithlessness. Return, forgiveness and mercy are necessary

(3.12-13) to spare a remnant.

The question arises as to Jeremiah's place within the remnant. Certainly he saw himself as distinguished from the massa damnata that was Israel, but it would be difficult to presume that he considered himself a member of an eschatological remnant. "Isaiah was conscious of a forgiveness of his own sins that separated him from a sinful people and made him an exemplar to the just remnant to whom salvation was promised."<sup>64</sup> Jeremiah was like Isaiah, a proleptic representative of the remnant.

The covenant had been broken and the remnant was without a proper and formal relationship to God. Israel and God are like divorced marriage partners; there is no hope of reconciliation (3.1-5). The covenant is null and void. The Lord, however, although rejecting Israel, would not entirely reject His people--there would be a remnant; but that group, in returning to the state of pristine Israel, would need a new basis of relationship with His God. The Lord, therefore, decreed a new covenant:

"Behold, the days are coming, says the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah, not like the covenant which I made with their fathers when I took them by the

---

<sup>64</sup>Vawter, Conscience, p. 274.

hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt, my covenant which they broke, though I was their husband, says the Lord. But this is the covenant which I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the Lord: I will put my law within them, and I will write it upon their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. And no longer shall each man teach his neighbor and each his brother, saying, 'Know the Lord,' for they shall all know me, from the last of them to the greatest, says the Lord; for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more." (31.31-34)<sup>65</sup>

This new covenant represents Israel's total and final return to God.

The future of the nation was beyond question; it had no future. Israel, however, would survive as a people after the nation's destruction.<sup>66</sup>

In summary, even when Jeremiah attempts to be most severe, when he speaks of the annihilation of the remnant itself, he must still allow for the mercy of God which will

<sup>65</sup>Vide, also, 32.37-41 which is remarkably similar. Von Rad (Theology, II, 214) notes that "These two passages almost read like two targums on a text."

<sup>66</sup>Bright, Jeremiah, p. CXV. Vide, also, Oesterley and Robinson, Hebrew Religion, p. 264; Vawter, Conscience, p. 239; 272-277; Bright, Covenant and Promise, p. 165.

not permit all Israelites to be utterly destroyed. This, as we have seen, does not insure the perdurance of Israel. The remnant will be Israelite but not Israel. He does, however, insist upon the punishment of even the remnant for its evil deeds. This points up the dual nature of the remnant which permeates the entire Hebrew Bible. The remnant consists of those who have survived past or present catastrophes as well as those who will be saved from the coming and often times impending doom of the day of the Lord. Jeremiah upholds the traditional connection between the remnant and the election and the covenant traditions. He does, however, seem to opt for a difference in treatment between those who are in Palestine and those who are in other lands. This is obviously connected to the times within which he prophesied. Finally, as in other writers, he also points up the purity of the final remnant, the remnant of the end-times. Jerusalem will be the seat of the future kingdom and the remnant from Israel will be party to the new covenant which will not be threatened through unfaithfulness. No remnant of Israel will exist, but a remnant from Israel will begin again.

#### c. Ezekiel

The prophecy of Ezekiel begins with the denunciation

of Israel's sinfulness<sup>67</sup> and inevitable punishment (20.30-31)<sup>68</sup> and ends with the promise of Israel's eventual restoration: ". . . the book constantly deals with the fate of all Israel, the judgement upon Israel, and the possibility of a future for the house of Israel."<sup>69</sup>

As in other prophetic works of the Hebrew Bible the theme of God's righteous yet unrelenting destruction of Israel is coupled with the promise of a remnant which will survive any disaster or punishment. God will remember his covenant (16.60); he will be faithful. Hence, when Ezekiel speaks about the fall of Jerusalem, he indicates that some will survive:

"Yet I will leave ( וְהוֹרַחֲתִי ) some of you alive. When you have among the nations some who have escaped ( פְּלִיטֵי ) the sword, and when you are scattered through the countries, then those of you who escape ( פְּלִיטֵיכֶם ) will remember me among the

---

<sup>67</sup>Unlike his colleagues, Ezekiel thought Israel's sinfulness lay in offenses against sacral orders. "Complaints about transgression of the social and moral commandments are very much less prominent. For Ezekiel, the cause of Israel's approaching fall lay quite indubitably in a failure in the sphere of the holy." E.g., 5.11; 8.7-13; 14.3-8; 20.43; 22.26; 23.7, 13, 30, 39; 36.22. (von Rad, Theology, II, 224)

<sup>68</sup>Vide, also, 23.23-24.

<sup>69</sup>Walther Zimmerli, Ezekiel I, E.t. by Ronald E. Clements, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), p. 55.





bring them out of the land where they sojourn, but they shall not enter the land of Israel. Then you will know that I am the Lord.<sup>72</sup> (20.34-38)

The historical remnant is not, however, to be considered as unequivocally saved. The future of the remnant seems, for Ezekiel, to be rather tenuous:

". . . He that is far off shall die of pestilence; and he that is near shall fall by the sword; and he that is left ( הַנִּשְׁאָר ) and is preserved ( הַנִּצּוֹר ) shall die of famine. Thus I will spend my fury upon them. . . ." (6.12)

Any survivors shall themselves be meaningless (7.16), for the Lord will not have pity upon His people (7.9). Indeed, even the remnant faces destruction (9.8; 11.13). Furthermore, if some few do manage to escape, they will be but examples for others of the righteous wrath of the Lord (12.16; 14.22).

Within Ezekiel's prophecy, there is a tension between the Israelites in exile and those in Jerusalem. The tension seems to be associated with a truth-claim by the Jerusalem-ites. There were, according to Ezekiel, some in Jerusalem who regarded themselves as the purified remnant, the rightful heirs to the promises:

"Son of man, your brethren, even your brethren, men

---

<sup>72</sup>Vide, also, 20.37-38; 22.17-19; 24.11.

of your kindred,<sup>73</sup> the whole house of Israel, all of them, are those of whom the inhabitants of Jerusalem have said, 'They have gone far from the Lord; to us this land is given for a possession.' . . ." (11.15)<sup>74</sup>

They believe that they are the purified remnant:

"Son of man, the inhabitants of these waste places in the land of Israel keep saying, 'Abraham was only one man, yet he got possession of the land; but we are many; the land is surely given us to possess.' . . ." (33.24)

The argument reflects quantity not quality; Ezekiel claims quality not quantity. Ezekiel berates against the attitude of the Jerusalemites and the Lord himself prophesies the end of that remnant:

". . . As I live, surely those who are in the waste places shall fall by the sword; and him that is in the open field I will give to the beasts to be devoured; and those who are in strongholds and in caves shall die by pestilence. . . ." (33.27)<sup>75</sup>

The land will be made a desolation and the proud will come

<sup>73</sup>Following the Hebrew.

<sup>74</sup>Cf. 1 Sam 26.19. Not being in possession of the land meant exile from the land and from the Lord.

<sup>75</sup>Vide G. A. Cooke, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936), p. 60.

to an end (33.28) so that "They will know that I am the Lord" (33.29). Even those who court Ezekiel are condemned for being two-faced and listening only for gain (33.31-32).

Some will be saved, however; God will gather His people:

'Thus says the Lord God: I will gather you from the peoples, and assemble you out of the countries where you have been scattered, and I will give you the land of Israel.' (11.17)

There will be a remnant which will dwell in Israel and that remnant will consist of converted individuals (11.19-20).<sup>76</sup>

In the remnant claim of the Jerusalemites, remnant understanding exhibits a new facet--a group, declaring itself the purified remnant, sets itself against the "whole house of Israel". While not breaking away from the house of Israel, the claimants take advantage of an existing situation of bifurcation--Jerusalemites vs. exiles--to declare that those in Jerusalem are the purified remnant who shall inherit the Abrahamic promises. Ezekiel rejects this declaration as false. The pretenders will be destroyed; the remnant is not a group within Israel; it is a purified Israel. The remnant will be Israel.<sup>77</sup>

---

<sup>76</sup>Cooke, Ezekiel, p. 126.

<sup>77</sup>It is not known whether such a group as "the

To Ezekiel, Israel is dead (37.1-6) but out of Israel's bones will come forth a new Israel:

". . . Behold, I will open your graves, O my people; and I will bring you home into the land of Israel. And you shall know that I am the Lord, when I open your graves, and raise you from your graves, O my people. And I will put my Spirit within you, and you shall live, and I will place you in your own land; then you shall know that I, the Lord, have spoken, and I have done it, says the Lord."

(37.12-14)<sup>78</sup>

The new Israel will be an historical, political entity. The citizens will return to the land of Israel (13.9) and will be the recipients of the ancestral promise (36.9, 29-30, 37). God will give Israel a new heart and a new spirit which will re-establish a reciprocal relationship between God and Israel (36.24-28). Von Rad understands this,

---

Jerusalemites" actually existed or was born in Ezekiel's fertile imagination. Regardless, Ezekiel believed such a situation was plausible, that is, an Israelite group could, at that time, be falsely calling itself the purified remnant. Cf. the conflicting views of Bright, Covenant and Promise, pp. 177-178 and Cooke, Ezekiel, pp. 367-368. The resolution to this question, although interesting, would be tangential to the issue at hand.

<sup>78</sup>The resurrection of Israel is predicated upon the obedience of Ezekiel in prophesying to the "dry bones". Obedience to the Lord produces the salvation of a remnant of Israel. (C. G. Howie, "Ezekiel", IDB, II, 210)

quite correctly, as "analogous to the making of the Old Covenant"<sup>79</sup> and, hence, a new covenant like that found in Jeremiah (Jer 31.31-33). The new Israel will be ruled by a shepherd sent by God (34.23-24), who will be a Davidid,<sup>80</sup> and Judah and Israel will again be one nation.<sup>81</sup>

Just as there will be a new creation symbolized by the vivification of the dry bones (31.12-14), so also will there be a new exodus testifying once again to God's wielding his might and power on behalf of his people:

"As I live, says the Lord God, surely with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm, and with wrath poured out, I will be king over you. I will bring you out from the peoples and gather you out of the countries where you are scattered, with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm, and with wrath poured out; and I will bring you into the wilderness of the peoples, and there I will enter into judgment with you face to face. As I entered into judgment with your fathers in the wilderness of the land of Egypt, so I will enter

---

<sup>79</sup>von Rad, Theology, II, 235. Vide, also, Cooke, Ezekiel, pp. 391-392.

<sup>80</sup>Jon Douglas Levenson, Theology of The Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40-48, HSM 10 (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press for Harvard Semitic Museum, 1976), p. 95.

<sup>81</sup>Karl Heinrich Cornill, "Book of Ezekiel", JE, V, 317.

into judgment with you, says the Lord God."

(20.33-36)

It is Ezekiel who turns most decisively from the collective Israel to the individual Israelite (3.17-21; 33.1-9). How does the individual save himself? Through righteousness. It is the righteousness of a man that saves his life (18.22). One must keep God's statutes, do what is lawful and right (18.21) and observe God's ordinances (18.9) to be saved. But another note has been chimed:

"And you, son of man, say to your people, the righteousness of the righteous shall not deliver him when he transgresses; and as for the wickedness of the wicked, he shall not fall by it when he turns from his wickedness; and the righteous shall not be able to live by his righteousness when he sins. Though I say to the righteous that he shall surely live, yet if he trusts in his righteousness and commits iniquity, none of his righteous deeds shall be remembered; but in the iniquity that he has committed he shall die. Again, though I say to the wicked, 'You shall surely die,' yet if he turns from his sin and does what is lawful and right, if the wicked restores the pledge, gives back what he has taken by robbery, and walks in the statutes of life, committing no iniquity; he shall

surely live, he shall not die. None of the sins that he has committed shall be remembered against him; he has done what is lawful and right, he shall surely live."

(33.12-16)

Salvation is not determined until the end. One must be more than generally good, one must be constantly good committing no iniquity.

There is no real indication of any specific members of the remnant though one would assume that the shepherd leader would be among them. As for Ezekiel, he certainly understood himself as one of the group from which the remnant would come. Though we are not given a specific indication that he is to be a member of that final group, it is correct to call him a proleptic member.<sup>82</sup>

Thus, in Ezekiel, one finds many of the traditional aspects of the remnant. There is both a past and a future remnant as well as both an historical and an eschatological application of the remnant motif. The future remnant will consist of the righteous and they will possess the land and inherit the promise. A new Israel will emerge from the carcass of the faithless Israel and that new Israel will have a new (renewed?) covenantal relationship with God. The new Jerusalem will be the seat of the theocratic state which

---

<sup>82</sup>Levenson, Restoration, p. 129.



will be historical, political and eschatological; a messiah-type figure will rule over the people. Prosperity and peace will be the people's constant companions and God will be with His people forever.

d. Joel

A terrible locust plague which was ravishing the land and which threatened the very existence of Israel precipitated the prophecy of Joel and was, according to him, due to God's righteous judgment upon the errant people. Joel tried to call the people to repentance and, in the process, he depicted the judgments and blessings of the Day of the Lord which, he felt, was being ushered in by the present catastrophe.<sup>83</sup> His message, addressed to "all inhabitants of the land" (1.2), is intended not only for the people of today but also for those of tomorrow:

Tell your children of it,

and let your children tell their children,

and their children another generation. (1.3)

The plague has brought forth untold horrors (1.4-1.12), so that the land can no longer support the people. These dire tribulations bear witness to the nearness of the

---

<sup>83</sup>Leslie C. Allen, The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah, NICOT (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1976), p. 36.

Day of the Lord (1.15-16) and are meant as a warning to Israel. The plague should force the people to rise up and repair their ways; for, if they yet return to the Lord, they could possibly avert total destruction:

"Yet even now," says the Lord,  
 "return to me with all your heart,  
 with fasting, with weeping, and with mourning;  
 and rend your hearts and not your garments."  
 Return to the Lord, your God,  
 for he is gracious and merciful,<sup>84</sup>  
 slow to anger, and abounding in steadfast love,  
 and repents of evil.

Who knows whether he will not turn and repent,  
 and leave ( הַשְׂמִיר ) a blessing behind him,  
 cereal offering and a drink offering  
 for the Lord, your God? (2.12-14)

Therefore, the author beseeches the people to return to the Lord. He asks that they gather together in a solemn assembly (2.15-16); indeed, the crisis is so acute that the bridegroom should leave his room (2.16). At the solemn

---

<sup>84</sup>Julius A. Bewer (John Merlin Powis Smith, William Hayes Ward, Julius A. Bewer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah and Joel, ICC [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911], p. 106) notes "The reason for hope even in extremis lies in the wonderfully gracious character of Yahweh".

assembly, the people are to pray for salvation by reminding the Lord of the election and the covenant:

"Spare thy people, O Lord,  
and make not thy heritage a reproach,  
a byword among the nations.

Why should they say among the people,  
'Where is their God?'" (2.17)

Salvation is achieved, therefore, by the repentance of the people coupled with the mercy of God.

Joel has been laboring to wean the people away from indifference and insensitivity to the things of God. This suggested prayer marks the climax of his endeavors: The people's desperate flinging of themselves upon Yahweh as the one who is able to save those who otherwise are helpless, a recognition of the close ties that bind them to him, and a concern for his glory.<sup>85</sup>

Because of the supplication, the Lord has pity on His people (2.18), sending forth foodstuffs to satiate them (2.19) and promising that His people shall not again be put to shame (2.27). It is then, within the context of this promise, that the Lord has Joel prophesy regarding the end-times.

There will be signs and portents heralding the Day

<sup>85</sup>Allen, Joel, p. 84.

of the Lord and only those who worship the Lord will be saved:

"And I will give portents in the heavens and on the earth, flood and fire and columns of smoke. The sun shall be turned to darkness, and the moon to blood, before the great and terrible day of the Lord comes. And it shall come to pass that all who call upon the name of the Lord shall be delivered (עֲרֵב); for in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem there shall be those who escape, (עֲרֵב) as the Lord has said, and among the survivors (עֲרֵב) shall be those whom the Lord calls. (2.30.32; Heb 3.3-5)

Thus, only those who worship the Lord can expect salvation. That this group will not be inclusive is indicated by the later threats against the Gentiles. They will be judged in the valley of Jershappet (3.2) and strangers shall here again pass through Jerusalem (3.17b). More importantly, however, the Gentiles are blamed for the evils that have beset Israel (3.2-3), for which the foreigners will be punished:

"...I will avenge their blood, and I will not clear the guilty.

for the Lord dwells in Zion." (3.21)

In the end, however, peace will prevail over the land and the golden age of Israel will begin. The enemies of Israel will be destroyed, Zion will be inhabited forever and the

Lord will live forever in Zion (3.19-21; Heb 4.19-21).

It is, therefore, an eschatological, exclusivistic remnant of which Joel speaks. Not all Jews can expect to be included because of their nationality. Their Jewishness is, however, a pre-requisite, although not the only one. They must also worship the Lord. But for those Jews who are loyal to the Lord he will be "a stronghold to the people of Israel" (3.16b).

e. Amos

Amos prophesied doom and destruction for not only Israel's neighbors but also Israel himself (chpts. 1-2). The evil perpetrated by the nations has earned them dire punishments<sup>86</sup> but the election of Israel has also been his condemnation for unfaithfulness to the covenant (3.1-11).<sup>87</sup> Transgression was an individual concern with which the law

<sup>86</sup>"Amos sees Yahweh as a god whose authority reaches far beyond the borders of the small country. In his eyes the tasks of Yahweh are not limited to Israel and Judah (cf. 9:7) or to matters where Israel or Judah were involved. Yahweh has power to act everywhere, and it is his right and duty to punish sin wherever it is found." (Arvid S. Kapelrud, Central Ideas In Amos [Oslo: University Press, 1961], p. 27). Cf. 9.7 where the Lord tells Israel that they are no more under His sway than the other lands.

<sup>87</sup>A careful reading of Amos makes it obvious that, although the prophecy of doom was a surprise to the audience, it was the goal of the author from the very first. (Cf. Kapelrud, Central Ideas, p. 19; von Rad, Theology, II, 153; Vawter, Conscience, p. 78.)

of Israel dealt; the entirety of Israel, however, has broken the covenant. Punishment for Israel must follow. The punishment will not, however, utterly destroy Israel, for a remnant will be spared:

Thus says the Lord: "As the shepherd rescues from the mouth of the lion two legs, or a piece of an ear, so shall the people of Israel who dwell in Samaria be rescued, with the corner of a couch and part of a bed." (3.12)

James Luther Mays, in his discussion of this verse, proposes:

The oracle may well have been given in answer to those who disputed the doom prophesied by Amos in the name of the deliverance which Israel expected from Yahweh as a matter of course. 'Is it deliverance you expect, O Israel! Well, here is what your "deliverance" will be like--the rescue of a corpse's shredded remains, a deliverance that means nothing to you!'<sup>88</sup>

This self-righteous attitude could have resulted in Amos' avoiding the election theme, since it was election which was the catalyst for the people's attitude. Amos, however, appealed directly to the election and attempted to correct Israel's misconception. Just because Israel is God's chosen

---

<sup>88</sup>James Luther Mays, Amos, CTL (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1969), p. 67. Cf. 8.7.

people, His protection cannot be construed as either automatic or perpetual. The election meant that Israel must obey the commandments or abrogate the covenant and face the inevitable consequence (9.10).

It was election, one of Israel's oldest and most deeply felt convictions, that had occasioned the complacency of Samaria and Bethel. In the popular mind it had been too easily assimilated to the Canaanite covenants with Baal, that is, the deity's guarantee of automatic protection in return for an equally automatic cult of honor. Nevertheless, Amos did not minimize the fact of election, but insisted on its true meaning. Israel had been made a people through Yahweh's choice, through his liberation of it from Egypt, his bestowal of the promised land, and his abiding presence. If Israel was faithless to the obligation entailed in all this, it was not only guilty of grievous sin but had actually ceased to be.<sup>89</sup>

The remnant will survive but it shall be few in number; the nation will, in effect, be bereft of future, helpless, hopeless:

For thus says the Lord God:

---

<sup>89</sup>Vawter, Conscience, p. 93.

"The city that went forth a thousand  
 shall have a hundred left ( חמסאיר ),  
 and that which went forth a hundred  
 shall have ten left ( חמסאיר )  
 to the house of Israel." (5.3)

Although the remnant will be small, membership is not decided capriciously. One's actions will determine whether salvation is achieved:

Seek good, and not evil,  
 that you may live;

and so the Lord, the God of hosts,  
 will be with you,

as you have said.

Hate evil, and love good,

and establish justice in the gate;

it may be that the Lord, the God of hosts,

will be gracious to the remnant ( שארית ) of Joseph.

(5.14-15)<sup>90</sup>

This pragmatic appeal to Israel represents a last desperate attempt to bring the people back into conformity with the covenant.

The remnant motif in Amos is unlike that of many other Biblical authors in that there is no promise of a

---

<sup>90</sup> Vide, also, 5.4.



future great nation; the remnant is not the kernel of a new Israel. The remnant as understood by Amos will be small and insignificant, meaningless for the future existence of Israel as a national entity:

And if ten men remain ( יִתְּרוּ ) in one house, they shall die. And when a man's kinsman, he who burns him, shall take him up to bring the bones out of the house, and shall say to him who is in the innermost parts of the house, "Is there still any one with you?" he shall say, "No"; and he shall say, "Hush! We must not mention the name of the Lord."

(6.9-10)

The remnant will exist and yet be impotent. Despite the dire predictions regarding the remnant, Amos never doubts that Israel will persist, however insignificantly:

". . . Behold, the eyes of the Lord God  
are upon the sinful kingdom,  
and I will destroy it from the  
surface of the ground;  
except that I will not utterly  
destroy the house of Jacob,"  
says the Lord. (9.8)

This harsh message is somewhat mitigated near the end of the book when Amos speaks of the eschatological future of the remnant:

"In that day I will raise up  
the booth of David that is fallen  
and repair its breaches,  
and raise up its ruins,  
and rebuild it as in the days of old;  
that they may possess the remnant ( רֵשִׁיט ) of Edom  
and all the nations who are called by my name,"  
says the Lord who does this.

.....

I will restore the fortunes of my people Israel,  
and they shall rebuild the ruined cities and  
inhabit them;  
They shall plant vineyards and drink their wine,  
and they shall make gardens and eat their fruit.  
I will plant them upon their land,  
and they shall never again be plucked up  
out of the land which I have given them,"  
says the Lord your God. (9.11-15)

Even this description of the hope of Israel is affected,  
however, by Amos' previous oracles. Amos presents a posi-  
tive yet much restrained view of the ultimate future.

One of Amos' unique teachings concerns the univer-  
salism of the Lord. As we have already seen, all nations  
are under God and are subject to Him. Yet, how does this  
view interact with the election tradition? Israel is

distinguished because, although God is head of all nations (9.7), He made Himself known only to Israel (3.2). All the dictates, however, that have been directed to Israel are universally applicable and valid.<sup>91</sup>

For Amos, the remnant would be a reality but its existence was primarily a motif of doom.<sup>92</sup>

Amos' usage of the remnant motif with its emphasis on the meaninglessness, ineffectiveness, and smallness of the remnant for Israel's national future is a more effective contrast to the popular hopes of Israel than would have been expressions of a complete denial of a remnant.<sup>93</sup>

The righteous will be saved, a remnant will come from Israel but that should not be cause for rejoicing. Israel as a great nation is doomed throughout the prophecy and it is only at the end that the prophecy is somewhat more optimistic. The traditional themes of election and covenant are once again linked to the remnant motif as is the eschaton.<sup>94</sup>

<sup>91</sup>Kapelrud, Central Ideas, pp. 42-43.

<sup>92</sup>Contra Joseph Dheilly, Prophets and Prophecies, E.t. by Rachel Attwater (Glen Rock, N. J.: Paulist Press, 1964), p. 71.

Of course, the remnant as a motif of doom must be understood in the context of the prevalent Israelite attitude of self-righteousness Amos was trying to counter.

<sup>93</sup>Hasel, The Remnant, p. 190.

<sup>94</sup>Contra von Rad (Theology, II, 130) who claims

The remnant is an eschatological entity whose future, for Amos, has a certain tentativeness (5.15). The day of the Lord will occasion the remnant but it will be a day of doom and destruction:

Woe to you who desire the day of the Lord!

Why would you have the day of the Lord?

It is darkness, and not light;

as if a man fled from a lion,

and a bear met him;

or went into the house and leaned

with his hand against the wall,

and a serpent bit him.

Is not the day of the Lord darkness,

and not light,

and gloom with no brightness in it?

(5.18-20)

Finally, Amos may be credited with enlarging the remnant motif to include Edom as a recipient of the Davidic promise (9.12). It is interesting that Amos has no need to explain the remnant to his readers; hence, the motif must have been fully communicative, needing only the refinement which Amos has introduced--universalism.

---

"With Amos for example, projection of the election tradition into the realm of eschatology is almost completely absent".

## f. Obadiah

Obadiah, the shortest book of the Hebrew Bible, is essentially an oracle against Edom; but, within the prophecy, one also glimpses the eschatological victory of Judah. The end-times are near and man will reap what he has sown:

For the day of the Lord is near upon all the nations.  
 As you have done, it shall be done to you,  
 your deeds shall return on your own head.  
 For as you have drunk upon my holy mountain,  
 all the nations round about shall drink;  
 they shall drink, and stagger,  
 and shall be as though they had not been.

(15-16)

By the time that this occurs, however, Judah will already have been sifted and only a righteous remnant shall remain:

But in Mount Zion there shall be  
 Those that escape ( פליטה ),  
 and it shall be holy ( קדש );  
 and the house of Jacob shall possess  
 their own possessions. (17)

But not everyone shall be so lucky:

The house of Jacob shall be a fire,  
 and the house of Joseph a flame,  
 and the house of Esau stubble;  
 they shall burn them and consume them,

and there shall be no survivor ( שָׂרִיד ) to  
 the house of Esau;  
 for the Lord has spoken. (18)

It seems, therefore, that the remnant will consist of those Jews who are holy. There is no indication that non-Jews have any share in the remnant (16).

In summary, for Obadiah, the remnant would be an eschatological entity which would consist of those Jews who were holy.<sup>95</sup>

g. Micah

Micah, who presumably was a younger contemporary of Isaiah, faced many problems which were similar to those encountered by Hosea and Isaiah. Along with Amos, Hosea and Isaiah, Micah championed pure worship and foretold the dire judgment of the Lord upon His people for their wandering ways:

Therefore, thus says the Lord:

Behold, against this family I am devising evil,  
 from which you cannot remove your necks;  
 and you shall not walk haughtily, for it will be  
 an evil time.

In that day they shall take up a taunt song  
 against you,

---

<sup>95</sup>Allen, Obadiah, p. 139.

and wail with bitter lamentation,  
 and say, "We are utterly ruined;  
 he changes the portion of my people;  
 how he removes it from me!

Among the rebellious he divides our fields."  
 Therefore you will have none to cast the line by lot  
 in the assembly of the Lord. (2.3-5)

Micah accused the political and religious leaders of injustice (3.9), bribery and gross self-righteousness (3.11); he accused the populace of uncleanness and lethargy (2.6-11);<sup>96</sup> and, he even declared that the rampant injustice<sup>97</sup> of the people would destroy Jerusalem itself (3.12). "He saw and judged the officials in terms of the old ideal of Israel as a society governed and preserved by YHWH."<sup>98</sup> It is Micah's unique contribution, however, that his indictments were specifically aimed at groups or individuals and did not fall upon the corporate nation. Even the punishments "would fall on the particular groups who had sinned, and would correspond to the deeds. The deed will return on their own

---

<sup>96</sup>For other transgressions, vide 2.2; 3.2-3, 10.

<sup>97</sup>James Luther Mays (Micah: A Commentary, OTL [Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1976], p. 19) points out that "The pivotal criterion among the normative words is justice; the rest are words and expressions employed to describe the violation of justice. . . ."

<sup>98</sup>Mays, Micah, p. 90.

heads."<sup>99</sup>

It is interesting to note that just as the election of Israel is a raison d'être for belief in the remnant, it is also one of the pivotal causes of the destruction of the many. It is the self-righteousness produced by excessive reliance upon the election that precipitates the erroneous attitude that "because I am a member of the chosen people, I can sin and not be punished":

. . . yet they lean upon the Lord and say,

"Is not the Lord in the midst of us?

No evil shall come upon us." (3.11)<sup>100</sup>

Amidst the gloom of their predicament, there is, however, a glint of hope: there will be a remnant remaining and that remnant will be gathered together and will constitute a new nation:

I will surely gather all of you, O Jacob

I will gather the remnant ( שארית ) of Israel;

I will set them together like sheep in a fold,

Like a flock in its pasture,

a noisy multitude of men.<sup>101</sup>

<sup>99</sup>Mays, Micah, p. 20. Jerusalem is not to fall because of Israel's transgression as a nation, but because it was built with violence (3.9-12).

<sup>100</sup>Allen, Micah, p. 255.

<sup>101</sup>Cf. Jer 23.3; 31.8-10; Isa 40.11; Ezek 34.



He who opens the breach will go up before them;  
 they will break through and pass the gate,  
 going out by it.

Their King will pass on before them,  
 the Lord at their head. (2.12-13)

The remnant will be gathered after the judgment by the Lord  
 who as shepherd will preserve His people and transcend His  
 righteous wrath.

Although there is judgment for past sins, there is  
 also the hesed of God which will preserve the remnant:

Who is a God like Thee, pardoning iniquity  
 and passing over transgression for the  
 remnant ( לְשׂוּרָתוֹ ) of his inheritance?

He does not retain his anger for ever  
 because he delights in steadfast love.

He will again have compassion upon us,  
 he will tread our iniquities under foot.

Thou wilt cast all their sins  
 into the depths of the sea.

Thou wilt show faithfulness to Jacob  
 and steadfast love to Abraham,

As thou hast sworn to our fathers  
 from the days of old. (7.18-20)

These are very important verses for the understanding of  
 the meaning and significance of the remnant. In these verses,

a group which calls itself "the remnant of his inheritance" rejoices over their salvation--not through self-righteousness but in thanksgiving. The importance of this lies in the fact that they identify themselves as a remnant not in expectation of the eschaton but in retrospection on a past catastrophe from which they were saved. Their status as a remnant is based upon the past and not the future. "Israel's sin brought them to the confined existence of a beleaguered remnant in a ruined city. YHWH's victory over their sin will give them back their life, and the land will become the sacrament of his forgiveness."<sup>102</sup>

The remnant in Micah can also be eschatologically employed:

In that day, says the Lord,  
 I will assemble the lame  
 and gather those who have been driven away,  
 and those whom I have afflicted;  
 and the lame I will make the remnant ( לשאר ית );  
 and those who were cast off, a strong nation  
 and the Lord will reign over them in Mount Zion  
 from this time forth and for evermore. (4.6-7)

The gathered remnant will be transformed into a "strong

---

<sup>102</sup>Mays, Micah, p. 169. Vide, also, Allen, Micah, pp. 256-257.

nation" which will be formed from those who have been "driven away". It is extremely important that this unique use of the remnant be fully noted. The remnant is not created by the mercy of God in mitigation of a righteous judgment. As Mays notes:

. . . here the remnant is created by God's saving activity, not his judgment, 'remnant' has become the name for the eschatological goal of YHWH's way with Israel. The remnant is by character a mighty nation; by reason of their nature they are a supernatural and invincible reality within world history (see 5.7-9).<sup>103</sup>

Furthermore, this is not a political remnant but a "social unit whose existence and character is a manifestation of YHWH's reign over them".<sup>104</sup>

The Lord himself will reign over Zion but there will be a shepherd king (5.2-6) who will rule Israel during the time of the return and the ingathering of the people of Israel (5.3). At this time, the remnant takes on a new dimension, for they will roar like the lion and devour the peoples who have been their adversaries:

Then the remnant (  $\text{רֵשִׁיט}$  ) of Jacob shall be

---

<sup>103</sup>Mays, Micah, p. 101.

<sup>104</sup>Ibid.

in the midst of many peoples  
 like dew from the Lord,  
 like showers upon the grass,  
 which tarry not for men  
 nor wait for the sons of men.  
 And the remnant ( שארית ) of Jacob shall be  
 among the nations,  
 in the midst of many peoples,  
 like a lion among the beasts of the forest,  
 like a young lion among the flocks of sheep,  
 which, when it goes through, treads down  
 and tears in pieces, and there is none  
 to deliver  
 your hand shall be lifted up over your  
 adversaries,  
 and all your enemies shall be cut off.

(5.7-9; Heb 5.6-8)

The remnant will eventually recover their strength and conquer their conquerors. Israel will again be victorious over his enemies.

In summary, all of the traditional elements associated with the remnant idea are present in Micah's prophecy: election, covenant, mercy of God and the belief that some will be spared from righteous judgment. The remnant is seen as both past and future, though membership in the past remnant does not insure membership in the eschatological rem-

nant. Micah prophesies an eschatological remnant not tied to judgment. The Lord will gather His people because they are simply that--His people. The prophet also ignores the corporate aspect of judgment and makes both transgression and punishment an individual or group concern, not a national one.

#### h. Zephaniah

The three short chapters of Zephaniah contain a number of significant statements about the remnant. "The thought of the book is centred upon one great theme, the coming of the day of Yahweh."<sup>105</sup> Zephaniah begins with a condemnation of Judah for its corruptions and religious syncretism (chpt. 1). The day of the Lord is at hand (1.7c) and all the evil will be punished:

I will bring distress on men,  
     so that they shall walk like the blind,  
     because they have sinned against the Lord;  
 their blood shall be poured out like dust,  
     and their flesh like dung.

Neither their silver nor their gold

---

<sup>105</sup>John Merlin Powis Smith (John Merlin Powis Smith, William Hayes Ward, Julius A. Bewer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah and Joel, ICC [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911]), p. 171; von Rad, Theology, II, 191.

shall be able to deliver them  
 on the day of the wrath of the Lord.  
 In the fire of his jealous wrath,  
 all the earth shall be consumed;<sup>106</sup>  
 for a full, yea, sudden end  
 he will make of all the inhabitants  
 of the earth. (1.17-18)

The situation seems hopeless; the future holds impending and inexorable doom. Even the righteous, in Zephaniah's world view, do not seem to be guaranteed salvation:

Seek the Lord, all you humble of the land,  
 who do his commands;  
 seek righteousness, seek humility;  
 perhaps you may be hidden  
 on the day of the wrath of the Lord.

(2.3)<sup>107</sup>

The remainder of the prophecy, however, makes it clear the faithful can expect to be saved.

The cosmic proportions of the judgment, which is described in Noachian terminology, reflect the finality of

<sup>106</sup>Zephaniah's universalism should be noted. Vide, also, chpt. 2, passim.

<sup>107</sup>For an analysis of the remnant significance of these verses, vide George W. Anderson, "The idea of the Remnant in the Book of Zephaniah", ASTI, 11 (1977/78), 12.

Zephaniah's understanding of "the day of the Lord":

"I will utterly sweep away everything  
 from the face of the earth," says the Lord.  
 "I will sweep away man and beast;  
 I will sweep away the birds of the air  
 and the fish of the sea.  
 I will overthrow the wicked;  
 I will cut off mankind  
 from the face of the earth," says the Lord.

(1.2-3)

It is more than a judgment, it is the judgment preceeding the reign of God upon the earth (3.15). The punishment which shall be meted out to the unfaithful of Judah shall also be visited upon the other nations (chpt. 2, passim). Indeed, some of these judgments will be executed by "the remnant of the house of Judah":

Woe to you inhabitants of the seacoast,  
 you nation of the Cherethites!  
 The word of the Lord is against you,  
 O Canaan, land of the Philistines;  
 and I will destroy you till no inhabitant is left.  
 And you, O seacoast, shall be pastures,  
 meadows for shepherds  
 and folds for flocks.  
 The seacoast shall become the possession

of the remnant ( לשאר ית ) of the house of Judah,  
 on which they shall pasture,  
 and in the houses of Ashkelon  
 they shall lie down at evening.

For the Lord their God will be mindful of them  
 and restore their fortunes. (2.5-7)

And elsewhere concerning the Moabites and Ammonites:

". . . The remnant ( שאר ית ) of my people shall  
 plunder them,  
 and the survivors ( יתר ) of my nation  
 shall possess them." (2.9)

The existence of the remnant of Judah is thus presumed in the second chapter but becomes a major concept in the last chapter which deals especially with those who are faithful to the Lord. According to Zephaniah, the day of the Lord will mean a sifting of the Lord's people so that only the righteous are left:

"On that day<sup>108</sup> you shall not be put to shame  
 because of the deeds by which  
 you have rebelled against me;  
 for then I will remove from your midst  
 your proudly exultant ones,

---

<sup>108</sup>"The day spoken of is that announced in v. 8 the day upon which the heathen are to be judged." (Smith, Zephaniah, p. 250)



and you shall no longer be haughty

in my holy mountain.

For I will leave ( הַשְׂאֲרִית ) in the midst of you

a people humble and lowly.

They shall seek refuge in the name of the Lord,

those who are left ( שְׂאֲרִית ) in Israel;

they shall do no wrong

and utter no lies,

nor shall there be found in their mouth

a deceitful tongue.

For they shall pasture and lie down,

and none shall make them afraid."

(3.11-13)

After the day of the Lord, the people of the Lord who are the remnant will be gathered together (3.20) as a holy nation. Further, one can look for the conversion of the Gentiles (3.9) and the restoration of Jerusalem (3.14) with the King of Israel in her midst (3.15). Membership in the remnant is for the faithful (3.8) and is lost by one's past deeds: the proud and haughty are to be excluded (3.11). Those left shall be holy and perfect.

#### i. Zechariah

Zechariah, like his contemporary Haggai, issued a strong call for repentance (1.1-6) which was grounded in the belief that the messianic age was imminent. Although

he realized that Israel had been and would be punished for Israel's evil ways (7.13-14), Zechariah looked beyond that punishment to the time when the Lord will return to Zion (8.3). The Lord will then gather the remnant (8.6- שְׂאֵרֵיהֶם) of His people and they will dwell in Jerusalem (8.6-8). Then there will be peace and bounty and the Lord "will cause the remnant ( שְׂאֵרֵיהֶם ) of this people to possess all these things" (8.12).

One presumes from the ethical teaching of Zechariah that the remnant must:

". . . Speak the truth to one another, render in your gates judgments that are true and make for peace, do not devise evil in your hearts against one another, and love no false oath, for all these things I hate, says the Lord." (8.16-17)

Furthermore, they must fast during the appointed seasons (8.18-19).

In the end, the remnant of the Israelites will not be saved alone; many nations "shall join themselves to the Lord in that day" (2.11; Heb 2.15)<sup>109</sup> and "the saved" will

---

<sup>109</sup>Hickley G. Mitchell (Hinckley G. Mitchell, John Merlin Powis Smith, Julius A. Bewer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi and Jonah, ICC, [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912], p. 144) states that "Zechariah, however, is not a thorough-going universalist, for he adds, always in the name of Yahweh, and he will dwell, not among them, but in thee".

become universal:

". . . In those days ten men from the nations of every tongue shall take hold of the robe of a Jew, saying, 'Let us go with you, for we have heard that God is with you.'" (8.23)

It is important to note, however, that even in this proclamation of universalism not all nations will be saved; the goyim also will be reduced to a remnant.

Here again the remnant is associated with the traditional themes of election, covenant and the hesed of the Lord. Zechariah does strike a relatively unique cord in his universalistic make-up of the remnant. Ethically, although norms are set forth, they are not represented as constituting a definite condition for membership in the remnant. There is no indication that being ethically superior would insure one's place in the remnant. It is rather presumed that the remnant will be ethically obedient, faithful and righteous.

#### j. Malachi

Although the Book of Malachi is bereft of relevant remnant vocabulary, it does contain valuable information regarding the understanding of the remnant in the Hebrew Bible. Malachi's teaching is a nationalistic appeal for individual faithfulness to the covenant. At the end-times, not all Israelites will be saved: only those who serve God

will be spared:

". . . Then once more you shall distinguish between the righteous and the wicked, between one who serves God and one who does not serve him.

"For behold, the day comes, burning like an oven, when all the arrogant and all evildoers will be stubble; the day that comes shall burn them up, says the Lord of hosts, so that it will leave them neither root nor branch. But for you who fear my name the sun of righteousness shall rise, with healing in its wings. You shall go forth leaping like calves from the stall. And you shall tread down the wicked, for they will be ashes under the soles of your feet, on the day when I act, says the Lord of host. . . ." (3.18-4.3; Heb 3.13-21)

The righteous will be saved but because of their righteousness. There is no promise that, regardless of the individual's actions, nevertheless a remnant of Israel will be spared. In Malachi, the determinant is the faithfulness of the person, not the all-merciful grace of the Lord. "If Israel will but discharge its obligation to the full, Yahweh may be counted upon to fulfil all his promises made through the prophets."<sup>110</sup>

---

<sup>110</sup> John Merlin Powis Smith (Hinckley G. Mitchell, John Merlin Powis Smith, Julius A. Bewer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi and Jonah, ICC, [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912]), p. 13.

If no faithful can be found "on that day", then there is no promise of a remnant and one could easily assume that there would be none. This problem is in part dealt with in the last verse of the book:

"Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the great and terrible day of the Lord comes. And he will turn the hearts of fathers to their children and the hearts of children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the land with a curse." (4.5-6; Heb 3.23-24)

According to these verses, the land is deserving of total destruction and yet there will be some spared through the actions of Elijah. J. M. P. Smith notes a difference in view between 4.1-3 (Heb 3.19-21) and 4.5-6 (Heb 3.23-24):

. . . they apparently take a different view of the day from that presented in vv. 1-3. There, no work of preparation seems to have been contemplated. The conditions on earth are well defined. Society falls into two classes the godly and the ungodly. All that is needed is the overthrow of the latter and the exaltation of the former. Here, all classes seem to be regarded as deserving of destruction. There are no hard and fast, sharply defined moral and spiritual lines between classes. A preliminary work of purification is needed in order to avert a total destruction

on Yahweh's day.<sup>111</sup>

In his haste to find an interpolation, Smith ignores the possibility of a sequential explanation. The definitiveness will be the result of Elijah's appearance which will obviously precede the destruction of the evil. Although the remnant is not specifically mentioned, can there be any doubt that it was a desire to insure some survivors that prompted such a verse? Thus, even a prophet who championed individualism as the key to salvation, includes a mollifying stance that protects Israel from total annihilation and must be interpreted as traditionally remnant oriented.

---

<sup>111</sup>Smith, Malachi, p. 82.

### 3. General Conclusions Regarding Remnant in the Nebiim

The most important contribution made to the remnant motif by the prophets was the interweaving of remnant and eschatology. This gave the concept a three dimensional outlook: one could have been saved from a past catastrophe, one could look forward to some being saved from a future, imminent, historical disaster or one could now look forward to some being saved at the eschaton. This new dimension, in its embryonic stage, still lacks a thorough resolution. There is little discussion of when exactly it will be formed and what its function and future would be at the eschaton. These further developments are left for the later writers whom we shall examine.

In the prophets the remnant as the purified Israel becomes increasingly important as prophet after prophet emphasizes the present corruption being supplanted by faithfulness--a process brought about by the removal of all corruption with the resultant remnant being pure and faithful.

In the prophets, we have seen the conception of the remnant as a corporate group, with the individuals unspecified, being slowly supplanted by increased focus on the individual. For the first time, there has been self-designation of an individual as a remnant before the fact--Elijah--though even here the remnant is historical

and somewhat off the mark (Elijah was not alone). There has, however, been no claim to eschatological remnant status--all the righteous are but proleptic representatives of an eschatological remnant.

The question is now whether Israel will be the remnant or whether the remnant will be from Israel. In either case, the remnant is intimately associated with the promise of God--it is the remnant that is the true Israel, the seed of Abraham, the chosen of God.



### C. Remnant in the Kethubim

The third section of the Hebrew Bible, the "Writings", contains few references to the remnant idea and, of these, only two have any relevance to the present study: Daniel and Ezra 9. The Book of Daniel illustrates an apocalyptic approach to the treatment of the remnant and is, therefore, quite valuable for our later investigations. Ezra 9.1-15 is ear-marked by three occurrences of the פליטה . This passage is significant because it unites the past remnant with the possibility of a future remnant in a threat against the continued existence of Israel.

#### 1. Daniel

Daniel<sup>1</sup> envisaged history in much the same way as

---

<sup>1</sup>Daniel, in the apocalyptic tradition, is actually pseudonymous. On the apocalyptic in Daniel, vide James A. Montgomery, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Book of Daniel, ICC (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927), pp. 80-82; John J. Collins, The Apocalyptic Vision of The Book of Daniel, HSM 16 (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1977).

The second half of the Book of Daniel, i.e. chpts. 7-12, is to be considered a unity. John J. Collins, in his defense of the unity of the chapters has noted:

"We also proceed on the assumption that chs. 7-12 constitute a unity. The unity of chs. 8-12 is generally accepted. A number of scholars have argued that ch. 7 stands apart from the rest, as it is written in Aramaic and the other chapters are written in Hebrew. No fully satisfactory solution to the problem of the two languages in the Book of Daniel can be found. However,

did the prophets: history is Heilsgeschichte which God will consummate with a judgment which will separate those faithful to the Lord from those who are unfaithful.

Daniel's understanding of history is best seen in the prayer of chapter 9<sup>2</sup> in which the past history of

it is clear that ch. 7 and ch. 8 at least describe the same events and originated at very nearly the same time. In view of the similarity of their imagery it is most likely that they were written by the same author. Accordingly such parallels as we find between ch. 7 and the later parts of the book are of primary importance for the understanding of that chapter." ("The Son of Man and The Saints of the Most High in the Book of Daniel", JBL, 93 [1, 1974], 54)

In the footnotes, Collins notes the problems associated with the prayer in Chapter 9. Further, he points out H. L. Ginsburg (Studies In Daniel [New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1948]) does not accept the unity of chpts. 8-12 but was effectively refuted by H. H. Rowley ("The Unity of the Book of Daniel", HUCA, 23 [1950-1951], 233-237).

The discussion of Daniel before other works obviously written earlier than Daniel is necessary to adhere to the methodological plan adopted for this study and does not affect the conclusions reached through the study.

<sup>2</sup>Chapter 9 is a peshet on Jer 25.11-14 and Jer 29.10. Vide, André Lacocque, The Book of Daniel, E.t. by David Pellauer (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979), p. 177; Norman W. Porteous, Daniel: A Commentary, OTL (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965), p. 134; Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. DiLella, The Book of Daniel, AB (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1973), pp. 245-247; 249-253 passim.

There is serious scholarly question concerning the integrity of Daniel 9. Verses 4-20, Daniel's prayer, seem to be an addition, if not an interpolation, based upon both literary and theological evidence (J. Collins, Apocalyptic Vision, pp. 20f.; vide, also, pp. 185-189; Lacocque, Daniel, pp. 178-187, passim; André Lacocque, "The Liturgical Prayer in Daniel 9," HUCA, 47 [1976], 119-142; Hartman, Daniel, pp. 245f.). Lacocque ("Liturgical Prayer", p. 141) has convincingly argued that ". . . the prayer at the core of

Israel's interaction with God is summarized. In this prayer,

---

Daniel 9 is a liturgical piece composed in Jerusalem during the time of the Exile, more specifically between 587 and 538 B.C.E. Vide, also, Hartman, Daniel, pp. 248f. This, however, does not solve the question of whether the material is an addition by the author or a later interpolation. The more relevant question, however, is the passage's usefulness in determining the theological stance in the book of Daniel. Collins (Apocalyptic Vision, p. 20), in accepting the prayer as a "traditional piece, not something composed especially for the content" rules out its use in any theological discussion of the book: "It is not legitimate to use the content of the prayer as a source for the theology of the book". This conclusion is not adequately substantiated. Collins seems, at least in this chapter of his book, to rely upon the arguments proving the prayer to be a secondary addition to prove also that it has no theological relationship with the rest of Daniel. The only pertinent argument is that "The sense of ch. 9 as a whole is not disrupted if we omit the prayer and pass from vs. 3 to vs. 21" (p. 20). Later, in an excursus on the prayer (pp. 185ff.), Collins further argues that the contrast between the prayer's Deuteronomic view of history and the book's apocalyptic view makes it clear the prayer was added by a redactor "who believed in the Deuteronomic view of history and felt this prayer was appropriate for Daniel" (p. 187).

Lacocque ("Liturgical Prayer"), while agreeing that the prayer is a traditional piece (119) and further agreeing that "the confession of sin on behalf of all 'Israel' in Daniel 9 appears to conflict with the selective outlook of the rest of the book" (121, emphasis mine), nevertheless sees the resolution in the liturgical and ritual use of the material. Instead of the contradiction which Collins sees between Deuteronomic and apocalyptic, Lacocque understands this as an example of the changing use of material:

" . . . there is a direct relationship between, not only the genre but also the content of the prayer, on the one hand, and the angelic response to Daniel on the other hand. For now, the original deuteronomic setting of the prayer has been replaced by an apocalyptic setting, a passage almost poles apart! The petitioning Apocalyptician had no intention whatsoever to 'change the purpose of God,' for that purpose is nothing but the vindication of Israel. As the prayer clearly indicates (see especially verses 17-19), the point was precisely to remind YHWH of His purpose, so that it

God is addressed as "great and terrible" (9.4)<sup>3</sup> but in particular as He "who keepeth covenant and steadfast love<sup>4</sup> with those who love him and keep his commandments" (9.4). Here a keynote is struck: God, in whom b<sup>e</sup>rit and hesed have been joined in perpetuum, seeks out those who do likewise. One must be righteous to be loved by God and righteousness consists of love of God and obedience to the

would not be further delayed. As can be expected in a book concerned with eschatology, the conception expressed in Dan 9 is germane to messianic expectation. The Judaic tradition makes clear that the coming of the eschaton is impeded by Israel's infidelity. The true respect of one sabbath would open the door to the Son of David. Daniel therefore (acting as representative of Israel) confesses his sin and that of his people, in order to remove the last obstacle on God's road to the vindication of Israel and the chastisement of the nations." (123, emphasis original)

The prayer, therefore, introduces the vision in verses 24-27 by providing the theological reason for the punishment of Israel. Furthermore, it explains why the time prophesied by Jeremiah has been so prolonged. Hence it is not an interpolation but an addition by the author which fits integrally into the book. (128, vide, also, Porteous, Daniel, p. 136)

<sup>3</sup>Of. Deut 7.21.

<sup>4</sup>Contra Hartman (The Book of Daniel) who translates this phrase as "you who loyally keep your covenant" (237) based upon "a hendiadys in Hebrew, literally, 'keeper of the covenant (b<sup>e</sup>rit) and loyalty (hesed)'" (241). Hartman's translation, however, fails to recognize the parallelism between the two halves of the verse. It is through this parallelism that the author declares the relationship between God and His people and sets forth the criteria attendant to that relationship.

commandments.

Daniel then looks at Israel's relationship with God and how Israel measures up to the criterion of righteousness. Israel has "sinned", "done wrong", "acted wickedly", "rebelled" and ignored the commandments, the prophets and God (9.5-6).<sup>5</sup> Daniel confesses that "All Israel has transgressed thy law and turned aside, refusing to obey thy voice" (9.11). Even Daniel himself is guilty (9.20). The inclusion of Daniel himself among those who have sinned makes it obvious that "all Israel" is an inclusive, not an exclusive term--all Israel means all Israelites. Notwithstanding this, Daniel's speaking of the prayer is sufficient proof that Daniel understands himself and the other penitents as no longer sinners.<sup>6</sup> As a result of Israel's sins, in His righteousness, God has brought upon Israel "a great calamity" (9.12) which has been more than deserved. Daniel, however, seeks the mercy of God, realizing that any remission of punishment would be due entirely to God: ". . . for we do not present our supplications before thee on the ground of

---

<sup>5</sup>The disloyalty of the people is heightened "because the people and their rulers all down the generations had been warned by prophets sent by Yahweh" (Porteous, Daniel, p. 137).

<sup>6</sup>On the liturgical and ritualistic aspects of the prayer in Daniel 9, vide, Lacocque, "Liturgical Prayer", p. 121. Note, also, that in 9.24 one of the pre-requisites for the end coming is the atonement for iniquity.

our righteousness, but on the ground of thy great mercy" (9.18).

In answer to his prayer and confession, Gabriel reveals to Daniel that the messianic kingdom is imminent and will come after only another half week (9.27).<sup>7</sup> At the end of this time righteousness will be victorious and iniquity will be destroyed. It is important to note that the destruction of wickedness includes not only foreign evil but also the evil within Israel (9.24, 27). During this entire period, there will be confusion and destruction: an anointed will be removed, Jerusalem will be sacked, there will be war, desolation and flood (9.26), and some Jews will defect from God's covenant and make another covenant with a prince (9.27).

The result, however, will be the Kingdom of God in which the righteous shall be exalted. At the judgment, "your [Daniel's] people shall be delivered, every one whose name shall be found written in the book"<sup>8</sup> (12.1). The saved, that is, those written in the book, are those Israelites

---

<sup>7</sup>Jeremiah's "seventy years" before the coming of the kingdom (25.11-14) were understood by Daniel as "seventy weeks of years" (9.24).

<sup>8</sup>"In the Persian Empire it had been customary to keep a register of citizens, and in the O. T. there appears the idea of a register of the members of the theocratic community on earth, from which for cause a name might be blotted out (Exod 32:32ff.; Ps 69:28; Isa 4:3; cf. Mal 3:16;

whose actions have caused them to be numbered among the faithful:

He [Antiochus IV Epiphanes] shall seduce with flattery those who violate the covenant; but the people who know their God shall stand firm and take action. And those among the people who are wise shall make many understand, though they shall fall by sword and flame, by captivity and plunder, for some days. When they fall, they shall receive a little help. And many shall join themselves to them with flattery; and some of those who are wise shall fall, to refine and to cleanse them and to make them white, until the time of the end, for it is yet for the time appointed.

(11.32-35)

The purpose of the persecution seems to have been to purify Israel; so that the Saints of the Most High, the faithful Israelites,<sup>9</sup> might receive ad aeternum the kingdom (7.18),

---

Ezek 13:9; Phil 4:3; Rev 3:5; Enoch 104:1; 108:3; Jubilees 30:20ff.)." (Gerald Kennedy, "Exposition of The Book Of Daniel", in The Interpreter's Bible, edited by George Arthur Buttrick, VI [New York: Abingdon Press, 1956], 541)

<sup>9</sup>The relationship and identification of the "saints", "the saints of the Most High", "the people of the saints of the Most High", "the people of the saints" and "the one in human likeness" have been the topics of numerous scholarly publications. The in depth examination by Alexander A. DiLella ("The One in Human Likeness and the Holy Ones of the Most High in Daniel 7", CBQ, 39 [1, 1977], 1-19) leaves little doubt that all of these terms refer to "faithful Israel responsive to the demands of the reign of God even in

their final reward for their steadfastness and faithfulness. Daniel's people over whom Michael has charge (12.1a) has been narrowed and delineated: "your people" (12.1a) has become "your people. . . everyone whose name shall be found written in the book" (12.1b). Yet, it is noteworthy that the final group retains the original appellation "your people". It is obvious, therefore, that all Israel will be delivered; but that, by all Israel, is meant a remnant from Israel,<sup>10</sup> those who were faithful, hence saved.<sup>11</sup> The wicked have forfeited their place in God's people. One further piece of data can be gleaned from the verses from chapter 11 quoted above: the ranks of the saints close only at the final consummation and one cannot be guaranteed membership in that eschatological community until one's faithfulness has been eternally sealed either at death or at the end. The warning is clear

---

the face of their present humiliation and suffering" (p. 19). For additional information on "the saints", cf. G. F. Hasel, "The Identity of 'The Saints of the Most High' in Daniel 7", Biblica, 56 (1975), pp. 173-192; V. S. Poythress, "The Holy Ones of the Most High in Dan VII," VT, 26 (2, 1976), 208-213.

<sup>10</sup>Hartman, Daniel, pp. 306-307.

<sup>11</sup>Nickelsburg (Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life In Intertestamental Judaism, HTS XXVI [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972], p. 16) identifies the two groups "from the specific historical situation reflected in Daniel. In the eyes of a Hasidic Jew of 167 B.C., the wicked were those who had compromised their Judaism and adopted the Hellenistic way of life. The righteous had been steadfast, even in the face of Antiochus' persecution."



and definite: ". . . some of those who are wise will fall" (11.33). One suspects, however, that the author and those he has labeled as "faithful" consider themselves prime candidates for election.

Central to the theology of the Book of Daniel is the resolution of the problem: What judgment is there for the dead. The years of persecution had meant that some righteous had fallen (11.33) and that some apostates had yet to receive God's wrath. Not only did justice demand an answer but the exhortation of the remaining faithful hinged on an adequate response:

Those Israelites who have perished will be judged:

. . . many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. (12.2-3)

God's justice will reach beyond the grave and judgment will be passed upon those resurrected. Who, however, will participate in this resurrection? The beginnings of the answer are to be found in the thrust of the Book of Daniel. The author was concerned with encouraging his fellow sufferers to continue in their faith. To this end, he wished to paint the glorious picture of the final victory when God's saints will be rewarded and justice will prevail. With this mind-set, he addressed the role of those who have already died. Certainly, this group includes only the Israelites. The fate of the Gentile is not at issue; the

final consummation is the vindication of Israel. As for the Israelites who have died, the author is concerned with both the faithful and the apostate. The faithful dead must be rewarded to give credibility to the justice of God and to exhort the present faithful to persist in spite of the persecution; the apostates must be punished to vindicate the justice of God. Hence, the "many" who will rise "at that time" (12.1) are the Israelites who have perished. Gentiles are not to be taken into account.<sup>12</sup> Furthermore, the reward or punishment meted out will be individual, not communal.

---

<sup>12</sup>Porteous, Daniel, pp. 170-171; Lacocque, Daniel, pp. 244-245; Hartman, Daniel, pp. 307-309. Vide, also, Nickelsburg, Resurrection, p. 19, who points out:

"The Danielic resurrection belief answers a religious need in the Hasidic community in which the Book of Daniel arose. Particularly in focus in Antiochus' persecution were the deaths of many Hasidic Jews. These deaths presented a specific theological problem. These Jews had died precisely because they had willfully chosen to obey the Torah. Thus their piety was the cause of their death. Conversely the Hellenizing Jews had saved their lives by what the Hasidic Jews considered to be a gross disobedience of the Torah. Thus piety caused death, and disobedience led to life. Clearly this confounded the standard Israelite canons of justice and retribution. Resurrection to life, on the one hand, and to punishment, on the other, was an answer to this problem. It is not surprising that this answer is explicitly given in a book whose central concern is the Antiochan persecution and which was written before the persecution had abated, while the problem still continued to manifest itself. Resurrection is asserted in Daniel because it is an answer to a problem that was of serious and existential concern to the readers of this book."

It is now possible to define further the "saints of the Most High". They are the "people who know their God" (11.32), they "who are wise" (11.33) and who "make many (rabbim) understand" (11.33). They are the maskilim who have had the duty of instructing the rabbim. Some of these maskilim will fall (11.35) but those who endure will be members of the "saints". Some of the instructed (rabbim) will also obtain membership in the "saints": those who are made to understand by the maskilim. Hence, the "saints" consist of the faithful maskilim and the faithful rabbim. The elect are defined, therefore, by wisdom and understanding;<sup>13</sup> one must do more than not violate the covenant.

In chapter 12, when the author speaks of the resurrection, those "who are wise shall shine like the brightness of the firmament; and those who turn many to righteousness, like the stars for ever and ever" (12.3). Though the exact mode is debatable, it is obvious that the maskilim are distinguished from the rabbim.<sup>14</sup>

Daniel looked forward to the establishment of the Kingdom of God "which shall never be destroyed" and which shall destroy all other kingdoms (2.44).<sup>15</sup> Those who inhabit

---

<sup>13</sup>Vide, Collins, Vision, p. 168.

<sup>14</sup>Lacocque, Daniel, p. 245.

<sup>15</sup>Vide, also, 7.11.

the kingdom are the "saints of the Most High" (7.18) and, according to v. 27, are the faithful among the Jews.<sup>16</sup>

"Every evil force should be overthrown, and all that exalted itself against God should be cast out. The kingdom should therefore endure for ever, just because it should contain within itself no seed of disintegration."<sup>17</sup>

In Daniel, we find a world whose salvation is utterly dependent upon God. He alone can make order out of the chaos that man has created, without him even the chosen people face extinction. Not all will be saved, however. Only those who are righteous will be assisted by God, but they can expect to be the citizens of the new kingdom, the Kingdom of God, which shall never be destroyed; for it will be totally pure. Destruction is the fruit of the unfaithful and when they are uprooted destruction will be eradicated. Furthermore, not only will the living faithful participate in this kingdom but also those who have died will be participants just as the unfaithful dead shall be punished along with the unfaithful living. Though important, this resurrectional phase of Daniel's thought is so embryonic that it remains unclear in many aspects. Suffice it to say that

---

<sup>16</sup>Porteous, Daniel, pp. 115-116.

<sup>17</sup>H. H. Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic (London: Lutterworth Press, 1963), p. 55.

the righteous Jews, living and dead, will inherit the Kingdom of God and will live in bliss and happiness forever and that the apostates, living and dead, will receive their just punishment.

That we have remnant theology presented in Daniel becomes evident when we examine the course of the final days. All men are threatened with destruction and it is only the mercy of God that saves a portion of the people--those who have been faithful to God. This portion or remnant is then promised the inheritance of God--the Kingdom.

## 2. Ezra: The Problem Over Mixed Marriages (9.1-15)

The leaders of the Israelites reported to Ezra that the purity of the "holy race" had been tarnished by the intermarriage of Israelites and foreigners (9.2);<sup>18</sup> this was interpreted as a sign of the "faithlessness of the returned exiles" (9.4). Ezra then prays to God, reviewing the unfaithfulness of Israel's past relationship with the Lord:

"O my God, I am ashamed and blush to lift my face to thee, my God, for our iniquities have risen higher than our heads, and our guilt has mounted up to the heavens. From the days of our fathers

---

<sup>18</sup>On intermarriage, vide, Jacob M. Myers, Ezra-Nehemiah, AB (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1965), p. 76.

to this day we have been in great guilt; . . . ."

(9.6-7)

Ezra, continuing his prayer, interprets the exile as punishment for the sin of the nation, but expresses guarded hope through the existence of a remnant which obviously consists of those Israelites who now reside in Jerusalem and Judah (9.9):

" . . . But now for a brief moment favor has been shown by the Lord our God, to leave us a remnant ( להשאיר לנו פליטה ), and to give us a secure hold within his holy place, that our God may brighten our eyes and grant us a little reviving in our bondage. . . ."

(9.8)

The remnant to which Ezra referred was saved by the mercy of the Lord from the punishment of the exile, but now, according to Ezra, the Israelites have again broken the commandments by intermarrying with foreigners and, thereby, compromising the purity of the holy race (9.10-12). This further disobedience has seriously threatened the continued existence of the remnant:

" . . . And after all that has come upon us for our evil deeds and for our great guilt, seeing that thou, our God, hast punished us less than our iniquities deserved and hast given us such a remnant as this, shall we break thy commandments again and intermarry with the peoples who practice these abominations?

Wouldst thou not be angry with us till thou wouldst consume us, so that there should be no remnant, nor any to escape ( לאין שארית ופליטה )? O Lord the God of Israel, thou art just, for we are left a remnant that has escaped ( כִּי-נִשְׁאָרוּ פְּלִיטָה ), as at this day. Behold, we are before thee in our guilt, for none can stand before thee because of this." (9.13-15)

This consideration that even the remnant is under judgment indicates that the remnant in the eyes of this author is certainly not secure in itself. Furthermore, the remnant is not to be considered those who are to be saved at the end time. The remnant is a here and now doctrine which looks back upon the action which precipitated its creation and yet must look at the present for the actions which will insure its continued existence. The significance of this passage lies in the inter-weaving of Mosaic and prophetic ideas.<sup>19</sup> The writer is a member of the remnant but there have been other remnants. Indeed, despite the unfaithfulness of Israel which often merited total annihilation, God, in His mercy and faithfulness, has always left some survivors. The question is ultimately: How long will God continue to do this? Could this present abomination not be the final one? These questions are, however, predicated

---

<sup>19</sup>Myers, Ezra, p. 79.

upon the presupposition that the existence of a remnant is not automatic. Each time the mercy and justice of God must determine whether or not Israel will continue to exist. There is no ego-centricity in this passage. There is no certainty. Ezra is pleading for the hesed of the Lord with full knowledge that this time he might not succeed.



## Conclusions

Our purpose in chapter one has been twofold: first, to identify events and individuals who were considered to be remnants in the Hebrew Bible; and, secondly, to determine the meaning(s) and significance of the remnant idea in the Hebrew Bible. Both of these goals will provide reference points for further research. The first will help to identify later occurrences of the remnant motif and the second will provide us with a control for the discussion of the remnant concepts of later authors both by identifying remnant consciousness and by pointing up the uniqueness of a certain author regarding the remnant.

In a brief conclusion such as this, it would be repetitive and quite tedious to attempt to summarize thoroughly either of our goals. The identification of remnant "touchstones" occurs on practically every page of the chapter and the meaning and significance of the motif can best be found through the summaries in the chapter.

There are, however, some general comments which can be rather briefly set forth. The remnant is integrally related to the Heilsgeschichte of God. It is God's faithfulness which allows a remnant to be saved and the remnant is consequently a testimony to God's saving activity in the world. The remnant may be from a past disaster or from some future, historical catastrophe; but "everywhere, always, and without exception, the remnant is defined by

judgment".<sup>1</sup> Most significantly, however, the remnant may also be linked with eschatology, in which case it becomes the community of the end-time. Regardless of its use, it is usually related to the covenant:

Through the covenant Israel was adopted as God's portion, consecrated and inviolable, and Israel bound itself to his will in the covenantal stipulations. When the nation breached these stipulations, it fell under the wrath. But the judgment that followed was no final repudiation by Yahweh. On the contrary, the very judgment of Israel, like the judgment of Israel's enemies, was the act by which the covenant was reaffirmed. How? Through the remnant that survived.<sup>2</sup>

Because of the election and the covenant, God became Lord of Israel and His mercy, love and faithfulness became the cornerstone of remnant theology. There would always be a remnant--its type and size were negotiable--but its existence was fact.

It is extremely significant for our later study that no group ever called itself the eschatological remnant in

---

<sup>1</sup>Ben F. Meyer, "Jews and the Remnant of Israel", JBL, 84 (2, 1965), 127.

<sup>2</sup>Ben F. Meyer, The Church in Three Tenses (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1971), p. 34.

the Hebrew Bible. Indeed, when the Jerusalemites tried to do just that, they were mercilessly attacked by Ezekiel.

The eschatological remnant was important not only as the mitigation of God's righteous judgment but also as the nucleus of the new Israel. The prophets "saw the remnant of the nation rising out of the ruins of its past, and standing up to become a new people of God, a people purified and disciplined in order to fulfill faithfully the purpose of God".<sup>3</sup>

Finally, it should be noted we have also seen a number of new ideas beginning in the Hebrew Bible which will be more fully developed and systematized later. The question of the right of birth: how does being an Israelite relate to membership in the remnant? The question of the nation: who is to survive in the remnant--the nation of Israel or people from Israel? The question of universalism: can the righteous non-Jew expect to be a part of the remnant? The answer to these and other questions must wait until the examination of the apocrypha and the pseudepigrapha.

In conclusion, can one now posit a definition for the remnant based upon the Hebrew Bible? The remnant seems to be those who are saved from some catastrophe. Furthermore, they then by virtue of being spared, constitute the

---

<sup>3</sup>R. E. Clements, The Conscience of the Nation (Oxford: University Press, 1967), p. 97.

new group to which the potentiality of the original group has been passed. Thus, they are also the true group.

## CHAPTER II

## REMNANT IN SELECT APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

## INTRODUCTION

In the general introduction, three criteria were set forth for identifying Apocryphal<sup>1</sup> and Pseudepigraphical<sup>2</sup> texts relevant to this study: Palestinian origin, pre-70 C.E. dating and some remnant orientation. Five documents fit those criteria without qualification: The Wisdom of Ben Sirach, 1 Enoch (Ethiopic Enoch), The Book of Jubilees, The Testament of Moses and the Psalms of Solomon. Fragments of three of these texts have been discovered at Qumran: The Wisdom of Ben Sirach, 1 Enoch and The Book of Jubilees. These fragmentary finds confirm the appropriateness of these documents for a study such as this, although caution must

---

<sup>1</sup>The "Apocrypha" includes "only the extra writings in almost all Septuagint manuscripts, and not those in the Vulgate", i.e.: 2 Ezra (= 1 Esdras), Tobit, Judith, Additions to Esther, Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach, 1 Baruch, Letter of Jeremiah, the Prayer of Azariah with the Song of the Three Young Men, Susanna, Bel and the Dragon, 1 Maccabees, 2 Maccabees (Charlesworth, Pseudepigrapha, p. 19).

<sup>2</sup>The "Pseudepigrapha", following Charlesworth (Pseudepigrapha, p. 21), is defined by five criteria: "First, the work must be at least partially, and preferably totally, Jewish or Jewish Christian. Second, it should date from the period 200 B.C. to A.D. 200. Third, it should claim to be inspired. Fourth, it should be related in form or content to the Old Testament. Fifth, it ideally is attributed to an Old Testament figure, who often claims to be the speaker or author."

Charlesworth (p. 22) suggests a list of documents which conform to these criteria.

still be exercised in forming any conclusions based solely upon such finds lest the discovery of a fragment be overly interpreted. The Qumran scrolls have produced no copies, fragmentary or otherwise, of the Testament of Moses or the Psalms of Solomon. Scholars, however, have recognized the similarity of thought between these two texts and the Qumran literature.

The only possibly relevant inter-testamental document which is not examined in this chapter is the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Here, a full explanation is necessary. Critical Einleitung questions concerning the Testaments remain unresolved; indeed, theories remain polarized.<sup>3</sup> To solve these vexing issues demands a separate study. To validate thematic conclusions demands the solutions to these issues. A preliminary investigation of the Testaments,<sup>4</sup> however, has yielded no new or significant

---

<sup>3</sup>Vide the excellent history of research on the Testaments by H. Dixon Slingerland, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical History of Research, SBIMS 21 (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977). Cf. also H. J. deJonge, "Die Patriarchentestamente von Roger Bacon bis Richard Simon" in Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Text and Interpretation, ed. by M. deJonge, SVTP 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 3-42.

<sup>4</sup>The results of this preliminary investigation were presented to a convention of the Society of Biblical Literature, New York City (November 1979) under the title: "Remnant In The Inter-Testamental Period: A Study of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs". Neither the study nor the discussion following the presentation produced any new or significant data.

data on the remnant.<sup>5</sup> Further, the key introductory problem

---

<sup>5</sup>Qumran fragments have been discovered which relate to the Testaments, but fragments of the Testaments have not been found at Qumran:

"A fragment from Cave I and some more important pieces from Cave IV belong to an Aramaic Testament of Levi, with a text far longer than that of the Greek text in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, but identical with that of Aramaic fragments recovered half a century ago from the Cairo Geniza. There is, moreover, a Greek manuscript of the Testaments from the tenth century in the library of Mount Athos, which contains two long additions to the Testament of Levi, a prayer of Jacob and some sacrificial prescriptions. The Aramaic of both these long additions has been found at Qumran (fragments from Cave IV) and the second of them corresponds also to the Geniza manuscript.

Recently we have identified a second Testament, that of Naphtali, written in Hebrew. The first fragment contains the genealogy of Bilhah, and once again its text is longer than that of the corresponding section of the Greek Testament (1.6-12). Later sections of the work contain considerations on the end of days--a theme scarcely mentioned in the corresponding Greek Testament." (J. T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in The Wilderness of Judaea, E.t. by J. Strugnell, Studies In Biblical Theology [London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1959], p. 34)

Cf. also J. T. Milik, "Review of M. deJonge, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", RB, 62 (1955), 298; J. T. Milik, "Le Testament de Lévi en araméen: Fragment de la grotte 4 de Qumrân", RB, 62 (1955), 398-406; J. T. Milik, "'Prière de Nabonide' et autres écrits d'un cycle de Daniel. Fragments araméens de Qumrân," RB, 63 (1956), 407, n. 1, in which he concludes: "Il faut, par conséquent, nuancer ce que j'ai dit en RB, LXII, 1955, 406. Je crois pourtant pouvoir maintenir que les Testaments des Douze Patriarches n'existaient pas à l'époque préchrétienne, en Palestine du moins". Slingerland (Testaments, pp. 52, 96) notes:

"It is certainly significant for the origins question that this document does not appear among the Qumran finds. As indicated in the history of research, the assumption has arisen that the Testaments was found at Qumran. This is not true. What have been

is the identification of Jewish and Christian strands within the text, a sine qua non task for the use of any thematic conclusions in a study focused solely on either Jewish or Christian Tradition, a study such as this one. The preliminary investigation has indicated any proposed method would be open to such serious challenge, because of the inter-woven condition of the final text, as to invalidate any conclusions. The purpose of this study, remnant in the Qumran literature, would not be served by a disproportionately lengthy and unproductive tangent into the Testaments which would do no more than repeat the remnant understanding presented in the other inter-testamental documents and whose results would remain disputable.<sup>6</sup>

---

unearthed are fragments of Levi and Naphtali traditions, parts of which were well known at the beginning of this century. . . . In any case, and regardless of terminology, the point remains that neither the Testaments as a whole nor any testament within the Testaments has been found among the Dead Sea materials." (p. 96)

Vide H. C. Kee, "The Ethical Dimensions of the Testaments of the XII as a Clue to Provenance", NTS, 24 (2, 1978), 259-270; M. deJonge, "Once More: Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", NT, 5 (1962), 311-319; J. H. Charlesworth, "Reflections on the SNTS Pseudepigrapha Seminar at Duke on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", NTS, 23 (3, 1977), 296-304, especially the conclusions on p. 304.

<sup>6</sup>M. deJonge ("Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" in Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Text and Interpretation, ed. by M. deJonge, SVTP 3 [Leiden: Brill, 1975], 198) clearly recognized this difficulty:



Hence, the Testaments will not be included.

---

"In the interpretation of a writing with such a complicated history as the Testaments many conclusions will necessarily remain hypothetical, but it seems right to assume that a particular passage is Christian until clear evidence of the contrary is adduced. In other words: The burden of proof does not fall on him who assumes that a certain passage is Christian, but on the scholar who considers a passage Jewish or, more especially, Essene. I should like to repeat here what I wrote in 1957: 'The parallels in the Qumran documents are no doubt of great importance for the discovery of pre-Christian elements in the Testaments as well as for the illustration of their general background, but it is far more difficult to use material from the Testaments for the reconstruction of the views of the Qumran sect. At the most the Testaments may, sometimes, give corroborating evidence, viz. in those cases where conceptions found in them agree with those which may definitely be attributed to the members of the Qumran sect. And even then the literary and historical relationship cannot be defined exactly'."

A. Ben Sirach<sup>1</sup>

The "Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sirach"<sup>2</sup> was addressed to

<sup>1</sup>English quotations, except where otherwise noted, are from the Revised Standard Version of the Bible. The Hebrew text is that of M. S. Segal, Sefer Ben Sira Ha-Shalem (2nd ed.; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1959). Segal's text has been checked against that edited by Israel Lévi, The Hebrew Text of the Book of Ecclesiasticus, Semitic Study Series 3 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1904) and use has been made of S. Schechter and C. Taylor, The Wisdom of Ben Sira. Portions of the Book Ecclesiasticus (Cambridge: University Press, 1899). The Greek text is that edited by Alfred Rahlfs, Septuaginta, 2 vols. (6th ed.; Stuttgart: Privilig. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1959), II; pp. 377-471.

The English enumeration, except where otherwise noted, is that of the RSV; the Hebrew of Segal.

<sup>2</sup>Found not in the Hebrew Bible but in the Greek Bible; the "Wisdom of Ben Sirach", one of the apocryphal books, is recognized as canonical by Roman Catholics but not by Protestants or Jews. Its author has named himself (50.27; Heb 50.39): Shimeon ben Yeshua ben Eleazar ben Sira; that is, Simon, son of Jesus, son of Eleazar, son of Sira. "Simon" does not appear in the Greek text. G. H. Box and W. O. E. Oesterley ("The Book of Sirach" in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament; ed. by R. H. Charles [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913], I, 291-292; hereafter cited Box and Oesterley, "Sirach") claim "Simon" breaks the symmetry of the verse and, hence, was added. It may have been derived, they speculate, from the high priest's name (50.1). Schechter (Ben Sira, "Notes", p. 65) defends the Hebrew text noting Sirach may have been called Simon after the high priest "whose younger contemporary he was". Neither suggestion is more than speculation, but (with Martin Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism, E.t. by John Bowden [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974], II, p. 88, n. 182) "the decisive thing is that the grandson renders the name of his grandfather 'Jesus' in the prologue; 50.27 is to be corrected from here".

The text traditionally has been known in Hebrew as "Hokmat ben Sira", in Greek as "The Wisdom of Jesus son of Sirach" and in Latin as "Ecclesiasticus". The Latin title's original significance is somewhat mysterious although the title was applied "in the early Church to entire groups of

the author's contemporaries and concerned current problems;

---

books now called 'deuterocanonical'" (John L. McKenzie, Dictionary of the Bible [New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1965; London: Collier Macmillan Publishers, 1965], p. 89) and, when later applied restrictively to this book, may have had liturgical or canonical connotations (vide Bruce Vawter, The Book of Sirach, Pamphlet Bible Series 40 & 41 [New York: Paulist Press, 1962], I, p. 9; D. deBruyne, "Le prologue, le titre et la finale de l'Ecclésiastique", ZAW, 47 [1929], 260-261).

The date of the author's literary activity is almost universally agreed: The translator, the grandson of the author, according to The Prologue, came "to Egypt in the thirty-eighth year of Euergetes", in 132 B.C.E. Since Ptolemy Physcon VII Euergetes II reigned 170-164 and 145-117 B.C.E. (Ptolemy III was also called Euergetes but reigned only 25 years, 247-222 B.C.E., and could not be a nominee) and, allowing for two generations, Ben Sira's date must be within the first third of the second century and before the Antiochan persecution (168 B.C.E.) to which he does not allude: Further the author eulogizes a high priest, Simon (50.1-24), whom he seems to have actually seen but who was now dead, presumably Simon II, 226-199 B.C.E. (Simon I was high priest 300-287 B.C.E.). These two datings coincide approximately, placing the composition of Ben Sirach between 190-175 B.C.E. (vide Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism, I, p. 131; Israel Lévi, "The Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach", JE, 11, 389; Box and Oesterley, "Sirach", pp. 293-294).

The original language was Hebrew. Until 1896, the text was preserved only in Greek and Syriac. Hebrew fragments of four manuscripts, covering approximately two-thirds of the book, were then discovered by Solomon Schechter in the Cairo Genizah (vide Schechter and Taylor, Wisdom, pp. v-x), and a fragment of a fifth manuscript by Joseph Marcus ("A Fifth Manuscript of Ben Sira", JQR, 21 [1930-1931], 223-240). Other fragmentary finds followed (vide Alexander A. DiLella, The Hebrew Text of Sirach, Studies In Classical Literature 1 [London, The Hague and Paris: Mouton & Co., 1966], pp. 15-16; on the authenticity of the Hebrew text, vide DiLella, Hebrew Text; Alexander A. DiLella, "Authenticity of the Geniza Fragments of Sirach", Bib, 44 [1963], 171-200). Two fragments (6.14-15 or 1.19-20; 6.20-31) have been discovered at Qumran (vide M. Baillet; J. T. Milik, R. deVaux, Les 'petites grottes' de Qumrân, DJD 3 [2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962], pp. 75-77, with Plate XV). On the relationship between the Qumran community and Ben Sirach, vide Jean Carmignac, "Les Rappports entre L'Ecclésiastique et Qumrân", RQ, 3 (1961-1962), 209-218;

yet, it is deeply rooted in the past. Ben Sirach saw in history the activity of God as well as paradigms of correct thinking and right action to be emulated and examples of incorrect thinking and wrong action to be avoided.<sup>3</sup> His answers to the questions of his time must be understood against the background of this historical mind set.

What was, if any, Ben Sirach's remnant understanding depends to great extent upon his perception of Hebrew Bible remnant. Fortunately, this is readily accessible through an examination of chapters 44-50.24, the "Praise for Israel's Past".

There are two specific references to the remnant, to Noah and to Joshua and Caleb. Neither application is startling.

Noah:<sup>4</sup>

. . . the righteous was found blameless;

In the season of destruction he

---

M. R. Lehmann, "Ben Sira and the Qumran Literature", RQ, 3 (1961-1962), 103-116; Alexander A. DiLella, "Qumran and the Geniza Fragments of Sirach", CBQ, 24 (1962), 245-267; J. Priest, "Ben Sira 45, 25 in the Light of the Qumran Literature", RQ, 5 (1964-1965), 111-118.

<sup>3</sup>Vide 2.10; R. T. Siebeneck, "May their Bones Return to Life!--Sirach's Praise of the Fathers", CBQ, 21 (1959) 424-427; Alexander A. DiLella, "Conservative and Progressive Theology: Sirach and Wisdom", CBQ, 28 (1966) 141.

<sup>4</sup>Translation of Box and Oesterley, "Sirach", here following the Hebrew.

became the continuator;<sup>5</sup>

For his sake there was a remnant ( נִרְצָוּ; κατάλειμμα ),

And by reason of the covenant

with him the Flood ceased.

By an eternal sign (God) concluded it with him,

not to destroy (again) all flesh.

(44.17-18; Heb 44.20-22)

Noah is held up as a model of righteousness.<sup>6</sup> There is more, however. Righteousness does not remain unanswered--good things happen to the righteous. Righteousness is rewarded. Hence, Noah became "the continuator". Noah is chosen and a

<sup>5</sup> " הַיְחִי " is best understood as a noun from the Hip'il of the root הָיָה . Its translation, therefore, must connote a declarative causative (vide E. Kautzsch, Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, 2nd English Edition rev. & tr. by A. E. Cowley [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910], p. 144) of "pass on or away, pass through" (BDB, p. 322) and, hence, should be translated along similar lines of "continuator", "renewer" (Box and Oesterley, "Sirach", p. 483) or the "scion" (Jerusalem Bible) which reflects the meaning of the verbal form in Job 14.7, 29.20. The Greek text has, " ἀντάλλαγμα ", which means "that which is given in exchange" (A Greek-English Lexicon, compiled by Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, rev. by Henry Stuart Jones [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961], p. 149) and is probably due to a mis-interpreted over-emphasis upon the substitution, replacement connotation in the Hebrew root to such degree that the continuation idea is seriously undermined.

<sup>6</sup>Cf. Siebeneck, "May their Bones", p. 422; John G. Snaith, Ecclesiasticus or The Wisdom of Jesus Son of Sirach, The Cambridge Bible Commentary: New English Bible [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974], p. 218; Thomas H. Weber, "Sirach" in The Jerome Biblical Commentary, ed. by Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer and Roland E. Murphy [2 vols. in 1; Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968], 553.

remnant will survive. Further, the covenant is related to the election and to the remnant. Here, the eternal sign seems to be interpreted as God's promise "Not to destroy all flesh".<sup>7</sup> For the author of Ben Sirach, the remnant will always exist because of the election which is formalized in the covenant.

The second specific reference to the remnant is to Joshua and Caleb (46.8). According to Ben Sirach, they "restrained the people from sin" (46.7):

And these two alone were preserved (  $\lambda\beta\alpha\mu\alpha\iota$ ; <sup>8</sup> $\delta\epsilon\iota\sigma\omega\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$  )  
 out of six hundred thousand people on foot,  
 to bring them into their inheritance,  
 into a land flowing with milk and honey.

(46.8; Heb 46.14)

The loyalty of Joshua and Caleb (46.7) kept the people from returning to Egypt (Num 14.4), and resulted in Joshua's and Caleb's designation as the remnant (Num 14.30). In addition to being excluded from the condemnation pronounced upon those who left Egypt, Caleb, according to Ben Sirach, is given strength "so that he went up to the hill country, and his

<sup>7</sup>This is a natural extension of the promise of Gen 9.11. The Greek text adds  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa\lambda\upsilon\sigma\mu\omega$  to conform to the Genesis reading. The Hebrew is a combination of Gen 9.11 and 9.17 and reflects the later Midrashic position Gen. Rab., : Vayera, 49.9 (Gen I, 429).

<sup>8</sup>The Hebrew root  $\lambda\beta\alpha$  means to "set apart"; here, as indicated by Num 14.30, it means "preserved" reflecting the Greek text.

children obtained it for an inheritance":

so that all the sons of Israel might see  
that it is good to follow the Lord.

(46.10)

For Ben Sirach, the past remnant is a clear message to the present Israel that the Lord rewards good.

The traditional remnant occurrences in the stories of the flood and the unsuccessful southern attack of Canaan are two examples, among many others, of "famous men" (44.1), "men of mercy, whose righteous deeds have not been forgotten" (44.10), models for their children (44.12) and proof that wisdom lies in the congregation of Israel (44.15).<sup>9</sup> These remnant references, therefore, are included not primarily because of their remnant content but because of the righteous deeds described.<sup>10</sup> Care must be exercised, therefore, lest their remnant significance be over emphasized.

Embedded in Ben Sirach's perception of Israel there is a deep belief that Israel will endure:

Their posterity will continue for ever,

<sup>9</sup>Weber, "Sirach", p. 553.

<sup>10</sup>Contra Siebeneck, ("May their Bones", p. 423) who over-emphasizes the importance of Noah as a remnant.

and their glory<sup>11</sup> will not be blotted out.<sup>12</sup>

(44.13; Heb 44.16)

The reference here is to the famous men whose "descendants stand by the covenants; their children also, for their sake" (44.12) and whose posterity is righteous.

For Ben Sirach, Israel will never be "blotted out"; a remnant will always exist:

But the Lord will never give up his mercy,

nor cause any of his works to perish;<sup>13</sup>

he will never blot out (ἐξαλείψῃ)<sup>14</sup> the descendants  
of his chosen one,

nor destroy the posterity of him who loved him;<sup>15</sup>

so he gave a remnant (κατάλειμμα) to Jacob,

<sup>11</sup> Hebrew text has צדקת where Greek has ἡ δόξα; "righteousness" as opposed to "glory".

<sup>12</sup> Text defective. Segal reconstructs ל]א תשח; Levi ל]א תשח. Greek text has ἐξαλειφθήσεται, "wipe out" which carries the meanings of both Hebrew suggestions. The intent seems clear: to wipe out whether as in blotting out or forgetting.

<sup>13</sup> Hebrew: "nor did he allow any of his words to fall to the ground".

<sup>14</sup> Hebrew text defective. Segal reconstructs the verse: לא [יכריח לבהיר] ניין; Levi has לא [יכריח] ניין. Both reconstructions conform to the Greek text.

<sup>15</sup> Hebrew text reconstructed by Segal: ונכח [ואחב] ין; לא ישמיר; by Levi ונכח [וזרע אחב] ניין לא ישמיר. Essentially, they agree.



and to David a root of his stock.<sup>16</sup>

(47.22; Heb 47.21-23)

Ben Sirach understands that even in spite of sin (47.21;<sup>17</sup> Heb 47.20) Israel will not be utterly destroyed (47.22), but this deeply rooted conviction does not preclude judgment:

Then the prophet Elijah arose like a fire,

and his word burned like a torch.

He brought a famine upon them,

and by his zeal he made them few in number.<sup>18</sup>

(48.1)

Judgment, yes; annihilation, no. Judgment, not for punishment per se, but to force repentance:

For all this the people did not repent,

and they did not forsake their sins,

till they were carried away captive from their land

and were scattered over all the earth;

the people were left very few in number,<sup>19</sup>

but with rulers from the house of David.

Some of them did what was pleasing to God,

<sup>16</sup>Segal reconstructs: ויתן לן יעקב פלטה ולן דוד ממנו  
[Levi: ויתן לן יעקב שארית ולדוד ממנו שרש].

Levi also would substitute פלטה for שארית .  
They agree; both following the Greek.

<sup>17</sup>Literally, "violent". In both cases, a kingdom which is unfaithful.

<sup>18</sup>Cf. 1 Kgs 19.18, a recognized remnant text.

<sup>19</sup>Note the remnant language.

but others multiplied sins.

(48.15-16)

The hope of Israel lay always in "the good" who will "never be cut off" (40.17)<sup>20</sup> and history must be understood as delivering confident hope in goodness through the examples of righteous men:

It was Ezekiel who saw the vision of glory  
which God showed him above the chariot of the  
cherubim.

For God remembered his enemies with storm,  
and did good to those who directed their ways aright.  
May the bones of the twelve prophets  
revive from where they lie,  
for they comforted the people of Jacob  
and delivered them with confident hope.<sup>21</sup>

(49.8-10)

In summary, in the "Praise for Israel's Past", it is obvious that Ben Sirach believes Israel would perdure--a belief made concrete in the idea of a remnant. It is also

<sup>20</sup>Translation that of NAB. For the reading vide Patrick W. Skehan, "Sirach 40:11-17" in Studies In Israelite Poetry and Wisdom (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1971), 129-131; reprinted from CBQ, 30 (1968) 570-572.

<sup>21</sup>Siebeneck ("May their Bones", p. 419) notes Sirach in these verses "wants those heroes. . . to come to life in their descendants by the appearance of contemporary leaders who will repeat the role which the judges and prophets had so well executed".

clear this group should "stand by the covenants" (44.12); this is the goal of judgment, i.e. purification (48.15). The remnant is not, however, conceived eschatologically; in these final chapters, it is an historical expression of God's commitment to His covenant people (47.22). Further the Noah passage as well as the Joshua and Caleb passage portray a righteous remnant meriting preservation from a catastrophe in which sinners are destroyed.

It is in relating these various remnant views that difficulty arises. One is tempted to the obvious solution: Israel will forever exist through a righteous remnant whose righteousness merits salvation. This solution, however appealing and integrating, is contrary to the basic teaching of Ben Sirach, imposing upon the text an eschatological flavour that is unfounded. To understand fully remnant in the "Wisdom of Ben Sirach", it is necessary to examine the teaching expounded in the first forty-three chapters in which the author explains his purpose for writing and works out his message. Only then can one perceive the relationship of the remnant beliefs outlined above.

In the Prologue, the translator states his understanding of Ben Sirach's purpose for writing the book:

. . . my grandfather Jesus . . . was himself also led to write something pertaining to instruction and wisdom, in order that, by becoming conversant with this also, those who love learning should make

even greater progress in living according to the law.

(Prologue)

Ben Sirach's grandson has perceived the key relationship--that of wisdom and law:<sup>22</sup>

All wisdom comes from the Lord  
and is with him forever.

(1.1)

With this opening verse, Ben Sirach re-iterates the divine origin of wisdom, echoing Hebrew Bible proverbial literature:

The Lord created me [wisdom] at the  
beginning of his work [Hebrew: "way"],  
the first of his acts of old.  
Ages ago I was set-up,  
at the first, before the beginning of the earth.

(Prov 8.22-23)

Wisdom, created by the Lord, is poured out on all flesh:

The Lord himself created wisdom;  
he saw her and apportioned her,  
he poured her out upon all his works,  
She dwells with all flesh according to his gift,  
and he supplied her to those who love him.

(1.9-10; Heb 1.8)

Although dwelling with all flesh, wisdom is especially

<sup>22</sup>With Sanders, Paul, p. 331.

found in Israel, the house of Jacob:<sup>23</sup>

"Then the Creator of all things

gave me a commandment,

and the one who created me

assigned a place for my tent.

And he said, 'Make your dwelling in Jacob,<sup>24</sup>

and in Israel receive your inheritance.' . . ."

(24.8)

It is in Israel, "in the portion of the Lord" (24.12), that wisdom "took root" (24.12) and "grew tall" (24.14). It is "in the holy tabernacle I ministered before him," (24.10) so "I was established in Zion" (24.10). In Israel wisdom is truly and fully found.<sup>25</sup> Wisdom was "established in Zion" and "in Jerusalem" was her dominion (24.11).<sup>26</sup>

Ben Sirach clearly recognizes and completely accepts the covenantal, exclusivistic nature of God's people. The poem on creation found in chapters 16-17, modeled on Genesis, begins with universal tones but, like its Hebrew Bible

<sup>23</sup>This belief is implied in 1.10 where wisdom is abundantly poured out (ירונה; ἐξορκήσασεν) upon "those who love him", the Jews (Qidd 49b [Nashim IV, 248]).

<sup>24</sup>Contrast 1 En 42.1-2 where wisdom finds no place to dwell.

<sup>25</sup>Sanders, Paul, p. 332.

<sup>26</sup>On the poem in chpt. 24, vide Patrick W. Skehan, "Structures in Poems on Wisdom: Proverbs 8 and Sirach 24", CBQ, 41 (1979) 365-379.

counterpart, soon narrows to Israel as "the Lord's own portion" (17.17)<sup>27</sup>:

He established with them an eternal covenant,  
and showed them his judgments. (17.12)

Wisdom which is poured out upon all God's works  
(1.9) is really acquired through the "fear of the Lord":

To fear the Lord is the root of wisdom,  
and her branches are long life. (1.20)

and:

To fear the Lord is the beginning of Wisdom;  
she is created with the faithful in the womb.  
(1.14)<sup>28</sup>

Indeed:

All wisdom is the fear of the Lord,  
and in all wisdom there is the fulfillment of the  
law.<sup>29</sup>

(19.20; Heb 19.17)

Wisdom, for Ben Sirach, is equivalent to "the law which  
Moses commanded us" (24.23):

<sup>27</sup>On the Israelite focus of the third strophe of this poem, vide Luis Alonso Schökel, "The Vision of Man in Sirach 16:24-17:14" in Israelite Wisdom: Theological and Literary Essays in Honor of Samuel Terrien, ed. by John G. Gammie, Walter A. Brueggemann, W. Lee Humphreys, James M. Ward [New York: Union Theological Seminary, 1978], 240.

<sup>28</sup>Cf. also 1.16.

<sup>29</sup>Greek text reads "and in all wisdom is the doing of law".

The man who fears the Lord will do this,  
and he who holds to the law will obtain wisdom.

(15.1)

And elsewhere:

If you desire wisdom, keep the commandments,  
And the Lord will supply it for you.  
For the fear of the Lord is wisdom and instruction,  
And he delights in fidelity and meekness.

(1.26-27)

It must be carefully emphasized, however, for Ben Sirach, Torah is neither preferred over wisdom nor legitimated and interpreted by wisdom. The former understanding ignores the sheer volume of universal wisdom material in the book; the latter the relationship between wisdom and election.<sup>30</sup> What, then, is the relationship?

E. P. Sanders has suggested:

. . . the relationship between wisdom and law is

---

<sup>30</sup>Contra Gerhard Maier (Mensch und freier Wille, WUNT 12 [Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1971], p. 46) for whom Ben Sirach prefers Torah obedience to Hellenistic wisdom. This ignores "the great mass of traditional wisdom material which forms much of the content of the Book" (Sanders, Paul, p. 332, n. 15). Also contra Gerhard von Rad ("The Wisdom of Jesus Sirach", Wisdom In Israel [Nashville and New York: Abingdon Press, 1972], 245) who understands in Ben Sirach "it is not that wisdom is overshadowed by the superior power of the Torah, but, vice versa, that we see Sirach endeavouring to legitimize and to interpret Torah from the realm of understanding characteristic of wisdom" (cf. also p. 247). This view ignores the connection of wisdom and election (Sanders, Paul, p. 332, n. 16).

dialectical; neither sub-ordinates the other. Wisdom is good and to be sought; it is embodied in the Torah; one will be wise who fears God and obeys the Mosaic commandments; the content of proper behavior is closely allied to the common wisdom tradition, but specified as being in agreement with and embodied in the Torah.<sup>31</sup>

This recognizes the independence as well as the interdependence of both wisdom and law; it recognizes the essential harmony which is evident between them throughout the text.

In the "Wisdom of Ben Sirach", the people are called to live under the law and that law is the Law of Moses:

All this<sup>32</sup> is the book of the covenant  
of the Most High God,  
the law which Moses  
commanded us  
as an inheritance for the  
congregation of Jacob.

(24.23)

---

<sup>31</sup>Sanders, Paul, pp. 332-333. Hengel (Judaism and Hellenism, I, p. 138) misses the mark, following R. Smend (Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt [Berlin: Reimer, 1906], p. xxiv) in declaring that Ben Sirach "formulates a Jewish declaration of war against Hellenism". This view ignores the general acceptance of Hellenistic wisdom in Sirach.

<sup>32</sup>"All this" refers to the produce of wisdom which has taken root in Israel (24.19-21).



Ben Sirach's understanding of the relationship between Wisdom and Torah as dialectical and his concomitant belief that wisdom is found truly and fully in Israel lead naturally to his further definition of Israel.

To begin with, Israel will endure (47.22).<sup>33</sup> This promise, rooted in the covenant and in the history of Israel (44.18), is not, however, to be interpreted individualistically. The promise is to Israel, the people of God, the house of Jacob. It is to be understood nationally.

Ben Sirach speaks of the Gentiles in the same national way. In chapter 36.1-17, a prayer for the deliverance and restoration of Israel, one glimpses Ben Sirach's view of the nations. He calls upon God to hasten the time for the destruction of the Gentiles and to gather all the tribes of Jacob so they may receive their rightful inheritance; no universalism, but true national particularism; destruction for the Gentiles<sup>34</sup> and a prayer of salvation

<sup>33</sup>Mention should be made of 37.25b: "but the days of Israel are without number" in Greek but in Hebrew Israel is read יְשׁוּרִן Jeshurun, which is certainly, though unfortunately, original (with Box and Oesterley, "Sirach", p. 447).

<sup>34</sup>Contra W. O. E. Oesterley (An Introduction To the Books of the Apocrypha [London: SPCK, 1958], p. 244) who claims "the attitude towards the Gentile world in our book is distinctly more favourable than the Pharisaic". Cf. also Schökel, "The Vision of Man", p. 243; Edmund Jacob, "Wisdom and Religion in Sirach", E.t. by Martin Schwarz in Israelite Religion, ed. by John G. Gammie, Walter A. Brueggemann, W. Lee Humpheys, James M. Ward (New York: Union Theological

for Jacob. The appeal is for the establishment of the Israelite theocracy over the whole earth.

Just as the prayer is for the restoration of Israel, so the call is to Israel, but it is neither eschatological nor individual. The thematic interplay of wisdom and law focuses the concerns of the author upon this world. His argument is not framed in the context of the final calamity, nor of the eschatological remnant, although as we have seen, the remnant is not foreign to him. His understanding of the future focuses upon the individual acting in time, being rewarded and/or punished in time--with death as the final equalizer. Because of this attitude, the question of individual election becomes a moot point. Ben Sirach's vision precludes such questions as the fate of a righteous Gentile, the individual election of the Israelite, the ability to renounce one's place in the covenant; indeed, the very question of "true Israel" in an individual, soteriological framework. The question of eternal reward or eternal punishment cannot arise due to the author's

---

Seminary, 1978) 256-257. In spite of this demonstrated attitude toward the Gentiles, J. Coert Rylaarsdam (Revelation in Jewish Wisdom Literature [Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1946; Midway reprint, 1974]) believes Ben Sirach is "eager to appeal to non-Jews" (20) and his grandson has "a missionary enthusiasm which is interested in reaching both the Gentiles and the Jews living in Alexandria" (27). He incorrectly extends the address to the unfaithful within Judaism to a universal address.

thematic stance.<sup>35</sup> References to Hades are unproductive and couched; Hades must not be interpreted as the place of eternal judgment:

Whether life is for ten or a hundred  
or a thousand years,  
there is not inquiry about it in  
Hades.

(41.4)

Elsewhere, and from the opposite viewpoint:

Who will sing praises to the Most High in Hades,  
as do those who are alive and give thanks.

(17.27)

The end of man is evil (18.12) and death is not viewed as a crossing over to eternal reward or punishment: ". . . for the hope of man is worms" (7.17).<sup>36</sup>

What reward or punishment is there? Ben Sirach understood both justice and mercy to be primary characteristics of God. Before we examine those divine attributes

<sup>35</sup>Sanders (Paul, p. 333) suggests "the author's view of the strict justice of reward and punishment in this life prevents the question of the election from being sharply focused as regards the individual". While basically agreeing, I think the ultimate reason must be traced to the dialectic, which Sanders has recognized, between wisdom and law. It is the preoccupation with this interplay which causes the author to dwell exclusively upon this world and to leave the election only partially examined.

<sup>36</sup>Vide Siebeneck, "May their Bones", p. 91. "Man must therefore fulfill his duty to praise God before death".

in action, however, it is necessary to understand Ben Sirach's vision of his audience.

It is, first of all, quite clear that Ben Sirach is addressing his fellow Israelites. Further, he sees Israel as divided into two groups; the godly and the sinners:

Good is the opposite of evil,  
and life the opposite of death;  
so the sinner is the opposite of the godly.

(33.14)<sup>37</sup>

And elsewhere:

What race is worthy of honor?

The human race.

What race is worthy of honor?

Those who fear the Lord.

What race is unworthy of honor?

The human race.

What race is unworthy of honor?

---

<sup>37</sup>Jacob ("Wisdom and Religion", p. 255) notes in Ben Sirach creation is one, "but it is a unity in duality". There are two aspects of everything that exists (33.14-15; 42.24). P. Winter ("Ben Sira and the Teaching of 'Two Ways'", VT, 5 [1955], 315-318) notes the similarity between Ben Sirach 33.7-15 and DSD 3.13-4.26. The DSD text points up Ben Sirach's non-eschatological rendition which lacks the focus on the last period found in DSD. Vide also Johann Marböck, Weisheit im Wandel: Untersuchungen zur Weisheits-theologie bei Ben Sira, BEB 37 [Bonn: Hanstein, 1971], pp. 152-154. Contra A. Büchler, "Ben Sira's Conception of Sin and Atonement", JQR, 13 (1922-1923), 307.

Those who transgress the commandments.

(10.19)

"The godly" are "those who fear the Lord", the righteous, while "the sinners" are "those who transgress the commandments", "the ungodly", "the wicked" (15.20); the apostate hates the law and is without wisdom while the faithful Jew does the word of God (33.2-3).

Fear of the Lord and following the commandments place one in the ranks of the godly.<sup>38</sup> For Ben Sirach, God's past treatment of the righteous illustrates and guarantees the present:

You who fear the Lord, wait for his mercy;  
 and turn not aside, lest you fall.  
 You who fear the Lord, trust in him,  
 and your reward will not fail;  
 you who fear the Lord, hope for good things,  
 for everlasting joy and mercy.  
 Consider the ancient generations and see:  
 who ever trusted in the Lord  
 and was put to shame?

---

<sup>38</sup>Ben Sirach upholds the covenant and, it may be presumed, the entirety of the Hebrew Bible as he knew it. Vide R. Travers Herford, Talmud and Apocrypha: A Comparative Study of the Jewish Ethical Teaching in the Rabbinical and Non-Rabbinical Sources in the Early Centuries (New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1971), p. 209.

Or who ever persevered in the fear  
of the Lord and was forsaken?  
or who ever called upon him  
and was overlooked?

(2.7-10)

And, of course, "to fear the Lord is the beginning of wisdom" (1.14).

Sin is disobedience to the Mosaic Law (41.8); it includes such acts as offences against truthfulness (4.25), bribery (40.12), immorality (23.16), disrespect to parents (3.10), dishonesty (5.8), hypocrisy (1.28) etc. For Ben Sirach, sin concerns moral prohibitions and almost exclusively man to fellow man relationships. Transgressions solely against God are mentioned seldom, although sins against a fellow man must also be considered against God. The bulk of Ben Sirach's teaching is concerned with man's horizontal relationships, but man's attitude to God is not neglected. The godly man is a humble man; the sinner arrogant (12.4-5).<sup>39</sup> The righteous man approaches God in humbleness (3.17-20). Indeed,

Those who fear the Lord will prepare their hearts,  
and will humble themselves before them.

(2.17)

---

<sup>39</sup>These verses parallel the godly and the humble; the sinner and the arrogant.

The righteous man obeys the commandments of the Lord and trusts in His mercy. The sinner, according to Ben Sirach, is more than in error; he is habitually in error:

A stubborn mind will be burdened  
 by troubles,  
 and the sinner will heap sin  
 upon sin.

(3.27)

He cannot be helped and shuns reproof (32.17). The sinner, instead of atoning, uses forgiveness as an excuse for sinning:

Do not be so confident of forgiveness<sup>40</sup>

That you add sin to sin.

Do not say, "His mercy is great,

he will forgive the multitude of my sins,"

for both mercy and wrath are with him,

and his anger rests on sinners.

Do not delay to turn to the Lord,

nor postpone it from day to day;

for suddenly the wrath of the Lord will go forth,

and at the time of punishment you will perish.

(5.5-7; Heb 5.7-11)

He is hated by the Most High (12.6) and is to be shunned by

---

<sup>40</sup>Greek reads: atonement.

his peers (12.4; 13.17). The punishment may come swiftly (20.18) or at any time (23.21) but it will most certainly be exacted by or at the time of one's death (7.36).

The sinner must be understood as distinct from a righteous man who occasionally sins.<sup>41</sup> All deserve punishment (8.5) because all have sinned (19.16). Every sin is punished (7.8); nothing is hidden from God (15.19); and life's afflictions are perceived as the result of sin (10.13).<sup>42</sup> The distinction between the sinner and the righteous man who sins centres on two points: the sin is habitual and the sinner unrepentant:

So if a man fasts for his sins  
and goes again and does the same things,  
who will listen to his prayer?  
and what has he gained by humbling himself?  
(34.26)

and:

Whoever hates reproof walks in  
the steps of the sinner  
but he that fears the Lord will  
repent in his heart. (21.6)

---

<sup>41</sup>Vide Büchler, "Sin and Atonement", p. 304.

<sup>42</sup>James L. Crenshaw ("The Problem of Theodicy in Sirach: on Human Bondage", JBL, 94 [1, 1975], 60) adds sleep and fantasy to the possible "occasions of divine vengeance".



Death is not eliminated by righteousness, for we all must die (8.5) but death is the time when a man's deeds will be revealed and his account settled (11.26-27).<sup>43</sup> Indeed, even a sinner who appears to have eluded his punishment, should not be counted as such:

Call no one happy before his death;  
a man will be known by his end.<sup>44</sup>

(11.28 Heb)

Death becomes, for Ben Sirach, the final time when the sinner is punished and the righteous rewarded<sup>45</sup>:

For it is easy in the sight of the Lord  
to reward a man on the day of death  
according to his conduct.

(11.26)<sup>46</sup>

Ben Sirach thus answers the virtuous who witness the anomaly of some wicked prospering and, vice versa, some righteous bearing with ill-fortune.

<sup>43</sup>Cf. also 28.6-7.

<sup>44</sup>Greek reads: "through his children" for "by his end".

<sup>45</sup>Ben Sirach's doctrine of retribution clearly resembles that set forth in Deut 28. Vide Oliver S. Rankin, Israel's Wisdom Literature: Its Bearing on Theology and the History of Religions (New York: Schocken Books, 1969), pp. 77-80; DiLella, "Conservative and Progressive Theology", pp. 143-144.

<sup>46</sup>Following the Greek. Verse omitted in Hebrew.

The righteous are rewarded with a long life (1.20) and at the time of their death but blessings will also befall them during their lifetime (14.1) and indeed "no evil will befall the man who fears the Lord, but in trial he will deliver him again and again" (33.1).<sup>47</sup> "God's punishment of sin is the result of his wrath; his doing good to the obedient is the result of his mercy"<sup>48</sup>:

Even if there is only one stiff-necked person,  
it will be a wonder if he remains unpunished.

For mercy and wrath are with the Lord:

he is mighty to forgive, and he pours out wrath.  
As great as his mercy, so great is also his reproof;  
he judges a man according to his deeds.

(16.11-12)

God, in His mercy and compassion, will save the righteous:

For the Lord is compassionate and merciful;  
he forgives sin and saves in time of affliction.

(2.11)

According to Ben Sirach, man chooses either to sin or to be righteous<sup>49</sup>:

<sup>47</sup>Cf. also 2.10; 7.1f.

<sup>48</sup>Sanders, Paul, p. 334.

<sup>49</sup>Vide F. R. Tennant, "The Teaching of Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom on the Introduction of Sin and Death", JTS, 2 (1901), 212.

It was he who created man in the beginning,  
and he left him in the power of  
his own inclination.

If you will, you can keep the commandments,  
and to act faithfully is a matter  
of your own choice.

He has placed before you fire and water:  
stretch out your hand for whichever you wish.  
Before a man are life and death,  
and whichever he chooses will be given to him.  
(15.14-17).

God is not the author of evil; man chooses it:  
He has not commanded any one to be ungodly,  
and he has not given any one permission to sin.  
(15.20)

In the same way, man can choose to seek forgiveness and to  
return to righteousness (5.17). God, for his part, will  
patiently accept the repentant back:

. . . the Lord is patient with them  
and pours out his mercy upon them.

(18.11)

Indeed, his patience and longsuffering sometimes cause  
sinners erroneously to conclude that the Lord will not  
punish them (5.4) and they pile sin upon sin and delay in  
turning to the Lord (5.7) becoming a habitual, rather than  
occasional, sinner. The man who seeks forgiveness and re-

turns to the Lord is able to atone for his sins:

Whoever honours his father atones  
for sins,

(3.3)

and

Store up almsgiving in your treasury,  
and it will rescue you from all affliction.

(29.12)<sup>50</sup>

Further, one who forgives his neighbor will have his sins pardoned in prayer (28.2); almsgiving will rescue one from all affliction (29.12); and the forsaking of unrighteousness will also atone (35.3). In addition, Ben Sirach's sympathetic treatment of the Temple services indicates his probable acceptance of them as efficacious though the Lord will not accept sacrifices which are "wrongfully obtained" or are offered by the ungodly (34.18-19).<sup>51</sup> A transgressor should sacrifice but he should also repent; for thus he brings on God's forgiveness:

Yet to those who repent he grants a return,  
and he encourages those whose endurance is failing.  
Turn to the Lord and forsake your sins;  
pray in his presence and lessen your offences.

<sup>50</sup>Cf. also 3.14-16; 3.30; 35.2.

<sup>51</sup>Leo G. Perdue, Wisdom and Cult, SBLDS 30 (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press for SBL, 1977), pp. 199-200.

Return to the Most High and turn away from iniquity,  
and hate abominations intensely.

.....  
How great is the mercy of the Lord,  
and his forgiveness for those who turn to him!

(17.24-26, 29)

Ben Sirach praises the righteous man, pleads for the righteous man who has sinned to return and pronounces the sentence of the Lord upon the sinner.

The righteous man, for Ben Sirach, is the true representative of Israel. Although he does not frame his discussion in such terms as "true Israel" or "faithful remnant", it is nonetheless quite clear that he recognizes that Israel is intended to be righteous (17.12-14). The righteous man may occasionally sin but he does not do so arrogantly, he does not do so repeatedly and he repents quickly. The lot of the sinner is utter destruction:

For the beginning of pride is sin,  
and the man who clings to it  
pours out abominations.

Therefore the Lord brought upon  
them extraordinary afflictions,  
and destroyed them utterly.

(10.13)

Ben Sirach may not have expressed belief in an afterlife

but he did believe goodness persists and the good, although subject to death, endure through their good name and their children<sup>52</sup>:

Have regard for your name, since  
it will remain for you  
longer than a thousand great  
stores of gold.

The days of a good life are numbered,  
but a good name endures for ever.

(41.12-13)

and

He who teaches his son will make  
his enemies envious,  
and will glory in him in the  
presence of friends.

The father may die, and yet he  
is not dead,  
for he has left behind him one  
like himself;  
while alive he saw and rejoiced,

---

<sup>52</sup>Siebeneck, "May their Bones", p. 118; Josef Haspecker, Gottesfurcht bei Jesus Sirach. Ihre religicese Struktur und ihre literarische und doktrinaere Bedeutung, An Bib 30 [Rome: Pontificio Institute Biblico, 1967], pp. 185, 201; Jack T. Sanders, "Ben Sira's Ethics of Caution", HUCA, L (1979), 73-106, passim; Herford, Talmud and Apocrypha, p. 206.

and when he died he was not grieved;  
 he has left behind him an avenger  
 against his enemies,  
 and one to repay the kindness  
 of his friends.

(30.3-6)

Just as one's punishment can be passed to descendants (23.24) (23.24) and be the cause of one's line being eradicated (10.17), so also the memory of a righteous man becomes his immortality (41.13).

Certainly, for Ben Sirach, the ideal rests in an Israel, righteous and pure, but the real sees the inevitable conflict between good and evil waged by man who has freedom of choice. This conflict is not eschatologically resolved; the elect, Israel, does not become the righteous elect, the true Israel. One is led to believe that the present situation will continue ad infinitum. The ideal will always be sought, perhaps at times achieved, not with eschatological certainty and perpetuity but temporally.

Returning now to Ben Sirach's understanding of the remnant, the relationship between his remnant views becomes clearer. Israel will forever exist--a belief expressed by the perdurance of a remnant,<sup>53</sup> This remnant, however, is

---

<sup>53</sup>Siebeneck ("May their Bones", p. 423) discusses the remnant in terms of a "new covenant". Ben Sirach does

not eschatologically discussed. Whatever eschatology is found in Ben Sirach is this-worldly and is politically and nationally coloured. There is no hope after death and resurrection seems denied (38.21). The fact that Ben Sirach does not believe in an afterlife precludes such an interpretation. Individual membership in the remnant may be earned through proper action, avoidance of sin; but Ben Sirach does not speculate about the ultimate future--the pure Israel, the pure remnant, the eschatological remnant. His message is present--live righteously so that you may live happily and die easily.

---

not formulate his covenantal vision in new covenant terms. Indeed, his is exactly the opposite point: the covenant is always the same: the Mosaic covenant.

The covenant is the Mosaic covenant which is embodied in the Mosaic Torah (24.23). Yet, at other times, Ben Sirach does speak of a succession of covenants with Abraham (44.20), Isaac (44.22), Jacob (44.23), Phinehas (45.24), David (45.25) etc. These are not alternative covenants. They must be viewed from Ben Sirach's understanding of the covenant as the embodiment of the perpetual relationship (17.12) between God and Israel which is passed on from generation to generation. Note he does not use Jeremiah's New Covenant language. The covenants, therefore, are the covenant at a specific point in history as it is inherited by another righteous Israelite. Contra Priest, "Ben Sira 45, 25", p. 117.



B. 1 Enoch<sup>1</sup>

The authors of Ethiopic Enoch<sup>2</sup> understood Israel

---

<sup>1</sup>English quotations, unless otherwise noted, are from R. H. Charles' translation, "I Enoch" in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, ed. by R. H. Charles (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), II, 163-281. The translations of R. H. Charles' earlier edition (The Book of Enoch or I Enoch: translated from the editor's Ethiopic text [2nd edition; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912]) and Michael A. Knibb (The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments [2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978], II) have also been compared. The Ethiopic text is that of Knibb (Ethiopic Book of Enoch, I); R. H. Charles' edition (The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch, Anecdota Oxoniensia, Semitic Series, Part XL [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906]) was compared. The Greek fragments are from the editions of Campbell Bonner (The Last Chapters of Enoch in Greek, Studies and Documents VIII [London, 1937; repr. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968]); Adolphe Lods (Le Livre d'Hénoch. Fragments grecs découverts à Akhmîn, publiés avec les variantes du texte Ethiopien, traduits et annotés [Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1892]), M. Black (Apocalypsis Henochi Graece, PVTG 3 [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970]) and Charles (Ethiopic Version, pp. 3-75, 175-177). The Latin fragments are from Charles (Ethiopic Version, pp. 219-222). Aramaic fragments are from J. T. Milik's edition (The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4 [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976]).

<sup>2</sup>The Ethiopic Book of Enoch is recognized, by most scholars (e.g., J. T. Milik, "Problèmes de la Littérature Hénochique à la Lumière des Fragments Araméens de Qumrân", HTR, 64 [1971], 333-378; Rowley, Relevance, p. 57; Rost, Judaism, p. 135; Deane, Pseudepigrapha, p. 56), as a composite work consisting of five sections, defined and delimited by Charles (Pseudepigrapha, pp. 168-170; Enoch, pp. xlvi-lvi). Chapters 37-71, commonly called the Parables (Similitudes) of Enoch will be omitted from consideration in this study. The date of the Parables seems more and more certainly to be post-70 C.E. (vide Milik, "Problèmes", pp. 333-378; Milik, The Books of Enoch, p. 96, argument pp. 89-107; J. C. Hindley, "Towards a Date for the Similitudes of Enoch. An Historical Approach.", NTS, 14 [1967-1968], 551-565;

vis-à-vis the eschatological future. History was the Heilsgeschichte of Israel. The emphasis, however, lay in the activity of God; all history reflected and would reflect God's sovereignty. It is from such vision that the hope of deliverance from the rampant evil of the authors' present must be understood.<sup>3</sup> Thus, although the past forms a continuum with the historical present and the eschatological future,<sup>4</sup> the authors neither seek the norms for the present

---

M. A. Knibb, "The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review", NTS, 25 [1979], 345-359). This is not to say the dating of the Parables has achieved any type of consensus. The arguments in favour of post-70 C.E. dating, however, seem convincing: no fragments from the Parables have been found at Qumran, although fragments from all other sections were discovered (Milik, Ten Years, p. 33; Hindley, "Towards a Date", p. 553; Knibb, "The Date of the Parables", p. 345); the five fold division of the book is early and modelled on the Pentateuch but the second book was originally the Book of the Giants, evidenced by its use by Mani, and a Christian Redactor substituted the Parables as the second book (Milik, "Problèmes", pp. 372-375); 56.5-7 refers to 3rd c. C.E. invasions of the Byzantine Empire (Milik, "Problèmes", p. 377); 56.5-7 refers to the Parthians and the return of the exiles (Hindley, "Towards a Date", pp. 558-564); few, even possible, references to the Parables in the New Testament and the early fathers (Hindley, "Towards a Date", p. 564). Hindley ("Towards a Date", pp. 564-565) proposes an early second century C.E. date while Milik ("Problèmes", pp. 377-378) prefers ca. 270 C.E.

The dating of the other sections of 1 Enoch, following Sanders (Paul, pp. 346-347), remains "uncertain, as is the date of the final redaction; and one can by no means safely assume that each major division is itself integral. . . . Each of the parts seems to fit well into a context in the Maccabean period, and I have made no effort to date the material more precisely. A very precise dating of the component parts could be little more than conjecture." Contra Charles, Pseudepigrapha, p. 164.

<sup>3</sup>R. Travers Herford, Talmud and Apocrypha, p. 216.

<sup>4</sup>The eschatological resolution would, in sum, be:

and the promises for the future from the early covenantal history of Israel nor dwell upon the instructional value of history. The past activity of God on behalf of the righteous becomes the partial model for His full and complete eschatological activity; thereby giving hope to the righteous. The call is for righteous endurance until the sovereignty of God would again, and finally, be manifest. In Enoch,<sup>5</sup> the focus, typical of its apocalyptic character,<sup>6</sup> is upon the gathering of the eschatological community. The election is presumed; indeed, one of the epithets for the righteous is "the elect".<sup>7</sup> The covenant is obviously operative: the law is binding and Israel is God's elect; but the covenant does not assume an active role. Plea is not made for Israel's perdurance on the basis of covenantal promise;<sup>8</sup> the righteous are not called "His people"; indeed,

---

"to execute judgement upon all, and to destroy all the ungodly." (1.9)

<sup>5</sup> Enoch hereafter cited as Enoch.

<sup>6</sup> On apocalyptic, vide Paul D. Hanson, The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology (rev. ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979); Rowley, Relevance; D. S. Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic: 200 BC-AD 100, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964); Johann Michael Schmidt, Die jüdische Apokalyptik: Die Geschichte ihrer Erforschung von den Anfängen bis zu den Textfunden von Qumran (2nd ed.; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1976).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. 1.3, 8; 5.8; 25.5; 93.1, 5, 10.

<sup>8</sup> Vide 83.5.

the eschatological salvation is not even discussed in terms of traditional covenantal promise-fulfillment. Further, the existence of a remnant is not traced to God's promise and His faithfulness to it but to His mercy. The history of Israel is a process of sustaining and gathering the righteous elect, the remnant, toward whose establishment all history has been inexorably moving.

The righteous will ultimately be separated from the wicked; the righteous to prosper, the wicked to be destroyed (1.8-9).<sup>9</sup> Until that time "generation upon generation shall transgress", but then "a generation<sup>10</sup> of righteousness arises, and transgression is destroyed and sin passes away from the earth, and all manner of good comes upon it" (107.1). The distinction between the righteous and the wicked, discussed in generations more than individuals,<sup>11</sup> is central to the message of Enoch and it is from here one must begin answering the standard remnant questions.

The authors address their fellow Jews (92.1) calling them to live in righteousness and offering the promise of future reward:

<sup>9</sup>Cf. 10.6; 16.1; 19.1. Vide Rowley, Relevance, p. 58.

<sup>10</sup>Aramaic reads "generations" (Milik, The Books of Enoch, p. 210).

<sup>11</sup>A fact endemic to the apocalyptic genre, but one which nearly obliterates

But seek and choose for yourselves righteousness  
 and an elect life,  
 and walk in the paths of peace,  
 And ye shall live and prosper.

(94.4)

The decision to be righteous is a free choice, premised upon man's free will to choose either good or evil, either righteousness or sin:

And now I say unto you the righteous:  
 Walk not in the paths of wickedness, nor  
 in the paths of death,  
 And draw not nigh to them, lest ye be destroyed.

(94.3)<sup>12</sup>

The call is specifically of Enoch to his children but the introduction to the section makes its more expansive application certain:

The book written by Enoch. . . for all my children

---

". . . any appeal to the sense of responsibility in the individual. He is not called upon to do anything, in regard to the great events described in the book. What is done is done by angels, or the Messiah, or God himself. Man's only part is to stand still and behold, and, if he is righteous, rejoice in the outcome of it all. It is taken for granted that the righteous have walked in the ways of the Lord, obeyed his commandments, etc., but even this more as a qualification for being on the right side in the day of judgment than as good for its own sake." (Herford, Talmud and Apocrypha, p. 220)

<sup>12</sup>According to The Book of Noah, man was "led astray" by the angels (8.2) but this does not deny man's free choosing.

who shall dwell on earth. And for the future generations who shall observe uprightness and peace.

(92.1)<sup>13</sup>

Thus, the call has a larger intended audience, but no specific indication is given that it is to be extended to the Gentiles.<sup>14</sup>

The authors seem to have been prompted by the conflict within their times (90.2) and, as a result, they seek to encourage the good with the hope of eventual resolution and deliverance:

But in those days blessed are all they who accept the  
words of wisdom and understand them,  
And observe the paths of the Most High, and walk  
in the path of His righteousness,  
And become not godless with the godless;  
For they shall be saved.

(99.10)

It is the righteous who in chapter after chapter of Enoch are designated as the eschatological elect:

And at its close shall be elected  
The elect righteous of the eternal plant of

---

<sup>13</sup>Cf. 1.2; also, compare Enoch's words to Methuselah, his son: 82.1; 107.3; 108.1.

<sup>14</sup>Gentiles may be saved (vide infra p. 226) but the book does not appear to be addressed to them, although the point must be made the language and/or message does not exclude them as, for example, would be the case in Jubilees.

righteousness,

To receive sevenfold instruction concerning  
all His creation. (93.10)

In what does this righteousness consist? We have already seen, in the passage quoted above, one must accept the words of wisdom (99.10) and follow the paths of the Most High (99.10). In other terms, one must "walk in the paths of peace" (94.4). There is, however, a lack of specificity in those exhortations. The apocalyptic character of the text affects the language of advice making it general. It is clear, however, that righteousness includes obedience to the Mosaic law:

Woe to them who pervert the words of uprightness,  
And transgress the eternal law, . . .  
(99.2a-b)

In the Apocalypse of Weeks reference is made to the Law, obviously the Mosaic Law of Sinai, which is "for all generations" (93.6c). Further, the wicked are condemned for not doing "the commandments of the Lord" (5.4);<sup>15</sup> in the "dream-visions", some of the Israelites are accused of forsaking the temple (89.51);<sup>16</sup> and, finally, in a descrip-

---

<sup>15</sup>Following the Ethiopic. The Aramaic is defective (Milik, The Books of Enoch, p. 146).

<sup>16</sup>"And again I saw those sheep that they again erred and went many ways, and forsook that their house, . . ."

tion of the eschatological cleansing,<sup>17</sup> reference is made to "uncleanness" which is, in part, transgression of purity laws (10.20).<sup>18</sup>

When conduct is the topic, much of the text is concerned with actions to be avoided, sins which were probably being committed in the authors' time and which they were specifically addressing. Pure exhortation (i.e. continuance of correct action) is more implicit, while the call, although to proper action, begins in the avoidance of sins. This results in greater explicitness of improper behaviour. Definition of righteous action, therefore, can be, to great extent, indirectly supplemented through the examination of transgression. The primordial sin is the union of the angels<sup>19</sup> of God with the daughters of men (6.1ff).<sup>20</sup> This Biblical story is, in Enoch, greatly embellished.<sup>21</sup> Through

<sup>17</sup>With Charles (Pseudepigrapha, p. 195) who notes the cleansing is by the Messianic kingdom not the deluge.

<sup>18</sup>In defining "uncleanness", Sanders (Paul, p. 349) adds to the words "The transgression of purity laws" the additional phrase, based upon the Greek, "and moral defilement which comes from certain other transgressions".

<sup>19</sup>The MT reads בני אלהים . It is in the LXX (Alexandrinus) that one finds ἀγγελοι . Cf. also Jub 5.1.

<sup>20</sup>Regarding this myth, vide J. Morgenstern, "The Mythological Background of Psalm 82", HUCA, 14 (1939), 29-126; Adolphe Lods, "La chute des anges", RHRP, 7 (1927), 295-315.

<sup>21</sup>Compare Gen 6.1-4. For the relationship to Jubilees, vide James C. VanderKam, "Enoch traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century Sources" in Seminar Papers:



their actions the angels have transgressed the word of God and the law (106.13-14). Though their children were destroyed by the Flood, yet their spirits continue to plague the world as demons (15.8ff).<sup>22</sup> They have taught men unrighteousness and revealed the eternal secrets of heaven. As a result, men transgress and have become liable to the wrath of God (9.6-9).

Elsewhere in Enoch, sin is man's creation. It is not unavoidable but voluntary and, hence, punishable:

I have sworn unto you, ye sinners, as a  
                   mountain has not become a slave,  
 And a hill does not become the handmaid of  
                   a woman,  
 Even so sin has not been sent upon the earth,  
 But man of himself has created it,  
 And under a great curse shall they fall  
                   who commit it.

(98.4)

The recognized compositeness of the text of Enoch makes resolution of these two views unnecessary. Both agree, however, sin is not from God and man chooses to sin making himself culpable.

---

Society of Biblical Literature, 1978, ed. by Paul J. Achtemeier (2 vols.; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press for SBL, 1978), 229-251.

<sup>22</sup>Rowley, Relevance, pp. 57-58.

How do men sin? Men blaspheme, commit apostasy (91.7) and perform acts of uncleanness (10.20). They are neither steadfast nor do they follow the commandments of the Lord (5.4). They are hard-hearted (5.4) and utter unseemly words against the Lord (27.2). Their houses are built with sin (94.7); they acquire gold and silver in judgment (94.7).<sup>23</sup> They oppress the righteous (94.6)--plundering them with the rulers' support (104.3) and persecuting them (95.7). They lie upon the witness stand and pronounce unjust sentences (95.6). They slay their neighbors (99.15), "afflict the righteous and burn them with fire" (100.7) and "execute judgement on the righteous" (100.10). Thus, sin is defined both horizontally, having to do with one's fellow man, and vertically, having to do with God. All sin, however, is a transgression of the will of God.

Since the wicked receive condemnation for these acts, righteousness must lie, at least in part, in the avoidance of them.

This leads to the question of the identity of the wicked. Who were these transgressors and what was their relationship to the righteous?

---

<sup>23</sup>In four passages (99.8; 96.4; 100.6; 104.6) the sinners are condemned for their riches. On these, vide G. W. E. Nickelsburg, "Riches, the Rich, and God's Judgment in I Enoch 92-105 and the Gospel according to Luke", NTS, 25 (1979), 324-344.

Some, at least, were Israelites:<sup>24</sup>

Woe to them who pervert the words of uprightness,  
And transgress the eternal law, . . . .

(99.2)

Transgression of the eternal law is most understandable within Judaism, i.e. here in reference to Israelites who "appeal to an erroneous (from the point of view of the author) interpretation of the Law".<sup>25</sup> Reference is also made to apostate Israelites:

Woe to them who reject the measure and  
eternal heritage of their fathers  
And whose souls follow after idols,  
For they shall have no rest.

(99.14)

---

<sup>24</sup>Charles (Pseudepigrapha, p. 276; Enoch, pp. 221-222; 258-259) identifies the righteous as the Pharisees and the wicked as an alliance of Sadducees, sinners, apostates and paganizers. Sanders, however, (Paul, p. 353) has observed "Charles's general method for dating the Enoch material (and also other pseudepigrapha) was to identify the works as Pharisaic and to date them according to Josephus's account of the fortunes of the Pharisees. Since, however, it is very unlikely that I Enoch, either in whole or in part, is Pharisaic, Charles's explanation collapses." Sanders continues: "The strangeness of the alliance which must have been in effect on Charles's view (Sadducees and paganizers) should in any case warn against the precise identification of the righteous as Pharisees and the sinners as Sadducees and their allies".

<sup>25</sup>Sanders, Paul, p. 353. Vide also Nickelsburg, Resurrection, p. 126.

Those blaspheming (91.7) are also most likely Israelites.<sup>26</sup>

The wicked also appear to have included Gentiles:<sup>27</sup>

And again I swear to you, ye sinners, that sin is prepared for a day of unceasing bloodshed. And they who worship stones, and graven images of gold and silver and wood [and stone] and clay, and those who worship impure spirits and demons, and all kinds of idols not according to knowledge, shall get no manner of help from them.

(99.6-7)

That these verses refer to Gentiles is supported by 91.9:

And all the idols of the heathen shall be abandoned,  
And the temples burned with fire, . . .

The wicked, therefore, includes not only apostate and "heretical" Israelites but also Gentiles. Here a problem arises. Once it is recognized that the sinners include both Israelites and Gentiles, the ability to assign specific transgressions to either group becomes extremely hazardous. Are the wealthy Israelite or Gentile, or both? Are the plunderers Israelite or Gentile, or both? No indication

<sup>26</sup>Cf. also 94.9, 96.7. Sanders (Paul, p. 353) notes both the transgressing of the law and the blaspheming may refer to Gentiles but more likely refer to Israelites.

<sup>27</sup>With Sanders, Paul, p. 354; contra Charles, Pseudepigrapha, p. 270; Nickelsburg, Resurrection, p. 126. Nickelsburg fails to note the relationship of 91.9 to 99.6-7.

is forthcoming from the text. Any attempt further to delineate sub-groups within the category "sinners" is further thwarted by the book's apocalyptic character. Sinners are those opposed to the righteous and what they represent. It is possible to enumerate sins but not to designate the sinners beyond that which has already been done.<sup>28</sup> This provokes a very interesting question. While it is obvious, at least in general, that the righteous are the righteous of Israel, is it possible there could be righteous Gentiles included in the elect?

In the dream-vision sequence Enoch says: "And I saw all the sheep which had been left, and all the beasts on the earth, and all the birds of the heaven, falling down and doing homage to those sheep and making petition to and

---

<sup>28</sup>Sanders (Paul, p. 353) notes "It is difficult to determine whether those who so treat the righteous are Gentiles, unrighteous Jews or both". Agreeing with this premise, I feel Sanders has illustrated this difficulty by his argument identifying, on the basis of 104.3 and 103.14-15, the plunderers as "the apostate Israelites" who collaborate in the active persecution and despoliation of the righteous (p. 354). I cannot agree with this identification which while proving the rulers were not the plunderers, although they assisted them, assumes then they are Israelites. As a result, I have some difficulty with his conclusion: "Thus it seems that the wicked are both the apostate and traitorous Israelites who collaborate with the rulers, thus gaining the right to become rich at the expense of loyal Jews, and the 'carpet-bagging' Gentiles who are in league with them" (p. 354). The Israelites may or may not have been those collaborating with the rulers. Further, the Gentiles are also condemned for their religious beliefs (99.6-7).

obeying them in every thing " (90.30). The beasts and the birds represent the Gentiles, as in Ezek 39.17. In 90.33 an idyllic scene is painted in which the righteous dead, the righteous living and the surviving Gentiles (presumably also righteous) assemble with the Lord of the Sheep who rejoices "because they were all good and had returned to His house". This must refer, as Charles has noted,<sup>29</sup> to "the conversion of the surviving Gentiles and their spontaneous submission to Israel". In another passage, after the earth has been cleansed of all oppression, it is noted: "all the children of men shall become righteous, and all nations shall offer adoration and shall praise Me, and all shall worship Me" (10.21).<sup>30</sup> Further, in chapter 108, those "born in darkness, who in the flesh were not recompensed with such honour as their faithfulness deserved" are transformed (v.11). In vss. 12-13, transformation seems equivalent to salvation. According to Charles<sup>31</sup> those "born in darkness" are the Gentiles; some of whom are faithful and rewarded (108.12), while others remain in darkness (108.14).<sup>32</sup> Some

---

<sup>29</sup>Charles, Pseudepigrapha, p. 259.

<sup>30</sup>Cf. also 91.14.

<sup>31</sup>Charles, Pseudepigrapha, p. 281.

<sup>32</sup>Sanders (Paul, p. 359), noting Charles' seems the best explanation, adds "it is one of a small handful of explicit references to the possibility of salvation for Gentiles in Palestinian Jewish literature before the Rabbinic Period".

Gentiles, at least, may be numbered among the saved and, since all wickedness will be destroyed (1.1), one must conclude these will be righteous Gentiles. Though they are somehow the faithful Gentiles, the exact criteria for determining faithfulness for Gentiles is not made explicit. The issue of the salvation of the Gentile, while broached, is not systematically pursued and one is left with a certain apocalyptic cloudiness which defies any attempt at clarity.

In general, the wicked are identified by their transgressions and the elect by their righteousness. The sinner, confident in his wealth and success, does not fear the Lord (101.7, 9). His faith in material prosperity as the ultimate goal is bolstered by the belief all suffer the same end--death in grief and darkness (102.6-8).<sup>33</sup> The righteous fear God (101.1),<sup>34</sup> accept His wisdom and obey the law (99.10). The attitude of the righteous has been at least shaken by the sufferings they have undergone while they watch the sinners prosper (104.6). The righteous are persecuted (95.7) and oppressed (91.12);<sup>35</sup> they suffer

---

Sanders then claims the sinners who cry aloud and see the faithful resplendent (108.15) are Israelite. Here, I would suggest just as the resplendent are a combination of Israelites and Gentiles so also are the sinners.

<sup>33</sup>Cf. also 97.8; 100.6.

<sup>34</sup>Ethiopic; Greek: , fear to do evil before him.

<sup>35</sup>The oppression of the righteous by the wicked is a recurrent theme. Charles mentions "oppression" in 94.6; 96.8; 98.6; 98.8 (bis); 99.15. 94.6 and 96.8 are extant in neither Aramaic nor Greek.

(96.3) and even die (103.15).<sup>36</sup> The sinners are mighty (96.8) and well fed (96.5); they oppress the faithful (96.8) and their riches make them appear as if righteous (96.4). In part, the authors respond to such an enigma by promising a divine adjudication of the patent injustices:

Woe to you who requite your neighbor with evil;  
For ye shall be requited according to your works.

(95.5)

Indeed, the presently prosperous sinners will eventually be delivered up to the faithful for judgment (95.3). They will receive no mercy (5.5) and for them there shall be no salvation (5.6). Whereas, for the righteous, there shall be rest (96.3) and salvation (5.6), mercy and peace (5.6). On the one hand, the sinners will receive according to their deeds (100.7), evil for evil, without mercy. On the other hand, the righteous, who will also be recompensed for their labours (103.3), will, it seems, receive their reward not because of their works but because of the mercy of God (92.4).<sup>37</sup>

Sinners are punished during their lifetime (22.10), during some type of catastrophic event (95.3)<sup>38</sup> or after

---

<sup>36</sup>Vide also 89.61, 69; 90.25; 103.10.

<sup>37</sup>Vide also 1.8.

<sup>38</sup>Vide also 96.1; 98.12.



death (22.9-13; 103.6). The righteous look forward to sharing in the blessings of the kingdom on a cleansed earth (25.4ff). There will be a resurrection of the righteous who have already died (103.4). In 22.13 reference is made to sinners in Sheol who have received punishment during their lifetime: "nor shall they be raised from thence". The assumption must be the other sinners (those not punished during their lifetime; 22.10) and the righteous (23.9) will rise -- the former for judgment and condemnation (chpts. 26-27); the latter for reward. In the end, the differentiation between the righteous and the wicked will be final and complete. This is not to say, however, that the elect have never sinned. Indeed, after recounting the deluge, the Lord says:

"And heal the earth which the angels have corrupted, and proclaim the healing of the earth, that they may heal the plague, and that all the children of men may not perish through all the secret things that the Watchers have disclosed and have taught their sons. And the whole earth has been corrupted through the works that were taught by Azazel: to him ascribe all sin." (10.7-8)

Elsewhere, in the promise of the blessings bestowed upon the elect:

And then there shall be bestowed upon the  
elect wisdom,  
And they shall all live and never

again sin,  
 Either through ungodliness or through  
 pride:

But they who are wise shall be humble.  
 And they shall not again transgress,  
 Nor shall they sin all the days of  
 their life,  
 Nor shall they die of (the divine)  
 anger or wrath,  
 But they shall complete the number  
 of the days of their life.

(5.8-9)<sup>39</sup>

The elect have transgressed, though no indication is forth-coming of how much transgression or what specific transgressions move one from the elect to the wicked. Further, they must remain constantly on guard lest they sin and be destroyed:

And now I say unto you the righteous:  
 Walk not in the paths of wickedness, nor  
 in the paths of death,  
 And draw not nigh to them, lest ye be  
 destroyed.

(94.3)

There is no mention of retribution on a personal,

---

<sup>39</sup>Vide also 89.41.

individual level. Yet, it is clear that one can repent and return (104.8-9).

In sum, salvation belongs to the righteous, a group consisting of Israelites and possibly Gentiles. Membership is attained through God's mercy but requires, as its sine qua non, righteousness and faithfulness to God and His word. How Gentiles fulfil this is not explained. Not all, Israelite or Gentile, will be saved. Sinners will not be saved; and, further, the elect may, by sinning, lose their place and be destroyed. A sifting will occur at judgment, but that will be the finale of a process begun at the deluge and culminating at the eschaton. This narrowing process will result in the salvation of "the elect". Although, in Enoch, this group is not called Israel, it is clear that they are indeed the seed of Noah "preserved for all the generations of the world" (10.3). The relationship of the saved Israelites and the saved Gentiles is not resolved. Conversion of the latter is perhaps forcing the text since it appears but vaguely. Attempts at resolution of this dilemma are further stymied by the composite character of the text. Suffice it to note that righteous Gentiles may be saved.

The history of Noah's seed is the history of the remnant of Israel. According to the revelation to Enoch, the evil which was introduced to the earth by Azazel becomes so pervasive that "the whole earth will be destroyed, and a

deluge is about to come upon the whole earth, and will destroy all that is on it" (10.2). The destruction will not be total, however, for Noah is to be spared--Noah and his family will form the remnant from the catastrophe and will preserve life: "And now instruct him that he may escape (ἐκφυγή) and his seed (σπέρμα) may be preserved for all the generations of the world" (10.3). A Greek textual variant has this thought developed more fully: "Instruct the righteous (man) what he is to do, from the son of Lamech, and he will preserve his soul unto life and escape through the world, and from him will be planted a plant and it will be established throughout all the generations of the world."<sup>40</sup> Here the remnant consists of those who have escaped a past catastrophe. The author carries this point further and gives it an eschatological charge, when he speaks a few verses later of the day of judgment and pleads: ". . . that all the children of men may not perish through all the secret things that the Watchers have disclosed and have taught their sons" (10.7). It is the Noachian remnant which will be the kernel of the future remnant:

"And then shall all the righteous escape ( σωθήσονται ),<sup>41</sup>  
 And shall live till they beget thousands  
 of children,

---

<sup>40</sup>Black, Apocalypsis Henochi Graece, p. 24; Charles, Pseudepigrapha, p. 195.

<sup>41</sup>Milik, The Books of Enoch, p. 189.

And all the days of their youth and  
 their old age  
 Shall they complete in peace."

(10.17)

This same theme is re-iterated in the Apocalypse of Weeks. After the rising up of wickedness, there is the first end "And in it a man shall be saved" (93.4). This undoubtedly refers to Noah. Unrighteousness is not ended, however, and the law becomes the line of demarcation between the elect and the sinners. It is then that Abraham is raised up and his progeny become "the plant of righteousness for evermore" (93.5). The remnant founded in Noah and sustained by Abraham is not a present reality. It is an eschatological reality:

And at its close shall be elected  
 The elect righteous of the eternal plant of  
 righteousness,  
 To receive sevenfold instruction concerning  
 all His creation.

(93.10).

This thematic remnant consciousness is repeated in the dream-visions. Here, after the dire prediction of destruction, Enoch is urged to pray that a remnant be spared: "and now, my son, arise and make petition to the Lord of glory, since thou art a believer, that a remnant may remain on the earth, and that He may not destroy the whole earth " (83.8).

Enoch complies:

' . . . And now, O God and Lord and Great King,  
 I implore and beseech Thee to fulfil my prayer,  
 To leave me a posterity on earth,  
 And not destroy all the flesh of man,  
 And make the earth without inhabitant,  
 So that there should be an eternal destruction.  
 And now, my Lord, destroy from the earth  
     the flesh which has aroused thy wrath,  
 But the flesh of righteousness and uprightness  
     establish as a plant of the eternal seed,  
 And hide not Thy face from the prayer  
     of Thy servant, O Lord.'

(84.5-6)

As a result, the whole earth is destroyed but Noah becomes the divine mitigation--the righteous remnant. The plea is made neither on the basis of the covenant nor God's faithfulness. Israel though spared through the Noachian remnant does not remain faithful to God (89.3). There is, however, always a true line through which the elect might be traced--Joshua, Caleb (89.39), Saul (89.43), Samuel (89.44), David (89.45), Solomon (89.48), Elijah (89.52). Even in the most disastrous of times, Israel was to endure:

"And he called seventy shepherds, and cast those sheep to them that they might pasture them, and He spake to the shepherds and their companions: 'Let each individ-

ual of you pasture the sheep henceforward, and everything that I shall command you that do ye. And I will deliver them over unto you duly numbered, and tell you which of them are to be destroyed--and them destroy ye.' . . ."

(89.59-60)

The passage then continues with the story of the over-zealousness of the shepherds which resulted in more sheep being punished than the Lord had consigned. Not only does this explain the destruction of the righteous along with the apostates but it also points once again to the remnant. Not all would be numbered for destruction. Yet, in the end, sheep will remain and justice will triumph: "And I saw till a great sword was given to the sheep, and the sheep proceeded against all the beasts of the field to slay them, and all the beasts and the birds of the heaven fled before their face." (90.19).

The authors of Enoch discuss the gathering and sustaining of the community of the righteous elect, the remnant. Thus, it is the eschatological unraveling which most piques their interest. The world upon which they are reflecting is radically awry. Justice has been turned topsy turvy. Sinners are in rebellion against God, their sins go unpunished, the righteous are oppressed, their tribulation is not alleviated and righteous deeds go unrewarded.<sup>42</sup> It is this

---

<sup>42</sup>On chapters 92-105 as a summary of this world situation vide George W. E. Nickelsburg, "The Apocalyptic Message of I Enoch 92-105", CBQ, 39 (1977), 309-328.

situation to which the eschatological picture must respond. It is this inequity at which the remnant consciousness of Enoch is leveled.

In summary, Enoch answered a felt need of the community: The need to place order in a world that seemed totally chaotic. It gave reasons for being righteous when righteousness seemed fruitless. The righteous were the elect; they would constitute the true eschatological community receiving reward at the final judgment. Membership was guaranteed to the righteous dead; it was available to the righteous living if they remained qualified. The righteous living, however, cannot be said to constitute the eschatological community, in whole or in part. Their membership is contingent.

It is clear that the elect is a remnant of the world community, a righteous remnant. It is not clear whether in the thought of the authors one could say the final remnant group constituted the true Israel, all Israel or the like. The discussion was not framed in these terms. Yet, the eschatological remnant would be the entirety of the people on earth (whatever existence is planned for the sinners is to be found in Sheol).



### C. Jubilees

#### The book of Jubilees<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>One of the Pseudepigrapha, the Book of Jubilees is a midrash on the events from the creation of the world to the exodus from Egypt and the Sinai event. The account is based primarily upon Genesis and Exodus 1-12.24 although the author borrowed heavily from other parts of the Hebrew Bible and other related literature.

Quotations from Jubilees are from R. H. Charles' translation, "The Book of Jubilees" in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, ed. by R. H. Charles, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), II, 1-82. There have been certain reservations concerning this translation [see W. Baars and R. Zuurmond, "The Project for a New Edition of the Ethiopic Book of Jubilees", JSS, 9 (1964), 67-74]; but, as of this time, the new edition promised by Baars and Zuurmond has not yet been forthcoming. See further: P. Grelot, "Recension de M. Testuz, Les idées religieuses du livre des Jubilés", VT, 11 (1961), 106-107.

The integrity of the book has been questioned by Gene L. Davenport (The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees, Studia Post-Biblica Vol. 20 [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971], 10-18), Michel Testuz (Les idées religieuses du Livre des Jubilés [Genève: E. Droz; Paris: Minard, 1960], pp. 16-42) and Ernest Wiesenberg ("The Jubilee of Jubilees", RQ, 3 [1961-1962], 36-38).

Davenport has suggested a tripartite history for the text of Jubilees: an angelic discourse (pp. 10-14), a redaction (pp. 14-15) and a temple redaction (pp. 15-16). He, however, admits that while his theory explains some of the conflicts, it does not destroy the essential unity of the work, for the different strata "may not be left in isolation, for neither redactor saw any significant contradictions between his work and that of his predecessor. Indeed, each probably saw his work as an elaboration, extension, and--consequently--interpretation of his predecessors" (17). Davenport's hypothesis, therefore, does not seriously affect an analysis of the book's contents, although it may explain certain inconsistencies (cf. Sanders, Paul, pp. 386-387).

According to Testuz, 1.7-25, 28; 23.11-32 and 24.28b-30 are additions (p. 39) of a second sect member, written during the sect's exile. Sanders (Paul, p. 386) has refuted Testuz's claim that the added sections express "haine ardente" of Gentiles while the remainder of the book expresses mere contempt for them. "The distinction is dubious" (Sanders, p. 386; cf. Jubilees, 22.22f. and Jaubert, La notion

does not, at first reading,

---

p. 93, n. 1). Sanders also notes that "Testuz himself uses the redactional passages as if they represent the principal author's view" (Sanders, p. 386; cf. Testuz, p. 69 where five of six passages cited as representing the original author's view are "redacted").

Wiesenberg discusses "many strands" in Jubilees and posits two authors, the second of whom is an anti-Roman Zealot (p. 38). He has contributed 30.7-16; 34.2-9; 37; 38 as well as some chronological revisions (pp. 38-39). Reinhard Pummer ("The Book of Jubilees and the Samaritans", Egl Theol, 10 [2, 1979], 153) has correctly noted that Wiesenberg's contention that "national-political aspirations" must be separated from "purely religious aspects" of Judaism (p. 38) is false. Military references and prowess are not solely Zealot.

That the author of Jubilees used sources is obvious. "On the whole, however, it seems best to take the entire work as integral" (Sanders, Paul, p. 387).

The question of the date of the book of Jubilees has received considerable attention through the years; theories have ranged from as early as just after the exile to as late as ca. 90 C.E. The former was proposed by Solomon Zeitlin ("The Book of Jubilees: Its Character and Its Significance", JQR, 30 [1939-1940], 8-16; cf. his "The Book of 'Jubilees' and the Pentateuch", JQR, 48 [1957-1958], 218-235) but has received no appreciable support (cf. the refutations of Rowley [Relevance, pp. 101-102, n. 3] and Testuz [Les idées, pp. 35-38]); the latter has been advocated by Hermann Röscher (Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die Kleine Genesis [Leipzig: Fues's Verlag (R. Reisland), 1874; repr.: Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1970], pp. 528-529) and has received little better support although William J. Deane ("Jubilees" in Pseudepigrapha [Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1891], 198-201) and A. C. Headlam ("Book of Jubilees" in A Dictionary of the Bible, ed. by James Hastings [Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1899], II, 791) have suggested dates in the 1st century C.E. nearer the time of Christ. Most scholars, however, place Jubilees during the Maccabean period (Charles, Pseudepigrapha, p. 1; Rowley, Relevance, pp. 99-105; Moore, Judaism, I, 199; Walter Schmithals, The Apocalyptic Movement [New York & Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1975], p. 200; C. C. Torrey, The Apocryphal Literature: A Brief Introduction [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1945], p. 128; Bent Ngack, "Qumran and the Book of Jubilees", Svensk Exegetisk Arsbok, 22-23 [1957-1958], 195; Testuz, Les idées, p. 35; Davenport, Eschatology, p. 16; Eissfeldt, Old Testament, p. 608; James C. VanderKam, Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees, HSM 14 [Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977],

appear to be remnant oriented.

pp. 207-285) and there does not seem to be any substantive reason for arguing differently. Of course, as Eissfeldt (The Old Testament, p. 608) has pointed out, this date does not exclude the inclusion of older traditions in the work.

Although the only complete, extant version of Jubilees is in Ethiopic (R. H. Charles, The Ethiopic Version of the Hebrew Book of Jubilees, Anecdota Oxoniensia, Semitic Series 8 [Oxford: Clarendon, 1895]), there are substantial portions preserved in Latin (Rönsch, Das Buch, pp. 10-95). The original language is most often thought to be Semitic, probably Hebrew (Charles, Pseudepigrapha, p. 4; Rönsch, Das Buch, pp. 523-524; Zeitlin, "The Book of Jubilees: its Character and its Significance", p. 21) and the evidence strongly favours this theory (VanderKam, Textual and Historical Studies, pp. 1-6); although A. Büchler ("Studies in the Book of Jubilees", REJ, 82 [1926]) has criticized at length this position (pp. 257-274) and has suggested Greek with a non-Palestinian provenance (extant Greek material has been collected by A. -M. Denis, "Liber Jubilaeorum", Apocalypsis Henochi Graeci et Fragmenta Pseudepigrapha Graeca, ed. by M. Black and A. -M. Denis, PVTG 3 [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970], pp. 70-120). Some fragments of the Book of Jubilees have been discovered at Qumran in Caves I (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert. I. Qumran Cave I [ed. Barthelemy and Milik], 1955, pp. 82-84, with Plate XVI), II (Baillet, Milik, deVaux, DJD 3, pp. 77-79, with Plate XV), III (Baillet, Milik, deVaux, DJD 3, pp. 96-98, with Plate XVIII), IV (J. T. Milik, "Fragment d'une source du Psautier [4QPs89] et fragments des Jubilés, du Document de Damas, d'un phylactère dans la grotte 4 de Qumran", RB, 73 [1966], pp. 94-106), and XI (A. S. van der Woude, "Fragmente des Buches Jubiläen aus Qumran Höhle XI [11QJub]", Tradition und Glaube: Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt, ed. by G. Jeremias, H. W. Kuhn and H. Stegemann [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971], 142-145; with Plate VIII; J. T. Milik, "A propos de 11QJub", Bib, 54 (1973), 77-78), but they prove only that fragments of Jubilees and possibly, by inference, Jubilees in toto existed in Hebrew. "It is generally held that that curious pseudepigraphon of the Old Testament is likely to shed some light on the ideology of the Qumran Covenanters. Some scholars are inclined to go further and would include the Book of Jubilees among the literary products of the Qumran Covenanters" (Wiesenberg, "The Jubilees of Jubilees", p. 3). The evidence, in addition to the Hebrew fragments of Jubilees, is twofold: In the Damascus Document (16.4) Jubilees seems to be cited authoritatively; and, the calendar advocated by Jubilees seems to be similar if not identical, to that found at Qumran.

The word "remnant" appears

---

(Regarding the calendar, *vide, et alia*: Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The Beginning of the Day in the Calendar of Jubilees", *JBL*, 77 [1958], 355-360 and 78 [1959], 157; H. Cazelles and E. Vogt, "Sur les origines du calendrier des Jubilés--Note sur le calendrier du Deluge", *Bib*, 43 [1962], 202-212, 212-216; Annie Jaubert, "The Calendar of the Book of Jubilees, its origin and its character", *VT*, 5 [1955], 34-76; Annie Jaubert, "Le calendrier des Jubilés et de la secte de Qumran. Ses origines bibliques", *VT*, 3 [1953], 250-264; Annie Jaubert, "Le calendrier des Jubilés et les jours liturgiques de la semaine", *VT*, 7 [1957], 35-61; Ernst Kutsch, "Der Kalender des Jubiläenbuches und das A und NT", *VT*, 11 [1961], 39-47; Ernst Kutsch, "Die Solstitien im Kalender des Jubiläenbuches und in äth. Henoch lxxii", *VT*, 12 [1962], 205-207; E. R. Leach, "A Possible Method of Intercalation for the Calendar of the Book of Jubilees", *VT*, 7 [1957], 392-397; Julian Morgenstern, "The Calendar of the Book of Jubilees, its Origin and its Character", *VT*, 5 [1955], 34-76; Solomon Zeitlin, "The Beginning of the Day in the Calendar of Jubilees", *JBL*, 78 [1959], 153-156)

Noack ("Qumran and the Book of Jubilees", 191-207) appeals for scholarly restraint in drawing conclusions from these fragments. Noack observes that "the primary inference to be drawn from that fact [that fragments were found at Qumran] is not that all, or most, of the Pseudepigrapha were written at Qumran or by members of the community or sect living elsewhere in Palestine, not even that they were written by people who cherished the same ideas as the covenanters, but solely that the theology of these late Jewish writings appealed favourably to them" (p. 194). Davenport (*Eschatology*, p. 17), on the other hand, suggests "a close connection between the circles in which Jubilees was produced and those from which the Qumran community developed. The citation of the angelic discourse in the Damascus Document, the use of the Jubilees calendar at Qumran, the similarity of attitude toward the faithful nation as the instrument of God in the great eschatological battle, and the likelihood that R<sub>2</sub> resided at Qumran point to a close kinship between the milieus." In fact, "most likely, the redactor worked in Qumran during the rules of Simon and John Hyrcanus in Jerusalem" (p. 16). Even, Davenport, however, elsewhere (p. 18) states his theory less definitively. "It means, at least, however, that those who established the Qumran community came from a background that shared certain beliefs about the calendar and the role of Israel. It may even indicate that Jubilees grew

infrequently<sup>2</sup> and does not per se suggest a remnant theology. One might, therefore, be tempted to ignore Jubilees in a study of remnant. This, however, would be premature since it will be proved that Jubilees has an organized, developed remnant theology and, furthermore, that the infrequent use of the term was consciously designed by the author<sup>3</sup> to

---

into its present form in the same circles from which the Qumran community came." Cf. also Davenport, Eschatology, p. 38, n. 21; William H. Brownlee, "Light On the Manual of Discipline (DSD) From the Book of Jubilees", BASOR, 123 (Oct. 1951), 30-32; Reinhard Deichgräber, "Fragmente Einer Jubiläen-Handschrift aus Höhle 3 von Qumran", RQ, 5 (1965), 415-422; Testuz, Les idées, pp. 179-195. Jubilees obviously had an influence upon Qumran but the difference must also be noted; especially the lack of sectarian commitment in Jubilees, lest their relationship seem so intimate that it produces false data. The relationship between Jubilees and Qumran is one of similarities. Even the calendar is such (Jaubert, La notion, p. 90).

<sup>2</sup>Cf. 20.6, where remnant refers to Abraham's sons and the sons of Gomorrah; 24.30 in which it refers to the total destruction of the Philistines.

<sup>3</sup>The question of authorship has received many and varied answers. Rönsch (Das Buch, p. 531) has proposed a Pharisaic author (vide also Charles, Pseudepigrapha, p. 1); Torrey (Apocrypha, p. 128) a Levite priest; S. Tedesche ("The Book of Jubilees", IDB, 2, 1002-1003) suggests either a Pharisee or a Levite priest; others a member of the Qumran sect (Eissdeltd, Old Testament, p. 607; Daniel Patte, Early Jewish Hermeneutic In Palestine, SBLDS 22 [Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1975], p. 235) or a proto-covenanter (D. E. Gowan, Bridge Between the Testaments, Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series 14 [Pittsburgh, Penn.: Pickwick Press, 1976], p. 350). The lack of sectarian commitment precludes Qumran authorship. Though certainly not identical, the thought-worlds in Jubilees and the Qumran documents are similar; their authors share many ideas and have a common background (vide Jaubert, La notion, pp. 88, 91; VanderKam, Textual and Historical Studies, p. 251, n. 79; Sanders, Paul, p. 385).

underscore his interpretation of the remnant and his refusal to apply the remnant understanding to any present group. It is his understanding that the remnant is to be eschatologically applied to all Israel and that all Israel is to be saved but "all Israel" is not to be interpreted as all Israelites--a misinterpretation inveighed against by some of the prophets.<sup>4</sup>

To prove this thesis, it will be necessary to examine in great detail the salvation scheme understood by the author of Jubilees. Because the remnant teaching in Jubilees is implicit rather than explicit, one must seek the remnant through its constitutive parts--i.e. by isolating and examining those characteristics which are traditionally the vehicles for remnant.

The author of the book of Jubilees understood history in terms of the Heilsgeschichte of Israel (1.4).<sup>5</sup> At the creation of the world, God selected Israel to be uniquely His own people (2.19), and, in time, Israel responded by accepting God as his personal deity (6.4).

<sup>4</sup>Vide Chapter I, passim.

<sup>5</sup>Although the author's intent is presumably to write the history of the world (Prologue), it is true that "si on excepte le récit de la création, il n'a écrit que l'histoire d'Israël, parce qu'Israël est pour lui le centre du monde" (François Martin, "Le livre des Jubilés", RB, 20 [1911], p. 321). The author attributes both "the earlier and the later history of Israel to Moses". God's teaching Moses more than that which is found in the Pentateuch is a common Rabbinic theme. Vide, e.g., Megilla 19b (Mo'ed IV, 119), Menachoth 29b (Ḳodashim, I, 190).

This relationship was formalized by a covenant between God and Israel--a covenant which clearly stipulated the rights and responsibilities of each of the parties, became a model of the history of Israel and assured the salvation of Israel. History will culminate when Israel, the elect of God, fully realizes his rightful inheritance in eternity, a time when God and His people will dwell together forever (1.26).<sup>6</sup> Thus, in Jubilees, the past history of Israel forms the basis for the historical present and the preparation for the eschatological future (1.4); it is in the early covenantal history of Israel that the author sought the norms for the present<sup>7</sup> as well as the promises for the future.<sup>8</sup>

The author's choice of Genesis and Exodus as the medium for his message attests to the importance he attached to history, most especially covenantal history. Through historical narration, the lessons of the past are recounted to the Israel of the author's day to encourage his fellow Israelites to prepare for the judgment of tomorrow. History, for the author of Jubilees, teaches through its

---

<sup>6</sup>Cf. 1 En 25.3, 77.1.

<sup>7</sup>With Martin ("Le Livre des Jubilés", p. 322) who believes the author of Jubilees "impose et célèbre le présent par le passé".

<sup>8</sup>With Davenport (Eschatology, p. 29) who points out "The redactor of the angelic discourse. . .has not painted an extensive portrait of the future, but has drawn upon the promises and the demands of the canon and held them aloft for his own day".

events:

'Incline thine heart to every word which I shall speak to thee on this mount, and write them in a book in order that their generations may see how I have not forsaken them for all the evil which they have wrought in transgressing the covenant which I establish between Me and thee for their generations this day on Mount Sinai. And thus it will come to pass when all these things come upon them, that they will recognise that I am more righteous than they in all their judgments and in all their actions, and they will recognise that I have been truly with them. . . .'

(1.5-6)<sup>9</sup>

Thus, after the flood, when Noah sees that evil has once again made inroads upon the earth, he recounts the pre-flood history to his sons and reminds them that "the Lord destroyed everything from off the face of the earth; because of the wickedness of their deeds, and because of the blood which they shed in the midst of the earth He destroyed everything" (7.25). Remembering this and fearing, after his death, that his sons "will be destroyed from

---

<sup>9</sup>Cf. Exod 34.27. The biblical parallel passage does not mention any reason for writing the text whereas Jubilees explicitly connects writing with proving the righteousness of God through recounting his righteous deeds. The question of righteousness is basic to covenant and remnant. The righteousness of God guarantees the remnant and the righteousness of man acts, at times, as the criteria for membership in the remnant.



the face of the earth" (7.27), Noah tries to warn them that they should heed the lessons of the past and walk in righteousness. Similarly, Abraham recounts "the judgment of the giants, and the judgment of the Sodomites" (20.5) in order to encourage his sons to "observe the way of the Lord" and "work righteousness, and love each his neighbor, and act on this manner amongst all men; that they should each so walk with regard to them as to do judgment and righteousness on the earth" (20.2). This theme of the instructional value of history permeates Jubilees and, as we shall see, may have been a major reason for its composition.

In his gleaning of lessons from history, the author believed that the message must take precedence over the individual facts.<sup>10</sup> He felt free, therefore, to recast his sources whenever they did not accomplish his pedagogical aims. For example, he wished to encourage the emulation of the patriarchs; and, as a result, he removed from their stories any materials which might be offensive to their

---

<sup>10</sup>R. H. Charles (The Book of Jubilees or The Little Genesis [London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902], p. xlvii) notes "Our book represents an extreme product of the midrashic process which is apparent on most pages of the Old Testament Chronicler". He then discusses the two most important tendencies of the Chronicler; he rewrote the history of Israel from a particular perspective and he altered the facts of that history whenever they did not conform to his presuppositions (emphasis mine).

memory.<sup>11</sup> He omitted the deception of the Egyptians by Abram who, in order to protect his life, made his wife Sarai declare that she was his sister (Gen 12.11-14, 18). For the same reason, he omitted Isaac's similiar deception of Abimelech (Gen 26.7-10) as well as Jacob's machinations to increase his flock at the expense of Laban (Gen 30.37-42). The author also desired to establish the pre-eminence of Levi over Judah:<sup>12</sup>

And he [Isaac] turned to Levi first, and began to bless him first, and said unto him: 'May the God of all, the very Lord of all the ages, bless thee and thy children throughout all the ages. And may the Lord give to thee and to thy seed greatness and great glory, and cause thee and thy seed, from among all flesh, to approach Him to serve in His sanctuary as the angels of the presence and as the holy ones.

(Even) as they, shall the seed of thy sons be for glory and greatness and holiness, and may He make them great

---

<sup>11</sup>Charles (Jubilees, p. 11) points out this is one of the tacts used by the author of Jubilees "to defend Judaism against the disintegrating effects of Hellenism". Deane (Pseudepigrapha, p. 231) attributes such an attitude to the author's "notion of the superiority of Israel". Charles' observation re-enforces the Maccabean dating while Deane's conforms to one of the basic teachings of Jubilees: Israel is superior to all other nations.

<sup>12</sup>Although according to the author of Jubilees the priesthood is given to the tribe of Levi, the salvation of Israel is still the prerogative of the tribe of Judah (31.20).

unto all the ages. And they shall be judges and  
princes, and chiefs of all the seed of the sons of  
Jacob;

They shall speak the word of the Lord in righteous-  
ness,

And they shall judge all His Judgments in righ-  
teousness.

And they declare My ways to Jacob

And My paths to Israel.

The blessing of the Lord shall be given in their  
mouths

To bless all the seed of the beloved. (31.13-15)

Because of this, the author was forced to omit the entirety  
of chapter 49 of Genesis in which Simeon and Levi are ranked  
below Judah:

Cursed be their anger, for it is fierce;

and their wrath, for it is cruel!

I will divide them in Jacob

and scatter them in Israel.

Judah, your brothers shall praise you;

your hand shall be on the neck of your enemies;  
your father's sons shall bow down before you.

.....  
The scepter shall not depart from Judah,

nor the ruler's staff from between his feet,  
until he comes to whom it belongs;

and to him shall be the obedience of the peoples.

(Gen 49.7-10)

Finally, it was the author's intention to promote the everlasting validity of the law and, to this end, he traced the various halachot into the depths of Israel's history.<sup>13</sup>

Thus, while, according to Jubilees (15.28) and the Pentateuch (Gen 17.10), circumcision may have been decreed to the Israelites in the time of Abraham, it was practiced, according to Jubilees, long before Abraham for, in heaven, the angels of the presence and the angels of sanctification were created circumcised (15.27). Similarly, although the Sabbath was first celebrated by men in the times of Moses (Exod 16.23), it had previously been celebrated, according to Jubilees, in heaven by God and the angels of the presence and the angels of sanctification. Israel was given the privilege of celebrating the Sabbath along with God and His angels as a sign of their unity:

And thus He created therein a sign in accordance with which they should keep Sabbath with us on the seventh day, to eat and to drink, and to bless Him who has

---

<sup>13</sup>Vide Moore (Judaism): "One of the chief ends of the author was to carry back the origins of the distinctive observances of Judaism to a remote antiquity and to connect them with epochs in the history of the patriarchs or of Noah and the antediluvians, and that not merely as ancestral customs but as laws then and there delivered by God for all future time." (I, 195) Vide also Davenport, Eschatology, p. 11. Charles (Jubilees, p. li) believes that the glorification of the law is another means of defending Judaism against Hellenism.

created all things as He has blessed and sanctified unto Himself a peculiar people above all peoples, and that they should keep Sabbath together with us. (2.21)

In Jubilees, history, however, is not just concerned with the past nor even with the past and the present. The events of both are directed towards the future, the salvation of Israel which will come to fruition in eternity when God Himself resides in the bosom of His chosen nation:

And so thou write down for thyself all these words which I declare unto thee on this mountain, the first and the last, which shall come to pass in all the divisions of the days in the law and in the testimony and in the weeks and the jubilees unto eternity, until I descend and dwell with them throughout eternity.

(1.26)<sup>14</sup>

Within this historical matrix, it is the unique, enduring relationship between God and his people Israel that most intrigued the author of Jubilees. This relationship is grounded in the covenant and results from God's designation of Israel as His own people.

One of the key theological premises of Jubilees is the election of Israel; an election rooted in the depths of Israel's past and yet directed towards eternity. The

---

<sup>14</sup>Davenport (Eschatology, p. 29) notes that this verse "is explicitly an eschatological one in that its purpose is to clarify the nature of the eschatological future".

importance of the election theme is confirmed by the author's inserting into the Genesis creation story an election statement by God:

'Behold, I will separate unto Myself a people from among all the peoples, and these shall keep the Sabbath day, and I will sanctify them unto Myself as My people, and will bless them; as I have sanctified the Sabbath day and do sanctify (it) unto Myself, even so will I bless them, and they shall be My people and I will be their God. And I have chosen the seed of Jacob from amongst all that I have seen, and have written him down as My first-born son, and have sanctified him unto Myself for ever and ever; and I will teach them the Sabbath day, that they may keep thereon from all work.' (2.19-20)

The election was, therefore, ab initio mundi; God already had made His choice, though, at that time, it had not yet been accepted by Israel. Furthermore, God's selection of Israel as uniquely His own was not temporally limited.

Their relationship was to be for eternity:

And after this they will turn to Me in all uprightness and with all (their) heart and with all (their) soul, and I will circumcise the foreskin of their heart and the foreskin of the heart of their seed, and I will create in them a holy spirit, and I will cleanse them so that they shall not turn away from Me from that day

unto eternity. (1.23)

Similarly:

And he said to the angel of the presence: 'Write for Moses from the beginning of creation till My sanctuary has been built among them for all eternity. And the Lord will appear to the eyes of all, and all shall know that I am the God of Israel and the Father of all of the children of Jacob, and King on Mount Zion for all eternity. And Zion and Jerusalem shall be holy.'

(1.28)<sup>15</sup>

The promise that Israel will be the chosen people of God also means that Israel will survive. God, through His selection, has insured the eternal existence of Israel

<sup>15</sup>Davenport (Eschatology, p. 15) believes this verse was written by a sanctuary-oriented redactor. He admits, however, this verse does "not change the purpose of the book, but merely adds to its scope". He also believes the verse is essentially eschatological (p. 30).

The projected scope of Jubilees ('from the beginning of creation till my sanctuary has been built among them for all eternity') does not correspond to its actual scope (from creation until the Sinai event). This discrepancy has prompted S. Zeitlin (The Rise and Fall of the Judaeen State, [3 vols., Philadelphia: JPS, 1968 (2nd ed., vol. 1), 1969 (2nd ed., vol. 2), 1978 (vol. 3)], I, p. 293) to speculate "It is probable that other books were written by the same group that wrote the book of Jubilees and these continued the account of the Israelites until the time of the building of the Temple". It is possible, however, that the author's statement is to be symbolic "from the beginning to the end". The eschatological orientation of the verse, the author's belief that God will reside with his people in eternity, the author's historical stance (the past as the guide for the present to prepare for the future) and the pedagogical tendency of Jubilees make the verse less historically significant and add to its symbolic importance.

(1.28). Thus, when Israel's existence was threatened by Cain's murder of Abel, God "raised up a second seed. . . on the earth instead of Abel" (4.7). Similarly, when everyone and everything upon the earth was to be destroyed in the flood, God spared Noah and his sons so that Israel might survive (5.5). "And he gave to Noah and his sons<sup>16</sup> a sign that there should not again be a flood on the earth. He set His bow in the cloud for a sign of the eternal covenant that there should not again be a flood on the earth to destroy it all the days of the earth" (6.15-16).<sup>17</sup> Thus, there will always be an Israel<sup>18</sup> and, in any catastrophe, there will always be a remnant of Israel.

The theme of election is reiterated in chapter after chapter of Jubilees as the history of the chosen people is unfolded in terms of their unique relationship with God. Israel is separated by God as a "people from among all the peoples" (2.19) and selected to celebrate the Sabbath with God and the angels in Heaven (2.20-21) as well as to participate with them in the rite of circumcision (15.29). Israel will be "holy and blessed throughout all days" (2.28) and

---

<sup>16</sup>The sons of Noah were spared on account of Noah (5.19).

<sup>17</sup>For Noah as a remnant figure see Hasel, The Remnant, pp. 135-147.

<sup>18</sup>This should not be interpreted as a promise of the existence of Israel, the land, but rather a commitment to the eternal existence of Israel, the people of God.



will be "a holy nation unto the Lord its God, and a nation of inheritance, and a priestly and royal nation for (His own) possession" (33.20).

Election is also the sine qua non of salvation.

Thus, Israel, the elect, is Israel, the saved:

And I will disclose to them abounding peace with righteousness and I will remove them the plant of righteousness<sup>19</sup> with all My heart and with all My soul, and they shall be for a blessing and not for a curse, and they shall be the head and not the tail. And I will build My sanctuary in their midst, and I will dwell with them, and I will be their God and they shall be My people in truth and righteousness. And I will not forsake them nor fail them; for I am the Lord their God. (1.16-18)

Similarly:

'Write for Moses from the beginning of creation till My sanctuary has been built among them for all eternity. And the Lord will appear to the eyes of all, and all shall know that I am the God of Israel and the Father of all the children of Jacob, and King on Mount Zion

---

<sup>19</sup>Charles (Jubilees, p. 5) reads "And I will plant them the plant of uprightness in the land" following Jer 32.41. This would reverse "the judgment in verse 13 'I will remove them from the midst of the land'". If Charles is correct, it is another proof of the righteousness of God towards Israel.

for all eternity.' (1.28)

But compare with the apostate's future:

Else He will [hide His face from thee,

And] give thee back into the hands of thy transgression,

And root thee out of the land, and thy seed likewise

from under heaven,

And thy name and thy seed shall perish from the whole

earth.

(21.22)<sup>20</sup>

It is obvious, therefore, that, for the author of Jubilees, Israel stands in a special position vis-à-vis God and it is clear that this is an everlasting relationship. Israel has been elected by God, but who is Israel?

The easiest way to begin to answer the question is negatively. The Gentiles are not part of Israel nor are they to be saved. According to the author of Jubilees, from the very moment of creation, God separated the Gentiles from the Israelites; the one destined to be led from Him and the other to be sanctified by Him:

And He sanctified it [Israell], and gathered it from amongst all the children of men; for there are many nations and many peoples, and all are His, and over all He has placed spirits in authority to lead them astray from Him. But over Israel He did not appoint

---

<sup>20</sup>Jub 21.22-24 = 4Q221Jub<sup>f</sup>1: The Qumran fragment, however, does not affect the meaning of 21.22 (VanderKam, Textual and Historical Studies, pp. 51-55).

any angel or spirit, for He alone is their ruler, and He will preserve them and require them at the hand of His angels and His spirits, and at the hand of all His powers in order that He may preserve them and bless them, and that they may be His and He may be theirs from henceforth forever. (15.13-32)<sup>21</sup>

The Gentiles are sinners "who have neither mercy nor compassion" (23.23) and "their works are unclean and all their ways are a pollution and an abomination and uncleanness" (22.16).<sup>22</sup> The contempt which is shown towards the Gentiles as a group is even more voracious when directed against those Gentiles who were enemies of Israel. Invectives are directed against the Edomites and Amorites, but none is as vicious as that against the Philistines and Isaac's curse upon them is perhaps the most vehement:

'Cursed be the Philistines unto the day of wrath and indignation from the midst of all nations; may God make them a derision and a curse and an object of wrath and indignation in the hands of the sinners the Gentiles and in the hands of the Kittim. And whoever

---

<sup>21</sup>This same sentiment is expressed in the LXX, Deut 32.8-9; in Sir 17.17 and Dan 10.13, 20, 21; 12.1. Vide Charles, Jubilees, pp. 111-112 on 15.31-32.

<sup>22</sup>From this verse, it is obvious that the exclusivism which marked Judaism in the time of Jubilees is here attributed to Abraham. This is another example of the author's desire to ground the present in the past; even to the extent of re-writing the past.

escapes the sword of the enemy and the Kittim, may the righteous nation [Judah] root out in judgment from under Heaven; for they shall be the enemies and foes of my children throughout their generations upon the earth. In fact, the Gentiles are so evil that their destruction will be so complete that not one will pass the final judgment:

And no remnant shall be left to them,

Nor one that shall be saved on the day of the wrath of judgment;

For destruction and rooting out and expulsion from the earth is the whole seed of the Philistines (reserved),

And there shall no longer be left for these Caphtorim a name or a seed on the earth. (24.28-30)

In general, the Gentiles can expect to be judged by Israel; and, most probably, they can expect to be damned: "And I will give to thy [Jacob's] seed all the earth which is under heaven, and they shall judge all the nations according to their desires, and after that they shall get possession of the whole earth and inherit it for ever" (32.19). It appears quite clear, therefore, that the Gentiles are not to be counted among 'the elect'.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup>Testuz (Les idées, p. 74) has correctly pointed out that Jubilees is not concerned with proselytism. The Gentiles are to be damned and they are unable to become part of Israel. Jubilees is totally exclusivistic, particularistic, and nationalistic.

The situation with regard to the Israelites is not equally definitive. That God has elected Israel to be His own people is perfectly clear. The question, however, centres on who is Israel; specifically, whether God's election of Israel means that only a portion of Israel is destined for salvation or whether all Israel is to be saved. If it can be proved that only a portion of Israel is destined for salvation, there is good probability that remnant theology is operative in the Book of Jubilees. The remnant would then obviously consist of those Israelites who belong to 'the elect'. If, however, all Israel is destined for salvation, then either there is no concept of remnant in Jubilees or it is not to be found in a distinction between 'the elect' and 'the damned' within Israel. In the first chapter of Jubilees, the author states:

And the angel of the presence who went before the camp of Israel took the tables of the division of the years-- from the time of the creation--of the law and of the testimony of the weeks of the jubilees, according to the individual years, according to all the number of the jubilees [according to the individual years], from the day of the [new] creation when the heavens and the earth shall be renewed and all their creation according to the powers of the heaven, and according to all the creation of the earth, until the sanctuary of the Lord shall be made in Jerusalem on Mount Zion, and all the

luminaries be renewed for healing and for peace and for blessing for the elect of Israel, and that thus it may be from that day and unto all the days of the earth.

(1.29)<sup>24</sup>

The problem in this text concerns the understanding of the phrase 'the elect of Israel'. Does it indicate exclusiveness or inclusiveness; should it be understood as the elect of Israel, or the elect, Israel? Testuz prefers the first reading, namely, that not all Israel is the elect of God. Rather only a portion of Israel is elect and, therefore, to be saved--that portion which the author of Jubilees represents. It is Testuz's belief that the author is a sectarian, an early Essene, and that this verse identifies the sect to which he belonged: "les Elus d'Israël".

Il est évident que notre auteur n'est pas un Essénien pareil à ceux que Josèphe décrit, puisqu'il donne encore des lois sur les mariages, sur les sacrifice au Temple, par exemple. Il appartient à une haute époque, où la secte ne s'est pas retirée de la vie nationale.

---

<sup>24</sup>Davenport (Eschatology, p. 31) contends this verse was added by R<sub>2</sub> (the sanctuary redactor). The verse assures the reader that God will come soon. "Thus, it is an eschatological passage." Charles believes (Jubilees, p. 9 on 1.29) that "Heaven and earth and the physical nature of man will be transformed pari passu with man's spiritual transformation (xxiii.26-28, 1.5)". Thus the renewal of creation is a gradual process "to be conditioned ethically by the conduct of Israel".

Both of these views underscore the eschatology of the verse. The question of the imminency of the eschaton does not change this fact.

Nous dirons donc que notre auteur est un essénien de l'antique observance.

S'il faut absolument donner un nom à la communauté à laquelle appartient l'auteur de Jubilés, nous lui donnerons celui que nous lisons dans les dernières lignes du chapitre premier, et qui pourra bien être le nom par lequel elle se désignait elle-même: les Elus d'Israël (1/29).<sup>25</sup>

Unfortunately, in order to prove his point, Testuz must understand the crucial phrase, the elect of Israel, out of its context within the totality of the Book of Jubilees. The author of Jubilees frequently alludes to the inclusiveness of the election of Israel.<sup>26</sup> Thus 1.25:

And they all shall be called children of the living God,

<sup>25</sup>Jaubert (*La notion*, p. 91) agrees with Testuz that the author belongs to a separatist movement but she believes that the movement is the "children of Israel" (6.34). As a result, she understands 1.29 as a separatist reference (p. 94), but she is correctly amazed at the infrequent use of the term. Furthermore, she realizes this single use of the term is definitely eschatological (p. 94). Unfortunately, she does not seek a reason but merely comments that it is quite different from the frequent use of the term in Qumran (p. 94).

<sup>26</sup>Noack ("Qumran and the Book of Jubilees", p. 205) points out that Jubilees "presupposes Israel in its entirety", and "aims at organizing and ruling the faith and worship, the life and obedience towards the Law, of the whole nation, Israel of history still being regarded as the people of the covenant; the true Israel and the only religious community. Jub, it is true, also speaks of apostasy, of worshipping idols and foreign gods and abandoning the customs inherited from the Fathers. But it is still the whole people that is called upon to become the true people of God, not a select part of Israel".

and every angel and every spirit shall know, yea, they shall know that these are My children, and that I am their Father in uprightness and righteousness, and that I love them.

Furthermore, in 1.28, God declares that he is "the God of Israel and the Father of all the children of Jacob, and King on Mount Zion for all eternity." To be a child of Jacob is to be a member of the people of Israel, the chosen of God.<sup>27</sup> Thus 2.24:

And to this (Jacob and his seed) it was granted that they should always be the blessed and holy ones of the first testimony and law, even as He had sanctified and blessed the Sabbath day on the seventh day.

In 2.20 God says that he has "chosen the seed of Jacob" to be His people while in 12.24, He declares that ". . . I shall be a God to thee and thy son, and to thy son's son, and to all thy seed: fear not, from henceforth and unto all generations of the earth I am thy God." Similarly:

. . . but (that) in Isaac should his name and seed be called: And (that) all the seed of his sons should be Gentiles, and be reckoned with the Gentiles; but from the sons of Isaac one [viz, Jacob] should become a holy seed, and should not be reckoned among the Gentiles.

---

<sup>27</sup>Sanders, Paul, p. 363. See also Testuz, Les idées, pp. 72-73.



For he should become the portion of the Most High, and all his seed had fallen into the possession of God, that it should be unto the Lord a people for (His) possession above all other nations and that it should become a kingdom and priests<sup>28</sup> and a holy nation.

(16.16-18)

Further evidence concerning the interpretation of 1.29 is to be found in a consideration of the blessings of the renewal of the earth, since, according to 1.29, they shall come upon 'the elect of Israel'. Elsewhere in Jubilees the future blessings are intended for all Israel: 1.28 ('Father of all the children of Jacob'); 50.5 (Israel will be cleansed by God).

The fact that in a linguistically parallel construction 'the elect of Israel' are opposed to 'the sinners of the Gentiles' (23.23), who are also called, inclusively, 'the sinners, the Gentiles' (23.24)<sup>29</sup> further substantiates the

---

<sup>28</sup>Charles (Jubilees, p. 116) has shown that, in the allusion to Exod 19.6, the Ethiopic reading "a kingdom and priests" which varies from the MT ( מַמְלָכָה כֹהֲנִים ) and the Latin version of Jubilees (regnum sacerdotale) "represents the Hebrew original" of Jubilees. Vide also John Hall Elliott, The Elect and The Holy, Supplements to Novum Testamentum XII [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966], p. 79. Elliott (p. 80) notes that in reference to Jub 16.18, "Those to whom these predicates are ascribed compose Israel in toto; specifically, the descendents of Jacob".

<sup>29</sup>Sanders, Paul, pp. 194-195, n. 2. Charles (Jubilees, p. 149 on 23.24) thinks the Ethiopic translation misunderstood these words in making them an apposition. Instead, he should have translated it as "sinners of the

inclusiveness of the election.

One further text needs to be discussed--the blessing of Jacob in 22.11ff., which might be understood as an indication of limited election within Israel:

Blessed be my son Jacob

And all the sons of God Most High, unto all the ages:

May God give unto thee a seed of righteousness;

And some of thy sons may He sanctify in the midst of the  
whole earth;

May nations serve thee,

And all the nations bow themselves before thy seed.

Be strong in the presence of men,

And exercise authority over all the seed of Seth.<sup>30</sup>

Then thy ways and the ways of thy sons will be justified,

So that they shall become a holy nation. (22.11-12)

Here, the problem concerns the interpretation of the phrase "some of thy sons" which could be construed as an indication that only a portion of Jacob's progeny is elect. Sanders refutes this possibility:

This is negated by the prayer that 'thy sons' should become 'a holy nation' in the same passage and by the reference to 'all his seed' in 16.18, as well as by

---

Gentiles". Charles, however, points out that "To the writer the terms 'Gentiles' and 'sinners' were practically synonymous". Cf. 24.28

<sup>30</sup>Charles (Jubilees, p. 139 on 22.12) points out "all the seed of Seth" is to be interpreted as "all mankind".

other references to the descendants of Jacob without qualification. The seed of Jacob, that is, all his descendants, as such is holy (22.27; 25.3; cf. 33.20,<sup>31</sup> 'Israel is a holy nation') and sacred (22.13). Israel is a 'plant of righteousness' (16.26; 21.24; 36.6). a 'seed of righteousness' (22.11), and a 'righteous nation' (24.29); Jacob's children will be a 'righteous generation' (25.3).<sup>32</sup>

Therefore, since it is clear that the author of Jubilees believed that all Israel is elect, it is difficult to believe that 1.29 should be interpreted as presenting an opposite viewpoint. "The phrase 'elect of Israel' (1.29) probably does not refer to a sect within Israel, the members of which are the only elect; it should be understood as 'the elect, Israel', for it is clear that all Israel is elect. . . ."<sup>33</sup> The author of Jubilees clearly understood

---

<sup>31</sup> Elliott (The Elect and The Holy, p. 82) points out that "The EF [Exodus Formula], as in 16:18, has been applied to Israel in toto".

<sup>32</sup> Sanders, Paul, p. 363. Vide also Davenport, Eschatology, p. 27.

<sup>33</sup> Sanders, Paul, p. 362. Jaubert (La notion) also believes that Israel will be bifurcated. She bases her interpretation on the radical law advocated in Jubilees. "On comprend qu'une communauté qui pratiquait un tel rigorisme était destinée à se séparer de la masse d'Israël" (p. 96). According to her understanding of Jubilees, "le livre des Jubilés continue à légiférer pour tout Israël, mais la violence polémique du ton manifeste par elle-même des profondeurs de divergence avec des adversaires puissants. Nous ne pouvons rien dire du jeu des partis à

that God's selection of Israel as His own people meant that

---

cette époque. La communauté des Jubilés devait se mettre à part par la rudesse de ses exigences et par son intransigeance en matière de calendrier. Il nous est apparu qu'elle n'avait pas encore rompu avec le Temple, mais nous ne pouvons mesurer exactement quelle était sa sphère d'influence ni son degré de participation à la vie de la nation" (p. 115). The final break, however, will not be complete until the time of Qumran: "Cette dramatique rupture est accomplie dans les documents de Qumrân" (p. 115). Thus, Jaubert's interpretation relies upon seeing the theology and times of Jubilees developing into those of Qumran and upon understanding Jubilees from the stance of the later break between the Qumran covenanters and the Jerusalemites. Both of these presuppositions are tenuous and unproven. Although she admits that all Israel is addressed by the author of Jubilees, she does not believe that all Israel will be saved. Consequently, Jaubert would understand the remnant as being 'the separated', the Qumran group. Thus, she would deny the eschatological background of 1.29 which she has elsewhere (p. 94) admitted. Unfortunately, this means that she also has ignored the mass of evidence which proves that all Israel will be saved, although all Israelites will not be among 'the elect'.

Davenport (Eschatology) also wishes to interpret Jubilees as indicating that only a portion of Israel will be saved. His interpretation is based upon Jub 31.18-20. According to Davenport: "The help of Judah and the deliverance of Israel which are to be found in Judah (vs. 19) and the peace for all the sons of the beloved (vs. 20b) may anticipate the restoration of the twelve tribes. More likely, it is a reference to Judah as the remaining tribe, in whom the remnants of the tribes find the fulfillment of their destiny. Judah, as judge, is the guardian of Israelite identity" (p. 65). Davenport later states much more definitively: "The purpose of the blessing of Judah is to show that Judah's existence as the remnant and her role as the tribe in whom the fragments of the other tribes find their continued life is the will of God" (p. 66). He summarizes: "The eschatology of the discourse [angelic discourse of which 31.18-20 is a part] is nationalistic in that Israel alone eventually will survive and be triumphant in the world, while the Gentiles will be judged for the way they have harassed and bothered the people of God. Judah is the remnant in whom the promise to the ancestors will find fulfillment. In her triumph, Israel will be triumphant" (p. 72). Although it is noteworthy that Davenport recognizes Jubilees does have a remnant theology, unfortunately, he

all Israel is elect, but does that mean that all Israelites are saved? Certainly not! Israel will be saved but some of the Israelites will be damned. The fate of Lot, Canaan, Sodom and Gomorrah is sufficient proof that for the author of Jubilees, "Physical descent is the basis of the election, and the election is the basis of salvation, but physical descent from Jacob is not the sole condition of salvation."<sup>34</sup>

Israelites cannot feel secure in their birthright alone:

And he told them of the judgment of the giants, and the judgment of the Sodomites, how they had been judged on account of their wickedness, and had died on account of their fornication, and uncleanness, and mutual corruption through fornication.

'And guard yourselves from all fornication and unclean-

---

contradicts the pan-Israelism of Jubilee's remnant concept. Judah cannot be the remnant of Israel because all Israel constitutes the remnant. Gentiles and apostate Jews are not part of Israel hence all Israel is saved. Furthermore, Davenport's interpretation ignores the assignment given to Levi by Isaac. Levi and his seed are to be closely associated with the Law (31.15) and, indeed, "they shall declare My ways to Jacob and My paths to Israel" (31.15). They will also "bless all the seed of the beloved" (31.15). Thus it seems that the promise of God is equally operative in Levi and Judah. It is thus inaccurate to trace Israel through Judah alone. Although the author of Jubilees wished to make Levi pre-eminent over Judah, he did not wish to abrogate the Davidic messiahship. Thus, he makes Levi predominate but retains the place of Judah as the tribe of the Messiah.

Although it is noteworthy that Davenport recognizes that Jubilees has a remnant theology, his interpretation contradicts the exegesis of the passage and the basic thrust of Jubilees.

<sup>34</sup>Sanders, Paul, p. 368 (emphasis his).

ness,

And from all pollution of sin,  
 Lest ye make our name a curse,  
 And your whole life a hissing,<sup>35</sup>  
 And all your sons to be destroyed by the sword,  
 And ye become accursed like Sodom,  
 And all your remnant as the sons of Gomorrah.

(20.5-6)

Similarly:

Beware, lest thou shouldst walk in their ways  
 And tread in their paths,  
 And sin a sin unto death<sup>36</sup> before the Most High God.  
 Else He will [hide His face from thee,  
 And] give thee back into the hands of thy transgression,  
 And root thee out of the land, and thy seed likewise  
 from under heaven,  
 And thy name and thy seed shall perish from the whole  
 earth. (21.22)

To protect one's inheritance it is necessary to remain  
 turned towards God and to do His will:

Turn away from all their deeds and all their uncleanness,  
 And observe the ordinance of the Most High God,  
 And do His will and be upright in all things.

---

<sup>35</sup>Cf. Isa 65.15; Jer 29.18.

<sup>36</sup>Cf. Num 18.22.

And He will bless thee in all thy deeds,  
 And will raise up from thee a plant of righteousness  
 through all the earth, throughout all generations  
 of the earth,  
 And my name and thy name shall not be forgotten under  
 heaven for ever. (21.23-24)

The events of Israel's past are adequate testimony that being an Israelite may entitle one to salvation but salvation must nonetheless be retained throughout one's life by constant faithfulness to God.

God chose Israel as His people, but His choice was not imposed upon an unwilling nation. Thus 12.19:

And he [Abraham] prayed that night and said,  
 'My God, God Most High, Thou alone art my God,  
 And Thee and Thy dominion have I chosen.  
 And Thou hast created all things,  
 And all things that are the work of thy hands.

"As always in Judaism, the divine choice does not eliminate freedom of action."<sup>37</sup>

The basis of this relationship between God and His elect, Israel, is the covenant which God offered to Israel and which he accepted. His acceptance means that Israel will be separated from all the nations of the earth (2.19) and made a holy and blessed nation (15.31) but it also means that

---

<sup>37</sup>Sanders, Paul, p. 363.

the law would be for Israel (3.14) and, as a result, Israel must walk in righteousness (7.26). God and Israel are bound to each other through the covenant. God, for His part, must be righteous towards His people; Israel, for his part must be righteous towards God. Righteousness involves one keeping a proper stance vis-à-vis the other. God's righteousness, His faithfulness to Israel, is proved in the fact that He has "not forsaken them for all the evil which they have wrought in transgressing the covenant" (1.6). He is "their Father in uprightness and righteousness" (1.25) and in the end they will recognise that he has been more righteous than they have been (1.6). God "is the living God, and He is holy and faithful, and He is righteous beyond all, and there is with Him no accepting of (men's) persons and no accepting of gifts; for God is righteous, and executeth judgment on all those who transgress His commandments and despise His covenant" (21.4). God's righteousness, therefore, means not only that Israel will endure but also that he will be judged for his transgressions. Israel's righteousness lay in the fulfillment of the commandments which carefully set forth how he was to remain forever faithful to God: "This law and testimony was given to the children of Israel as a law for ever unto their generations." (2.33) Israel had been commanded to "observe His commandments and His ordinances and His judgments, and walk not after the abominations and after the graven images and after the molten images"



(21.5). By observing the commandments of God, Israel becomes righteous (21.15) and, as a result, there shall be "a righteous generation and a holy seed" (25.3). Negatively, the righteousness of Israel lay in separating himself from the Gentiles and the unfaithful Israelites. The author of Jubilees constantly reminded the Israelites of their need to be separated from the Gentiles:<sup>38</sup>

Separate thyself from the nations,  
and eat not with them:  
And do not according to their works,  
And become not their associates;  
For their works are unclean,  
And all their ways are a pollution and an  
abomination and uncleanness.

(22.16)

The Israelites who are a holy nation unto the Lord are not to eat with the Gentiles (30.16) nor are they to join with them in business ventures (24.18). There shall be no inter-marriage (22.20); indeed, the giving of one's daughter to a Gentile is tantamount to giving her to Moloch (30.10) and the Israelite who does so shall be rooted out of the land

---

<sup>38</sup>The separation of Israel as uniquely God's people may also be a factor in the predominance of the calendar in Jubilees. Moore (Judaism, I, pp. 194-195) believes "the motive for it [the calendar system of Jubilees] was probably not the mere charm of symmetry, but the desire to create a distinctively Jewish division of time fundamentally unlike those of other peoples, and particularly that of the Greeks". (Vide I Enoch 76, 14; 82, 1-8)

(30.10). The Israelites are not to deport themselves like the Gentiles nor imitate them: "On this account, it is prescribed on the heavenly tablets as touching all those who know the judgment of the law, that they should cover their shame, and should not uncover themselves as the Gentiles uncover themselves" (3.31). Israel is to set himself off from the sinners, the Gentiles, just as Yahweh set him off from them: "And the Creator of all things blessed it, but he did not sanctify all peoples and nations to keep the Sabbath thereon, but Israel alone: them alone he permitted to eat and drink and to keep Sabbath thereon on earth" (2.31).<sup>39</sup>

Positively, the Israelites were to be righteous, faithful, and obedient to God:

And this I [Isaac] command you, my sons, that ye practice righteousness and uprightness on the earth, so that the Lord may bring upon you all that the Lord said that he would do to Abraham and to his seed. (36.3)

Similarly:

And he [Abraham] commanded them that they should observe

---

<sup>39</sup>Sanders points out: "It is noteworthy that most of the commandments specified in Jubilees are those which the Rabbis categorized as 'commandments between man and God'. The commandments which govern man's behavior toward man seem to be presupposed and are doubtless to be kept. Thus Jacob is instructed to honour his father and brother (35.1; cf. 7.20: honour father and mother, love the neighbour), and the prohibition of and punishment for murder are specified in 4.32." (Paul, p. 364)

the way of the Lord; that they should work righteousness, and love each his neighbor, and act on this manner amongst all men; that they should each so walk with regard to them as to do judgment and righteousness on the earth. That they should circumcise their son, according to the covenant which He had made with them, and not deviate to the right hand or the left from all the paths which the Lord had commanded us; and that we should keep ourselves from all fornication and uncleanness, [and renounce from amongst us all fornication and uncleanness]. (20.2-3)

Each of the heroes in Jubilees is lauded by the author for his righteousness and it is through these righteous men that one can trace the proper covenantal response of Israel. When "lawlessness increased on the earth and all flesh corrupted its way" (5.2),<sup>40</sup> God determined to destroy everything upon the earth, "but Noah found grace before the eyes of the Lord" (5.5). Noah alone was spared "for his heart was righteous in all his ways, according as it was commanded regarding him, and he had not departed from aught that was ordained for him" (5.19). In fact, Noah "in his life on

---

<sup>40</sup>The story of the imprisonment of the Watchers and the destruction of their children has been combined with the flood narrative to portray the consequence of lawlessness" (Davenport, Eschatology, p. 47).

Jub 5.1-2 = 11QJub3. The Qumran fragment, however, does not affect the meaning (VanderKam, Textual and Historical Studies, p. 39).

earth. . .excelled the children of men save Enoch because of the righteousness, wherein he was perfect" (10.17).

Abraham also excelled in devotion to God. Even the voices in heaven declared "that he was faithful in all that He told him, and that he loved the Lord, and that in every affliction he was faithful" (17.15). Like Noah, he was the only one of his time who was perfect in all his deeds:

For the days of the forefathers, of their life, were nineteen jubilees, and after the Flood they began to grow less than nineteen jubilees, and to decrease in jubilees, and to grow old quickly, and to be full of their days by reason of manifold tribulation and the wickedness of their ways, with the exception of Abraham. For Abraham was perfect in all his deeds with the Lord, and well-pleasing in righteousness all the days of his life; and behold, he did not complete four jubilees in his life, when<sup>41</sup> he had grown old by reason of the wickedness<sup>42</sup> and was full of days. (23.9-10)

Jacob, also, was praised "for he is on the upright path and he is a perfect man: and he is faithful and will not perish" (27.17). He is called a "perfect and upright son" in 35.12 "for there is no evil but only goodness in him".

<sup>41</sup>The Latin and the Ethiopic read "until", not "when". Charles (Jubilees, p. 145 on 23.10) believes it to be a "corruption of  $\omega s =$  'when' into  $\epsilon\omega s =$  'until'".

<sup>42</sup>The wickedness of others made Abraham grow old; Abraham himself was perfect. Cf. same verse.

Finally, it is said Joseph "walked in uprightness, for he was without pride and arrogance, and he had no respect of persons, and did not accept gifts, but he judged in uprightness all the people of the land" (40.8). It seems, therefore, righteousness and uprightness are practically synonymous and one who is righteous obeys God, follows the commandments, is faithful to God, loves the Lord, and does not act haughtily or arrogantly. In other words, as we have already pointed out, righteousness is a proper relationship vis-à-vis God which means, for Israel, obeying the covenant.<sup>43</sup>

According to the author of Jubilees righteousness will be rewarded and evil punished (20.6-10). Those who do not forsake God, who walk in faithfulness and righteousness, will be rewarded with length of days and material prosperity:

But serve ye the most High God, and worship Him  
continually:  
And hope for His countenance always,

---

<sup>43</sup>For further information on righteousness, vide Benno Przybylski, The Meaning and Significance of the Concept of Righteousness in the Gospel of Matthew: With Special Reference to the Use of this Concept in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Tannaitic Literature (unpublished PhD Dissertation, McMaster University, 1975).

One should note the connection between righteousness and faithfulness in translating the Ethiopic. "The Ethiopic verb tsa-da-ka and its noun and adjective forms are cognates of the Hebrew verb tsa-dak and its various forms. This leads us to translate the Ethiopic terms with some form of to be faithful. August Dillmann, Lexicon Linguae Aethiopicae (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1959), pp. 1311ff." (Davenport, Eschatology, p. 21, n. 1).



voice, and kept My charge and My commandment, and My laws, and My ordinances, and My covenant; and now obey My voice and dwell in this land. (24.10-11)

It is interesting to note here that the historical reason is followed by the imperative--Isaac's father has merited but Isaac must continue to merit. As long as one lives, righteousness is to be retained, lost or regained through one's actions. It is only through death that the book is closed and one's righteousness becomes finally determined. Promises similar to those made to Isaac are made to the other heroes who do not forsake the covenant. Thus, to Jacob, the perfect man, God declares:

'I am the Lord God of Abraham, thy father, and the God of Isaac; the land whereon thou art sleeping, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed after thee. And thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, and thou shalt increase to the west and to the east, to the north and the south, and in thee and in thy seed all the families of the nations be blessed.' (27.22-24)

Thus, those who do not forsake God will inherit the land which is the promise of Abraham and the enduring mark of God's faithfulness to his people; to be in the land is to be in Israel; those who obey God will not be 'rooted out of the land'. The reward for righteousness will also, in some way, be eternal. All those who observe the Sabbath "will be holy and blessed throughout all days like unto us" (2.28).

Similarly, one should "work judgment and righteousness that ye may be planted in righteousness over the face of the whole earth, and your glory lifted up before My God" (7.34).

The unfaithful, on the other hand, can expect punishment for their transgressions. Those who follow the "children of men" in whom there is no righteousness (21.21) will have short lives (23.4) while those who forsake the ordinances and commandments of God will fall into the hands of the enemy (1.10).<sup>44</sup> When Cain killed Abel, his punishment began immediately: "And the Lord reproveth Cain because of Abel, because he had slain him, and he made him a fugitive on the earth because of the blood of his brother, and he cursed him upon the earth" (4.4). Furthermore, when Cain's house collapsed and he was killed, his death was 'a righteous judgment', for a man should be killed with the instrument with which he killed (4.31). God "executeth judgment on all those who transgress His commandments and despise His covenant" (21.4) both now and upon the day of judgment (5.10). Most transgressions, however, can be atoned for by returning to righteousness:<sup>45</sup> "And of the children of Israel it has been written and ordained: If

---

<sup>44</sup>This most probably refers to the destruction and captivity of Israel (cf. Charles on 1.10, Jubilees, p. 4). Verses 11-13 refer to the evils in Judah and its eventual captivity.

<sup>45</sup>Vide also 31.1-2.



they turn to him in righteousness, He will forgive all their transgressions and pardon all their sins. It is written and ordained that he will show mercy to all who turn from all their guilt once each year" (5.17-18).<sup>46</sup> It is the opinion of the author of Jubilees that all the people of Israel have at some time sinned and yet God in His mercy will cleanse them if they return to Him:

I know their contrariness and their thoughts and their stiffneckedness, and they will not be obedient till they confess their own sin and the sin of their fathers. And after this they will turn to Me in all uprightness and with all (their) heart and with all (their) soul, and I will circumcise the foreskin of their heart and the foreskin of the heart of their seed, and I will create in them a holy spirit, and I will cleanse them so that they shall not turn away from Me from that day unto eternity. (1.22-23)

Indeed, once each year the Israelites are commanded to spend one day in mourning for their sins, transgressions, and errors "so that they might cleanse themselves on that day once a year" (34.19). Finally, there is also the example of the return of Jacob's house to God: "And they gave up the strange gods and that which was in their ears and which was

---

<sup>46</sup>Charles (Pseudepigrapha, p. 20) believes that these verses were either interpolated or transposed from 34.18-19. In either case, this does not affect its use here.

on their necks and the idols which Rachel stole from Laban her father she gave wholly to Jacob" (31.2). In most cases, therefore, when one sins, one can return to God.

There are, however, some sins which are so serious that there is no atonement possible.<sup>47</sup> Thus one who profanes the Sabbath and does work on it "shall surely die eternally" (2.27) and one who eats blood "shall be rooted out the land" both he and his descendants (6.12). One who is not circumcised on the eighth day,<sup>48</sup> "belongs not to the children of the covenant which the Lord made with Abraham, but to the

<sup>47</sup>Sanders notes "that all the commandments which, if transgressed, lead to expulsion from Israel are Biblical commandments" (Paul, p. 370).

<sup>48</sup>The Mss as well as the Latin version have "till the eighth day", but Charles translates "on the eighth day". He bases this on the parallelism between verse 14 ("And the uncircumcised male who is not circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin on the eighth day, that soul will be cut off from his people, for he has broken My covenant.") and verse 26 ("And every one that is born, the flesh of whose foreskin is not circumcised on the eighth day, belongs not to the children of the covenant which the Lord made with Abraham, but to the children of destruction; nor is there, moreover, any sign on him that he is the Lord's, but (he is destined) to be destroyed and slain from the earth, and to be rooted out of the earth, for he has broken the covenant of the Lord our God.") Charles explains the error as a corruption of ׁ into ׃ or ׃ into ׃ in the Hebrew. Furthermore, it is to be noted that, according to Shab 19:5: "A child could be circumcised on the 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, or 12th day, neither earlier nor later. How so? Usually it is circumcised on the 8th day. Should it be born on the evening it is circumcised on the 9th: should it be born on Friday evening it is circumcised on the 10th: should the Sunday be a festival, on the 11th: should the Sunday and Monday be New Year's days, on the 12th. If the child is ill, it is not circumcised till well." (Cf. Charles, Jubilees, pp. 108-109 on verse 14; pp. 110-111 on verse 26).

children of destruction" and he is destined "to be destroyed and slain from the earth, and to be rooted out of the Land, for he has broken the covenant of the Lord our God" (15.26). One who uncovers his father's skirt "is to be put to death and slain, and stoned with stones, and rooted out from the midst of the people of our God" (33.13) while one who devises evil against his brother "shall fall into his hand, and shall be rooted out of the land of the living, and his seed shall be destroyed from under heaven" (36.9).<sup>49</sup> It is quite obvious from these examples that those who commit these transgressions "forsake the covenant", i.e., they forfeit their rightful place in Israel--they are "rooted out of the land". We have already seen that all Israel is to be saved and that through descent from Jacob, one qualifies to be in Israel, "in the Land".<sup>50</sup> It is, however, also

---

<sup>49</sup>Sanders, (Paul, p. 367) notes "the author maintains the old view of the collective punishment of the entire people because of the unatoned or unpunished sin of an individual". Thus the entire nation can be judged for the uncleanness of one man (30.15) while it is also possible that the punishment of one man can "avert the punishment which would otherwise fall on the entire people":

And do thou command the children of Israel that there be no uncleanness amongst them, for every one who lies with his daughter-in-law or with his mother-in-law hath wrought uncleanness; with fire let them burn the man who has lain with her, and likewise the woman, and He will turn away wrath and punishment from Israel. (41.26)

<sup>50</sup>W. D. Davies (The Gospel and The Land, [Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1974], p. 50)

true that one's actions can cause one to be removed from Israel; hence, even though all Israelites will not be saved, it is nonetheless true that all Israel will be saved, since those who forsake the covenant are no longer to be considered part of Israel. Just as Noah's sons were saved because of Noah's righteousness; so too, one's seed is damned because of one's transgressions.

The purpose of atonement and punishment is to cleanse, to purify. Israel as the people of God is holy; and, therefore, uncleanness cannot be tolerated in him: "and there shall be nothing unclean before our God in the nation which He has chosen for himself as a possession" (33.11). Similarly:

And there is no greater sin than the fornication which they commit on earth; for Israel is a holy nation unto the Lord its God, and a nation of inheritance, and a priestly and royal nation and for (His own) possession; and there shall no such uncleanness appear in the midst of the holy nation. (33.20)

Indeed, the purification of Israel is a sign of the end of

---

notes "The connection between Israel's conduct and the land is marked. In Jub 6:12-13 the failure to observe the demands of Yahweh is incompatible with occupation of the land: 'The man who eats the blood of beasts or of cattle or of birds during all the days of the earth, he and his seed shall be rooted out of the land.' Again, in Jub 15:28, the reward of those who observe circumcision is that 'they will not be rooted out of the land.'"

the world:

And the jubilees shall pass by, until Israel is cleansed from all guilt of fornication, and uncleanness, and pollution, and sin, and error, and dwells with confidence in all the land, and there shall be no more a satan or any evil one, and the land shall be clean from that time for evermore. (50.5)<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup>The necessity to keep Israel pure conflicts with the salvation of Israel and the historical reality in the story of Judah's atonement for his intercourse with Tamar, his daughter-in-law:

And Judah acknowledged that the deed which he had done was evil, for he had lain with his daughter-in-law, and he esteemed it hateful in his eyes, and he acknowledged that he had transgressed and gone astray; for he had uncovered the skirt of his son, and he began to lament and to supplicate before the Lord because of his transgression. And we told him in a dream that it was forgiven him because he supplicated earnestly, and lamented, and did not again commit it. And he received forgiveness because he turned from his sin and from his ignorance, for he transgressed greatly before our God; and every one that acts thus, every one who lies with his mother-in-law, let them burn him with fire that he may burn therein, for there is uncleanness and pollution upon them; with fire let them burn them. And do thou command the children of Israel that there be no uncleanness amongst them, for everyone who lies with his daughter-in-law or with his mother-in-law hath wrought uncleanness; with fire let them burn the man who has lain with her, and likewise the woman, and He will turn away wrath and punishment from Israel. And unto Judah we said that his two sons had not lain with her, and for this reason his seed was established for a second generation, and would not be rooted out. For in singleness of eye he had gone and sought for punishment, namely, according to the judgment of Abraham, which he had commanded his sons, Judah had sought to burn her with fire. (41.23-28)

Thus, since the transgression committed by Adam and Eve, the entire history of Israel can be viewed as a process of total purification. Salvation for Israel cannot be a fact until all Israel has been cleansed. Purification consists in 'rooting out' all those who forsake the covenant so that only the righteous remain.<sup>52</sup> Of course, one must remember that, since the unfaithful are "rooted out" of Israel, the integrity of Israel is insured. The process of the cleansing of Israel is linked in Jubilees with the eradication of the rampant evil that preceded the flood: "And the Lord destroyed everything from off the face of the earth; because

---

In this story, one finds that the historical reality of Judah's survival contradicts the fact that this sin should have caused death and 'rooting out'. This, however, would have endangered the salvation of Israel for the salvation of Israel is to be found in Judah (31.19). Furthermore, the fact is that Judah did historically survive his sin even though uncleanness must be kept from Israel. Judah's lenient treatment is due to two reasons:

His earnest repentance apparently suffices for his forgiveness; thus he is not executed. The fact that there was a mitigating factor in his transgression--his second and third sons had not consummated a relationship with Tamar--seems to have prevented his 'seed' from being 'rooted out'." (Sanders, Paul, p. 378)

Sanders continues:

"It thus appears that the author's view that there is no atonement for forsaking the covenant, when it conflicts with the historical reality of the continuation of Israel and with his conviction that Israel is elect and will ultimately be cleansed and saved, yields." (Paul, p. 378; emphasis his).

<sup>52</sup>Davenport, Eschatology, p. 15.

of the wickedness of their deeds, and because of the blood which they had shed in the midst of the earth He destroyed everything" (7.25). After the flood had abated, only Noah and those on the ark with him were left--only the righteous remained (6.2). Lot and his daughters were also to be 'rooted out' for they "committed sin upon the earth, such as had not been on the earth since the days of Adam till his time; for the man lay with his daughters" (16.8). As a result, "it was commanded and engraven concerning all his seed, on the heavenly tablets, to remove them and root them out, and to execute judgment upon them like the judgment of Sodom, and to leave no seed of the man on earth on the day of condemnation" (16.9). In the same way, Canaan is to be destroyed and because of this, Jacob is enjoined not to marry a woman from Canaan (22.20). Just as the 'rooting out' of Lot's seed will not be finally accomplished till the "day of condemnation" (16.9) so also the 'rooting out' of Canaan will not be fully accomplished till "the day of judgment" (22.21). In the story of Noah, it is obvious the righteous were saved from the flood. As we have seen, the text of 6.2 makes this perfectly clear. The effect of the 'rooting out' of Lot and Canaan is not equally obvious, but the intent is quite discernible. The parallel theme of the promise being passed from one righteous man to the next clarifies the author's intent. Israel will continue to exist and the promise to the fathers is to be passed only

in righteousness, as Noah reminds his sons: "work judgment and righteousness that ye may be planted in righteousness over the face of the whole earth, and your glory lifted up before my God, who saved me [Noah] from the waters of the flood" (7.36). Conversely, if they do not heed his warning and "do not walk in righteousness" (7.26), they then walk "in the path of destruction" (7.26) and both they and their seed might very well "be destroyed from the earth" (7.29). Israel must be cleansed of all those who forsake the covenant, for he is the people of God. One positive aspect of this cleansing can be found in the separation of those who are righteous and follow the covenant from those--Gentiles and apostate Israelites--who are unrighteous and forsake the covenant. The author of Jubilees frequently appeals to the distinction between these two groups<sup>53</sup> to convince his

---

<sup>53</sup>On the one hand, those who are faithful are called "the children of the living God" (1.25), "the children of Jacob" (1.28), "the seed of Jacob" (2.20), "the children of Israel" (2.33), "the children of the sons of Noah" (10.1), "the sons of the righteous" (10.7), "the sons of Noah" (10.13), the seed of Abraham (13.3), "the children of the covenant" (15.26), "the sons of Israel" (15.33), the seed of Isaac (16.18), "the whole seed of Shem" (19.17), "a holy nation" (22.11), "a holy seed" (25.12); "the people of our God" (33.10), "a royal nation" (33.20), "a nation of inheritance" (33.20), "the people of the land" (40.8). In fact, a study of their appellations is a study of Israel, the elect. On the other hand, the damned are called "the sons of perdition" (10.3), the "children of destruction" (15.26), Gentiles, those who are rooted out of the earth (30.22), those who will be destroyed (30.22), and "adversaries" (30.22). The term "children of men" presents special problems. It seems to be a neutral term, implying neither sal-



readers to return to the true Judaism of the forefathers. The fact that Israel must be cleansed by separation has already been proved. One very interesting episode which dramatically points up the separation of Israel from the rest of the children of men is the story of Abraham, who was forced to separate himself from his father because of the evil which had engulfed the father:

And the child began to understand the errors of the earth that all went astray after graven images and after uncleanness, and his father taught him writing, and he was two weeks of years old, and he separated himself from his father, that he might not worship idols with him. And he began to pray to the creator of all things that He might save him from the errors of the children of man, and that his portion should not fall into error after uncleanness and vileness. (11.16-17)

The key phrases in this story are "save him" and "that his portion should not fall into error". The first is strikingly reminiscent of the Noah story when Noah alone was spared (5.19) while the second points to the reason for the "saving", namely, to preserve Israel from error. As it was Noah's function, it was also Abram's to be the true representative of Israel, the "true Israel". Both of these

---

vation nor damnation (10.18; 11.17; 15.31). There are, however three verses in which "children of men" must be understood pejoratively (21.21, 22; 23.14).

stories illustrate how Israel is radically cleansed when evil within the world reaches monumental proportions and threatens his very existence.

There can be little doubt that Jubilees was written for a grander and more immediate purpose than simply to recount a small part of the past history of Israel. It is the purpose of the author to issue a warning to Israel, to call for all Israel to return to the Lord. He is ringing the death knell on the bell of the past. Just as evil was rampant in the time of Noah and in the time of Abraham, so also, is it now: "For all have done evil, and every mouth speaks iniquity and all their works are in uncleanness and in abomination, and all their ways are pollution, uncleanness, and destruction" (23.17). The Israelites have adopted the ways of the Gentiles and have turned from God. They "have forgotten commandment, and covenant, and feasts, and months, and Sabbaths, and jubilees, and all judgments" (23.19). As a result, there shall be some type of warfare whose intent is to make them return (23.20). From this holocaust there will be a remnant ("those who have escaped") but this remnant:

shall not return from their wickedness to the way of righteousness, but they shall all exalt themselves to deceit and wealth, that they may each take all that is his neighbor's, and they shall name the great name, but not in truth and not in righteousness, and they shall

defile the holy of holies with their uncleanness and  
the corruption of their pollution. (23.21)

The evil is so great that even the remnant will not be  
righteous, so that the Lord will pronounce judgment upon  
them:

And a great punishment shall befall the deeds of  
this generation from the Lord, and He will give them  
over to the sword and to the sinners of the Gentiles,  
who have neither mercy nor compassion, and who shall  
respect the person of none, neither old nor young,  
nor any one, for they are more wicked and strong to  
do evil than all the children of men.

And they shall use violence against Israel and trans-  
gression against Jacob,

And much blood shall be shed upon the earth,

And there shall be none to gather and none to bury.

In those days they shall cry aloud,

And call and pray that they may be saved from the hand  
of the sinners, the Gentiles;

But none shall be saved.

And the heads of the children shall be white with grey  
hair,

And a child of three weeks shall appear old like a man  
of one hundred years,

And their stature shall be destroyed by tribulation and

oppression.

(23.22-25)

Even after such holocaust, however, there will still be a remnant, Israel will return to purity through the covenant--obedience to the commandments and righteousness. Thus:

And in those days the children shall begin to study  
the laws,

And to seek the commandments,

And to return to the path of righteousness.

.....

And at that time the Lord will heal His servants,

And they shall rise up and see great peace,

And drive out their adversaries.

And the righteous shall see and be thankful,

And rejoice with joy for ever and ever,

And shall see all their judgments and all their curses  
on their enemies.

And their bones shall rest in the earth,

And their spirits shall have much joy,

And they shall know that it is the Lord who executes  
judgment,

And shows mercy to hundreds and thousands and to all  
that love Him.<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup>This verse indicates that the souls of the righteous can look forward to some type of eternal happiness

And do thou, Moses, write down these words; for thus are they written, and they record (them) on the heavenly tablets for a testimony for the generations for ever.

(23.26-32)<sup>55</sup>

The call to return to the Lord is not issued to any group or sect within Israel; it is issued to the generations, to all Israelites. It is obvious from these verses that the remnant is not yet formed, but it is quite apparent what the conditions are for membership: one must be righteous and fulfill the covenant.<sup>56</sup> The Israel of that day will be in possession of the land, the enemies are never to rise again,

after death. It is noteworthy, however, that there is no expressed hope of the resurrection of the body.

According to Davenport (Eschatology, p. 4), the eschatological discrepancy between this verse and 23.11 is explained by a form and redaction analysis of Jubilees which "reveals that the references to the day of judgment and the scene in xxiii, 14-31 are from different traditions. Moreover, we do not have a mere linking of traditions. The 'author' of the second edition of Jubilees interpreted the events of his day as the day of judgment, the day mentioned in the other stratum."

<sup>55</sup>Davenport (Eschatology, p. 36) contends that vss. 24-31 constitute an eschatological poem.

The exact sequence of events at the end-times is difficult to determine, but it is not necessary that we delve into it for the purpose of this study. Vide Davenport, Eschatology, pp. 36-46; Charles, Jubilees, p. 150 on 23.30.

<sup>56</sup>Davenport (Eschatology, p. 19) adopts a similar interpretation when discussing the prophetic and apocalyptic aspects of certain verses (i, 4b-26, 27-28, and xxiii, 14-31): "It is apocalyptic in its emphasis on the necessity for each individual Israelite to be faithful to Torah in order to be a part of redeemed Israel. . .".

the judgments of Israel will have descended upon their enemies, and the Lord will have executed judgment. The call is to the eschatological remnant, the final "true Israel". The remnant will be finally formed but, until then, it must be considered an open group in which membership is available to all Israelites. This does not seem to mitigate the eternally damning commandments but it does preclude any type of sectarian reading. There is absolutely no restrictive phraseology concerning the coming salvation.<sup>57</sup> Israel will still be totally saved for there has also been no mitigation for those who "forsake the covenant". The situation has not changed but the circumstances have become desperate.

In Jubilees, the final aim of God is the salvation of Israel, which can only be accomplished when Israel is cleansed of all those who are evil and consists of only the

---

<sup>57</sup>Testuz (Les idées) attempts to substantiate a restrictive interpretation of Jubilees. In his discussion of the Sinai event, he points out:

"Cette dernière alliance sera renouvelée avec les seuls soumis de nouveau aux lois de l'Alliance. Pour notre auteur, il n'existe de vrais serviteurs de Dieu que dans la communauté à laquelle il appartient. Il s'agit donc ici de l'alliance avec les Elus d'Israël, de l'alliance finale et définitive, déjà conclue avec un petit groupe, et dont on n'attend plus, pour un avenir proche, que la matérialisation" (p. 69).

This argument hinges upon the author's previous argument concerning the interpretation of "Les Elus d'Israël" (1.29). If the elect of Israel is not to be restrictively interpreted, then any argument based upon such an interpretation becomes false.

righteous. The righteous seem to be the "true Israel", the remnant of Israel. We have seen that, in the past, it has been the righteous who have been the recipients of the promises of God and they have been separated as the people of God in whom there can be no uncleanness. The rest of the children of men have been destined for damnation--either because they are not of the elect of God or because they have forsaken their place in the elect of God. Those that remain after the purification which has been necessary because of the evil in the world--they are the saved, the elect, the children of the covenant, the remnant, the 'true Israel', 'all Israel'. The process of purification has been a process of separating faithful from unfaithful.

The remnant, however, is not a past or present concept in Jubilees--it is an eschatological term. There are those who already have earned a place in the remnant. They are those, like the patriarchs, who have lived righteous lives and have died. There are also those who have excluded themselves from the remnant. They are those who have forsaken the covenant. And, there are those who have never had a chance of being included in the remnant. They are the Gentiles. The people, however, of the author's time fall, for the most part, into none of these categories. They must strive to become a part of the remnant, but even for the righteous among them, their place is not secure. The membership roles are open, both to enter and to leave, until

the judgment.<sup>58</sup> No one, however, can doubt that the author

<sup>58</sup>Davenport (Eschatology, p. 77) believes God "has called into existence a small group of faithful people who are the hope of Israel". From this, it is difficult to determine whether Davenport has appreciated the use of remnant or not. His statement, at least, indicates a sympathy for a remnant understanding.

Testuz (Les idées) divides the world into two camps; the one, those "qui connaissent Dieu et sa loi" (p. 72), will reap the harvest of the covenantal promises (p. 70); the other, those "qui ne connaissent pas Dieu et sa volonté" (p. 72), will finally be destroyed (p. 70). The former he identifies with "Israël, l'Israël fidèle" (p. 72) and the latter with "tous les Gentils" (p. 72). It seems that Testuz also believes it is possible to pass from the group who know God into the group who do not know God (for the reverse possibility see p. 73) and, more significantly, that those who do so, in effect, become Gentiles:

"Nous avons vu cette Alliance avec Israël proclamée dès la Création, puis renouvelée successivement avec Noé, Abraham, Jacob, chaque fois avec des promesses plus magnifiques. De même, nous avons relevé que Dieu n'élut pas tout les peuples, et nous assisté à la constitution progressive de cette masse anonyme et réprouvée des Gentils: Caïn, Canaan et les autres descendants de Noé sauf Shem, les fils d'Abraham excepté Isaac, Esaü et ses enfants." (p. 70)

Elsewhere:

"Remarquons que la réciproque n'est pas vraie: un Israélite peut fort bien déchoir de sa dignité et se ravalier au rang des Gentils, s'il n'observe pas les lois de l'Alliance, la circoncision, la célébration du Sabbat, etc. Dieu le traitera alors comme un des Gentils qu'il imite dans sa conduite: il sera exilé du pays, puis condamné à la destruction. Toutefois, il lui est laissé la possibilité de se repentir: il lui suffit de se soumettre à nouveau aux exigences de la loi, pour que Dieu lui soit indulgent." (p. 73-74)

Thus, it seems that one finds Israelites in both groups: the faithful in the one and the unfaithful in the other:

"De plus, constatons que pour les Jubilés, il y a à l'intérieur du peuple d'Israël deux catégories



of Jubilees considers himself to be a prime candidate; but, according to his own criteria, even he cannot be assured of membership.<sup>59</sup>

We have now completed our study of the central message of Jubilees and, at this time, it is most useful to review the basic characteristics of the remnant in the Hebrew Bible to determine whether such an understanding has been found in Jubilees; and, if so, how central it is to the author's message.

Remnant in the Hebrew Bible is inextricably bound to the judgment and restoration which results from the encounter between God and the Israelites precipitated by the election of Israel as the people of God. In fact, with the introduction of the theme of the judgment of Israel,

---

d'Israélites: les fidèles qui observent les lois de l'Alliance, et les autres." (p. 74)

For Testuz, Israel is divided and the unfaithful Israelites are, in essence, Gentiles.

Testuz has placed too much emphasis on the Gentiles--an emphasis which is foreign to Jubilees. It is correct there are faithful and unfaithful Israelites, but there is no indication the unfaithful are to be called Gentiles. This in spite of their obviously equivalent destiny: destruction. Although the author of Jubilees saw an orderly universe, he is not pre-occupied with systematics.

<sup>59</sup>Jaubert (La notion, p. 91) believes that the author of Jubilees belonged "à un mouvement séparé de la masse d'Israël" but that the group had not yet broken with the Jerusalem Temple. Testuz (Les idées, p. 74) places the author within the faithful part of Israel--those who are trying to convert the errant Israelites back to true belief.

"the question of the remnant is ipso facto posed".<sup>60</sup>

Remnant is always defined by judgment--a judgment which is related to both the past and the future. The election was frustrated by the evil in the world which contaminated Israel and meant that there must be a time of purification and sifting to cleanse Israel so that only the pure and faithful would remain. Faithfulness is based upon loyalty to Yahweh and his covenant. Ultimately, the remnant rests in the promise of salvation to Israel. This promise eventually meant that the remnant of Israel would be gathered at the end of time to dwell forever with God. Remnant in the Hebrew Bible is also based upon a call to salvation which is addressed to all and answered by some. The function of God is not, however, to be minimized; for the essential elements behind remnant are God's choice, God's promise and God's faithfulness:

Through the covenant Israel was adopted as God's portion, consecrated and inviolable, and Israel bound itself to his will in the covenantal stipulations. When the nation breached these stipulations, it fell under the wrath. But the judgment that followed was no final repudiation by Yahweh. On the contrary, the very judgment of Israel, like the judgment of Israel's enemies, was the act by which the covenant was re-

---

<sup>60</sup>Meyer, "Jesus and the Remnant", p. 127.

affirmed. How? Through the remnant that survived.<sup>61</sup>

As we have noted, all of these characteristics are found in Jubilees with the major exception of the claim to present remnant theology. It seems that there is definitely a remnant theology in Jubilees but can there be any legitimate explanation for the author's seeming reticence to orient his remnant beliefs to the present. The prophets' major objection to remnant belief was the self-righteousness which it engendered in the people. The permeation of Israelite society by the remnant ideal caused the people to believe that the promise of God to his people was unconditional: their transgressions would be forgiven and, in the end, they would be saved regardless of their previous conduct. The situation at the time of Amos indicates that this attitude was prevalent among the Israelites. They were self-righteous in their election and, as a result, evil was rampant. Amos, therefore, predicted dire consequences, for he hoped his emphasis on destruction rather than salvation would shock the people to return to God. It is obvious the same type of message is being conveyed by the author of Jubilees. He is well versed in remnant theology but he seems to be in an era much akin to Amos': The people are rejecting God and evil has triumphed.

---

<sup>61</sup>Meyer, The Church, p. 34.

To counteract this situation, he must emphasize the damnation resulting from sin and the terrible consequences of "forsaking the covenant".<sup>62</sup> On the other hand, he must also give hope to Israel. Amos gave hope through the promise of the mitigation of the disaster. The author of Jubilees, however, though he believed in mitigation by God, emphasized the emulation of the righteous. He wanted Israel to reform permanently by turning back to the ways of the patriarchal heroes rather than by temporally being fearful of complete extermination only to fall back into self-righteousness when faced by the hope of mitigation. The author of Jubilees used the structure of remnant theology but emphasized the open-endedness of the remnant--the fact that the remnant is not closed until the day of judgment. Thus penitents may be saved and sinners damned. Further, he emphasized the fact that some sins are eternally damning and that for these sins there is no chance for atonement. The net effect of this stance towards remnant is a hardening of the exclusion principle, a return to emulation of past heroes, and a drastic reduction of the possibility of self-righteousness.

---

<sup>62</sup>Martin ("Le Livre des Jubilés", pp. 522-523) says about the judgment: "Ce jugement terrible, c'est surtout en tant que rendu contre les pécheurs que l'envisage l'auteur des Jubilés. Il parle très rarement, dans un seul passage croyons-nous, de la miséricorde que fait l'auteur du jugement <<à des centaines, à des milliers et à tous ceux qui l'aiment>>" (23.31).

In order to avoid the pitfalls of the remnant theology in the Hebrew Bible, the author seems to have purposefully avoided an emphasis on the word itself lest the Israelites read self-righteousness into Jubilees. The futurity of the remnant means that the author cannot yet be identified as a member of the remnant of Israel nor can one read sectarianism into Jubilees. Jubilees is addressed to all Israel--keeping mindful that Israel consists of those Israelites who are not apostates and that they are indeed proleptic representatives of the future remnant, although they are not yet to be identified with it. Jubilees is unique in that one finds therein unquestioning exclusivism. The Gentiles are considered only negatively in the salvation scheme.

The question of the centrality of remnant in Jubilees is answered by the very fact that once the remnant characteristics are compared to the message of Jubilees, one sees that they permeate every aspect of the book. The message of the remnant is integral to the message of Jubilees.

#### D. THE TESTAMENT OF MOSES

The text traditionally known as the "Assumption of Moses" is, in actuality, part of a composite work consisting of the Testament of Moses and the Assumption of Moses.<sup>1</sup>

Although no significant portion of the Assumption of Moses is extant, approximately half of the Testament of Moses survives in Latin.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The relationship between the Assumption and the Testament is debatable. In the lists of apocryphal books the "Testament of Moses" (Διαθήκη Μωυσέως) is followed by the "Assumption of Moses" (Ἀνάψις Μωυσέως) (Charles, Pseudepigrapha, p. 407). Ceriani recognized a fifth century palimpsest he found as part of the "Assumption of Moses" referred to and quoted in a number of Greek fragments (vide A. -M. Denis, "Assumptio Mosis", Apocalypsis Henochi Graeci et Fragmenta Pseudepigrapha Graeca, ed. by M. Black and A. -M. Denis, PVTG 3 [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970], 63-67). Schürer realized the extant verses were more properly a testament of Moses than a discussion of the assumption of Moses (note the idea of assumption occurs only at 10.12, "receptionem" is in uneasy apposition to "morte" and is not reflected in 1.15, 10.14 or 11.8) and hypothesized the two were parts of one work called the Assumption of Moses. Charles by and large accepted Schürer's suggestion but believed the two texts existed independently before being joined together (Charles, Pseudepigrapha, pp. 407-408). Charles' argument is convincing but, in any case, the extant text is more correctly the "Testament of Moses" (vide also, A. B. Kolenkow, "The Assumption of Moses as a Testament", Studies on The Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers, ed. by G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., SCS 4 [Cambridge, Mass.: SBL, 1973], 71-77).

<sup>2</sup>According to Nicephorus, the Testament of Moses consisted of 1100 stichoi (Charles, Pseudepigrapha, p. 408) which means that approximately half the text is extant (contra F. C. Burkitt, "Assumption of Moses", in A Dictionary of the Bible, ed. by James Hastings [Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1900], III, 449).

According to the author of the Testament of Moses,

---

The translation used is that of Charles, Pseudepigrapha, pp. 414-424. Latin text from R. H. Charles, The Assumption of Moses (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1897), pp. 54-101. Greek fragments have been collected by Denis, Fragmenta, pp. 63-67 (vide also Charles, Assumption, pp. 103-110).

The original language was Hebrew. The Latin text was derived from the Greek (Charles, Pseudepigrapha, pp. 409-410) and the Greek from the Hebrew (Ibid.; Charles, Assumption, pp. xxxvi-xlv; vide also D. H. Wallace, "The Semitic Origin of the Assumption of Moses", TZ, 11 [1955], 321-328).

There are three theories concerning the date of the Testament: the period of Antiochus Epiphanes, early first century C.E. and post-70 C.E. The latest is least likely. S. Zeitlin ("The Assumption of Moses and the Revolt of Bar Kokba", JQR, 38 [1947-1948], 1-45) is quite beside the mark in claiming Anno Mundi dating was not used by Jews during the Second Commonwealth. Note Jub 50.4 (vide, supra, "The Book of Jubilees", n. 1, re: dating). More recently K. Haacker ("Assumptio Mosis-eine samaritanische Schrift?", TZ, 25 [1969], 385-405) has advocated a post 70-C.E. date. His dating is predicated upon proving Samaritan provenance and falls since the text totally lacks uniquely Samaritan references (vide J. D. Purvis, "Samaritan Traditions on the Death of Moses", Studies on the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers, ed. by G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., SCS 4 [Cambridge, Mass.: SBL, 1973], 93-117, esp. 116-117).

The majority of scholars have followed Charles (Assumption, lv-lvii) in dating the text 7-30 C.E. The Temple still stands (1.17-18; 8.9); 6.8-9 refers to the attack on the Jews under Varus in 4 B.C.E.; 6.7 states that Herod's sons will reign shorter periods than their father (true of only Archelaus who reigned until 6 C.E.); and the last explicit historical reference concerns 4 B.C.E. (Varus; 6.8-9).

J. Licht ("Taxo, or the Apocalyptic Doctrine of Vengeance", JJS, 12 [1961], 95-103) and later G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr. ("Assumption of Moses", Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism, HTS 26 [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1972], 28-31, 43-45, 97; "An Antiochan Date for the Testament of Moses", Studies on the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers, ed. by G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., SCS 4 [Cambridge, Mass.: SBL, 1973], 33-37) have advocated the earlier date based upon chpt. 6 being an interpolation.

Israel, even prior to the creation of the world, had been selected by God as his people. This is evidenced in the pre-creation preparation of Moses to be mediator of the

---

The decisive issue for these dating theories is the unity of the text. Charles ("Assumption", pp. 28-30) argued that chpts. 8-9 refer to the Antiochan persecution and rightly belong before chpt. 6, which refers to Varus (C. Lattey ["The Messianic Expectation in 'The Assumption of Moses'", CBQ (1942), 9-21] proposed that only chpt. 8 be transposed. This, however, ignores the unity of chpts. 8-9 in which Taxo, chpt. 9, seems to refer to the persecution in chpt. 8.). Nickelsburg (Resurrection, pp. 43-45; Licht, pp. 102-103, proposed the theory but did not fully develop it) argues chpt. 6 is an interpolation based upon the book's pattern (sin, punishment, turning point [changed from "repentance" (Resurrection, p. 29); cf. D. J. Harrington, "Interpreting Israel's History: The Testament of Moses as a Rewriting of Deut 31-34", Studies on the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers, ed. by G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., SCS 4 (Cambridge, Mass.: SBL, 1973), 66.], salvation) in which chpt. 6 does not fit; the close similarity between chpt. 8 and the Antiochan persecution; the similarity between Taxo and his sons and the Hasidim killed during the Maccabean outbreak. J. J. Collins ("The Date and Provenance of the Testament of Moses", Studies on the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers, ed. by G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., SCS 4 [Cambridge, Mass.: SBL, 1973], 15-32) has challenged the interpolation theory. The textus receptus dates from the post-Herodian period; chpt. 8 is modeled on the Antiochan persecution but is eschatologically employed; the author passed over the Antiochan persecution to avoid honouring the Maccabees whose descendants, the Hasmoneans, he hated (vide chpt. 6). Later Collins ("Some Remaining Traditio-Historical Problems in the Testament of Moses", Studies on the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers, ed. by G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., SCS 4 [Cambridge, Mass.: SBL, 1973], 38-43) accepts a slightly modified Licht-Nickelsburg theory. The result is a combination theory: the Testament was originally written in the Antiochan period and then later, re-written by a redactor, certainly an author in his own right, who made it anti-militant in view of the circumstances of 4 B.C.E. I might add that this more thoroughgoing eschatological edition could have resulted in the Testament being linked with the Assumption of Moses by the redactor.



covenant: "Accordingly He designed and devised me, and He prepared me before the foundation of the world, that I should be the mediator<sup>3</sup> of His covenant" (1.14).<sup>4</sup> Israel is God's own people (1.12) whom he has willed to be his elect<sup>5</sup> (4.2); "He hath created the world on behalf of His people" (1.12). Indeed, at the end of the world, when all evil has been eradicated, it is Israel, the people of God, who will be exalted unto heaven:<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>The title is not applied to Moses in the Hebrew Bible but he performs mediatorial functions (cf. Exod 20.19). Later authors recognize this role and apply the title: TM 1.14; 3.12; Gal 3.19-20.

<sup>4</sup>Verse quoted in Greek by Gelasius of Cyzicum (vide Charles, Assumption, p. 6). William John Ferrar (The Assumption of Moses, Translations of Early Documents, Series I, [London: SPCK, 1918], p. 21) translates "qui praepatus sum" more correctly as "who [Moses] was prepared."

Charles (Pseudepigrapha, p. 415) claims Moses is assigned pre-existence; this may exceed the text (with D. J. Harrington, "Interpreting Israel's History", p. 64). The verse is meant to locate Israel's election before the creation of the world, to affirm God's comprehensive plan (cf. 1.13, 17; 12.4; vide D. L. Tiede, "The Figure of Moses in the Testament of Moses", Studies on the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers, ed. by G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., SCS 4 [Cambridge, Mass.: SBL, 1973], 90) not to establish Moses' pre-existence; on this point, the text is quite unclear (cf. Jer 1.5).

<sup>5</sup>Reading, with Charles (Assumption, pp. 68-69) "electam" for "exceptam".

<sup>6</sup>The eschatology of these verses has been challenged by T. W. Manson ("Miscellanea Apocalyptica", JTS, 46 [1945], 42-45). For Manson, "nuntii" (10.2) is Elijah, not Michael and thus the stages become: the return of Elijah to gather the dispersed of Israel; the overthrow and punishment of the Roman oppressors; and the triumph of Israel as the world-power. Adela Yarbro Collins ("Composition and Redaction of

Then thou, O Israel, shalt be happy,  
 And thou shalt mount upon the necks and wings of the  
 eagle,  
 And they shall be ended.  
 And God will exalt thee,<sup>7</sup>  
 And He will cause thee to approach to the heaven of the  
 stars,  
 In the place of their habitation. (10.8-9)

Israel's priveleged position vis-à-vis God has been formalized and made reciprocal in the covenant which was executed between God and His people: "'Lord of all, King on the lofty throne, who rulest the world, and didst will that this people should be Thine elect people, then (indeed) Thou didst will that Thou shouldst be called their God, according to the covenant which Thou didst make with their fathers. . .'" (4.2).<sup>8</sup> In this covenantal relationship,

---

the Testament of Moses 10", HTR, 69 [1-2, 1976], 180-182) shows Manson's translation of 10.3ff. is forced and neglects the military role of the nuntius.

<sup>7</sup>On text exegesis, vide Collins ("Composition and Redaction", pp. 183-186) who resolves the textual difficulties in verse 8 by recognizing the hand of the first century redactor who, by adding "alas aquilae" alludes to the tearing down of the golden eagle erected by Herod over the Temple gate.

<sup>8</sup>"The covenant is the center of the author's theology: it is because of God's covenant with the fathers that Israel has a future" (D. J. Harrington, "Summary of Gunther Reese, Die Geschichte Israels in der Auffassung des frühen Judentums, Chpt. III," Studies on the Testament of Moses:

God, who is faithful in all things (11.16), has promised not only that his people would possess the land (1.9; 2.1) but also that "their seed should never fail from the land" (3.9).

In the covenant oath, the Israelites accepted certain obligations. In an all encompassing phrase, they promised to "do and fulfil the commandments of God" (12.10). A brief survey of the evils which caused others to be punished will help to illustrate the type of action which was forbidden under this agreement: one should neither perform human sacrifice nor attempt to establish and perform idol worship (2.8); one must not work impiety (2.9); one should neither do iniquity nor defile the houses of worship (5.3); one should neither commit apostasy nor render unjust verdicts for the sake of a bribe (5.4-6); and, one should neither eat, drink or carouse to excess nor devour the food of the poor nor practice lawlessness (7.4-6). Positively, one must show complete loyalty to God, the covenant and the commandments. Temple sacrifice, in its pure Biblical form, is also upheld. The two faithful tribes lament "because they will not be able to offer sacrifice to the Lord of their fathers" (4.9). Their inability to sacrifice is, of course, due to the impurity of the sacrificial system in the

restored temple (5.4; 6.1).<sup>9</sup>

Israel finds constancy impossible, however; and, as a result, God must frequently punish His people for their transgressions. Though righteous (3.5), his judgment is nonetheless severe. The chief men of Israel are slain (6.4) and neither the old nor the young are shown any quarter (6.5). Moreover, the Gentile nations serve to execute God's vengeance upon His unfaithful people: "And in those days a king<sup>10</sup> from the east shall come against them. . . . And he shall cast forth all the people, and he shall take them to the land of his nativity, . . ." (3.1, 3).

Similarly:

. . . He will stir up against them the king of the kings of the earth<sup>11</sup> and one that ruleth with great power, who shall crucify those who confess to their circumcision: and those who conceal (it) he shall torture and deliver them up to be bound and to be led into prison. And their wives shall be given to the gods among the Gentiles,<sup>12</sup> and their young sons shall

---

<sup>9</sup>Vide Charles, Pseudepigrapha, p. 417.

<sup>10</sup>Nebuchadnezzar.

<sup>11</sup>Antiochus IV.

<sup>12</sup>The Latin text reads "diis donabuntur" but although he translates as "deis donabuntur", Charles (Pseudepigrapha, p. 420), following Haupt, also suggests "disdonabuntur" which would translate "will be distributed among the Gentiles".

be operated on by the physicians in order to bring forward their foreskin. (8.1-3)

Indeed, the entire Israelite nation, both the guilty and the innocent, must bear the wrath of God. The sin of the unfaithful is visited upon the whole people: "Righteous and holy is the Lord, for, inasmuch as ye have sinned, we too, in like manner, have been carried away with you, together with our children'" (3.5).<sup>13</sup> Judah suffers for the sins of Israel; punishment is treated nationally.

Because of the covenant and the faithfulness of God, it is possible for the punished nation to seek God's compassion. When the Israelite nation is punished by exile, the ten guilty tribes, prompted by the reproach of the two faithful tribes, mourn, regretting the results of their actions (3.6-7), i.e., that all were punished for their transgressions. All twelve tribes then cry out: "'God of Abraham, God of Isaac and God of Jacob, remember Thy covenant which Thou didst make with them, and the oath which Thou didst swear unto them by thyself, . . .'" (3.9). This outcry is immediately unsuccessful, though perhaps, in the long run, contributory to the appearance of the "one who is over them" (4.1).<sup>14</sup> It is this "intercessor" who

---

<sup>13</sup>Cf. also 3.7.

<sup>14</sup>Charles (Pseudepigrapha, p. 417; vide also,

then imprecates God to have compassion (4.4) because he had willed that "this people should be Thine elect people" (4.2) and that "Thou shouldst be called their God, according to the covenant which Thou didst make with their fathers" (4.2). God has compassion on them and there is a partial return from exile (4.7-9).<sup>15</sup> Two points must be noted: The role of the faithful who elicit the response of regret from the unfaithful and the intercession of God as occasioned, not caused, by the prayer of the "one who is over them" (4.1). Further, the prayer refers to the election and the covenant, not repentance.<sup>16</sup> In fact, it seems that only the two faithful tribes take advantage of the restoration offered:

---

Ferrar, Assumption, p. 26) identifies this leader as Daniel (Dan 9.4-19). Harrington ("Interpreting Israel's History", p. 64) notes "4.1 most likely refers to Daniel, but Ezra is a possibility". The similarity of Daniel's prayer to the Testament text far outweighs any resemblance to Ezra.

<sup>15</sup>Nickelsburg's "salvation" ("An Antiochan Date", p. 33) is preferred to Harrington's "partial vindication" ("Interpreting Israel's History", p. 64). "Vindication" whether partial or complete, implies a righteousness which is not present in the text. If Harrington had meant "partial" to mean the two faithful tribes, he would have been more correct, but for him "partial" refers to the fact "the two tribes 'will not be able to offer sacrifice to the Lord of their fathers (4.8)'".

<sup>16</sup>Harrington ("Interpreting Israel's History", p. 65) is correct in noting repentance is not present (in these verses) but, if he wishes to view chpts. 9-10 as eschatological, he must see in them at least a form of repentance. Cf. 1.18 which clearly indicates "the day of repentance" is to precede "the consummation of the end of the days". I propose that this is found in 10.10 which reads, in part, "et confiteberis creatori tuo" (Charles, Assumption, p. 89).

"and the ten tribes shall increase and multiply among the Gentiles during the time of their captivity" (4.9). For the author, the mercy of God is decisive in Israel's maintaining his privileged place and, indeed, all things are done "of His [God's] good pleasure" (12.7).<sup>17</sup>

This is not, however, to undermine the role of the Israelites' free will and the faithfulness of the few. Two facts exist simultaneously: the Israelite may choose either good or evil; there are always those who are faithful to the covenant and to God.<sup>18</sup> This group follows the advice given by Moses to Joshua: "(Be strong) and of a good courage so as to do with all that has been commanded that thou mayst be blameless unto God" (1.10). This faith is found in the two tribes that do not adopt the evil ways of the other ten: "Then the God of heaven will make the court of His tabernacle and the tower of His sanctuary, and the two holy tribes shall be (there) established: but the ten tribes shall establish kingdoms for themselves according to their own ordinances." (2.4-5) Similarly: ". . . the two tribes shall continue in their prescribed faith, sad and lamenting because they will not be able to offer

---

<sup>17</sup>Charles, Pseudepigrapha, p. 412.

<sup>18</sup>Charles, Pseudepigrapha, p. 412. Note that, although the prayer of chpt. 4 is similar to Dan 9, it does not even allude to Dan 9:11: "All Israel has transgressed thy law and turned aside, refusing to obey thy voice".

sacrifices to the Lord of their fathers. And the ten tribes shall increase and multiply among the Gentiles during the time of their captivity." (4.8-9) The two tribes certainly represent such faithfulness but, in the Testament of Moses, the representative par excellence is Moses,<sup>19</sup> himself, the purported prophetic speaker, who is "the sacred spirit who was worthy of the Lord, manifold and incomprehensible, the lord of the word, who was faithful in all things, God's chief prophet throughout the earth, the most perfect teacher in the world" (11.16). It is Moses who "'every hour day and night had his knees fixed to the earth, praying and looking for help to Him that ruleth all the world with compassion and righteousness, reminding Him of the covenant of the fathers and propitiating the Lord with the oath'" (11.17). It is Moses who is designated before creation (1.14), as the mediator of the covenant, defending Israel from the judgment of God.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup>Tiede ("The Figure of Moses", p. 91) notes Moses is not portrayed as a great national champion but as a guardian who protects by "his purity of spirit"; by his worthiness, his faithfulness, and his prayer (11.16-18).

<sup>20</sup>12.6 does not indicate Moses' mediatorial role would continue after death (contra Charles, Assumption, p. 49; Ferrar, Assumption, p. 14). Its meaning is restricted by 11.12ff. and 12.7. Joshua's lack of belief in his own abilities (11.12ff.) is being rebutted. Moses was intercessor (12.6), but not due to his own virtue but God's choice (12.7). Kolenkow ("The Assumption of Moses as a Testament", p. 77, n. 13) notes "The defective text of 12.6 does not make clear whether Moses has a continuing role as intercessor". The context makes it clear 12.6 is not to be so interpreted.



In like manner, another similar figure, Daniel, shall later perform an intercessory role when the exile is punishing Israel (4.1-6). A Moses figure, "he shall spread forth his hands, and kneel upon his knees and pray on their behalf" (4.1). His intercession occasions God's compassion and the people return.

Finally, there will be Taxo<sup>21</sup> who, standing in this same tradition, will intercede for Israel's relief, for God's compassion. This time, however, prayer is not the answer. The times are even graver (9.2); graver measures seem necessary.

Taxo understands he and his sons are members of a faithful group within Israel, a group which has always existed (9.4-5). Their deaths, brought on not by transgression but by their covenantal faithfulness, will exceed the bounds of punishment by the nations and cause God to

---

<sup>21</sup>The identity of the figure, Taxo, has evoked much discussion (cf. Rowley, Relevance, pp. 134-141). "No explanation of the name is fully satisfactory" (Collins, "Date and Provenance", p. 22) and perhaps no resolution is intended by the author. If we admit Taxo is derived from the Greek, τάξων, "orderer" (S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, E.t. by G. W. Anderson [Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1959], p. 300) and he, in parallel with Moses and Daniel, represents the pious and faithful Jew, while having, in addition, eschatological significance, his actual identity becomes irrelevant. It is his function which is important just as Moses' pre-ordination was more important as a statement about the election of Israel (1.14) than about the figure of Moses. He and his sons typify faithful, loyal Jews (M. Rist, "Assumption of Moses", IDB, III, 451).

intervene as the avenger of his faithful (9.7).<sup>22</sup> The actions of Taxo and his sons would threaten Israel and jeopardize God's word: "But wholly to root out and destroy them is not permitted" (12.13). Thus, Taxo vows:

"Let us fast for the space of three days and on the fourth let us go into a cave which is in the field, and let us die rather than transgress the commands of the Lord of Lords, the God of our fathers."

(9.6)

The author understands God's intervention on behalf of Taxo and his sons to be the dawning of the eschaton when evil will be destroyed (10.1-2) and Israel exalted (10.8).

The call of the Testament of Moses is to return to the Mosaic Law which is being forsaken by the author's contemporaries. Who, however, is addressed?

Clearly, Gentiles are not being called.<sup>23</sup> At the beginning of the world the purposes of creation were deliberately withheld from them so "the Gentiles might thereby be convicted, yea to their own humiliation might by (their) arguments convict one another" (1.13).<sup>24</sup> Furthermore, at

<sup>22</sup>Vide D. M. Rhoads, "The Assumption of Moses and Jewish History: 4 B.C.-A.D. 48", Studies on the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers, ed. by G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., SCS 4 [Cambridge, Mass.: SBL, 1973], p. 57.

<sup>23</sup>Ferrar, Assumption, p. 14.

<sup>24</sup>Deane (Pseudepigrapha, p. 128-129) notes the

the end of the world, God will punish the Gentiles:

For the Most High will arise, the Eternal God alone,  
And He will appear to punish the Gentiles,  
And He will destroy all their idols. (10.7)

Indeed, the nations can ultimately look forward to being rooted out by the Israelites (12.8).

The world has been created, as we have seen, for Israel and, in the Testament of Moses, Israel is called to return to its pristine Mosaic purity.<sup>25</sup> Faithfulness is the sine qua non for answering the call and models of faithful men from Israel's past are held up for emulation. The faithful must be pure and righteous, non-militant,<sup>26</sup> ready to die rather than transgress the covenant:<sup>27</sup>

"... for observe and know that neither did the fathers nor their forefathers tempt God, so as to transgress His commands. And ye know that this is our strength, and thus we will do. Let us fast<sup>28</sup> for the

Gentiles "are raised up merely as instruments of Chastisement for sinning Jews; and when this purpose is fulfilled, they shall themselves be judged, and meet with the reward of their lawlessness and idolatry".

<sup>25</sup>With Collins, "Date and Provenance", p. 32.

<sup>26</sup>Contra Charles C. Torrey, "'Taxo' in the Assumption of Moses", JBL, 62 (1943), 1-8.

<sup>27</sup>Charles, Pseudepigrapha, p. 407.

<sup>28</sup>The fact is a sign primarily of resolution not repentance. Contra Licht ("Taxo", p. 98) to whom the fast is teshuvah. With this one can only partially agree. The

space of three days and on the fourth let us go into a care which is in the field, and let us die rather than transgress the commands of the Lord of Lords, . . .," (9.4-6)

Some will answer the call, but others within Israel will not: "Those, therefore, who do and fulfill the commandments of God shall increase and be prospered; but those who sin and set at naught the commandments shall be without the blessings before mentioned, and they shall be punished with torments by the nations" (12.10-12). Israel is, therefore, divided by the author into two groups--the faithful and the unfaithful; the one to be blessed, the other tormented.

This dichotomy within Israel has created in the text a tension between the solidarity of Israel which is elect due not to intrinsic merit but God's choice (12.8) and the faithful few who have always been within Israel (9.4), between man's merit and God's mercy. Thus, the election of Israel was contingent upon God's divine choice and not upon Israel's intrinsic or earned righteousness: "For I say

---

tashuvah is to insure one is truly innocent of sin. It is clear (9.5) that Taxo understands he and his sons are faithful, but this does not rule out "preventative medicine". It is interesting that in Esther 4.16 a fast for three days is called by the Queen in anticipation of her audience with the king. Sandra Beth Berg (The Book of Esther: Notes, Themes and Structure, SHS 44 [Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1979], pp. 38-39) notes, in Esther, the fast may be one of hopeful anticipation or mourning for her fate. Both of these may be present in the Testament of Moses.

unto you, Joshua, it is not on account of the godliness of this people that thou shalt root out the nations!" (12.9). Yet, as Taxe points out, there has always been a faithful few in whose shadow the present faithful now stand. The tension remains systematically unresolved. For the nation, indeed, the tension is not in need of resolution.<sup>15</sup> The interplay between the parts is natural. God's mercy and faithfulness to the covenant are needed for Israel to survive; Israelites must be faithful to receive God's blessings. Both statements must be viewed against the background of the text's purpose: to call Israel back to the Mosaic faith. From this perspective both statements have independent, yet interrelated validity.

In the past the gracious intervention of God caused the evil times, the punishment, to be abated (4.6). Now again, the evil times are upon the nation and his contemporaries and the hope is held out for the intercession of God. That intercession has been pronounced in the past by the actions of a faithful one (Deut [11.47], Isaiah [4.4-1]). Now, again, a faithful one is predicted whose actions will occasion the intercession of God.

Related to this subject is the belief that at all times there have been a faithful few in the land.

---

<sup>15</sup> Deuteronomy 10:17-18 (Deuteronomy 10:17-18) to show that the text is "a not a promise".

held to the Mosaic faith. These are, for example, the two faithful tribes and the sons of Taxo.

Israel will be exalted (10.8) but who is considered part of Israel? Soteriologically, the Testament of Moses is national, not individual. All Israel is eligible for exaltation but there is no clear indication of the procedure envisaged for gathering Israel. Yet, the entire thrust of the text makes exalted Israel, faithful Israel. There is, however, no indication of how membership is achieved. Is it only those faithful at the end? Is there a resurrection of the faithful dead?<sup>30</sup> Is punishment cleansing so that unfaithful Israelites will be made clean and, therefore, faithful? Individual soteriology is not systematically discussed. It is outside the purpose and scope of the text. The call is to Israel; Israel will survive; but the salvation of the individual Israelite is never an issue.

In summary, one can say in the Testament of Moses there is expressed the belief a faithful remnant of Israelites has always existed. All Israel will be exalted (saved) but no statement is made concerning membership in the exalted people, although their faithfulness is presumed. The remnant is, therefore, not eschatologically charged in the extant Testament. The relationship between the faithful few and all

---

<sup>30</sup>The question is unresolved in the text (vide Nickelsburg, Resurrection, p. 31).

Israel being saved is not resolved.

## E. The Psalms of Solomon<sup>1</sup>

The remnant understanding reflected in the Psalms of Solomon is most clearly delineated through a careful examination of the world-view of the psalmists.<sup>2</sup> For them,

---

<sup>1</sup>The English translation is that of G. B. Gray, "Psalms of Solomon" in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of The Old Testament, ed. by R. H. Charles (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), I, 625-652. The translation of R. Harris and A. Mingana (The Odes and Psalms of Solomon [2 vols.; Manchester: University Press, 1916], II) has also been consulted.

The Greek text is that printed by Rahlfs (Septuaginta, II, 471-489), a reprint of that of O. von Gebhardt, Ψαλμοὶ Σολομῶντος: Die Psalmen Salomo's zum ersten Male. . . . herausgegeben, TU XIII 2 (Leipzig: 1895). The Syriac text is that of Harris and Mingana, Odes and Psalms, I. The Hebrew retro-version of Wilhelm Frankenberg (Die Datierung der Psalmen Salomos. Ein Beitrag zur jüdischen Geschichte, BZAW I [Giessen: Ricker, 1896]) has also been consulted.

<sup>2</sup>The date of the Psalms of Solomon is generally agreed to be the middle of the first century B.C.E. (Gray, "Psalms", pp. 627-630; Jaubert, La notion, p. 254; J. O'Dell, "The Religious Background of the Psalms of Solomon", RQ, 3 [1961], 241; Gerhard Maier, Mensch und freier Wille, pp. 264-280; Joachim Schüpphaus, Die Psalmen Salomos: Ein Zeugnis jerusalemer Theologie und Frömmigkeit in der Mitte des vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts, Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte Des Hellenistischen Judentums VII [Leiden: Brill, 1977], p. 127; Paul Volz, Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im Neutestamentlichen Zeitalter [Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1966 (=1934)], p. 26; P. Winter, "Psalms of Solomon", IDB, III, 959). They were originally written in Hebrew, though the Hebrew text is no longer extant (Gray, "Psalms", p. 627; O'Dell, "Religious Background", p. 242; Winter, IDB, III, p. 659). Most probably they were not composed by one author, although they reflect a similar viewpoint (Sanders, Paul, p. 388; Volz, Die Eschatologie, p. 26; Winter, IDB, p. 959). Scholars have generally agreed the



all Israel is elect and salvation is attained through God's mercy which is poured forth upon His people Israel.

Central to this view is the authors' belief in the election:

And, now, thou art our God, and we the people whom

Thou hast loved:

Behold and show pity, O God of Israel, for we are

Thine;

And remove not Thy mercy from us, lest they assail

us.

For Thou didst choose the seed of Abraham before all  
the nations,

And didst set Thy name upon us, O Lord,

And Thou wilt not reject (us) for ever.

Thou madest a covenant with our fathers concerning  
us;

And we hope in Thee, when our soul turneth (unto  
Thee).

The mercy of the Lord be upon the house of Israel  
for ever and ever.

(9.16-19 [8-10])

---

authors were Pharisees (H. Braun, "Vom Erbarmen Gottes über den Gerechten. Zu Theologie der Psalmen Salomos", ZNW, 43 [1950-1951], 1-2; Maier, Mensch und freier Wille, pp. 282-301; Schüpphaus, Die Psalmen Salomos, p. 158) but this viewpoint has recently been seriously challenged (O'Dell, "Religious Background", pp. 241-257; Sanders, Paul, pp. 402-404; cf. infra, fn. 36).

The emphasis in this passage and in the Psalms in general falls upon God who has chosen Israel, bestows his mercy upon Israel and is the hope of Israel. This utter dependence upon God is characteristic of the psalm genre and it exemplifies the attitude espoused by these psalmists.

The covenant which God made with our fathers includes us. For the writer, the covenant of the Hebrew Bible is still operative. Further, it forms the foundation for the psalmist's hope for the future. All Israel is elect. This election placed Israel in a special position vis-à-vis all the nations and guaranteed; "Thou wilt not reject (us) for ever". Gray's translation of this phrase, following von Gebhardt, is conjecture.<sup>3</sup> The Greek has "thou will not cease".<sup>4</sup> Both von Gebhardt's conjecture and the Greek are supported, however, by the thought in 7.5:

For Thou art merciful,

And wilt not be angry to the point of consuming us.

And also in 7.8:<sup>5</sup>

<sup>3</sup>Gray, "Psalms", p. 643.

<sup>4</sup>Greek: οὐκ ἀπόση.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. also 18.1-4 (1-3).

. . . For Thou wilt pity the seed of Israel for ever  
And Thou wilt not reject (them): . . .

The understanding is clear; Israel will not be repudiated by God. Further, all three passages inseparably link the perdurance of Israel to God's mercy and pity.<sup>6</sup>

It is interesting to note the parallelism of the three triptychs in 9.16-18 (8.10). The first lines parallel the election and the covenant while the next two lines of each triptych give parallel pleas which are, in reality, the request for sustaining mercy. The election, formalized in the covenant, becomes the basis for the psalmist's plea for mercy.

The God of Israel is also the Lord of all. He sustains the animals (5.11-12 [9-10]); directs foreign nations (7.3) and judges all men, both Israelite and Gentile (17.23-27 [21-25]).<sup>7</sup> Though the God of Israel is a universal God who bestows his mercy upon the whole earth (5.17 [15] ), "the portion and the inheritance of God is Israel" (14.3[5] )

---

<sup>6</sup>Greek text has ἐλεῆμων (7.5) and οἰκτιρήσεις (7.8); οἰκτίρησον and ἐλεός (9.8).

<sup>7</sup>Cf. also 18.3: "Thy judgements (are executed) upon the whole earth in mercy; . . .". Even here, however, the universalism is tempered with particularism. Verse 4 (3) notes ". . .Thy love (is) toward the seed of Abraham, the children of Israel" which points up that although God's mercy is upon all His works (1a), it is most abundantly poured forth upon Israel (1b).

and it is particularism which dominates the psalms.

Israel is the elect. Who, however, constitutes this group? The answer is made difficult by the multiplicity of titles for the elect. The most common term used is the "pious",<sup>8</sup> in Greek "ἔσθιοι" which in the Septuagint translates "קִיָּים" in the Canonical Psalms.<sup>9</sup> These "pious" are the "righteous":<sup>10</sup>

Famine and sword and pestilence<sup>11</sup> (shall be) far  
from the righteous,

For they shall flee away from the pious as  
men pursued in war; . . .<sup>12</sup>

(15.8 [7] )

Here the parallelism identifies the righteous (δικαίωv )  
with the pious (ἔσθιωv ) as elsewhere the pious (ἔσθιοι )

<sup>8</sup>Cf. 2.40 (36); 3.10 (8); 4.9 (8); 8.40 (34); 9.6 (3); 12.4, 7 (6); 13.11 (12); 14.2 (3; bis [Gray has this verse listed as 14.2 (5) but the Greek makes it obvious it should read 14.2 (3)]); 14.7 (10); 15.8 (7).

<sup>9</sup>Adolph Büchler, Types of Jewish-Palestinian Piety from 70 B.C.E. to 70 C.E. (New York: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1968), p. 128.

<sup>10</sup>Cf. also 2.38 (34); 3.3, 4, 5, 7 (6), 8 (7), 14 (11); 4.9 (8); 10.3; 13.5 (6), 6 (7), 7 (8; bis), 8 (9), 9 (11); 14.4 (9); 15.8 (6), 8 (7); 16.15.

<sup>11</sup>Greek: death.

<sup>12</sup>Text defective; Greek yields "no tolerable sense" (Gray, "Psalms", p. 646). The phrase is not crucial for our argument.

are identified with the poor (πτωχοῦς ):<sup>13</sup>

And the pious shall give thanks in the assembly  
of the people;

And on the poor shall God have mercy in  
the gladness of Israel; . . .<sup>14</sup>

(10.7 [6] )

Here also one must take note that the pious are not separatists; they are living their righteousness within, not separate from, the people. The importance of this observation will become clear later. The pious are further identified as "those who fear the Lord":<sup>15</sup>

But upon the pious is the mercy of the Lord,

And upon them that fear Him His mercy.

(13.11 [12] )

Those who fear the Lord are called Israel (5.21 [18] ) as are the pious (14.3 [5] ). Elsewhere, those who receive the mercy of the Lord are called "those who love Him in sincerity", another characteristic title for the pious (6.9 [6] ).<sup>16</sup> Sanders<sup>17</sup> has noted that the righteous are also designated

<sup>13</sup>Cf. also 5.2; 15.2 (1); 18.3 (2).

<sup>14</sup>On this phrase, vide Gray, "Psalms", p. 643.

<sup>15</sup>Cf. also 2.37 (33); 3.16 (12); 4.26 (23); 5.21 (18); 6.8 (5).

<sup>16</sup>Cf. also 10.4; 14.1.

<sup>17</sup>Sanders, Paul, p. 399.

by the first person plural pronoun: "we" or "us";<sup>18</sup> the psalmists are the pious, the righteous. Thus, it seems all these titles are synonymous.

Qualitatively, the pious are those who fear the Lord (2.37) and love Him in sincerity (6.9 [6] ) and in truth (14.1). They also call upon the Lord (2.40 [36] ) and remember Him at all times (3.3); they are poor (5.13 [11] )<sup>19</sup> and are afflicted by the sinners (2.39 [35] ). They are scrupulously careful of even sins of ignorance (3.8 [7] )<sup>20</sup> and they follow the Mosaic law:

Faithful is the Lord to them that love Him in truth,

To them that endure His chastening,

To them that walk in the righteousness of His

commandments,<sup>21</sup>

In the law which he commanded us that we might live.

(14.1 [1-2] )

Although, characteristically, the righteous follow

<sup>18</sup>4.27 (23); 5.9 (7); 7.8f. (9f.); 9.16 (8).

<sup>19</sup>Büchler notes the poor are materially poor, the victims of a famine (Types, pp. 134-135)..

<sup>20</sup>Büchler, Types, p. 138.

<sup>21</sup>The meaning is unclear. According to Büchler (Types, p. 152) it means not "the righteousness consisting in the observance of the enactments of the law", but "the perfectness of the laws", paralleling Hebr. Ps. 19.10 and 119.144. Thus, to obey the laws "is one way of loving God, Deut. 10.12, 13".

the law, nonetheless, they occasionally sin, though they do not pile sin upon sin (3.7 [6] ). Their sins are predominantly sins of ignorance, although chapter 16 is written by a psalmist who has sinned more seriously:

When my soul slumbered (being afar) from the Lord, I  
 had all but slipped down to the pit,  
 When (I was) far from God, my soul had been wellnigh  
 poured out unto death,  
 (I had been) nigh unto the gates of Sheol with the  
 sinner, when my soul departed from the Lord  
 God of Israel--

Had not the Lord helped me with His everlasting mercy.

(16.1-3)<sup>22</sup>

Here, the psalmist, who considers himself saved by God from the brink of damnation (16.4-5), was not a pious man who had committed sins of ignorance. He prays God keep him "from wicked sin" (16.7) and mentions a number of examples. They include "every wicked woman that causeth the simple to stumble" (16.7)<sup>23</sup> "anger and unreasoning" (16.10) and "murmuring, and impatience in affliction" (16.11). The

<sup>22</sup>On the textual difficulties, vide Gray, "Psalms" pp. 646-647. In spite of difficult readings, the intent of the passage is not compromised.

<sup>23</sup>The "wicked sin", ἀπὸ ἀμαρτίας πονηρᾶς, of v. 7 is then specified by, among others, "every wicked woman", ἀπὸ πάσης γυναικὸς πονηρᾶς. The choice of word should be noted.

impression is the psalmist is speaking personally of sins he has committed--hardly sins of ignorance. Clearly, however, the writer considered himself one of the righteous (16.1) who had slipped far from the Lord. Though he "had apparently not been securely within the fold of the 'pious' all his life",<sup>24</sup> our psalmist never thought of himself as "a sinner", distinguishing himself from them, even when he was nearly lost.<sup>25</sup> The psalmist places all credit for his past salvation (16.4) and all hope for his future preservation (16.9-12) upon God (16.5) and His mercy (16.6). The activity of the righteous who has sinned appears to be endurance of God's chastisement (16.15a)--an endurance representative of the recognition by the righteous of his transgression and his return. By enduring this chastening, the righteous remain within the covenant and, hence, "receive mercy from the Lord" (16.15b).<sup>26</sup>

More common, however, are sins committed by the pious in ignorance.<sup>27</sup> The sin committed unwittingly is brought to light by the Lord's chastening of the pious. The righteous

---

<sup>24</sup>Sanders, Paul, p. 308.

<sup>25</sup>Note 16.2: συνέγγυς πολλῶν ἁδου μετὰ ἁμαρτωλοῦ.  
Vide H. Braun, "Vom Erbarmen", p. 15.

<sup>26</sup>This is not a question of meriting the mercy. It is a question of membership. Covenant members receive God's mercy and grace; non-members do not. Cf. the excellent discussion by Sanders (Paul, pp. 392-397, esp. 396-397).

<sup>27</sup>Cf. 3.9 (8), 13.5 (7).



recognize suffering as the Lord's judgment (3.3) and do not despise it even when its reason is not immediately evident. Following logically, the Lord is righteous, judgment is from the Lord for sin, the righteous man is suffering and, to his knowledge, he has committed no sin; then, he must have committed sin "in ignorance".<sup>28</sup> He, therefore, makes atonement "by fasting and afflicting his soul" (3.9 [8] )<sup>29</sup> and God counts him guiltless (3.10 [8] ).<sup>30</sup> God's chastening, however, will alone, without atonement, blot out sins done in ignorance by the righteous (13.9 [10] ).<sup>31</sup> Thus, God's chastening is to be received happily (10.1-2); it is the special mark of the pious, Israel:

Thy judgements (are executed) upon the whole earth in  
mercy:

And Thy love (is) toward the seed of Abraham, the  
children of Israel.

Thy chastisement is upon us as (upon) a first-born,

<sup>28</sup>Note even the suffering of the righteous at the hands of sinners is interpreted as being causally related to the righteous' sins (17.6 [5] ).

<sup>29</sup>Büchler (Types, p. 140) points out "the author of these psalms never refers to a sacrifice of atonement or any other sacrifice".

<sup>30</sup>"His sin still exists even after such atonement on his part, until God purifies him of his guilt" (Büchler, Types, p. 145).

<sup>31</sup>The fact these are unwitting sins is attested in 13.5 (7).

only-begotten son,<sup>32</sup>

To turn back the obedient soul from folly (that is wrought) in ignorance.

May God cleanse Israel against the day of mercy and blessing.

Against the day of choice when He bringeth back His anointed.

(18.3-6 [3-5] )

Chastisement is to turn back the righteous, to prevent him from multiplying sins and to cleanse Israel (10.1-2). In part, it is similar to God's forgiveness which also cleanses (9.12 [6] ). Chastisements even appear to bolster the righteous and make him steadfast (8.38 [32] ).<sup>33</sup> The righteous are troubled not by the chastening but by the fear their sins, albeit unwitting and minor, may cause them to "be taken away along with the sinners" (13.4 [5] ).<sup>34</sup> This attitude stems from the fact the suffering of the pious differs from that

---

<sup>32</sup>13.8 (9) also has chastisement as the lot of the firstborn.

<sup>33</sup>Cf. also 5.9 (7).

<sup>34</sup>Büchler (Types, p. 149) notes the difference between Job's outlook and that of the pious in the Psalms of Solomon. The comparison and contrast is mentioned a number of times in various sections of his discussion (pp. 137, 139, 148, 152). The thematic relationship is marked and one wonders what a systematic examination of the two works would produce. It may be conjectured the Psalms of Solomon, in part, are an answering theology to Job.

of the sinners only in degree and privacy (13.5-7 [6-8] ). The elect, therefore, include the righteous, who are identified as pious Israelites and within whom the psalmists are to be numbered. It is clear, however, that they constituted but one part of Israel. What other groups are recognized in the Psalms? Are they part of the elect?

The second group to be considered is the sinners. For the psalmists, sinners may be either gentile or Israelite. The clearest reference to Gentile sinners is in Psalm 2:

When the sinner waxed proud, with a battering ram he  
cast down fortified walls,  
and Thou didst not restrain (him).

Alien nations ascended Thine altar,

They trampled (it) proudly with their sandals;  
Because the sons of Jerusalem had defiled the holy  
things of the Lord,

Had profaned with iniquities the offerings of God.

(2.1-3)

Here it is obvious the "sinner" is the "alien nations", namely, Pompey's soldiers. It is also noteworthy that the Romans' actions are understood as caused by the sins of "the sons of Jerusalem" and, thence, by God (2.4). The psalm centers on the mercy of God which is displayed in his righteous judgments (2.12 [10] ). The God of Israel is the Lord of all men and He has used the Gentiles to chastise His

people (2.7) for their sins (2.9-15 [9-14] ). The Gentiles, however, had over-stepped their mandate and their "lust of soul" (2.27 [24]) in punishing Israel now threatened his very existence: "And they will make an utter end, unless Thou, O Lord, rebuke them in Thy wrath" (2.26 [23]). As a result, God, in His mercy (2.39 [35]), slays Pompey (2.30-31 [26-27]), bringing the proud to eternal destruction (2.35 [31]) for he had not recognized that "it is God who is great" (2.33 [29]) and who is "king over the heavens" (2.34 [30]). It is clear that the salvation of Israel from the Gentiles is a merciful act done to save Israel, His people. Further it is also evident that the threat, at least from the psalmist's point of view, was "life-threatening" to Israel. Therefore, these verses point up not only the sinners as, in part, being Gentile<sup>35</sup> and the sinners as being judged and eternally

---

<sup>35</sup>Possible references to Gentile sinners may also be found in Psalms 1 and 17, though both are debatable. Sanders (Paul, p. 400) sees the sinners in Psalm 1 as Gentile, while Gray ("Psalms", p. 628) relates 1.8 with 2.3a and, hence, sees the sinners as Israelite. Winter (IDB, III, 959) agrees with Gray, as does Büchler (Types, p. 140). Sanders, while admitting the sins are similar, relates 1.8 to 8.26 (22) which is more clearly a reference to Romans than to Jewish sinners, "whom the Romans have already destroyed and led away (8.20-24 [18-21]). Following that 'defilement', God is said to judge 'the nations' (8.27 [23]). Gray, however, also takes the defilement of 8.26 (22) to be that of the Jewish sinners (p. 628). So also Winter, p. 959." I am inclined to favour Sanders' argument. Psalm 17 (v. 26 [23]) is less certain, since the verses may be read as either parallel or progressive; the latter favouring a Jewish interpretation, the former a Gentile interpretation.

destroyed by God but also, in part, the psalmist's remnant understanding. Israel's imminent destruction is mitigated by a merciful God who preserves His people. The question of the numbers destroyed or preserved is irrelevant, as we have seen before, to the question of a remnant understanding.

The Psalmists are much more interested, however, in Israelite sinners.<sup>56</sup> We have already seen that the sins of the sons of Jerusalem were responsible for the Roman invasion (2.1-3, quoted above). Jews are also the sinners discussed in Psalm 8 where a catalog of sins concludes:

They left no sin undone, wherein they surpassed not  
the heathen.

(S.14 [13])

Further, it is Jewish sinners who rise up against the pious Jews as punishment for the sins of the righteous (17.6 [5]).<sup>57</sup>

<sup>56</sup>The identification of the Israelite sinners as the Sadducees by most scholars (Gray, "Psalms", p. 630; Winter, *III*, p. 359; Braun, "Erbarmen Gottes", p. 2) has been challenged by Büchler (*Exeg.*, pp. 171-173) and more recently by Sanders (*Paul*, pp. 402-404). Sanders' pro-Hasmonean argument is most convincing. He notes 17.6-12 [5-10] is most understandable as referring to the Hasmoneans. Further, these sinners of Psalm 17 were destroyed by "a man that was alien to our race", probably Pompey. Sanders points out "the Sadducees were not destroyed by Pompey or Herod. The Hasmoneans, however, lost their power, and in that sense were destroyed, when Pompey took Jerusalem". The pro-Pharisee case demands the Hasmoneans be simply identified with the Sadducees. This cannot be so easily done.

<sup>57</sup>Gray, "Psalms", p. 648.

This reading is confirmed in 17.9 (7) which refers to "a man that was alien to our race", namely Pompey, by whom God "didst cast them down, and remove their seed from the earth" (17.8 [7]). "Them" here obviously refers to "the sinners" in 17.6 (5) who must logically be Israelite.<sup>38</sup>

The sinner differs from the pious man who sins. The sinner piles sin upon sin (3.12 [10]); when sinning, he acts as if there were no avenger (8.12 [11]). He stumbles and curses his life, his birth and his mother's travail (3.11 [9]).<sup>39</sup> He is a profane (4.1), guileful (4.27 [23]) and lawless (4.27 [23]) man. He is a hypocrite (4.7 [6]) and a man-pleaser (4.8 [7]). He does not remember nor fear God and, indeed, he even seeks to provoke God's anger (4.24-25 [21]). In sum, he acts as if God will neither see nor judge him (4.14 [11]).<sup>40</sup>

More specifically, sinners are accused of incest (2.15 [13]) and adultery (8.10-11 [10]); they have even profaned the temple (8.13 [12]) with their transgressions.<sup>41</sup> They have committed harlotry (2.13 [11]) and have afflicted the

<sup>38</sup>It is probable 17.26 (23) also refers to Jewish sinners.

<sup>39</sup>Cf. the attitude of the righteous, 3.3-6.

<sup>40</sup>Cf. also 2.18 (17); 9.5 (3).

<sup>41</sup>Büchler (Types, p. 141) has noted the incorrectness of equating levitical impurity with sin. It is the cause of the impurity which may be a sin.

righteous (2.39 [35]). They lust after women and lie when contracting on oath (4.4). They steal (4.11 [9]), break up families and lay waste houses (4.13 [10-11]).<sup>42</sup> They slander (12.1); indeed, they even delight in their corruption (14.4 [6-7]).

The sinners will be punished: "According to their sins" (2.7).<sup>43</sup> Ultimately the wicked will be destroyed which may, it appears, refer to either absolute death or death and eternal punishment:

But the sinners shall be taken away into destruction,  
And their memorial shall be found no more.

(13.10 [11])

The destruction of the sinner is for ever, . . .

(3.13 [11])

But sinners shall perish for ever.

(15.15 [13])

But:

And the inheritance of sinners is destruction and  
darkness,

<sup>42</sup>The meaning of "break up families" and "lay waste houses" is unclear. As Sanders (Paul, p. 402) notes it may refer to either "oppression or moral seduction". He prefers the latter because of the reference to the Serpent (4.11 [9]) and "the statement that with deceit the sinners 'beguiled the souls of the flawless' (akakoi, tamimim) (4.25 [22])".

<sup>43</sup>Cf. also 2.17 [16], 38 [34], 39 [35].

And their iniquities shall pursue them unto Sheol  
beneath.

(15.11 [10])

Therefore their inheritance is Sheol and darkness  
and destruction,

And they shall not be found in the day when the  
righteous obtain mercy; . . .

(14.6 [9])

Thus, the wicked seemed eternally doomed either by eternal death or eternal punishment after death. Obviously, therefore, the sinners, that is those who have previously sinned, are not "in Israel", regardless of whether they be Gentile or Israelite:

For the portion and the inheritance of God is Israel.

But not so are the sinners and transgressors,

.....

Therefore their inheritance is Sheol and darkness  
and destruction,

And they shall not be found in the day when the  
righteous obtain mercy; . . .

(14.3-4 [5-6], 6 [9])

The title Israel is not even applied to the sinners. They, if they be Israelite, appear to have forfeited their place in Israel.

Up to this point, it is clear the pious are members



of the elect, Israel, though 13.4 (5) and psalm 16 illustrate that even they must be on guard lest they fall and become sinners.<sup>44</sup> Further, the sinners are not members of the elect, are not part of Israel.

While the psalms deal with mankind largely in terms of the pious and the sinner, there is, nonetheless, another group which must be discussed, i.e., those Israelites who can be classified as neither the pious, à la the psalmists, nor the sinners. These are the Israelites who have not transgressed seriously enough to be one of the sinners and who are not as scrupulous as the pious. It is these who are, in part, referred to as "the assembly of the people":

And the pious shall give thanks in the assembly

(ἐκκλησία; לַקָּהָל<sup>45</sup>) of the people;

And on the poor shall God have mercy in the gladness

<sup>44</sup>Schüpphaus (Die Psalmen Salomos, p. 122) notes "Die Tatsache, dass sowohl der Sünder als auch der unvollkommene Fromme sündigen, gibt zugleich Aufschluss darüber, dass den Menschen nicht eine einzelne Tat, ein bestimmtes Tun oder Handeln als Sünder oder Frommen qualifizieren, sondern allein seine positive oder negative Grundhaltung zu dem Gott Israels". That a basic attitude (Grundhaltung), rather than a single act (einzelne Tat), differentiates the sinner from the pious does not take into account that the exclusion seems to be limited to those who sin in certain ways. Sanders (Paul, p. 405) lists these as sinning "by deliberately profaning the Temple and its sacrifices, by aiding and abetting the enemy, and by insolently being immoral and not repenting".

<sup>45</sup>So Frankenberg's (Die Datierung, p. 77) retro-version.

of Israel;<sup>46</sup>

For good and merciful is God for ever,

And the assemblies ( συναγωγαῖ; πῶν<sup>47</sup>) of Israel  
shall glorify the name of the Lord.

(10.7-8 [6-7])

It is clear the pious understand Israel to be a group more inclusive than themselves. In addition to the passage quoted from Psalm 10 (just above), the use of the term "house of Israel" in the concluding verses of Psalms 9 and 10 is also instructive:

The mercy of the Lord be upon the house of Israel for  
ever and ever.

(9.19 [10]b)

<sup>46</sup>Gray ("Psalms", p. 643) questions the meaning of this phrase. Is "the gladness (εὐφροσύνη) of Israel" a term for the Messianic Age? Should it not be a term parallel to "assembly" with "poor" as the subject of another verb in place of ἐλέησει?

The phrase also seems difficult to me. The verse makes better sense without a Messianic interpretation. Perhaps εὐφροσύνη may be due to dittography (cf. 10.6 [5]b where εὐφροσύνη also appears). Frankenberg (Die Datierung, p. 77) has πῶν (10.7 6 a) and πῶν (10.6 5 b). It is possible εὐφροσύνη should have been ἐκκλησία, yielding:

And the pious shall give thanks in the assembly of the  
people;

And on the poor shall God have mercy in the assembly  
of Israel; . . .

<sup>47</sup>Frankenberg, Die Datierung, p. 77.

The salvation of the Lord be upon the house of Israel  
unto everlasting gladness!

(10.8 [7]c)<sup>48</sup>

Here the term appears more inclusive than just the pious. Further, Psalm 11, a hymn of expectation, while employing none of the expected titles, uses the term "saints", ἁγίωv, ωv (11.1) and frequently Israel (11.2, 5 [6], 8 [7], 9 [8] (bis), 9 [9]) to refer to the community. The psalm refers to the Lord's gathering of Israel in Zion, the summoning of the saints (11.1). This eschatological group, while certainly including the pious, is not exclusive of other Israelites who have not sinned so grievously as to be classified as "sinners".

The punishment of the sinners has already been discussed. What, however, is the reward for the righteous? They will "inherit life in gladness" (14.7 [10]) and "shall live by the compassion of their God" (15.15 [13]). They will "rise to life eternal" (3.16 [12]) and "the life of the righteous shall be for ever" (13.9 [11]). And further, "He that doeth righteousness layeth up life for himself with the Lord" (9.9 [5]). These passages are difficult. By the time these psalms were written, there was a belief in an after-life,<sup>49</sup> but do these particular psalms express such a belief?

---

<sup>48</sup>Cf. also 7.9 (10) b; 8.40 (34) b.

<sup>49</sup>Vide Büchler, Types, p. 154.

Büchler has argued these passages do not refer to life after death as the reward for the righteous.<sup>50</sup> His argument is instructive and points the way to a discussion of remnant.

In Psalm 13, the lot of the righteous is compared to that of the sinner:

For the life of the righteous shall be for ever;  
 But sinners shall be taken away into destruction,  
 And their memorial shall be found no more.

(13.9-10 [11])

Thus, the righteous are not carried away into destruction which was the expressed worry in 13.4 [5]. Positively, the "for ever" seems to mean "prolonged life and continued protection to the end of his life".<sup>51</sup> This is supported by the contrasts in 13.4-5 [5-7]. The sinners are taken away and overthrown, "But not one of all these things toucheth the righteous". They are spared the lot of the sinner. This sparing of the righteous is due to God's mercy which is upon the pious, the fearers of the Lord (13.11 [12]). They will "inherit life in gladness" (14.7 [10]) and "shall live by the compassion of their God" (15.15 [13]). In other words, the righteous were saved from an impending disaster<sup>52</sup> (13.3

---

<sup>50</sup>Büchler, Types, pp. 149-155.

<sup>51</sup>Büchler, Types, p. 150. He cites Hebr. Ps. 37.9, 10 as parallel.

<sup>52</sup>Regarding the disaster being over, cf. 13.1.

[4]) which, to their minds, constituted a threat to their very existence (13.4 [5]). Rather than an example of life after death, there is here an example of the traditional, Hebrew Bible remnant.<sup>53</sup> In Psalm 9 the relevant verses are:

He that doeth righteousness layeth up life for himself  
with the Lord;

And he that doeth wrongly forfeits his life to  
destruction;

For the judgements of the Lord are (given) in  
righteousness to (every) man and (his) house.

(9.9-10 [5])

"The judgements" refer to the Roman slaughter in Jerusalem and "the destruction" to the slaughter of the sinners by Pompey.<sup>54</sup> Thus, the contrast is the escape of the righteous from the slaughter of the sinners. The survival is not after life but after the catastrophe. Here again, the righteous form a remnant saved from a present danger. The psalmist prays:

And now, Thou art our God, and we the people whom Thou  
hast loved:

Behold and show pity, O God of Israel, for we are  
Thine;

And remove not Thy mercy from us, lest they assail us.

---

<sup>53</sup>The argument on these passages is based, to great extent, on that by Büchler though he did not make the final connection between the passages and the remnant motif.

<sup>54</sup>Büchler, Types, p. 150.

For Thou didst choose the seed of Abraham before all the  
nations,

And didst set Thy name upon us, O Lord,

And Thou will not reject (us) for ever.

Thou madest a covenant with our fathers concerning us;

And we hope in Thee, when our soul turneth (unto Thee).

The mercy of the Lord be upon the house of Israel for  
ever and ever.

(9.16-19 [8-10])

This passage is especially helpful. Here, the psalmist, speaking as a member of the pious (9.6 [3]), pleads for the mercy of God to save the pious from the imminent disaster which threatens. The plea is made with pure hope and trust and not on the basis of any merit of the righteous, though their righteousness is attested (9.6 [3]).<sup>55</sup> Further, the covenant guarantees God "wilt not reject us for ever" (9.18 [9]). The plea is to be part of the "not rejected" and not to be given up to destruction. The salvation cannot be considered life after death but life after the catastrophe.

The third passage again contrasts the sinner with the righteous:

He [the sinner; 3.11 (9)] falleth--verily grievous is

---

<sup>55</sup>Cf. also 9.15 [7] where the righteous, who are admittedly not sinless, repent and are presumably shriven.

his fall--and riseth no more.

The destruction of the sinner is for ever,

And he shall not be remembered, when the righteous is  
visited.

This is the portion of sinners for ever.

But they that fear the Lord shall rise to life eternal

And their life (shall be) in the light of the Lord,  
and shall come to an end no more.

(3.13-16 [10-12])

Here again the contrast is the key.<sup>56</sup> The sinner is destroyed while the God-fearer is not. The "rising" of the righteous cannot be interpreted resurrectionally for it was written in light of 3.5:

The righteous stumbleth and holdeth the Lord righteous:

He falleth and looketh out for what God will do to  
him;

He seeketh out whence his deliverance will come.

This, then, contrasts with the sinner in 3.13 (10). Thus, the righteous rises from his fall to length of days while the sinner "riseth no more". Though not a reference to a remnant from a catastrophe, this passage certainly expresses the remnant idea--sifting the good from the evil--one for preservation, the other destruction.

---

<sup>56</sup>Büchler, Types, p. 153.

The psalmist in Psalm 15 was saved from his distress by calling upon the name of the Lord (15.1). He is contrasted with the sinner who is not protected by the Lord (15.9 [8]), inherits "destruction and darkness" (15.11 [10]) and "shall perish for ever" (15.15 [13]). When the righteous are said to "live by the compassion of their God" (15.15 [13]), this must mean "live" in life and not after life. As Böhler notes "Not one single word in the poem suggests that the pious died, and that the change promised would only come after his death".<sup>57</sup> The righteous are here again a righteous remnant saved from a threat (15.1) by the mercy of God while the sinners are destroyed.

Finally, in Psalm 14, the psalmist declares the pious "shall inherit life in gladness" (14.7 [10]). The contrast here is again between the pious and the sinner. The lot of the sinner is, as before, "Sheol and darkness and destruction, and they shall not be found in the day when the righteous obtain mercy" (14.6 [9]). In contrast, the pious live by the commandments; indeed, they "shall live by it for ever" (14.2 [3]):

Their planting is rooted for ever;

They shall not be plucked up all the days of heaven:

For the portion and the inheritance of God is Israel.

(14.3 [4-5])

---

<sup>57</sup>Ibid.



"The pious man acts in accordance with its commandments, and therefore will live long, while the sinners are carried off before their time."<sup>58</sup> Once again, there is in this passage no reference to the death of the pious. Here, the life is a long life. Israel, the pious, is rooted for ever and shall not be plucked up. Israel will endure at least through the pious, although this should not be understood as the pious appropriating the title Israel for themselves. It is nonetheless true that they must have understood themselves to be models of proper Israelite living.<sup>59</sup> Clearly, however, their eschatological vision, discussed below, precludes the self-understanding that they are the only true Israelites.

The righteous are rewarded; but, although the psalmists may well have believed in life after death, that belief is not reflected in their psalms<sup>60</sup> and is not specified as one of

<sup>58</sup>Ibid.

<sup>59</sup>"They have not given up hope on the rest of Israel, except the worst sinners, nor have they concluded that they have the exclusive right to be called the covenant people." (Sanders, Paul, p. 409)

<sup>60</sup>Braun ("Erbarmen Gottes"), while not answering Böhler's argument, holds that the pious would inherit eternal life: "Neben all diesen innerzeitlichen Erweisen der göttlichen Barmherzigkeit weiss unser text sehr wohl, dass die Frommen in der Barmherzigkeit ihres Gottes leben werden.' Im ewigen Leben der Frommen kommt Gottes Barmherzigkeit zum endgültigen Ziel." (p. 7) He cites the verse above (15.15) as well as 3.12; 12.6; 13.11; 14.3f. and 14.10, concluding "So vollendet sich die schon hier zeitlich erfahrene Barmherzigkeit Gottes im ewigen Leben" (p. 7). Thus, he presumes the meaning of the verses, letting the language stand as the proof and concentrating not on establishing the meaning

their rewards.

Ultimately the psalmists look forward to the gathering of Israel:

Turn, O God, Thy mercy upon us, and have pity upon us;  
 Gather together the dispersed of Israel, with mercy  
 and goodness;  
 For Thy faithfulness is with us.

(17.33-35 [27-28])

It is through God's mercy the dispersed will be gathered, but to whom does this refer?

We have already seen the lot of the sinner: he is recompensed according to his deeds, he is shown no pity and is condemned to destruction. Thus:

According to their sins didst Thou recompense them, O  
 God;  
 So that it befell them according to their deeds.  
 God showed them no pity;  
 He sought out their seed and let not one of them go  
 free.

but on the relationship between the presumed meaning, ewigen Leben, and the mercy of God, Gottes Barmherzigkeit. Later, in his in depth discussion of Psalms 15, 13 and 9, he presumes the meaning of the verses to be life after death (pp. 37, 39).

O'Dell ("Religious Background", p. 245) also presumes the meaning to be life after death; as does Winter (IDB, II, p. 959), Volz (Die Eschatologie, p. 27) and Nickelsburg (Resurrection, pp. 131-134). Nickelsburg argues from the resurrection without ever proving textually that it is meant as such. So also Rowley, Relevance, p. 80.

Faithful is the Lord in all His judgements  
Which He doeth upon the earth.

(17.10-12 [8-10])<sup>61</sup>

The destruction of the sinner is for ever,  
And he shall not be remembered, when the righteous  
is visited.

This is the portion of sinners for ever.

(3.13-15 [11-12])

He has sinned so grievously he is no longer part of Israel:

The salvation of the Lord be upon Israel His servant  
for ever;

And let the sinners perish together at the presence of  
the Lord;

But let the Lord's pious ones inherit the promises of  
the Lord.

(12.7 [6])

Israel will be gathered; Israel will be saved. Who constitutes  
Israel? It is the pious (12.7 [6])<sup>62</sup> who, however, must be  
cleansed of all sinners:

Let God remove those that live in hypocrisy in the  
company of the pious,

(Even) the life of such an one with corruption of

<sup>61</sup>Cf. also 2.7, 17 [16], 38 [34].

<sup>62</sup>vide Büchler, Types, pp. 151, 177.

his flesh and penury.

Let God reveal the deeds of the men-pleasers,

The deeds of such an one with laughter and derision;

That the pious may count righteous the judgement of  
their God,

When sinners are removed from before the righteous.

(Even the) man-pleaser who uttereth law guilefully.

(4.7-10 [6-8])

The sifting process has been one brought on by men who have chosen to sin grievously rather than to trust entirely in God's mercy:

Our works are subject to our own choice and power

To do right or wrong in the works of our hands;

And in Thy righteousness Thou visited the sons of men.

He that doeth righteousness layeth up life for himself  
with the Lord;

And he that doeth wrongly forfeits his life to  
destruction;

For the judgements of the Lord are (given) in  
righteousness to (every) man and (his) house.

.....

And now, Thou art our God, and we the people whom Thou  
hast loved:

Behold and show pity, O God of Israel, for we are  
Thine;

And remove not Thy mercy from us, lest they assail us.

(9.7-10 [4-5], 16 [8])

The pious when purified, shall then enter a new age:

Behold, O Lord, and raise up unto them their king, the  
son of David,

At the time in the which Thou seest, O God, that he  
may reign over Israel Thy servant.

And gird him with strength, that he may shatter unrighteous rulers,

And that he may purge Jerusalem from nations that  
trample (her) down to destruction.

Wisely, righteously he shall thrust out sinners from  
(the) inheritance,

He shall destroy the pride of the sinner as a potter's  
vessel.

With a rod of iron he shall break in pieces all their  
substance,

He shall destroy the godless nations with the word  
of his mouth;

At his rebuke nations shall flee before him,

And he shall reprove sinners for the thoughts of  
their heart.

And he shall gather together a holy people, whom he  
shall lead in righteousness,

And he shall judge the tribes of the people that has

been sanctified by the Lord his God.  
And he shall not suffer unrighteousness to lodge any  
more in their midst,  
Nor shall there dwell with them any man that knoweth  
wickedness,  
For he shall know them, that they are all sons of  
their God.  
And he shall divide them according to their tribes,  
upon the land,  
And neither sojourner nor alien shall sojourn with  
them any more.  
He shall judge peoples and nations in the wisdom of his  
righteousness.  
And he shall have the heathen nations to serve him under  
his yoke;  
And he shall glorify the Lord in a place to be seen  
of all the earth;  
And he shall purge Jerusalem, making it holy  
as of old:  
So that nations shall come from the ends of the earth to  
see his glory,  
Bringing as gifts her sons who had fainted,  
And to see the glory of the Lord, wherewith God hath  
glorified her.

(17.23-35 [21-31])

This passage describes the coming of the new age in which the tribes will be gathered and of which the sinners shall have no part. The sinners shall be thrust out from the inheritance (17.26 [23]). Obviously these are native Israelites who have sinned so grievously as to have forfeited their place in Israel. The psalmist further sees Israel purged of the nations (17.25 [29]). These seem to be best understood as foreigners in Israel.<sup>63</sup> Then shall the holy people be gathered (17.28 [26]). These are most certainly, but not exclusively, the pious. They must also include all Israelites whose deeds have not numbered them among the wicked who have lost the inheritance. These include people who have sinned (17.21-22 [19-20]) but whose sins were not considered heinous enough to classify them among "the sinners". All Israel will be gathered and all Israel will be saved, but not all Israelites will be saved. As we have seen, those Israelites who break the covenant and forfeit their place in Israel, the sinners, will be destroyed. Israel then, served by the Gentiles (17.32 [30]), will be a "pure Israel", a "true Israel", "sanctified by the Lord" (17.28 [26]), a remnant of Israelites who now constitute all Israel.

The psalmists accepted the traditional concept

---

<sup>63</sup>Cf. 17.27 [24].

of the remnant as the survivors of a catastrophe as well as the later eschatological understanding. They saw the covenant underlying salvation and man as saved through the mercy of God. The eschatological remnant would consist of all Israel, though not all Israelites. The pious, in their pre-eschatological form, were models for their fellow Israelites.



## Conclusions

The meaning and significance of the remnant which resulted from the examination of the Hebrew Bible has not been altered by the examination of select apocrypha and pseudepigrapha in Chapter Two. The remnant is grounded in the covenant, arising from God's faithfulness to His covenantal promises and necessitated by the Israelites' inability to remain constant. The election is of all Israel; it is national not individual. The covenant, in every case, is the Mosaic covenant which has been revealed to all Israel and which demands compliance with its dictates as the pre-requisite for membership.

The remnant is understood both historically and eschatologically. Remnant examples based upon escape from past catastrophe appear less often than in the Hebrew Bible and are usually a re-telling of Hebrew Bible stories. Eschatological/Apocalyptic applications of the remnant, however, have become much more frequent.

Basically, Judaism retains a particularistic, exclusivistic orientation, although universalism is, at times, broached, albeit in limited fashion. Within Judaism, Israelites who commit certain transgressions are understood as excluded from the covenant. All others are members.

None of the documents examined to date reflects the self-understanding of an individual or group as the eschatological remnant, the "true Israel". Often, there is a

proleptic understanding which is limited by the ability of the members to remain faithful until their death or the eschaton, whichever comes first. Salvation is, therefore, achieved through faithfulness to the Mosaic covenant in which all Israelites participate by birth. Israelites do not need to join the covenant; they need only choose to remain within it by their proper performance of its commandments.

The point must also be made that no group has yet seen the necessity or purpose for separating from their countrymen for any reason--political or religious. It remains for the Qumran covenanters, to whom our attention shall now be turned, to take this critical step.

## CHAPTER III

### THE REMNANT UNDERSTANDING AT QUMRAN

#### INTRODUCTION

The Dead Sea Scrolls<sup>1</sup> find has produced manuscripts or fragments of every book of the Hebrew Bible except Esther<sup>2</sup> and, indeed, some of the books are represented by more than ten copies<sup>3</sup>. In addition, copies of a number of the books in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha have also been found.

Before beginning the examination of the understanding and significance of the remnant at Qumran,<sup>4</sup> it is

---

<sup>1</sup>Accounts of the discovery of the texts are myriad. There does not seem any reason for listing them. The reader is referred to the standard Bibliographies on the subject.

<sup>2</sup>Whether Esther was not part of the Qumran Canon or is missing from the cache by chance is little more than speculation.

<sup>3</sup>Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Psalms.

<sup>4</sup>The question of the identity of the sect or group that produced the Dead Sea Scrolls lies outside the scope of this study. Literature on the subject is extensive but falls generally into two camps: Essene authorship and non-Essene authorship. I hesitate to call the Dead Sea Covenanters Essene since the argument is akin to shoe-horning. The points of contact between the two groups though significant are not sufficient to make the identification. To do so, as many scholars are inclined, limits the Jewish groups of the period to those we now know. This is overly-simplistic. It is, however, indisputable that the two groups were similar. The Dead Sea Covenanters were "essene-like". The group will, therefore, in this study not be called "the Essenes" though their Essene qualities are hereby acknowledged.

necessary to discuss briefly the question of methodology.

In general the documents date between the second century B.C.E. and the first century C.E.

Scholars generally agree the Dead Sea Scrolls were written over a period of time and, therefore, show an historical development.<sup>5</sup> Nevertheless, the specifics of this admission have achieved little consensus.<sup>6</sup>

Not only is the literature not homogeneous but the individual texts are also composed of various strata. This can be easily shown by an examination of the Hodayot,<sup>7</sup> although the same has been claimed of the Community Rule<sup>8</sup>,

<sup>5</sup> Cf. e.g. M. Euphros, "The Discipline Manual of the Judean Covenanters", *OTS*, 8 (1950), 156-192. E. Reicke, "Die Talmarine-Schriften und die Damaskus-Fragmente", *St Th*, 2 (1949), 45-70; J. L. Teicher, "The Damascus Fragments and the Origin of the Jewish Christian Sect", *JCS*, 2 (1951), 115-143.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. H. A. Butler, "The Chronological Sequence of the Scrolls of Qumran Cave One", *EQ*, 2 (1960), 533-539; E. Rabinowitz, "Sequence and Dates of the Extra-Biblical Dead Sea Scroll Texts and Damascus Fragments", *Vt*, 3 (1953), 175-185.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Jürgen Becker, Das Heil Gottes: Heils- und Sündenbegriffe in den Qumran-Texten und in frühen Testamentschriften (Vorträge in den Vordernöck und JAFFA; 1964) EP. EO-56; Sverre Holm-Nielsen, Hodayot. Psalms from Qumran Acta Theologica Danica 2 (Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1966), EP. 3192f.; Johann Maier, Die Texte vom Toten Meer (München: Ernst Reinhardt Verlag, 1960), II, 63.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Peter von der Osten-Sacken, Gott und Babel: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Qalilismus in

the War Scroll<sup>9</sup> and the Damascus Document.<sup>10</sup>

The Damascus Document raises a unique problem since the most complete text was not found at Qumran but at a Genizah in Cairo in 1896. The relationship between CD and the rest of Scrolls is still being examined.<sup>11</sup>

Since the problem of the homogeneity of the Dead Sea Scrolls is not yet resolved, it seems that greater accuracy would be produced by the more painstaking method of examining each relevant text seriatim; rather than by attempting an overview. By "relevant" is meant each text

den Texten aus Qumran SUNT 6 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1969), p. 239; Claus-Hunno Hunzinger, "Beobachtungen zur Entwicklung der Disziplinarordnung der Gemeinde von Qumrān" in Qumran-Probleme. Vorträge des leipziger Symposions über Qumran-Probleme vom 9. bis 14. Oktober 1961, H. Bardtke, ed. (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1963), 231-247; E. F. Sutcliffe, "The First Fifteen Members of the Qumran Community: A Note on 1QS 8:1ff.", JSS, 4 (2, 1959), 134-138; Maier, Die Texte, I, 21; J. Murphy-O'Connor, "La gènese littéraire de la Règle de la Communauté", RB, 76 (1969), 528-549.

<sup>9</sup>Cf. Becker, Das Heil Gottes, pp. 43-50; Claus-Hunno Hunzinger, "Fragmente einer älteren Fassung des Buches Milḥama aus Höhle 4 von Qumrān:", ZAW, 69 (1957), 131-151.

<sup>10</sup>Cf. Becker, Das Heil Gottes, pp. 56f.; Rabinowitz, "Sequence and Dates", p. 175.

<sup>11</sup>Cf. Charles T. Fritsch, The Qumran Community: Its History and Scrolls (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956), pp. 76-89.

which reflects some remnant consciousness. <sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup>I have consulted the following general translations of the Qumran documents (hereafter cited by last name only): J. Carmignac, E. Cochrane and H. Lignee, Les Textes de Qumran: Traduits et Annotés (2 vols.); Paris: Editions Letouzey et Ane, 1963; A. Dupont-Sormier, The Essene Writings From Qumran, E. t. by G. Verres (Clarendon, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1973); Theodor H. Gaster, The Dead Sea Scriptures (3rd ed.); Garden City: New York, Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1976); U. Katz, Die Texte: Verres, The Dead Sea Scrolls. The Hebrew Texts Consulted Here (those edited by: A. W. Habermann, et., Negillot Me'atav Yehuda (The Scrolls from the Judean Desert); Israel: Macabbaroth Lesifrut Publishing House, 1959; E. Lohse, ed., Die Texte aus Qumran, Hebräisch und Deutsch (2nd. rev. ed.; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchverlagsgesellschaft, 1971) and the edition of the Tefillin by Yisrael Yadin, Tefillin from Qumran (KSPHY 1-4), (Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 1969). In addition, the photographs of the Qumran manuscripts have been used whenever necessary: cf. Discoveries in the Judean Desert.

## A. The Rule of the Community (1QS)<sup>1</sup>

A discussion of remnant in the Rule of the Community must begin with the sectarian self-understanding reflected in the document. Nowhere in 1QS does the sect clearly attribute to itself the title "remnant". If, and when, the sectarians understood themselves as the "faithful remnant", "the historical remnant" or "the eschatological remnant" hinges on an examination of their self-understanding and not on a linguistic study of the term "remnant", although as their self-understanding is plumbed occurrences of remnant vocabulary will be noted and discussed.

The Qumran covenanters' self-understanding, as reflected in 1QS, begins with the perception of their own uniqueness which is grounded in election and covenant.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Rule of the Community, also called the Manual of Discipline and designated 1QS, describes the doctrines of the sect and the rules and regulations by which daily life was governed. All quotations, unless otherwise noted, are from the translation by Vermes. In addition, the other general translations of the Qumran texts detailed in the Introduction (cf. p. 354, fn. 12) have been consulted as have William Hugh Brownlee's The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline: Translation and Notes (BASOR, Supplementary Studies Nos. 10-12; New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951), Leaney's The Rule of Qumran, J. Pouilly's La Règle de la Communauté de Qumrân: Son Evolution Littéraire (Cahiers de la Revue Biblique, 17; Paris: Gabalda, 1976) and P. Wernberg-Møller's The Manual of Discipline: Translated and annotated with an Introduction (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, I; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1957). For Hebrew sources, vide p. 354, fn. 12.

Thus, they call themselves the elect of God's will? (6.6), the elect of the time (9.14) and the elect of mankind (11.16)?<sup>3</sup> as well as God's "chosen ones" (11.7). Their self-perception includes, therefore, the realization that they are the elect,<sup>4</sup> this election is sealed through the Cuman covenant.

What, however, is the covenant which binds together the members of the Community? In 1QS, the Cuman covenant is understood as a continuation of the Mosaic covenant:

Whenever approaches the Council of the Community shall enter<sup>5</sup> the Covenant of God in the presence of

<sup>2</sup> THIS MUST be so since and Habermann who took follow the scriptal emendation which corrects "THU" to "THU". Thus, Sanders (Paul, p. 214) translates as above. Similarly, Johse (p. 29), Vermes (p. 25), Gaster (p. 61), Tearey (The Rule of Qumran, p. 209), Snowles (The Dead Sea Manual, p. 52), Vermes (The Habermann, p. 57), Gaster (The Habermann, p. 25), Giddert (I, 11).

<sup>3</sup> Commenting on this passage, Tearey (The Rule of Qumran, p. 216) asserts that in referring to the sect's self-understanding as the covenant, the passage is, however, a statement of election. Although election is a pre-condition of covenant, this study has already established that being the elect does not guarantee being "of the covenant", in the Hebrew Bible, all Israel is elect by divine fiat; what is distinctive statement concerning Israel's perseverance, however, is not a guarantee of one being in any covenant. The theology is much more nuanced.

<sup>4</sup> Sanders (Paul, p. 214) notes that the secretaries' self-designation as the elect is "usually followed by a qualifying word".

<sup>5</sup> See Habermann (The Association in the Scrolls of the Dead Sea Manual of Association, pp. 107, 108, 109, 110) notes that the same verb, here KIN, is utilized in rabbinical literature as a technical designation for both the article-ment and document and petition for covenantation.



all who have freely pledged themselves. He shall undertake by a binding oath to return with all his heart and soul to every commandment of the Law of Moses in accordance with all that has been revealed of it to the sons of Zadok, the Keepers of the Covenant and Seekers of His will, and to the multitude of the men of their Covenant who together have freely pledged themselves to His truth and to walking in the way of His delight.

(5.7-10)

The Covenant of God,<sup>6</sup> to which the sectarians were pledged, is, indeed, the Hebrew Bible covenant, to which the entrant is in fact returning promising to "do what is good and right before Him as He commanded by the hand of Moses and all His servants the Prophets" (1.2f).<sup>7</sup> Thus, the covenanter is bound to the Law of Moses, the commandments of the Hebrew Bible, "all that has been revealed", and he shall be examined "with respect to his understanding and practice of the Law"

---

<sup>6</sup>The sectarian covenant is variously "the Covenant of God" (5.7), "the Covenant of Grace" (1.7), "the Covenant of the everlasting Community" (3.11; the phrase is reversed in 5.5-6), "an everlasting Covenant" (4.22), "His Covenant" (5.19, 22), "their Covenant" (6.19; "their" here refers to the Zadokite priests, cf. 5.2 and later 1QSa 1.2-3), "the Covenant of the Community" (8.16-17).

<sup>7</sup>Cf. Jaubert, La notion, p. 122.

(5.21)<sup>8</sup> Yet, it is nonetheless true that the Qumran covenant is "their<sup>9</sup> Covenant" (5.9).<sup>10</sup> It is uniquely theirs because the sectarians understood it contained, in addition to material generally revealed, "hidden things" (5.11) revealed solely to the community (8.12). These "hidden things" appear to have been revealed, at least in part, through the study of the law: "This (path) is the study of the Law which He commanded by the hand of Moses, that they may do according to all that has been revealed from age to age, and as the Prophets have revealed by His Holy Spirit" (8.14-16). Moses and the prophets are thus authors, not interpreters, of the Law. The action of the holy spirit is, therefore, accomplished in two complementary ways: "the prophets have been divinely led to write mysteries or secrets (razim); and the Teacher of Righteousness and his sect have been given the equally divine ability to reveal the true interpretation (peshar) of them".<sup>11</sup>

Further the sons of Aaron, the Zadokite priests,<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup>The covenanter must do more than practice the Law; he must also understand (Verständnisses; Löhse, p. 21; cited incorrectly as v 12).

<sup>9</sup>"Their" refers to the priestly founders of the community.

<sup>10</sup>Cf. also 6.19.

<sup>11</sup>Leaney, The Rule of Qumran, p. 223.

<sup>12</sup>The terms are interchangeable (for "sons of Zadok",

hold a special position in the sectarian covenant. They are said to have established the covenant (5.21-22). They are especially mentioned as recipients of the covenantal revelation, as those whose covenant understanding is to be followed by the neophyte (5.9, quoted above), as being in authority in the community (5.2), although it is clear, in these passages, that they share these roles with "the multitude"<sup>13</sup> of the men of the Community" (5.2, 9). "Attrib-

---

cf. 5.2,9). Zadok, a priest of a local sanctuary in pre-Davidic Jerusalem (2 Sam 8.17) is listed in the Aaronid genealogy (1 Chron 6.1-8). "Once this was accepted and had become part of the canon in c. 200 B.C. sons of Zadok would be well content to employ at times the title 'sons of Aaron'" (Leaney, The Rule of Qumran, p. 177; on the Zadokite priesthood, cf. also pp. 91-95).

<sup>13</sup>Chaim Rabin (Qumran Studies [Scripta Judaica II, Oxford: University Press, 1957], p. 105), argues 217 does not mean "assembly" but rather "means 'multitude' in Biblical and 'majority' in Mishnaic Hebrew". On this, cf. also Jastrow. The correlative "and" which precedes the phrase under discussion is written clearly above the line. If translated, the practicalities of the sentence become difficult. In the case of disagreement between the sons of Zadok and the "multitude", whose views are pre-eminent? Rabin argues the superscript is wrong. If so, the priests become subordinate to the "multitude"; they become "only an executive body". This, however, seems unsupported by 9.7-8 where a more radical picture emerges:

The sons of Aaron alone shall command in matters of justice and property, and every rule concerning the men of the Community shall be determined according to their word. (9.7-8)

This passage, however, is also difficult. Over whom are the sons of Aaron solely placed and when do they exercise this control? Does this indicate an earlier stage of the sect's history when the priests ruled alone? (So, Hunzinger,

uting to the Zadokite priests the establishing of the covenant, as well as the preserving of it (1QS 5.2f., 9), may indicate their role in revealing the secrets of the Covenant and controlling the exegesis by which the secrets are revealed, as well as their general authority to supervise God's ordinances . . . ." <sup>14</sup> The sectarian covenant further defines its uniqueness by its method of entrance. Every Israelite is born into the Mosaic covenant and the responsibility of the Israelite is to remain within the covenant by following its dictates. Membership in the sectarian covenant, however, is not automatic; it requires the conscious decision to enter: "He [the Master] shall admit into the Covenant of Grace all those who have freely devoted themselves to the observance of God's precepts . . . ." (1.7f.) In summary, the Mosaic covenant remains fully in effect at Qumran, yet the Mosaic covenant at

---

"Beobachtungen zur Entwicklung", pp. 243-245.) If so, how does this fit into the final Community Rule where it is not recounted historically? Perhaps the context is future. Note the phrase "when these things will be in Israel" (9.3; translator: Rabin, Qumran Studies, p. 98) which may indicate a future state of affairs (so Rabin, Qumran Studies, pp. 98f.). The future, however, here seems to be the historical future, the final document's present. Leany, (The Rule of Qumran, p. 166) suggests that "the priests initiated legislation which had to be finally approved in the full assembly and gain majority approval before being regarded as binding". This would explain how 1QS could have been an effective legislative document in its present form. In any case, the sons of Zadok were held in special esteem and held some type of unique authority.

<sup>14</sup>Sanders, Paul, pp. 241-242.

Qumran is different. On the one hand, the Qumran covenant is the Mosaic covenant because the Mosaic covenant contained the "secret things" to be discovered. Hence, the Qumran covenant should not be termed "new", in distinction to "old". On the other hand, it has new qualities in the very existence of hidden revelation. Perhaps a better understanding might be achieved if the discussion were framed differently. The sectarian covenant is the Mosaic covenant with its further divine revelation. This does not imply replacement or abrogation but deeper understanding and development. It does not imply new, versus old, (à la Jeremiah's new covenant) but allows the use of "new" when understood as focused on the difference between the Mosaic covenant and the Qumran Covenant, the further revelation. Excessive emphasis on either the similarity of the Mosaic and Qumran covenants or the difference must be avoided. "A new covenant must be established. . . simply because the old one has been disregarded by the majority of the people"<sup>15</sup> and "le peuple d'Israël est toujours le peuple élu," with some remaining faithful, while "les autres n'ont pas résisté aux attaques de Bélial"<sup>16</sup> are both as inaccurate as "So wird

---

<sup>15</sup>Holm-Nielson, Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran, p. 284.

<sup>16</sup>A. Mary, "Y a-t-il une prédestination à Qumrân?", RQ, 6 (1967-1969) p. 170.

der Weg des neuen Bundesvolkes zum Heilsweg, während der Weg des geschichtlichen Bundesvolkes zum Weg des Unheils wird. . .".<sup>17</sup> The former view ignores the "newness" of the sectarian covenant with its "hidden things", the latter finds in the Qumran covenant a "Spannung" in the original "Bund", dividing Israel at the same time into a "geschichtliche Grösse" and a "theologische Grösse". As has been shown, the sectaries' understanding of the Qumran covenant was also more nuanced than any one of these positions.

Membership in the Qumran covenant required the initiative of freely pledging oneself to the covenant way of life (5.10). In 1QS, this option appears limited to Israelites:<sup>18</sup>

Every man, born of Israel [מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל] , who freely pledges himself to join the Council of the Community, shall be examined by the Guardian at the head of the Congregation concerning his understanding and his deeds.

(6.13f.)

---

<sup>17</sup>Report of Rudolf Schreiber, "Der Neue Bund im Spätjudentum und Urchristentum" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Tübingen, 1955), TLZ 81 (1956), col. 696.

<sup>18</sup>With Leaney (The Rule of Qumran, pp. 167f) who notes "the men of Qumran contemplated an Israel only of Israelites". Cf. also B. E. Thiering, Redating the Teacher of Righteousness, Australian and New Zealand Studies In Theology and Religion 1, (Australia: Theological Explora-

The applicant is examined by the Guardian ( 71211 ) and, if he passes, he is then admitted into the Covenant" (6.15) and instructed in the "rules of the Community" (6.15). All this, however, seems to occur before he is admitted into the fellowship of the sect:<sup>19</sup>

And later, when he comes to stand before the Congregation, they shall all deliberate his case, and according to the decision of the Council of the Congregation he shall either enter or depart.

(6.15-16)

Thus, a distinction is made, during the initiation process, between entering the covenant and entering the community, between initial acceptance and incorporation into the Community. Indeed, even the incorporation is not viewed as one step but consists, for the initiate, of a process of testing and gradual assimilation. Thus, it is possible to speak of a series of indoctrinating procedures which see-

<sup>19</sup>ions, (OTO), p. 24. Hence, any comparison with Earl (Wendell) Williams, The Witness, p. 271 is false in the main. Earl envisaged an "age" of all races (cf. pp. 3, 10).

<sup>20</sup>Sardens (Earl, p. 246) notes that, in 6.15-16, "during the Council of the Community is where the sect as entering the covenant". While substantially correct, the passage is more nuanced. It refers in some regard to the procedure for entrance into the Community and the appropriate stages thereof, at least from the recruit's, a distinction between entering the covenant and entering the Community. This distinction is not, however, systematically applied and, thus, Sardens is in general quite correct.

ment a state normally spoken of in summary terms: being in the covenant is being in the Community.

According to 1QS, it is Israelites who apply for admission into the Qumran sect and who then pass through a series of stages to gain full acceptance into the fellowship of the community.

It is clear, however, that not all Israelites choose to join the sectarian covenant:

Then the Priests shall recite the favours of God manifested in His mighty deeds and shall declare all His merciful grace to Israel and the Levites shall recite the iniquities of the children of Israel, all their guilty rebellions and sins during the dominion of Satan. And after them, all those entering the Covenant shall confess and say: We have strayed! . . . And the Priests shall bless all the men of the lot of God who walk perfectly in all His ways, . . .

And the Levites shall curse all the men of the lot of Satan, . . .

(1.21-25)

The meaning is unmistakable. There are those who enter the covenant; upon entrance, they are of "all the men of the lot of God". Even after the acceptance ceremony, however, some remain not of the lot of God, for "the



Levites shall curse all the men of the lot of Satan". Some Israelites enter the covenant, some do not. It is from the latter, "the men of falsehood", who do not hold fast to the Covenant, that the sectarians must separate (5.1-3). And elsewhere:

And he shall undertake by the Covenant to separate from all the men of falsehood who walk in the way of wickedness.

For they are not reckoned in His Covenant. They have neither inquired nor sought after Him concerning His laws that they might know the hidden things in which they have sinfully erred; and matters revealed they have treated with insolence.

(5.10-12)

Here the "men of falsehood" are defined as those not in the Covenant. More exactly, they are those who look with disdain upon the revealed law and do not seek out the "hidden things". The passage further substantiates the fact that not all Israelites choose the covenant. The attitude of insolence towards the revealed law and neglect of the hidden law of which the men of falsehood are accused makes sense only when applied to Israelites. In summary, not all Israelites choose to enter the covenant (6.13f.) and those who do not are to be avoided: "For all those not reckoned in His covenant are to be set apart, together with all that is theirs" (5.18). "The Qumran Community has claimed to be

a holy people which was living in an unclean world, but separated from it through the boundary of a sacred life."<sup>20</sup> The separation is to be more than intellectual, it is to be physical. The lot of the wicked shall be "a multitude of plagues", "everlasting damnation", "eternal torment" and "endless disgrace together with shameful extinction in the fire of the dark regions. The times of all their generations shall be spent in sorrowful mourning and in bitter misery and in calamities of darkness until they are destroyed without remnant or survivor" (4.12-14).<sup>21</sup> God "will blot from the earth all them that despise His word" (5.19). Nonetheless, the sectarians did view these Israelites as yet redeemable if they would "turn from their wickedness" (5.14). Their destruction is premised upon non-repentance and seems finalized only at God's visitation.

Concomitantly, the elect can so transgress the covenant that they are excommunicated. Here a distinction

<sup>20</sup>C. Betz, "The Eschatological Interpretation of the Sinai-Tradition in Qumran and in the New Testament", JSJ, 6 (1967-1968), 96. Betz continues "However, in its case the unclean world was Israel." As Betz implies, the community was within Israel, it did not constitute Israel. Unfortunately, in his discussion of the resemblance of the Qumran experience to the Sinai tradition, he does not deal with this issue specifically. The questions of the meaning of membership in the sectarians vis-à-vis membership in Israel, and conversely, of not choosing membership and its effect upon membership in Israel are not explored.

<sup>21</sup>Cf. also 5.13 where the men of falsehood will be left "no remnant". So also 4.14.

is made. Members who have been in the covenant less than ten years are expelled for blaspheming "while reading the Book or praying" (7.1-2), for slandering the Congregation (7.16), for murmuring against the authority of the Community (7.17) or for sharing food with an excommunicated elder (7.25).<sup>22</sup> One who has been in the community for ten full years and betrays the Community is also expelled (7.23-24) as is any of the men of perfect holiness "who deliberately or through negligence transgresses one word of the Law of Moses" (8.22-23).

Thus, the non-sectarian Jew was able to join the community and the sectarian Jew could be expelled from the community. Being within or without is not, in 1QS, considered a determined and fixed situation. Man's condition remains fluid and depends upon his resolve. Nonetheless, being inside or outside the covenant is soteriologically crucial: those outside the covenant face destruction; those within the covenant will receive God's mercy.

Although membership is voluntary, requiring the initiative of the applicant, there is nonetheless an abiding belief that God is solely responsible for choosing both the elect and the lost:

He has created man to govern the world, and has

---

<sup>22</sup>It is noteworthy that only one of these transgressions is against God; the others are against the community.

appointed for him two spirits<sup>23</sup> in which to walk until the time of His visitation:<sup>24</sup> the spirits of truth and falsehood. Those born of truth spring from a fountain of light, but those born of falsehood spring from a source of darkness. All the children of righteousness are ruled by the Prince of Light and walk in the ways of light, but all the children of falsehood are ruled by the Angel of Darkness and walk in the ways of darkness.

The Angel of Darkness leads all the children of righteousness astray, and until his end, all their sin, iniquities, wickedness, all their unlawful deeds are caused by his dominion in accordance with the mysteries of God.

(3.17-23)

The passage is remarkable, for it totally ignores man's initiative and free will. God determines each man's lot at birth. Indeed, "from the God of Knowledge comes all that is and shall be. Before ever they existed He established their whole design, and when, as ordained for them, they come into being, it is in accord with His glorious

---

<sup>23</sup>On the meaning of "spirits" at Qumran cf. A. A. Anderson, "The Use of 'Ruah' in 1QS, 1QH and 1QM", JSS, 7 (1962), 293-303.

<sup>24</sup>The last judgment.

design that they accomplish their task without changes" (3.15-17). Further, God "has caused them [His chosen ones] to inherit the lot of the Holy Ones" (11.7-8) and "He will draw me near by His grace, and by His mercy will He bring my justification" (11.13).<sup>25</sup> Election, entrance into the covenant, is here by the grace of God.

In spite of this insistence on God's having chosen the elect from the womb, of being the chosen (9.14), the sectarians, as has been demonstrated, also strongly insisted on their freely choosing the covenant, on being "those who have chosen the way" (9.17-18). What of the correlation between these two seemingly contradictory views? Do they represent two differing philosophies within the sect?<sup>26</sup> Are they representative of two periods within the sect's history? Are they to be accepted as representing one the ideal, the other the praxis of the sect?<sup>27</sup> Are they the result of the sect's theology not being systematic?<sup>28</sup> Are they the result of differing genres of literature within the documents of

---

<sup>25</sup>Cf. also 11.2.

<sup>26</sup>Matthew Black, The Scrolls and Christian Origins (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1961), p. 125.

<sup>27</sup>Holm-Nielsen, Hodayot, pp. 279-284.

<sup>28</sup>J. Licht, "The Doctrine of the Thanksgiving Scroll", IEJ, 6 (1956) 5ff.; J. T. Milik, Ten Years, p. 119; Helmer Ringgren, The Faith of Qumran, p. 111; Kurt Schubert, The Dead Sea Community: Its Origin and Teachings, E.t. by John W. Doberstein (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959), p. 61.

the sectarians? Three complementary points must be made. First, to the sectarians, the "Community Rule", whatever its source or redaction history, was a unified document with some sort of official status.<sup>29</sup> Secondly, and following from the first point, the two views of entering the covenant were not contradictory to the sect. Third, the statement in 1QS concerning the doctrine of the two Spirits occurs not in hymnic material, whose genre could excuse the emphasis on God's choice, but in halakic material where two "contradictory" views would not be tolerated. Thus, both beliefs, that of God choosing and that of man's free choice, are equally important to the authors (compilers) of 1QS. "Their assertion of God's governing providence did not exclude their certainty that a man could determine his own destiny."<sup>30</sup> Why, however, did the sectarians accept as true two such logically exclusive tenets? Sanders discusses this problem at length and convincingly argues that the "strong insistence on both these points"<sup>31</sup> can be traced to the sect's need to explain their status as the specially elect. "The election by definition must be by God's will; that much is obvious."<sup>32</sup> For the Qumran sectarians, this

---

<sup>29</sup>Sanders, Paul, pp. 266, 325.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., p. 264.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., p. 266.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid.

was complicated by the fact that the election was not of Israel but of individual Israelites and that not all Israelites were elect. "God chose some but not others because he decided to do so; God chooses those who choose his way and rejects those who despise his commandments. Both of these answers, depending on the circumstances, could be considered to be true."<sup>33</sup> Sanders further notes that "vis-à-vis God, no one can be worthy; one's choice must be by grace."<sup>34</sup> "When considering outsiders, however, or those trying to enter the covenant, or the backsliders within the covenant, and in giving halakah to deal with these people, the sectarian authors would naturally write as if all is at man's disposal."<sup>35</sup> Thus as answers to different questions both statements are valid. When the question involves those within the covenant vis à vis confederates or God, the emphasis falls upon God's choice;<sup>36</sup> when the question involves those outside the covenant, or even those within who are not achieving, the backsliders, the emphasis falls upon man's choice.

---

<sup>33</sup>Ibid.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid., p. 267.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid. J. van der Ploeg, The Excavation at Lamma. A Survey of the Judeean Brotherhood and its Ideas, E.T. by Kevin Smyth (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1956), p. 116.

The Rule of the Community is not an eschatological text. The main focus is on the historical present. There is, however, as could be anticipated, some eschatological content, since the community lived in the present but with an active anticipation and constant preparation "for the encounter with the holy God".<sup>37</sup>

According to 1QS, the eschatological end will bring the eradication of falsehood and the establishment of truth for ever (4.19). It is then God will refine

. . .for Himself the human frame by rooting out all spirit of falsehood from the bounds of his flesh. He will cleanse him of all wicked deeds with the spirit of holiness; like purifying waters He will shed upon him the spirit of truth (to cleanse him) of all abominations and falsehood. And he shall be plunged into the spirit of purification that he may instruct the upright in the knowledge of the Most High and teach the wisdom of the sons of heaven to the perfect of way. For God has chosen them for an everlasting Covenant and all the glory of Adam shall be theirs.<sup>38</sup>

(4.20-23)

---

<sup>37</sup>Etz, "Sinai-tradition", p. 93.

<sup>38</sup>Black (The Scrolls, p. 139) understands this as a restoration of Adam's glory. Hence, it is a new act of creation.



This is a very important passage for the study of the remnant in 1QS and, indeed, in Qumran. Here the eschatological concern of the sectarian community is broached within a predominantly non-eschatological document.<sup>39</sup>

As was pointed out previously, the teaching in 1QS is focused upon the historically present organization of the sect. Further, the groups diametrically opposed in 1QS are the sectarian Jews and the non-sectarian Jews. It is against each other that they are mutually defined. Yet the individual's position vis-à-vis the two remains fluid. There is no eschatological finality in these discussions. What is the eschatological view? As is to be expected, the eschatological community must be pure and God is to refine and cleanse it. But who is this group? The answer is the meaning of "the human frame".<sup>40</sup>

<sup>39</sup>This is not to say that the concerns of the community were not eschatological nor that the community did not consider itself to be in some eschatological transition (vide E. Licht, "Time and Eschatology in Apocalyptic Literature and in Qumran", *JJS*, 15 [1967], 177-182). 1QS, however, deals primarily with historical time, with living prior to the eschaton although certainly in preparation for it. It is the focus of 1QM which is primarily eschatological.

<sup>40</sup>Brownlee (The Dead Sea Manual, p. 16), originally proposed the translation "some of mankind" but later ("Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament", *JJS*, 7 [1956-1957], p. 25) interpreted the phrase as a messianic reference. While not denying his point that the suffering servant is echoed in the context, I cannot accept his hypothesis. In his treatment of this passage, Brownlee does not discuss the sect's belief in two Messiahs nor the

I have followed Yadin's<sup>41</sup> pointing and, therefore, Yener's translation<sup>42</sup> of W'N n'nn . Yadin points the phrase W'N n'nn, a phonetic spelling of W'N n'nn ,<sup>43</sup> literally the "building of man". Habermann<sup>44</sup> points the phrase W'N n'nn, literally, "from the Sons of man". Although the latter pointing is more obvious<sup>45</sup> and more natural<sup>46</sup>, it is nonetheless erroneous.<sup>47</sup> According to Habermann's pointing, the text indicates some of mankind would be

fact that the suffering servant of Isaiah is often interpreted collectively. Nembers-Wylier (The Manual, p. 85) notes that the phrase "those chosen by divine pleasure" is dependent on Isa 42:1 which was interpreted collectively. Emwale's individualistic interpretation is further questioned by the very collective nature of the passage.

<sup>41</sup>Y. Yadin, "A Note on DSD II:20", IEJ, 14 (1955), pp. 40-45. So also, Dupont-Sormer, Guilbert and Gaster who translate as "fabric" (Dupont-Sormer, Gaster), "le corps" (Guilbert).

<sup>42</sup>So also Dupont-Sormer, Guilbert (Les Textes, I, 56) and Gaster.

<sup>43</sup>Yade for י.צ; י.צ.י and א. ת.י, 9.

<sup>44</sup>So also those who translates as "and from among the Son of man" (Nembers-Wylier) (he also notes the alternative pointing and translation). Excurses (The Red Sea Series, I, 16), Leant (The Bible of Sumer, p. 177) and Members-Wylier (The Manual, p. 85) also.

<sup>45</sup>Y. Yadin, "An Analysis of the Texts on the Two Systems in DSD II in Some Historical Context", Excurses of The Red Sea Series, ed. Dr. Yadin Yadin and Yigael Yadin (2nd ed.; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1951), pp. 51, 52.

<sup>46</sup>Leant, The Bible of Sumer, p. 159.

<sup>47</sup>Yadin, "An Analysis", p. 57; cf. also Yadin's explanation ("A Note on DSD II:20", pp. 40-45).

refined and cleansed in the end times. This, however, is contrary to the eschatological understanding of the sect. An explanation is necessary. 1QS 4.20-23 focuses on the eschatological resolution. At that time "the humanity ('man') that shall be thus purified shall consist only of the righteous who are inevitably polluted by the present world--the wicked shall be utterly destroyed altogether with the destruction of Evil."<sup>48</sup> This has already been recounted (4.13-14). It may be presumed, therefore, to speak of some of mankind after the destruction of the wicked misses the mark. There is no need to elucidate further the fact that the elect now represent mankind. Put another way, premised upon the belief in the election of Israel, the eschatological community is Israel. All mankind appears to be the sectarian Jews at the time of the eschatological end. Thus, it is not valid to claim, concerning this text, "the purification of 'some' seems consistent with the scrolls' doctrine".<sup>49</sup> It

---

<sup>48</sup>Licht, "An Analysis", p. 97.

<sup>49</sup>Leaney, The Rule of Qumran, p. 158. In fairness to Leaney, it should be noted that, after rejecting Licht's theory, he adds "although it might be argued that the elect would now represent mankind, all evil men and evil itself having been destroyed already, and that what is here being described is a new creation after that destruction". Although indicating his preference for Brownlee's theory ("This is a most attractive suggestion"), Leaney does end by straddling the proverbial fence.

must be noted, however, that the final eschatological community, although it will consist of those within the covenant, is not specified as being co-terminous with the present covenantal group (note the individual fluidity) nor does it unqualifiedly guarantee salvation to its members (one must join and keep perfect). Those whom "God has chosen" for His covenant are here identified as those who are purified. The title "elect", "chosen", may be used before the eschaton but its meaning is eschatologically charged. Before the eschaton, it appears to have a certain provisional interpretation. The fluidity of entrance/exit proves the ranks remain open. This may account in part for the dependence expressed upon God's election of grace. "I am of the elect" is really "I have joined the elect, I shall strive to remain in the elect and with God's grace I will be elect". The place, if any, of the Gentile within this scheme is not discussed. 1Q3 does not take up the Gentile issue.

Eschatologically, the sect may be legitimately called Israel. Did the sectarians, however, claim that title for themselves in the pre-eschatological period?

Indeed, if the sectarians thought of themselves as the remnant of Israel, they would have necessarily thought of themselves as Israel, the true Israel, and, as would seem appropriate, they would be expected to have called themselves such. Further, they would also have had a predictable attitude toward the non-sectarian Jews: the non-sectarians

have forfeited their right to the title Israel by denying God's covenant. The relevant question then becomes, how did the sectarians understand themselves vis-à-vis Israel?

The first indication is found in the Qumran conception and use of history. The sect accepts the historical heritage of Israel as its own heritage:

Then the Priests shall recite the favours of God manifested in His mighty deeds and shall declare all His merciful grace to Israel and the Levites shall recite the iniquities of the children of Israel, all their guilty rebellions and sins during the dominion of Satan. And after them, all those entering the Covenant shall confess and say: "We have strayed! We have disobeyed! We and our fathers before us have sinned and done wickedly in walking counter to the precepts of truth and righteousness. . . ."<sup>1</sup>

(1.21-26)

The recitation of "the favours of God manifested in His mighty deeds" clearly establishes the sectaries as Israelites who recognize the history of Israel as their history but this does not indicate their appropriation of that history as uniquely their own. In fact, their use of a sectarian covenant re-enforces this reticence. Further, it must be noted that immediately after quoting this brief historical reflection the Priests bless not "Israel" nor "true

Israel" but "the men of the lot of God who walk perfectly in all His ways" (2.2). Here, where the use of such restrictive language would have been expected, the sectary declined. There is no appropriation of the title "Israel".

A further indication of the sect's consciousness of being of Israel and not Israel can be found in the members' belief that they are repenting or returning. Whoever wishes to join the Covenant "shall undertake by a binding oath to return with all his heart and soul to every commandment of the Law of Moses. . . ." (5.6). And, in the hymnic material in 1QS:

I will bear no reproach  
against them that turn from transgression,  
but will have no pity  
on all who depart from the Way.

(1Q.20)

They are, therefore, conscious not of being Israel but of being the returned, repentant part of Israel.<sup>50</sup>

Another relevant phrase is "the multitude of Israel" (5.22). Brownlee suggests the phrase is parallel to the "majority of the men of the Community" (5.22.) and, therefore, "the true Israel is to be identified with the sectarian Community".<sup>51</sup> Although this is possible, Sanders has sug-

<sup>50</sup> Sanders, Paul, p. 245.

<sup>51</sup> Brownlee, The Dead Sea Manual, p. 22.

gested the phrase in 5.22 could also mean "the majority of those Israelites who join the covenant, distinguishing them from Israelites who do not join".<sup>52</sup> This possibility, he notes, "is supported by 1QS 6.13f.: every man from Israel who volunteers to join the Council of the Community".<sup>53</sup> Here it is clear the sect understood itself as a sub-group of Israel and not as Israel. In light of the other references to Israel and the lack of concrete evidence that the sect appropriated the title in an exclusivistic manner, Sanders' suggestion appears more likely.

The Qumran group's understanding of its Israelite historical heritage easily explains its use of phrases such as the "God of Israel" (3.24) and "the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel" (9.11). These usages indicate no unique appropriation of the name "Israel".

In the Covenant renewal ceremony, the Priests, Levites and then all the people enter seriatim "that every Israelite may know his place in the Community of God according to the everlasting design" (2.22). Sanders accepts this usage as a "likely" passage "in which 'Israel' is applied to the sect as such".<sup>54</sup> The use does not seem so

<sup>52</sup>Sanders, Paul, p. 246.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid.

<sup>54</sup>Sanders, Paul, p. 246. Also contra Stegner ("The Self-Understanding", p. 26) who, without substantiation,

clear. I agree that "'every Israelite' seems to include the priests, the Levites and the (ordinary) people previously mentioned, all of whom are sectarians" but I hesitate to continue "and all of whom together make up 'Israel'"<sup>55</sup> unless that be particularized with such a phrase as "in perfection" or "in the desert". "Every Israelite" does mean all the sectarian Israelites but it is noteworthy that the phrase is not כל-ישראל<sup>56</sup> but rather כול איש ישראל, which could easily be partitive.

In 1QS 5.5, in a discussion of the practice of the community, it is noted:

. . . ׀אא׀ or ׀א׀ כ׀א<sup>57</sup> shall circumcise in the Community the foreskin of evil inclination and of stiffness of neck. . .

The syntax has been debated. Brownlee reads ׀אא׀ which he interprets as "the conjunction Waw and a surrogate of Yahweh".<sup>58</sup> God is then the actor who circumcises and then lays a foundation and atones for the volunteers. Vermes

quotes this passage as part of "some interesting manuscript support" for the community having identified itself as "the true and ideal Israel, the small remnant that stayed faithful to the will of God and thereby insured the continuance of God's people".

<sup>55</sup>Sanders, Paul, p. 246.

<sup>56</sup>Vide e.g., Deut 13.11.

<sup>57</sup>So Lohse.

<sup>58</sup>Brownlee, The Dead Sea Manual, p. 19.



apparently reads אָן אַײַן interpreting the subject as "the man" of 5.4 and translating:<sup>59</sup>

No man shall walk in the stubbornness of his heart so that he strays after his heart and eyes and evil inclination, but he shall circumcise in the Community the foreskin of evil inclination and of stiffness of neck. . . .

For Vermes, it is the men of the community who are the subjects of the infinitives "to lay a foundation" and "to atone". Hence, he adds "they" as the subject:

. . . that they may lay a foundation of truth for Israel, for the Community of the everlasting Covenant. They shall atone for all these in Aaron who have freely pledged themselves to holiness, and for those in Israel who have freely pledged themselves to the House of Truth, and for those who join them to live in community and to take part in the trial and judgements and condemnation of all those who transgress the precepts.

(5.6-7)

With Sanders, I prefer Vermes' translation. "The best reading would seem to be a series of infinitives which refer

---

<sup>59</sup>Dupont-Sommer's translation is the same as Vermes'. So also Guilbert.

back to 'the men of the community', with some parenthetical remarks in between the infinitive clauses."<sup>60</sup>

It is, therefore, the "men of the Community" who lay the foundation<sup>61</sup> of truth. But for whom is the foundation laid? The text reads "for Israel, for the community of the everlasting Covenant". The problem lies in determining the meaning of this phrase. Does it refer to Israel, the present community, or Israel, the future, eschatological community? If the present community is meant, then the sect has appropriated the title "Israel"<sup>62</sup> but it also would mean the community has laid a foundation for the community. If, however, the future, eschatological community is meant, then the current sectarians are laying a foundation for the future, eschatological sect. The latter must be preferred.

---

<sup>60</sup>Sanders, Paul, p. 300.

<sup>61</sup> וַיִּבֶן from בָּנָה, to establish.

<sup>62</sup>Stegner, The Self-Understanding, pp. 26f. So also W. D. Davies, "'Knowledge' in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matthew 11:25-30", HTR, XLVI [1953], 117. Millar Burrows ("The Discipline Manual of the Judaean Covenanters", p. 172) and S. Talmon ("The Sectarian וְחָד--A Biblical Noun" VT, 3 [1953], 138) have suggested וְחָד be read as a verb. E. Wernberg-Müller ("Some Reflections on the Biblical Material in the Manual of Discipline", Stud Theo, 9 [1953], 65) counters "that interpretation is hardly justifiable in view of the fact the present text is due to the author's ingenious explanation of וְחָד in Isa XXVIII.16 to which the passage clearly alludes".

In 1QS 8.11, Israel also implies a group more inclusive than the sect's members: "the Interpreter shall not conceal from them [those confirmed for two years], out of fear of the spirit of apostasy, any of those things hidden from Israel which have been discovered by him". Here the meaning is clear. That which was hidden from Israel as a whole is not hidden from the Interpreter and is revealed by him to some of Israel, to "them".<sup>63</sup>

1QS 8.12 begins the next section of the Rule with the phrase "And when these become members of the Community in Israel". Here  $\text{לְיִשְׂרָאֵל}$  has a superlinear reading  $\text{לְיִשְׂרָאֵל}$ .<sup>64</sup> Vermes obviously reads  $\text{לְיִשְׂרָאֵל}$  as locative. Brownlee translates "When these things come to pass in Israel to the Community";<sup>65</sup> Leaney as "When these things exist as a

<sup>63</sup>Davies ("'Knowledge' in the Dead Sea Scrolls", p. 117f.) notes that:

"Here we are almost certainly, to take Israel, as often, if not always, elsewhere in 1QS, to refer to the community of the New Covenant which is the true Israel. On the other hand, it is possible to take Israel here in its usual sense as referring to the people of Israel as a totality, in which case VIII:11 means that there are things hidden from Israel, i.e., the whole of the people, which the seekers of the community may discover: their discoveries are to be transmitted to the council of the community."

<sup>64</sup>Davies, "'Knowledge' in the Dead Sea Scrolls", p. 117.

<sup>65</sup>Brownlee, The Dead Sea Manual, p. 32.

community in Israel".<sup>66</sup> All three appear to agree, Israel is locative to the community.<sup>67</sup> Davies suggests, however, that "probably. . . 1<sup>e</sup> yahad is an interpretative note to explain that Israel here refers to the community as such and not to the whole of the people of Israel. . .".<sup>68</sup> The former view is to be preferred. 1QS 8.4 and 9.3 help substantiate that interpretation. Further, it is doubtful that the superlinear addition should be interpreted here against the flow of thought in the rest of 1QS concerning the appropriation of the title, "Israel", by the community. Davies seems to have been led astray by his belief that the community equaled Israel elsewhere and often in the Community Rule.<sup>69</sup>

One final text must be discussed: 1QS 9.5f.: "At that time the men of the Community shall set apart a House of Holiness in order that it may be united to the most holy things and a House of Community for Israel, for those who

---

<sup>66</sup>Leaney, The Rule, p. 209.

<sup>67</sup>Davies ("'Knowledge' in the Dead Sea Scrolls", p. 117) notes that Brownlee suggested to him that Israel refers to the whole of the people of Israel. One can but conjecture Brownlee has changed his mind.

<sup>68</sup>Davies, "'Knowledge' in the Dead Sea Scrolls", p. 117. So also Stegner, "The Self-Understanding", p. 27.

<sup>69</sup>Cf. Davies' ("'Knowledge' in the Dead Sea Scrolls", p. 117) extensive list of 1QS references where the community equals Israel. These references have been discussed throughout this section.

walk in perfection". In this passage, "Israel" is qualified by "those that walk in perfection". Does this mean the sectarians are Israel? If Pouilly's hypothesis<sup>70</sup> that the community is divided into two groups, Aaron and Israel, is acceptable, as seems the case, then 9.6f is an example of this division. Israel becomes, rather than synonymous with the sectarian community, merely a substitute for the laity, in opposition to Aaron, the priesthood. Israel is not the appropriation of the title for the sect but one of two constitutive parts of the community. It has, therefore, no connection to "true Israel" or "remnant". Further, "those who walk in perfection" is, like 9.8, to be understood as an apposition. In this case the text could be re-phrased: "a House of Community for the laity, for those who walk in perfection". The text does not represent an appropriation of the title "Israel" to equal "true Israel".

The same argument must be followed when interpreting 1QS 8.5. Here also, Israel is juxtaposed to Aaron, the laity to the priesthood:<sup>71</sup>

It shall be an Everlasting Plantation,

<sup>70</sup>Pouilly, La Règle, p. 24; Jaubert, La notion, p. 159.

<sup>71</sup>David Flusser, "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity" in Scripta Hierosolymitana IV: Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls, edited by Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin (2nd ed.; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1965) 231.

A House of Holiness for Israel, an  
 Assembly of Supreme Holiness for Aaron.

(8.5f.)

The passage has a further interest for this study.

Schubert<sup>72</sup> uses it as partially substantiating that the  
 Qumran community had a permanent self-understanding: "Again,  
 following an Old Testament image, Isaiah 60:21, the commu-  
 nity compared itself with the root or the shoot of a planting,  
 which is set into the ground as a small, tender plant, but  
 will grow up into a magnificent tree". Closer scrutiny,  
 however, shows such an interpretation to be off centre. To  
 begin, the Isaianic passage Schubert sees as the source of  
 the reference disputes his conclusion:

Your people shall all be righteous;

they shall possess the land for ever,

the shoot of my planting, the work of my hands,

that I might be glorified.

The least one shall become a clan,

and the smallest one a mighty nation:

I am the Lord;

---

<sup>72</sup>Schubert, The Dead Sea Community, pp. 81f. Cf.  
 also Otto Betz, Offenbarung und Schriftgebrauch in der  
Qumranschrift, Wort 6 (Tübingen: J. C. Mohr [Paul Siebeck],  
 1960), pp. 158-161; Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, Erwartung und  
Genesistisches Heil: Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindefletern  
von Qumran SUNT (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966),  
 p. 172; Leary, The Rule of Qumran, pp. 215f.

and in its time I will hasten it. (60.21f.)

The passage focuses on the salvation of all alike and the land as an eternal possession. Thus the meaning is eschatological. Further the "shoot" is noted not especially because of its humble beginnings but because "by its increase and its prosperity it will show itself to be a work in which he [God] is glorified".<sup>73</sup> This is significant. Schubert seems really to place the emphasis on the "planting", that is, on the shoot as the offshoot. This misses the mark. Salvation in the Isaianic text is for all alike and the emphasis should be on the shoot as the result of the planting. The phrase is not to be interpreted linguistically as a partitive but theologically as a flourishing and, therefore, linguistically as a possessive. Note the expansion in the following verses where the decimated generations are to grow into mighty nations.<sup>74</sup> The key to the meaning is growth and eventual inclusiveness, "growth to" not "salvation from".<sup>75</sup> In 108 the same emphasis prevails. There also the verses look to the

<sup>73</sup>Claus Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, E.T. by David M. G. Stalker, O.T. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1969), p. 365.

<sup>74</sup>Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, p. 365.

<sup>75</sup>This is not to say the text does not refer to a salvation but the planting imagery is focused on the growth and on the seed.

eschatological inclusion. There also the emphasis should not be contorted to refer to remnant but should be placed, as in Isaiah, upon the growth aspect. Hence, it is a corner-stone (8.7) not as a remnant of but a foundation for. The focus is on the relationship between the sect and the future. Further, if we are permitted to see the author(s) of 1QS as implying the meaning of Isaiah, then it becomes noteworthy that the Isaiah text refers to the salvation of all.

Although not all the examples are "crystal clear", the bulk of evidence falls significantly short of the common scholarly belief that the Qumran sectarians considered themselves the only true Israelites, true Israel or the like. In 1QS, it is obvious that the members of the sect believed themselves to be the chosen of God, members of a special covenant, a special part of Israel; but it is equally obvious that they did not consider the non-sectarian Israelites no longer Israelites and that they did not appropriate the title Israel to refer exclusively to themselves.



## B. The Damascus Document (CD)<sup>1</sup>

Analysis of 1QS has revealed that the Qumran sectarians, whose covenant was the Mosaic covenant with additional hidden revelations revealed only to the sect, did not appropriate to themselves the title "remnant", "true Israel" or "Israel". Further they did not believe that the eschatological remnant would consist of those who were sectarians. The fluidity of membership makes it clear that the community saw individuals as joining or leaving until the ranks were eschatologically closed. Certainty of membership in the remnant was left to the eschaton. Pre-eschatological membership may only be understood as proleptic membership in the remnant.

The sectarian self-understanding reflected in the Damascus Document acts as a valuable verification for these conclusions drawn from the examination of remnant in 1QS.

---

<sup>1</sup>All English quotations, unless otherwise noted, are from the translation by Chaim Rabin, The Zadokite Documents (2nd rev. ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958). The notations to chapter and verse are also based upon Rabin's edition. The other general translations of the Qumran texts detailed in the Introduction (cf. p. 354, fn. 12) have been consulted as have R. H. Charles' "The Fragments of a Zadokite Work" in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, edited by R. H. Charles (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933) II, 785-834 and S. Schechter's Documents of Jewish Sectaries, The Library of Christian Studies (2 vols. in 1; New York: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1970). For Hebrew sources, vide p. 354, fn. 12.

Like 1QS, CD is focused upon the historical present, though it, like the Community Rule, contains some eschatological instruction. In contradistinction, however, CD has a deep interest in the past, a trait which was only peripherally evident in the Community Rule. Thus, the first part of CD contains an historical survey of Israelite history and the sect which reaches back to Genesis although the survey displays greater interest in the post 586 BCE period. These lessons of history are oriented to fidelity in the present:

And now, children, hearken unto me, that I may uncover your eyes to see and to consider the works of God; to choose him in whom (or: that in which) He delights and to reject him whom He hates; to walk uprightly in all His ways and "not to seek after thoughts of guilty inclination and eyes of whoredom".<sup>2</sup>

(2.14-17)

Walking in the stubbornness of their hearts and not keeping the commandments of God brought down the watchers (2.18) and caused the flood in which all flesh "became as though they had not been" (2.20).<sup>3</sup> It is interesting, although Noah is next mentioned (3.1), that there is no reference to his being

---

<sup>2</sup>Charles ("Fragments", p. 805) reads *ללך* for *ללך* with Schechter ("Documents", p. 65). So also here Rabin, Zadokite Documents and Cothenet (II, p. 154).

<sup>3</sup>I take "walking in the stubbornness of their hearts" (2.18f) to be equivalent to "doing their own will" (2.20f).

saved from the flood and no reference to his Genesis remnant status. The former may be presumed; the latter is less likely so. The sons of Jacob (3.4), their sons in Egypt (3.5), the wanderers at Kadesh (3.7) and their sons (3.9)<sup>4</sup> all perished because they did not hearken to the voice of God<sup>5</sup>--a phrase seemingly identical with "the commandments He taught them" (3.8).<sup>6</sup> Only the three Patriarchs, Abraham,<sup>7</sup> Isaac and Jacob escape the author's wrath and they are called "friends of God and His covenanters for eternity" (3.2-4). In 2.2 the address "all ye that are in the covenant" introduces the discussion of "the ways of the wicked" (2.2f). It is in this discussion that the patriarchs are called "His covenanters for eternity" (3.4). Thus it is clear from the passage as a whole that the sectarian covenant and the Patriarchal Covenant must be considered as substantially the same. "The covenant in the land of Damascus was therefore considered

---

<sup>4</sup>Probably the Judges and Kings.

<sup>5</sup>The tradition is thus aware of the four covenants "cut" with Adam, Noah, Abraham and Moses (Georg Molin, Die Söhne des Lichtes [Wien: Verlag Herold, 1954], p. 136).

<sup>6</sup>With Rabin (The Zadokite Documents, p. 11) who identifies אֱלֹהִים as God rather than Moses. This makes the He of יְהוָה God also. This is preferred based upon the immediate context where God plays a major role and Moses is not mentioned. Further, cf. 2.21 where אֱלֹהִים is more clearly God.

<sup>7</sup>For Abraham as friend, cf. Isa 41.8; Jub 17.18, 19.9.

as a continuation of God's covenant with the fathers and God's covenant with Moses."<sup>8</sup>

The author then passes on to the early sectarians<sup>9</sup> who were destroyed "because they forsook the covenant of God and chose their own desire and went about after the stubbornness of their hearts by doing each man his own desire" (3.11-12). Here, however, a remnant is specifically mentioned: "But with them that held fast to the commandments of God who were left over ( נותרו ) of them, God established His covenant with Israel even until eternity by revealing to them hidden things concerning which all Israel had gone astray" (3.12-14). Much is found in this passage. The criteria for being spared, being part of the remnant, is holding fast to the commandments of God. This is, of course, to be expected considering the example which preceded. Secondly, those who so behaved survived as a remnant. Here, caution must be exercised in interpretation. This is a traditional remnant reference to a group spared from a catastrophe: being given over to the sword (3.11).<sup>10</sup> It is

---

<sup>8</sup>Göran Forkman, The Limits of the Religious Community, E.t. by Pearl Sjölander (Sweden: Studentlitteratur Lund, 1972), p. 71.

<sup>9</sup>CD 3.10 "the first members of the covenant". So, vide, Flusser, "The Dead Sea Sect", p. 237 and Sanders, Paul, p. 241.

<sup>10</sup>Vide Dupont-Sommer, p. 126.

true that their salvation is due to faithfulness, to being true to the commandments of God, but their remnant status is historical not eschatological. Further discussion is beneficial. The remnant, saved from the sword, is a remnant from a much larger massa damnata. It is a remnant saved from destruction, a remnant post factum, not with proleptic anticipation, not with eschatological certainty. Indeed, it is only a remnant vis-à-vis a past event. Thus, it says nothing of the self-understanding of the sect vis-à-vis the future.<sup>11</sup> Thirdly, God establishes "His covenant with Israel even until eternity". It is noteworthy that this is not called a "new" covenant, a term used later in CD.<sup>12</sup> Indeed, the covenant here established appears, as in 1QS, to be the Mosaic covenant with the added revelation of "hidden things" (נסתרות).<sup>13</sup> What of the phrase "with Israel"? Has the sect appropriated the title of Israel? It does not seem so. In 1QS, it has already been demonstrated the sectarian covenant is open to all Israel. In CD, a similar sentiment is expressed by "with Israel": All Israel should be in the

---

<sup>11</sup>Contra Schubert, The Dead Sea Community, pp. 80f.

<sup>12</sup>Wide infra the discussion of the "new covenant" in CD.

<sup>13</sup>Laws deduced, not explicitly stated; cf. Hag 11b. Cf., also, E. J. Roberts, "Some Observations on the Damascus Document and the Dead Sea Scrolls", BJRL (1952), 383f.

covenant.

Other relevant historical references are found elsewhere in CD. After what appears to be an allusion to the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar,<sup>14</sup> God "remembered the covenant of the forefathers"<sup>15</sup> and "He caused a remnant ( השאיר ) to remain of Israel and gave them not up to be consumed" (1.4f). Here again the remnant is from a past catastrophe. In this case, it is, however, not traced to the merit of those spared but to God's faithfulness to His covenant. Indeed, it is God's faithfulness which makes the covenant truly eternal.<sup>16</sup> The text continues:

And in the epoch of wrath, three hundred and ninety years after He had given them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, He visited them; and He caused to grow from Israel and Aaron a root of cultivation, to possess His land and to wax fat in the goodness of His soil. And they considered their trespass and they knew that they were guilty men; but they were like the blind and like them that grope their way

---

<sup>14</sup>This is confirmed by 1.6f.

<sup>15</sup>On the covenant of the forefathers equaling the covenant of Abraham, Issac and Jacob, vide R. F. Collins, "The Berith-Notion of the Cairo Damascus Covenant and Its Comparison with the New Testament", Eph Theol Lov, 39 (3, 1963), 557f.

<sup>16</sup>Collins, "The Berith-Notion", p. 558.

for twenty years. And God considered their works, for with a perfect heart did they seek Him; and He raised for them a teacher of righteousness to lead them in the way of His heart. . . .

(1.5-11)

Note that the sect is not here identified as the remnant but as "a root of cultivation"<sup>17</sup>. The emphasis is placed upon the growth of that root. The language is not "remnant of" but "growth from". The growth must be understood as a part of Israel and Aaron, not a part left of Israel and Aaron.<sup>18</sup> It is "caused to grow forth" and is not made synonymous with the remnant spared from Nebuchadnezzar's victory. If the historical remnant is identified as Israel, as seems certain, then the sect should be understood as

---

<sup>17</sup>Contra I. Rabinowitz, "A Reconsideration of 'Damascus' and '390 Years' in the 'Damascus' ('Zadokite') Fragments", JBL, 73 (1954), 13. Rabinowitz would have the years refer to a period before rather than after Nabuchadnezzar's destruction of Jerusalem. Unfortunately the phrase on which he hinges his theory, "after (before) he had given", is ambiguous. The Hebrew is difficult. It does not mean either "after" or "before" but merely expresses relationships. Hence the consideration of "before" or "after" was not important to the writer. This ambivalence is reflected in my explanation.

<sup>18</sup>Here again Israel stands for the laity, Aaron for the priesthood. Cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Qumran Scrolls, the Ebionites, and Their Literature" in The Scrolls and the New Testament, edited by Krister Stendahl (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1957), 223. Also William Sanford LaSor, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972), pp. 49f.

part of Israel and not as identified with Israel.<sup>19</sup>

One further summary of the sect's genesis must be examined. Here it is best to quote at length:

For also in ancient times God visited their deeds and his anger was kindled against their practices, for it is a people of no understanding. They are a nation void of counsel, inasmuch as there is no understanding in them. For in ancient times Moses and Aaron arose by the hand of the Prince of Lights, and Belial raised Jannes and his brother by his evil device, when Israel was delivered for the first time. And in the epoch of the desolation of the land there arose the removers of the boundary and they lead Israel astray, and the land became desolate, for they spoke rebellion against the commandments of God given by the hand of Moses and also by the hand of those anointed with the holy spirit and prophesied falsehood so as to cause Israel to turn away from God.

But God remembered the covenant of the forefathers,

---

<sup>19</sup>Contra Lucetta Mowry, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early Church (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962), pp. 42f. Mowry identifies the "root of planting" with the sect as the remnant. So also Schubert, "The Dead Sea Community", p. 81. Schubert confuses the remnant with the perdurance of Israel. Indeed, Israel does endure through a remnant but that past perdurance or promise of future perdurance must not be confused with any present status.



and He raised from Aaron men of understanding and from Israel men of wisdom and He caused them to hear; and they digged the well: the well which princes digged, which the nobles of the people delved with the staff. The Well is the Law. And those that digged it are they that turned (from impiety) of Israel, who went out from the land of Judah and sojourned in the land of Damascus, . . . .

(5.15-6.5)

Once again an historical survey establishes the relationship between those within and those outside the sectarian covenant. The points are familiar. Israel has been led astray, the people rebelled against the commandments of God. Israel turned away from God. Hence, there is the establishment of the sect "from Israel" whose members consist of those who "turned". The sectarians, therefore, are most conscious of being a part of Israel and not all Israel. Further, they do not write in terms of their being an eschatological remnant, the true people of God awaiting the coming of God. They are not Israel, the people of God, but a part of Israel, not as a part left, a remnant, but as a part of a larger existing whole. This is also the case in 4.3f. where the Sons of Zadok are called "the elect of Israel". The construct appears to have a partitive meaning;<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup>So also 8.16.

the elect are "the elect from among Israel".<sup>21</sup>

Integral to this discussion of history has been the sectarian understanding of covenant; it is, therefore, best at this time to consider the covenantal designation found solely in CD: the "new covenant".

In the brief halakic enumeration found in the admonition of CD, the sectary is warned:

To keep the Sabbath day according to its exact rules and the appointed days and the fast-day according to the finding of the members of the new covenant in the land of Damascus ( הברית החדשה בארץ דמשק ).

(6.18f)

Later in 8.21 (MS B 19.34) those who have joined the sect are addressed as: "All the men that have entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus" ( בברית החדשה בארץ דמשק ).

Finally in MS B 20.12 "the covenant and compact which they established (or: swore) in the land of Damascus" is identified again with that "which is the new covenant" ( ברית החדשה ). One notes in this instance that the text is partially corrupt but, that the re-construction seems certain.

<sup>21</sup>With Sanders, Paul, pp. 245f. The exact meaning of the phrase is difficult. Are the sons of Zadok the priests of the sect, the sectarians, or some others? The meaning is ambiguous.

In the discussion of 1QS, it was noted the Qumran covenant must be considered as the Mosaic covenant with new revelation. That understanding is also in CD:

And every member of the covenant for all Israel, they shall let their sons who attain to pass among them that are mustered swear with an oath to the covenant. And likewise is the ruling during the whole epoch of wickedness with regard to everyone who turns from his corrupt way: on the day that he speaks to the overseer of the Many, they shall muster him with the oath of the covenant which Moses concluded with Israel, namely the covenant to return to the Law of Moses with all one's heart and with all one's soul, i.e. to that which is found to be done in the whole epoch of wickedness. And let no man let him know the rulings until he has stood before the overseer, lest he turn out to be a fool when he examines him.

(15.5-11)

The covenant is clearly that of Moses and to join the community is an act of return. Further the sect held dear the belief that the covenant was "for all Israel". Every Israelite should be a member. The oath taken is that "of the covenant which Moses concluded with Israel". Yet in spite of the sameness, there was a difference. The sectarian covenant, which demanded adult commitment to enter, had

further knowledge and teachings revealed only to members.<sup>22</sup> Thus "let no man let him know the rulings" until he has been accepted. Even these, however, are found in the Law of Moses: "for in it everything can be learnt" (16.2).

Care must be exercised in relating the "new covenant" of Qumran to the "new covenant" in the prophecy of Jeremiah. Although Jeremiah's introduction of such language may have made the use of such terminology by the sectarians acceptable, the two concepts are not the same.<sup>23</sup> It is, however, incorrect to specify, even in part, the difference in terms of remnant.<sup>24</sup> The Qumran covenant is "for all Israel". Those who do not join may be wicked but are still of Israel. No attempt is made in the pre-eschatological references to deny them their place in the people. So also is Jeremiah's covenant "with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah" (Jer 31.31). It is also incorrect to over-emphasize the need for men to join the new covenant. Membership is indeed not by birth but "the emphasis on the divine initiative" is not lacking in the sectarian covenant.<sup>25</sup> The

---

<sup>22</sup>Cf. 3.10-14.

<sup>23</sup>Contra Milik (Ten Years, p. 113) who believes the covenanters' "relations with God were founded on the 'New Covenant' which Jeremiah had proclaimed" (31.31-4, cf. Ezek 36.22-8).

<sup>24</sup>Collins, "The Berith-Notion", p. 574.

<sup>25</sup>Collins, "The Berith-Notion", p. 575. So also M.

Qumran covenant does suppose a new initiative on God's part for He reveals the "mysteries", the "hidden things" (3.10-14) to the sectarians.<sup>26</sup>

Although non-sectarians were not considered "outside of Israel", it is nonetheless true that full observance of the Law was only possible as a sectarian (7.4-6 [MS B 19.4-6])

This naturally leads to further examination of the self-understanding of the sectarians vis-à-vis the rest of Israel. In CD, four groups are discussed: sectarians, non-sectarians, apostates and Gentiles.<sup>27</sup> The last group is least mentioned and then not for definition but application. Proselytes are mentioned in 17.6 where they are fourth in rank behind priests, Levites and the ordinary Israelites.<sup>28</sup>

---

Delcor, "Le vocabulaire juridique, culturel et mystique de l' 'initiation' dans la secte de Qumrân", in Qumran-Probleme. Vorträge des leipziger Symposions über Qumran-Probleme vom 9. bis 14. Oktober 1961, edited by H. Bardtke (Berlin: Akadem Akadeime-Verlag, 1963), 113-114; Milik, Ten Years, p. 114.

<sup>26</sup>Collins ("The Berith-Notion", p. 580) identifies the newness as "precisely" its eschatological character. He totally ignores the additional revelation of the sectarian covenant.

<sup>27</sup>Vide Bo Reicke, "The Constitution of the Primitive Church in the Light of Jewish Documents" in The Scrolls and the New Testament, edited by Erister Stendahl (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1957), 153.

<sup>28</sup>This may indicate the differing practices of various Essene groups. Cf. 1QS 6.13. Contra H. H. Rowley, "The Covenanters of Damascus and the Dead Sea Scrolls", EJRL (1952), 127. Rowley notes that "It is improbable that the last class means proselytes from the Gentiles, since the sect avoided any dealings with Gentiles, and it is more probable that the reference is to converts from amongst the

In the laws in CD, those condemned to death by the sect are "to be put to death by the ordinances of the gentiles" (9.1).<sup>29</sup> Further, no sectarian should "spend the Sabbath in a place near gentiles" (11.15), no sectarian should shed the blood of a gentile (12.6) nor "carry off anything of their property" (12.7). Finally, "Let no man sell clean beasts and birds to gentiles, in order that they may not sacrifice them" (12.9) nor sell grain, wine or slaves to them (12.10f). It is clear from these regulations that the sect had relations, although very limited, with Gentiles.<sup>30</sup> These injunctions indicate the sect's attitude toward the gentiles: they are to be avoided; at least, unless an execution is in order.

The bulk of attention in CD is to the definition and relationship of the sectarian and non-sectarian Israelite.<sup>31</sup>

---

Jews to the sect which regarded itself as the true Israel". This, of course, implies those who do not turn are not of Israel. This is incorrect.

<sup>29</sup>On this, vide Isaac Rabinowitz, "The Meaning and Date of 'Damaskus' Document IX.I", RQ, 6 (1967-1969), 433ff.

<sup>30</sup>M. H. Segal, "The Habakkuk Commentary and the Damascus Fragments", JBL, 70 (1951), 141.

<sup>31</sup>Stegner ("The Self-Understanding", p. 16) follows Jaubert (La notion, pp. 218f.) in understanding the sect as the remnant which has escaped the sword. The proof is less than convincing. Both scholars miss the point that the sectarians are not the only Israelites. 1QS and CD are in agreement in stating that there are two groups of Israelites: sectarians and non-sectarians. As long as this remains true, the remnant application is presumptuous and premature.

Thus the sectarians are defined against those "that backslide from the way" and those "that abhor the ordinance" (2.6). Even here, however, there is no mention of the non-sectarian having forfeited his place in Israel. True, he will eventually receive his just reward (7.9), visitation by God unto extinction (7.9),<sup>32</sup> but he may, "during the whole epoch of wickedness" (15.7) turn "from his corrupt way" (15.8) and "return to the Law of Moses" (15.9); for it is "the covenant for all Israel" (15.5). All Israel should be in the sectarian covenant. Non-sectarians, presumably Jews based upon the former discussion of Gentiles and the language of return, may "return" at anytime and should be received, mustered "on the day he speaks to the overseer of the Many" (15.8). Other relationships with non-sectarians are much less amicable: "let no man of all the members of the covenant of God trade with the Children of the Pit (or: of perdition) except for cash" (13.14f). Relationships with Gentiles have already been discussed; this must refer to other Jews. Indeed, it is best "to keep apart from the Children of the Pit (or: of Perdition; or: of Corruption)" (6.15).

As non-sectarians may join the covenant, so may

---

<sup>32</sup>So Rabin (Qumran Studies, p. 28), assuming haplography, restores the verse after 8.2.

sectarians leave the covenant:<sup>33</sup>

Longsuffering is with Him and much forgiving to make conciliation for those that turn from impiety, but power and might and great wrath with flames of fire by the hand of all angels of destruction against them that backslide from the way and those that abhor the ordinance, so that there shall be no remnant or survivors of them.

(2.4-7)

Thus the turning can be in either direction. Apostates "shall not be reckoned with the gathering of the people" (8.21b) and, in the end, the backslider can expect the same end as the non-sectarian: "They shall be visited to extinction" (8.2) except in this case it shall be "by the hand of Belial" (8.1). Eschatologically:

. . .all those of the members of the covenant who have broken out of the boundary of the Law (or: have broken through the limit of the Law): when the glory of God will appear unto Israel they shall be cut off from the midst of the camp, and with them all the evildoers of Judah (or: that did evil to, or: condemned Judah) in the days of its purgings. (MS B 20.25-27)

---

<sup>33</sup>Cf. A. -M. Denis, Les Themes de connaissance dans le Document de Damas, Studia Hellenistica 15 (Louvain: Publications Universitaires de Louvain, 1967), pp. 146ff.



The apostate sectarians are "cut off ( יכרתו ) from the midst of the camp". This is extremely informative. Here, in an eschatological passage, the backsliders are cut off from the saved; they have by their actions given up their place within Israel. The time of fluidity within Israel and the Covenant is past. The camp may be here identified with Israel and all those not in the Covenant become, at this time, outside Israel. It is interesting that this occurs clearly only in eschatological descriptions. In CD 1.20f., a passage describing those who abhor "all them that walked uprightly" (1.21), when naturally the question of forfeiting one's place in Israel/the Covenant could be broached, no mention is made.

In 1QS, it was pointed out that God chose the elect of the covenant but that the elect also chose the covenant. This same attitude is expressed in CD. We have already noted the emphasis on turning, returning to the covenant. Indeed, a primary purpose for writing CD appears to have been

. . .to make each man his brother righteous, that their step may take hold of the way of God, and God shall hearken to their words, and He will hear, and a book of remembrance shall be written before Him for them that fear God and that think upon His name; until salvation and righteousness shall be revealed for them that fear God. And then ye shall again discern between

the righteous one and the wicked one, between him that serveth God and him that hath not served Him.

(MS B 20.18-21)

Man is responsible for his actions and the evildoers will be punished. Yet in CD there is also the concept of the chosen of God. Thus concerning the backsliders, it is said:

For God has not chosen them from of old, from the days of eternity, and before they were established He knew their works and abhorred the generations when they arose, and He hid His face from the land from their arising (or: and from Israel) until their being consumed.

(2.7-9)

The sentiment is interesting. The text either coincidentally or purposefully appears to be a resolution of the dichotomy between being chosen and choosing. Here God chooses but His choice is predicated upon His foreknowledge of man's choice. This interpretation is made more tenable by the emphasis on divine foreknowledge in the lines which follow (2.9f). Yet only lines later it is said "those whom He [God] hated He caused to stray" (2.13), and elsewhere the elect God "'caused them to hear'" (6.3). Sanders, in examining 2.7-9 and 2.13, notes that "in this formulation God's choice precedes and determines the trans-

gression".<sup>34</sup> As in 1QS, there is no problem from the standpoint of the writer(s). God has chosen and yet man chooses. Each statement is true and both statements may logically co-exist. It must be hypothesized that in CD, as in 1QS, they constitute answers to two different questions.

One further point concerning CD must be mentioned. As in traditional remnant theology, in CD there is a belief expressed in the perdurance of Israel through a remnant:

And in all of them [epochs] He raised for Himself men called by name, in order to leave a remnant ( פליטה ) for the land and to fill the face of the universe of their seed, and to make (or: and He made) them known. . . .

(2.11-12)

Does this refer to the sect? If so, how is it intended? To understand the text it is necessary to examine the argument within which it occurs. The section begins with a call to "all ye that are in the covenant" (2.2) to hearken to the exposition of "the ways of the wicked" (2.2f). Of those wicked, it is noted, "there shall be no remnant or survivors" (2.6f). This lack of a remnant is a future concept indicating their eventually being consumed (2.9). Their actions are taken as indicative of their not having been chosen by

---

<sup>34</sup>Sanders, Paul, p. 261.

God (2.7). Furthermore, until their destruction God has hidden "His face from the land" (2.8). The argument then reverts to a consideration of history. In every period of time there have always been those who were faithful--these are the "men called by name" (2.11), the chosen ones. Here the argument clearly centres on continued existence to which God's past actions are cited as a future guarantee. The verses are meant to re-enforce the initial call to "hearken". The chosen have been left in each epoch as a remnant. They insure the continuance of Israel. Some have always been left; some will always be left. Who are they? The chosen ones. Thus in 2.14f the sectarians appear to be addressed as those not yet of the remnant. The writer addresses the "children" that he might uncover their eyes "to see and to consider the works of God; to choose him in whom (or: that in which) He delights and to reject him whom He hates; to walk uprightly in all His ways and not to seek often thoughts of guilty inclination and eyes of whoredom" (2.15-16). These have become the remnant in the past and mutatis mutandis these will become the remnant in the future. Thus the argument can continue with the call "to consider", "to choose" and "to walk uprightly" lest you fall and become one of those to be destroyed. Prior to any destruction of the wicked, historical or eschatological, those who choose the right can best be called proleptic representatives of the future remnant. It is, therefore, perfectly

clear why the sectarians would assiduously avoid calling themselves that which they were not yet.<sup>35</sup>

In summary, the remnant attitude reflected in CD is the same as that of 1QS. The sectaries cannot be considered the remnant of any future event; they can, however, be considered part of the historical remnant of a past catastrophe. The non-sectarian Israelites form the other part of that historical remnant. It is the eschatological sect which will be the eschatological remnant, Israel. The historical sect, however, has sedulously avoided appropriating any title which would be construed as equating the historical sect with the eschatological remnant.

---

<sup>35</sup>Stegner ("The Self-Understanding", p. 23) sees in the sectarian philosophy of history a Periodenlehre, with history divided into periods of time each characterized by the scheme: sin, punishment and restoration. "An integral part of this teaching is that during each period of world history an 'elected remnant' appears". He then identifies the sect with one of these remnants. This is, of course, an over extension of the remnant. With this interpretation, the remnant status of the group becomes imposed upon a subgroup which itself does not recognize its own remnant status.

### C. The Thanksgiving Hymns (1QH)<sup>1</sup>

The third sectarian document to be considered is the Hodayot, the Thanksgiving Hymns. Here again it is the self-understanding of the sectarians and their conception of the meaning and significance of the remnant which will be examined. As in the Damascus Document, the examination will use 1QS as the control for comparison and contrast. It is important to note that this document is, like 1QS and CD, not of a predominantly eschatological tone. It is primarily concerned with plumbing the I-Thou relationship where "I" may be either the individual or the community and where the mode of the task is the poetic, psalmic genre. This last point must be re-iterated. Until now the literature, with the exception of the last section of the Community Rule, has been almost completely prose. In the Hodayot this gives way to a poetic, psalmic, more personally theological genre. Any verification, therefore, of the data already generated will be doubly important. It will not only confirm but do so

---

<sup>1</sup>All English quotations, unless otherwise noted, are from the translation by Vermes. The other general translations of the Qumran texts detailed in the Introduction (cf. p. 354, fn. 12) have been consulted as have M. Delcor's Les Hymnes de Qumran (Hodayot), (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1962); Holm-Nielsen's Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran and M. Mansoor's The Thanksgiving Hymns, STDJ III (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1961). For Hebrew sources, vide p. 354, fn. 12.

through a different genre of literature.

The basis of the relationship between man and God is, in 1QH, as in 1QS and CD, the covenant.<sup>2</sup> This covenant contains the hidden mysteries of God which are revealed to the sectaries (8.10-11).<sup>3</sup> Further, the knowledge of those hidden things<sup>4</sup> is taught, according to 2.12, by at least one of the sectaries: the interpreter.<sup>5</sup>

In the hymns God is repeatedly celebrated as the author and controller of all things:

Thou hast created all the spirits  
[and hast established a statute] and law  
for all their works.

Thou hast spread the heavens for Thy glory  
and hast [appointed] all [their hosts]  
according to Thy will;

.....

<sup>2</sup>Frequently it is "your covenant": 2.22, 28; 4.5. 19, 24, 34, 35, 39; 7.8, 10, 20; "my covenant": 5.23.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. also 5.26; 7.26-27. Concerning the latter, vide E. P. Sanders, "Chiasmus and the Translation of 1Q Hodayot VII, 26-27", RQ, 6 (1966), pp. 427-431.

<sup>4</sup>On religious knowledge in 1QH, vide J. DeCaevel, "La Connaissance Religieuse dans les Hymnes d'Action de Graces de Qumran", Eph Theol Lov, 38 (3, 1962), 435-460.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. H. Michaud, "A Propos d'un passage des Hymnes (1Q Hodayot, II, 7-14)", RQ, 1 (1958-1959), 414f.; Paul Garnet, Salvation and Atonement in the Qumran Scrolls, WUNT 5 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1977), p. 14.

Thou hast fashioned [all] their [inhabitants]  
and the seas and deeps [by Thy might].

Thou hast fashioned [all] their [inhabitants]  
according to Thy wisdom,  
and hast appointed all that is in them  
according to Thy will.

(1.9-10, 13-15)

Creation by God's direct act was pre-supposed in the Hodayot.<sup>6</sup> Creation was for God's glory (1.10) and man's purpose was to praise His name (3.23). God's creation of "all the spirits" not only confirms the belief in God's creative power but also may allude to the doctrine of the two spirits. Thus "before creating them Thou knewest their works for ever and ever" (1.7f).<sup>7</sup> God is praised as man's creator (1.15) who has established from the womb man's lot either with the just or the wicked:<sup>8</sup>

I know through the understanding which comes from Thee  
that righteousness is not in a hand of flesh,  
[that] man [is not master of] his way

---

<sup>6</sup> Ringgren, The Faith of Qumran, p. 52.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. also 1.15, 4.31, 15.22.

<sup>8</sup> Vide Eugene H. Merrill, Qumran and Predestination: A Theological Study of the Thanksgiving Hymns (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975), pp. 16-23; G. Morawe, Aufbau und Abgrenzung der Loblieder von Qumrân, Th A (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961), pp. 139-140.



and that it is not in mortals to direct their step.  
I know that the inclination of every spirit  
[is in Thy hand];  
Thou didst establish [all] its [ways] before ever  
creating it, and how can any man change Thy words?  
Thou alone didst [create] the just  
and establish him from the womb  
for the time of goodwill,  
That he might hearken to Thy Covenant  
and walk in all (Thy ways),  
And that [Thou mightest show Thyself great] to him  
in the multitude of Thy mercies,  
and enlarge his straitened soul to eternal salvation,  
to perpetual and unfailing peace.  
Thou wilt raise up his glory  
from among flesh.  
But the wicked Thou didst create  
for [the time] of Thy [wrath],  
Thou didst vow them from the womb  
to the Day of Massacre,  
for they walk in the way which is not good.  
They have despised [Thy Covenant]  
and their souls have loathed Thy [truth];  
They have taken no delight in all Thy commandments  
and have chosen that which Thou hatest.

(15.12-19)

This extended discussion of God's determination of man's lot re-enforces the teaching found in 1QS and CD. The emphasis on such belief is, of course, endemic to the 1QH genre.<sup>9</sup> The author has a strong sense of determination which is heightened in the Hoydayot by the emphasis on man's position vis-à-vis God. It is also noteworthy in this passage that the purpose of the just is to "hearken to Thy Covenant" and to "walk in all (Thy ways)". Further to be noted is the inter-relationship between the designation of the wicked from the womb and the fact that they "have despised (Thy Covenant)". "They have taken no delight in all Thy commandments and have chosen that which Thou hatest".<sup>10</sup> Concomitantly, "Thou hast confirmed the counsel of truth in my heart and the waters<sup>11</sup> of the Covenant for those who seek it" (5.9).

---

<sup>9</sup>Contra J. P. Hyatt ("The View of Man in the Qumrân 'Hoydayot'", NTS, 2 [1955], 280) who states that "The doctrine of the two spirits and the predetermined lots is not elaborated in the Hodayot, but underlies a number of passages." The very nature of the hymnic genre makes the doctrine very appealing to the writer, who alludes to it whenever placing himself in God's control.

<sup>10</sup>Cf. also 17.24.

<sup>11</sup>Holm-Nielson (Hodayot, p. 94) challenges the translation. He concludes "Until new light appears on the matter, I consider it sufficient to leave the text open". He contends "מֵי" cannot be understood". Current suggestions are more confusing than revealing. Vermes' reconstruction, he contends, has no analogy. I also could find none. His linguistic argument is cogent and the deletion of "waters of" will not adversely affect the argument herein presented.

As in 1QS and CD, the chosen are also those who choose. Yet in the Hodayot, as is to be expected, the poetic psalmic genre gives overwhelming precedence to being chosen by God, which is a theme frequently celebrated by the author:

I thank Thee, O Lord,  
 for Thou hast placed my soul  
 in the bundle of the living,  
 and hast hedged me about  
 against all the snares of the Pit.<sup>12</sup>  
 (2.20f)

I thank Thee, O Lord,  
 for Thou hast redeemed my soul from the Pit,  
 and from the Hell of Abaddon  
 Thou hast raised me up to everlasting height.  
 I walk on limitless level ground,  
 and I know there is hope for him  
 whom Thou hast shaped from dust  
 for the everlasting Council.  
 (3.19ff)<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup>The pit is contrasted with living. Holm-Nielson (Hodayot, p. 41) denies any special significance in the present situation. This does not seem best. Holm-Nielson admits the contrast between pit and life. Hence it is difficult not to see the equation pit equals the wicked.

<sup>13</sup>On this passage, vide Robert E. Laurin, "The Question of Immortality in the Qumran 'Hodayot'", JSS, 3 (1958), 344-355.

I thank Thee, O Lord,  
 for Thou hast [fastened] Thine eye upon me.  
 Thou hast saved me from the zeal  
 of lying interpreters,  
 and from the congregation of those  
 who seek smooth things.

(2.31f)

In the psalms, the dominant focus is upon man's utter dependence upon God. No one can be righteous before God (7.28)<sup>14</sup> and, in fact, righteousness is only achievable with God's help (16.11). It is God who causes man to draw near (12.23), who through His Holy Spirit has "drawn me near to understanding of Thee" (14.13).

In 1QH, as in 1QS and CD, the wicked are the non-sectarian Jews:

But Thou, O God, wilt reply to them,  
 chastising them in Thy might  
 because of their idols  
 and because of the multitude of their sins,  
 that they who have turned aside from Thy Covenant  
 may be caught in Their own designs.

(4.19)

---

<sup>14</sup>Cf. also 9.14; 12.19; 13.17.

They reject the Covenant (4.34)<sup>15</sup> and commit apostasy (11.11); they choose that which God despises (15.19) disobeying God (4.17) and His commandments (4.27).<sup>16</sup> They are those who rebel (2.8), traitors (2.10), scoffers (2.11), deceivers (2.16) and interpreters of error (2.14). In 1QH, the wicked are often described as offering a serious threat to the godly. They lay out snares (3.26) seeking to seduce God's people (4.7). They are the enemies of the righteous (9.25), stronger than they (2.35), violent men (12.11) who seek the life of at least one psalmist (2.21).

The opposite of these men are, of course, those who belong to God, those whom He has chosen (2.13).<sup>17</sup> They are those who hold fast to "Thy Covenant" even though it may cause persecution from the rest of Judaism (2.21). They possess insight (1.31), keep God's commandments (16.13) and the covenant (15.15). They hate evil (14.19), do not transgress God's word (12.24) nor sin (14.17f). They are "the elect of righteousness" (2.13),<sup>18</sup> "Thine elect" (14.15),<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup>For a more complete list of descriptive phrases, vide Holm-Nielson, Hodayot, pp. 292f.

<sup>16</sup>Literally "mouth". Cf. 1 Sam 15.24.

<sup>17</sup>For a more complete list of descriptive titles, vide Holm-Nielson, Hodayot, pp. 290f.

<sup>18</sup>With Holm-Nielson, Hodayot, p. 35. Contra Gaster who takes it to mean "picked troops".

<sup>19</sup>Sanders (Paul, p. 245) notes "Thine elect" is, in

the poor (2.32).<sup>20</sup>

Membership in these two groups is not to be considered static. On the one hand, God will pardon "those who repent of their sin" (14.24). Thus the psalmist knows that "there is hope for those who turn from transgression and for those who abandon sin" (6.6). On the other hand, there are those "who have turned aside from Thy [God's] Covenant" (4.19). Thus the situation remains fluid--some may enter, others depart.

Although 1QH is not primarily eschatological, it does at times contain eschatological speculation.<sup>21</sup> Thus,

---

this verse, parallel to "those who know Thee". The verse, therefore, should be understood as referring to a group of Israel. The phrase does not represent an appropriation of the title Israel.

<sup>20</sup>Vide S. Légasse, "Les pauvres en Esprit et les 'Volontaires' de Qumran", NTS, 8 (1962), 336-345.

<sup>21</sup>Holm-Nielson (Hodayot, pp. 295-298) doubts there is, in the Hodayot, "really a single place of which it can be said that it gives a portrayal of the eschatological salvation, apart from the negative side of it that ungodliness shall be brought to an end" (296). Holm-Nielson is, therefore, eschatologically shy. His true understanding, however, is much less defensible. He notes the negative side of the eschatology is a consequence of the elect having already been placed "within the eschatological situation" by their acceptance of the revelation of God (297). Thus only the resolution of the wicked is left. This attitude must be viewed as another attempt to see the community as the remnant rather than as a proleptic remnant (cf. p. 284). Indeed, Holm-Nielson's argument may have been framed by the common scholarly belief in the community as the remnant. This then forced the concomitant, logical belief in the eschatology already being present in the community. The community's identification as the eschatological remnant within history has already been challenged in this study. Holm-Nielson's conclusions are, therefore, breeched.

the psalmist looks forward to the final "war of the heavenly warriors" (3.36). "The sons of His truth" (6.29) will overthrow wickedness and "all the sons of iniquity shall be no more" (6.30):

Thou wilt blot out all wickedness [and sin] for ever,  
 and Thy righteousness shall be revealed  
 before the eyes of all Thy creatures.

(14.16)

It is at the Judgement that "all men of lies" will be destroyed and that "there shall be no more seers of error" (4.20). Continuing, and, therefore, logically referring to the Judgement time:

But those who please Thee  
 shall stand before Thee for ever;  
 Those who walk in the way of Thy heart  
 shall be established for evermore.

(4.21f)

The most important passage for this study is a description of the imminent eschatological end:

I am consoled for the roaring of the peoples,  
 and for the tumult of k[ing]doms when they assemble;  
 [for] in a little while, I know,  
 Thou wilt raise up survivors among Thy people  
 and a remnant within Thine inheritance.  
 Thou wilt purify and cleanse them of their sin  
 for all their deeds are in Thy truth.

Thou wilt judge them in Thy great lovingkindness  
 and in the multitude of Thy mercies  
 and in the abundance of Thy pardon,  
 teaching them according to Thy word;  
 and Thou wilt establish them in Thy Council  
 according to the uprightness of Thy truth.

(6.7-10)

Along with Sanders, I take this passage to be eschatologically oriented.<sup>22</sup> The phrase "in a little while" seems to make an eschatological interpretation necessary.<sup>23</sup> Further, the descriptions of the destruction of all wicked makes the application of the term "remnant" to the remaining group totally valid and underlines its inappropriateness prior to this time. It is only now the group is truly a remnant, an eschatological remnant. The fluidity of membership has ceased. All those not within the covenant are destroyed and those left are "the remnant". In addition, the passage hints, at least, that some non-sectarians might be converted in the end times. Thus, "survivors among Thy people" will be raised up as will "a remnant within Thine inheritance". The survivors, it can be speculated, may not be synonymous with the remnant and the two groups may be the converted

---

<sup>22</sup>Sanders, Paul, pp. 250-251.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 250.



non-sectarians and the sectarians.<sup>24</sup> It is interesting that a few lines later one reads: "All the nations shall acknowledge Thy truth, and all the people Thy glory" (6.12). The exact meaning is questioned. Dupont-Sommer and Delcor<sup>25</sup> interpret the line as the conversion of the Gentiles and their admission to the Covenant. No attestation for this view can be found in the remainder of scrolls' teaching and the interpretation must, therefore, be considered inaccurate.<sup>26</sup>

One further motif remains to be discussed: the branch and plantation. Three passages in the Hodayot are involved: 6.14-16; 7.18-20; 8.4-26.

The first follows a discussion of those who, having turned to God, have been brought into fellowship with the Angels:

They shall send out a bud [for ever]  
 like a flower [of the fields],  
 And shall cause a shoot to grow  
 into the boughs of an everlasting Plant.  
 It shall cover the whole [earth] with its shadow  
 [and its crown] (shall reach) to the [clouds];  
 its roots (shall go down) to the Abyss

---

<sup>24</sup>With Sanders, Paul, p. 251.

<sup>25</sup>Compare Garnet, Salvation and Atonement, p. 23.

<sup>26</sup>Garnet, Salvation and Atonement, p. 23.

[and all the rivers of Eden shall water its branches]. The image is one of ultimate growth. The passages surrounding these verses are eschatological. Prior to 6.14-16, the topics were remnant, judgment and purification. After 6.14-16, the discussion is of the utter destruction of all sinful men. Hence the meaning of the intervening verses must be cautiously approached. Their Sitz im Leben is important and must be presumed to have an eschatological trajectory. The "They" are probably those brought into fellowship, those who turned to God. This seems certain based upon 6.11ff. although a significant lacuna exists in 6.13f. The focus of the passage is not, however, on the "They"; it is on the growth which shall result from their activity. They shall send out and shall cause to grow. It is the plant and its successful growth which totally controls the image. Similar images in 1QS and CD confirm this orientation as does the future vision of the surrounding verses. The plant grows to such great size its shadow covers the whole earth. The reconstruction of "earth" seems certain. The becoming of the plant then fits nicely with the succeeding verses which recount the utter destruction of the wicked. The plant has taken over the earth.

The second passage employs similar imagery:

But I lean on the [abundance of Thy mercies]  
 and hope [for the greatness] of Thy grace,  
 That Thou wilt bring [salvation] to flower

and the branch to growth,  
 providing refuge in [Thy] strength

[and raising up my heart].

This passage re-enforces the meaning of the prior passage. Again the focus is one of growth, of flowering. It also has a futuristic orientation. The growth is hoped for, not already achieved. The final passage, called The Parable of the Trees, is an extended treatment of the plantation motif. It is necessary to quote at length:

I [thank Thee, O Lord,

for] Thou hast placed me beside a fountain of streams  
 in an arid land,

and close to a spring of waters

in a dry land,

and beside a watered garden

[in a wilderness].

[For Thou didst set] a plantation

of cypress, pine, and cedar for Thy glory,

trees of life beside a mysterious fountain

hidden among the trees by the water,

and they put out a shoot

of the everlasting Plant,

But before they did so, they took root

and sent out their roots to the watercourse

that its stem might be open to the living waters

and be one with the everlasting spring.

And all [the beasts] of the forest  
fed on its leafy boughs;  
its stem was trodden by all who passed on the way  
and its branches by all the birds.  
And all the [trees] by the water rose above it  
for they grew in their plantation;  
but they sent out no root to the watercourse.  
And the bud of the shoot of holiness  
for the Plant of truth  
was hidden and was not esteemed;  
and being unperceived,  
its mystery was sealed.  
Thou didst hedge in its fruit, [O God],  
with the mystery of mighty Heroes  
and of spirits of holiness  
and of the whirling flame of fire.  
No [man shall approach] the well-spring of life  
or drink the waters of holiness  
with the everlasting trees,  
or bear fruit with [the Plant] of heaven,  
who seeing has not discerned,  
and considering has not believed  
in the fountain of life,  
who has turned [his hand against] the everlasting [bud].

(8.4-11)

The passage is difficult. For example, how many of the details in the parable have correspondences? Some are clear, others quite opaque. The first point is that a plantation of "trees of life", presumably representing the righteous, has been planted among the "trees by the water", presumably the wicked. It is conceivable that the mysteriousness of the fountain could refer to the specialness of the sectarian covenant to whose mysteries there is possible allusion. If so, the water might very well be the Mosaic covenant.<sup>27</sup> The plantation then "put out a shoot of the everlasting Plant".<sup>28</sup> Here the interpretation is cloudy. What is the relationship between this and the succeeding verses? The key is the transitional verse "before they did so" (8.7). The actions described after actually occurred before. Thus the unbelievers "feed on" the trees of life, which must refer to some type of persecution (8.8f). They seem to win at first, i.e. during the reign of Belial (8.9). The discussion then re-

---

<sup>27</sup>Garnet (Salvation and Atonement, p. 28) identifies the watercourse as the "teaching of the Law". I substantially agree. Dupont-Sommer identifies the watercourse as the Teacher of Righteousness himself. He reads במקור not במקור . The photographs seem to favour Garnet.

<sup>28</sup>Helmer Ringgren ("The Branch and the Plantation in the Hodayot", BR, 6 [1961], 4) understands the branch to refer to "the founder of the sect" or "the sect itself in its insignificant beginnings". This is to be questioned. The text has future implications not historical recollections. Later Ringgren identifies the plantation as the remnant of Israel (p. 6). His images seem to be confused.

turns to the shoot of holiness which is probably to be identified with the pre-eschatological community through whom those who see, believe and "turn" will be saved. Thus the community understood itself as the plantation<sup>29</sup>, which is even clearer when the image is seen in light of the other relevant plantation passages. The image is constant. The community represents a proleptic remnant. "The exclusion of unbelievers is not only the natural consequence of their ignoring the Branch and the trees of life which have caused it to sprout, it is also an additional and deliberate act of God in judgement, . . ." <sup>30</sup>

In summary, 1QH re-enforces the remnant understanding gleaned from 1QS and CD. There is a concentrated effort not to attribute remnant terminology to the sect in any pre-eschatological passage while the eschatological application is accepted for the sect at that time.

---

<sup>29</sup>Cf. Paul Schulz, Der Autoritätsanspruch des Lehrers der Gerechtigkeit in Qumran (Meisenheim am Glan: Verlag Anton Hain, 1974), pp. 27ff.; Morawe, Aufbau und Abgrenzung, pp. 123ff.

<sup>30</sup>Garnet, Salvation and Atonement, p. 28. Cf. also Ringgren, "The Branch and the Plantation", p. 7.

D. The War Scroll (1QM)<sup>1</sup>

The Community Rule, the Damascus Document and the Hodayot differ fundamentally from the War Scroll in eschatological content. Whereas the former three had some eschatological orientation but were predominantly focused on the historical period, prior to the great resolution, the War Scroll, and also 1QSa, and 1QSB among others, are concerned with the "final" end-times, that is, the eschatological period. Thus, in these texts, certain shifts of emphasis and definition vis-à-vis those of the former books can be expected. It is now, with full eschatological understanding, that the title "remnant" becomes applicable and is claimed for the members of the eschatological sect.

The War Scroll is an account of the attack of the sons of light against the company of the sons of darkness (1.1). Who, however, are these adversaries?

It is most instructive to begin with "the Sons of

---

<sup>1</sup>All English quotations are from Batya and Chaim Rabin's translation of Yigael Yadin's edition (The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness (Oxford: University Press, 1962). The general translations of the Qumran documents have also been consulted (cf. p. 354, fn. 12) as has the translation of the War Scroll by J. van der Floeg (Le Rouleau de la Guerre: Traduit et Annoté avec une Introduction, STDJ II Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959). For the Hebrew text cf. p. 354, fn. 12. Yadin's Hebrew text has also been consulted.

Darkness".<sup>2</sup> They are "the army of Belial" specified as "the troop of Edom and Moab, and the sons of Ammon", the Philistines and "the troops of the Kittim of Asshur, and in league with them the offenders against the covenant" (1.1f).<sup>3</sup> They are called "all unjust Flesh" (4.3), "the men of his [Satan's] lot without remnant" (4.2),<sup>4</sup> the "wicked" (4.4), "the nation of wickedness" (15.2). The eschatological battle shall be fought against "all the nations" (15.1; 16.1), against the "assembly of the nations" (14.5), who are under the dominion of Belial (13.4; 15.2). "The Sons of Darkness" are, in sum, "the Enemy" (3.5), "all opponents of justice", "opponents of God" (3.5f). The various titles identify the enemy to large degree as Gentile. In 12.10 it is the Gentile nations who are God's adversaries and in 11.8f. it is obvious that the Gentiles are referred to by "our enemies", the "troops of Belial" and "the seven nations of vanity". The enemies in 1QM are now the nations,

---

<sup>2</sup>Yadin (The Scroll of the War, p. 256) translates the phrase as "to attack the lot of the Sons of Darkness". Thus this is a reference to the "pre-ordained segment" of humanity who are evil.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. also 2.10-14 for another catalogue.

<sup>4</sup>Yadin (The Scroll of the War, p. 273) has observed that the "long inscription did not change according to the phases of the war". He continues "they fall into three parts: God's wrath or its expression--definition of the enemy--an expression for complete destruction".



that is, the Gentiles.<sup>5</sup> This is a clear departure from the position reflected in 1QS, CD and 1QH where the group opposed to the sectarian consisted of the non-sectarian Jews.

The 1QM list of enemies does contain one Jewish reference: "the offenders against the Covenant". This is interesting. The phrase is taken from Daniel 11.32 (cf. CD 20.25-27) where it refers to Hellenizing Jews. Besides the conclusion, therefore, that these are (were) Israelites, it is also quite clear they are now to be considered on a par with the Gentile. The title Israel is not applied and they are "in league with" the Gentile enemies. It appears they have so transgressed as to be no longer part of Israel.<sup>6</sup>

The lot of all the enemies is certain. According to the standard of the Thousand, they shall incur the "anger of God in wrath" and be "without remnant" (4.1f)<sup>7</sup>. They shall all be slain (3.8). God's ". . . wrath shall not cease until they are annihilated'" (3.9). The Kittim receive

---

<sup>5</sup>Cf. 4.12; 6.6; 14.7; 15.2.

<sup>6</sup>Cf. M. H. Segal, "The Qumran War Scroll and the Date of Its Composition" in Scripta Hierosolymitana IV: Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls, ed. by Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin (2nd. ed.; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1965), 141.

<sup>7</sup>One is struck by the repetition of "the lot". Occurring 16 times in 1QM, the phrase repeatedly emphasizes the choice of God versus the choice of man. In 1QM the die is at last finally cast.

special and repeated mention: "the dominion of the Kittim shall depart so that wickedness be subdued, without a remnant and none shall escape of [all Sons of] Darkness" (1.6f). "The Kittim shall be smashed without [remnant and survivor,<sup>8</sup> and there shall be] an uprising of the hand of the God of Israel" (18.2f); they shall be destroyed utterly (18.5). Finally, there are the references to the nations in general: ". . . an assembly of nations He [God] hath gathered for annihilation without remnant" (14.5); ". . . through them that are upright in the way shall all wicked nations come to an end" (14.7).<sup>9</sup> The point is poignantly made: all wickedness is to be eradicated; there shall be no remnant.

What of the righteous? They, of course, shall be the opponents of the wicked in the great eschatological battle: "From all the tribes of Israel they shall mobilize for them men of valour to go forth to serve according to the pre-ordained periods of the war year after year" (2.7f); "the whole congregation shall wage it together" (2.9). They are called the "Congregation of God" (4.9), the "Tribes of God" (4.10), the "assembly of God" (4.10), "Thy people of Israel" (10.9), "a people of men holy through the Covenant"

---

<sup>8</sup>So Yadin (The Scroll of the War, p. 344) restores on the basis of Ezra 9.14.

<sup>9</sup>Cf. also 15.2.

(10.10), other similar terms, and, most relevant to this study, "the remnant and the survivors" ( שארית ומחיה לבריתכה; 13.8). On this point, some discussion is necessary. The "people to be redeemed by Him" are those "that stumble unto wondrous [mighty deeds]" (5.5) and are contrasted with "an assembly of nations He hath gathered for annihilation without remnant". Further in 15.1f. "the lot of God", parallel to "Israel" is contrasted with "all nations of wickedness". Indeed, in 11.8, the "us" of the scroll is contrasted with "the troops of Belial". "The contrast implies that the 'we' of the Scroll are the Israelites. . . ." <sup>10</sup>

To begin, in 1QM, there appear only two groups into which all men must be categorized: the wicked and the righteous. We have already seen the wicked are the Gentiles--born Gentiles and Jews who have so transgressed they are now to be considered on a par with the Gentiles. Based upon this premise, are we to assume then all Jews who are not apostate are members of the "people of God"? This appears to be the eschatological situation. If so, and bearing in mind that all the wicked are to be destroyed, then it is appropriate in an eschatological context for the righteous to be both

---

<sup>10</sup>Sanders, Paul, p. 249.

Sanders has also noted an interesting parallel between 1QS and 1QM "the sentence 'they do not [know that from the God] of Israel is all that is and that will be' (1QM 17.4f.) appears also in 1QS 3.15 with only one difference: 'God of Israel' becomes 'God of Knowledge'" (249).

"Israel" (10.3) and "the remnant and the survivors for the sake of Thy covenant" (13.8). These are the true people Israel "which Thou hast chosen for Thyself from all the nations of the lands, a people. . . open of ear and hearing (OR: understanding) deep things" (10.9, 11). This may quite easily refer to the hidden mysteries of the sectarian covenant. In 1QM, the rule for the ordering of the battle divisions is outlined for "when their establishment is at full" (5.3), implying some influx of members. Hence, it seems correct to conclude that others, in the pre-eschatological period non-sectarians, have now joined the covenant. The chosen group, it can be concluded, consists only of sectarians, but they are both those who were sectarians before the dawn of the eschatological time as well as recently converted members.

Of the application of the title "remnant" to these Jews, much can be said. Two passages need to be quoted at length and explained. The first is from the blessings and curses which were to be pronounced during battle:

But as for Thee, O God of our fathers, we bless thy name for all eternity, being an [eternal] people. Thou madest a covenant with our forefathers, and Thou wilt fulfil it unto their seed for all appointed times of eternity. In all things ordained by Thy glory there has been remembrance of Thy [being] in our midst for

the assistance of the remnant and the survivors for the sake of Thy covenant and to relate Thy true deeds and the judgements of Thy wonderful mighty acts. Thou, [O God], didst redeem us for Thyself as an eternal people, and into the lot of light thou cast us for Thy truth.

(13.7-10)

The passage identifies the "we", "our" of the Scroll with the remnant. It is "we" who have been redeemed "as an eternal people". The change of terminology from 1QS, CD and 1QH to reflect the change in self-understanding, in definition, is marked. All history seems to have been tending to this time.

One other passage must be discussed:

But we, the remn[ant of Thy people, shall bless] Thy name, O God of mercies, who hast kept the covenant with our forefathers, and unto all our generations Thou hast made passing great Thy mercies upon the rem[ains of the people of Israell] during the dominion of Belial. With all the mysteries of his hatred they have not beguiled us away from Thy covenant. His spirits of destruction Thou hast chided [away from us, and when there acted evilly the me]n of his dominion, Thou hast preserved the soul of those to be redeemed by Thee. Thou hast raised up all fallen through Thy power, but them that

are high of stature Thou wilt hew down [and the haughty  
 thou wilt humble]. . . . But we, Thy holy people,  
 through Thy true deeds shall praise Thy name and exalt  
 Thy mighty act for [ever]. . . .

(14.8-13)

Without doubt, the "we", the eschatological sect, refers to the remnant of Israel.<sup>11</sup> All others are destroyed (15.16). Those left, therefore, constitute both the remnant of Israel and Israel Himself. The covenant which has been kept is the covenant of the forefathers, the Mosaic covenant with the additional revelation of "the mysterious secrets" (15.14). In this passage, as in 1QH, the emphasis falls on the election of God rather than the choice of man. A natural emphasis, one would assume, since the text dwells upon the spectacular salvation of the Sons of Light from the war with the Sons of Darkness as a fait accompli and would, therefore, emphasize not man's but God's role.

Concerning the remnant in 1QM and especially its uniqueness vis-à-vis the doctrine as used in 1QS, CD and 1QH, there must be some discussion of the views of Hunzinger,

---

<sup>11</sup>Bertil Gärtner (The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament, SNTSMS 1 [Cambridge: University Press, 1965], p. 48) cites 14.8f. as a proof "the community itself is the 'remnant'". In this he fails to distinguish as the sectarians did, between the historical sect and the eschatological sect.

Osten-Sacken and their followers. Their views concern the history of the text of 1QM. Hunzinger believes 1QM to be "eine sozusagen 'qumranisierte' Fassung".<sup>12</sup> Osten-Sacken, following Hunzinger's lead, understood the "Gegensatz zwischen Israel und den Völkern"<sup>13</sup> to result from the fact that 1QM should be originally dated "zu Beginn der Makkabäerzeit".<sup>14</sup> Thus, 1QM is from a period before the sect split from the rest of the hasidic movement. The language of 1QS and 1QH reflects then the post-split situation and properly speaks of those within the sect versus those outside the sect--referring only to Israelites. Hunzinger's hypothesis regarding the history of 1QM text is feasible but conclusions regarding the sectarian terminology do not follow. Hunzinger dates 4QM<sup>a</sup> earlier than 1QM.<sup>15</sup> Hence one should expect to find here evidence of "eine sozusagen qumranisierte" proof that the sectarians were less concerned with Israel-Gentile vocabulary. The reality is the opposite. Rather than more restrictive one finds the language less restrictive. In 1QM 14.8f there is reference

---

<sup>12</sup>Hunzinger, "Fragmente", p. 150.

<sup>13</sup>Osten-Sacken, Gott und Belial, p. 85. Cf. also Becker, Das Heil Gottes, pp. 74f.

<sup>14</sup>Osten-Sacken, Gott und Belial, p. 85.

<sup>15</sup>Cf. Hunzinger, "Fragmente", pp. 151-151.

to "the remn[ant of Thy people] and to "the rem[ains of the people of Israell]. These phrases are opposite "all wicked nations". In 4QM<sup>a</sup> the "remains of the people of Israel" is totally missing and "the remnant of Thy people" is only "Thy people". When the text is made Qumranian, it is precisely the Israel-Gentile opposition which is sought.<sup>16</sup>

1QM is an eschatological text in which the title "remnant" is applied to the members of the eschatological sect. They are the remnant; they are Israel.

---

<sup>16</sup>With Sanders, Paul, pp. 251f. Cf. also the debate between Davies and Collins: Philip R. Davies, 1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran. Its Structure and History. Biblica et Orientalia, 32 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1977); Philip R. Davies, "Dualism and Eschatology in the Qumran War Scroll", VT, 28 (1, 1978), 28-36; J. J. Collins, "Dualism and Eschatology in 1QM. A Reply to P. R. Davies", VT, 29 (2, 1979), 212-216; Philip R. Davies, "Dualism and Eschatology in 1QM. A Rejoinder.", VT, 30 (1980), 93-97.



### E. The Messianic Rule (1QSa)<sup>1</sup>

The Rule of the Congregation of Israel in the Last Days, first considered to be the lost beginning of the Manual of Discipline, was later recognized as an independent document. The text's two columns describe the eschatological community of the people of Israel.<sup>2</sup> Thus, here as in 1QM,

---

<sup>1</sup>All English quotations are from Vermes' translation. In addition the general translations of the Qumran documents have been consulted (cf. p. 354, fn. 12) as has H. Neil Richardson's "Some Notes on 1QSa" JBL, 76 (1957), 108-122. For the Hebrew texts, vide p. 354, fn. 12.

<sup>2</sup>E. F. Sutcliffe ("The Rule of the Congregation [1QSa] II, 11-12: Text and Meaning" RQ 2 [1959-1960], 512), in his exposition of 1QSa 2.11-12, claims "the setting of all the writings of the brotherhood is eschatological in that they were all written in what were believed to be the last days". In other words "the sect believed that they were living in the last days and were expecting the advent of the prophet and the anointed ones of Aaron and Israel". As proof he cites CD 1.12, 4.4 and 1QpHab 2.5f. None of these passages is in any way conclusive. According to CD 1.12 the Teacher of Righteousness would make known "to the last generations what He (would do) to the last generation, the congregation of traitors". The reference is unclear and debatable; the temporal orientation is open to multiple interpretations. Dupont-Sommer (p. 122) understands the last generation as "the official Synagogue, the Jewish nation governed by the High Priest". Gaster translates "to demonstrate to future ages what He does to a generation that incurs His anger, that is, to the congregation of those that betray Him and turn aside from His way". Sutcliffe's conclusion is not without problem; CD 1.12 does not prove Sutcliffe's point. CD 4.4 refers to the "elect of Israel, the (men) named who shall stand at the end of days". Dupont-Sommer (p. 127) interprets this phrase as "all those who are to belong to it [the sectarian covenant] at the consummation of the world". The same interpretation must be applied to 1QpHab 2.5f. where it is clear the reference is to the eschatological

evidence of the eschatological understanding of the sectaries will be evident and should further support the terminological shift which is representative of a conceptual difference recognized by the sectaries between the historical sect and the eschatological sect.

In the eschatological vision, the sect would consist of all Israel:

This is the Rule for all the congregation of Israel in the last days, when they shall join [the Community to walk according to the law of the sons of Zadok the Priests and of the men of their Covenant who have turned aside [from the] way of the people, the men of His Council who keep His Covenant in the midst of iniquity, offering expiation [for the Land].

---

group (cf. William H. Brownlee, The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk, SBLMS 24 [Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979], p. 55). The question here is one of definition. Can the historical existence of the sect be appropriately called eschatological? Certainly they believed they were living in the last days; it can even be stated the end was thought to be imminent. This, however, does not identify the historical with the eschatological. Here, scholars may have been misled by the resemblance of Qumran with the early christian community. Many similarities are apparent but whereas the early christian community believed the Messiah had come, and, therefore, they were living in the eschatological times, this is not the Qumran situation. The Messiah(s) had not yet come (cf. LaSor, The Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 98-104), and a distinction must be recognized as still remaining between the historical sect and the eschatological sect.

When they come, they shall summon them all, the little children and the women also, and they shall read into their [ears] the precepts of the Covenant and shall expound to them all their statutes that they may no longer stray in their [errors].<sup>3</sup>

And this is the Rule for all the hosts of the congregation, for every man born in Israel.

(1.1-6)

In this rule of the last days the community expressed the belief "that eschatological Israel would be formed by the conversion of the rest of Israel to the way of the sect".<sup>4</sup> Thus shall "all the congregation of Israel" join those who are the members of the sect. Further, the passage can declare that the rule is "for all the hosts of the congregation" which is identified as "every man born in Israel".<sup>5</sup> From this it is evident that all those who are members of the eschatological sect constitute "all Israel". What of the

---

<sup>3</sup>Richardson ("Some Notes", p. 110) suggests the sin consists in "rejecting the law of Moses". This is possible.

<sup>4</sup>Sanders, Paul, p. 247.

<sup>5</sup>Schubert (The Dead Sea Community, p. 82) understands the opening words of 1QSa as indicating the community believed it was the whole of Israel. So also LaSor (The Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 93f). It is difficult to follow Schubert's logic when "all the Congregation of Israel" is immediately qualified by "they shall join" the community.

wicked whose destruction has been repeatedly decreed? One can only hypothesize. Quite probably the wicked of Israel have been destroyed; hence, Israel no longer contains them and consists solely of those in the sect at that time. Who are those converted? We are not told who they are except that they are Israelites. What the dividing line is between those converted and those destroyed is also not indicated. Are any destroyed at all? Perhaps all are converted and saved? We are not made privy to the answers. In any case one point is indisputable. Eschatologically, a conversion of non-sectarian Israelites will occur. After this, all Israel will be sectarian and will be saved. It is interesting and equally supportive of the overall theory regarding the remnant in Qumran that those who join with the covenanters are called those "of the congregation of Israel". At that moment it is proper to speak of Israel as more inclusive than the sectarians. Shortly after, however, it is proper to speak of the Rule as being "for all the hosts of the congregation, for every man born in Israel". These verses represent the two opposing viewpoints--one the historical reality, the other the eschatological reality. Thence the community is called "the congregation of Israel" (1.20) and "the whole congregation of Israel" (2.12).

F. The Blessings (1QSb)<sup>1</sup>

Fragments from a collection of blessings (Segenssprüche<sup>2</sup>) were originally attached to the Community Rule (1QS) and the Messianic Rule (1QSa). Vermes recognizes the Messianic orientation of the Segenssprüche and postulates that they were "intended for the Messianic age"<sup>3</sup> or, if they were used in the historical community that they were "anticipating and symbolizing the coming of the Messianic era".<sup>4</sup>

The text does provide further verification that the community is identified as those "that fear [God and do] His will, that keep His commandments, and hold fast to His holy [Covenant], and walk perfectly [in all the ways of] His [truth]; whom He has chosen for an eternal covenant which shall endure for ever" (1.1ff). No remnant consciousness, however, expressed or implied, is evident.

As an eschatological text, the 1QSb gives only tacit evidence to the study of the remnant.

---

<sup>1</sup>All English quotations are from Vermes' translation. The other general translations cited in the Introduction (p. 354, fn. 12) have also been consulted. For the Hebrew text, cf. p. 354, fn. 12.

<sup>2</sup>So Lohse.

<sup>3</sup>Vermes, Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 206.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

G. Commentary on Habakkuk (1QpHab)<sup>1</sup>

A brief scanning of the text clearly identifies this commentary as being eschatologically oriented (7.1f). The order of the discussion in column 2 is indicative of the commonly attested eschatological resolution. In 2.1-10, those unfaithful at the end of days are identified as "the unfaithful of the New [Covenant]". Yet they are not the last generation, for they will hear what will happen to that generation (2.7). These are to be destroyed by the Kittim (3.4). God will not, however, allow the Kittim to destroy his people (5.3) but "God will execute the judgement of the nations by the hand of His elect" (5.4). Israel will perish; God has given His word. Thus the scenario appears to be that the wicked of Israel will be destroyed by the Kittim and then the Kittim by Israel, His elect. Israel is, therefore, in the end, all Israel. Further, Israel will consist,

---

<sup>1</sup>All English quotations are from Vermes. In addition, the general translations of the Qumran Scrolls have also been consulted (cf. p. 354, fn. 12) as well as the translations of 1QpHab by Petrus Boccaccio, Interpretation Habacuc (3rd ed.; Rome: Pontificum Institutum Biblicum, 1963); William H. Brownlee, The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk; Maurya P. Horgan, Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books, CBQMS 8 (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979), pp. 12-21; J. van der Ploeg, "Le Rouleau d'Habacuc de la grotte de 'Ain Fesha", Bibliotheca Orientalis, (1951), 2-11 and the partial translation of I. Rabinowitz, "The Second and Third Columns of The Habakkuk Interpretation Scroll", JBL, 69 (1950), 31-49. For the Hebrew texts cf. p. 354, fn. 12 as well as that of Boccaccio, Interpretation Habacuc.

at that time, of only the faithful because all the wicked will have been destroyed.

H. Commentary on Micah (1QpMic [1Q14])<sup>1</sup>

The fragmentary remains of the peshar on Micah indicate little more than that the text was at least in part interpreted eschatologically. One notes such phrases as "the end of days" (6. 2 ), "saved from the day of judgment" (10. 6-7 ) and "the last generation" (17-18, 5 ).

Fragment 10 provides some limited additional information. "Those who volunteer to be added to the chosen ones of [God]"<sup>2</sup> are to "be saved from the day of [judgment]" (10. 5-7 ). Horgan, following Milik, restores "God" as the qualifier of "the chosen ones"; she, however, also notes "Israel" as a possibility.<sup>3</sup> This, of course, does not imply all those in the Community are guaranteed salvation; it is clear that another qualifying phrase, reconstructed as "who observe the law" by Milik and Horgan,<sup>4</sup> fit in the lacuna after the restored "God". Whether the reconstruction be exact or not, the intent to qualify is certain. Thus volun-

---

<sup>1</sup>All English quotations are from Horgan's Pesharim, pp. 56 ff. Other general translations of the Qumran documents have been consulted (cf. p. 354, fn. 12 ). For Hebrew texts cf. p. 354, fn. 12.

<sup>2</sup>Here also the themes of human choice and divine election are melded.

<sup>3</sup>Horgan, Pesharim, p. 61.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.



teering was not the only criterion. One must be a true practitioner.

I. Commentary on Isaiah (4QpIsa<sup>a</sup> [4Q161])<sup>1</sup>

Fragments 2-6 mention the remnant but only in the biblical text (Isa 10.22). The interpretation is unfortunately too fragmentary to be of any real value. Two points are made. In Fragments 2-6, ii, 8, the interpretation of Isa 10.22 reads "and many will per[ish]". This may well refer to the destructive rampage of the Kittim. In any case, not all will be destroyed; some will be saved. Later, in Fragment 7, ii, 7, it is stated that the Kittim "will fa[ll] by the hand of Israel", a comment in Isa 10.34. With Horgan,<sup>2</sup> I understood this as an eschatological reference to the end of days when good will triumph over evil.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>All English quotations are from Horgan's translation (Pesharim, pp. 73-76). Other general translations of the Qumran documents have been consulted (cf. p. 354 fn. 12 ). For the Hebrew text cf. p. 354, fn. 12.

<sup>2</sup>Horgan, Pesharim, p. 83.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. 1QM 11.8f. and 18.1-5.

J. Commentary on Isaiah (4QpIsa<sup>d</sup> [4Q164])<sup>1</sup>

In fragment 1, the interpretation of Isa 54.11c includes reference to "the congregation of his chosen ones" but the exact meaning of this term remains unclear. The introduction of the interpretation is too fragmentary for a re-construction to be certain. Horgan<sup>2</sup> suggests the interpretation of the passage is "[thalt the council of the community was established [among] the priests and the p[people in the midst of] the congregation of his chosen ones, like a stone of lapis lazuli in the midst of the stones". The meaning of "chosen ones", which may also be read as singular, is difficult. "Les lacunes du contexte empêchent de préciser si cet 'élu' était le Docteur de Justice (comme dans l'Interprétation d'Habacuc IX, 12), ou tout le peuple de dieu (comme dans l'Int. Hab. V, 4)."<sup>3</sup> Certainty is not possible.

---

<sup>1</sup>All English quotations are from Horgan's translation (Pesharim, p. 126). Other general translations of the Qumran documents have been consulted (cf. p. 354, fn. 12). as well as the translation of J. M. Allegro ("More Isaiah Commentaries from Qumran's Fourth Cave", JBL, 77 [1958], 220f. For Hebrew texts cf. p. 354, fn. 12.

<sup>2</sup>Horgan, Pesharim, p. 126.

<sup>3</sup>Carmignac, Les Textes, II, 75.

K. Commentary on Nahum (4QpNah [4Q169])<sup>1</sup>

There are three relevant references in the peshar on Nahum. In fragments 1-2, Column ii, the "Seekers-After-Smooth-Things [and] their [partisans]" (7-8) "will perish before [the congregation of] the elect [of God] [and all] the inhabitants of the world" (8-9). These fragments are clearly eschatological (1-2, ii, 3-4). The picture of the wicked perishing in front of the elect is quite traditional. It is noteworthy, however, that the elect and the inhabitants of the world are, in this reconstruction, two separate groups. Strugnell suggests, rather than a correlative conjunction, some translation like "as it says, 'all the inhabitants of the world stand in awe before him'".<sup>2</sup> Horgan notes that "while this suggestion cannot be rejected out of hand, no similar secondary citations or allusions are found elsewhere in this text".<sup>3</sup> Two points must be made. First, Horgan's reconstruction does not fill the entire space of the lacuna. Second, Strugnell's reconstruction better suits

---

<sup>1</sup>All English quotations are from Horgan's Pesharim, pp. 162-166. Other general translations of the Qumran documents have been consulted (cf. p. 354, fn. 12) as well as that of 1QpNah by J. Allegro, "More Unpublished Pieces of a Qumran Commentary on Nahum (4QpNah)", JSS, 7 (1962), 304-308. For Hebrew texts cf. p. 354, fn. 12.

<sup>2</sup>John Strugnell, "Notes en marge du volume V des 'Discoveries in The Judaean Desert of Jordan'", RQ, 7 (1969-1971), 206f.

<sup>3</sup>Horgan, Pesharim, p. 170.

the eschatological picture in the scrolls where the wicked will be destroyed and the covenanters will be "all the inhabitants of the world".

The other fragments relevant to the remnant are 3-4, iii, 3-5. Here "the Seekers-After-Smooth-Things" will have their wicked deeds revealed "to all Israel at the end of time". Then, "when the glory of Judah is [re]vealed, the simple ones of Ephraim will flee from the midst of their assembly. They will abandon those who led them astray and will join [I]srael" (3-4, iii, 4f).<sup>4</sup> Relevant to this study is the clear verification of the fact previously found in other Qumran texts, that others will eventually join the community. Here some clarification of terminology is necessary. The verses are eschatological, discussing "the end of time". Hence it is appropriate to use the term "Israel". The eschatological sect will have an influx of others, formerly non-sectarians. These are here referred to as "the simple ones of Ephraim". Horgan identifies this phrase as probably referring "to those who were intellectually vulnerable and easily 'led astray' by the Seekers-After-Smooth-Things".<sup>5</sup> This view is misleading for it ignores the basic definition of "the simple ones"--they

---

<sup>4</sup>The text has a short lacuna which does not affect the general meaning (cf. Horgan, Pesharim, p. 186).

<sup>5</sup>Horgan, Pesharim, p. 186.

are the Israelites who join the community in the end-times.

L. Commentary on Psalms (4QpPs<sup>a</sup> [4Q171])<sup>1</sup>

The Commentary on Psalms from Cave 4 includes a number of pertinent references to a study of remnant at Qumran. The thrust of the text is primarily eschatological: the wicked will perish and the righteous will inherit their legacy (1.10, iii, 1, 10).

The righteous are the congregation of the elect (1-10, ii, 5; 1-10, iii, 5) who are those "who return to the Law, who do not rebelliously refuse to turn back from their evil" (1.10, ii, 3). Here, as in 1QS, the righteous are identified as those returning to the covenant. The covenant is, therefore, by implication the Mosaic covenant. In 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> they are opposite those "who refuse to turn back from their sin" (1-10, ii, 3f). These will be "cut off" (1-10, ii, 4). Indeed, "there will not be found on earth any [wicked man]" (1-10, ii, 8). This destruction will be carried out by the Gentiles (1-10, ii, 20). Here some clarification is neces-

---

<sup>1</sup>Formerly designated 4QpPs37 this fragmentary document is now realised to be a commentary on more than one psalm. All English quotations are from Horgan's Pesharim, pp. 195-200. General translations of the Qumran Documents were also consulted (cf. p. 354, fn. 12) as well as that of Hartmut Stegemann in "Der Pešer Psalm 37 aus Höhle 4 von Qumran (4QpPs37)", RO, 14 (1963), 235-270 and "Weitere Stücke von 4Qp Psalm 37, von 4Q Patriarchal Blessings und Hinweis auf eine unedierte Handschrift aus Höhle 4Q mit Exzerpten aus dem Deuteronomium", RO, 6 (1967-1969), 193-227 and J. M. Allegro, "A Newly-Discovered Fragment of a Commentary on Psalm XXXVII From Qumran", FBC, 86 (1954), 69-75. For Hebrew text cf. p. 354, fn. 12.

sary. Why does the writer oppose the righteous with the wicked of Israel? If this text is eschatological, should not the wicked be identified as the Gentiles? The answer is twofold. First, the destruction of all wicked, whether Jew or Gentile, is anticipated. This passage discusses the destruction of the wicked of Israel which will presumably precede the destruction of Gentile. It is this destruction which will allow the correct appropriation of the title "Israel" to the eschatological sect (1-10, iv, 18f). Secondly, the text being interpreted forces the opposition. This is, of course, a less compelling reason than the first but it should nonetheless be considered as contributory.

The most interesting and revealing interpretation concerns Psalm 37.34. Here the author declares: "[The interpretation of it concerns the last generation]<sup>2</sup> which will gloat over the judgment of wickedness;<sup>3</sup> and with [the congregation of] his chosen ones they will rejoice in the inheritance of truth" (1-10, iv, 11f). The first lacuna must be restored based upon the phrase "his chosen ones".<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>Horgan (Pesharim, p. 225) so translates on the basis of 1QpHab27.

<sup>3</sup>Stegemann ("Der Pëscher", p. 264) would translate "wicked ones".

<sup>4</sup>Stegemann ("Der Pëscher", p. 264) suggests "the congregation of the poor ones". In any case, it is a designation of the Qumran sectaries. Cf. also Legasse, "Les Pauvres en Esprit", 336-345.



"His chosen ones" seem to be the covenanters. Thus the first restoration must be a complementary group, not sectarians. The result is another confirmation that the numbers of the sect will be eventually swelled by other, previously non-sectarian, righteous. Both groups will rejoice together "in the inheritance of truth".

## Conclusion

The catalyst for this project must be traced to the common scholarly view that the Qumran covenanters understood themselves to be the eschatological remnant, that is, they equated the historical sect with the eschatological sect. A few examples of this attitude will suffice.

According to A. N. Gilkes the sectarians thought of themselves as "the chosen remnant of the chosen people".<sup>1</sup> Vermes notes that "In their own eyes they constituted the one true Israel, the Church of God's elect. . . . They were not only the faithful 'remnant', but also the last in the great line of God's chosen ones. . .".<sup>2</sup> Van der Ploeg writes "The sect looked on itself as the 'true Israel', as did the Church".<sup>3</sup> Gärtner claims that "It was just this attitude to the community--as the realization of the holy eschatological company, characterized by purity and by fellowship with the dwellers in the heavenly world--which formed such a powerful basis for the self-consciousness of the Qumran

---

<sup>1</sup>A. N. Gilkes, The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1962), p. 97.

<sup>2</sup>Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 16; cf. also p. 35.

<sup>3</sup>Van der Ploeg, The Excavations at Qumran, p. 211.

sect".<sup>4</sup> Finally, according to Charles F. Pfeiffer "The Qumran community clearly thought of itself as the true Israel and looked askance at the less orthodox brethren who called themselves Jews".<sup>5</sup>

From whence this attitude came is difficult to determine. Certainly it has not resulted from a detailed analysis of the meaning and significance of the remnant in Qumran literature. An organized, cogent examination of this self-understanding has been wanting. Yet scholars have accepted an unfounded conclusion. But why? The answer seems to lie in a problem of trajectory. An explanation is necessary. From the first, the Dead Sea literature was striking for its blatant parallels with the literature of the early Christian community. The resemblances were myriad and even a cursory reading of the scrolls will fill one's imagination. The similarities were so great that Jesus' "hidden life" was even postulated to have been training at Qumran. The hunt, therefore, began and, like Topsy, grew until the scrolls could even be thought of as a Christian product. The resemblances were admittedly there but they may have focused scholarly

---

<sup>4</sup>Gärtner, The Temple and the Community, p. 91.

<sup>5</sup>Charles F. Pfeiffer, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Bible, Baker Studies In Biblical Archaeology (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1969), p. 77.

attention in the wrong direction. Thus the relationship between the Dead Sea literature and Christian literature predominated rather than that between the Dead Sea literature and the Hebrew Bible and Inter-testamental literature. As a result it is not surprising that the Christian eschatological understanding and indeed the Christian remnant understanding would be imposed upon the Qumran group. No full scale study was made since the point seemed obvious to all.

A second answer to the question "from whence came the current interpretation of the covenanters' remnant understanding" is found in the broader scholarly pre-supposition that all the groups of the period, Jewish as well as Christian, were governed by a remnant consciousness in which they understood themselves to be the eschatological remnant.

The purpose of this dissertation has been to ascertain whether the assumption concerning the remnant at Qumran was correct. The result has been clear: the assumption is false. The Qumran sectarians did not understand the historical sect to be the eschatological sect. They did not have a self-consciousness of being the eschatological remnant of Israel.

The study began with the Hebrew Bible and its remnant teaching. Two separate remnant applications emerged. The remnant, in the form in which we first met

it, was applied to those left after a catastrophe. In other words, it referred to the part of a group which survived. It could, however, also be applied when the catastrophe is threatened but never materializes. Here, the remnant idea is present though the title would not be applied post facto since the remnant did not become actualized. Both are applications of the historical remnant. The key word is "historical"--the remnant event, whether actual or threatened, must have happened within history. In the first case it is perfectly proper to attach the title "remnant" to those preserved. Theologically, the remnant is saved by God's act--direct or indirect.

The historical remnant can also be a future historical remnant. In this case a group looks forward to preservation from some catastrophe--either currently happening or expected to happen in the future. The Hebrews' perception of history as the Heilsgeschichte of God caused the political disasters which befell ancient Israel to be regarded as the punishment for the Israelites' evil deeds. The monumental proportions of these punishments, however, made the end of Israel seem imminent. The answer was found in the doctrine of the remnant. Here a slight theological tangent is necessary. This application of the future remnant was an adaptation of the

historical remnant necessitated by the present dire circumstances and their relationship to the covenantal theology upon which Israel was founded. The reality of the historical remnant was transferred into the belief in the future remnant at a time when the dire circumstances of the historical present threatened the existence of Israel and the veracity of God himself. God's promises of Genesis 12.1-3 are initially fulfilled by the capture of and settling in the land. God had protected His people (He was their God), He had given them many progeny and He had given them the land. These promises and hence God's faithfulness were threatened by the grim reality of impending doom upon Israel. Even though this was understood as just punishment for Israel's unfaithfulness, even though the covenant had been trampled by Israel and could easily be considered utterly broken, yet the belief in the faithfulness of God to His promises endured. God had not abandoned Israel; God would not abandon Israel; Israel would perdure. Hence there was the application and adaptation of the historical remnant to the present and, therefore, future circumstances. God would always save a remnant because God is faithful. This conception of remnant is then viewed from two different perspectives. On the one hand, the concept could be positive in that a remnant would survive; on the other hand, the concept could be negative in that only a remnant would survive.

The former emphasized perdurance for growth; the latter in emphasizing perdurance alone seems to have been one of a series of possible solutions to the inevitable egotism produced by a group believing in its own "immortality".

The eschatological remnant is also found in the Hebrew Bible. This usage seems an extension of the future remnant to the distant future. The line of demarcation between the future historical remnant and the eschatological remnant is not always clearly defined and more than once scholars have been misled by a desire to see eschatological import in every future reference. This, it must be admitted, is a common Christian reading of the Biblical texts. A major question emerging from the study of the understanding and significance of remnant in the Hebrew Bible must be: when is a future remnant an eschatological remnant?

Although the remnant is frequently found in the Hebrew Bible, no individual or group has the self-understanding of being the eschatological remnant. Indeed, when some Jerusalemites make such a claim, Ezekiel quickly and definitively responds. Yet, it is often true that there is at least an implied belief that an individual or group is proleptically to be considered in the eschatological remnant. This, however, is to be understood as tentative. Membership remains fluid. No justification for the current view of the Qumran remnant understanding can be

found in the Hebrew Bible.

The study then progressed to an examination of select Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. The results were nearly the same as those concerning the Hebrew Bible.

Here again the remnant was grounded in the covenant. Here again the remnant was understood both historically and eschatologically. The former was seen to great degree in historical overviews of Israel's great men who epitomized the faithfulness necessary to obtain membership in a remnant. This lesson was then applied to the current situation to encourage faithfulness and as a type of guarantee of future remnant salvation. Thus the focus of remnant teaching was upon perseverance within the Mosaic covenant into which all Israelites are born.

The eschatological remnant was also found in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha and, as in the Hebrew Bible, the historical and the eschatological must be delineated with care lest they be confused. Hence, one should remain faithful so that when a (the) remnant is formed, one will be accorded membership. Two points must be made. The Israelite was not joining a group, his actions kept him in Israel. Secondly, no individual or group claimed membership in the eschatological remnant. Membership was contingent and one could at best be considered a proleptic representative of the remnant. The ability to leave Israel



made such a statement indisputable. Salvation was, therefore, achieved by remaining within the covenant. The remnant will consist of those who do so. The emphasis in this period fell on the individual and his salvation hopes. The vision of the remnant centered increasingly upon the remnant as an expression of future salvation. The remnant was linked with the present circumstances which will be improved either in the immediate or the eschatological future. Once again, no evidence emerged to substantiate the current understanding of the Qumran remnant consciousness.

In the third chapter, the study reached its central issue: what was the Qumran covenanters' remnant understanding? Now that the literary background of the Qumran literature had been examined, it was easier to understand the thinking of the covenanters and, therefore, to appreciate the sameness or uniqueness of their remnant perception. The tide of scholarship had agreed the sectarians thought of themselves as the eschatological remnant. The result of the study was the determination that the sect did not understand itself as the eschatological sect. The sectarians had a clear vision of being a sect within Israel.<sup>6</sup> They recognized that non-sectarian Israelites

---

<sup>6</sup>J. Maier, according to the summary of his thesis in TLZ, 85 (1960) cols. 705f., also recognized the sectarians consciousness of being chosen from out of Israel as forerunners of the true Israel.

remained Israelites, that is, they did not surrender their right to be Israelites by not joining the movement. Further, the sect provided for and recognized the ability of the individual to join the sect or to renounce the sect. This fluidity precludes a true eschatological understanding of the sect as an historical movement. Furthermore, the covenanters looked forward to a conversion of some (all) non-sectarians before or at the end. The Qumran Covenanters were an historical sect which understood themselves to be the proleptic representatives of the final eschatological sect. Thus they understood the election as individual rather than as national. They believed that the sectarian covenant which was the Mosaic Covenant plus additional "hidden things" revealed only to the sect was the true covenant. In spite of this belief, however, they did not consider themselves to be the "true Israel". The non-sectarians had not yet decisively renounced their place in the covenant. The sectarian covenant was the covenant for all Israel, that is, all Israel should belong. Membership, however, was not automatic. One had to make an adult conscious decision to join. The sectarians recognized the historical application of the remnant and saw themselves as part of the Israel which had been repeatedly saved by God through the preservation of a remnant. This understanding, however, must not be confused with any claim to be the eschatological remnant. The historical

sect never appropriated titles aimed at the identification of itself as Israel, true Israel or the remnant of Israel. The members were conscious of their status as part of Israel and not from Israel.

This understanding is most evident through an examination of the individual documents. From this the separation of the historical sect and the eschatological sect becomes clear. In those documents dealing primarily with the historical sect an obviously conscious effort has been made to avoid any use of terminology which would identify the historical sect with the eschatological sect, i.e. Israel, true Israel. It is only in their eschatological passages that one has a glimpse of the future situation. Further, in the non-eschatological texts, the sectarians are seen in opposition to the non-sectarians. The polarity is between two groups within Judaism.

In the documents concerned primarily with the eschatological future, the situation is markedly different. Here, the sect is the eschatological sect, includes those who join at the end (as in 1QSa) and unabashedly claims the title Israel. The sectarians are then the true Israel and all not in the sect are not in Israel. Here also the enemies of the sectarians have changed. They are now the Gentiles. Those Jews who have not joined the sectarian covenant have renounced their place within Israel and

are now counted amongst the Gentiles. The final battle between the forces of good and the forces of evil is to be fought between Israel and the Gentiles.

Thus, the commonly held scholarly opinion seems incorrect. The remnant understanding in the Hebrew Bible and in the relevant Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha does not support the belief that the covenanters understood themselves to be the eschatological remnant. Further, the sectarian writings do not allow for this interpretation. That the historical sect was also the eschatological sect has not been proved true. This theory remains to be tested by scholarly scrutiny but, if it stands the examination, the other facets of Qumran doctrine must then be re-examined in light of this sectarian remnant understanding.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SYSTEM OF REFERENCES

### A. TEXTS, TRANSLATIONS AND TOOLS

- Aland, Kurt et al. The Greek New Testament. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1966.
- Albeck, Hanok. Mishnah. 6 vols. Tel Aviv: Dvir, 1958.
- Allegro, John M. Qumrân Cave 4: I (4Qa58-4Q186). Discoveries in the Judaeen Desert of Jordan 5; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Baillet, M., J. T. Milik, and R. deVaux. Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân: Exploration de la falaise, les grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q, 7Q à 10Q, le rouleau de cuivre. 2 vols. Discoveries in the Judaeen Desert 3; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
- Barthelemy, D. and J. T. Milik. Qumran Cave I. Discoveries in the Judaeen Desert 1; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.
- Benoit, P., J. T. Milik, and R. deVaux. Les grottes de Murabba'ât. 2 vols. Discoveries in the Judaeen Desert 2; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.
- Black, Matthew, ed. Apocalypsis Henochi Graece. Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graeca 3; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970.
- Blackman, Philip. Mishnayoth. 6 vols. 3rd ed.; New York: Judaica Press, 1965.
- Bonner, Campbell, ed. The Last Chapters of Enoch in Greek. Studies and Documents VIII; London: (rpt. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968), 1937.
- Box, G. H., and W. O. E. Oesterley. "The Book of Sirach", in R. H. Charles, ed., The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913, I, 268-517.
- Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.

- Brownlee, W. H. The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline: Translation and Notes. Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research Supplementary Studies Nos. 10-12; New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951.
- . The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 24; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979.
- Burrows, Millar, ed. The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery. Vol. I; The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary. New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950.
- Carmignac, J., P. Guilbert, and E. Cothenet. Les textes de Qumran traduits et annotés. 2 vols. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1961, 1963.
- Charles, R. H., ed. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.
- . "The Assumption of Moses", in R. H. Charles, ed., The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913, II, 407-424.
- . The Assumption of Moses Translated from the Latin Sixth Century Ms., the Unemended Text of Which is Published Herewith, Together with the Text in Its Restored and Critically Emended Form. London: Black, 1897.
- . The Book of Enoch or I Enoch: translated from the editor's Ethiopic Text. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912.
- . "The Book of Jubilees", in R. H. Charles, ed., The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913, II, 1-82.
- . The Book of Jubilees or The Little Genesis. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902.
- . "I Enoch", in R. H. Charles, ed., The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913, II, 163-281.
- . The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch. Anecdota Oxoniensia, Semitic Series, Part XI; Oxford: University Press, 1906.

- . The Ethiopic Version of the Hebrew Book of Jubilees. Anecdota Oxoniensia, Semitic Series 8; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895.
- . "The Fragments of a Zadokite Work", in R. H. Charles, ed., The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913, II, 785-834.
- Cross, Frank Moore, David Noel Freedman, and James A. Sanders eds. Scrolls from Qumran Cave I-The Great Isaiah Scroll, The Order of the Community, The Pesher to Habakkuk. Jerusalem: The Albright Institute of Archaeological Research, 1974.
- Danby, Herbert. The Mishnah. 1933; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- Delcor, M. Les Hymnes de Qumran (Hodayot). Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1962.
- Denis, A. -M., and M. Black, eds. Apocalypsis Henochi Graeci et Pseudepigrapha Graeca. Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graeca 3; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970.
- Denis, A. -M. "Liber Jubilaeorum", in his Fragmenta Pseudepigrapha Graeca. Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graeca 3; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970, 70-120.
- DeVaux, R. and J. T. Milik. Qumrân Grotte 4: II. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 6; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.
- Dillmann, August. Lexicon Linguae Aethiopicae. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1959.
- Dupont-Sommer, A. The Essene Writings From Qumran. Edited by G. Vermes. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1973.
- Einspahr, Bruce. Index to Brown, Driver and Briggs Hebrew Lexicon. Chicago: Moody Press, 1976.
- Elliger, K. and W. Rudolph, eds. Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1968-1975.
- Epstein, I., ed. The Babylonian Talmud. London: Soncino Press, 1935-1948.

- Ferrar, William John, trans. The Assumption of Moses.  
Translations of Early Documents--Series I; London and  
New York: SPCK, 1918.
- Finkelstein, Louis. Sifre on Deuteronomy. 1939; rpt. New  
York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1969.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. The Dead Sea Scrolls--Major Publications  
and Tools for Study. Sources for Biblical Study 8;  
Missoula, Mont. Society of Biblical Literature and  
Scholars Press, 1975.
- Frankenberg, Wilhelm. Die Datierung der Psalmen Salomos.  
Ein Beitrag zur jüdischen Geschichte. Beiheft zur  
Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft I;  
Giessen: Ricker, 1896.
- Freedman, H. and Maurice Simon, eds. Midrash Rabbah.  
10 vols. London: Soncino Press, 1939.
- Gaster, Theodor H. The Dead Sea Scriptures. 3rd. ed.;  
Garden City: New York, Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1976.
- von Gebhardt, O. Ψαλμοὶ Σολομῶντος: Die Psalmen Salomo's  
zum ersten Male...herausgegeben. Texte und Unter-  
suchungen, Berlin XIII2; Leipzig: 1895.
- Gray, G. B. "The Psalms of Solomon", in R. H. Charles, ed.,  
The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament.  
2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913, II, 625-652.
- Habermann, A. M., ed. Megilloth Midbar Yehuda (The Scrolls  
from the Judaeian Desert). Israel: Machbaroth Lesifrut  
Publishing House, 1959.
- Harris, R., and A. Mingana. The Odes and Psalms of Solomon.  
2 vols. Manchester, University Press, 1916.
- Holm-Nielson, Svend. Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran. Acta  
Theologica Danica II; Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1960.
- Horgan, Maurya P. Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of  
Biblical Books. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph  
Series 8; Washington, D. C.: The Catholic Biblical  
Association of America, 1979.
- Horowitz, H. S. Siphre ad Numeros adjecto Siphre zutta.  
1917; rpt. Jerusalem: Wahrman Books, 1966.
- , and I. A. Rabin. Mechilta d'Rabbi Ismael. 1931;  
rpt. Jerusalem: Wahrman Books, 1970.



- Jastrow, Marcus. A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Jerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature. 2 vols. 1903: rpt. Israel: 1972.
- Kautzsch, E. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. Second English edition rev. and trans. by A. E. Cowley; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.
- Knibb, Michael A. The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.
- Kuhn, K. G. Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten: Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960.
- . "Nachträge zur 'Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten'", Revue de Qumran 4 (1963) 163-234.
- Lauterbach, Jacob Z. Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael. 3 vols. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1933-1935.
- Levertoff, Paul P. Midrash Sifre on Numbers. Translations of Early Documents, Series III, Rabbinic Texts. New York: York: MacMillan, 1926.
- Levi, Israel, ed. The Hebrew Text of the Book of Ecclesiasticus. Semitic Study Series 3; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1904.
- Lisowsky, Gerhard. Konkordanz zum hebräischen Alten Testament. Second edition; Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1958.
- Lods, Adolphe. Le Livre d'Hénoch, Fragments grecs découverts à Akhmîn, publiés avec les variantes du texte Ethiopien, traduits et annotés. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1892.
- Lohse, E., ed. Die Texte aus Qumran Hebräisch und Deutsch. Second rev. edition; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1971.
- Maier, J. Die Texte vom Toten Meer. 2 vols. München: Ernst Reinhardt Verlag, 1960.
- Mandelkern, Solomon. Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae. 2 vols. Graz: Akademische Druck-U. Verlagsanstalt, 1955.

- Mansoor, M. The Thanksgiving Hymns. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah III; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1961.
- May, Herbert G. and Bruce M. Metzger, eds. The Oxford Annotated Bible With the Apocrypha. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Milik, J. T., ed. The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
- Pouilly, J. La Règle de la Communauté de Qumrân: Son Evolution Littéraire. Cahiers de la Revue Biblique, 17; Paris: Gabalda, 1976.
- Rahlf's, Alfred, ed. Septuaginta. 2 vols. Sixth edition; Stuttgart: Privilig. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1959.
- Rönsch, Hermann. Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die Kleine Genesis. Leipzig: Fues's Verlag (R. Reisland), 1874; rpt. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1970.
- Sanders, J. A. The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan 4; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.
- Schechter, S. Document of Jewish Sectaries. The Library of Christian Studies, 2 vols. in 1; New York: Ktav Publishing House Inc., 1970.
- , and C. Taylor. The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Portions of the Book Ecclesiasticus. Cambridge: University Press, 1899.
- Segal, M. S. Sefer Ben Sira Ha-Shalem. Second edition; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1959.
- van der Ploeg, J. Le Rouleau de la Guerre: Traduit et Annoté avec une Introduction. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah II; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959.
- , and A. S. van der Woude, eds. Le Targum de Job (de la Grotte XI de Qumran). Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971.
- Vermes, G. The Dead Sea Scrolls in English. Rev. ed. Harmondsworth: Penquin Books, 1968.
- Wernberg-Møller, P. The Manual of Discipline: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction. Edited by J. van der Ploeg. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah I; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1957.

- Yadin, Yigael, Batya and Chaim Rabin, trans. The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness. Oxford: University Press, 1962.
- Yadin, Yigael. Tefillin From Qumran (X Q Phyl 1-4). Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 1969.
- Zuckermann, M. S. Tosephta. New edition. Jerusalem: Wahrmann Books, 1970.

#### B. BOOKS AND ARTICLES

- Achtemeier, E. R. "Righteousness In The O T", Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, IV, 80-85.
- Alexander, Philip S. "The Targumim and Early Exegesis of 'Sons of God' In Genesis 6", Journal of Jewish Studies, 23 (1972) 60-71.
- Allegro, J. M. "A newly-discovered fragment of a commentary on Psalm XXXVII from Qumrân", Palestine Exploration Quarterly, 86 (1954) 69-75.
- , "More Isaiah Commentaries from Qumran's Fourth Cave (4QpIs<sup>b</sup>)", Journal of Biblical Literature, 77 (1958) 215-221.
- , "More Unpublished Pieces of a Qumran Commentary on Nahum (4QpNah)", Journal of Semitic Studies, 7 (1962) 304-308.
- Allen, Leslie C. The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah. New International Commentary on the Old Testament; Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1976.
- Anderson, A. A. "The Use of 'Ruah' in 1QS, 1QH and 1QM", Journal of Semitic Studies, 7 (1962) 293-303.
- Anderson, George W. "The Idea of the Remnant in the Book of Zephaniah", Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute, 11 (1977/78) 11-14.
- Baars, W., and R. Zuurmond. "The Project for a New Edition of the Ethiopic Book of Jubilees", Journal of Semitic Studies, 9 (1964) 67-74.

- Bardtke, H., ed. Qumran-Probleme. Vorträge des leipziger Symposions über Qumran-Probleme vom 9. bis 14. Oktober 1961. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1963.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. "The Beginning of the Day in the Calendar of Jubilees", Journal of Biblical Literature, 77 (1958) 355-360; 78 (1959) 157.
- Becker, J. Das Heil Gottes. Heils-und Sündenbegriffe in den Qumrantexten und in Neuen Testament. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 3; Göttingen: Vanderhoeck and Ruprecht, 1964.
- Berg, Sandra Beth. The Book of Esther: Motifs, Themes and Structure. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 44; Missoula, Mont.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1979.
- Betz, Otto. "The Eschatological Interpretation of the Sinai Tradition in Qumran and in the New Testament", Revue de Qumran, 6 (1967-1969) 89-107.
- Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament 6; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1960.
- Bewer, Julius. "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Obadiah and Joel", in John Merlin Powis Smith, William Hayes Ward and Julius A. Bewer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah, and Joel. International Critical Commentary; Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911.
- Black, Matthew. The Scrolls and Christian Origins. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1961.
- Blank, Sheldon H. "The Current Misinterpretation of Isaiah's she'ar yashub", Journal of Biblical Literature, 67 (1948) 211-215.
- Prophetic Faith In Isaiah. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1958.
- Blau, Ludwig. "Bible Canon", Jewish Encyclopedia, III, 140-150.
- Boccaccio, Petrus. Interpretation Habacuc. Third edition; Rome: Pontificum Institutum Biblicum, 1963.

- Braun, H. "Vom Erbarmen Gottes über den Gerechten. Zur Theologie der Psalmen Salomos", Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 43 (1950/51) 1-54.
- Bright, John. Covenant and Promise The Prophetic Understanding of the Future in Pre-Exilic Israel. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976.
- . A History of Israel. Second edition; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1972.
- . Jeremiah. The Anchor Bible; Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1965.
- Brownlee, W. -H. "Light on the manuel of discipline (DSD) from the Book of Jubilees", Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 123 (October 1951) 30-32.
- . "Messianic Motifs of Qumrân and the New Testament", New Testament Studies, 3 (1956-1957) 12-30, 195-210.
- Büchler, A. "Ben Sira's Conception of Sin and Atonement", Jewish Quarterly Review, 13 (1922/23) 303-335, 461-502; 14 (1923/24) 53-83.
- . "Studies in the Book of Jubilees", Revue des Études Juives, 82 (1926) 253-274.
- . Types of Jewish-Palestinian Piety from 70 B.C.E. to 70 C.E. New York: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1968.
- Budde, K. "Über die Shranken, die Jesajas prophetischer Botschaft zu setzen sind", Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 41 (1923) 154-203.
- Burkitt, F. C. "Assumption of Moses", in James Hastings, ed., A Dictionary of the Bible, III; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1900.
- Burrows, M. "The Discipline Manual of the Judean Covenanters", Oudtestamentische Studiën 8 (1950), 156-192.
- Butler, H. A. "The Chronological Sequence of the Scrolls of Qumran Cave One", Revue de Qumran, 2 (1960) 533-539.
- Campbell, J. C. "God's People and the Remnant", Scottish Journal of Theology, III (1950) 78-85.

Carmignac, Jean. "Les Rapports entre L'Ecclesiastique et Qumran", Revue de Qumran, 3 (1961/62) 209-218.

Cassuto, Umberto. A Commentary On The Book of Genesis. (Translated by Israel Abrahams) 2 vols. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, P. I, 1961; P. II, 1964.

Cazelles, H. and E. Vogt. "Sur les origines du calendrier des Jubilées--Note sur le calendrier du Déluge", Biblica, 43 (1962) 202-212; 212-216.

Charlesworth, James H. The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 7; Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1976.

----- . "Reflections on the SNTS Pseudepigrapha Seminar at Duke on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", New Testament Studies, 23 (1977) 296-304.

----- . "The SNTS Pseudepigrapha Seminars at Tübingen and Paris on the Books of Enoch", New Testament Studies, 25 (1979) 315-323.

Childs, Brevard S. The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary. Old Testament Library; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1974.

Clines, David J. A. "The Significance of the 'Sons of God' Episode (Genesis 6:1-4) in the Context of the 'Primeval History' (Genesis 1-11)", Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, 13 (1979) 33-46.

Collins, Adela Yarbro. "Composition and Redaction of the Testament of Moses 10", Harvard Theological Review, 69 (1976) 179-186.

Collins, John J. The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel. Harvard Semitic Monographs 16; Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1977.

----- . "The Date and Provenance of the Testament of Moses" in G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., ed., Studies on the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 4; Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973, 15-32.

- . "Dualism and eschatology in 1QM. A reply to P. R. Davies", Vetus Testamentum, 29 (1979) 212-216.
- . "Some Remaining Traditio-Historical Problems in the Testament of Moses", in G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., Studies on the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 4; Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973, 38-43.
- . "The Son of Man & The Saints of the Most High in the Book of Daniel", Journal of Biblical Literature, 93 (1974) 50-66.
- Collins, R. F. "The Berith-Notion of the Cairo Damascus Covenant & its Comparison with the NT", Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses, 39 (1963) 555-594.
- Cooke, G. A. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel. International Critical Commentary; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1936.
- Cornill, Karl Heinrich. "Book of Ezekiel", Jewish Encyclopedia, V, 316-318.
- Crenshaw, James L. "The Problem of Theodicy in Sirach: on Human Bondage", Journal of Biblical Literature, 94 (1975) 47-64.
- ✓ Danell, G. A. Studies In The Name Israel in the Old Testament. Uppsala, 1946.
- Davenport, Gene L. The Eschatology of The Book of Jubilees. Studia Post Biblica Vol. 20; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971.
- Davidson, Robert. Genesis 12-50. Cambridge Bible Commentary; London: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- ✓ Davies, G. Henton. "Remnant", in Allan Richardson, ed., A Theological Word Book of the Bible. London: SCM Press, 1950, 188-191.
- Davies, P. R. "Dualism and eschatology in the Qumran War Scroll", Vetus Testamentum, 28 (1978) 28-36.
- . "Dualism and Eschatology in 1QM. A Rejoinder.", Vetus Testamentum, 30 (1980) 93-97.
- . 1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran. Its Structure and History. Biblica et Orientalia, 32; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1977.

- ✓ Davies, W. D. The Gospel and the Land. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1974.
- . "'Knowledge' in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matthew 11:25-30", Harvard Theological Review, XLVI (1953) 113-139.
- Deane, William J. Pseudepigrapha. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1891.
- deBruyne, D. "Le prologue, le titre et la finale de l'Ecclesiastique", Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Berlin, 47 (1929) 257-263.
- DeCaevel, Jean. "La connaissance religieuse dans les hymnes d'action de grâces de Qumrân", Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses, 38 (1962) 435-460.
- deJonge, M. "Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" in M. deJonge, ed., Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Studia In Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 3; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975, 193-246.
- deJonge, H. J. "Die Patriarchentestamente von Roger Bacon bis Richard Simon", in M. deJonge, ed., Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Studia In Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 3; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975, 3-42.
- . "Once More: Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", Novum Testamentum, 5 (1962) 311-319.
- . Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Text and Interpretation. Studia In Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 3; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975.
- Deichgräber, R. "Fragmente einer Jubiläen-Handschrift aus Höhle 3 von Qumran", Revue de Qumran, 5 (1965) 415-422.
- Delcor, M. "Le vocabulaire juridique, cultuel et mystique de l' 'initiation' dans la secte de Qumrân", in H. Bardtke, ed., Qumran-Probleme. Vorträge des leipziger Symposions über Qumran-Probleme vom 9 bis 14, Oktober 1961. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1963, 109-134.
- Denis, A. M. Les themes de connaissance dans le Document de Damas. Studia Hellenistica 15; Louvain: Publications Universitaires de Louvain, 1967.



- ✓ Dheilly, Joseph. Prophets and Prophecies. (Translated by Rachel Attwater) Glen Rock, N. J.: Paulist Press, 1964.
- DiLella, A. A. "Authenticity of the Geniza Fragments of Sirach", Biblica, 44 (1963) 171-200.
- . "Conservative and Progressive Theology: Sirach and Wisdom", Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 28 (1966) 139-154.
- . The Hebrew Text of Sirach. Studies In Classical Literature 1; London, The Hague, Paris: Mouten & Co., 1966.
- . "The One in Human Likeness and the Holy Ones of the Most High in Daniel 7", Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 39 (1977) 1-19.
- . "Qumrân and the Geniza Fragments of Sirach", Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 24 (1962) 245-267.
- ✓ Dittmann, Herbert. "Der heilige Rest im Alten Testament", Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 87 (1914) 603-618.
- ✓ Dreyfus, F. "La doctrine du 'reste d'Israël' chez le prophète Isäie", Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques, XXXIX (1955) 361-386.
- Driver, S. R. The Book of Genesis. Westminster Commentaries; 3rd ed.; New York: Edwin S. Gorham, 1905.
- . A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy. International Critical Commentary; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1965.
- Eichrodt, W. Der Heilige in Israel: Jesaja 1-12. Die Botshaft des Alten Testaments, 17/1; Stuttgart, 1960.
- . Theology of the Old Testament. (Translated by J. A. Baker) 2 vols. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967.
- ✓ Eissfeldt, O. The Old Testament, An Introduction. (Translated by P. R. Ackroyd) New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
- Elliott, John Hall. The Elect and The Holy. Supplements to Novum Testamentum XII; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966.

- Eybers, I. H. "Some Light on the Canon of the Qumran Sect", in Die Ou Testamentiese Werkgemeenskap in Suid-Afrika, 1962; rpt. in The Canon and Masorah of the Hebrew Bible: An Introductory Reader, ed. Sid Z. Leiman (New York: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1974), 23-36.
- Fisher, Eugene. "Gilgamesh and Genesis: The Flood Story In Context", Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 32 (1970) 392-403.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "The Qumran Scrolls, the Ebionites, and their Literature", in Krister Stendahl, ed., The Scrolls and the New Testament. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1957, 208-231.
- Flusser, David F. "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity", in Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin, eds., Scripta Hierosolymitana IV: Aspects of The Dead Sea Scrolls. Second edition; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1965, 215-266.
- Fohrer, Georg. "Neuere Literatur zur alttestamentlichen Prophetie", Theologische Rundschau, 19 (1951) 277-346; 20 (1952) 193-271, 295-361.
- ✓ ----- "Nouns of the Stem טפל", Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, VII, 978-979.
- ✓ ----- "The Verb טפל", Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, VII, 979-980.
- Forkman, Göran. The Limit of the Religious Community. (Translated by Pearl Sjölander) Sweden: Studentlitteratur Lund, 1972.
- Fritsch, C. T. The Qumran Community: Its History and Scrolls. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956.
- Gaehr, T. J. "Shear-jashub; or the Remnant Sections in Isaiah", Bibliotheca Sacra, 79 (1922) 363-371.
- Garnet, Paul. Salvation and Atonement in the Qumran Scrolls. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament 3; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1977.
- Garofalo, S. La nozione profetica del 'Resto d'Israele'. Contributo alla teologia del Vecchio Testamento. Rome, 1942.

- Gärtner, Bertil. The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 1; Cambridge: University Press, 1965.
- Gilkes, A. N. The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd. 1962.
- Ginzburg, H. L. Studies In Daniel. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1948.
- Ginzberg, Louis. The Legends of the Jews. (Translated by Henrietta Szold) 6 vols. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1968.
- Gowan, D. E. Bridge Between the Testaments. Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series 14; Pittsburgh, Penn.: Pickwick Press, 1976.
- Gray, George Buchanan. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah I-27.. International Critical Commentary; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912.
- A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Numbers. International Critical Commentary; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1912.
- Grelot, R. "Recension de M. Testuz, Les idées religieuses du livre des Jubilés", Vetus Testamentum, 11 (1961) 101-108.
- Gressmann, H. Die älteste Geschichtsschreibung und Prophetis Israels. Göttingen: 1921.
- Der Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 6; Göttingen, 1905.
- Gross, H. "Rest", in Johannes B. Bauer, ed., Bibeltheologisches Wörterbuch II, 1000-1003.
- Haacker, K. "Assumptio-Mosis-eine samaritanische Schrift?", Theologische Zeitschrift, 25 (1969) 385-405.
- ✓ Hanson, Paul D. The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology. Rev. ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.

Harrington, D. J. "Interpreting Israel's History: The Testament of Moses as a Rewriting of Deut 31-34", in G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr. ed., Studies on the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 4; Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973, 59-68.

----- . "Summary of Günther Reese, Die Geschichte Israels in der Auffassung des frühen Judentums, ch. III", in G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., ed. Studies on the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 4; Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973, 69-71.

Hartman, Louis F., and Alexander A. DiLella. The Book of Daniel. Anchor Bible; Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1978.

✓ Hasel, G. F. "The Identity of 'The Saints of the Most High' in Daniel 7", Biblica, 56 (1975) 173-192.

✓----- . "Linguistic considerations regarding the Translation of Isaiah's Shear-Jashub: A Reassessment", Andrews University Seminary Studies, 9 (1971) 36-46.

✓----- . The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah. Andrews University Monographs 5; Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University, 1974.

Haspecker, Josef. Gottesfurcht bei Jesus Sirach. Ihre religioese Struktur und ihre literarische und doktrinaere Bedeutung. Analecta Biblica 30; Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1967.

Headlam, A. C. "Book of Jubilees", in James Hastings, ed., A Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. II; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1899, 791.

✓ Heaton, E. W. The Old Testament Prophets. Great Britain: R & R Clark Ltd., 1961.

✓----- . "The Root <sup>TKW</sup> and the Doctrine of the Remnant", Journal of Theological Studies, NS 3 (1952) 27-39.

Hengel, Martin. Judaism and Hellenism. (Translated by John Bowden) Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.

- Herford, R. Travers. Talmud and Apocrypha: A Comparative Study of the Jewish Ethical Teaching in the Rabbinical and Non-Rabbinical Sources in the Early Centuries. New York: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1971.
- Herntrich, V., and G. Schrenk. "λειμμα κτλ. The 'Remnant' in the Old Testament", Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, IV, 196-209.
- Hermann, Siegfried. Die prophetischen Heilserwartungen im Alten Testament. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament 87; Stuttgart, 1965.
- Heschel, Abraham J. The Prophets. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1962.
- Hindley, J. C. "Towards a Date for the Similitudes of Enoch. An Historical Approach.", New Testament Studies, 14 (1967-1968) 551-565.
- Hirsch, E. D., Jr. Validity In Interpretation. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967.
- Howie, C. G. "Ezekiel", in George Arthur Buttrick, ed., The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. 4 vols. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962, II, 203-213.
- Hunzinger, C. -H. "Beobachtungen zur Entwicklung der Disziplinarordnung der Gemeinde von Qumrān", in H. Bardtke, ed., Qumran-Probleme. Vorträge des leipziger Symposions über Qumran-Probleme vom 9. bis 14. Oktober 1961. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1963, 231-245.
- "Fragmente einer älteren Fassung des Buches Milhamā Aus Höhle 4 von Qumrān", Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 69 (1957) 131-151.
- Hyatt, J. P. "The View of Man in the Qumrān 'Hodayot'", New Testament Studies, II (1955) 276-284.
- Jacob, E. Theology of the Old Testament. (Translated by A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock) London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1958.
- "Wisdom and Religion In Sirach", (Translated by Martin Schwarz) in John G. Gammie, Walter A. Brueggemann, W. Lee Humphreys, and James M. Ward, eds., Israelite Wisdom. New York: Union Theological Seminary, 1978, 247-260.

- Jaubert, A. "The Calendar of the Book of Jubilees, its origin and its character", Vetus Testamentum, 5 (1955) 34-76.
- . La notion d'alliance dans le Judaïsme.  
Université de Paris-Faculte des Lettres; Editions du Seuil, 1963.
- . "Le calendrier des Jubilés et de la secte de Qumrân. Ses origines bibliques", Vetus Testamentum, 3 (1953) 250-264.
- . "Le calendrier des Jubilés et les jours liturgiques de la semaine", Vetus Testamentum, 7 (1957) 35-61.
- Jenni, E. "Remnant", in George Arthur Buttrick, ed., The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. 4 vols. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962, 32-33.
- Jeremias, Joachim. "Der Gedanke des 'Heiligen Restes' im Spätjudentum und in der Verkündung Jesu", Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 42 (1949) 184-194.
- Kaiser, Otto. Isaiah 13-19: A Commentary. (Translated by R. A. Wilson) OTL Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1974.
- Kapelrud, Arvid S. Central Ideas In Amos. Oslo: University Press, 1961.
- Käsemann, Ernst. New Testament Questions of Today. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1969.
- Kee, H. C. "The Ethical Dimensions of the Testaments of the XII as a Clue to Provenance", New Testament Studies, 24 (1978) 259-270.
- Kennedy, Gerald. "Exposition of the Book of Daniel", in George Arthur Buttrick, ed., The Interpreter's Bible. Vol. VI; New York: Abingdon Press, 1956, 339-549.
- Kittel, R., ed. Biblia Hebraica. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1937.
- Knibb, M. A. "The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review", New Testament Studies, 25 (1979) 345-359.

- Knight, George A. F. Theology As Narration. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1976.
- Koehler, L. Old Testament Theology. (Translated by A. S. Todd) London: Lutterworth Press, 1957.
- Kolenkow, A. B. "The Assumption of Moses as a Testament", in G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., ed., Studies on the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 4; Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973.
- Kuhn, Heinz-Wolfgang. Enderwartung und Gegenwärtiges Heil: Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindeliedern von Qumran. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.
- Kutsch, Ernst. "Der Kalender des Jubiläenbuches und das A und NT", Vetus Testamentum, 11 (1961) 39-47.
- "Die Solstitien im Kalender des Jubiläenbuches und in äth. Henoch lxxii", Vetus Testamentum, 12 (1962) 205-207.
- Lacocque, André. The Book of Daniel. (Translated by David Pellauer) Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979.
- "The Liturgical Prayer in Daniel 9", Hebrew Union College Annual, 47 (1976) 119-142.
- LaSor, William Sanford. The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972.
- Lathey, C. "The Messianic Expectation in 'The Assumption of Moses'", Catholic Biblical Quarterly, (1942) 9-21.
- Laurin, R. B. "The Question of Immortality in the Qumran Hoyayot", Journal of Semitic Studies, 3 (1958) 344-355.
- Leach, E. R. "A Possible Method of Intercalation for the Calendar of the Book of Jubilees", Vetus Testamentum, 7 (1957) 392-397.
- Leaney, A. R. C. The Rule of Qumran and Its Meaning. Introduction, Translation & Commentary. The New Testament Library; London: SCM Press, 1966.

Légasse, Simon. "Les Pauvres en Esprit et les 'Volontaires' de Qumran", New Testament Studies, 8 (1962) 336-345.

Lehmann, M. R. "Ben Sira and the Qumran Literature", Revue de Qumran, 3 (1961-1962) 103-116.

Leiman, Sid Z., ed. The Canon and Masorah of the Hebrew Bible: An Introductory Reader. New York: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1974.

Levenson, Jon Douglas. Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40-48. Harvard Semitic Monographa 10; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press for Harvard Semitic Museum, 1976,

Levi, Israel. "Sirach, The Wisdom of Jesus the Son of", Jewish Encyclopedia II, 388-397.

Lewis, Jack P. A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood In Jewish and Christian Literature. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968.

----- . "What Do We Mean By Jabneh?", Journal of Bible and Religion, 32 (1964) 125-132.

Licht, J. "An Analysis of the Treatise on the Two Spirits in DSD", in Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin, eds., Scripta Hierosolymitana IV: Aspects of The Dead Sea Scrolls. Second edition; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1965, 88-100.

----- . "The Doctrine of the Thanksgiving Scroll", Israel Exploration Journal, 6 (1956) 1-13, 89-101.

----- . "Taxo, or the Apocalyptic Doctrine of Vengeance", Journal of Jewish Studies, 12 (1961) 95-103.

----- . "Time and Eschatology in Apocalyptic Literature and in Qumran", Journal of Jewish Studies, 16 (1967) 177-182.

Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott. A Greek-English Lexicon. (Revised by Henry Stuart Jones) Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.

Lieberman, Saul. "The Discipline in the So-Called Dead Sea Manual of Discipline", Journal of Biblical Literature, 71 (1952) 199-206.



- Lindblom, J. Prophecy In Ancient Israel. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.
- Lods, Adolphe. "La chute des anges", Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses, 7 (1927) 295-315.
- Lonergan, Bernard J. Method In Theology. New York: Herder and Herder, 1972.
- Maier, Gerhard. Mensch und freier Wille: Nach den jüdischen Religionsparteien Zwischen Ben Sira und Paulus. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament 12; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1971.
- Manson, Th. W. "Miscellanea Apocalyptic (Pss. Sol. 18.6; Ass. Mos. 10.1-10)", Journal of Theological Studies, 46 (1945) 41-45.
- Marböck, Johann. Weisheit im Wandel. Untersuchungen zur Weisheitstheologie bei Ben Sira. Bonner Biblische Beiträge 37; Bonn: Hanstein, 1971.
- Marcus, Joseph. "A Fifth Manuscript of Ben Sira", Jewish Quarterly Review, 21 (1930-1931) 223-240.
- Martin, Francois. "Le Livre des Jubilés", Revue Biblique, 20 (1911) 321-344; 502-533.
- Marx, A. "Y a-t-il une prédestination à Qumrân?", Revue de Qumran, 6 (1967-1969) 163-182.
- Mauchline, John. Isaiah 1-39. Torch Bible Commentaries; London: SCM Press Ltd., 1962.
- Mays, James Luther. Amos. Old Testament Library; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1969.
- Micah: A Commentary. Old Testament Library; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976.
- Meinhold, J. Studien zur israelitischen Religionsgeschichte. Band I: Der heilige Rest. Teil I: Elias, Amos, Hosea, Jesaja. Bonn: 1903.
- Merrill, Eugene H. Qumran and Predestination: A Theological Study of the Thanksgiving Hymns. (Series edited by J. van der Ploeg) Studies On the Texts of the Desert of Judah VIII; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975.

- Meyer, Ben F. The Church In Three Tenses. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1971.
- . "Jesus and the Remnant of Israel", Journal of Biblical Literature, 84 (1965) 123-130.
- Michaud, H. "A propos d'un passage des Hymnes (1QH 2.7-14)", Revue de Qumran, 1 (1958-1959) 413-416.
- Milik, J. T. "A propos de 11 QJub", Biblica, 54 (1973) 77-78.
- . "Fragment d'une source du Psautier (4Q Ps 89) et fragments des Jubilés, du document de Damas, d'une phylactère dans la grotte 4 de Qumran (4Q Jub<sup>f</sup>)", Revue Biblique, 73 (1966) 94-106.
- . "Le Testament de Levi en arameen: Fragment de la grotte 4 de Qumran", Revue Biblique, 62 (1955) 398-406.
- . "'Prière de Nabonide' et autres écrits d'un cycle de Daniel. Fragments araméens de Qumran (4Q Pr Nab ar 4Q ps Dan ar<sup>a-c</sup>)", Revue Biblique, 63 (1956) 407-415.
- . "Problemes de la Litterature Henochique a la Lumiere des fragments Arameens de Qumran (4Q Hen Astr a-e, 4Q Cryptic)", Harvard Theological Review, 64 (1971) 333-378.
- . "Review of M. deJonge, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", Revue Biblique, 62 (1955) 297f.
- . Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea. (Translated by J. Strugnell) Studies In Biblical Theology; London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1959.
- Miller, Madeleine, and J. Lane Miller. "Canon", in Harper's Bible Dictionary. New York: Harper & Row, 1973, 90-91.
- Mitchell, Hinckley G. "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Haggai and Zechariah", in Hinckley G. Mitchell, John Merlin Powis Smith, and Julius A. Bewer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi and Jonah. International Critical Commentary; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912.

Molin, Georg. Die Sohne des Lichtes. Wien: Verlag Herold, 1954.

Montgomery, James A. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel. International Critical Commentary; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927.

----- . A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings. International Critical Commentary; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.

Moore, George F. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges. International Critical Commentary, 2nd. ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1903.

----- . Judaism In the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim. 3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955.

Morawe, G. Aufbau und Abgrenzung der Loblieder von Qumrân. Theologische Arbeiten 16; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961.

Morgenstern, Julian. "The Calendar of the Book of Jubilees, its Origin and its Character", Vetus Testamentum, 5 (1955) 34-76.

----- . "The Mythological Background of Psalm 82", Hebrew Union College Annual, 14 (1939) 29-126.

Mowinckel, S. He That Cometh. (Translated by G. W. Anderson) Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1959.

----- . Psalmenstudien. Verlag P. Schippers: Amsterdam, 1961.

Mowry, Lucetta. The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early Church. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Muilenburg, J. "Jeremiah the Prophet", in G. A. Buttrick, ed., The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. 4 vols. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962, II, 823-835.

Müller, Werner E. Die Vorstellung vom Rest im Alten Testament. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973.

Murphy-O'Connor, J. "La genèse littéraire de la Règle de la Communauté", Revue Biblique, 76 (1969) 528-549.

Myers, Jacob M. Ezra-Nehemiah. Anchor Bible; Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1965.

McKenzie, John L. Dictionary of the Bible. New York: Macmillian Publishing Co., Inc., 1965; London: Collier Macmillan Publishers, 1965.

Nickelsburg, G. W. E., Jr. "An Antiochan Date for the Testament of Moses", in G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., ed., Studies on The Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 4; Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973.

----- . "The Apocalyptic Message of I Enoch 92-105", Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 39 (1977) 309-328.

----- . "Assumption of Moses", in his Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism. Harvard Theological Studies 26; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1972, 28-31, 43-45, 97.

----- . Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life In Intertestamental Judaism. Harvard Theological Studies 26; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972.

----- . "Riches, the Rich, and God's Judgment in I Enoch 92-105 and the Gospel according to Luke", New Testament Studies, 25 (1979) 324-344.

Nicholson, E. W. Deuteronomy and Tradition. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1967.

Noack, Bent. "Qumran and the Book of Jubilees", Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok, 22-23 (1957-1958) 191-207.

Noth, Martin. Exodus. (Translated by J. S. Bowden) Old Testament Library; London: SCM Press Ltd., 1962.

----- . The History of Israel. Second edition; New York: Harper & Row, 1960.

----- . Leviticus. (Translated by J. E. Anderson) London: SCM Press Ltd., 1965.

----- . Numbers. (Translated by James D. Martin) Old Testament Library; London: SCM Press Ltd., 1968.

- O'Dell, J. "The Religious Background of the Psalms of Solomon", Revue de Qumran, 3 (1961) 241-257.
- Oesterley, W. O. E. "Ecclesiasticus", in An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha. London: SPCK, 1958, 222-255.
- , and Theodore H. Robinson. Hebrew Religion: Its Origin And Development. London: SPCK, 1961.
- von der Osten-Sacken, Peter. Gott und Belial: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Dualismus in den Texten aus Qumran. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1969.
- Palmer, Richard E. Hermeneutics. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1969.
- Patte, Daniel. Early Jewish Hermeneutic In Palestine. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 22; Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1975.
- Perdue, Leo G. "Sirach", in his Wisdom and Cult. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 30; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press for the Society of Biblical Literature, 1977, 188-211.
- Peterson, David L. "Genesis 6:1-4, Yahweh and the Organization of the Cosmos", Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, 13 (1979) 47-64.
- Pfeiffer, Charles F. The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Bible. Baker Studies In Biblical Archaeology; Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1969.
- Pfeiffer, R. H. "Canon of the O T", in George Arthur Buttrick, ed., The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. 4 vols. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962, I, 498-520.
- van der Ploeg, J. The Excavations at Qumran. A Survey of the Judaeen Brotherhood and its Ideas. (Translated by Kevin Smyth) London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1958.
- , "Le Rouleau d'Habacuc de la grotte de 'Ain Fesha", Bibliotheca Orientalis (1951) 2-11.

- Porteous, Norman W. Daniel: A Commentary. Old Testament Library; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965.
- Poulet, Donat. "The Moral Causes of the Flood", Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 4 (1942) 293-303.
- Poythress, V. S. "The Holy Ones of the Most High in Dan. VII", Vetus Testamentum, 26 (1976) 208-213.
- Priest, J. "Ben Sira 45, 25 in the Light of the Qumran Literature", Revue de Qumran, 5 (1964-1965) 111-118.
- Przybylski, Benno. The Meaning and Significance of the Concept of Righteousness in the Gospel of Matthew: With Special Reference to the Use of this Concept in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Tannaitic Literature. Unpublished PhD Thesis, McMaster University, 1975.
- Pummer, R. "The Book of Jubilees and the Samaritans", Eglise et Theologie, 10 (1979) 147-178.
- Purvis, J. D. "Samaritan Traditions on the Death of Moses", in G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., ed., Studies on the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 4; Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973.
- Rabin, Chaim. Qumran Studies. Scripta Judaica II; Oxford: University Press, 1957.
- , and Yigael Yadin, eds. Scripta Hierosolymitana IV: Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls. 2nd ed.; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1965.
- , The Zadokite Documents. 2nd rev. ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.
- Rabinowitz, I. "The Meaning and Date of 'Damascus' Document IX.1", Revue de Qumran, 6 (1967-1969) 433-435.
- , "A Reconsideration of 'Damascus' and '390 Years' in the 'Damascus' ('Zadokite') Fragments", Journal of Biblical Literature, 73 (1954) 11-35.
- , "The Second and Third Columns of the Habakkuk Interpretation Scroll", Journal of Biblical Literature, 69 (1950) 31-49.

- . "Sequence and Dates of the Extra-Biblical Dead Sea Scroll Texts and 'Damascus Fragments'", Vetus Testamentum, 3 (1953) 175-185.
- von Rad, Gerhard. Deuteronomy. (Translated by Dorothea Barton) Old Testament Library; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1966.
- . Genesis. (Translated by John H. Marks) Old Testament Library; London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1961.
- . Old Testament Theology. (Translated by D. M. G. Stalker) 2 vols. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.
- . "The Wisdom of Jesus Sirach", in his Wisdom in Israel. Nashville and New York: Abingdon Press, 1972.
- Ramban. Commentary On The Torah-Exodus. (Translated by Charles B. Chavel) New York: Shilo Publishing House, Inc., 1973.
- . Commentary On The Torah-Genesis. (Translated by Charles B. Chavel) New York: Shilo Publishing House, Inc., 1971.
- . Commentary On The Torah-Leviticus. (Translated by Charles B. Chavel) New York: Shilo Publishing House, Inc., 1974.
- Rankin, O. S. Israel's Wisdom Literature. New York: Schocken Books, 1969.
- Rashi. Pentateuch With Targum Onkelos, Haphtaroth and Rashi's Commentary, Exodus. (Translated by M. Rosenbaum, and A. M. Silbermann) New York: Hebrew Publishing Company, n.d.
- . Pentateuch With Targum Onkelos, Haphtaroth and Rashi's Commentary, Genesis. (Translated by M. Rosenbaum, and A. M. Silbermann) New York: Hebrew Publishing Company, n.d.
- . Pentateuch With Targum Onkelos, Haphtaroth and Rashi's Commentary, Leviticus. (Translated by M. Rosenbaum, and A. M. Silbermann) New York: Hebrew Publishing Company, n.d.

- . Pentateuch With Targum Onkelos, Haptaroth and Rashi's Commentary, Numbers. (Translated by M. Rosenbaum, and A. M. Silbermann) New York: Hebrew Publishing Company, n.d.
- Redford, Donald B. A Study of the Biblical Story of Joseph. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, vol. XX; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970.
- Reicke, Bo. "The Constitution of the Primitive Church in the Light of Jewish Documents", in Krister Stendahl, ed., The Scrolls and the New Testament. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1957, 143-156.
- . "Die Ta'amire-Schriften und die Damaskus-Fragments", Studia Theologica, 2 (1949) 45-70.
- Rhoads, D. M. "The Assumption of Moses and Jewish History: 4 B.C.-A.D. 48", in G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., ed., Studies on the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 4; Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973, 53-58.
- Richardson, H. "Some Notes on IQ Sa", Journal of Biblical Literature, 76 (1957) 108-122.
- Ringgren, H. "The Branch and the Plantation in the Hodayot", Biblical Research, 6 (1961) 3-9.
- . The Faith of Qumran. (Translated by Emilie T. Sander) Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963.
- . Israelite Religion. (Translated by David E. Green) Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.
- Rist, M. "Assumption of Moses", in George Arthur Buttrick, ed., Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. 4 vols. Nashville/New York: Abingdon Press, 1962, 3, 450-451.
- Roberts, B. J. "Some Observations on the Damascus Document and the Dead Sea Scrolls", Bulletin of the John Rylands Library (1952) 366-387.
- Rowley, H. H. The Biblical Doctrine of Election. London: Lutterworth Press, 1950.



- . "The Covenanters of Damascus and the Dead Sea Scrolls", Bulletin of the John Rylands Library (1952) 111-154.
- . The Growth of the Old Testament. 1950; New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1963.
- . Men of God. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1963.
- . The Relevance of Apocalyptic. London: Lutterworth Press, 1963.
- . "The Unity of the Book of Daniel", Hebrew Union College Annual, 23 (1950-1951) 233-273.
- Russell, D. S. The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic 200 BC-AD 100. Old Testament Library; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.
- Rylaarsdam, J. Coert. Revelation in Jewish Wisdom Literature. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1946.
- Ryle, Herbert E. The Book of Genesis. The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges; Cambridge: The University Press, 1914.
- . The Canon of the Old Testament. London: 1892.
- Sakenfeld, Katherine D. "The Problem of Divine Forgiveness In Numbers 14", Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 37 (1975) 317-330.
- Sanders, E. P. "Chiasmus and the Translation of 1Q Hodayot VII, 26-27", Revue de Qumran, 6 (1968) 427-431.
- . Paul and Palestinian Judaism. London: SCM Press, 1977.
- Sanders, Jack T. "Ben Sira's Ethics of Caution", Hebrew Union College Annual, 50 (1979) 73-106.
- Sarna, Nahum M. Understanding Genesis. New York: Schocken Books, 1972.

- Scharbert, Josef. Prolegomena eines Alttestamentlers zur Erbsündenlehre. Quaestiones Disputatae 37; Freiburg: Herder, 1968.
- Schechter, Solomon. Aspects of Rabbinic Theology. New York: Schocken Books, 1969.
- Schilling, O. "Rest" in der Prophetie des Alten Testaments. Unpublished Th.D Inauguraldissertation, Universität Münster, 1942.
- Schilling, S. Paul. Isaiah Speaks. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1959.
- Schmid, Hans Heinrich. Gerechtigkeit als Weltordnung. Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie 40; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1968.
- Schmidt, H. Die grossen Propheten. Die Schriften des Alten Testaments, II/2; Göttingen, 1915.
- Schmidt, Johann Michael. Die jüdische Apokalyptik: Die Geschichte ihrer Erforschung von den Anfängen bis zu den Textfunden von Qumran. 2nd ed.; Neukirchen-Vluy: Neukirchener Verlag, 1976.
- Schmithals, Walter. "The Apocalyptic Literature", in his The Apocalyptic Movement. (Translated by John E. Steely) New York & Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1975.
- Schökel, Luis Alonso. "The Vision of Man in Sirach 16:24-17:14", in John G. Gammie, Walter A. Brueggemann, W. Lee Humpheys, and James M. Ward, eds., Israelite Wisdom. New York: Union Theological Seminary, 1978, 235-245.
- Schreiber, Rudolf. Der Neue Bund im Spätjudentum und Urchristentum. (Dissertation Tübingen, 1955). Report in Theologische Literaturzeitung, 81 (1956) cols. 695-698.
- Schubert, K. The Dead Sea Community: Its Origin and Teachings. (Translated by John W. Doberstein) New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959.
- Schulz, Paul. Der Autoritätsanspruch des Lehrers der Gerechtigkeit in Qumran. Meisenheim am Glan: Verlag Anton Hain, 1974.

- Schüpphaus, Joachim. Die Psalmen Salomos: Ein Zeugnis Jerusalemer Theologis und Frömmigkeit in der Mitte des vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts. Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des Hellenistischen Judentums 7; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977.
- Jorst Seebass. "אֲתֵר יֵת", Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament, I, 207-212.
- Segal, M. H. "The Habakkuk Commentary and the Damascus Fragments", Journal of Biblical Literature, 70 (1951) 131-147.
- . "The Qumran War Scroll and the Date of Its Composition", in Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin, eds., Scripta Hierosolymitana IV: Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls. 2nd ed.; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1965, 138-143.
- Siebeneck, R. T. "May Their Bones Return to Life!--Sirach's Praise of the Fathers", Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 21 (1959) 411-428.
- Skehan, Patrick W. "Sirach 40:11-17", in his Studies In Israelite Poetry and Wisdom. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1971, 129-131.
- . Studies In Israelite Poetry and Wisdom. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 1; Washington, D. C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1971.
- . "Structures in Poems on Wisdom: Proverbs 8 and Sirach 24", Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 41 (1979) 365-379.
- Skinner, John. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis. International Critical Commentary; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912.
- Slingerland, H. Dixon. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical History of Research. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 21; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977.
- Smend, R. Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt. Berlin: Reimer, 1906.

- Smith, John Merlin Powis. "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Malachi", in Hinckley G. Mitchell, John Merlin Powis Smith, and Julius A. Bewer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi and Jonah. International Critical Commentary; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912.
- . "A Critical And Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Micah, Zephaniah and Nahum", in John Merlin Powis Smith, William Hayes Ward, and Julius A. Bewer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah, and Joel. International Critical Commentary; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911.
- Snaith, John G. Ecclesiasticus or The Wisdom of Jesus Son of Sirach. The Cambridge Bible Commentary: New English Bible; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Snaith, N. H. "Righteousness", in Alan Richardson, ed., A Theological Word Book. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1950, 202-204
- Spiegel, Shalom. "Noah, Daniel and Job, Touching on Canaanite Relics in the Legends of the Jews", in Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume. New York: American Academy of Jewish Research, 1945, 305-355 (English section).
- Stegemann, Hartmut. "Der Peser Psalm 37 aus Höhle 4 von Qumran (4QpPs 37)", Revue de Qumran, 14 (1963) 235-270.
- . "Weitere Stücke von 4Qp Psalm 37, von 4Q Patriarchal Blessings und Hinweis auf eine unedierte Handschrift aus Höhle 4Q mit Exzerpten aus dem Deuteronomium", Revue de Qumran, 6 (1967-1969) 193-227.
- Stegemann, U. "Der Restgedanke bei Isaias", Biblische Zeitschrift NF 13 (1969) 161-186.
- Stegner, W. R. The Self-understanding of the Qumran Community compared with the Self-understanding of the Early Church. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Drew University, 1960.

- Stendahl, Krister, ed. The Scrolls and The New Testament. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1957.
- Strugnell, John. "Notes en marge du volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan'", Revue de Qumran, 7 (1969-1971) 163-276.
- Sundberg, Albert C., Jr. "The 'Old Testament': A Christian Canon", Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 30 (1968) 143-155.
- Sutcliffe, E. F. "The First Fifteen Members of the Qumran Community: A Note on 1QS 8:1ff", Journal of Semitic Studies, 4 (1959) 134-138.
- "The Rule of the Congregation II, 11-12: Text and Meaning", Revue de Qumran, 2 (1959-1960) 541-547.
- Talmon, S. "The Sectarian yhd--A Biblical Noun", Vetus Testamentum, (1953) 133-140.
- Tedesche, S. "Book of Jubilees", in George Arthur Buttrick, ed., The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. 4 vols. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962, 2, 1002-1003.
- Teicher, J. L. "The Damascus Fragments and the Origin of the Jewish Christian Sect", Journal of Jewish Studies, 2 (1951) 115-143.
- Tessnant, F. R. "The Teaching of Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom on the Introduction of Sin and Death", Journal of Theological Studies, 2 (1901) 207-223.
- Testuz, Michael. Les idées religieuses du Livre des Jubilés. Genève: E. Droz; Paris: Minard, 1960.
- Thiering, B. E. Redating the Teacher of Righteousness. Australian and New Zealand Studies In Theology and Religion 1; Australia: Theological Explorations, 1979.
- Tiede, D. L. "The Figure of Moses in the Testament of Moses", in G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., ed., Studies on The Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 4; Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973.
- Torrey, C. C. The Apocryphal Literature: A Brief Introduction. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1945.

- . "'Taxo' in the Assumption of Moses", Journal of Biblical Literature, 62 (1943) 1-8.
- VanderKam, James C. "Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second Century Sources", in Paul J. Achtemeier, ed., Seminar Papers: Society of Biblical Literature, 1978. 2 vols. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press for the Society of Biblical Literature, 1978, 229-251.
- . Textual and Historical Studies In The Book of Jubilees. Harvard Semitic Monographs 14; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977.
- deVaux, R. "Le 'Reste d'Israël' d'après les prophètes", Revue Biblique, 42 (1933) 526-539.
- Vawter, Bruce. The Book of Sirach. Pamphlet Bible Series 40 & 41; New York: Paulist Press, 1962; Parts I & II.
- . The Conscience of Israel. London: Sheed and Ward, 1961.
- . A Path Through Genesis. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1956.
- Vermes, G. The Dead Sea Scrolls In English. Baltimore: Penquin Books, 1962.
- Volz, Paul. Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im Neutestamentlichen Zeitalter. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1966 (=1934).
- Vriezen, Th. C. An Outline of Old Testament Theology. Newton, Mass.: Charles T. Branford Co., 1958.
- Wallace, D. H. "The Semitic Origin of the Assumption of Moses", Theologische Zeitschrift, 11 (1955) 321-328.
- Ward, William Hayes. "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Habakkuk", in John Merlin Powis Smith, William Hayes Ward, and Julius A. Bewer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah, and Joel. International Critical Commentary; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911.
- Warne, D. M. The Origin, Development and Significance of the Concept of the Remnant in the Old Testament. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1958.

- Weber, Thomas H. "Sirach", in Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy, eds., The Jerome Biblical Commentary. 2 vols. in 1; Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968, 541-555.
- Wenham, G. J. The Book of Leviticus. New International Commentary on the Old Testament; Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1979.
- Welch, Adam C. Deuteronomy: The Framework To The Code. London: Oxford University Press, 1932.
- Wernberg-Møller, P. "Some Reflections on the Biblical Material in the Manual of Discipline", Studia Theologica, 9 (1955) 40-66.
- Westermann, Claus. Isaiah 40-66. (Translated by David M. G. Stalker) Old Testament Library; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1969.
- Wiesenberg, Ernest. "The Jubilee of Jubilees", Revue de Qumran, 3 (1961-1962) 3-40.
- Winter, P. "Ben Sira and the Teaching of 'Two Ways'", Vetus Testamentum, 5 (1955) 315-318.
- . "Psalms of Solomon", in George Arthur Buttrick, ed., The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. 4 vols. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962, 3, 958-960.
- Woods, F. H. "Old Testament Canon", in Hastings Dictionary of the Bible. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1900, III, 606-607.
- Woude, A. S. van der. "Fragmente des Buches Jubiläen aus Qumran Höhle XI (11Q Jub)", in G. Jeremias, H. W. Kuhn, and H. Stegemann, Tradition und Glaube: Das Frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971, 140-146.
- Yadin, Y. "A Note on DSD IV:20", Journal of Biblical Literature, 74 (1955) 40-43.
- Zeitlin, S. "The Assumption of Moses and the Revolt of Bar Kokba", Jewish Quarterly Review, 38 (1947-1948) 1-45.

- . "The Beginning of the Day in the Calendar of Jubilees", Journal of Biblical Literature, 78 (1959) 153-156.
- . "The Book of Jubilees: its Character and its Significance", Jewish Quarterly Review, 30 (1939-1940) 1-32.
- . "The Book of 'Jubilees' and the Pentateuch", Jewish Quarterly Review, 48 (1957-1958) 218-235.
- . "An Historical Study of the Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures", Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research, 3 (1931-1932) 121-156.
- . The Rise and Fall of the Judaeae State. 3 vols. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2nd ed., vol. 1, 1968; 2nd ed., vol. 2, 1968; vol. 3, 1978.
- Zimmerli, Walther. A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Chapters 1-24. (Translated by Ronald E. Clements) Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- . Ezekiel 1. (Translated by Ronald E. Clements) Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.

### C. SYSTEM OF REFERENCES

Rabbinic references are very complex and, hence, I offer an explanation of the citations found in this dissertation.

The Babylonian Talmud is cited without the prefatory b or B. The citation is by tractate, folio and side of the standard edition and is followed by the order, volume and page of the Soncino edition.

The Mekilta of R. Ishmael is cited by tractate, chapter, volume and page number in Lauterbach's edition,



page number in Horovitz's edition and the passage in Exodus being commented on.

Sifra is cited by biblical section, pereq or parasha and halakah.

Finally, Genesis Rabbah and Midrash Rabbah are cited by tractate, chapter and volume and page number of the Soncino edition.