

Wisdom's Wide Trajectory:
Reading the Letter of James in Light of *4QInstruction*

Submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor
of Philosophy in the Department of Religions and Theology.

Trinity College Dublin
The University of Dublin

2019

Helen Joan Cashell Moran

Declaration

I declare that this thesis has not been submitted as an exercise for a degree at this or any other university and is entirely my own work.

I agree to deposit this thesis in the University's open access institutional repository or allow the Library to do so on my behalf, subject to Irish Copyright Legislation and Trinity College Library conditions of use and acknowledgment.

Signed: _____

Summary

This Ph.D thesis examines the relationship between the categories of wisdom and apocalyptic in the Letter of James in light of a critical assessment of *4QInstruction*. *4QInstruction* is studied because it represents an important example of a sapiential composition in which views that may be labeled “apocalyptic” are expressed. This thesis is structured in two parts. Part One comprises of Chapters One to Three and provides the context and justification for the study to follow. Part Two is made up of Chapters Four to Six, which investigate: (1) the pursuit of wisdom, an admonition that is central to both writings (i.e. Chapter Four), (2) who this wisdom is made available to (i.e. Chapter Five), and (3) the internal and external obstacles that are present in the world that may impede upon a person’s pursuit of wisdom (i.e. Chapter Six).

Chapter One traces the historical development of wisdom in terms of its overall theoretical framework and its generic existence. Attention is given to the problematic nature of the terms “wisdom”, “apocalyptic”, and “eschatology” in order to begin to clarify how others use these terms, and how they are used in this present study. The inclusion of the latter two terms is justified because the wisdom tradition develops and transforms into a place where these components become intertwined.

Chapter Two situates *4QInstruction* in terms of the wisdom and apocalyptic debate, and begins to establish its significance for the Letter of James. It is demonstrated that *4QInstruction* is a central writing in terms of compelling scholars to re-evaluate how the categories of wisdom and apocalyptic are understood. Throughout this chapter basic commonalities between *4QInstruction* and James are noted. The identification of these commonalities enables us to see that, very often, little separates these two writings in terms of their content and worldview.

Chapter Three explores James in light of the expansion or development of the category of wisdom and its amalgamation of apocalyptic constructs. Presenting and engaging with the research that has recognized James’ inclusion of wisdom, eschatological, and apocalyptic tenets and/or perspectives, achieves this. Moreover, the limitations present in existing scholarship on this topic are also highlighted. This study appreciates the blending of the categorical lines

between wisdom and apocalyptic in James, while also emphasizing both the transformative effect this has on the category of wisdom, and how it enhances our understanding of the interpretative framework behind James.

Chapter Four studies the revealing of wisdom in James. The apocalyptic tradition's affiliation with the revelation of wisdom is stressed. To be more specific, the portrayal of the revealing of wisdom in James 1:5, the significance of the differentiation made between earthly and heavenly wisdom in James 3:13-18, and how σοφία ἄνωθεν is to be understood in relation to the Mosaic Torah in light of *4QInstruction* and its representation of the same themes, are all in focus. The importance of the wisdom of James 1:5, and the identification of its significance, offers insight when it comes to other central aspects of James' teaching (e.g. the relationship between σοφία ἄνωθεν, νόμος, and λόγος, and the importance of not being enticed by one's own ἐπιθυμία). These are also discussed.

In light of the significance of σοφία ἄνωθεν, Chapter Five studies the recipients of wisdom in James in light of *4QInstruction*. This is an important question because doing revelation enables wise living and right action. Moreover, it also enables one to be part of God's faithful community. This chapter has two primary research questions: firstly, who is given revelation? Secondly, in terms of the faithful communities portrayed in James and *4QInstruction*, is the language of "inclusion" or "exclusion" more appropriate? In other words, is it a matter of "getting in" or "staying in"?

Chapter Six explores the closely associated topics of sin and evil in James, and the conceptions/traditions that may have influenced this author. This is important because James portrays humanity as having an apparent proclivity to sin and evil (i.e. Jas 1:8, 14; 4:8), and this assessment of humanity is pertinent to this thesis in terms of evaluating the potential (earthly and otherworldly) obstructions one may experience in terms of their pursuit of wisdom.

In conclusion, while others have noted that the categories of wisdom, eschatology, and apocalyptic are all present in both *4QInstruction* and James, to date, no work has engaged or assessed these writings in relation to one another. This lacuna in biblical scholarship is the impetus of this study and what follows is one step in filling it. At the very least, it is hoped that a more nuanced interpretation of James will emerge.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to so many people that a simple “thank you” on paper almost seems inadequate. Firstly, I am very grateful to my supervisor Dr Benjamin Wold. In addition to offering exceptionally detailed feedback, both this project and I have benefited greatly from his infinite patience and instruction. Secondly, my thanks are due to the two examiners of this thesis, Prof Grant Macaskill, Kirby Laing Chair of New Testament Exegesis at the University of Aberdeen, and Dr Daniele Pevarello, Department of Religions and Theology, Trinity College Dublin. I have no doubt that this thesis has benefited enormously from your feedback and suggested amendments.

Prof Matthew Goff and Rev Dr Jeremy Corley have proven to be faithful friends. In their own way they have both offered me encouragement when I needed it most, and have both given valuable responses on various sections of my work. I would also like to acknowledge Rev Brendan McConvery; it was Brendan who opened up my eyes to biblical studies and encouraged me to pursue a Ph.D. In addition, I would like to thank Helen Thornbury at the TCD Graduate Studies Office who offered practical support in the final years of my Ph.D. Helen, I cannot express how much I have appreciated your kindness and understanding.

So many of my friends have served as a great support-base and provided an often much-needed distraction, but there simply is not enough space here to mention everyone. As a result, I am going to limit the list to those who have been directly involved in this process. Firstly, I wish to thank Dr Sarah Shier. Sarah’s guidance, support, and most importantly, her friendship, are immeasurable. Special thanks are also owed to Marie Flanagan, Dr Katie Dunne, Dr Eimhim Walsh and Dr Paul Clogher, who have all offered invaluable support and guidance. In the latter days, my tea breaks with Niamh Brennan cheered me up no end. Finally, I want to acknowledge my oldest friend, Tammy Winters. I think it is fair to say that Tammy has absolutely no idea what this thesis is about, but she has been there throughout and always believed in me.

During the course of my Ph.D studies I encountered a number of unexpected complications. It is true to say that I would not have overcome these obstacles if it were not for the love of my family. To my mother, Teresa, thank

you for encouraging me to study. It was my Mam who fostered the importance of education in me at a young age. To my brother, Derek, and my gorgeous niece, Zoë: you both brighten my world. To my parents-in-law, Beth and Mairtín, thank you for being so supportive and loving. My brothers-in-law, Donal and Matthew, thank you for being my brothers. Special thanks are owed to Donal for being Donal, and for always managing to make me laugh. I have to include my Heidi in here somewhere because she has been deprived of so many morning cuddles so this project could be brought to completion.

Finally, but most importantly, it is with the deepest gratitude and sincerest love that I dedicate this thesis to the two main men in my life. Firstly, to my husband, Oisín; you deserve the biggest thanks of all. During the course of these (many!) postgraduate years you have never once complained, and have never doubted my ability. I am entirely indebted to you and would not be in the position where I am writing these acknowledgements if it were not for your constant encouragement. Secondly, to my late father, Paddy (1941-2018); I am proud to be your daughter and can only hope you knew how much this statement is true. While it pains me that you are longer physically here, the former sentence will forever remain accurate. Ar dheis Dé go raibh a anam dílis.

Table of Contents

Declaration	ii
Summary	iii
Acknowledgements	v
Table of Contents	vii

I. Identifying the Context

General Introduction	1
Chapter One: Theoretical Approaches to Wisdom and Apocalyptic	6
Introduction	6
<i>Comment: Assessing the Task Before Us</i>	7
1.1. Form Criticism and the Emergence of Genre Theory	12
<i>1.1.1. Classification</i>	16
<i>1.1.2. Family Resemblance Model</i>	18
<i>1.1.3. A Mode of Comprehension</i>	19
<i>1.1.4. Genres as Distinct Modes of Perception and/or Constructing Meaningful Worlds</i>	19
<i>1.1.5. Prototype Theory</i>	20
<i>1.1.6. The Synchronic and Diachronic Elements of Genre</i>	22
<i>Comment on Form Criticism and Genre Theory</i>	24
1.2. Wisdom	24
<i>1.2.1. The Category of Wisdom and its Inclusion of Apocalyptic</i>	25
<i>1.2.2. Wisdom as Genre in the Hebrew Bible</i>	31
<i>1.2.3. Wisdom as Genre at Qumran</i>	35
1.3. Apocalyptic	43
<i>1.3.1. The Apocalypse Genre</i>	43
<i>1.3.2. Eschatology and its Relationship to Apocalyptic</i>	48

1.4. The Current Approach to Wisdom and Apocalypticism	52
1.4.1. <i>The SBL Wisdom and Apocalypticism Group</i>	52
<i>Comment on Methodology</i>	56
Conclusion: The Task of this Study.....	57
Chapter Two: <i>4QInstruction</i> and the Letter of James.....	59
Introduction.....	59
2.1.1. <i>4QInstruction</i>	60
2.1.1.1. <i>History of Research</i>	60
2.1.1.2. <i>4QInstruction's Genre</i>	65
2.1.2. The Provenance of <i>4QInstruction</i>	67
2.1.2.1. <i>Palaeography</i>	68
2.1.2.2. <i>Date of 4QInstruction and its Relationship to the Yahad</i>	72
<i>Conclusions: The Provenance of 4QInstruction</i>	79
2.1.3. The Recipient(s) of <i>4QInstruction</i>	80
2.1.3.1. <i>The Mebin</i>	80
2.1.3.2. <i>The Mebin's Status</i>	81
2.1.3.3. <i>The Identity of the Mebin</i>	83
2.1.3.4. <i>Poverty and the Mebin</i>	85
<i>Conclusions: The Recipient(s) of 4QInstruction</i>	88
2.2.1. The Letter of James.....	89
2.2.1.1. <i>The Letter of James Throughout History</i>	90
2.2.1.2. <i>(Recent and Relevant) History of Research</i>	96
2.2.1.3. <i>James' Genre</i>	98
2.2.2. The Provenance of the Letter of James.....	101
2.2.2.1. <i>Author and Date</i>	101
2.2.2.2. <i>The Recipients and Occasion of the Letter of James</i>	105
<i>Conclusions: The Provenance of the Letter of James</i>	114
Conclusions.....	115
Chapter Three: James' Apocalyptic Perspective: Eschatological Emphasis.....	116
Introduction.....	116
3.1. Conflicted Boundaries in James.....	116

3.1.1. <i>Conflicted Boundaries</i>	117
3.1.2. <i>Darian Lockett</i>	119
3.2. The Apocalyptic Perspective of <i>4QInstruction</i> and James	122
3.2.1. <i>The Cosmos and Eschatology in 4QInstruction</i>	123
3.2.2. <i>The World and Eschatology in James</i>	130
<i>The Crown of Life [τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς] in James 1:12</i>	137
<i>Eschatology in 4QInstruction and James</i>	138
Conclusions	140

II. Revealing of Wisdom and its Association with the Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition

Chapter Four: Revelation: Understanding Revelation and its Relationship to Νόμος in James in Light of <i>4QInstruction</i>	142
Introduction.....	142
<i>The Revealing of Wisdom and its Association with the Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition</i>	142
4.1. The Revealing of Wisdom in James.....	144
4.1.1. <i>The Nature and Purpose of Revelation in James</i>	144
4.1.2. <i>James 3:13-18: Two Kinds of Wisdom</i>	150
4.2. The Revealing of Wisdom in <i>4QInstruction</i>	153
4.2.1. <i>4Q417 I i lines 13b-18 and קוֹזוֹן הַהַגָּה</i>	153
4.2.2. <i>רז נהיה</i>	158
4.2.3. <i>4Q417 I i lines 1-9 and the Scope of רז נהיה</i>	164
<i>Comment: James' Revelation in Light of 4QInstruction</i>	167
4.3. Revelation and the Authority of Νόμος in James	170
4.3.1. <i>James' Understanding of Νόμος</i>	170
4.3.2. <i>Revelation and Νόμος in James</i>	182
4.4. Revelation and Torah in <i>4QInstruction</i>	188
4.4.1. <i>4QInstruction's Understanding of Torah</i>	189
4.4.2. <i>Revelation and Torah in 4QInstruction</i>	191
<i>Comment: Revelation and Νόμος in James in Light of 4QInstruction</i>	194
Conclusions	194

Chapter Five: Recipients: Inclusive or Exclusive Community?	196
Introduction.....	196
5.1. The Recipients of Revelation in James.....	197
<i>Comment on the Phrase “The Twelve Tribes in the Diaspora”</i>	197
5.1.1. <i>James 1:1: Literal or Metaphorical Address?</i>	199
5.1.2. <i>James 1:1: Eschatological Significance</i>	205
5.1.3. <i>James 1:1: Scriptural Allusion to Isaiah 49:5-6</i>	211
<i>James 1:1: Then who has Access to Revelation?</i>	212
5.2. The Recipients of Revelation in <i>4QInstruction</i>	215
5.2.1. <i>Interpreting אנוש</i>	216
5.2.2. <i>4Q418 81+81a lines 1-2: Separation of the Addressee from</i> <i>the רוח בשר</i>	226
5.2.3. <i>4Q423 1, 2 i lines 1-4: Stewardship over the Garden of</i> <i>Eden</i>	231
<i>Recipients of Revelation: Non-Inclusion of Gentiles</i>	237
Conclusions.....	239
Chapter Six: Humanity’s Proclivity to Sin and Evil: An Obstacle in the Pursuit of Wisdom in James in Light of <i>4QInstruction</i>	242
Introduction.....	242
6.1. Evil Inclination.....	243
6.1.1. <i>The יצר</i>	243
6.1.2. <i>יצר at Qumran</i>	248
6.1.3. <i>יצר/ διαβουλίον in Sirach</i>	251
6.1.4. <i>ἐπιθυμίας in Philo</i>	256
<i>Comment on the Inclination to Evil</i>	260
6.2. James 1:12-15: God Tests but does not Tempt.....	261
6.2.1. <i>History of Interpretation</i>	262
6.3. Evil Inclination in <i>4QInstruction</i> : Internal and External?	268
6.3.1. <i>4Q417 1 i lines 9, 11, 17-18</i>	269
6.3.2. <i>4Q416 1 line 16: יצר בשר</i>	272
6.3.3. <i>4Q417 1 ii line 12: יצר רע</i>	274
<i>Comment: The יצר (and רע יצר) in 4QInstruction</i>	277
6.4. Internal Evils in James	277

6.4.1. <i>The Ἐπιθυμία in James 1:14 (cf. 1:15, 4:2)</i>	277
6.4.2. <i>The Διψυχία in James 1:8; 4:8</i>	285
6.5. External Evils in James	290
6.5.1. <i>James 2:19: “Even the Demons Believe”</i>	291
6.5.2. <i>James 4:7: “Resist the Devil”</i>	292
6.5.3. <i>The Tongue as an Instrument of Evil</i>	293
<i>Comment: Internal and External Evils in James</i>	295
Conclusions	295
General Conclusions	297
Bibliography	304

General Introduction

James 1:5 reads: “If any of you is lacking in wisdom [ὕμῶν λείπεται σοφίας], ask God, who gives to all generously and ungrudgingly [αἰτείτω παρὰ τοῦ διδόντος θεοῦ πᾶσιν ἀπλῶς καὶ μὴ ὀνειδίζοντος], and it will be given to you [καὶ δοθήσεται αὐτῷ].” For many scholars, this verse represents a straightforward admonition to pursue wisdom; however, as is argued in the pages to follow, there is much that may be said about the interpretative background of this verse, and early Jewish traditions, that help us to understand it. Moreover, it serves to demonstrate the diversity of wisdom literature, in this case in the New Testament, and its various trajectories.

This Ph.D thesis examines the relationship between the categories of wisdom and apocalyptic in the Letter of James in view of a critical assessment of *4QInstruction*. The decision to study *4QInstruction* is based on the understanding that it represents an important and relatively fresh example of a composition that also expresses views that may be labeled “apocalyptic”. *4QInstruction* is framed in such a way throughout this thesis as to allow implications to be drawn for James. Therefore, James, a so-called “wisdom” New Testament text that many scholars have struggled to situate among various traditions during the period, is considered in light of a sustained study of the Second Temple sapiential tradition, and, particularly, its inclusion of apocalyptic. This thesis is structured in two parts. Part One comprises of Chapters One to Three and provides the context and justification for the study to follow. Part Two is made up of Chapters Four to Six, which investigate: (1) the pursuit of wisdom, an admonition that is central to both writings (i.e. Chapter Four), (2) who this wisdom is made available to (i.e. Chapter Five), and (3) the internal and external obstacles that are present in the world which may impede upon a person’s pursuit of wisdom (i.e. Chapter Six).

Chapter One traces the historical development of wisdom in terms of its overall theoretical framework and its generic counterpart. Attention is given to the problematic nature of the terms “wisdom”, “apocalyptic”, and “eschatology” in order to begin to clarify how others use them, and how I use them in this study. The inclusion of the latter two terms is justified because the wisdom tradition develops and transforms into a place where these components become intertwined. Notably, the contributions of the SBL *Wisdom and Apocalypticism*

Group are also discussed.¹ The findings of this SBL group are especially pertinent to this current study because this group acknowledges that the categories of wisdom, eschatology, and apocalyptic are all present in both *4QInstruction* and James, but it fails to assess or critically engage with these writings in relation to one another.² This lacuna in biblical scholarship is the impetus of this study and what follows is one step in filling it.

Chapter Two situates *4QInstruction* in terms of the wisdom and apocalyptic debate, and begins to demonstrate its significance for James. A survey of all recent and salient scholarship, in terms of the application of the categories of wisdom and apocalyptic carried out on *4QInstruction*, is presented. Chapter Two establishes that *4QInstruction* is a central writing in terms of compelling scholars to re-evaluate how the categories of wisdom and apocalyptic are understood, and, despite having only been made available in a critical edition in 1999, much significant and pioneering work has already been carried out in relation to this previously unknown Second Temple Jewish composition.³

Chapter Three focuses on the Letter of James. It is examined in light of the category of the development of wisdom and its amalgamation of apocalyptic constructs. Much of this analysis stems from a critical assessment of *4QInstruction* in Chapter Two. The aim of Chapter Three is to demonstrate the potential *4QInstruction* has for, and to explicate the applicability of James, to this overall study. Although James is clearly not “apocalyptic”, John Collins observes that at times, the apocalyptic “worldview could also come to expression in other genres, that were not directly reports of visions or otherworldly

¹ See Benjamin G. Wright and Lawrence M. Wills, eds., *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005). See §1.4.1.

² Included in *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism* are two essays that discuss James, and one that looks at *4QInstruction*. For those that discuss James see Patrick J. Hartin “‘Who is Wise and Understanding Among us?’ (James 3:13): An Analysis of Wisdom, Eschatology and Apocalypticism in the Letter of James,” 149-168; Patrick A. Tiller, “The Rich and Poor in James: An Apocalyptic Ethic,” 169-180. In relation to the essay on *4QInstruction* see Matthew J. Goff, “Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and the Pedagogical Ethos of *4QInstruction*,” 57-68.

³ *4QInstruction* was only officially published in a critical edition in 1999. See John Strugnell and Daniel J. Harrington, eds., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2. 4QInstruction: 4Q415 ff.* (With a re-edition of *1Q26* by Torleif Elgvin. *DJD* 34; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999). See §2.1.

journeys.”⁴ Moreover, according to Collins, the essential ingredients of an apocalyptic worldview:

were a reliance on supernatural revelation, over and above received tradition and human reasoning; a sense that human affairs are determined to a great degree by supernatural agents; and the belief that human life is subject to divine judgment, culminating in reward or punishment after death.⁵

Therefore, much of this thesis exemplifies Collin’s observation of an apocalyptic worldview in relation to James, stemming largely from a critical assessment of *4QInstruction*. As is the case in Chapter Two, a presentation of all recent and relevant scholarship that discusses the categories of wisdom and apocalyptic in relation to James is offered in Chapter Three. In this context, the contributions of Patrick Hartin and Todd Penner are especially important.⁶ Although both scholars helpfully apply the categories of wisdom, eschatology and apocalyptic to James, it is argued that their contributions are limited because they appear to insist that one category must be dominant or controlling of the other. While this thesis views *4QInstruction* and James primarily as wisdom compositions, it is not necessary to consider the inclusion of apocalyptic motifs as subordinate; on the contrary, the inclusion of these apocalyptic aspects have a transformative effect on the category of wisdom.

Part Two of this thesis is comprised of three chapters, all of which are closely related to one another. In the introduction of a recent (i.e. 2017) edited volume entitled *The Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition and the Shaping of New Testament Thought*, the editors, Benjamin E. Reynolds and Loren T. Stuckenbruck discuss the possibility of considering the disclosure of the cosmos and of wisdom as “apocalyptic.” They comment: “Wisdom and the revelation of wisdom have long been recognized as contributing, in some way, to Jewish

⁴ John J. Collins, “From Prophecy to Apocalypticism: The Expectation of the End,” in *The Continuum History of Apocalypticism* (ed. John J. Collins; London: Continuum, 2003), 129-161, 157.

⁵ Collins, “From Prophecy to Apocalypticism,” 157.

⁶ See Patrick J. Hartin, *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999); Todd C. Penner, *The Epistle of James and Eschatology: Re-reading an Ancient Christian Letter* (JSNTSS 121; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996). See §3.1.1.

apocalyptic tradition.”⁷ Although the majority of this thesis was completed before this volume was produced, it is interesting to note that Part Two of this thesis is concerned largely with the revealing of wisdom and its association with the apocalyptic tradition. This is especially true of Chapter Four which examines the portrayal of the revealing of wisdom in James 1:5, the significance of the differentiation made between earthly and heavenly wisdom in James 3:13-18, and how σοφία ἄνωθεν is to be understood in relation to the Moasic Torah in light of *4QInstruction* and its representation of the same theme.

Having established the significance of the revealing of wisdom in terms of the interpretation of James as a whole, Chapter Five proceeds by exploring the recipients of this wisdom. This chapter asks: who is given revelation? Moreover, in terms of the faithful communities portrayed in James and *4QInstruction*, is the language of “inclusion” or “exclusion” more appropriate? In other words, is it a matter of “getting in” or “staying in”? If differences emerge between these two writings in terms of inclusion or exclusion, what implication(s) does this have when it comes to interpreting James?

In Chapter Six the closely associated topics of sin and evil in James come into focus. The concepts/traditions that may have influenced the author are explored. The inclusion of this question is warranted because James portrays humanity as having an apparent proclivity to sin and evil, and this apparent inherent proclivity may be assessed in terms of the potential earthly and otherworldly obstructions one may experience in terms of their pursuit of wisdom. In other words, this proclivity to evil has consequences in terms of the recipients’ pursuit of wisdom and their inclusion among God’s faithful community. This proclivity to sin and evil is presented as having internal (i.e. Jas 1:8, 14; 4:8) and external (i.e. Jas 2:19; 4:7) dimensions, and both of these dimensions, alongside the understanding that both are ongoing and continuous, may be understood to place one’s pursuit of wisdom, and their place among the faithful, in jeopardy.

In conclusion, this thesis assesses James in light of *4QInstruction* in view of the scholarly re-assessments of the categories of wisdom and apocalyptic in

⁷ Benjamin E. Reynolds and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, eds., *The Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition and the Shaping of New Testament Thought* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2017), 7. See Chapter Four.

early Judaism, with the understanding that a more nuanced interpretation or appreciation of James will emerge. With the exception of one short article written by Darian Lockett entitled “The Spectrum of Wisdom and Eschatology in the Epistle of James and 4QInstruction” dating from 2005, no work to date has studied these two writings in relation to one another, nor explored the potential one may have for the other in light of the developments made in terms of the wisdom and apocalyptic debate.⁸ It is my hope that this thesis, although only an initial contribution, is the first step in reading James within emerging scholarship on early Jewish wisdom developments. Equally, it is now over five hundred years since the Reformation, and Martin Luther’s infamous damning evaluation of the Letter of James, it is hence also my hope that this thesis will serve to reaffirm the significance of this small New Testament writing, most especially in terms of the potential contribution it can make to our understanding of Second Temple Judaism’s impact on early Christianity.

Before moving on to the following six chapters, one final point is worth noting; Chapter One discusses how the categories of wisdom and apocalyptic are no longer considered non-complementary categories. While this is accurate, it is fair to say that the ramifications of this statement have been seen to be more significant for Jewish apocalyptic. In other words, while much has been written on Jewish apocalyptic, its Christian counterpart remains (somewhat) ambiguous and largely unexplored, or at least, it is the case that the co-existence of wisdom and apocalyptic has not yet fully been explored in terms of early Christianity. This topic is returned to in the General Conclusions of this thesis, but in this present context, it is worth noting that it is hoped that this present study of James will also start to remedy this.

⁸ See Darian Lockett, “The Spectrum of Wisdom and Eschatology in the Epistle of James and 4QInstruction,” *TynBul* 56 (2005): 131-148. See §3.1.2.

Chapter One: Theoretical Approaches to Wisdom and Apocalyptic

Introduction

This chapter will trace the historical development of wisdom in terms of its overall theoretical framework and its generic existence. To do this, inherently flawed and vague terms, especially “wisdom”, “apocalyptic”, and “eschatology”, will be discussed. Including apocalyptic and eschatology is justified because, as this chapter will demonstrate, the wisdom tradition develops and transforms into a place where components such as these become part and parcel. In many respects, a large part of this chapter is devoted to an evaluation of the overall scholarly contributions to the fields of wisdom, apocalyptic, and eschatology, while at the same time I endeavor to specify exactly what is meant by the adjectives “wisdom”, “apocalyptic” and “eschatological”. Fixed terminological definitions of these phenomena are necessitated by the lack of consistency with which scholars use their associated words.¹ All language is imperfect and while terms will be problematized it will soon become apparent that they cannot altogether be abandoned; that is to say, they are categories of convenience.

Attention to scholarly categories serves as a point of departure when assessing the transitional status of wisdom. In addition to conveying the advances that have been made in scholarship, I highlight the work that still needs to be done. The aim is not so much to resolve any of the problems outlined, as such a goal is both presumptuous and unrealistic, but rather to seek to establish a clear methodology that will serve when studying *4QInstruction* (1Q26; 4Q415-418, 423) and the Letter of James.² At the very least, I endeavour to attain to a consistency and transparency in my use of language.

¹ Indeed as Richard A. Horsely and Patrick A. Tiller note, it would “be difficult to find any two prominent concepts in biblical studies that are more vague in their lack of definition, more careless in their lack of application, and more diverse in their understanding by biblical interpreters than wisdom and apocalyptic(ism).” See Richard A. Horsely and Patrick A. Tiller, *After Apocalyptic and Wisdom: Rethinking Texts in Context* (Eugene: Cascade Books, 2012), 1.

² *4QInstruction* was officially published in volume 34 of the *Discoveries of the Judean Desert* in 1999. See DJD: 34.

Comment: Assessing the Task Before Us

It is accurate to say that much of this chapter is concerned with discussing the wisdom and apocalyptic traditions. However, before moving on to this task, it is first important to acknowledge a number of caveats. Firstly, Stuart Weeks, amongst others, has recently questioned whether it is possible, and indeed appropriate, to discuss “wisdom”, in terms of a corpus of literature, influence, and as a genre. He calls the usefulness of this very category into question and argues that it is almost impossible to identify a coherency in wisdom literature. For him, the wisdom corpus is made up of miscellaneous books that can be associated with some more general human endeavour. He comments:

If “wisdom literature” refers to an ill-defined corpus, the members of which adopt different views and different styles . . . then perhaps it is time we stopped using such terms altogether . . . I suspect that much the same might be said of other terms, like “apocalyptic literature”, . . . Whilst it is not impossible that there was some self-consciously distinct wisdom tradition with its own all-embracing worldview and its own social and cultural location within early Judaism, labeling a group of texts “wisdom” does not make it so.”³

Weeks is wise to err on the side of caution in terms of using sapiential, and indeed apocalyptic, labels. Identifying a coherency in wisdom literature is exceptionally difficult, but this does not necessarily infer it is an entirely arbitrary task. For Weeks, it is important that any perceived wisdom text be viewed individually, and hence not set against a miscellaneous corpus of literature. Therefore, Weeks argues that if a writing resembles Proverbs, we should then be nominalist and say it resembles Proverbs, as opposed to proposing

³ Stuart Weeks, “Is ‘Wisdom Literature’ A Useful Category?” in *Tracing Sapiential Traditions in Ancient Judaism* (eds., Hindy Najman, Jean-Sébastien Rey and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar; JSJSup 174; Leiden: Brill, 2016), 3-23, 22. See also Mark Sneed, “Is the ‘Wisdom Tradition’ a Tradition?” *CBQ* 73 (2011): 50-71; idem, *Was There a Wisdom Tradition? New Perspectives in Israelite Wisdom Studies*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature Press, 2015; Michael V. Fox, “Who Can Learn? A Dispute in Ancient Pedagogy,” in *Wisdom You Are My Sister: Studies in Honor of Roland E. Murphy, O. Carm., on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday* (ed. Michael L. Barré; CBQMS 29; Washington DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1997), 62-77.

it resembles the wisdom tradition in general.⁴ For him, this must involve looking at other useful generic classifications such as “instruction” or “sentence literature”. These more specific genre classifications may occur in more than one genre. Once this cataloging is established, specific themes may be isolated with the aim of enhancing one’s interpretation of the writing. Weeks’ insistence on viewing writings individually is helpful and compelling.

Secondly, as will become clear below, much debate surrounds the theory behind literary genres. This is especially the case when it comes to the wisdom genre, and while its existence is called into question by some scholars (cf. §1.2.2. – 1.2.3.), this chapter is more concerned with presenting the scholarly analysis and theory surrounding this so-called genre, than it is with affirming or denying its existence. The relevance of this scholarly theory is especially met with when we come to later discussing the ideas and forms encountered in *4QInstruction* and James in Chapter Two.⁵ Moreover, this subsequent discussion in Chapter Two relates back to Weeks’ emphasis on clearer formal classifications such as instruction.

It is helpful to note that, an exclusive emphasis on discussing genre, whether it be wisdom or apocalyptic, has resulted in scholars failing to recognize that investigations moving beyond the question of these genres are often more insightful. For example, in the case of wisdom, understanding that wisdom represents a broad category, one under which many works may belong, various genres operate, and numerous analogies in terms of content be included, can yield more fruitful results. Moreover, considering wisdom as a broad category serves to demonstrate the diversity of wisdom in terms of its overall category and associated literature. Throughout this thesis wisdom is viewed as a vast spectrum containing numerous multifaceted trajectories. In addition, this thesis argues that the co-existence of wisdom and apocalyptic encountered in writings such as *4QInstruction* and James is representative of one distinct trajectory in the development of Jewish and Christian wisdom traditions. However, my analysis intends to move past viewing these two writings in generic terms associated with wisdom and apocalyptic exclusively. Rather, this thesis aims to base its analysis

⁴ Weeks, “Is ‘Wisdom Literature’ A Useful Category?” 23.

⁵ See §2.1.1.2. and §2.2.1.3.

on significant similarities between *4QInstruction* and James in terms of their content.

It is equally important to note that this chapter, and by extension Chapters Two and Three, intend to offer an informed *status quaestionis*. It is my view for the former to be achieved it is first essential to present a thorough discussion of both wisdom and apocalyptic. This will involve discussing their adjectival use, their theoretical worldviews and their hypothetical generic form. This is made necessary because of modern scholarship's preoccupation with identifying tangible genres. More precisely, this apparent need to identify distinguishable genres is especially applicable when discussing the wisdom and apocalyptic debate because the co-existence of these two categories has often been characterized by attempts to define the wisdom genre, and this genre is believed to have a particular worldview. As will be demonstrated in §1.4.1. it is reasonable to argue that this has complicated the task. Problematizing this approach, most especially when it is the exclusive methodology adapted, and highlighting its shortcomings, is returned to later in the chapter.

In terms of wisdom, and which is now most likely becoming obvious, attempting to provide a precise explanation or definition of what exactly is meant when a work is described in terms of the wisdom genre remains an arduous task.⁶ The difficulties encountered when attempting to define this genre may be attributed to, as James L. Crenshaw notes, "the variety of phenomena that employ the Hebrew word *hokmah* and similar ideas in the ancient Near East".⁷ The difficulties of defining the category of wisdom, in terms of understanding this general category and its genre, are not to be glossed over, but included in the corpus of literature that is commonly identified as wisdom, is the quest for self-understanding and mastery of the world.⁸ Elsewhere, and somewhat despairingly

⁶ When attempting to define wisdom, a number of questions or enquiries need to be in focus: what exactly is wisdom? Is it an appropriate biblical category? Does its definition derive from form critical, historical, or material evidence? Is it a distinct social movement, a secular stance on life, a literary convention, or merely the presence of intellectual tradition in Israel. Cf., Gerald T. Sheppard, *Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct: A Study of the Sapientializing of the Old Testament* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1980), 3.

⁷ James L. Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction* (London: SCM Press, 1970), 17.

⁸ Cf. Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom*, 16.

it might be added, Crenshaw comments that an “adequate definition of wisdom eludes interpreters of the OT”.⁹ Perhaps Crenshaw’s comments are most worthy of noting because they beg the question why it is so hard to define the category of wisdom in terms of its associated genre. These difficulties may be attributed to different factors, including the evolution and traditions deriving from various Ancient Near East (henceforth ANE) counterparts and influences from differing regions. Moreover, perhaps a definition defies so many because such definitions fail to take into account the transitional status of wisdom. Despite its lack of appeal, the task of [attempting to define](#) the wisdom genre and discussing the general sapiential tradition remains necessary [in the interests of offering context for subsequent chapters](#). These topics are treated in Parts One and Two of this chapter.

When it comes to the adjective “apocalyptic”, and its associated genre, the same difficulties are met with in terms of identifying a universally agreed upon definition. While various definitions of “apocalyptic”, in relation to its genre and adjectival use, have been put forward, it is fair to say that there remains no uniformed agreement in terms of its acceptable use and application. The continued uncertainty surrounding “apocalyptic” is the focus of Part Three of this chapter. In addition, in Part Four I will demonstrate that, while the scholarly understanding of genres has improved considerably in recent years, the realization of the categories of wisdom and apocalyptic as being mutually inclusive of one another, and not as previously understood as being incompatible, has not been fully reached or applied to the category of Christian apocalyptic. As we shall see, the compatibility of wisdom and apocalyptic, in terms of genre and

⁹ See James L. Crenshaw, “Wisdom in the OT,” *IDB*: 952-956. Cf. Christopher M. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies in Q* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 331, n. 21. However, Crenshaw continues and offers the following evaluation of wisdom: “Wisdom shares a common vocabulary with prophetic, priestly discourse, and historiography. Certain words are universal, hence cannot be used to establish wisdom influence. Into this category of common linguistic stock fall such words as knowledge and intelligence, good and bad, wisdom and folly, obedience and disobedience. Impoverished indeed is the language of any group without such words. Even when an Israelite is called a wise man or woman, it does not necessarily imply a technical use of the adjective.” Crenshaw, “Wisdom in the OT,” 953.

worldview, will be particularly relevant when the Letter of James is in focus in Chapter Two, and throughout the remainder of this thesis.

This chapter, and by extension, this entire thesis, is situated in the general wisdom and apocalyptic discussion that has been taking place in recent years. To be more specific, this thesis looks at the wisdom and apocalyptic discussion in terms of how it relates to the Letter of James stemming largely from analysis carried out on *4QInstruction*, with the understanding that *4QInstruction* represents or serves as one example of a Second Temple Jewish wisdom text with an apocalyptic worldview.¹⁰ In terms of the general wisdom and apocalyptic discussion, the limitations of this discussion are acknowledged throughout, but the legitimacy of this approach is also affirmed. While Matthew Goff argues that genres are best viewed or identified as “a heuristic construct we develop to make a wide range of texts intelligible”,¹¹ throughout this thesis it is argued that wisdom and apocalyptic, in terms of genre and worldview, are better understood as being contemporary theoretical tools, used by authors, that enable both ancient and modern-day readers to engage with a writing. It is essential to keep this understanding of theoretical tools in mind. Therefore, a limited usefulness and relevance of the wisdom and apocalyptic genres is affirmed throughout.

One final point is deserving of comment; my methodology also seeks to move beyond a discussion of genres. It is my view that such discussions only get one so far. It will become clear that much of the wisdom and apocalyptic debate to date, that is the co-existence of these two categories, has been preoccupied with attempts to define wisdom as a genre (see §1.4.1.). Rather, if wisdom is considered a broad category, to which common ideas and forms belong, the contextual task of this thesis (i.e. reading James in light of *4QInstruction*) is made less complicated. If we read *4QInstruction* and James as possibly participating in other genre classifications (e.g. instruction and epistle) that may belong to a broader category (i.e. wisdom), we are hence looking past the

¹⁰ Harrington argues that *4QInstruction* contains “wisdom in an apocalyptic context”. See Daniel J. Harrington, “Wisdom and Apocalyptic in 4QInstruction and 4 Ezra,” in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition* (ed. Florentino Garcia Martínez; BETL 168; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003), 355, 343-357.

¹¹ Matthew J. Goff, “Qumran Wisdom Literature and the Problem of Genre,” *DSD* 17 (2010): 315-335, 334.

exclusive generic framework of both.¹² In other words, *4QInstruction* and James are two writings that may partially belong to specific macro genres, but what is more important is that both may be included in the broader wisdom category. Furthermore, while these writings are not identical, notable similarities exist between the two. These similarities enable us to recognize the progression and transitional nature of wisdom, while also offering us an interpretative background and context when seeking to explain so-called anomalies in James, such as the emphasis on the need to ask for wisdom in James 1:5.¹³

1.1. Form Criticism and the Emergence of Genre Theory

Although they are imperfect tools, genres remain necessary for structuring our categories. Since the wisdom genre is one focus of this investigation, comments on how genre theory came into being are useful. Much of modern biblical scholarship, including genre theory and its lineage, is shaped by the Enlightenment, since which biblical criticism was crystalized; the study of the Bible took on a positivistic approach to knowledge, and historical critical approaches were shaped by a quest to establish historical fact. Various critical methods such as redaction, narrative and historical criticism were developed and applied to biblical texts with greater regularity.¹⁴ Form criticism emerged from historical criticism and its development can be attributed to historical criticism reaching an *impasse*, chiefly because of the excesses of source analysis. The origins of form criticism lie in a desire to create a critical method that aims to identify and analyze units of originally oral discourse that have been incorporated into ancient texts.¹⁵ It is important to note that the application of

¹² *4QInstruction*'s genre is discussed in §2.1.1.2. and the genre of James is discussed in §2.2.1.3.

¹³ See §4.1.1.

¹⁴ More often than not, questions relating to dating, authorship, and if pseudepigraphical texts should be regarded as forgeries, were at the centre of investigations. Moreover, biblical criticism before the Enlightenment has a long pre-history: e.g. see James L. Kugel, "The Bible in the University," in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpretation* (eds., W. H. Propp, B. Halpern and D. N. Freedman; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 143-165; *idem*, *Early Biblical Interpretation* (Philadelphia: Westminster, Press, 1986); John W. Rogerson, *Old Testament Criticism in the Nineteen Century; England and Germany* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985).

¹⁵ For a detailed discussion of form criticism see Edgar V. McKnight, *What is Form Criticism?* (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 1997); Paul R. House, ed., *Beyond Form Criticism: Essays in Old*

form criticism, which is associated primarily with Herman Gunkel (1862-1932), is limited.¹⁶ For example, Gunkel considered genres to exist in a pure form, and argued that each genre stemmed from a unique *Sitz im Leben*.¹⁷ However, recent literary theory has problematized understanding genres in this way. But, for Gunkel, the relationship between form and context was considered inflexible.¹⁸ Nevertheless, the value of form criticism remains intact and it continues profoundly to shape our interaction with genre theory.¹⁹

At first, form criticism was interested in oral genres, but it developed, and most significantly, it evolved to address itself to the literary genre represented in numerous writings and/or pericopae. The concern of form criticism was hence to establish the function of that literary genre and how it was designed to serve in the life of the community and/or individual. Frequently, form critical approaches are accused of having a generalizing tendency. Perhaps, this is because, as suggested by James Muilenburg, form criticism is primarily “concerned with what is common to all representations of a genre, and therefore applies an external measure to the individual pericopes [*sic*]. It does not focus sufficient attention upon what is unique and unrepeatable, upon the particularity of the formation.”²⁰ Despite the categories and parameters that Gunkel applied when discussing genres being now considered as too narrow, emerging from these inadequacies is an awareness that form and genres need to be read dynamically.

Testament Literary Criticism (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992); Marvin A. Sweeney and Ehud Ben Zvi, eds., *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty First Century* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003).

¹⁶ See Hermann Gunkel, “The Literature of Ancient Israel,” in *Rethinking the Text: Interdisciplinary and Form-Critical Insights on the Bible* (eds. Timothy J. Sandoval, Carleen Mandolfo, and Martin J. Buss; JSOTSup 384; London: Clark, 2003), 26-83.

¹⁷ See Kenton L. Sparks, *Ancient Texts for the Study of the Hebrew Bible: A Guide to the Background Literature* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2005).

¹⁸ See Sparks, *Ancient Texts for the Study of the Hebrew Bible*, 6-7.

¹⁹ A proficient examination of form criticism during various historical periods can be found in Martin J. Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism in Its Context* (JSOTSup 274; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999).

²⁰ James Muilenburg, “Form Criticism and Beyond,” in *Beyond Form Criticism: Essays in Old Testament Literary Criticism*, 49-70, 54.

This involves recognising that any given text has contextual relationships and is responsive to related texts and forms.²¹

In many respects, genres are a contemporary theoretical phenomenon and, by virtue of their very nature, an inevitable fuzziness or confusion cannot be escaped. According to Collins, most debates concerning genre revolve around one or both of these issues: (1) concerns for the delimitation of genres; and/or (2) the question of their function.²² While the understanding of genres being a contemporary theoretical phenomenon is stressed throughout this thesis, the task of examining how a text is determined as participating in any given genre, or the implied expectations of that genre, remains essential. According to Alastair Fowler, there are three stages of a genre's development. Firstly, the genre assembles itself until a form type emerges. Secondly, the form is used and adapted consciously, and thirdly there is a secondary use of its form, by ironic inversion, or by subordinating it to a new context.²³ In practice, these phases overlap and very often Fowler is sometimes accused of succumbing to "organistic fallacy."²⁴ Fowler's desire to trace the development of genres into three neat steps might be viewed as over-scrupulous, but it does serve as a solid footing against which the maturity of any given genre might be traced.

How we assess any piece of writing is influenced by our perceptions of genre. Moreover, how one identifies the genre of a text shapes its meaning. At

²¹ While outlining the future of form criticism, John Sweeney and Ehud Ben Zvi comment: "Moreover, in considering the rhetorical or communicative aspects of texts, form-critical scholars will no longer presume that genres are static or ideal entities that never change. Rather, they will recognize the inherent fluidity of genres, the fact that they are historically, culturally, and discursively dependent, and they will study the means by which the genres are transformed to meet the needs of the particular communicative situation of the text." Sweeney and Ben Zvi, *The Changing Face of Form Criticism*, 9-10.

²² John J. Collins, "Epilogue: Genre Analysis and the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 17 (2010): 418-430, 420-421.

²³ Alastair Fowler, *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genre and Modes* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 170-190.

²⁴ For example see David Fishelov, *Metaphors of Genre: The Role of Analogies in Genre Theory* (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press, 1993), 28; cf., John J. Collins, "The Genre Apocalypse Reconsidered" (paper presented at Manchester University, 2009), 1-25, 16. I would like to thank Prof Collins for kindly sending me a copy of this paper via email in February 2013.

the forefront of all genre theory is the recognition that genres are a means of communication, and each genre brings with it a set of expectations. Carol Newsom notes that “we have almost never made explicit what questions we are trying to investigate when we talk about genre and thus what particular approach to genre we find most helpful.”²⁵ Most recently, a significant percentage of literary theorists have begun to understand genres as an *action*. In the field of rhetoric, in particular, genre is often constructed as a pattern of responses that both the audience and author will recognize as appropriate in a specific situation. This might emphasize the community and the social setting from which the text originates. Molly Zahn observes:

If genre is defined as a typified action, as a way in which an author or language user responds to a given situation, or for a means of communication and meaning making, then it follows that genre must be meaningful at the level of the author and audience . . . the “genre” of the Second Temple period properly denotes a category or pattern that would have been recognizable to Second Temple writers and/or their audiences, not simply as a category that we modern scholars have developed for our own heuristic purposes.²⁶

Zahn’s above comments are noteworthy because she argues that, throughout the Second Temple period, authors were consciously participating in or contributing to known literary patterns. This former observation is helpful because it raises the possibility that some ancient authors were thus purposefully adhering to and/or developing the distinguishable traits of a given literary pattern. Moreover, Zahn’s above comments make it credible to propose that ancient authors were hence consciously participating in the development and on-going use of genres.²⁷

²⁵ Carol M. Newsom, “Pairing Research Questions and Theories of Genre: A Case Study of the Hodayot,” *DSD* 17 (2010): 270-288, 272.

²⁶ Molly M. Zahn, “Genre and Rewritten Scripture: A Reassessment,” *JBL* 131 (2012): 271-288, 280.

²⁷ Similarly Goff refers to Josephus, who during his famous summary of the Bible as he knew it, after the law and the prophets, argues there are four additional books that contain “precepts for the conduct of human life” (*Ag. Ap.* 1.40). Goff argues that the point here is “to acknowledge that [Josephus] had some understanding, however vague, of a category of literature that roughly

The usefulness of genres for both ancient and modern readers and writers alike is therefore affirmed.

Newsom identifies six ways to consider the question of genre: (1) classification; (2) family resemblance model; (3) as a mode of comprehension; (4) the role of genre communication, or as it is often referred to, “Prototype Theory”; (5) viewing genres as distinct modes of perception or as ways of constructing meaningful worlds; and (6) discussing the dialogic natures of genres in a fashion that is both synchronic and diachronic. It is important to note, as she does, that these approaches to genre are neither exhaustive, nor are they strictly separate to one another.²⁸ Newsom’s ability to identify six ways of viewing and discussing genres is valuable, and more often than not, the six methods she categorizes are mixed and overlap. These approaches will now be considered briefly.

1.1.1. Classification

The method of classification continues to prove popular among genre theorists.²⁹ According to Zahn, adopting the classificatory method involves viewing genres as “tools for the classification of texts, with each genre constituting a box or pigeonhole into which texts with the same characteristics could be placed.”³⁰ In practice, this traditional view of genres tends to break down in the face of “real” writings or literature. Commonly, such texts appear to mix genres, omit supposedly essential features of that genre, and often contain elements that are traditionally perceived as being at odds with the alleged genre.³¹ Jaques Derrida maintains that a text cannot simply belong to a genre; rather he chooses to speak of a type of participation without belonging:

approximates our designation ‘wisdom literature’”. See Goff, “Qumran Wisdom Literature and the Problem of Genre,” 303.

²⁸ Newsom, “Pairing Research Questions,” 276.

²⁹ Newsom refers to this method in terms of having “amazing resistance”. Newsom, “Pairing Research Questions,” 272.

³⁰ Zahn, “Genre and Rewritten Scripture,” 276.

³¹ Cf., Fowler, *Kinds of Literature*, 38-39.

A text cannot belong to no genre, it cannot be without or less a genre. Every text participates in one or several genres, there is no genreless text; there is always genre, yet such participation never amounts to belonging. And not because of an abundant overflowing or free, anarchic and unclassifiable productivity, but because of the *trait* of participation itself, because of the effect of the code and of the genres mark. Making genres its mark, a text demarcates itself. If marks of belonging belong without belonging, then genre-designations cannot be simply part of the corpus.³²

The traditional interpretation of genres being a clearly demarcated textual category, and the possibility of its identification by the presence of specific and distinctive formal features can no longer be upheld. Classificatory approaches cannot be ruled out entirely, but the importance attributed to their results need to be minimized. Fowler notes that, “if literature is generally organized, genres are likely to have some taxonomic application. But it turns out . . . to be unexpectedly limited.”³³ Recently, literary theorists have begun to highlight how flexible the categories of genre can be. A shift away from understanding genres in taxonomical terms, to recognising that they are fundamental to all human interpretation and communication, including literature, is evident.³⁴ In this sense, as noted by Zahn, genres are instruments “not of classification or prescription, but of meaning – they are used, reproduced, and manipulated to communicate in specific ways with their authors.”³⁵ Appropriately, Fowler and Zahn postulate that compositions can participate in multiple genres simultaneously. Henceforth, there is no longer any need to argue that a text belongs to a particular genre exclusively.³⁶

³² Jacques Derrida, “The Law of Genre,” in *Modern Genre Theory* (ed., David Duff; London: Pearson Education, 2000), 219-232, 230.

³³ Fowler, *Kinds of Literature*, 37-41.

³⁴ Cf., Zahn, “Rewritten Scripture,” 280.

³⁵ Zahn, “Rewritten Scripture,” 280.

³⁶ Fowler once remarked that a genre is “much less of a pigeonhole than a pigeon.” Fowler, *Kinds of Literature*, 37. Zahn expands on Fowler’s observation and proposes that genres may be more appropriately regarded as flocks of pigeons. Each bird in the flock can be seen as representing an individual text associated with a genre. She continues: “Just as flock of pigeons might change shape, lose and add members, be absorbed into larger flocks or break apart into several smaller flocks, genres and their boundaries are not static. Furthermore, just as pigeons can fly off on their

1.1.2. Family Resemblance Model

The family resemblance model is based on generic analogy. Although the individual elements may have no single trait in common, a network of overlapping similar traits can identify an ostensibly disparate group as having family resemblance.³⁷ It is built upon Ludwig Wittgenstein's discussion of what is common to the variety of things we call games, including ball games, word games, card games etc. We know that word games are different to ball games and yet we use the same word to describe both; hence he draws an affinity between them, which leads him to conjecture that games form a type of family.

In many respects, the family resemblance model was a counter-measure to classification theory,³⁸ which in terms of genre, can show a linear relationship among texts: A resembles B, B resembles C, C resembles D etc. One criticism often leveled against this approach is that by the end A and D, or indeed Z, could look very different and it is difficult to see why they would ever have been grouped together in the one classification in the first place. As John Swales remarks, "family resemblance theory can make anything resemble anything."³⁹ However, this particular approach does have considerable appeal. In relation to this thesis, subsequent chapters will argue that notable similarities exist between *4QInstruction* and the Letter of James, and in this respect, the family resemblance model might be viewed as informing my initial analysis. However, it is fair to say that the benefits of the family resemblance model are most often felt in comparative studies. Hence, the applicability of the family resemblance

own or join another flock or go back and forth between flocks, texts are no longer seen as 'belonging' to a single genre. Instead, we can speak of texts 'participating' in genres: dipping to them, employing their elements in modified fashion, combining them." Zahn, "Rewritten Scripture," 277. Interestingly, Collins has since pointed out that Fowler's quip concerning pigeonholes is not so much a rejection of classification, as it is an objection to its rigidity. See Collins, "Epilogue," 421.

³⁷ It should be noted that some of this language is borrowed from Newsom. See Newsom, "Pairing Research Questions," 271.

³⁸ See Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1958); Newsom, "Pairing Research Questions," 273.

³⁹ John Swales, *Genre Analysis: Research English in Academia and Research Settings* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1990), 51.

model for this study might be seen as being especially limited because this thesis serves as more than a comparative study.

1.1.3. A Mode of Comprehension

Persons intuitively compare A with B as a way of making sense of both. Therefore, either consciously or subconsciously, persons engage in a type of intertextuality that helps to locate a specific writing or text in relation to others. Jonathan Culler notes: “A work can only be read in connection with or against other texts, which provide a grid through which it is read and structured by establishing expectations which enable one to pick salient features and give them a structure.”⁴⁰ In this way, this perception of the relationship between these texts is the sense of the genre that facilitates the comprehension of texts with which one is not familiar. Although intertextuality may be viewed as helpful, it is, as Newsom notes, “. . . based on a hypothetical sense rather than an empirical finding of how readers actually acquire a sense of genre, and in fact it is in some way mistaken about the nature of this process.”⁴¹

1.1.4. Genres as Distinct Modes of Perception and/or Constructing Meaningful Worlds

Viewing genres as distinct modes of perception and/or constructing meaningful worlds has its origins with Pavel Medvedev who comments; “every genre has its methods and means of seeing and conceptualizing reality, which are accessible to it alone. . . . The process of seeing and conceptualizing reality must not be severed from the process of embodying it in the form of a particular genre.”⁴² Although this approach stresses the cognitive function of genre, it is less concerned with genre acquisition than it is with the constructive power of the genre. In this sense, as Newsom notes, genres can be seen as a form of “knowing” and conceptualizing the world.⁴³

⁴⁰ Jonathan Culler, *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics and the Study of Literature* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975), 147.

⁴¹ Newsom, “Spying Out the Land,” 23-24.

⁴² Pavel M. Medvedev, *The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship: A Critical Introduction to Sociological Poetics*. (trans. A. Wehrle; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978), 133.

⁴³ See Newsom, “Pairing Research Questions,” 275

1.1.5. Prototype Theory

Collins describes prototype theory as having “considerable appeal”, a comment that begins to demonstrate the popularity enjoyed by this particular approach.⁴⁴ Its acceptance may be attributed to two main reasons: (1) it offers a seemingly realistic means of understanding the relationship(s) between writings and genres; and (2) it allows one to formulate coherent theories when dealing with examples of mixed genres. Derived from cognitive science, and involving a compilation of a list of features that each member of a group must contain, prototype theory, as Benjamin Wright notes, “suggests that one of the ways that human beings organize conceptual and semantic spaces is by recognising or identifying prototypical exemplars that together create a template against which other possible groups are judged.”⁴⁵

A classic example in the field concerns the way in which people think of the category of birds. Empirical studies indicate that, when people were asked to identify a prototype for “bird,” even though people in different continents identified different species, they tended to identify a small bird (e.g., robin, sparrow).⁴⁶ Thus a robin or sparrow might be referred to as a typical member. With the example of a bat fitting this category, the ambiguity of genres is witnessed. A bat is an atypical member and its inclusion is not straightforward, but it nevertheless belongs to this overall category.⁴⁷ Consequently Newsom aptly discerns, “membership in a category may be a matter of degree.”⁴⁸ In relation to genre, prototype theory requires the identification of the exemplars that function as prototypes, as well as the analysis of, Newsom explains, “the privileged properties that establish the sense of typicality that those exemplars evoke”.⁴⁹ Prototype theory extends beyond the parameters of classification in that it involves more than simply compiling a list of features, it also requires

⁴⁴ Collins, “The Genre Apocalypse Reconsidered,” 13.

⁴⁵ Benjamin G. Wright, “Joining the Club: A Suggestion about Genre in Early Jewish Texts,” *DSD* 17 (2010): 289-314, 292.

⁴⁶ Cf. Newsom, “Pairing Research Questions,” 274.

⁴⁷ Cf. Wright, “Joining the Club,” 293.

⁴⁸ Carol M. Newsom, “Spying out the Land: A Report from Genealogy,” in *Bakhtin and Genre Theory in Biblical Studies* (ed., Roland Boer; Atlanta: SBL, 2007), 19-30, 24.

⁴⁹ Newsom, “Spying out the Land,” 24.

analysis of what makes these features typical in relation to this category. Crucially, the identification of typical and atypical exemplars takes place within a *Gestalt* structure, and this *Gestalt* framework acts as an idealized cognitive model (henceforth ICM)⁵⁰ against which our concepts are processed and evaluated.⁵¹

Prototype allows for the possibility of a text participating in numerous genres. Wright proposes that frequently components of a genre, particularly atypical members, exhibit features that extend into other genres and vice versa. He notes, “we will likely find that some genres blend with other genres or that texts might participate in multiple genres (and generate new ‘blended’ genres, if enough texts do this).”⁵² Every single text’s participation in a genre causes that genre to develop continually. Moreover, participation in a genre often causes an expansion of its boundaries. This may be indicative of what happened to the wisdom genre; such an expansion is to be recognized as reflective of the historical circumstances at the time of composition and, more generally, of the social milieu. Interesting to note is that Michael Sinding postulates that prototype theory operates ahistorically; that is to say, the prototypical exemplars can be read out of historical order and thus without a sense of how one text influences or imitates another “and still have a good grasp of the genre, as a *genre*, as anyone.”⁵³

Prototype theory encompasses a form of classification, but Collins notes that such involvement is unavoidable as “the first step in any analysis of genre is to delimit the relevant corpus, and in order to do that we cannot avoid making a

⁵⁰ The phrase “idealized cognitive model” originates with George Lakoff. See George Lakoff, *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About the Mind* (Chicago: Chicago: University Press, 1987).

⁵¹ Wright offers this explanation of prototype theory; “Any individual category is characterized by a *constellation* of elements or properties that enable us to identify typical or atypical examples related to one another in a *Gestalt* structure that acts an idealized cognitive model (or ICM)) presupposed background frames against which our concepts makes sense.” See Wright, “Joining the Club,” 294.

⁵² Wright, “Joining the Club,” 295.

⁵³ Michael Sinding, “After Definitions: Genre, Categories, and Cognitive Science.” *Genre* 35 (2002): 181-220, 193. Cf., Newsom, “Spying Out the Land, 26.

list of features by which the corpus is defined”.⁵⁴ It is the way in which this list of features is compiled and used, that conveys a methodological change. According to Collins, distinguishing features of genres are to be attributed structural importance. Moreover, it is essential that a form of hierarchy and different levels of abstraction is identified.⁵⁵ A text that is considered prototypical during the early stages of a genre’s development might lose this status when the corpus is increased.⁵⁶ This is because genres continually develop and evolve. Two of the main reasons why prototype theory is so attractive to modern literary theorists is that (1) it is built from the understanding that genres are not static entities; and (2) it allows for genres to blur and overlap; in fact, such occurrences are expected. It was mentioned above that this thesis is situated within the general wisdom and apocalyptic discussion, and while this discussion is discussed in detail below in §1.4.1., in this present context it is worth noting that the analysis of the wisdom and apocalyptic discussion shares much in common with prototype theory, especially in terms of the understanding of genres as blurring and overlapping with one another. In this respect, the method of prototype theory may be viewed as being relied on partially in the chapters to follow.

1.1.6. The Synchronic and Diachronic Elements of Genre

It was mentioned previously in §1.1. that no approach to genre should be viewed as exclusive or exhaustive. This observation becomes all the more clear when the synchronic and diachronic elements of genre are in focus. Underlying this approach is the assumption that part of what constitutes the meaning and/or significance of a genre is how it relates to other genres. Therefore, genres are

⁵⁴ Collins, “Epilogue,” 419-420.

⁵⁵ Collins cites instruction as an example: it can come in the form of a simple proverb, or an elaborate discourse, or even narrative and dialogue. He comments: “It makes a difference whether the features can be structured so that we can perceive a *Gestalt*, or whether the features are unrelated to each other.” Collins, “Epilogue,” 420.

⁵⁶ Cf., Collins. He comments: “New texts are perceived as belonging to a genre because they resemble the prototypical exemplars, but the understanding of prototypes may be modified by the inclusion of new texts . . . without multiple exemplars, and some variation, there would be no reason to speak of genre at all.” “Epilogue,” 424.

studied in unison with one another. Originally the brainchild of Yuri Tynyanov (1894-1943)⁵⁷ a Russian formalist, this mode of genre theory was further developed by a fellow Russian formalist Mikhail Bakhtin (1895-1975). The latter formalist was concerned with the social and historical developments of genre. Interesting to note is that the latter concern of Bakhtin's appears to have been a common point of interest among Russian formalists as many began to investigate the evolution of genres, and saw them not as isolated developments but in relation to the genre system as a whole. Despite some of the methods adapted by these formalists being unhelpful and antiquated, their overall endeavour remains significant because it involved describing the relationship between existing genres at the time.

Bakhtin identifies the continuous transformation and profound conservatism of genres, while noting their simultaneous static and evolving nature and how it is "the same and yet not the same, always old and new simultaneously."⁵⁸ Moreover, he asserts that a genre is "representative of creative memory in the process of literary development".⁵⁹ Characteristic of his work is his insistence that discourse contains two kinds of truth: monological and dialogical. Monological is presented as a single voice and does not allow for contradiction, whereas dialogical is the form of truth that emerges in the midst of several unmerged voices. Dialogical truth cannot be systematized or finalized. Conceding that literature is a set of monological voices, he nevertheless insists on the potential of literature being truly dialogical "drawing on multiple voices without subordinating them to any one voice, creating a space of interplay in which the reader becomes a participant who must negotiate among these voices."⁶⁰ Bakhtin's formulation of genre brings together its synchronic and diachronic elements. Such an approach would work well within an overall prototype methodology. Cognitive theory can help refine Bakhtin's insights, while Bakhtin's methods can prevent the former from becoming too abstract.

⁵⁷ See Yuri Tynyanov, "The Literary Fact," in *Modern Theory* (ed., David Duff; Harlow: Longman, 2000), 29-49.

⁵⁸ Mikhail Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (ed. and trans. Caryl Emerson; Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press, 1984), 106.

⁵⁹ Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 106.

⁶⁰ Cf., Newsom, "Spying Out the Land," 77.

Comment on Form Criticism and Genre Theory

While it is fair to say that form criticism, and its various associated genre methodologies, only have a limited effectiveness and only go so far in addressing literature, it is equally fair to say that genre theory provides the reader with one (ample) way in which a writing may be interpreted and engaged with thereafter. As Mark Sneed comments: “Genres are necessary for the production of meaning . . . Every text/speech, while it draws on a genre (or genres), in some way departs from it and forms the particular or the unique.”⁶¹ Once it is recognized that genres are not static entities, and in fact the blurring and overlapping among genres is almost to be expected, observations that are made even sharper in light of the above discussion on prototype theory in §1.1.5., the influence and limited application of genre theory for the study to follow is an obvious choice.

Therefore this thesis assumes the position of genre nominalism, as opposed to genre realism. While genre realism considers genres in terms of being stable and static, genre nominalism accepts that genres are fuzzy and continually changing. In other words, genre nominalism assumes, as Kenton Sparks notes, that there is “a flexibility and partially arbitrary character to all classifications . . . generic categories are essentially taxonomic inventions.”⁶² Situating itself in the general wisdom and apocalyptic discussion, the thesis explores the Letter of James, the exploration of which stems largely from analysis carried out on *4QInstruction*, and how James relates to this larger discussion. At this point it is important to note that these two writings are understood as belonging to the broader wisdom category. While it is accurate to say that more appropriate generic classification may exist for *4QInstruction* and James (see §2.1.1.2 and 2.2.1.3.), forms and ideas are included in both writings that are also commonly cited when attempts are being made to identify wisdom, and its hypothetical genre. It is to the category of wisdom to which our attention now turns.

1.2. Wisdom

Part Two of this Chapter examines the category of wisdom. In order to achieve this, a thorough discussion of this overall category is offered where its

⁶¹ See Sneed, “Is the Wisdom Tradition a Tradition?” 54-55.

⁶² Sparks, *Ancient Texts*, 6.

incorporation of an apocalyptic perspective will be stressed. This is followed by sub-sections that explore the apparent manifestation of the wisdom genre, in terms of the Hebrew Bible, and later at Qumran.

1.2.1. The Category of Wisdom and its Inclusion of Apocalyptic

Wisdom traditions make up an important aspect of the Ancient Near East literature and culture, and their significance is largely witnessed in the Hebrew Bible. When it comes to understanding or engaging with the concept(s) of wisdom throughout the Hebrew Bible, Gerhard von Rad's (1901-1971) research has had a profound impact on our scholarly discourses.⁶³ Working from within a form critical framework,⁶⁴ von Rad explores the concept of Israelite wisdom and dismisses the common misconception that it is the product of an exclusive theological school; rather he argues that it involves "the whole of life, and had to be occupied with all of its departments."⁶⁵ According to von Rad, the understanding of the world for ancient Israel is inherently different from ours today. It seems that this world was viewed in terms of being in process, as opposed to actually being. Ancient Israel knew neither the concept of nature, nor the Greek one of "cosmos", nor did it view the world as a stable and harmonious ordered organism. Moreover, this world fell more within the sphere of the imponderable and immeasurable.⁶⁶ Finally, its neighbours largely influenced this worldview, at least in terms of wisdom. Von Rad postulates that the traditional court setting of wisdom literature is more an Egyptian characteristic. He

⁶³ For a brief overview of the life and contributions of von Rad, see Manfred Oeming, "Gerhard von Rad as a Theologian of the Church," *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 62/3 (2008): 231-237. It should be noted that von Rad's treatment of Israelite wisdom is exhaustive; e.g. see his *Old Testament Theology: The Theology of Israel's Historical Traditions* (trans D. M. G. Stalker; London: Oliver and Boyd, 1962). He expands on his initial findings on wisdom in a later monograph that is dedicated entirely to this subject matter: Gerhard von Rad, *Wisdom in Israel* (trans. James D. Martin; London: SCM Press, 1972).

⁶⁴ Muilenburg compliments von Rad and credits him as being an influential form critic. See Muilenburg, "Form Criticism and Beyond," 51.

⁶⁵ von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 428.

⁶⁶ Deliberately exaggerating his observation, von Rad comments, "to her [Israel] 'world' was a sustaining activity of Jahweh, in which the extraordinary was no more marvelous than the apprehended order." von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 427.

maintains, “. . . Israelite wisdom is not nearly so strongly tied to a class or focused on the world of officials.”⁶⁷

Von Rad identifies two kinds of wisdom literature: (1) a form of wisdom teaching which tries to discover elementary orders; and (2) one that educates like a teacher.⁶⁸ Von Rad excels at tracing the development of Israelite wisdom, and perhaps most significant, in terms of this present context, are his comments regarding the later development of the wisdom tradition. He notes that the “scope of this wisdom theology was widened for the last time through its fusion with apocalyptic”, but goes on to comment that this fusion is “only heralded in the latest book of the Hebrew canon.”⁶⁹

Likewise, Leo Perdue, once a student of Crenshaw’s, offers a skillful treatment of the development of wisdom and the sage throughout various periods of history, with a particular focus on the First Temple period, the Persian period, and the Hellenistic period. Perdue notes a number of important developments occurring in each;⁷⁰ however, like von Rad, he maintains that it was during the Hellenistic period that sapiential thought became further developed and linked itself to a sort of apocalyptic reality. He comments: “This type of sage, who came out of mantic wisdom, was now the one who not only taught the wisdom of the past and preserved the archaic traditions, but who was also a seer who had insight into the secret mysteries of the cosmos.”⁷¹ It is important to note here both the influence of these categories and approaches and its recognizable occurrences in scholarship devoted to various wisdom compositions.

Combining their efforts,⁷² Crenshaw and John Gammie identify six types of wisdom within Israel and the Ancient Near East: (1) prudential or practical;⁷³

⁶⁷ von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 430.

⁶⁸ von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 432.

⁶⁹ von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 451.

⁷⁰ For example throughout the First Temple period, he notes that the role of the sage was concerned largely within the monarchy and ruling the government and temple, whereas the Hellenistic period brought about a time of change: by and large, Aramaic and Hebrew were taken over by Greek. See Leo G. Perdue, *Wisdom Literature: A Theological History* (London: John Knox Press, 2007), 327-331.

⁷¹ Perdue, *Wisdom Literature*, 330.

⁷² See James L. Crenshaw, ‘Method in Determining Wisdom Influence Upon “Historical” Literature,’ *JBL* 88 (1969); 129-142, 132-134; John G. Gammie, “From Prudentialism to

(2) critical or skeptical;⁷⁴ (3) juridical;⁷⁵ (4) wisdom of nature;⁷⁶ (5) theological;⁷⁷ and (6) mantic or magical.⁷⁸ These six types serve to demonstrate that biblical wisdom participates in a diverse intellectual and literary tradition. Crenshaw considers the category of wisdom, broadly speaking, as a “particular attitude towards reality, a worldview”, and this worldview consists of a way of looking at things that “begins with humans at the fundamental point of orientation. It asks what is good for men and women. And it believes that all essential answers can be learned in experience, pregnant with signs about reality itself.”⁷⁹ Crenshaw’s position is particularly noteworthy; he considers Hebrew wisdom literature to be the literature of the sages, basing his analysis on Jer 18:18 which refers to the intellectual leaders of Israel.⁸⁰

Gammie identifies an intensification of national self-identity, commenting that wisdom is first nationalized and then eschatologized. This

Apocalypticism: The Houses of the Sage and the Varying Forms of Wisdom,” in *The Sage in Israel and The Ancient Near East* (eds. John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990); 479-498. It is interesting to note that while attempting to identify broad categories in the sapiential tradition, Collins distinguishes five, not six. See John J. Collins, “Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility,” in *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie* (eds. Leo G. Perdue, Bernard Brandon Scott, and William Johnston Wiseman; Louisville: John Knox Press, 1993), 388.

⁷³ Proverbs is an example of prudential wisdom.

⁷⁴ Job and Qoheleth are examples of critical wisdom.

⁷⁵ This type of wisdom is associated with the law. Psalms 1, 19 and 119 all have a particular emphasis on the Torah.

⁷⁶ This particular type of wisdom focuses on the realm of natural phenomena, such as birth, survival, as well as upon patterns and grouping in animate beings and in the inanimate world. Certain Psalms such as 104, 127, and 128 fall under this category.

⁷⁷ Theological wisdom is the manifestation of sages wrestling with issues of meaning, purpose, justice and creation. This is largely determined by content and is found in both critical and traditional wisdom. It is encountered in Job, Qoheleth, the Wisdom of Solomon and a number of Psalms.

⁷⁸ Mantic or magical wisdom has to do with the interpretation of dreams and hidden signs. Examples of this form of wisdom are encountered in Daniel 2 and 4, Gen 37-50; a varying form of it may be also encountered in Job’s lament of the day of his birth in Job 3:8.

⁷⁹ James L. Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction* (London: SCM Press, 1981), 17-18, See also Crenshaw, “Method in Determining Wisdom Influence,” 130.

⁸⁰ Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom*, 27-29.

represents, according to him, a movement among sages where they moved away from prudentialism to a form of apocalypticism.⁸¹ Apocalyptic sages, like those who wrote Daniel, moved beyond the parameters of prudential sages by transforming wisdom with the emergence of a more vivid eschatology and the acceptance of a temporal dualism.⁸² He goes on to argue that there are three vocal points or topics where one can readily discern a shift in the wisdom tradition: the family, the king, and Israel in relation to other nations. At the core of his analysis is a differentiation between wisdom as a literary form, and wisdom as a worldview. Noteworthy is that von Rad, Perdue, Gammie, and Crenshaw all reach similar conclusions, but do so independently of one another: that is, all conclude that wisdom came to be involved with apocalyptic.

The identification of wisdom being eschatologized is particularly important because it serves to demonstrate wisdom's inclusion of apocalyptic constructs. In many respects, the traditional notion of wisdom, that is the idea that the righteous are rewarded and the wicked are punished, a thought framework that is largely associated with the book of Proverbs, is being challenged. Books such as Job and Qoheleth are understood in terms of representing the manifestation of a critical response to this "crisis of wisdom". This "crisis of wisdom" marks the abandonment of an exclusive earthly framework. Therefore, as Samuel Adams notes: "act and consequence is extended into the afterlife When compared with the more limited outlook of earlier wisdom, this move represents a fundamental shift."⁸³ Chapter Two of this thesis will argue that *4QInstruction* may be seen as one of the earliest examples in terms of where this fundamental shift is encountered.

⁸¹ Gammie, "From Prudentialism to Apocalypticism," 495.

⁸² This temporal dualism contrasts the events of the present age with those of a future age that is yet to come. Belief in immortality of the soul and resurrection of the dead is now commonplace, the former being encountered in the Wisdom of Solomon, the latter in Daniel. Gammie notes: 'For them [apocalyptic sages], after earthly kingdoms and empires had passed, at some future date, the Most High would also allow his people ('the people of the Saints of the Most High') to share in the everlasting power and sovereignty, which among older sages belonged to God alone.' Gammie, "From Prudentialism to Apocalypticism," 488-489.

⁸³ Samuel L. Adams, *Wisdom in Transition: Act and Consequence in Second Temple Instructions* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 7.

In light of the above contributions that affirm the incorporation of an apocalyptic perspective into the general category of wisdom, one can be forgiven for finding it unusual that, up until recently, many scholars continued to stress a conflict between wisdom and apocalyptic(ism). Part One of this chapter presented the recent advances made among genre theorists, and it may be argued that one possible reason behind this supposed conflict may be hence attributed to biblical scholars having to play catch-up on terms of their understanding and application of genres, and that, in fact, the boundaries of genre are not as rigid as originally was thought to be the case. Therefore, this failure to grasp or engage with the evolving nature of genres largely contributed to, what was previously considered to be, the problematic relationship of wisdom and apocalyptic.⁸⁴ This topic is returned to in §1.2.2. – 1.2.3.

The number of writings that combine sapiential and apocalyptic dimensions is significant. The active relationship between wisdom and apocalyptic, particularly in relation to the Hebrew Bible, and later in Qumran literature and the New Testament, might be affiliated with the initial proposal made by von Rad that “the real matrix from which apocalyptic literature originates” is wisdom.⁸⁵ While, as we have just seen, others put similar theories forward,⁸⁶ it would appear that von Rad’s came to be the most influential, even if

⁸⁴ Sneed notes that Crenshaw’s rigid view of genres is encountered when it comes to Crenshaw’s engagement with wisdom Psalms (Psalm 1, 32, 34, 37, 49, 73, 112, 127, 128, 133). Crenshaw rejects the existence of these psalms as wisdom literature, and rather maintains that they are merely instances that reflect some themes commonly found in Hebrew wisdom literature. See James L. Crenshaw, “Wisdom Psalms,” *CurBS* 8 (2000): 9-17. Cf. Sneed, “Is the Wisdom Tradition a Tradition?,” 67.

⁸⁵ von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 306.

⁸⁶ See also Michael Stone, who for example, studied the “lists of revealed things” in the apocalypses and concluded that such speculative concerns most probably derived from wisdom sources. See Michael E. Stone, ‘Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature,’ in *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernst Wright*. (eds. Frank Moore Cross, Weimer E. Lemke, and Patrick D. Miller; Garden City: Doubleday, 1976), 414-452, 414-451. Collins argues that there is a demonstrable apocalyptic influence in the Wisdom of Solomon, most especially in terms of its formation of the judgment of the dead. See John J. Collins, “Cosmos and Salvation. Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic in the Hellenistic Age.” *HR* 17 (1977): 121-142. Despite firm affinities being drawn between wisdom books and apocalypses, the differences between these two remain overwhelming.

at first it did not win much acceptance. Notwithstanding this, it has contributed to a tendency to discuss or view apocalyptic in sapiential terms. It is interesting to note, as Collins has, that von Rad's failure to define what he meant by "wisdom" and "apocalyptic" is cited most often when rejecting his proposal.⁸⁷ On the other hand, much of the focus of historical Jesus scholars has been on the alleged tension between sapiential forms and apocalyptic expectations in the teachings attributed to Jesus. This is noteworthy and goes back to my comments in the General Introduction of this thesis that, although the scholarly understanding of the mutual inclusion of wisdom and apocalypticism has improved considerably in recent years, much of this discussion has not yet reached or been applied to the category of Christian apocalyptic.

Contrary to this above perspective is Christopher Tuckett's view. He argues that the approach adopted by Crenshaw and others runs the risk of making the category of wisdom so elastic that it "becomes correspondingly less useful". Moreover, he goes on to postulate whether the inclusion of mantic wisdom in the broader category of wisdom may not be "confusing a word-study approach with the attempt to provide a modern taxonomy".⁸⁸ Tuckett doubts whether eschatology and/or eschatological warnings should ever be included in the broader wisdom category. Such an inclusion, according to him, runs the risk of extending the category to breaking point.⁸⁹ Tuckett's reluctance to "elasticize" the category of wisdom is certainly justified; however, his approach is too limiting and fails to take into account the various influences and traditions that are being utilized and combined in the overall category of wisdom, most especially those during the Hellenistic period. The clear solution to counter Tuckett's perspective is to broaden one's understanding of the category of

⁸⁷ See Collins, "Wisdom, Apocalypticism and Generic Compatibility," 387.

⁸⁸ Christopher M. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies in Q* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 335, n.34.

⁸⁹ He concedes that a continuity may be identified between wisdom and eschatology in the sense that both are concerned with an intervention of God, so to speak, but for him, wisdom is based on experience from the past, whereas eschatology looks to the future. In this sense, he views eschatology as the antithesis of wisdom. See Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, 136. The overly simplistic and binary nature of Tuckett's argument is apparent and perhaps its overall usefulness can be called into question.

wisdom in light of the research of von Rad and others, and to engage seriously with the diversity of compositions included under the broad umbrella of wisdom.⁹⁰ To achieve this, the question of whether wisdom constitutes as a definitive genre, primarily in terms of the Hebrew Bible and later at Qumran, needs to be examined.

1.2.2. Wisdom as Genre in the Hebrew Bible

According to Collins, “the category of wisdom literature is identified in modern scholarship primarily with the books of Proverbs, Qoheleth and Job in the Hebrew Bible and the apocryphal or deuterocanonical books of Ben Sira (Sirach) and the Wisdom of Solomon,”⁹¹ but as we shall see is also the case in terms of Qumran wisdom literature below (§1.2.3.), this list is not universally agreed upon.⁹² The basis for the association of these diverse books is, Collins continues, the high density of references to *hokmah* and *sophia*, but when one attempts to identify exactly what these books have in common, scholars have found the task to be surprisingly difficult.⁹³ For a variety of reasons, a large percentage of scholarship appears to have become fixated with matters relating to the wisdom genre, and the task here is to offer a synopsis of what has been advanced in this regard. While outlining the worth of the wisdom genre and how it can serve us in terms of this present work, it is also acknowledged that it remains only one trajectory to guide this present study.

If the category of wisdom is viewed as a theoretical phenomenon, and/or as a worldview,⁹⁴ it is reasonable to assume that its generic counterpart may be

⁹⁰ It is interesting to note that although Crenshaw acknowledges wisdom’s association with apocalyptic, he counters the “scholarly trend to blur distinctions between different genres of literature.” See James L. Crenshaw, “Gold Dust or Nuggets? A Brief Response to Kenneth Kuntz,” *CurBS* 1 (2003): 155-158, 156.

⁹¹ John J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), 1.

⁹² E.g. see Sneed, “Is the Wisdom Tradition a Tradition?,” 66-67. Sneed makes the point that the discussion to include specific works as Hebrew wisdom literature “should not be simply categorical. There may be more than one way to categorize Hebrew wisdom literature, in which, say, Daniel might be included or Job excluded.”

⁹³ Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 1

⁹⁴ It is interesting to note that Sneed has recently challenged the position that wisdom is a worldview. In his “Is the Wisdom Tradition a Tradition?,” Sneed’s contribution is thought

hence considered as containing similar characteristics in terms of form, style and/or subject matter. However, identifying a coherency among the traits of wisdom literature is exceptionally difficult. From the outset, it is possible to suggest that scribes in the ANE may have been consciously participating or adhering to a specific genre, or at the very least these scribes were being influenced by the same tradition(s), and this is perhaps the reason why similarities may be identified between the likes of Proverbs and the Wisdom of Solomon. A contemporary reader and interpreter of these two writings may argue that both contain wisdom motifs that are common to wisdom literature, but the question remains: how exactly are so-called common wisdom motifs to be determined and identified? Before addressing this question, it is helpful to point out what wisdom literature is not. Collins persuasively maintains that wisdom literature is not narrative or prophecy, it does not have the binding force or law, nor does it include references to specific Israelite traditions such as the Exodus or the covenant at Sinai.⁹⁵ Crenshaw's attempt to define wisdom, in terms of its genre, is commendable and is worth noting:

formally, wisdom consists of proverbial sentence, or instruction, debate, intellectual reflection; thematically, wisdom comprises self-evident intuitions about mastering life for human betterment, gropings after life's secrets with regard to innocent suffering, grappling with finitude, and quest for truth concealed in the created order and manifested in Dame Wisdom. When a marriage between form and content exists, there is wisdom literature.⁹⁶

Whilst formulating the above definition, Crenshaw had these primary considerations in mind. The first is that wisdom signifies a literary corpus (e.g., Proverbs and Sirach).⁹⁷ Secondly, noting the parallels between Israelite wisdom

provoking. However, he argues the primary function of wisdom literature was to train young scribes, and the latter is problematic because it may be accused of being one-dimensional and limiting.

⁹⁵ See John J. Collins, "Wisdom Reconsidered in Light of the Scrolls," *DSD* 4 (1997): 265-281, 265.

⁹⁶ Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom*, 19.

⁹⁷ Despite being aware of the differences often encountered among texts belonging to the wisdom corpus, Crenshaw maintains that it contains "a mysterious ingredient that links them together in a special way." Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom*, 17.

and ANE texts, he argues that these parallels “furnish an important clue that assists one in determining precisely what constitutes wisdom”.⁹⁸ Crenshaw’s third consideration is that present within wisdom literature is a distinct attitude towards reality which evokes a particular worldview and which expresses itself with considerable thematic coherence.⁹⁹ Imbedded within wisdom literature is the belief that all fundamental answers to what is good and bad can be learned through experience. It is this optimism that lies at the centre of wisdom. Humanity’s responsibility is to search for these answers and to strive to live in harmony with the world. Crenshaw recognizes the inclusion of apocalyptic within the wisdom spectrum, and thus comments that wisdom “is truly a citizen of two worlds, the heavenly and the earthly”.¹⁰⁰ It is expected that, if a tradition develops, its literary element will be indicative of these changes. Despite Crenshaw making advances in terms of defining the wisdom genre, he concedes that this identification continuities and/or remains a challenge. This is largely due to the fact that, and as already been stated, recognizing a coherency in wisdom literature remains difficult. Referring to Crenshaw’s work, Collins argues that wisdom is better understood in the form of a macro-genre, much like prophecy, and this allows it the opportunity to embrace various literary forms.¹⁰¹ Collins comments that “there is universal agreement that wisdom does not constitute a literary genre and that it can find expression in various literary forms”.¹⁰² Similarly, Sneed prefers to describe wisdom literature, not in terms of genre, but rather as a mode, because, according to him, the language of mode encompasses “a broader category than genre”, and hence represents “a higher level of abstraction.”¹⁰³

A wide range of compositions are grouped under the wisdom umbrella, and this realization led Menahem Kister to attempt to discern exactly what is meant or being evoked when the wisdom label is used. Focusing on Sirach and

⁹⁸ Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom*, 17.

⁹⁹ Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom*, 17-18.

¹⁰⁰ Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom*, 18.

¹⁰¹ Collins’ work is not intended to refute Crenshaw, as much as it is meant to nuance Crenshaw’s views. See Collins, “Wisdom Reconsidered,” 265-267.

¹⁰² Collins, “Wisdom Reconsidered,” 265.

¹⁰³ Sneed, “Is the Wisdom Tradition a Tradition?,” 57.

the *Book of Mysteries*, Kister proposes that “wisdom teachers” could compose texts in the Second Temple period that, strictly speaking, were not wisdom texts.¹⁰⁴ He cites the Prayers of the Fathers (Sir 44-49) as an example of a section that, if it were not included in a larger sapiential work, would not be readily discerned as a wisdom text.¹⁰⁵ By the same rationale, according to Kister, elements representative of wisdom literature could be taken and used by people who were not wisdom teachers.¹⁰⁶ Michael Stone had previously suggested that Second Temple literature contains a “tension between the genre of wisdom literature and the much wider concept of wisdom” in the sense of knowledge in relation to revealed truths, the prophets and the Torah.¹⁰⁷ According to Kister, Stone’s argument is confirmed by the diversity of sapiential literature at Qumran.¹⁰⁸ For example he understands the *Book of Mysteries* (1Q27) as “a fusion of concepts of genres” that draws on multiple sources, including prophecy and both biblical and early Jewish strands of the wisdom tradition.¹⁰⁹ The diversity of Qumran sapiential literature is returned to below (§1.2.3.). Kister’s analysis is important because it reminds scholars that wisdom is a broad label in terms of genre and that sapiential texts can include many different kinds of literary forms. However, as Goff notes, “Kister does not delineate which texts should be considered wisdom literature or the criteria one uses to identify the main representatives of this corpus. This problematizes his use of the phrase ‘wisdom teacher’”.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁴ Menahem Kister, “Wisdom Literature and Its Relation to Other Genres: From Ben Sira to *Mysteries*,” *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Centre for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. John J. Collins, Gregory E. Sterling, and Ruth A. Clements; STDJ 51; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 13-48. 19.

¹⁰⁵ Kister, “Wisdom Literature and Its Relation to Other Genres,” 13.

¹⁰⁶ Kister, “Wisdom Literature and Its Relation to Other Genres,” 18. He cites 4QMMT as an example.

¹⁰⁷ Michael E. Stone, “Apocalyptic Literature,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (ed. M. E. Stone; CRINT 2.2; Assen/Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/Fortress Press, 1984), 383–437, 389.

¹⁰⁸ Kister, “Wisdom Literature and Its Relation to Other Genres,” 21, 45.

¹⁰⁹ Kister, “Wisdom Literature and Its Relation to Other Genres,” 46.

¹¹⁰ Goff, “Qumran Wisdom Literature and the Problem of Genre,” 326.

Offering a definitive conclusion in terms of the form that the wisdom genre embodies is impossible. Indeed, it is often asked if one should speak of a wisdom genre at all. In other words, is it useful to speak of a wisdom genre, and can adequate definitions be provided? Or should the understanding of wisdom as genre be done away with altogether because it has proven to be too ambiguous and is thus meaningless? In fact, since genre theory is largely a modern construct, it is questionable whether questions relating to its existence should even be entertained. A more credible line of inquiry might be asking whether one can accurately speak about genres. In this present context it is important to note that it is this current author's view that commonalities between various compositions can be discerned, and discontinuities may be explained by the impermanent status of genres in general. All genres, including wisdom, if it is considered a genre, are not static entities. Keeping this in mind, it may be more helpful to move past the need to identify the exact genre of a text, and to recognize that when the concept of wisdom is invoked, numerous forms and ideas occur. In this sense, the relationship between genre and concept is essential. It is the identification of conceptual wisdom forms and ideas that allow us to recognize the commonalities of various writings, and subsequently to place these writings in various categorical groupings such as wisdom literature. These forms include beauty or *mashal*, but it is important to note that they are not exclusive to wisdom, rather they are also found in other genres such as instructional literature and epistle. If epistle is deemed to be more applicable cataloguing for James or instructional writing for *4QInstruction* (see §2.1.1.2 and 2.2.1.3.), this does not diminish either writings' participation in the broader wisdom category. The diversity of wisdom literature may hence be explained by the various trajectories of wisdom, and the numerous genres that participate in this broader category. It is important to keep this in mind when discussing the forms present in *4QInstruction* and James, and the combination of wisdom and apocalyptic elements in Chapter Two.

1.2.3. Wisdom as Genre at Qumran

When the diversity of the Qumran sapiential corpus is included in the discussion, we see wisdom speeches being used in more than one worldview. This is precisely the reason why Collins argues that when studying Qumran wisdom

literature, the marriage of form and content once identified by Crenshaw ends in divorce.¹¹¹ In terms of the sapiential literature at Qumran, Goff notes that three additional problems are found: (1) the fragmentary nature of the scrolls often means that so little of the scroll is preserved that any comments in relation to its genre or worldview are a guess at best; (2) he notes that “the task of demanding which compositions should be considered wisdom literature is no longer grounded by the anchor of the biblical canon”,¹¹² and (3) the innovation one finds in early Jewish wisdom literature means one can identify a text as participating in the wisdom tradition, “even if it has little in common with biblical wisdom or includes much that is alien to older sapiential texts”.¹¹³

The sheer diversity of the Qumran wisdom literature makes it difficult to identify common traits that allow it to be branded as a discrete body of literature. Although some of these writings accord with traditional wisdom, such as the exhortation or the beatitude (e.g. 4Q298 3-4 ii lines 3-6, 4Q525 2 ii), Goff notes that “there is no single form . . . that is prevalent enough throughout the corpus as a whole to function as a defining element of these texts as sapiential compositions.”¹¹⁴ Moreover, in terms of social setting, huge diversity is also encountered. There is no sense that these wisdom writings should be viewed as being indicative of a single milieu. For example, *4QBeautitudes* (4Q525) accords well with the social setting of Sirach, and appears to agree with von Rad’s proposal that wisdom literature comes from a class of intellectuals,¹¹⁵ whereas the poverty portrayed in *4QInstruction*, even if metaphorical at times (4Q417 2 i lines 14-15 – see §2.1.3.4.), portrays a very different picture. The *Book of Mysteries* (1Q27; 4Q299-301); and the *Treatise on the Two Spirits* (1QS) show affinity with *4QInstruction* in terms of their inclusion of the themes of eschatology and higher or heavenly revelation, but they do not reflect at any

¹¹¹ Collins, “Wisdom Reconsidered,” 280.

¹¹² Goff notes that this means that in principle, people can argue that this or that text from Qumran is sapiential. He uses the *Treatise of the Two Spirits* as an example and points out that it identifies itself as an instruction (1QS 3:13) and thus could be considered a wisdom text. Goff, “Qumran Wisdom Literature and the Problem of Genre,” 320.

¹¹³ Goff, “Qumran Wisdom Literature and the Problem of Genre,” 320-321.

¹¹⁴ Goff, “Qumran Wisdom Literature and the Problem of Genre,” 322.

¹¹⁵ Von Rad, *Wisdom in Israel*, 15-24.

stage that their intended audience is poor. Armin Lange argues that *4QInstruction* and *Mysteries* have a common milieu,¹¹⁶ and in light of their mutual inclusion of the themes of eschatology and higher revelation, Lange's argument is persuasive.¹¹⁷

Collins has stressed that a common worldview is not the binding ingredient that makes this corpus recognizable as a distinct body of writings.¹¹⁸ This observation is noteworthy because the diversity of Qumran wisdom literature is appraised when one consults a list of the works frequently grouped under the umbrella of the Qumran wisdom corpus. For example, Goff lists the following as wisdom texts at Qumran: *4QInstruction*; the *Book of Mysteries*;¹¹⁹ *4QWiles of the Wicked Woman* (4Q184);¹²⁰ *4QSapiential Work* (4Q185);¹²¹ *4QWords of the Maskil to all Sons of Dawn* (4Q298);¹²² *4QWays of Righteousness* (4Q420-421);¹²³ *4QInstruction-like Compositions B* (4Q424);¹²⁴ and *4QBeatitudes*,¹²⁵ but this list is not universally agreed on.¹²⁶ It is fair to say

¹¹⁶ Armin Lange, "In Diskussion mit dem Tempel: zur Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kohelet und weisheitlichen Kreisen am Jerusalemer Tempel," in *Kohelet in the Context of Wisdom* (ed. A. Schoors; BETL 136; Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 113–59.

¹¹⁷ These topics will be returned to in Chapters Three to Six of this thesis.

¹¹⁸ Collins, "Wisdom Reconsidered," 281.

¹¹⁹ The text of 1Q27 was preliminary published by de Vaux in 1949. See Roland de Vaux, "La Grotte des manuscrits hébreux," *RB* 66 (1949): 589-609. Also see D Barthelémy and J. T. Milik, eds. *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD: 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955), 102-107. The manuscripts from cave four (i.e. 4Q299-301) were published in DJD: 20 under the official editorial work of Lawrence H. Schiffman.. See Torleif Elgvin, *et al.*, eds., *Qumran Cave 4* (DJD: 20; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 31-123.

¹²⁰ *4QWiles of the Wicked Woman* was officially published in 1969 by John Allegro. See John M. Allegro, ed., *Qumran Cave 4 (4Q158-4Q186)* (DJD: 5; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 82-85.

¹²¹ 4Q185 was also published in DJD: 5. See DJD: 5, 85-87.

¹²² 4Q298 was officially published in DJD: 20 in 1997.

¹²³ 4Q420-421 were officially published in DJD: 20. See DJD: 20, 173-202.

¹²⁴ 4Q424 was officially published in 2000. See Sarah Tanzer, ed., *Qumran Cave 4 XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1* (DJD: 36; Oxford, Clarendon, 2000), 333-346.

¹²⁵ See Goff, "Qumran Wisdom Literature and the Problem of Genre," 287-288. In Goff's monograph, *Discerning Wisdom*, he lists the following manuscripts as minor Qumran wisdom texts: 4Q302; 4Q303-305; 4Q412; 4Q413; 4Q419; 4Q425; 4Q411; 4Q426; 4Q528. See Matthew J. Goff, *Discerning Wisdom The Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (VTSup 116;

that, among this list, it is difficult to discern a clear, binding commonality in terms of their content and worldview.¹²⁷ For example, *4QBeatitudes* appears to contain the notion of personified wisdom, but no allegory to wisdom as woman is detailed, whereas *4QWiles of a Wicked Woman* is focused on a wicked woman who seemingly represents, as Strugnell suggests, the appropriation of Dame Folly and the Strange Woman in Proverbs 1-9.¹²⁸ Similarly, *4QSapiential Work A* and *4QBeatitudes* extol the Torah as an important source of wisdom, not unlike Ben Sira, but no other wisdom texts from Qumran appear to do this.¹²⁹

The inclusion of Goff's suggested list of Qumran wisdom compositions is helpful because it reaffirms von Rad's proposal that wisdom, in terms of the category and the theoretical genre, came to be influenced by traditions and tropes that were unknown to traditional Israelite wisdom, especially apocalypticism.¹³⁰ In this thesis it is the influence of apocalypticism to the category of wisdom that is particularly in focus.¹³¹ For example, as previously stated, *4QInstruction*, as Goff convincingly argues, is best understood as a wisdom composition with an apocalyptic worldview, whereas the apocalyptic worldview of *Mysteries* might be understood as being even more prevalent again. However, these two writings include the enigmatic phrase רז נהיה, and in this way, Goff argues, *Mysteries* "shows continuity with Early Jewish wisdom, or at least one major representative

Leiden: Brill, 2007), 264-286. Also see Daniel J. Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran* (London: Routledge, 1996).

¹²⁶ *4QBeatiudes* was officially published in 1998. See Émile Peuch, eds., *Qumrân Grotte 4 XVIII: Textes Hébreux (4Q521-4Q528, 4Q576-4Q579)* (DJD: 25; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 115-178.

¹²⁷ E.g. Tigchelaar argues that *4QWays of Righteousness* is not a wisdom text, and rather suggests is best understood as a halakhic work. See Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, "Sabbath Halakha and Worship in 4QWays of Righteousness: 4Q421 11 and 13+2+8 par 4Q264a 1-2," *RevQ* 18/71 (1998): 359-372.

¹²⁸ See John Strugnell. "Notes en marge du volume V des "Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan,"" *RevQ* 7 (1970): 163-276, 264; cf. Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 106. Also see Harrington, *Qumran Wisdom Texts*, 31-35.

¹²⁹ This subject will be returned to in §4.4.1-4.4.2.

¹³⁰ von Rad, *Old Testament Wisdom*, 451. Also see Goff, "Qumran Wisdom Literature and the Problem of Genre," 288.

¹³¹ See Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 232.

of it.”¹³² However, the diversity of Qumran wisdom literature is again met when it is realized that *4QInstruction* and *Mysteries* serve as two main Qumran examples in terms of the embodiment of an apocalyptic influence on wisdom, because while other Qumran wisdom texts include some characteristics or traits that might be associated with apocalypticism, these elements do not occur as centrally as they do in *4QInstruction* and *Mysteries*. This analysis is not meant to problematize further the wisdom genre, but rather to demonstrate that the category of wisdom became so diverse that various genres were being incorporated.¹³³ While it is fair, and one might even argue that it is accurate to view the label of wisdom as being wide in terms of its genre and the overall category, it is the recognition and acknowledgement of its width that allows one to appreciate the transitional nature of wisdom, and all that is grouped within it. In this respect, one’s understanding of the wisdom genre entirely hinges on whether they consider genres in terms of realism or nominalism.¹³⁴ The former understanding of genre, may reasonably be associated with the likes of Gunkel and Crenshaw who maintain that genres are pure, ontological categories, whereas nominalism literary theorists embrace the haziness and flexibility of genres, and view pure genre classifications as being arbitrary. As argued earlier, it is this latter understanding of genres that guides this entire thesis.

Responding, or attempting to make sense of the miscellany nature of Qumran wisdom literature, Collins, in his 1997 article, attempts to identify a coherency in Qumran sapiential literature. For him, this coherency lies in its instructional purpose; that is to say, they seem to have been written to educate those who were supposed to strive for understanding.¹³⁵ This pedagogical function, according to Collins, functions as the new cornerstone against which wisdom literature should be understood. Therefore, other factors such as worldview or social setting are too diverse to be considered a common ingredient that gives unity to the Qumran sapiential corpus. Collins writes:

¹³² Goff, “Qumran Wisdom Literature and the Problem of Genre,” 292.

¹³³ This understanding of the literary genres may be viewed in contrast to Gunkel who maintains that a genre is associated with a particular social group, and hence a pure form of this genre can be identified. See Gunkel, “The Literature of Ancient Israel,” 26-83.

¹³⁴ See Sneed, “Is the Wisdom Tradition a Tradition?” 66-67.

¹³⁵ Collins, “Wisdom Reconsidered,” 279-280.

While all sorts of material might be conceivably used for instruction, wisdom instructions can be distinguished from other genres, such as narrative, prophecy, law or hymnody. They may be cast in second-person direct address, whether hortatory or informative, or they can make use of third-person statements of putative fact. The coherence of wisdom literature, however, lies in its use as instructional material rather than in literary forms, strictly defined.¹³⁶

Collins' citation is helpful as it illustrates the difficulty of defining wisdom literature, and makes clear that Collins turns to the notion of instruction as a criterion when attempting to define it. Similarly, Goff notes that the social setting and function of wisdom literature are connected with pedagogy and, according to him, this is representative of a milieu in which instruction occurs.¹³⁷ However, it is noteworthy that instruction is in itself much broader than wisdom literature, and this observation leads Goff to conclude that, "the most important criterion for defining wisdom literature as a distinct body of literature is not restricted to sapiential texts".¹³⁸ That instruction is not confined to wisdom is apparent, but its place in the wisdom genre remains central. However, the validity of the pursuit of the social location is further problematized when we realize that instruction is not indicative of any one specific social location.¹³⁹ Goff agrees with Collins on the identification of wisdom genre as a type of macro genre with two caveats. Firstly, he stresses the noetic element of wisdom literature, arguing that this portrays or stresses a desire for understanding of the world. Secondly, he refers to elements of wisdom literature such as its themes, motifs, and vocabulary as examples of how these texts participate in an overall sapiential discourse.¹⁴⁰ Just as Collins argues that, in Qumran wisdom literature, the marriage of form and content ends in divorce, Goff suggests that a divorce between early Jewish wisdom and traditional wisdom takes place.¹⁴¹ In light of these former

¹³⁶ Collins, "Wisdom Reconsidered," 281.

¹³⁷ Goff, "Qumran Wisdom Literature and the Problem of Genre," 318.

¹³⁸ Goff, "Qumran Wisdom Literature and the Problem of Genre," 327.

¹³⁹ Sneed argues for the need to view the relationship between genres and social locations as being very flexible, and argues that "one cannot necessarily read a setting off from a genre." Sneed, "Is the Wisdom Tradition a Tradition?," 55.

¹⁴⁰ Goff, "Qumran Wisdom Literature and the Problem of Genre," 327-328.

¹⁴¹ Goff, "Qumran Wisdom Literature and the Problem of Genre," 330.

sentiments, it is my argument that this divorce reflects the ongoing developments of the genre(s)/ and/or macro genre(s) in and of itself, and of course, of the overall category of wisdom.

Wright also recognizes the problem of the wisdom genre, which for him is especially apparent when Qumran wisdom literature is included. He notes the need to view genres as having indeterminate boundaries, and that the counter argument is primarily due to the perceived necessity of deciding on a writing's singular allegiance.¹⁴² Wright argues that it is possible to speak about genres accurately. This is based on two rationales. Firstly, although scholars have identified a number of works that can be considered wisdom, disagreement emerges when trying to determine what criteria apply when deciding if a text belongs to the wisdom genre. As an advocate of prototype theory, Wright proposes that the application of prototype theory to this overall question remedies this situation. Secondly, it is helpful to understand genres as a means of communicating a specific idea or ideas to an intended audience. Therefore, similar to the proposals put forward by Collins and Goff, Wright argues that it is best to view the wisdom genre as a kind of instructional literature. Investigation of this genre and its content provides insight into the nature of the cosmos and human behaviour.¹⁴³ For Wright then, Sirach, Job, Qoheleth, Proverbs, and the Wisdom of Solomon are exemplars of the wisdom genre. Based on the justification that these works are generally agreed to be indicative of wisdom, Wright is able to form a lucid ICM of wisdom literature. This in turn may be applied to the wisdom texts from Qumran:

(1) Instruction and pedagogical form and intent that articulates (2) a concern for pursuing or acquiring wisdom (or its equivalent) through study and learning and, which exhibits (3) an engagement with earlier sapiential tradition (perhaps in conjunction with other authoritative sources), resulting in (4) an interest in or concern for practical ethics and behaviour.¹⁴⁴

¹⁴² Wright, "Joining the Club," 292.

¹⁴³ Wright, "Joining the Club," 296-297.

¹⁴⁴ Wright goes on to discuss possible default properties of wisdom, e.g., the use of proverbial sayings or an emphasis on experience or the human dimension. He also allows for the possibility of "optional variables" such as women, speech, riches. Wright, "Joining the Club," 299.

Notwithstanding his proposed ICM, Wright acknowledges that when it comes to the alleged exemplars of wisdom, it is difficult to specify exactly what it is these books have in common.¹⁴⁵ This is reminiscent of Crenshaw's comments when he refers to the "mysterious ingredient" of wisdom.¹⁴⁶ Essentially, Wright identifies four central properties of wisdom but, for him, these are not to be understood to serve as a checklist to determine whether a work is or is not wisdom literature, but rather they represent a framework through which might be determined the extent to which a text is participating in the wisdom genre. While Wright's rationale makes sense, it is difficult to look past his proposed ICM as anything other than an attempt to identify exemplars that serve as a checklist of the wisdom genre. Wright is not the first to note these four central properties, but he is the first to combine them with the aim of formulating an ICM of wisdom.

However, not everyone accepts Wright's ICM. For example Goff combines the first and second properties arguing that they are one and the same.¹⁴⁷ Wright disagrees maintaining that instructional function and noetic perspectives are different and/or separate even if combined with one another. Using apocalypses as an example, Wright acknowledges that they are "rulebooks" intended for instruction, but that their instructional purpose is most likely intended to enforce or compel certain kinds of behaviour rather than encouraging one to investigate or study. Therefore, if an ICM of a "rulebook" were to be offered, instructional content could conceivably be part of this model, even if it were not likely to be coupled alongside a concern for study and investigation.¹⁴⁸

Prototype theory offers an explanation as to why, very often, the borders of a genre might blur and overlap, and to a large extent, it facilitates an examination of when this happens. This explanatory solution of the hybridity of genres facilitates or provides us with a means or lens through which this relationship might be discussed, but it does not contribute anything that has not already been discerned. That being said, this overview of the wisdom genre has already highlighted the importance of the pursuit of instruction, in terms of its

¹⁴⁵ Wright, "Joining the Club," 300.

¹⁴⁶ Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom*, 17. See p.29, n. 92 of this thesis.

¹⁴⁷ See Goff, "Qumran Wisdom Literature and the Problem of Genre."

¹⁴⁸ Wright, "Joining the Club," 301.

importance to the genre and to the overall category. This idea will be important to keep in mind when our attention turns to [attributing tentative genre classifications to 4QInstruction and James in Chapter Two](#), and the theme of revelation in Chapter Four of this thesis.

1.3. Apocalyptic

In §1.2.1. the category of wisdom and its amalgamation of apocalyptic constructs was outlined. It was established that this later inclusion may be viewed in terms of representing the general “crisis of wisdom” expressed in books such as Job and Qoheleth. Therefore, in the Hellenistic period the category of wisdom evolved from an exclusively earthly framework, to one where earthly and otherworldly paradigms came into play. This inclusion of the otherworldly is indicative of an apocalyptic perspective. In many respects, much of this analysis may be viewed in terms of aligning itself with von Rad’s thesis that apocalypticism, understood in this thesis as a category from which a dominant worldview and literature emerged, has its origins in wisdom.¹⁴⁹

In Part Three of this chapter, the category of apocalyptic is examined, with a special emphasis on its generic counterpart. This is then followed by a discussion outlining the adjectival use of “apocalyptic” and “eschatological”. These sections are intended to offer clarity, in terms of offering a clearer understanding of my use of these terms, to the reader of this work.

1.3.1. The Apocalypse Genre

The debate surrounding the origins of the wide apocalyptic category seems to have arisen from the perception that apocalyptic, and its associated literature, was an unusual element in the biblical corpus. In other words, the provenance of the category of apocalyptic was in need of explanation.¹⁵⁰ Generally speaking, as

¹⁴⁹ See von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 301-308. It is important to note that von Rad’s thesis that the origins of apocalyptic may be attributed to wisdom, has been challenged by some scholars. E.g. see Paul Hanson. For Hanson, apocalyptic is a child of prophecy See Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975).

¹⁵⁰ Cf. John J. Collins, “Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Ancient World,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Eschatology* (ed. Jerry L. Walls; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007): 40-55, 41.

has been discussed above, the apocalyptic genre emerged in Judaism in the Hellenistic period as a new phenomenon, drawing on many sources such as prophecy and wisdom, but combining them in novel ways.¹⁵¹ Much of the debate concerning the origins of the apocalypse genre has been impressivonistic in character and scholars who perceived a parallel for a particular motif in another tradition have often jumped hastily to conclusions about the origin of the entire phenomenon.¹⁵² In particular, the latter half of the twentieth century bore witness to a number of important works being produced that focused on enquiries into definitions and the taxonomy of the origins of apocalyptic genre. Such examples include Klaus Koch and Paul D. Hanson.¹⁵³ It is interesting to note that Koch was the first scholar to address the problem of defining apocalyptic in a systematic way. He identified form criticism and literary and linguistic history as “the only starting point” for this task.¹⁵⁴ To achieve this aim, a group of writings must be identified and according to him, “to this group belong first and foremost the book of Daniel, *I Enoch*, *II Baruch*, *IV Ezra*, *the Apocalypse of Abraham* and the Book of Revelation.”¹⁵⁵ This may be viewed in similar terms to Crenshaw’s desire to identify a corpus of wisdom writings outlined in §1.2.2.

Koch’s identification of a group of writings that he considers to be apocalyptic foretells the aim of the 1979 Apocalyptic Group in the SBL Genres Project, which intended to reach an agreement on the writings to which the adjective “apocalyptic” should be applied,¹⁵⁶ and to offer a methodology which would make the classifying of works, as either apocalyptic or something else,

¹⁵¹ John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), 23-37.

¹⁵² For an extreme example, see Hanz Dieter Betz, “On the Problem of the Religio-Historical Understanding of Apocalypticism,” *JTC* 6 (1969): 146-154.

¹⁵³ See Klaus Koch, *Ratlos von der Apokalypitik* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1970); Hanson, *Dawn of Apocalyptic*.

¹⁵⁴ Koch asserted that “if we are to succeed at all in the future in arriving at a binding definition of apocalyptic, a starting point in form criticism and literary and linguistic history is in the nature of things, the only one possible.” Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*, 24.

¹⁵⁵ Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*, 23.

¹⁵⁶ Collins notes: “the notion that there is a class of writings that may be labeled ‘apocalyptic’ has been generally accepted since Frederick Luke published the first comprehensive study of the subject in 1832.” Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 2-3.

more comprehensible.¹⁵⁷ This group linked the noun and/or adjective “apocalyptic” to a means of revelation, and distinguished two types of apocalypse: (1) the “historical” type which focuses on the end of history and might sometimes be divided into periods, in the guise of prophecy, (e.g., Daniel); and (2) otherworldly journeys in which a visionary might be taken on a tour of the heavens or the nether regions (e.g., the *Book of Watchers*). A consequence of their methodology is that apocalyptic is defined exclusively in terms of genre. For them an apocalypse is:

a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial, insofar as it involves another, supernatural world.¹⁵⁸

Apocalyptic is hence reduced to genre.¹⁵⁹ By creating a master paradigm, which listed supposed features of form and content on one axis,¹⁶⁰ and the names of proposed apocalyptic works on the other, the group is often charged with applying a classificatory method to this question.¹⁶¹ It is interesting to note that

¹⁵⁷ Collins describes their aim as wanting to “attain consistency and clarify the use of the term and the assumption that the single name ‘apocalyptic’ should refer to a single coherent and recognizable type of writing.” See John J. Collins, “The Jewish Apocalypses,” *Semeia* 14 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1979), 2-3.

¹⁵⁸ Collins, “Jewish Apocalypses,” 9.

¹⁵⁹ David Hellholm criticizes the group for not having indicated a specific function of an apocalypse and asks, “why were apocalypses ever written?” David Hellholm, “The Problem of Apocalyptic Genre,” in *Early Christian Apocalypticism: Genre and Social Setting* (*Semeia* 36; ed. Adela Yarbro Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1986), 13-64-26. In a recent paper (2009), Collins states that this omission was intentional claiming that the function of an apocalypse is “best discussed at the level of the individual texts, in their specific contexts . . .” Collins, “The Genre Apocalypse Reconsidered,” 14.

¹⁶⁰ Examples of the suggested form and content of apocalyptic works include mediums by which the revelation is communicated, the human recipient, or otherworldly journeys. For a full list of the components of this master paradigm see Collins, “Jewish Apocalypses,” 6-8.

¹⁶¹ Discussing this mater-paradigm, Collins writes, “The master-paradigm may be divided into two main sections: the framework of the revelation and its content. The framework in turn involves both the manner in which the revelation is conveyed and the concluding elements. The

Newsom defends the group's methodology, arguing that it was intended to reconstruct, rather than construct. In addition, she postulates that a form of prototype theory was being applied but concludes that this was most likely intuitive on their part.¹⁶² Similarly, Wright makes a comparison between the inferred methodology of this SBL group and suggests that their definition might serve as an ICM of apocalypse. He surmises that the central characteristics of their definition can act or operate within a set of structural relations that meaningfully function together as a template or background scheme.¹⁶³ Recently, Collins has acknowledged that the original approach of the group resembles prototype theory, but states that such similarities and resemblances are coincidental.¹⁶⁴ Moreover, a fundamental difference exists between the group's methodology and that of prototype theory: by creating a master paradigm, the SBL group established boundaries. In 2009, Collins presented a paper at Manchester University in which he discussed the achievements and limitations of the 1979 Apocalypse Group. His defense of the group, and its approach, is worth noting:

I should emphasize, however, that genre analysis may be undertaken for various reasons, and that these reasons may call for different approaches. In the case of *Semeia* 14, the goal was to identify and define, and this was never supposed to be more than the first stage of a more comprehensive study . . . I think it is still true that the first stage in the analysis of any genre is to identify it.

content embraces historical and eschatological events on a temporal axis and otherworldly beings and places on a special axis." See "Jewish Apocalypses," 5.

¹⁶² Newsom notes how the SBL group draw a distinction between central properties and those that are not peripheral, and views this as being representative of a prototype theoretical framework. The ICM of apocalypse, according to Newsom, "organizes and authorizes the extension from the prototypical cases to those that are atypical." Thus a central exemplar such as pseudepigraphy may nevertheless be absent, even from a prototypical text. This is the case with John's Apocalypse. Newsom, "Spying out the Land," 22-25.

¹⁶³ He offers this slightly revised form of the definition; "(1) revelatory literature with a narrative framework in which (2) a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, which discloses a transcendent reality which is both (3) temporal – insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation – and (4) spatial – insofar as it involves another, supernatural world." See Wright, "Joining the Club," 296-297.

¹⁶⁴ See Collins, "The Genre Apocalypse Reconsidered," 12-13.

This stage requires definition, at least of the prototypical core, even if there are also fuzzy fringes. Without such definition, or without clarity about a prototypical core, there can only be confusion as to what it is that we are talking about.¹⁶⁵

In the same year (i.e. 1979) as the SBL Apocalyptic Group was founded, an international colloquium on apocalypticism was held in Uppsala, and from this a volume was produced.¹⁶⁶ Although this volume has proven itself to be significant, it fails to offer any consensual definitions. During the following years, Stone penned two influential articles in which he encourages the reader to recognize that apocalypticism cannot be reduced to eschatology. Referring to *I Enoch* and Daniel as apocalyptic exemplars, he demonstrates that apocalypses drew from the well of Israelite sapiential literature.¹⁶⁷ As we now know, this is something von Rad proposed a decade and a half earlier, having based his argument on Daniel back then. Von Rad argued that, “knowledge is the nerve-centre of apocalyptic literature, knowledge based on a universal Jahwism, surprisingly divorced from the sayings history.”¹⁶⁸ Stone’s contributions also deserve attention. In addition to the previous assessments, he convincingly argued that, despite the common scholarly consensus at that time, *I Enoch* predates Daniel. With this in mind, any attempt to define apocalyptic should take *I Enoch* as its starting point. The conclusions reached by von Rad and Stone made it even more difficult for scholars to sustain any theories that insisted on drawing a sharp distinction between wisdom and apocalyptic in terms of genre and worldview. In similar fashion Martin Hengel characterized apocalyptic wisdom as “higher wisdom through revelation”.¹⁶⁹ Moreover, in 1995 Argall’s

¹⁶⁵ Collins, “The Genre Apocalypse Reconsidered,” 22.

¹⁶⁶ See David Hellholm, ed., *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1983).

¹⁶⁷ See Stone, “Lists of the Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature,” 414-452; “The Book of Enoch and Judaism in the Third Century BCE,” *CBQ* 40 (1978): 479-492.

¹⁶⁸ von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 306.

¹⁶⁹ Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. (vol.1; London: SCM Press, 1974), 210-218.

doctorate dissertation was published, and in it he compares Ben Sira to *I Enoch*, discussing both in terms of being wisdom texts.¹⁷⁰

Also prevalent in this scholarly landscape is an attempt made by Collins to compile a list of features he considered to be indicative of an apocalyptic worldview. He identifies three: (1) the importance of supernatural revelation; (2) the heavenly world which is inclusive of angels; and (3) a theme of eschatological judgment.¹⁷¹ Collins' assessment of an apocalyptic worldview is helpful, and it is reasonable to associate much of this worldview as being representative of the Hellenistic period. The Hellenistic period, to summarize Goff, may be connected with a widespread sense of alienation, political upheaval, and the decline of national independence in the Near East.¹⁷² In this respect, it is possible to discuss partially the apocalyptic worldview in terms of the then ongoing "crisis of wisdom".

1.3.2. Eschatology and its Relationship to Apocalyptic

In 1960 Ernst Käsemann famously published an article (in German) in which he argued that Jewish apocalyptic is the mother of Christian theology. Most striking about this article is that he did not feel it necessary to offer a definition of exactly what he meant when he used the word "*apokalyptisch*".¹⁷³ It was only some years later, and motivated by criticisms, that Käsemann offered a definition. For him, apocalyptic is "the imminent hope in the Parousia", that is "the special form of eschatology that deals with the end of history".¹⁷⁴ It is interesting to note that,

¹⁷⁰ Argall, *I Enoch and Sirach*.

¹⁷¹ Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 10.

¹⁷² Cf. Matthew J. Goff, "Recent Trends in the Study of Early Jewish Wisdom Literature," *CurBS* 7 (2009): 376-416, 388.

¹⁷³ See Ernst semann, "Die Anfänge christlicher Theologie," *ZThK* 57 (1960): 162-185. Generally speaking, Käsemann's hypothesis was not received well; the negative reactions it received led Käsemann to write subsequent articles Käsemann, Käsemann, to clarify his point. See Ernst Käsemann, "Zum Thema der urchristlichen Apokalyptik," *ZThK* 59 (1962): 257-284; "Paulus und der Frühkatholizismus," *ZThK* 57 (1960): 75-89.

¹⁷⁴ Käsemann writes: "we have been embarrassed by no longer having any specific term for the particular kind of eschatology which attempts to talk about ultimate history. It is not in dispute that 'apocalyptic' is ambiguous. But of what term is that not true? It emerges from the context that almost throughout I speak of primitive Christian apocalyptic to denote an expectation of

while critiquing Käsemann's hypothesis, Rudolf Bultmann challenges Käsemann's original exposition stating that "it can be said that eschatology is the mother of early Christian theology, but not apocalyptic."¹⁷⁵ Since Käsemann is actually using and/or equating "apocalyptic" with "eschatology", Bultmann's statement is not only ironic, but also serves to illustrate the confusion that exists between these two terms. In 2007 Florentino García Martínez published an article that reflects on Käsemann's thesis, and in doing so provides a more nuanced understanding of apocalyptic. Following García Martínez's lead, instead of viewing Jewish apocalyptic tradition as the explanation for all later Christian theology, it is important to recognize the influence the Jewish apocalyptic tradition had on early Christianity, and to view eschatology as one of its essential components.¹⁷⁶

While García Martínez's understanding of the apocalyptic tradition is supported throughout this thesis, it is also the case that to engage effectively with the category of apocalyptic, its associated linguistic components, and their associated inadequacies, require preliminary comments. A differentiation thus needs to be made between eschatology and apocalyptic; these two terms cannot and should not be used interchangeably. Significantly when Robert J. Miller discusses apocalypticism, he astutely asserts that it is only one kind of eschatology. He notes that while "all apocalypticism is eschatological . . . not

immanent Parousia." Ernst Käsemann, "The Beginnings of Christian Theology," in *New Testament Questions Today* (London: SCM Press, 1969), 82-109. 109, n.1

¹⁷⁵ See Rudolf Bultmann, "Ist die Apokalyptik die Mutter der christlichen Theologie? Eine Auseinandersetzung mit Ernst Käsemann," in *Apophoreta, Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen, Walter Elsterster* (ed., F. H. Kettler; BZNW 30; Berlin: 1964), 64-69, 69.

¹⁷⁶ García Martínez writes: "[T]he influence of Jewish apocalyptic tradition does not enter Christian thought as a post-paschal reaction to the gospel message but is present from the beginning of the preaching of Jesus . . . Christianity, like the Qumran sect, began as an apocalyptic sect within Judaism, and since the question about the womb is in fact a question about origins, we can state that the Jewish apocalyptic tradition was the womb of Christian theology." See Florentino García Martínez, "Is Jewish Apocalyptic the Mother of Christian Theology," in *Qumranica Minora 1: Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism*, (ed., Eibert Tigchelaar; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 129-152, 144.

every eschatology is apocalyptic.”¹⁷⁷ Miller’s statement further serves to highlight the ambiguity and confusion that is often associated with apocalyptic. Moreover, eschatology may also be viewed as a hallmark in terms of an apocalyptic perspective, but ongoing confusion appears also to accompany it in terms of its proper use.

Generally speaking, the term “eschatology” refers to end-time expectation. Bill T. Arnold defines eschatology as “the expectation of a future eon discontinuous with the present, in which the circumstances of history will be transformed and the present cosmos redeemed by God.”¹⁷⁸ It is interesting to note that eschatology is not bound to a specific literary genre because it is characterized by themes and motifs that could be adapted by many genres; it is, however, frequently encountered in writings that have an apocalyptic worldview.¹⁷⁹ Generally speaking, an eschatological perspective contains or exhibits the belief that the present world will be overturned, and it hence fits neatly into a writing that has an apocalyptic worldview, and it is in this manner that the adjective “eschatological” is used throughout this thesis. More often than not, an eschatological conviction serves as motivation to encourage those living in the present world to live faithfully by the covenant and the righteousness enjoined by the prophets. Eschatological hopes became a major trope in writings from the Second Temple period, and sapiential literature is no exception.

¹⁷⁷ Robert J. Miller, *The Apocalyptic Jesus: A Debate* (eds., Robert J. Miller et al., Santa Rosa: Polebridge Press, 2001), 6.

¹⁷⁸ Bill T. Arnold, “Old Testament Eschatology and the Rise of Apocalypticism,” *The Oxford Handbook of Eschatology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008): 23-40, 32. Christopher Rowland observes that the word eschatology is regularly used in a variety of different senses, some of which extend the meaning of the phrase to such an extent that the connection with the original future orientation has virtually disappeared. He comments: “Thus we can find the term being used to describe the critical nature of human decisions, the fate of the individual believer’s soul after death, the termination of this world order and a setting up of another, events like the last judgment and the resurrection of the dead, and a convenient way of referring to future hopes about the coming of God’s kingdom on earth, irrespective of whether in fact it involves an ending of the historical process.” Christopher Rowland, “The Eschatology of the New Testament Church,” *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, 56-72, 56.

¹⁷⁹ By its very definition, an apocalypse always foresees eschatological salvation, but not all eschatology is expressed in apocalyptic form. Cf., David A. Person, “Eschatology,” *ABD* 2; 576a.

Very often a distinction is drawn between prophetic eschatology and apocalyptic eschatology, but Collins suggests that the difference between the two lies in the expectation of the judgment of the individual dead.¹⁸⁰ Moreover, eschatology may be *realized* and/or *inaugurated*. Most scholars have used these adjectives with the understanding that they are not necessarily in tension with one another. Torleif Elgvin, for example, argues that *4QInstruction* contains a realized eschatology while also pointing out that “an eschatological discourse on the coming judgment occupies a full two-columns of the work.”¹⁸¹ Therefore, for Elgvin, a realized eschatology need not be entirely realized, that is to say, it might anticipate a time of consummation. However, depending on the context, the term may require some further specification. For example, when John Kloppenborg uses the language of eschatology, he tends to polarize realized and future eschatology and assigns them to separate strata. He refers to the designation “future eschatology” as “apocalyptic”. In this sense, realized eschatology is portraying a view in which the kingdom has already come, and therefore the expectation of coming judgment is rejected.¹⁸² John Dominic Crossan views these two differing types of eschatology as mutually destructive. He comments: “there is . . . counterevidence to any claim that a nonapocalyptic eschatology came first and an apocalyptic one developed only later. The earliest nonapocalyptic eschatology I can find is already an anti-apocalyptic one.”¹⁸³ He

¹⁸⁰ John Collins, “Apocalyptic Eschatology as the Transcendence of Death,” *CBQ* 36 (1974) 21-43. For example, various passages throughout the Hebrew Bible such as Isa 24-27 or Zec 9-14 portray the expectation of a future time when YHWH will bring a judgment of equilibrium to the cosmos, including a time of restitution for Israel. Whether this should be defined or explained in terms of being an example of prophetic eschatology or apocalyptic eschatology remains to be seen.

¹⁸¹ Torleif Elgvin, “Early Essene Eschatology: Judgment and Salvation According to Sapiential Work A,” in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conference on Texts from the Judean Desert. Jerusalem, 30 April 1995*. (eds. Donald W. Parry and Stephen D. Ricks; STDJ 20; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 126-166, 128..

¹⁸² John S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 241-243.

¹⁸³ John Dominic Crossan, *Birth of Christianity: Discerning What Happened in the Years Immediately After the Execution* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999), 305. Interestingly, Crossan argues that the inherent tension between these two eschatologies stems from their different views

applies a definition that allows him to maintain a tension between an apocalyptic eschatology with a real time expectation, and a sapiential eschatology that is entirely realized.¹⁸⁴ Clearly, Crossan's and Kloppenborg's use of the phrase "realized eschatology" is different than Elgvin's, and it is instances such as these that highlight the need for succinct explanations of the use of language to be provided in the first place. With this in mind, throughout this thesis my use of the term "eschatology", and its adjectival counterpart, refers to eschatology that includes both realized and future elements.

1.4. The Current Approach to Wisdom and Apocalypticism

Despite the recent scholarly awareness that sapiential and apocalyptic do not need to be viewed as mutually exclusive, resistance to this paradigm shift remains, and certain spheres of New Testament scholarship appear unaware of developments in early Jewish studies.

1.4.1. The SBL Wisdom and Apocalypticism Group

As we saw in §1.2.3. an awareness of the diversity of wisdom literature grew in the 1990s with the publication of Qumran cave 4 materials in critical editions. This resulted in the reassessment of the categories of wisdom and apocalyptic. In 1994, a SBL group was formed with the aim of exploring the compatibility of the genres wisdom and apocalyptic.¹⁸⁵ In the group's own words, their aim was: "reexamining the social concept of wisdom and apocalypticism and rethinking the overly rigid boundaries that had been erected between them."¹⁸⁶ In itself, this aim is significant as it envisages a compatible relationship. In the early stages of

of the character of God. According to him, "the marriage of apocalypticism and ethicism is a much more difficult issue. Can they be combined? As long as apocalypticism involves a God who gives force and violence to end force and violence, they cannot be combined; one has to choose between them . . . Ethicism . . . is absolute faith in a nonviolent God and the attempt to live and act in union with such a God." *Birth of Christianity*, 287.

¹⁸⁴ Crossan, *Birth of Christianity*, 258-260.

¹⁸⁵ Some of the proceedings and findings of this group were later made available in an edited volume; see Wright and Wills, eds., *Conflicted Boundaries*.

¹⁸⁶ George W. Nickelsburg, "Wisdom and Apocalypticism in Early Judaism: Some Points for Discussion," in *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism* (eds. Benjamin G. Wright and Lawrence M. Wills; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005,) 17-38.

the group, George Nickelsburg notes that this group would focus on everything that can be defined as sapiential and apocalyptic, but which often cannot be separated from one another. The reason for this is:

because both are products of wisdom circles that are becoming increasingly diverse in the Greco-Roman period. Thus, apocalyptic texts contain elements that are at home with wisdom literature, and wisdom texts reflect growing interest in eschatology. Moreover, claims of revelation, inspiration, or divine enlightenment can be found in both “sets” of texts.¹⁸⁷

It becomes clear that Nickelsburg’s starting point for analyzing wisdom and apocalypticism is indebted to, amongst others, von Rad, Crenshaw, Perdue, and Gammie. Nickelsburg focuses on the scholars who tend to dichotomize wisdom and apocalyptic, insisting that these categories are mutually exclusive, or at the very least insist that one label should prevail. Frequently, generic incompatibility is assumed when often the opposite is the case. Each category needs to be given the appropriate amount of flexibility to incorporate texts from different times, locations, and contexts. Nickelsburg is acutely aware of the necessities and limitations of language, and aptly describes terms such as “sapiential”, “apocalyptic”, and “eschatology” as “windows into another world, a means for trying to understand that to which we do not have first-hand access of.”¹⁸⁸ Responding to Nickelsburg, Sarah Tanzer argues that the definitional issues of wisdom need to be addressed. In terms of genre, she argues, it is necessary to investigate the various dimensions of wisdom, (e.g., its context, worldview, tradition, and revelation as sources of wisdom) and how their presence in various texts may be shaped by the specific worldview of a text.¹⁸⁹

Tanzer’s comments are noteworthy because there is an uncomfortable truth surrounding her claims that, despite the progress the group has made in

¹⁸⁷ Nickelsburg, “Wisdom and Apocalypticism in Early Judaism,” 20.

¹⁸⁸ Nickelsburg continues to write that, “it is imperative that the means not be construed as the end, or the window confused with the landscape.” “Wisdom and Apocalypticism in Early Judaism,” 36.

¹⁸⁹ Sarah Tanzer, “Response to George Nickelsburg; ‘Wisdom and Apocalypticism in Early Judaism,’” in *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism* (eds. Benjamin G. Wright and Lawrence M. Wills; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005,) 39-50, 45.

terms of understanding and engaging with apocalypticism, too often scholars find themselves on unknown terrain when it comes to dealing with the broader category of wisdom. Responding to Tanzer, Nickelsburg outlines three questions that he considers to be pivotal if one wants to proceed to the next step of the investigation. Firstly, Crenshaw's assessment of wisdom includes the view that wisdom literature contains a "mysterious ingredient" that ties it together.¹⁹⁰ According to Nickelsburg, this "mysterious ingredient" is the "purposeful, 'systematic,' and sometimes obsessive quest to understand how things are or should be and why."¹⁹¹ The notion of searching and seeking are central components of wisdom literature: for example, they pertain to Ben Sira 38:1-3 and *1 Enoch*. Secondly, Nickelsburg maintains that the pursuit of this understanding focuses on the issue of what is right and what is wrong and the consequences that follow on from this.¹⁹² On a mundane level, these consequences might include social ostracizing if it involves ill-mannered conduct at a banquet. In terms of so-called "apocalyptic wisdom" and its worldview, compliance or non-compliance, and in terms of searching for its meaning may encompass issues of divine justice, and if in fact, it is present in the world. Thirdly, Nickelsburg claims that a central component of wisdom literature is how one acquires, or where one goes for, the knowledge that leads to such cosmic understanding.¹⁹³ This may involve turning to nature (e.g. *1 En* 2:1-5:4), or could involve appealing to traditions that would include the Torah, the prophets and the writings and traditions of the wise (e.g. Ben Sira).¹⁹⁴ In an apocalyptic context, often the means of acquiring access to understanding is made possible through a special or received form of revelation. This type of revelation may involve dreams, visions, or heavenly journeys (e.g. *1 En* 24-26).

It is possible that this feeling of being on unknown terrain, identified by Tanzer above, may be explained by a flawed or blindsided methodology on the

¹⁹⁰ Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom*, 17.

¹⁹¹ George W. Nickelsburg, "Response to Sarah Tanzer," in *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism* (eds. Benjamin G. Wright and Lawrence M. Wills; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005) 51-56, 51.

¹⁹² Nickelsburg, "Response to Sarah Tanzer," 52.

¹⁹³ Nickelsburg, "Response to Sarah Tanzer," 53.

¹⁹⁴ See Chapter Four of this thesis, esp. §4.3. -4.4.

part of a large number of scholars who are trying to explain the co-existence of wisdom and apocalyptic. More often than not, if a work is considered to contain wisdom and apocalyptic ideas, an attempt is made to establish its genre (i.e. typically identified as wisdom), and then to identify its worldview (frequently considered apocalyptic). While such an approach is not wholly incorrect, it often results in failing to see that wisdom is a broad category to which numerous genres and forms participate in. Typical wisdom forms such as *mashal*, proverbs and beatitudes can occur in multiple genres, and therefore this complicates those who insist a wisdom genre classification must prevail. Arguing a text is a wisdom text does not necessarily mean it belongs to the wisdom genre, if such a genre exists. The forms of the so-called wisdom genre are not specific to it, but rather to the broader category in general.

That being said, the SBL group has made a significant contribution to how we assess the relationship between wisdom and apocalyptic. Generally speaking, a new focus is nowadays utilized that has shifted the specifics and subtleties of the relationship between sapiential and apocalyptic where these two entities are viewed as being inclusive of one another. This is the best possible perspective to apply when attempting to engage with the theme of wisdom in complex compositions. Notwithstanding this research, questions are still frequently raised which view sapiential and apocalyptic in terms of mutually exclusive categories. This is especially true in relation to historical Jesus studies. Moreover, and more significantly to our present discussion, this tendency to problematize wisdom and apocalyptic is also encountered in James scholarship.¹⁹⁵ This topic will be returned to in the next chapter.

When certain writings are spoken about in relation to one another, an analysis of the hybridization of wisdom and apocalyptic might become expected. Certainly their boundaries are permeable. Furthermore, because of the relative recent realization and awareness that there is no generic incompatibility between wisdom and apocalyptic, and that they are in fact mutually inclusive of one another, a great deal of work remains to be done in relation to the study of New Testament literature and the formation of early Christianity. In this vein, this

¹⁹⁵ Hartin, *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus*; Penner, *The Epistle of James and Eschatology*.

thesis considers the wisdom and apocalyptic discussion in relation to the Letter of James surfacing largely from critical analysis of *4QInstruction*.

Comment on Methodology

It is fair to say that genre theory has an important role to play when assessing wisdom and apocalyptic. However, it is equally fair to say that this role need not be absolute. What I mean by this is when, in Chapter Two for example, we are discussing *4QInstruction* and James, our discussion needs to move past the formal discussion of genres. The identification of common forms and ideas and how these relate to the concept of wisdom, whether it be worldly or heavenly, can often yield more insightful results, most especially when dealing with a text like *4QInstruction*. In terms of genre, it has been made clear that any given genre can no longer be viewed as being representative of one specific *Sitz im Leben*, contra Gunkel.¹⁹⁶ The identification of pure genres is now largely considered arbitrary because it has been established that genres contain many forms that are typically not exclusive to a specific genre. Indeed, as is made clear with the discussion of prototype theory in §1.1.5. a text can participate in multiple genres. Weeks notes: “[w]here the conventions marking two genres do not clash, there is nothing to prevent a work belonging to both—which is why, for example, we can encounter even such oddities in modern literature as detective stories written in verse.”¹⁹⁷

The occasional adjectival use of “sapiential” and “apocalyptic”, and to a lesser extent “eschatological”, is encountered throughout this thesis. I acknowledge that it is important that a work such as this one is seen to move past

¹⁹⁶ In addition to questions about genre are those questions concerning social milieu. Attempting to locate the social milieu behind each text provides one with the means of connecting both on a deeper and more nuanced level. When considering a variety of texts and asking why both sapiential and apocalyptic elements occur, it is possible that answers may be found in their underlying concepts, such as their soteriology. Although Grant Macaskill warns that one must be cautious when attempting to “ensure a proper identification of the concepts underlying a text: these concepts must be clearly betrayed, either by the use of language of the text under consideration, or by the shape of the narrative of the text.” See Grant Macaskill, *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 13.

¹⁹⁷ Weeks, “Is ‘Wisdom Literature’ A Useful Category?”, 20.

polarizing, or considering aspects of *4QInstruction* and James in binary terms, and that one must remain cautious when using such adjectives.¹⁹⁸ However, it is also my argument that these terms remain necessary and the best tools we have to describe the presence of common themes, ideas, and forms present in both writings. They remain categories of convenience, particularly for descriptive purposes, but their limitations are acknowledged. For example, when discussing revelation in Chapter Four, it is difficult for one to discuss this theme and not use the adjective “apocalyptic”. Indeed, the terms “apocalypse” and “apocalyptic” derive from the Greek term ἀποκάλυψις, the latter which means “revelation” or “unveiling”,¹⁹⁹ Moreover, this particular adjectival use of apocalyptic is helpful to highlight the formal difference between revelation and traditional sapiential forms such as beatitude and proverb. Therefore, the analysis in the chapters to follow intends to move past a formal genre discussion, and rather aims to consider *4QInstruction* and James as being part of the wider wisdom tradition. This wisdom tradition is considered to be continually developing, and much like genres, it is hence not a static entity. Moreover, the category of wisdom includes a large number of works that contain common ideas and forms, and most importantly, various literary genres are encountered.

Conclusion: The Task of this Study

The wisdom tradition is discussed in this chapter. To be more specific, the idea that wisdom is a broad category to which many works fall under is argued. It has been demonstrated that during the latter half of the Second Temple period the wisdom tradition developed to such an extent that forms and ideas, such as

¹⁹⁸ It is important to note that Weeks cautions against the adjectival use of “wisdom” and “sapiential”. He argues; “it should be clear that labels like ‘wisdom’ or ‘sapiential’ have to be applied with greater caution if they are supposed to suggest that a text, form or idea corresponds to some distinctive feature that is common to all biblical books, if only because such features are very rare, and because, even at a fundamental level, there are significant differences between our texts. Indeed, there are few things, if any, that can be called ‘sapiential’ in the sense of some general and meaningful connection with all the wisdom books.” See Weeks, “Is ‘Wisdom Literature’ A Useful Category?”, 17.

¹⁹⁹ See Morton Smith, “On the History of Apocalyp̄tō and Apocalyp̄sis,” in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17 1979* (ed. David Hellholm; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 9-20.

apocalyptic and eschatological tropes, came to be included in the wider sapiential framework. Some may argue that the former argument, that is the idea the Jewish sapiential tradition develops to a place where apocalyptic is included infers, on one level at least, that there was a time when these two categories were binaries. I do not see this to be the case and disagree with this alleged inference. It is possible to identify works, those that may be considered as falling under the wisdom umbrella based on the inclusion of particular forms and ideas, and also to recognize that these work include the inclusion of forms that are associated with apocalyptic. This recognition of this identification does not infer any binary relationship, then or now, but highlights the continual evolving nature of the category of wisdom, and its inclusion of seemingly atypical wisdom forms, Therefore, scholarship needs to move past dichotomizing wisdom and apocalyptic because any perceived incompatibility between the two is false.

It is also important to note that there are numerous appropriate forms to use when the concept of wisdom is invoked. This realization problematizes those who insist that one genre classification must prevail, particularly those who insist on classifying a writing as belonging to the wisdom genre. *4QInstruction* and James are introduced in Chapter Two, and while it will be argued that neither belongs to the wisdom or apocalyptic genre *per se*, forms and ideas commonly associated with wisdom and apocalyptic are identified in both. The above discussion on wisdom (i.e. §1.2.1 – 1.2.3.) and apocalyptic (i.e. §1.3.1. – 1.3.2.) will enhance our engagement with these writings. Moreover, the presentation of genre theory in §1.1.1. – 1.1.6. will provide us with the theoretical context to see that the differing genres of *4QInstruction* and James does not diminish either writings' participation in the wisdom tradition. It will be argued that, in terms of content and influence, *4QInstruction* is best interpreted as a writing in which wisdom and apocalyptic elements are combined. A central research question of this thesis is thus to determine whether this is also true of the Letter of James, and it is argued that we will be in a better place to address this question as a result of the critical assessments of *4QInstruction* presented throughout.

Chapter Two: *4QInstruction* and the Letter of James

Introduction

In light of the developments made in terms of the difficulties associated with adhering to rigid genre classifications demonstrated in Chapter One, and the development of the wisdom category generally, this chapter introduces the reader to *4QInstruction* and the Letter of James. To be more specific, this chapter situates *4QInstruction* in terms of the wisdom and apocalyptic debate, and demonstrates its significance for the Letter of James. In addition, two excurses will be offered that introduce the genre classifications to which *4QInstruction* and James may be tentatively attributed to, namely instructional writing and epistle. This will be beneficial in terms of establishing how the forms encountered in both writings relate to wisdom, conceptually speaking.

4QInstruction is the focus of Part One. A survey of all the recent and salient scholarship carried out on this Second Temple wisdom composition is offered. Questions concerning its provenance, including its authorship, date, and recipients, are also presented. This introduction to *4QInstruction* provides the necessary context for suggesting how it may be relevant for this study of wisdom and apocalyptic in the Letter of James. Part Two focuses on the Letter of James. The approach taken is to apply the same research questions that were applied to *4QInstruction*. In addition, a survey of recent and relevant scholarship on James is also offered, along with an in-depth treatment of this writing's provenance. Conclusions concerning the provenance of both of these writings will guide and shape our interaction with these writings thereafter.¹ Moreover, basic commonalities between these writings will be noted throughout with the aim of demonstrating that, in fact, little separates them in terms of content and possibly even their worldview.

It will be demonstrated that *4QInstruction* is a central writing in terms of forcing scholars to re-evaluate how the categories of wisdom and apocalyptic are

¹ Cf. Todd Penner, "The Epistle of James in Current Research," *CRBS* 7 (1999): 257-308, 296: "The projected historical realities are thus mediated, in part, by the framing questions and approaches adopted."

understood. Therefore, how the scholarly community understands *4QInstruction*, while also highlighting its significance for James, is explored.

2.1.1. 4QInstruction

2.1.1.1. History of Research

4QInstruction remains relatively unknown within biblical scholarship. This is largely because of the composition's late publication date and it only being made accessible in a critical edition to the scholarly community in 1999.² It has been discussed under a variety of titles, e.g. מוסר למבין ("Instruction for an understanding one"), Sapiential Work A, Instruction, and 4Q415ff; however, since 1999 the title "4QInstruction" has been applied with greater regularity and is the therefore preferred choice of this work.³

4QInstruction is a previously unknown Jewish document, but the number of manuscripts discovered, either seven or eight, may support its popularity in antiquity.⁴ In fact, after the biblical books of Deuteronomy, Isaiah and Psalms,

² *4QInstruction* was officially published in 1999 in volume 34 of the *Discoveries of the Judean Desert* series, but an earlier reasonably accessible transcription of it can be found in the contentious Wacholder and Abegg's *Preliminary Edition* (1991-1992). See Ben Z. Wacholder and Martin G. Abegg, eds., *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and the Aramic Texts from Cave 4* (Washington D. C : Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991-1992), 44-154. Apart from marking the first publication of *4QInstruction*, the actual publication of this volume was significant and proved itself to be very controversial. Originally John Strugnell had been given the exclusive rights to publish *4QInstruction* in the *DJD* series; the Wacholder and Abegg preliminary edition pre-empted this official publication. Moreover, most of the reconstruction of *4QInstruction* was made possible through the accessibility of the cards from the Preliminary Concordance; Strugnell contributed to these cards extensively. For a concise history of this period in *4QInstruction* research see Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstruction the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction* (STDJ 44; Leiden, Brill, 2001), 7-10.

³ It is important to note that the title "4QInstruction" is not supported by everyone because of its implied cave designation. It suggests that all the fragments of this composition were discovered in cave 4 when in fact this is not the case; a number of its fragments were also discovered in cave 1, i.e. 1Q26. Taking this into consideration, perhaps a more accurate title might be one that does not denote a specific cave designation, or indeed one that encompasses both such as "1/4QInstruction".

⁴ The exact number of manuscripts is disputed. For example, most agree that 1Q26, 4Q415, 4Q416, 4Q417, 4Q418, 4Q418a and 4Q423 make up the seven manuscripts of *4QInstruction*.

Jubilees and *Enoch*, and specific *Yahad* works such as the *Community Rule*, the *War Scroll* and the *Damascus Document*, *4QInstruction* is one of most heavily attested compositions discovered. Moreover, its seven or eight manuscripts are preserved in over 425 fragments. The vast majority of fragments are in poor material condition. It is estimated that only thirty to thirty-five percent of the composition remains. As a result, reconstruction of *4QInstruction* has occupied a great deal of scholarly attention.⁵ Eibert Tigchelaar perceptively notes that *4QInstruction* “contains words and ambiguous technical terms, and the style of the composition makes it hard to analyse the syntax of clauses.”⁶

Since the publication of *DJD* 34, a staggering number of publications have subsequently emerged that discuss specific topics or categories in relation to *4QInstruction*. For example, despite remaining unpublished, Torleif Elgvin’s doctoral thesis remains an invaluable resource.⁷ Moreover, much attention has been devoted to trying to adequately identify and engage with central themes

Tigchelaar, however, argues that 4Q418 1 and 2 should be considered as a separate manuscript. He therefore argues that eight manuscripts of *4QInstruction* were found at Qumran. See Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 61-70.

⁵ E.g. see Torleif Elgvin, “The Reconstruction of Sapiential Work A,” *RevQ* 16 (1995): 559-80; Émile Puech and A. Steudel., “Un nouveau fragment de manuscrit 4QInstruction (XQ7 = 4Q417 ou 418),” *RevQ* 19 (2000): 623-627; Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*; *idem*, “הבא ביהרד in 4QInstruction (4Q418 64+199+66 PAR 4Q417 1 i 17-19) and the Height of the Columns of 4Q418,” in *RevQ* 18 (1998): 589-593; *idem*, “More Identifications of Scraps and Overlaps,” in *RevQ* 19 (1999): 61-68.

⁶ Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, “The Addressees of 4QInstruction,” in *Sapiential, Liturgical, and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organisation for the Qumran Studies Oslo 1998, Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet* (eds., Daniel K. Falk, Florentino Garcia Martinez, and Eileen M. Schuller; STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 62-78, 63.

⁷ Torleif Elgvin, “An Analysis of 4QInstruction,” (Ph.D Dissertation submitted to the Hebrew University, 1997). It is interesting to note that Elgvin’s doctoral thesis pre-dates the critical edition of *4QInstruction* by two years. Elgvin’s familiarity with *4QInstruction*, and the contribution his thesis makes to the field, may be understood in relation to Elgvin’s role as an official editor of the composition.

present within this writing: representative examples include poverty,⁸ revelation,⁹ and eschatology.¹⁰ Moreover, how *4QInstruction* relates to its contemporary Jewish context, and its possible significance, have been explored and proposed by many.¹¹ Recently, the potential that *4QInstruction* may have for New Testament studies has also come into focus.¹²

⁸ Catherine M. Murphy, *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran Community* (STDJ 40; Leiden: Brill, 2001), Benjamin Wold, “Metaphorical Poverty in *Musar leMevin*,” *JJS* 58 (2007): 140-153.

⁹ Torleif Elgvin, “The Mystery to Come: Early Essene Theology of Revelation,” in *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments* (eds. Frederick H. Cryer and Thomas L. Thompson; JSOT 290; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 113-150; Matthew J. Goff, “*The Mystery to Come in 4QInstruction*,” *DSD* 10 (2003): 163-186; Daniel J. Harrington, “The *Raz Nihyeh* in a Qumran Wisdom Text,” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 449-453.

¹⁰ Torleif Elgvin, Early Essene Eschatology: Judgment and Salvation According to Sapiential Work A,” in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995* (eds. Donald W. Parry and Stephen D. Ricks; STDJ 20; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 126-166; Armin Lange, *Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill, 1995); Jean-Sébastien Rey., *4QInstruction: sagesse et eschatology* (STDJ 81; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

¹¹ E.g. see John Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997); Matthew J. Goff, *Discerning Wisdom: The Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Leiden: Brill, 2007); Loren Stuckenbruck, “4QInstruction and the Possible Influence of early Enochic Traditions: An Evaluation,” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (eds. Charlotte Hempel, Armin Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 245-262.

The latter volume, *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* is a collection of papers held during a conference in Tübingen in 1998. Other articles that discuss *4QInstruction* include: Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, “Towards a Reconstruction of the Beginning of 4QInstruction (4Q416 Fragment 1 and Parallels),” 99-126; George J. Brooke, “Biblical Interpretations in the Wisdom Texts from Qumran,” 201-222; Daniel J. Harrington, “Two Early Approaches to Wisdom: Sirach and Qumran Sapiential Work A,” 297-322; and J. Frey, “Flesh and Spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Texts: An Inquiry into the Background of Pauline Usage,” 367-404.

Similarly, the Orion Centre of the Hebrew University held a symposium in 2001 where Qumran sapiential literature was the focus of the call of papers; some of the papers delivered focused on *4QInstruction*. See John J. Collins, George E. Sterling and Ruth A. Clements eds., *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the*

As was discussed in §1.2.3., the category of wisdom became all the more diverse at Qumran, further causing wisdom scholars to reevaluate the category of wisdom. In this respect, *4QInstruction* is no exception.¹³ In fact, it is the diversity of the wisdom encountered in *4QInstruction* that affirms its presence (and relevance) to this thesis in terms of providing a new trajectory through which the Letter of James may be examined. In terms of the parameters of this present work, it is important to acknowledge the contribution of Goff.¹⁴ Goff's work is especially relevant because he too situates or frames much of his analysis in terms of the general wisdom and apocalyptic debate; indeed the SBL's Wisdom and Apocalypticism Group edited volume entitled, *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism*, includes an essay on *4QInstruction* by Goff.¹⁵ Throughout much of his work, Goff uses the language of "worldly" and "heavenly", which he acknowledges is borrowed from Florentino García Martínez.¹⁶ This primary use of "worldly" and "heavenly" may be considered

Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Centre for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20-22 May, 2001 (STDJ 51; Leiden: Brill, 2004). Articles that discuss *4QInstruction* include: John J. Collins, "The Eschatologizing of Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 49-66; Torleif Elgvin, "Priestly Sages? The Milieus of Origin of *4QMysteries* and *4QInstruction*," 67-88; and Benjamin G. Wright, "The Categories of Rich and Poor in the Qumran Sapiential Literature," 101-124. In addition, in 2012 *4QInstruction* was the focus of the Qumran section at the SBL Annual meeting in Chicago.

¹² Matthew J. Goff, "Discerning Trajectories: *4QInstruction* and the Sapiential Background of the Sayings Source Q," in *JBL* 124 (2005): 657-673; idem, "Recent Trends in the Study of Early Jewish Wisdom Literature: The Contribution of *4QInstruction* and Other Qumran Texts," *CBR* 7 (2009): 376-416; Benjamin G. Wold, "Family Ethics in *4QInstruction* and the New Testament," *NovT* 50 (2008): 286-300.

¹³ See Mathew J. Goff, "Wisdom at Qumran: *4QInstruction* and the Hodayot," in *DSD* 11 (2004): 263-288; Daniel J. Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran* (London: Routledge, 1996); John Collins, "Wisdom Reconsidered in Light of the Scrolls," *DSD* 4 (1997): Armin Lange, "Wisdom and Predestination in the DSS," in *DSD* 2 (1995): 340-354;

¹⁴ Goff has produced two monographs that focus on *4QInstruction* exclusively: see Matthew J. Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*; idem, *4QInstruction* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2013).

¹⁵ See Matthew J. Goff, "Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and the Pedagogical Ethos of *4QInstruction*," in *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism* (eds. Benjamin G. Wright and Lawrence M. Wills; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 57-68.

¹⁶ See Florentino García Martínez, "Wisdom at Qumran: Worldly or Heavenly?" in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Tradition* (ed. Florentino García

prudent on Goff's part because it avoids the difficulties associated with the terms "wisdom" and "apocalyptic".¹⁷ Moreover, Goff's evaluation of *4QInstruction* as a wisdom text with an apocalyptic worldview may be considered as being instrumental to the foundations of this thesis.¹⁸ Although Goff's evaluation is considered especially helpful, it is interesting to note that his description of *4QInstruction* is indicative of the wider discussions concerning wisdom and apocalyptic, the latter which has often been unnecessarily complicated by attempts to define wisdom as a genre that is characterized by an apocalyptic worldview.¹⁹ It is more helpful to view *4QInstruction* as being part of the broader wisdom tradition in which apocalyptic ideas became linked.

One final note on *4QInstruction's* research is warranted; the interpretation of Genesis 1-3 remains an important dimension of *4QInstruction* scholarship, and indeed it is one that continues to separate commentators. Some of the reasons for this will be made clear in Chapters Three and Four, but in this present context it is helpful to note that how one evaluates Genesis 1-3 in terms of *4QInstruction's* overall interpretative framework may be considered as crucial in terms of how central issues such as determinism, and whether creation is depicted as being universal or not in this writing, are decided.²⁰ It is fair to say that undoubtedly *4QInstruction* scholarship will continue to grow.

Martínez; BETL 168; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003). 1-15. Goff attributes his use of "worldly" and "heavenly" to García Martínez in *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 27.

¹⁷ An in-depth discussion of these terms and their associated categories, in terms of their usefulness and associated (persistent) difficulties, was presented in Chapter One of this thesis.

¹⁸ See Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*. See also Daniel J. Harrington, "Wisdom and Apocalyptic in 4QInstruction and 4 Ezra," in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Tradition* (ed. Florentino García Martínez; BETL 168; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003), 343-357.

¹⁹ Cf. §1.4.1.

²⁰ In terms of how Genesis 1-3 is to be understood when interpreting *4QInstruction*, there are two main "schools of thought" or opposing arguments. On the one side there is Collins and Goff; representative examples of their views may be found in: John J. Collins, "In the Likeness of the Holy Ones: The Creation of Humankind in a Wisdom Text from Qumran," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated New Issues* (eds. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich; JSOT 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 609-618; Matthew J. Goff, "Adam, the Angels and Eternal Life: Genesis 1-3 in the Wisdom of Solomon and 4QInstruction," in *Studies in the Book of Wisdom* (eds. Geza G. Xeravits and Jozsef

2.1.1.2. 4QInstruction's Genre

Before moving on to discuss the provenance of *4QInstruction* a brief excursus of the genre to which *4QInstruction* may belong is beneficial. While the difficulties, and indeed the redundancies, of adhering to rigid genre classifications were outlined in Chapter One, attributing a genre classification to *4QInstruction* is advantageous for the subsequent discussion in terms of providing perspective for the comparative context of this thesis. To be more specific, it is important to establish the implications of the different forms in which wisdom is conceived in this writing, and later in James. However, it is important to note that this genre classification should not be seen to limit our discussion. In Chapter One, Weeks' insistence on viewing works individually was presented. Since this thesis endeavours to read the NT Letter of James in light of *4QInstruction*, it is reasonable to explicate *4QInstruction's* genre, especially as it should be considered different to that of James. As we shall see, in terms of form, *4QInstruction* and James are not the same, and while this needs to be acknowledged, it does not weaken the comparative or contextual basis of this study.

As the title of this writing suggests, *4QInstruction* is largely concerned with offering instruction to its addressee. In fact, it may be more appropriate to say that *4QInstruction* contains an explicit and insistent pedagogical nature. This emphasis on pedagogy naturally lends itself to an "instruction" generic specification.²¹ It is helpful to recall that when in Chapter One formal attempts to definite wisdom were being made, Crenshaw, Collins, Goff and Wright included instruction among wisdom's so-called characteristics or traits.²² It is addressed to a *mebin*, usually translated as an "understanding one", and while nothing is said about the speaker, it is reasonable to understand the speaker as a teacher who

Zsengeller; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 1-22. Alternatively, there is Benjamin G. Wold, whose work, amongst other things, argues for the universality of creation in *4QInstruction*. See Benjamin G. Wold, *Women, Men and Angels: The Qumran Wisdom Document Musar leMevin and its Allusions to Genesis Creation Traditions* (WUNT II 201: Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005); idem, "The Universality of Creation," *RevQ* 102 (2013): 211-226; *4QInstruction: Divisions and Hierarchies* (STDJ 123; Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).

²¹ Cf. Collins, "Wisdom Reconsidered," 279-280.

²² See §1.2.2. – 1.2.3.

considers his role to be that of an instructor.²³ Instruction is offered to the addressee on a variety of issues. Notably, *4QInstruction* shows a marked interest in ordinary life concerns. For example, instruction is offered on marriage and filial piety (e.g., 4Q416 2 iii lines 15-21) and extensive advice on financial matters urging the addressee to pay debts off promptly and avoid going surety, is offered (e.g., 4Q416 2 ii lines 4-6 and 4Q417 2 i lines 21-22). The former is reminiscent of Proverbs 6:4 where the addressee is urged to stay awake until a debt is paid.²⁴ Goff argues:

One should not simply imagine *4QInstruction* as influenced by the wisdom tradition in a vague or abstract sense. Rather, the author of the document, as part of his own education, was exposed to the study of teachings preserved in the book of Proverbs. In this respect, he can be compared to Ben Sira, in that both figures are teachers whose pedagogy is steeped in the traditional wisdom of Israel, as represented by Proverbs.²⁵

Assuming that we agree Proverbs is representative of the wisdom tradition, it is clear from a brief overview of *4QInstruction*'s content that it is certainly influenced by this tradition. However, and perhaps more importantly, *4QInstruction* includes material that does not appear to conform to the traditional wisdom tradition. This is nowhere more the case when it comes to the numerous exhortations to pursue wisdom, a wisdom that appears to extend beyond proverbial influence.²⁶ While it is true that an emphasis on the pursuit of wisdom is to be expected in a writing participating in the broad category of wisdom, it is what this wisdom represents that marks a stark difference in terms of Proverbs or Ben Sira. This is discussed in greater detail in Chapter Four, esp. §4.2.1. – 4.2.2., and for now it is thus sufficient to note that the wisdom on offer seems largely to represent heavenly wisdom. For example, the knowledge obtained from this wisdom discloses information about the orchestration of the cosmos (e.g., 4Q417 1 i lines 8-9). Throughout this thesis *4QInstruction* is conceived of as instructional literature, and while it is acknowledged that in terms of form,

²³ See §2.1.3.1.

²⁴ Cf. Goff, *4QInstruction*, 13.

²⁵ Goff, *4QInstruction*, 13-14.

²⁶ See §4.2.2.

instruction is broader than wisdom literature, *4QInstruction*'s affiliation with the wisdom tradition is stressed fostered on the basic commonalities it shares with Proverbs and Ben Sira. In addition, for this present thesis, it is again important to reiterate that while formal differences exist between *4QInstruction* and James, it is what these formal differences imply for how wisdom is understood in each text that is important. This topic will be returned to below.

2.1.2. The Provenance of *4QInstruction*

Questions relating to the date and social setting of *4QInstruction* are central concerns throughout this section. Moreover, discussing the provenance of *4QInstruction*, amongst other writings, has the potential to provide us with information or further context about the union of wisdom and apocalypticism found in this composition. Despite the importance I attribute to provenance, it is not uncommon to encounter a monograph where matters relating to the provenance of *4QInstruction* are not addressed at all. Perhaps the reasons for this might lie in the difficulties encountered when one tries to determine the provenance of this writing. For example, it is often impossible to come to firm conclusions in relation to matters concerning its provenance. Despite this, the task remains of offering a critical synopsis of the scholarly arguments surrounding *4QInstruction*.

When attempting to establish the provenance of *4QInstruction*, it is noteworthy that the mutual co-existence of wisdom and apocalypticism is the *entrée* taken by many scholars. For example, Elgvin initially put forward the proposal that *4QInstruction* was a conflation of two literary layers: (1) an older sapiential work; and (2) a later apocalyptic layer.²⁷ It may be helpful to note that Elgvin's views are primarily built upon understanding that *4QInstruction* is dependent on the *Epistle of Enoch*, whereas Tigchelaar argues that, in fact, the

²⁷ See Elgvin, "Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Early Second Century BCE." in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* (eds. Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. Vanderkam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 226-247, 226-227. Elgvin initially set out these views in this doctoral dissertation, however this work remains unpublished. Fortunately, many of the arguments expressed in this work have been published elsewhere.

relationship between these two writings was the opposite way around.²⁸ The present inclusion of Elgvin and Tigchelaar's arguments are particularly noteworthy because they serve to demonstrate the different methods and the general sense of uncertainty often met with when it comes to making sense of *4QInstruction's* form, and how to engage with this writing thereafter.

Therefore, it is fair to say that the proposed genre of *4QInstruction* has influenced how some scholars approach questions relating to its provenance. For example, *4QInstruction* is sometimes understood in exclusively sapiential terms and is hence often situated alongside Ben Sira and Proverbs to establish its provenance.²⁹ However, other methods are also used when seeking to determine *4QInstruction's* provenance: Strugnell explores language and vocabulary in *4QInstruction* and definitive *Yahad texts*,³⁰ whereas Daryl Jefferies focuses on the supposed parallels between *4QInstruction* and the *Damascus Document*, the *Rule of the Community* and the *Rule of the Congregation*.³¹

2.1.2.1. Palaeography

When it comes to the field of Dead Sea Scrolls research, palaeography has proven to be invaluable. In fact, as N. Avigad observes: “when the first scrolls appeared, with no known archaeological context and no historical data in their text, the only means for establishing their dates was a comparative

²⁸ Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 208-224.

²⁹ A methodology similar to this is encountered in Collins' work; he discusses *4QInstruction* briefly against the backdrop of almost every wisdom document known from early Judaism. See Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*, 59-62.

³⁰ Strugnell concludes that *4QInstruction* differs both in terms of vocabulary and thought to core *Yahad* documents; however, he concedes that there is a large area of linguistic overlap between *4QInstruction* and “sectarian” texts such as the *Hodayot*, the *Rule of the Community*, and the *War Scroll*. Strugnell. “The Sapiential Work 4Q415ff. and Pre-Qumranic Works from Qumran,” 606-607.

³¹ Discerning what he believes to be parallels between *4QInstruction* and these *Yahad* texts, Jefferies proposes that *4QInstruction* origins lie in the *Yahad* and therefore it should be considered “sectarian”. His arguments are, however, not persuasive. Daryl J. Jefferies, *Wisdom at Qumran: A Form Critical Analysis of the Admonitions in 4QInstruction* (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2002), 59-62.

palaeographical study with dated epigraphical material.”³² Although now dated, Avigad’s work is one of the few that serves as an introduction to the analysis of the transition of Jewish scripts. In terms of linguistic developments of the ANE, the Aramaic script is universally regarded as the parent script of “square Hebrew”, the category of script in which the Dead Sea Scrolls are composed.³³

Frank Moore Cross’s contribution is considered pioneering.³⁴ With regard to palaeography, Cross identifies three phases of formal script at Qumran: (1) the Archaic Script (250 BCE – 150 BCE); (2) the Hasmonean Script (150 BCE – 30 BCE); and (3) the Herodian Script (30 BCE – 70 CE).³⁵ Accepting Cross’s and Roland de Vaux’s dates in turn means that the Herodian Script is roughly equivalent to Period II at Qumran (31 BCE – 68 CE).³⁶ Furthermore, Ada

³² N. Avigad, “The Palaeography of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents,” in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. (eds., Chaim Rabin and Yigael. Yadini; Jerusalem: Magnes; Hebrew University Press, 1958), 56-88, 56.

³³ At the beginning of the Persian period the place of both early Hebrew and the early Aramaic languages in society changed enormously. Use of the former ceased little by little and generally it was restricted to the writing of sacred scriptures, whereas the latter became the *lingua franca* of the ANE, including Palestine. Gradually, the Hebrew script became superseded by its Aramaic counterpart. For more on this see Avigad, “The Palaeography of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 56-59.

³⁴ See Frank Moore Cross, “The Development of Jewish Scripts,” in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*. (ed. George Ernest Wright; London: Routledge, 1961), 133-203.

³⁵ It cannot be over-stated that the dates which Cross attributes to these three transitional periods of scripts are indicative of his own findings and are not necessarily agreed upon by everyone. For example, Avigad dates the Herodian Script to 50 BCE – 70 CE, twenty years earlier than Cross. See Avigad, “The Palaeography of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 77. Moreover, Ada Yardeini’s classifications of these periods is somewhat different again. While Cross refers to the first period of Jewish Scripts as the Archaic script, Yardeini prefers the designation “The Proto-Jewish Script” which she dates from the mid-third century BCE to the Hasmonean revolt in 167 BCE. She comments that this stage “represents the transition stage from the late Aramaic to the Jewish script.” Similarly, she dates the Hasmonean Script from 167 to the beginning of the Herodian Period in 37 BCE, and attributes the dates 37 BCE to the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE to the Herodian script. Furthermore, and as noted in the main text, she discerns a fourth stage in the development of Jewish scripts. See Ada Yardeini, *Textbook of Aramaic, Hebrew and Nabataean Documentary Text from the Judean Desert and Related Material* (Vol.2; Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 2000), 153.

³⁶ See Roland de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Oxford University Press, 1973), 24-41.

Yardeni identifies a fourth phase in the development of Jewish scripts: the post-Herodian Script, which she dates from 70 CE to the end of the Bar Kokhba revolt in 135 CE.³⁷ Although these certain classifications of scripts are helpful when discussing a specific manuscript, it soon becomes clear that often a manuscript is illustrative of a transitional period between scripts. Indeed, as we shall soon see, this is the case with 4Q416 and 4Q418. Therefore, although palaeographical studies are advantageous in many respects, it is not possible to determine precise dates. The evolution of scripts is continuous.³⁸ Moreover, another crux to the study of palaeography is the awareness that each scribe has an individual style of handwriting.³⁹ Assessing and offering firm conclusions in terms of handwriting is especially difficult when a manuscript is judged to be representative of a transitional hand between two periods.⁴⁰

Cross is able to identify what he determines to be discernable characteristics or traits from each of the three scripts. This allows him to situate or attribute specific texts discovered at Qumran to a particular phase of script evolution.⁴¹ Palaeography provides at least some clues about *4QInstruction's*

³⁷ See Ada Yardeni, *Textbook of Aramaic, Hebrew and Nabataean Documentary Texts from the Judean Desert and Related Material* (Jerusalem: Hebrew University Press, 2000), 153.

³⁸ Cf. Ada Yardeni, *The Book of Hebrew Script: History, Palaeography, Script Styles, Calligraphy & Design* (Jerusalem: Carta, 1997), 50.

³⁹ See Avigad, "The Palaeography of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents," 72.

⁴⁰ In addition to the chronological classifications, three main categories of writing may be discerned: (1) a calligraphic book hand which is an elaborated version of the script that evolved from the Aramaic official script; (2) a cursive script which partly reflects certain types of cursive letter-signs in the Aramaic script and partly reflects cursive forms which evolved independently from the Jewish book-hand; and (3) together with these two main styles, several intermediate scripts of various degrees of fluency and in various phases of evolution exist in the documents. See Yardeni, *The Book of Hebrew Script*, 57.

⁴¹ For example, Cross classifies compositions belonging to the Archaic scripts if they contain widely differing sizes of letters and contained within them is a preservation of the variety of the width of strokes. Similarly, works belonging to the Hasmonean Script preserve the tradition of large and small letters with letters and shading is idiosyncratic, whereas the Herodian hand sharply breaks with tradition of variety in size and tends to standardize letter height. Letters continue to be hung from the line but a feeling for a base line sets in. See Cross, "The Development of Jewish Scripts", 198.

relationship to the *Yahad*.⁴² Despite the insights palaeography can offer, the importance one attributes to its findings often require nuancing. Palaeography determines when a specific composition was actually written down, but not when it was originally composed.

The majority of manuscripts discovered at Qumran are copies. In terms of palaeography, the evolution of a script is frequently witnessed in comparing the different manuscripts of the same composition, and in this respect, *4QInstruction* is no exception. The editors of *DJD 34* identify 4Q415,⁴³ 4Q417,⁴⁴ 4Q418a,⁴⁵ and 1Q26 as early Herodian script, while 4Q416⁴⁶ and 4Q418⁴⁷ as transitional between Hasmonean and early Herodian script. Finally Elgvin distinguishes 4Q423 as belonging to the mid-late Herodian hand.⁴⁸ While it has been proposed by some scholars that a scriptorium operated at Qumran, if this is the case, then it stands to reason that it was here that the manuscripts of *4QInstruction* we have today were produced, but not originally written.

There is no reason to view any of the *4QInstruction* manuscripts as the original autograph. Therefore, in terms of *4QInstruction*, palaeography cannot help us determine the original date of authorship; however, it does illustrate

⁴² Making this observation on palaeographical grounds, Cross discerns that various “sectarian” works make their first appearance early on in the Hasmonean Period, making him conclude that this period was the “heyday” of “sectarian” compositions. See Cross, “The Development of Jewish Scripts,” 135.

⁴³ See *DJD 34*: 42.

⁴⁴ It is important to note that two features of the skin of 4Q416 limit the precision that can be reached in describing and dating its script; damage to the surface has shared part or all of many letters, and even when the letter in question is quite clear, the ink has run at certain points, which prevents the study of the order of the strokes. *DJD 34*: 143-147.

⁴⁵ See *DJD 34*: 476.

⁴⁶ The editors judge the hand of 4Q416 to be earlier than those of 4Q415, 4Q417, and 4Q418 by twenty-five years.

⁴⁷ The editors concede that in many respects the hand of 4Q418 is “transitional” between late Hasmonean and early Herodian script, but recommend attributing 4Q418 to an early point in the Herodian period. Interestingly, the editors note that the hand of 4Q415 is almost identical with that of 4Q418 and comment: “That two spectrums of the same work were written in the same script perhaps attests the work of a common scriptorium”. *DJD 34*: 214-217.

⁴⁸ As the official editor of 4Q423 Elgvin notes: “A date in the early first century CE seems probable.” *DJD 34*: 506-507.

when this composition was being copied. It is for this reason that it may be more accurate to understand palaeography in terms of helping to determine the popularity of a work, over a space of time. That numerous copies of *4QInstruction* exist in differing scribal hands, and that they portray various formal scripts, serves to demonstrate that these manuscripts were being copied over a significant period of time. Based on editors' palaeographical identification of specific *4QInstruction* manuscripts, it is reasonable to suggest a date of copying between 50 BCE (i.e. nearing the end of the Hasmonean Script) and 20 BCE (i.e. the Herodian Script was well established).⁴⁹ This further suggests that *4QInstruction* interested members of the *Yahad*. Indeed, its importance may be further denoted by its discovery in Cave 1.⁵⁰ However, palaeography needs to be used alongside other methods when attempting to attribute a date to *4QInstruction*, (e.g., lexical consideration and its similarities and dissimilarities between it and proposed contemporary literature). But even then, any theories put forward will remain hypotheses.

2.1.2.2. Date of *4QInstruction* and its Relationship to the *Yahad*

In all matters relating to provenance it is the actual dating of *4QInstruction* that may be considered as being the most interesting in terms of this present work. My reasoning behind this previous statement is based off the premise that attributing a date to *4QInstruction* gives us an actual date from which it may be affirmed that the wisdom category has developed to include apocalyptic, that is assuming *4QInstruction* is understood in these terms. More often than not, as we will see below, *4QInstruction* is dated quite late (i.e. mid – to - late second-century BCE), but often no precise or clear reasons are offered as to why this should be the case.

⁴⁹ Murphy notes that the mid – to - late Hasmonean date of the related work 4Q419 suggests that the related material was known and copied earlier still. See Murphy, *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran Community*, 164,

⁵⁰ Elgvin discusses the significance of 1Q26 and argues that only copies of the most important books of compositions were hidden in cave 1. Elgvin, “The Reconstruction of Sapiential Work A,” 559, cf., Stegemann, H., *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus* (Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, IV (1994): 88-90.

It is worth noting that ideally all dimensions of *4QInstruction* (i.e. its sapiential, eschatological and apocalyptic counterparts) are taken into consideration when attempting to offer firm conclusions in relation to its dating. With this observation in mind, it is interesting to note that Strugnell and Harrington view *4QInstruction* in terms of being a missing link in the broader wisdom tradition, and attribute it a date somewhere between Proverbs and Sirach,⁵¹ but their evaluation of the composition is based exclusively on sapiential considerations and does not seem to adequately engage with the non-sapiential material in the composition. In addition, the attribution of a date somewhere between Proverbs and Sirach may be considered as being much too broad. When it comes to proposing a date for *4QInstruction*, Goff's contribution may be considered as especially helpful. He interacts with *4QInstruction*'s non-sapiential material and this leads him to observe that it contains a familiarity with *1 Enoch* and the apocalyptic tradition.⁵² He concludes that it was composed at a time when this tradition was no longer in its early stages of development, and he therefore dates *4QInstruction* to "some time" in the second-century BCE, conceding that an early second century dating is a "valid possibility".⁵³ Most recently Goff appears more open to a late third century BCE dating.⁵⁴

In his most recent publication, Elgvin has reconsidered his views concerning *4QInstruction* being made up of an older sapiential layer and a later apocalyptic one. He now favours a pre-Maccabean date for this composition. He

⁵¹ DJD 34: 31. The same year (i.e., 1999) Strugnell reiterates his conclusions in relation to the dating of *4QInstruction*: "The Sapiential Work A 4Q415ff. and Pre-Qumranic Works from Qumran," 607.

⁵² Goff demonstrates a number of similarities between *4QInstruction* and *1 Enoch*: angelic visions are encountered in 4Q417 1 i lines 15-19 and *1 En* 93:1-2; 103:1, whereas the Hebrew word *raz* is used in both to denote revealed knowledge. See *1 En* 106:19. Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 179-189. It is important to note that the similarities between *4QInstruction* and *1 Enoch* had already been identified by Stuckenbruck. See Stuckenbruck, "4QInstruction and the Possible Influence of Early Enochic Traditions," 245-262.

⁵³ Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 229-231.

⁵⁴ Goff argues that *4QInstruction* influenced the *Yahad*. Agreeing with Cross's dating of the origins of the community at Qumran to the middle of the second-century BCE, Goff proposes that this might suggest "4QInstruction was written at the beginning of the second century BCE (as Elgvin has argued) or perhaps even the late third." Goff, *4QInstruction*, 35.

cites the lack of allusions to the persecution of righteous Jews as an indication of a date that precludes the revolt.⁵⁵ Moreover, his conclusions are partially based on lexical considerations; for example, he discusses the Hebrew word רָז and illustrates how its usage is very similar in both 4Q416 2 and Sir 8:18. He writes; “this observation suggests the same linguistic milieu behind these two specific texts, located in Jerusalem/Yehud around 200 BCE.”⁵⁶ Elgvin’s argument is generally persuasive.⁵⁷ Similarly, Lange proposes a date in the late third/early second-century BCE based upon his analysis of terms such as רָז and כִּשָׁר . It is Lange’s view that such terms are indicative of late Hebrew.⁵⁸ The topic of the significance of the רָז language will be returned to in §3.2.2. This brief survey demonstrates that the majority of scholars attribute a date to *4QInstruction* that pre-dates the *Yahad*. This is representative of the wider consensus that it is a non-sectarian text. However, in contrast to this consensus is Jefferies who considers *4QInstruction* to be a central “sectarian” document. While he does not seem to suggest it is a product of the *Yahad* itself, he attributes a mid – to - late half second-century BCE date to it based on his conviction that *4QInstruction* demonstrates general compatibility with the *Yahad*. Jefferies reasons for this are two-fold: (1) his arguments are largely based on palaeographical considerations (see 2.1.2.1.); and (2) he considers the numerous admonitions encountered throughout *4QInstruction* to be reminiscent of the wider wisdom tradition that produced Ben Sira and Proverbs.⁵⁹ It is fair to say that, generally speaking, most *4QInstruction* scholars have vehemently rejected Jefferies’ views.⁶⁰ Similarly,

⁵⁵ Elgvin, “Priestly Sages,” 80-84.

⁵⁶ See Elgvin, “From Secular to Religious Language in 4QInstruction,” 160.

⁵⁷ It may also be helpful to note that Elgvin’s views are prefaced by this belief that 4Q423 5 1 refers to Korah and the ongoing tensions between Aaronic priests. See Elgvin, “Priestly Sages,” 80-84.

⁵⁸ Lange, “Wisdom and Predestination in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 341.

⁵⁹ See Jefferies, *Wisdom at Qumran*, 77.

⁶⁰ Jefferies’ work has been vehemently criticized and its scholarly contribution has often been called into question. For example, Tigchelaar critically assesses Jefferies’ work and concludes that “with regard to analysis of content, setting or function, this work is of little value; in regard to analysis of structure it may serve as a stimulus for further literary analysis.” However, Tigchelaar does credit Jefferies as being a pioneer in *4QInstruction* research as the majority of Jefferies’ research was carried out before either Elgvin’s dissertation or DJD 34 were readily

Jean-Sébastien Rey highlights what he considers to be close similarities between *4QInstruction* and Sirach in terms of style, and tentatively puts forward the theory that both authors might have been contemporaries and received formal scribal training together. He comments, “Nous en avons conclu qu’il s’agissait de textes vraisemblablement contemporains et que ces deux auteurs auraient pu suivre une formation commune.”⁶¹

Both Jefferies and Rey’s arguments are noteworthy, most especially Rey’s conclusion that *4QInstruction* is Essene. It raises the question: what criteria may be developed to determine if a text originates from the *Yahad* or not? The criteria of inclusion and exclusion are adopted by Wold, but originally derive from Lange, and despite what might possibly be considered their inflexibility, they remain helpful.⁶² Analysis of the forms and themes of central *Yahad* writings provide the basis for the development of Lange’s criteria of inclusion and exclusion. Representative markers of inclusive criteria include: (1) if a distance from the Jerusalem Temple and its priesthood is reflected; (2) if the text projects a worldview that whoever is not part of the *Yahad* is predestined to perish in a great eschatological event; (3) if a specific terminology (e.g. עֲצַת הַיְהוּדָה “Council of the Community” and/or אַנְשֵׁי הַיְהוּדָה “men of the community”) is encountered which reflects an Essene self-understanding; and (4) if a text encourages a stricter observance of Torah, especially issues pertaining to Sabbath halakhah. On the other hand, representative examples of exclusive criteria include (1) no emphasis on concerns relating to calendar issues being encountered; (2) if a text is written in Greek, Aramaic or Nabatean; and (3) any

available. Eibert J. C. Tighelaar, review of Daryl Jefferies, *Wisdom at Qumran: A Form Critical Analysis of the Admonitions in 4QInstruction*, DSD 12/3 (2005): 372-374.

⁶¹ Rey, *4QInstruction: sagesse et eschatologie*, 334.

⁶² See Armin Lange, “Kriterien essenischer Texte,” in Jörg Frey and Hermutt Stegemann, eds. *Qumran kontrovers: Beiträge zu den Textfunden von Toten Meer* (Bonifatius: Paderborn, 2003), 59-69; Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*. Cf. Strugnell, “The Sapiential Work 4Q415ff and Pre-Qumran Works from Qumran”, 596. In relation to *4QInstruction*, Wold is aware that these criteria might be also viewed as inflexible, but remains convinced that applying them to this composition remains a worthwhile task. He comments: “Although some of Lange’s criteria are debatable or perhaps too rigid in conception, critical interaction between them and discussions surrounding the provenance of *Musar leMevin* will be beneficial.” Wold, *Women, Men and Angels*, 9.

text written before 150 BCE is to be considered as either not Essene, or at least proto-Essene, based on the understanding that the *Damascus Document* represents the origination of the Essene community.⁶³

4QInstruction does not contain any of the typical characteristics or terms that are normally associated with writings composed by the *Yahad*. While it is possible that *4QInstruction* may reflect a deterministic worldview, it will be argued throughout this thesis that its centrality to this composition may be viewed as being limited.⁶⁴ Similarly, *4QInstruction* conveys no interest in purity laws, nor does it show any awareness of the Teacher of Righteousness or of the communal structures of the rituals outlined in the Qumran handbooks. In addition, it differs to undisputed *Yahad* writings in multiple ways. These include: matters pertaining to halakhah,⁶⁵ cultic issues,⁶⁶ the status of the Torah,⁶⁷ the minimal interest in national affairs it displays.⁶⁸ Moreover, although the term $\eta\eta$ is contained in the document, it is never in reference to a “sectarian” community.

⁶³ See Wold, *Women, Men and Angels*, 10-11. Wold notes that Lange cautions against identifying a text as Essene based on one inclusive criteria, whereas if only one of the exclusive criteria are true of a given document, one may justifiably render that document as not Essene.

⁶⁴ Cf., Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 88-92. See §3.4.

⁶⁵ The issue of halakhah is not totally absent from *4QInstruction*; the declaration in 4Q416 2 iv lines 8-9 that the husband has authority over his wife’s vows is reminiscent of Num 30:6-15. However, *4QInstruction* associates the proper ethical attitude one should have in marriage with poverty (4Q416 iii line 20), whereas the *Damascus Document* never associates marriage to poverty. See Lawrence H. Schiffman, “Halakhic Elements in the Sapiential Texts from Qumran,” in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 89-101.

⁶⁶ Although *4QInstruction* frequently calls the addressee to praise God and the angels (4Q416 2 iii line 11; 4Q418 81 line 11), this is never connected with the observance of festival days or prescribed methods of prayer. In addition, it never advocates its instruction in relation to accommodating the Sabbath. Goff remarks: “4QInstruction shapes conduct in a way that is closer to Proverbs than Leviticus.” Goff, *Heavenly and Worldly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*, 225.

⁶⁷ Although *4QInstruction* bases its authority on the Torah, it never directly cites it as a source of authority. This is contrary to the movement associated with the Teacher of Righteousness, who placed a heightened sense of importance on the Torah which is reflected in the *Damascus Document* and the *Community Rule*. See §4.4.1. – 4.4.2. of this thesis.

⁶⁸ The group that *4QInstruction* addresses is not presented as the remnant of Israel through which restoration shall occur. In contrast to this, the *Community Rule* is addressed to a group that is depicted as an interim temple. Goff notes, “It (*4QInstruction*) shows no familiarity with this type of Judaism whatsoever.” Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*, 225.

Returning to Rey, his work is beneficial in terms of the linguistic analysis it offers, but his conclusions in relation to *4QInstruction*'s provenance, and most especially his latter suggestion of it being Essene, are not persuasive and may even be characterized as unsupportable.⁶⁹ Wold rejects the view that *4QInstruction* is of Essene provenance, or that it was interpolated by an Essene group; rather, he suggests that it is representative of a broader Jewish milieu which represented a single genre combining elements of wisdom and themes associated with apocalyptic literature.⁷⁰ As mentioned above, Strugnell and Harrington regard *4QInstruction* in terms of being a general offshoot of Jewish wisdom, and also suggest it is representative of the wider non "monastic" branch of the Essene movement mentioned by Josephus.⁷¹ Although both editors favour the former proposal, they remain open to the suggestion of *4QInstruction*'s association with the Essene movement. Elsewhere, Harrington advocates that this composition represents the intellectual and religious heritage of a group larger than the Essenes,⁷² while Goff and Elgvin both remain convinced of some connection between the Essenes and *4QInstruction*; Goff refers to it as "pre-Essene" or "early Essene",⁷³ whereas Elgvin argues that it is representative of the wider Essene movement.⁷⁴

⁶⁹ Determining *4QInstruction* to be Essene, Rey comments, "Les consignes halakhiques qui ne sont attestées qu'en *4QInstruction* et dans le Document de Damas confirment cette hypothèse. Il pourrait s'agir de coutumes issues du mouvement essénien." Rey, *4QInstruction: sagesse et eschatology*, 336.

⁷⁰ See Wold, *Women, Men and Angels*, 19-20.

⁷¹ See DJD 34: 21-22, 34.

⁷² See Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran*, 85.

⁷³ See Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 227.

⁷⁴ Elgvin identifies what he discerns to be three individual sociological entities of the origins of Qumran literature: (1) a wide Essene movement inspired by apocalyptic theology; (2) the *Yahad* as an elite movement among the Essenes; and (3) Qumran is one of many centres of a larger *Yahad*. Elgvin situates *4QInstruction* in the first sociological entity. See Elgvin, "The *Yahad* is More than Qumran," 273-279. Interestingly, contained in the same edited volume is a partial rejection by Boccaccini of Elgvin's hypothesis; he rejects the third sociological entity identified by Elgvin on historical and archaeological grounds arguing, "the community at Qumran and its sectarian literature cannot be taken as representative of the entire Essene movement, of Essene theology and way of life . . . The Qumranites were not ordinary Essenes; their uniqueness however, did not make them leaders of the Essene movement. On the contrary; in their radical

Other scholars such as James Aitken and Adams are perhaps overly cautious when it comes to attributing a composition date for *4QInstruction*. For example, in *4QInstruction*, Aitken identifies what he considers to be the development of the thought found in Sirach.⁷⁵ Based on the reasoning that *4QInstruction* appears to have been composed at a time when the apocalyptic traditions found in Enochic books had been established and been developed into a “collective consciousness”, hence *4QInstruction*’s inclusion of themes not found in Sirach, and on the palaeographical considerations of *4QInstruction*’s manuscripts outlined above in §2.1.2.1. Aitken favours a composition date of *4QInstruction* in the Herodian period.⁷⁶ Similarly, although Adams notes that sapiential texts are often lacking in historical detail, he views the mundane advice being offered throughout *4QInstruction* as indicative of a time of political stability. He suggests that this might be representative of *4QInstruction* being written after the tumultuous period of the Maccabean revolt, and argues that “the late second-century B.C.E. is the most likely period of composition”, placing the author of *4QInstruction* “a few generations later than the career of Ben Sira.”⁷⁷ Aitken and Adam’s views are well thought-out, but it may be argued that they are failing to properly engage with the apocalyptic dimension of this writing, most especially Adams. Aitken’s language, however, of “collective consciousness” in terms of the incorporation of apocalyptic into the wisdom category is helpful.

position the Qumranites were outcasts even within their movement.” Gabriele Boccaccini, “Qumran: The Headquarters of the Essenes or a Marginal Splinter Group,” in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (ed. Gabriele Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 303-309, 308.

⁷⁵ See James K. Aitken, “Apocalyptic, Revelation and Early Jewish Wisdom Literature,” in *New Heaven and New Early Prophecy and the Millennium: Essays in Honour of Anthony Gelston* (eds. P. J. Harland and C. T. R. Hayward; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 181-194. It is important to note that although Aitken identifies the differences between *4QInstruction* and Sirach, he warns against separating or contrasting these two writings entirely. *Contra* see Elgvin, “Early Essene Eschatology,” 131. 136; Harrington, “Two Early Jewish Approaches to Wisdom: Sirach and Qumran Sapiential Work A,” *JSP* 16 (1997): 25-38, 26.

⁷⁶ Aitken, “Apocalyptic, Revelation and Early Jewish Wisdom Literature,” 181-193, 182-183.

⁷⁷ See Adams, *Wisdom in Transition*, 244-245.

Conclusions: The Provenance of 4QInstruction

In conclusion, theories favouring a *Yahad* provenance for *4QInstruction* are thoroughly unconvincing. Arguments that *4QInstruction*'s origins lie in the *Yahad* inevitably rely upon or support the attribution of a late date to this writing, which is equally unconvincing when the criteria of inclusion and exclusion, presented above, are taken into account. Viewing *4QInstruction* in relation to the wider Essene movement is certainly an attractive proposal; however, difficult and provoking questions immediately arise. For example, if *4QInstruction* can be attributed to a *Yahad* origin, then why is there a major concern for money and borrowing throughout? Based on our current understanding of the *Yahad*, concerns like these are unlikely to have been uppermost in their lives. In a shared or "communal" context it does not seem credible that the need for creditors and for good credit with moneylenders would have arisen. Nevertheless, and more importantly, the non-alignment of *4QInstruction* with those of the *Yahad* did not prevent it from becoming incorporated into the *Yahad*. The *Yahad*'s appreciation of *4QInstruction* is demonstrated by the amount of copies found at Qumran, and the likely possibility that it was a source for the *Hodayot* and the *Treatise on the Two Spirits*, based on their compelling terminological similarities.⁷⁸

4QInstruction is representative of a wider Jewish cultural milieu in which the fusion of wisdom and apocalyptic became commonplace. *4QInstruction* may thus be viewed as a byproduct of this milieu. With regard to the date of *4QInstruction*, the view of this present work is that it should be attributed to the early second-century BCE, certainly before the Maccabean revolt *contra* Adams *et al.* As Elgvin notes, its lack of allusions or references to this revolt is most telling, as is its inclusion of specific Hebrew nouns such as רַר.⁷⁹ It is helpful to view this earlier date against the backdrop of Daniel. Correlative to a late composition date for *4QInstruction*, arguing that it was originally composed in the early second-century BCE allows for the possibility that it became generally well known and was thus considered of some importance when the Teacher of

⁷⁸ Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 199-200, outlines the similarities between *4QInstruction* and the *Treatise on the Two Spirits* (primarily in 1QS iii lines 13-18 and 1QS iv lines 15-26), and in the *Hodayot* (1QH v lines 19, 23, 26, 29). See also Elgvin, "Priestly Sages," 84; idem, "An Analysis of 4QInstruction," 160-161.

⁷⁹ See §4.2.2.

Righteousness' movement began, some time in the mid – to - late second-century BCE.⁸⁰

2.1.3. The Recipient(s) of 4QInstruction

2.1.3.1. The Mebin

The Hebrew title of this composition indicates that, literally speaking, it is addressed to a single individual i.e. a *mebin* or student (מבין), but, to summarize Collins, this is probably a literary device utilized by the author to make his tone appear more personal.⁸¹ The term elsewhere refers to those wanting to learn; for example, in Prov 17:24 it is used to describe someone who wants to attain knowledge and understanding. The term מבין might be considered as being parallel with סופר (“scribe”) in Chron 27:32, and describes courtiers trained in every branch of wisdom in Dan 1:4.⁸² Instruction or advice is offered to the *mebin* on a variety of issues: marriage (e.g. 4Q416 2 iii lines 20-21, 4Q416 2 iv lines 1-13); the borrowing of loans (e.g. 4Q416 2 ii lines 5-10); and ontological

⁸⁰ When it comes to dating the beginning of the Teacher of Righteousness' ministry, and by extension the community at Qumran, various opinions exist. The likes of Cross and de Vaux date the beginning of the both to the second half of the second-century BCE; de Vaux' argument is primarily based on the excavation of coins at Khirbet Qumran which he attributes to the reign of John Hyrcanus (135-104 BCE). Because of the discovery of these coins, de Vaux argues that the community was occupied during this time. See de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 5. Similarly, Cross proposes the teacher of righteousness ministry began late into the reign of Jonathan (160-142 BCE), or early into the reign of Simon (142-134 BCE). Cross, *The Ancient Library at Qumran*, 105. Not in agreement with these dates are Jodi Magness and Michael Wise, who date the establishment of the community at Qumran to the first half of the first-century BCE (ca. 100-50 BCE). See Magness, *The Archaeology at Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 65; Michael Wise, “Dating the Teacher of Righteousness and the Floruit of his Movement,” 53-87. Despite both of their arguments being convincing, it is possible that both could be accused of dismissing, or at least, diminishing palaeographical evidence. For example, Wise writes. “so palaeographical dating is imprecise because it is inherently subjective”, “Dating the Teacher of Righteousness and the Floruit of his Movement,” 57. However the question arises: can the same not be said of archaeology? Certainly palaeography is not an exact science; it is open to interpretation, but its findings are based on detailed and skilled analysis of Hebrew scripts. Its entire worth needs not to be dismissed so quickly.

⁸¹ See Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 70-79.

⁸² Cf., Goff, *4QInstruction*, 15.

concerns (e.g. 4Q416 i lines 1-9). Consequently, it is fair to say that the knowledge being offered throughout *4QInstruction* comprises of this-worldly and otherworldly matters.

The counsel is offered by an instructor (משכיל). To summarize Wold, *4QInstruction* is directed to one who is told to understand (ואתה מבין), understands (מוסר למבין), and at times, simply “you” (ואתה in 4Q418 81 line 4).⁸³ In addition, the composition contains a number of third-person masculine addressees (4Q416 1). Most notably, a second-person feminine addressee occurs in 4Q415 2 ii lines 1-9, however, how significant the inclusion of this feminine address is remains to be seen. It is my argument that the inclusion of this second-person address is illustrative of the author advising the *mebin* on how to instruct a woman, as opposed to being representative of directly speaking to a woman. The former view is based on the understanding that it would be particularly unusual for a woman to be addressed in a wisdom composition that originates from the early second-century BCE. Finally, a number of second-person masculine plural suffixes are included throughout the composition (e.g., לבבמה or עיניכמה in 4Q417 i line 27). With regard to the gender of the addressee, based on the large number of masculine prefixes used when addressing the *mebin*, it is most likely the case that the addressee(s) was male, but a female presence cannot be ruled out entirely. When our attention turns to the Letter of James, we will see that the same may be said of James’ recipients.

2.1.3.2. The Mebin’s Status

In *4QInstruction*, the *mebin* is portrayed as having a higher or superior status: he has access to a higher form of wisdom (e.g. 4Q417 1 i lines 1-9, 13b); he is included in the lot of angels (e.g. 4Q418 81 line 4); and he has (metaphorical) authority over the Garden of Eden (4Q423 1+2 i line 4).⁸⁴ However, despite having an elevated status, he is expected to behave righteously; that is to say, the maintenance of his elevated status is dependent upon his compliance with the writing’s instructions. In this present context, it is important to note that the

⁸³ See Wold, *Women, Men and Angels*, 3.

⁸⁴ These textual examples are discussed in Chapters Four and Five. See esp. §4.2.3., and §5.2.2 – 5.2.3.

language one uses to depict or express this higher status of the *mebin* is indicative of whether one considers *4QInstruction* as being a deterministic text or not. For example, Goff uses the language of election to discuss and describe the *mebin*'s status, but his characterization of the *mebin* as being elect is based upon his interpretation of the *mebin* being part of a pre-determined community.⁸⁵ It remains to be seen then if the language of election or exaltation is more appropriate in terms of representing the *mebin*'s identity. What is important to note in this present context is that the *mebin* has a higher status. This will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Five of this dissertation, especially in §5.2.1.

It is generally agreed that *4QInstruction* depicts two groups of humanity at the beginning of creation: (1) spiritual people (עם רוח) who are fashioned in the pattern of the holy ones (קדושים), which is probably a reference to angels; and (2) a “fleshly spirit” (רוח בשר). This proposed division of humanity results in this composition being most often read as conveying a dualistic perception of humanity. According to this reading, the respective fates of a “spiritual people” and a “fleshly spirit” are pre-determined. This understanding is indebted to an interpretative framework in which Genesis 1-2 is understood as depicting two creations. Therefore, following this view, in *4QInstruction* a “spiritual people” are created separately from a “fleshly spirit”, and the creation of the former is considered to be reminiscent of Genesis 1. In contrast, the creation of a “fleshly spirit”, a group of people who, we learn from 4Q416 1 line 12, stand eschatologically condemned, is akin to the fleshly creation of Adam in Genesis 2. Collins and Goff are the two main advocates of this interpretation, which is largely based on their translation of אנוש in 4Q417 1 i line 16 as the first man Adam.⁸⁶ An in-depth discussion of this is offered in Chapter Five of this thesis in relation to the theme of revelation in both writings (see §5.2.1.).

Recently, however, Wold has challenged the above interpretation and argues that, ontologically speaking, only one group of humanity is articulated in

⁸⁵ E.g. Goff considers *4QInstruction*'s inclusion of phrases such as “the sons of truth” and “men of favour” as being representative of the pre-determined, elect group in which the *mebin* is a member of. See Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 220.

⁸⁶ Collins, “In the Likeness of the Holy Ones,” 609-618; Goff, “Adam, the Angels and Eternal Life: Genesis 1-3 in the Wisdom of Solomon and *4QInstruction*,” 1-22. Such a view has parallels in Philo's idea of a double creation of humanity in Genesis 1-2.

4QInstruction. Moreover, he calls into question the existence of the entire category of the spiritual people.⁸⁷ According to Wold, wisdom was available to all of creation but a percentage of creation went astray and failed to pursue it. The foolish succumbed to the inadequacies of their human nature, and hence became known (collectively) as the fleshly spirit. The latter is to be understood as the fate that the *mebin* is being exhorted to avoid. Despite rejecting the category of the spiritual people, Wold considers there to be a deliberate antithesis of spirit and flesh operating throughout this composition. He notes: ‘nonetheless there remains a contrast of fleshly and spiritual identities and tendencies in *4QInstruction*. In 4Q418 81+81a lines 2-3 God has separated the addressees from the fleshly spirit and the latter are condemned to destruction (4Q417 1 i 14-15). All of creation wrestles with “flesh” and it is by the study of the רז נהיה that the Mēvîn is separated and distinguished from the “spirit of flesh.”’⁸⁸ As previously stated, this subject will be treated in greater detail in Chapter Five, but in this present context it is important to emphasize that the *mebin* is not considered among the “fleshly spirit”.

2.1.3.3. The Identity of the Mebin

While a higher or elevated status may be inferred, little is known about this addressee’s actual identity. Strugnell and Harrington propose that *4QInstruction* is intended for the formal training of royal scribes and is thus addressed to young aristocratic men.⁸⁹ However, although Rey argues that the author of *4QInstruction* and Ben Sira were contemporaries (see §2.1.2.2) he is not convinced that the two authors belonged to the same social groups.⁹⁰ Wright agrees with Rey and emphasizes the unlikelihood that both authors moved in the

⁸⁷ See Wold, “Universality of Creation,” 211-226. Wold’s article was inspired by Cana Werman’s article where she offered an alternative translation of the עמ רוח. See Cana Werman, “What is the Book of Hagu?” in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls – Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Centre for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20-22 May, 2001* (eds. John J. Collins, Gregory E. Sterling and Ruth A. Clements. STDJ 51; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 125-140, 137.

⁸⁸ Wold, “Universality of Creation,” 16.

⁸⁹ DJD 34: 20.

⁹⁰ See Rey, *4QInstruction*, 334.

same social circles.⁹¹ The improbability of Ben Sira and the author of *4QInstruction* being colleagues is also made evident by the emphasis on poverty encountered throughout *4QInstruction*.⁹² Terms such as מְבִין and בֵּין נֶבֶן strengthen the suggestion of an instructional setting because they are used in sapiential compositions to refer to a student; however, it is difficult to support fully this proposal because such terms are not representative of a school setting exclusively.⁹³ Rather, these terms are better understood as denoting some sort of pedagogical background generally.⁹⁴ Moreover, as mentioned above, the continued emphasis on the need to maintain a good report with moneylenders (e.g. 4Q416 2 ii lines 5-10), coupled with the possible inclusion of women (or a female address, at least), make Elgvin's labeling of this group presented in §2.1.2.2. as pre-Essene group all the more unconvincing.⁹⁵

Alternatively, Lange proposes *4QInstruction* is addressed to priests.⁹⁶ However, this suggestion has been found to be unpersuasive to most other scholars on account of this writing's lack of references to feast days, halakhic observance, and matters relating to ritual purity.⁹⁷ Also, most telling are the infrequent occurrences of divine names and epithets throughout.⁹⁸ Overall, *4QInstruction* is not interested in priestly matters such as torah observance. Appropriately, Elgvin reasons that some Levitical background to this composition cannot be excluded entirely, but he remains skeptical of a temple

⁹¹ See Wright, "Categories of Rich and Poor," 101-124.

⁹² See §2.1.3.4.

⁹³ Cf. Tigchelaar, "The Addressees of 4QInstruction," 69.

⁹⁴ See Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 245-246.

⁹⁵ See Elgvin, "The Mystery to Come," 116.

⁹⁶ See Armin Lange, "The Determination of the Fate by the Oracle of the Lot in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Mesopotamian Literature," in *Sapiential Perspectives*, 39-48. Fletcher-Louis expounds on Lange's theory further. See Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 42; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 178-185.

⁹⁷ This was discussed in §2.1.2.2.

⁹⁸ Strugnell and Harrington note the absence of the divine name and epithets. They explore if this might be explained by *4QInstruction*'s close affinities with the wisdom tradition but conclude that the "usage of the Wisdom tradition might lead one to expect greater frequencies" of the divine name and epithets. DJD 34: 26.

milieu.⁹⁹ Elgvin explains the occasional and infrequent references to Torah as being typical of the confines of a sapiential teacher at the time. It was customary, he argues, for a sapiential instructor from the pre-Hasmonean Yehud to give advice or indirectly refer to the temple and/or Torah when offering instruction on life and family.¹⁰⁰ For Goff, the use of priestly language throughout is best viewed as a means of describing the elect status of the *mebin*.¹⁰¹ Taking all of this into consideration, the possibility of the inclusion of priests among the addressees of *4QInstruction* cannot be ruled out definitively, but their possible presence among this group does not determine or alter its interpretation.¹⁰²

It may be argued that not much insight has been gained from the above analysis in terms of determining the actual identity of the *mebin*, and in fact, we are merely left with a number of hypotheses from leading *4QInstruction* scholars. However, I would argue that the presentation provides us with an opportunity to forge a link, or at least draw a basic comparison, between *4QInstruction* and James. If *4QInstruction* is understood as being addressed to a predominantly male, non-elect and non-priestly group(s), which in light of the above survey seems to be the most reasonable and convincing view to take, then it is possible to argue that less separates *4QInstruction* and James than might originally be considered to be the case. It is hoped that small inferences, such as this one, will start to introduce the reader more to the logic behind a study that has these two wisdom compositions at its centre.

2.1.3.4. Poverty and the Mebin

When attempting to identify the addressees of *4QInstruction*, it is customary for scholars to focus on the poverty depicted in the text. Indeed, several secondary reminders of the *mebin's* poverty are included.¹⁰³ Collins considers

⁹⁹ Elgvin argues that the sparse references included in this text that refer to cultic matters, should most likely be viewed as being used metaphorically by the author. See Elgvin, "Priestly Sages," 85.

¹⁰⁰ Elgvin, "Priestly Sages," 85.

¹⁰¹ Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 229.

¹⁰² See Stuckenbruck, "Angels and God: Exploring the Limits of Early Jewish Monotheism," 64.

¹⁰³ E.g. the harsh working conditions of that the *mebin* has to endure are outlined in 4Q416 2 ii lines 13-14.

4QInstruction to be revolutionary because there is “no precedent in Jewish wisdom literature for its insistence on the poverty of the addressee.”¹⁰⁴ Tigchelaar warns that Collins’ observation should be nuanced because, apart from 4Q416 2 ii-iii, there are only two references that actually describe the *mebin* being poor.¹⁰⁵ Tigchelaar’s caution is astute and justified. Taking into account the emphasis this writing seemingly placed on poverty, it is reasonable to argue that the heirs of this composition were experiencing some form of material hardship.¹⁰⁶ Indeed, the depiction of poverty such as this is almost expected when one carries out a brief survey of the historical world of third and second-centuries BCE Palestine. The Ptolemaic control of Palestine during this period was one of economic reorganization and financial disparity, largely resulting in poverty and inequality.¹⁰⁷ Taking the historical circumstances of the time into consideration, it is unlikely that the addressees of *4QInstruction* were lucky enough to escape such economic distress.

In addition, several features make the inclusion of poverty in *4QInstruction* unique. For example, the work appears to concentrate much more on poverty and the conditions that result in impoverishment, than on wealth or the wealthy. This is evident in the author’s choice of vocabulary. הון is the only word used to depict wealth or money throughout, while עשר, the latter which is used to denote matters relating to money, is absent.¹⁰⁸ Moreover, *4QInstruction*

¹⁰⁴ Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*, 118; *idem*, “Wisdom Reconsidered in Light of the Scrolls,” 272.

¹⁰⁵ Tigchelaar, “The Addresses of 4QInstruction,” 70. *Contra*, Aitken locates the impoverished state of the addressee as being emphasized throughout. Aitken, “Apocalyptic, Revelation and Early Jewish Literature,” 184. Aitken’s argument is unsupportable.

¹⁰⁶ Because of the economic situation of Palestine during this time, frequently a living was earned by many though common professions such as farming and craftsmanship. Being aware of this, Goff highlights a possible allusion to such professions in 4Q423 3 line 2 and 4Q416 2 ii lines 9-18. Furthermore, citing the differing levels of economic levels in 4Q417 2 i 17-20, Goff maintains that a profession such as farming is being indirectly referred to here. See Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 228; *idem*, *Discerning Wisdom*, 56.

¹⁰⁷ See Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period*, 18-55.

¹⁰⁸ See Job 24:4, 9, 14; 34:28; 36:6; Prov 3:34; 14:21; 15:15, 15; 16:19; Qoh 6:8; Sir 13:20, 22, 24.

is exceptional among sapiential texts in addressing the poor directly. Rather than exhibiting an interest in the poor as an economic class, this writing is fixated upon the so-called poverty of the *mebin*.¹⁰⁹ This suggests that something other than material poverty is being depicted.

Strugnell and Harrington argue that “there is nothing noteworthy” about *4QInstruction*’s poverty language, except for the strange infrequency of words such as עני and ענוה.¹¹⁰ Moreover, several terms meaning “poor” or “poverty” are included throughout. These are: ריש, אביון, מחסור, and דל. In addition, the writing continually reminds the *mebin* “you are poor” (אביון אתה). This has led some scholars, such as Collins, Harrington, Murphy, and Wright to view the “you are poor” statements as evidence for the *mebin*’s actual poverty.¹¹¹ Tigchelaar proposes that this is a conditional clause (i.e., “if you are poor”).¹¹² Tigchelaar’s conditional reading seems unconvincing, however, because of the frequency that poverty is mentioned. To complicate matters further, there appears to be a variety of economic situations being depicted throughout this composition.¹¹³

The question is not whether the *mebin* is “poor” or not as the composition repeatedly asserts that he is; but rather, to determine whether poverty language is literal or not. In traditional wisdom literature, wealth can be used as a means of referring to more than material gain; Prov 1-9 depicts wisdom as a great wealth while Prov 3:15-16 depicts wisdom as the antithesis of poverty. The metaphor of wealth referring to wisdom is especially striking because naturally the reverse is also possible: being poor might be viewed as being symptomatic of lacking in wisdom. It is exactly this that Wold suggests in relation to *4QInstruction*. He suggests that poverty, which is by no means an ideal, is “a metaphorical

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 54-55.

¹¹⁰ DJD 34: 25-26. Wright, “The Categories of Rich and Poor,” 110, suggests the reasons for the absence of these words might be because “*4QInstruction* betrays no concern for the rich as a social class. Whereas Ben Sira advises his protégés about how to deal with the rich, *4QInstruction* contains no such advice.” But perhaps it is fair to say, as Wright concedes, this observation might be viewed as being more relevant when attempting to gauge the social location of *4QInstruction*.

¹¹¹ Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 118; Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran*, 45; Wright, “The Categories of Rich and Poor,” 110-112; Murphy, *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 187.

¹¹² Tigchelaar, “Addressees,” 71.

¹¹³ Cf. Goff, *4QInstruction*, 25.

description that implies, at times, lacking in a manner unrelated to material need or debt.”¹¹⁴ Wold wonders whether *4QInstruction*'s lack of reference to a wealthy class signifies that the addressees of this composition are in some way isolated from them.¹¹⁵ The idea of poverty denoting a person lacking wisdom is especially striking and will prove pertinent to our discussion in Chapter Three. Elsewhere, Wold argues against viewing the poverty of *4QInstruction* in materialistic terms (i.e., this worldly), and encourages an otherworldly reading. Therefore, Wold regards poverty as describing an aspect of human nature.¹¹⁶

In conclusion, it is rater unlikely that the addresses of this text were lucky enough to escape economic distress. However, this does not mean that the use of poverty throughout *4QInstruction* is only literal. A metaphorical use of this *topos* is also possible. If material poverty were such an issue for the *mebin*, the constant reminders of his poverty are difficult to explain. Similarly, Wold makes a good case that the constant refrain “you are poor” not be simplified to a literal reading entirely.¹¹⁷ In this present context it needs to be noted that the topic of poverty is important for our assessment of James because poverty and wealth are also part of that sapiential composition, however the use of poverty in these writings is not synonymous. While it has been noted above that *4QInstruction* is exceptional among wisdom texts because it addresses the poor directly, it is the rich who are addressed in James 2:1, but James' address to the rich is in relation to their mistreatment of the poor (Jas. 2:1-7). Another interesting link between these to compositions is thus noted.

Conclusions: The Recipient(s) of 4QInstruction

In Part One a review of research is offered. In particular, the identity of the recipients of *4QInstruction* comes into view. *4QInstruction* was written to a (mostly, if not exclusively) male, non-specific group community or communities in Palestine in the early second-century BCE. That this group applied a sectarian sense of understanding to themselves cannot be ruled out entirely. According to

¹¹⁴ Wold, *Women, Men and Angels*, 26.

¹¹⁵ Wold, *Women, Men and Angels*, 27.

¹¹⁶ Wold, “Metaphorical Poverty in Musar leMevin,” 140-153.

¹¹⁷ In his article Wright comments, “I do not think we need to take the claims of poverty seriously.” Wright, “The Categories of Rich and Poor,” 122.

this interpretation, this group viewed itself in exclusive terms and it remains open to interpretation how general these instructions actually were: for example, were Gentiles included in the author's purview?¹¹⁸ My conclusion stands in contrast to Strugnell and Harrington who are dubious as to whether a group/community should be spoken about at all.¹¹⁹ However, it is acknowledged that firm conclusions about the precise identity of this group are impossible, although some insight may be gained regarding the group's dynamics. What can be said with some degree of certainty is that this group expresses itself with a worldview that includes "wisdom" and "apocalyptic" perspectives.

Our attention now turns to James, another wisdom writing, in which in this and Chapter Three, it is argued that it also contains a worldview shaped by "wisdom" and "apocalyptic" perspectives. The above sections have served to introduce the reader to *4QInstruction*, and while questions concerning its provenance and how its addressees are to be understood have been addressed, some signposts have also been included along the way to stress the possible significance of *4QInstruction* for James. It is to this that our attention now turns.

2.2.1. The Letter of James

This thesis argues that the Letter of James is important because it serves to demonstrate the transition and expansion of the wisdom tradition.¹²⁰ Generally speaking, James is a wisdom composition, and like *4QInstruction*, some of its wisdom instructions seem to display an apocalyptic influence. To be more specific, throughout this thesis it is argued that *4QInstruction* and James

¹¹⁸ This question is returned to in Chapter Five.

¹¹⁹ See DJD 34: 35.

¹²⁰ An excursus on the genre to which James appears to belong is offered in §2.2.1.3. However, at this point it is important to note that throughout this thesis the terms "letter" and "epistle" are used interchangeably. Adolf Deissmann argues that a formal distinction may be made between letters and epistles. This distinction was both literary and sociological. For Deissmann, real letters were spontaneous and responding to real situations in life, whereas epistles were those produced by the educated and cultured, and while in the form of a letter, epistles were in fact literary and moral exercises. See Adolf Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East* (trans. L. R. M. Strachan; Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1978). However, subsequent research has altered Deissmann's distinctions.

represent literary examples that belong to a multifaceted trajectory in the development of Jewish and early Christian wisdom traditions. Both writings combine wisdom and apocalyptic elements. Subsequent analysis and discussion will culminate in a more nuanced understanding of central instructions and ideas in James.

But first, it is necessary to introduce the Letter of James. James is hence the focus of Part Two of this chapter. A review of research will be set out which aims to illustrate recent (noteworthy and relevant) contributions to the field. Ways in which the provenance of James has been assessed will also be offered. This task is necessary in order to provide context for the study of James in light of *4QInstruction*. The Letter of James is important for numerous reasons, most significantly here because it is one of our best examples of falling under the category of Christian wisdom literature. It is noteworthy that although the Letter of James is relatively short, it is surrounded by much controversy. Questions relating to its author, date, interpretation, authenticity, its place in the canon etc. have been at the centre of commentaries for centuries. These next sections aim to offer an overview of the various opinions and methods adopted by scholarship in relation to these *topoi*. My own views and methodologies will also be clarified.

2.2.1.1. The Letter of James Throughout History

This section serves to offer the reader a brief overview of the reception of the Letter of James throughout history.¹²¹ The decision to include this section is based upon the argument that the neglect the Letter of James suffered, something that has only changed in recent decades, contributed to the difficulties many commentators encountered in terms of establishing or trying to explain its generic framework. However, it needs to be noted that this section is not intended to represent a definitive treatment of this complex topic, or as being the final word. Rather, the specifics in terms of the conversation relating to the reception of this epistle throughout various periods of history will be offered, and

¹²¹ For an excellent synopsis on the history of interpretation of James from patristic to modern times see Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Letter of James: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 124-161.

a secondary reading will be provided in the footnotes alerting the reader to where more exhaustive and detailed treatments may be found.

It is unfortunate, to say the least, that the first clear citation we have of James in the east dates from the early third-century CE (i.e. Origen d. 253/54 CE and the *Ps-Clementine Epistula de virginitate*), and the first citation in the West is more than a century later, in Hilary of Potiers (*De Trinitate* 4.8, 356 CE).¹²² The earliest manuscript is from the late third-century. It is thus later than Origen, and there is no western text of James at all. The late appearance of James on the scene has funded a number of hypotheses, all of which remain entirely speculative, but may be considered significant in terms of the implications they carry for its dating. For example, Kloppenborg notes that hypotheses range from the suggestion that this writing was composed relatively late in the second-century, to it being attributed to the brother of Jesus very late, to the proposal that for some unknown reason it circulated privately and in obscurity for more than a century.¹²³

Throughout the past five hundred years the history of the interpretation of James has been particularly affected by two factors: (1) the historical-critical method frequently applied to James continued to be shaped by the premises and perceptions of the Reformation; and (2) the hostile attitude adopted by Martin Luther (1483-1546) towards this writing. These two factors are coincidental and work simultaneously.¹²⁴ Because of Luther's fundamentally negative attitude towards James, fragmentary patristic references to the letter are commonly viewed as negative and representative of the early marginalization of the writing. However, a point that often remains unsaid is that although patristic references to James are fragmentary, they are nonetheless an indication that the early Catholic Church fathers were using this early Christian composition. In other words,

¹²² Cf. John S. Kloppenborg, "The Provenance of James," (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies, University of Victoria BC, June 2013), 1-57. 6. I would like to thank Prof. Kloppenborg for kindly sending me a copy of this paper via email in October 2017.

¹²³ See Kloppenborg, "The Provenance of James," 6.

¹²⁴ Cf., Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 125. Also Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of James* (ICC; London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 99-110, includes an informative discussion of reception.

although textual references to James cannot be viewed as definitive proof of its use or acceptance,¹²⁵ they may be viewed as representative of its general acceptance.

Establishing how early James is cited historically in the early church depends on identifying examples or instances in early Christian literature where the teaching of James is cited or referenced. This sort of identification is often difficult and demonstrative of a commentator's opinion.¹²⁶ Although the evidence for the use of James before Origen (184-254) is slim, this is not, as such, a cause for alarm because references to many other NT writings (e.g. the Pauline letters) are also infrequently attested. Whatever the reasons behind the relative absence of James up until this period, references to it soon become more plentiful. If we agree with those scholars of James who contend that this writing was composed in Jerusalem (see §2.2.2.2.), then in turn it is possible that hometown pride may serve as a possible explanation as to the why churches of Palestine tended to favour James.¹²⁷

The events of the sixteenth-century CE are most significant when offering an overview of this writing's history of interpretation. The reasons for this are numerous and include: (1) Luther's dislike of the epistle; (2) the spirit of critical inquiry associated with the Renaissance; (3) the rediscovery of Greek; (4) the questioning of historical attributions of authorship; and (5) the beginning of

¹²⁵ It will soon become clear when outlining the history of the interpretation of James, that questions relating to its authorship are often considered as the decisive element. It would appear that this is particularly the case for early church fathers, but nevertheless scant references to James may be identified in the works of Jerome (184 – 254 CE) and Clement of Alexandria (ca. 220 CE). See Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 126-130.

¹²⁶ This is largely due to the fact that early Christian writers referred to books and used their content without actually citing the name. Therefore, trying to establish when James is used is dependent on establishing when the teaching of James is being referred to, but since much of James' teachings can be considered traditional, this task is made even more arduous.

¹²⁷ Cyril of Jerusalem (315-384 CE) includes James in his canonical list. Moreover, because of the nature of James, monks enthusiastically made use of the epistle. For example, Johnson notes that James was commonly used by Antiochene and Egyptian monks. Cf., Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 132. In addition, James was included in both canonical lists sponsored by Pope Damasus (in 382 CE) and Pope Innocent 1 (405 CE). General use of James in the west was helped primarily through the influence of three scholars chiefly associated with Origen: Rufinus, Jerome and Augustine.

textual criticism. Significantly, awareness began to emerge which recognized the NT as a collection of writings whose language and rhetoric were shaped by a world utterly different than that of Christendom. The Letter of James had numerous opponents in the sixteenth-century, but none were as outspoken as Luther. Luther's critique of James may be largely considered as twofold.¹²⁸ Firstly, he remained unconvinced that this composition was written by an apostle and is not therefore (by his own criteria) properly authoritative as Scripture.¹²⁹ For Luther, the apostolic authorship of James determined its authority. Secondly and more importantly, Luther considered the teaching of James to contradict Paul (especially James 2:14-26). Luther championed the works of Paul because he appropriated Paul's struggle against the fundamental law-observers in Galatia as the template for his own struggle for *sola fide* against the Catholic position on "faith and works". Hence for Luther, any work that contradicts Paul is theologically unacceptable.¹³⁰ Because of these mitigating factors Luther characterized James as a "strawy epistle" in comparison with those of Paul, 1 Peter and John's Gospel, which, in his opinion, "show thee the Christ."¹³¹ The derogatory comments Luther made towards the Letter of James have had a long lasting impact on James and continue to influence much of its scholarship, even up until present day.¹³²

¹²⁸ Above it is mentioned that Luther's critique of James is largely twofold, but a third possibility as to why Luther largely rejected James is offered by LeAnn Snow Fletcher. In her "Mercy Triumphs over Judgment: Preaching James as Social Gospel," *LP* (2006): 35-39 (esp. 35), she suggests that Luther's dislike is based upon this writing's concern and/or sympathy with the poor. This dimension of James, she suggests, is something with which Luther did not agree because he (i.e. Luther) is known as being harsh towards the poor, and for his desire for the feudal system to be maintained. Her suggestion is certainly innovative.

¹²⁹ In fact, Luther argues that James had already been rejected by the ancients because it was not written by an apostle. See E. Theodore Bachmann, ed. *Luther's Works 35: Word and Sacrament I* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1960), 395.

¹³⁰ Theodore Bachmann, *Luther's Works 35*, 396.

¹³¹ Theodore Bachmann, *Luther's Works 35*, 362.

¹³² It is important to note that, although Luther had undoubtedly a negative view of James, some caution needs to be exercised in terms of overstating his critique. For example, he does not exclude James from the canon, and he quotes the letter rather frequently in his writings. Luther's concluding remarks on James are noteworthy: "I cannot include him [James] among the chief

It is noteworthy that, despite the dominance of Luther's views, such views were not shared by all of his fellow reformers. For example, John Calvin (1509-1564) is clearly countering Luther's view when he writes; "There are also some at this day who do not think it [James] entitled to authority. I, however, am inclined to receive it without controversy, because I see no case for rejecting it."¹³³ By the end of the sixteenth-century the main approaches or theories regarding the interpretation of James had been established. As a result, the seventeenth and eighteenth-centuries saw a number of commentaries on James emerge that were clearly influenced by Luther, Calvin or Erasmus.¹³⁴

The nineteenth-century witnessed interpretations being applied to James in terms of its historical circumstances; consequently, the goal of scholarship was now to locate the historical placement, and by implication, the explanation of various NT writings, including James.¹³⁵ When discussing the critical methods of the nineteenth-century Johnson aptly comments: "What is noteworthy . . . is not their conclusions, but the effect they expend in making specifically *historical* arguments to *explain* the text."¹³⁶ On account of this form of historical interpretation being now applied to James, the contributions of many commentators were often centred on questions relating to its authorship, the

books, though I would not prevent anyone from including or extolling him as he pleases, for there are otherwise many good sayings in him." Theodore Bachmann, *Luther's Works* 35, 397.

¹³³ John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistle of James* (1551), (trans, J. Owen; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948): 276. Cf., Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 142. In addition, *contra* Luther, Calvin did not determine or base the epistle's authority on its authorship; however, he remained unconvinced that James the brother of the Lord penned the letter. In fact, he regarded James, the son of Alphaeus, as its rightful author. See Douglas J. Moo, *The Letter of James* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 12.

¹³⁴ See Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 143-146.

¹³⁵ For example, German scholars such as A. Neander and M. Schneckenberger used the historical method to reach rational and traditional conclusions about James. Neander regards James, along with Paul and John, as pivotal figures in earliest Christianity, and sees no conflict between them. Schneckenberger argues that James is written to counteract the "faith alone" attitudes of recent Jewish converts and quotes Philo to convey that such views existed in Judaism at this time. See A. Neander, *Epistle of James Practically Explained* (1850); (trans., H. C. Conant; New York: Sheldon, 1852); M. Schneckenberger, *Annatio ad Epistolam Jacobi Perpetua cum Brevi Tractatione Isagogica* (Stuttgart: F. L. Loflund, 1832), respectively.

¹³⁶ Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 147. Emphasis original.

occasion of the letter, and its date. Two dominant theories prevailed in the nineteenth century: (1) some favoured an early date for the letter and read it in terms of its traditional attributions, whereas (2) others read it as a pseudonymous production and as contemporaneous with historical currents within the second-century CE Christianity. Although nineteenth-century analysis and interpretations of James does not deserve to be dismissed entirely, it is dismaying to realize how little emphasis is placed on the actual text or writing. Johnson notes: “What the debates made most clear, however, was what happened when James became mainly a matter of historical inquiry and explanation, rather than of passionate engagement or appropriation.”¹³⁷ Historical analysis such as this resulted in James being marginalized to the extreme.¹³⁸ Unfortunately, similar trends have continued on into the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

This thesis argues that James and *4QInstruction* participate in the same sapiential trajectory, a trajectory where apocalyptic *topoi* are incorporated. While the significance that *4QInstruction* may have in terms of interpreting and engaging with the complex generic framework encountered in James is only possible in recent years, that is since *4QInstruction* was made available in a critical edition in 1999, this does not explain why it is only recently (see below) that any definitive scholarly attempts have been made to understand James’ generic framework. In light of the above survey outlining James’ reception history, it is fair to say that commentators found it difficult to make sense of the highly Jewish feel of this writing, and its apparent contradiction of established tenets of Christianity, such as Paul’s teachings on faith and works. However, it may also be argued that the lacuna that exists in scholarship, the lacuna this thesis aims to fill, may be explained and/or attributed by James’ widespread

¹³⁷ Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 151.

¹³⁸ For example, almost simultaneously both L. Massebieau and F. Spitta questioned if James was even a Christian composition. Massebieau opined that James was a Jewish composition of Essene coloration composed in the first-century BCE, and only later were the two references to Jesus (1:2; 2:1) added in. See L. Massebieau, “L’*épître de Jacques; est-elle l’oeuvre d’un chrétien?*” 31-32 (1895) 249-283; F Spitta, *Zur Geschichte und Literatur des UrChristentums 2: Der Brief des Jakobus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1896). Cf. Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 48.

neglect. If a scholar did engage with this writing, inevitably this interaction was influenced by the approaches, methods and commonly held views of the then contemporary scholarly community. As a result, trying to make sense of or explain the inclusion of material in James, material that does not necessarily fit into a neat genre classification (as then understood), only came into the reach of scholars in the twentieth-century. Moreover, it is equally true to say that the advances that were outlined in Chapter One in relation to the recent developments of genre theory, have undoubtedly given the scholar a new methodological approach through which James may be assessed.

2.2.1.2. (Recent and Relevant) History of Research

It is fair to say that in the last forty to fifty years a type of renaissance has taken place in relation to the Letter of James. Much of this might be attributed to two leading twentieth-century commentaries on this writing: the first is the ICC commentary on James penned by James Hardy Ropes,¹³⁹ and the second is the already mentioned infamous commentary by Martin Dibelius.¹⁴⁰ Dibelius characterized James as paraenesis and accused this epistle of having little, if any, definable structure. However, despite Dibelius' criticisms, his volume seemingly re-ignited the scholarly community's interest in this small writing. Since then a large number of commentaries have been devoted to James.¹⁴¹ Most notably, in 2013 a second ICC commentary on James authored by Dale Allison was

¹³⁹ See James Hardy Ropes, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of James* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1916).

¹⁴⁰ See See Martin Dibelius, *James: A Commentary on the Epistle of James* (ed. Helmut Koester; trans. Michael A. Williams; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976).

¹⁴¹ For example, see Richard Bauckham, *James: Wisdom of James, disciple of Jesus the Sage* (London: Routledge, 1999); Luke Cheung, *The Genre, Composition and Hermeneutics of James* (Cumbria: Paternoster Press, 2003); Peter H. Davids, *The Epistle of James: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982); Nicholas Ellis, *The Hermeneutics of Divine Testing* (WUNT II/396; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015); Matt Jackson-McCabe, *Logos and Law in the Letter of James* (Leiden: Brill, 2001); Johnson, *The Letter of James*, idem, *Brother of Jesus, Friend of God: Studies in the Letter of James* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004); Ralph P. Martin, *James* (World Biblical Commentary, Vol. 48; Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1988); Douglas J. Moo, *James: An Introduction and Commentary* (Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, Vol. 16; Westmont: Inter-Varsity Press, 1985); idem, *The Letter of James*.

produced.¹⁴² In addition, a significant number of articles,¹⁴³ and book chapters¹⁴⁴ have also emerged during this time. At present (i.e. 2018) the amount of scholarly work being carried out in relation to this composition is staggering.

¹⁴² Allison, *James*.

¹⁴³ Representative examples include: Dale C. Allison, "The Fiction of James and Its *Sitz im Leben*." *RB* 108 (2001): 529-570; Peter H. Davids, "The Meaning of ΑΠΕΙΡΑΣΤΟΣ in James 1:13," *NTS* 24/3. (1978): 391-410; J. H. Elliot, "The Epistle of James in Rhetorical and Social Scientific Perspective: Holiness-Wholeness and Patterns of Replication." *BTB* 23 (1993): 71-81; Matt Jackson-McCabe, "A Letter to the Twelve Tribes in the Diaspora: Wisdom and 'Apocalyptic' Eschatology in the Letter of James," in *SBLSP* (1996): 504-517; Luke Timothy Johnson, "The Use of Leviticus 19 in the Letter of James," *JBL* 101/3 (1982): 391-401; John S. Kloppenborg, "Diaspora Discourse: The Construction of Ethos in James," in *NTS* 53 (2007): 242-270; idem, "James 1:2-15 and Hellenistic Psychagogy," *NovT* 52 (2010), 37-71; Darian Lockett, "Wholeness in Intertextual Perspective: James' Use of Scripture in Developing a Theme," *MTJ* 15.2 (2016): 92-106; Joel B. Marcus "The Evil Inclination in the Epistle of James," *CBQ* 44 (1982): 606-621; idem, "The Twelve Tribes in the Diaspora (James 1:1)" in *NTS* 60 (2014): 433-447; Leo G. Perdue, "The Epistle of James in Current Research." *CRBS* 7 (1999): 257-308; Molly M. Zahn, "Genre and Rewritten Scripture: A Reassessment." *JBL* 131 (2012): 271-288.

¹⁴⁴ Dale C. Allison, "The Audience of James and the Sayings of Jesus." in *James, 1&2 Peter and Early Jesus Tradition* (eds. Alicia J. Batten and John S. Kloppenborg; London: Bloombury, 2014), 58-77; Alicia Batten, "God in the Letter of James: Patron or Benefactor?" in *The Social World of the New Testament: Insight and Models* (eds. Jerome H. Neyrey and Eric C. Stewart; Peabody, Hendrickson, 2008), 63-84; Richard Bauckham, "James and the Gentiles (Acts 15:13-21)." in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts* (ed. Ben Witherington; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 154-196; David A. Kaden, "Stoicism, Social Stratification, and the Q Tradition in James: A Suggestion about James' Audience," in *James, 1&2 Peter and Early Jesus Traditions* (eds. Alicia J. Batten and John S. Kloppenborg; London: Bloomsbury, 2014), 97-122; John S. Kloppenborg, "Judeans or Judean Christians in James?" in *Identity and Interaction in the Ancient Mediterranean* (eds. Zeba A. Crook and Philip A. Harland; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007), 113-135; Darian Lockett, "God and 'The World': Cosmology and Theology in the Letter of James," in *Cosmology and New Testament Theology* (eds. Jonathan T. Pennington and Sean M. McDonough; New York: T&T Clark, 2008), 144-156; idem, "'Necessary but Not Sufficient': The Role of History in the Interpretation of James," in *Explorations in Interdisciplinary Readings: Theological, Exegetical, and Reception-Historical Perspectives* (eds. Robbie F. Castleman, Darian Lockett, and Stephen O. Presley; Eugene: Pickwick Publications, 2017), 69-90 Schlomo Pines, "Notes on the Twelve Tribes in Qumran, Early Christianity and Jewish Tradition," in *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity. Presented to David Flusser on the Occasion of his Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (eds.

Especially noteworthy for this present study are the contributions of Patrick J. Hartin and Todd Penner. Hartin's monograph emphasizes the wisdom of James in light of Q traditions,¹⁴⁵ whereas Penner views the eschatological mindset of the Jamesian community as a dominant backdrop against which James should be read.¹⁴⁶ Penner's work is especially helpful because he argues that James' categorization as a "Hellenistic wisdom text" needs to be re-examined.¹⁴⁷ Furthermore, James' significance for the wisdom and apocalyptic debate was recognized by the SBL Wisdom and Apocalyptic Group which devoted an entire session to the Letter of James at the annual SBL meeting in Atlanta in 2015.¹⁴⁸

2.2.1.3. James' Genre

In §2.1.1.2. the genre of *4QInstruction* was discussed. There it was noted that in terms of form, *4QInstruction* and James are not the same. Generally speaking, *4QInstruction* may be understood in terms of instructional literature associated with the wisdom tradition, whereas James is best understood as a letter/epistle and is representative of the early Christian wisdom tradition. As we have just seen in §2.2.1.2. Dibelius characterized James as paraenesis, which for him equated to this writing having little, if any, definable structure.¹⁴⁹ For Dibelius, James could not have been a "real letter" because the writing lacked any personal or situational reasons that would have forced the author to pen the letter. The genre of James, according to Dibelius, was thus paraenesis, the latter being understood as referring to a genre of hortatory literature, which resisted any

by Ithamar Gruenwalk, Shaul Shaked and Gedaliahu G. Strousma; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 151-154.

¹⁴⁵ Hartin, *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus*.

¹⁴⁶ Penner, *The Epistle of James and Eschatology*.

¹⁴⁷ Penner, *The Epistle of James and Eschatology*, 257.

¹⁴⁸ Contributors to this session included: Helen Cashell-Moran, "The Significance of the Eschatological Restorative Imagery of James 1:1: Wisdom, Eschatology, and Apocalypticism in James,"; Timothy A. Gabrielson, "In Search of Common Ground: The Overlapping Ethics of Wisdom and Apocalypticism, with James and *2 Enoch* as a Test Case,"; Andrew Guffey, "Faith without Works is . . . Apocalyptic? Apocalyptic Wisdom Between James and Paul,"; Benjamin Wold, "Sin and Evil in James: Sapiential and Apocalyptic".

¹⁴⁹ See Dibelius, *James*, 3-4.

immediate application to a single audience, or a single set of circumstances that lacked any demonstrable continuity of thought. While Dibelius' characterization of James as paraenesis is not without basis, his understanding that this in turn meant this writing had no definable structure is difficult to support. Therefore, a more appropriate line of questioning might be: how does paraenesis function in this writing? Moreover, if it is paraenesis, does this then necessarily infer an incompatibility between paraenesis and epistle/letter?

In this instance it is perhaps most beneficial to begin with the latter question; that is to say, whether James may be understood as an epistle/letter.¹⁵⁰ In a 1970 article Frederick O. Francis argues that James is best viewed in accord with ecclesiastical tradition and as representing a form of a letter.¹⁵¹ It is fair to say that the arguments articulated by Francis are now generally agreed upon based on the understanding that didactic letters were common in antiquity.¹⁵² For example, in light of Francis' work, Davids argues that it is necessary to move past the form critical approach of Dibelius, and discover the redactional level of James. For Davids then, James is a literary epistle, intended for publication, but must be considered different to Pauline letters because the latter were sent to specific churches and addressed specific situations. For Davids, this means that "(1) the epistle will reflect the *Sitz im Leben* of its place of publication, not that of its 'recipients' . . . (2) the form of the epistle will differ from that of an actual letter, especially in its lack of personal detail, but also in other ways."¹⁵³ Likewise, Johnson considers James as "prophetic discourse in the form of a letter,"¹⁵⁴ while Donald Veresput argues "the epistolary prescript is seen to constitute the fundamental generic signal offered by the author".¹⁵⁵ Moreover, Veresput continues, the NT writing of James is thus "a Jewish-Christian letter to

¹⁵⁰ It is important to note that "letter" and "epistle" are used interchangeably throughout this thesis. See note 120 on p. 89.

¹⁵¹ Frederick O. Francis, "The Form and Function of the Opening and Closing Paragraphs of James and 1 John," *ZNW* 61 (1970): 110-126.

¹⁵² E.g. see *1 En* 92-105; *Epistle of Titus*; *Epistle of Peter to James*. Cf. Allison, *James*, 73, n. 394.

¹⁵³ Davids, *Commentary on James*, 24-25.

¹⁵⁴ Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 24.

¹⁵⁵ Donald Veresput, "Genre and Story: The Community Setting in the Epistle of James," *CBQ* 62 (2000): 96-110, 98.

the Diaspora regarding the regulation of the familiar areas of communal discord typical of ancient voluntary associations.”¹⁵⁶ Finally, Allison also considers James in terms of a letter. For him, reading James as a letter communicates much:

It underlines the religious authority of the author. It encourages one to anticipate prophetic consolation and warning. It moves one to anticipate words for a broad audience as opposed to a small, well-defined community. And it positions the reader not as a dialogue partner but as a listener: one expects to hear exhortations that disallow discussion and instead call for obedience.¹⁵⁷

In light of the above analysis James is considered as a letter/epistle throughout this thesis. It remains true that the search for the genre reflects more than formal classification, it also reflects the search for meaning, appropriate reading, and engagement with the writing thereafter. In the case of James, it is the view of this present author that is best understood as belonging to the epistolary genre. However, in terms of how we are to interpret and engage with this writing thereafter, it is also my view that it is the instructional nature of this letter that is most important.

This brings us back to the first question posed above; that is, how does paraenesis function in this writing? If paraenesis is understood as moral exhortation, this epistle’s instructions represent the author’s views on how the addressee is to live righteously.¹⁵⁸ However, the instructions included throughout this epistle are often loosely related to one another, and in terms of an overall structure, many commentators find it difficult to identify a coherency. Bauckham proposes that James is in three major parts: (1) Prescript (Jas 1:1); (2) Introduction (Jas 1:2-27); and (3) Expositions (Jas 2-5).¹⁵⁹ James’ exhortations range from emphasizing the importance of action (i.e. Jas 1:22-25), to warning against favouritism of the rich (i.e. Jas 2:1-13), to stressing the importance of

¹⁵⁶ Veresput, “Genre and Story,” 99.

¹⁵⁷ Allison, *James*, 76.

¹⁵⁸ For Popkes, paraenesis is not a literary genre. See Wiard Popkes, “James and Parenesis, Reconsidered,” in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in their Textual and Situational Contexts* (eds., Tord Formberg and David Hellhom; Oslo: Aschehoug, 1995), 535-561.

¹⁵⁹ Bauckham, *Wisdom*, 63-63.

heavenly wisdom (i.e. Jas 3:13-18). It is fair to say that all of these exhortations serve to advise the addressee on how to live ethically and righteously. As is discussed in Chapter Four, the emphasis which this epistle places on heavenly wisdom conveys an apocalyptic tradition influence, but for now it is sufficient to note that James, like *4QInstruction*, is best understood as an epistle in which heavenly wisdom, conceptually speaking, plays a major role.

2.2.2. The Provenance of the Letter of James

2.2.2.1. Author and Date

The authority of this letter is not necessarily interlinked with or dependent upon its authorship, but as has just been illustrated above, this position has often been vehemently contested throughout history.¹⁶⁰ Determining the identity of the writer of this letter is certainly justified because such information may enable us to place it more accurately into its historical context. However, a number of unrealistic and “imaginative” theories have been put forward in relation to its authorship. One notable example is R. Eisenman, who suggested that the author of James was the same person as the Teacher of Righteousness at Qumran.¹⁶¹ The opening verse of this writing reads: “James, a slave of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes in the Diaspora, greetings [Ἰάκωβος θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ χαίρειν].”¹⁶²

This opening line has led many scholars to try to discern the exact identity of this James [Ἰάκωβος]. This simple self-identification suggests that his (or this) name held a certain amount of authority at the time of its composition. Therefore, it is reasonably safe to assume that if James is well known, then he is mentioned elsewhere in the NT. The NT refers to at least four different men

¹⁶⁰ One of Luther’s primary critiques of this epistle was based on its authorship: for Luther, the authority of it centred on the legitimacy of its authorship, which, he maintained was in doubt.

¹⁶¹ See R. Eisenman, “Eschatological ‘Rain’ Imagery in the War Scroll from Qumran and in the Letter of James,” *JNES* 49 (1990): 173-184.

¹⁶² An exhaustive treatment of James 1:1 is offered in Chapter Five (esp. §5.1.1. – 5.1.3.) and therefore, the above treatment will limit itself to detailing exclusively with matters pertaining to the writing’s authorship.

named James,¹⁶³ of which three are mentioned in the same verse: “When they had entered they went to the upper room where they were staying. Peter and John and James and Andrew; Philip and Thomas; Bartholomew and Matthew, James the son of Alphaeus and Simon the Zealot; and Judas the son of James.” (Acts 1:13) Reference is made to the fourth James in both Mark 6:3 and Matt 13:55, where in both verses he is described as one of Jesus’ four brothers.¹⁶⁴

Distinguishing which (if any) James is being referred to in James 1:1 is not as difficult as it may initially appear. This is because two of the James from the NT references can be excluded on the grounds that they are not well known. In Acts 1:13, reference is only made to James the father of Judas to distinguish this particular Judas from the more infamous Judas, and James the son of Alphaeus is rather obscure and mentioned only in lists of apostles such as this one.¹⁶⁵ The third James of Acts 1:13 is the son of Zebedee. He is one of the most prominent apostles in the gospel narratives and appears to have belonged to the “inner circle”, alongside Peter and John. For instance, it is this particular James who witnessed the resurrection of Jairus’ daughter in Mark 5:37, and the transfiguration in Mark 9:2. These points might initially lead us to think that this James is an ideal candidate to be our author; however, this James was put to death by Herod Agrippa 1 in circa 44 CE, a date that is largely considered to be earlier than the composition date of this writing.¹⁶⁶ We are thus left with only one other James: that is, James, the brother of Jesus. We know from Acts 12:17 that this James attained a position of leadership in the early church. It is in this leadership role that he is conveyed as having come into conflict with Paul (e.g. Gal 2:9, 12).¹⁶⁷ That this James was well known and prominent enough to pen an epistle in his own name is more than plausible. One can therefore appreciate why

¹⁶³ It is, of course, possible that a James who is not mentioned in the NT is the author of this writing, but as Moo puts it: “we would have expected that so important a person would have left traces of himself in early Christian tradition.” Moo, *The Letter of James*, 10.

¹⁶⁴ It is important to note that this James only became a follower of Jesus after his resurrection. Cf. 1 Cor 15:7; John 7:5.

¹⁶⁵ Cf. Moo, *The Letter of James*, 9.

¹⁶⁶ See Acts 12:2.

¹⁶⁷ Also see Acts 15:13; 21:18; Gal; 1:19.

so many early Christians have traditionally identified James, the brother of Jesus, as the author of this letter.

Jesus' brother, James, may have written this letter. Alternatively, it may have been attributed to him at a later date as a means of ensuring its teaching would be considered authoritative. Is this letter best understood as pseudepigraphical? Allison maintains that James was not composed before 100 CE and adds, "[a] date of 100-120 would seem to fit the bill."¹⁶⁸ That this epistle is a pseudepigraphon, written in James' name, is perhaps the more commonly held view today,¹⁶⁹ but that is not to say that some commentators do not support the proposal that the historical James stands behind this epistle.¹⁷⁰

Putting forward firm conclusions on the subject of authorship is difficult because both sides of this argument are relative; as a result, one's views concerning authorship, and by extension its dating, often come down to the individual's intuition and bias. However, a case may be made that the historical James, referenced in the Synoptics, stands behind this epistle. As already noted, this James was an influential figure in early Christianity. Despite Allison's views concerning the pseudepigraphical nature of James, he notes that ecclesiastical history makes him the first bishop of Jerusalem.¹⁷¹ In addition, several circumstances may be seen to corroborate this conclusion. Firstly, the overtly Jewish tone of this epistle is consistent with the NT accounts of James; for example, we can surmise from the portrait in Acts and from Paul's difficulties with delegates from James in Gal 2:2 that James observed the Mosaic Law, and worked primarily (and possibly even exclusively) among Jews (i.e. Jews who

¹⁶⁸ Allison, *James*, 29. It is interesting to note that one of Allison's objections to the historical James standing behind this writing is that there is no clear knowledge of this epistle before the time of Origen. See Allison, *James*, 13. However, later when arguing that James has Roman provenance, its widespread neglect in the early church is almost dismissed as being unimportant by this same commentator. See Allison, *James*, 95-98.

¹⁶⁹ For example, see Dibelus, *James*, 11-21; Laws, *A Commentary on James*, 38-42; Jackson-McCabe, "The Politics of Pseudepigraphy and the Letter of James," 599-623; Allison, *James*, 3-32.

¹⁷⁰ E.g. see Theodore Zahn, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1909), 101-151; Robinson, *Redating the New Testament*, 128-139; Blomberg and Kamell, *James*, 27-35.

¹⁷¹ Allison, *James*, 6.

were already or were becoming followers of Jesus).¹⁷² Secondly, this epistle exhibits significant overlaps with the speech attributed to James in Acts 15:13-21, as well as the letter issued by a group under James' leadership in Acts 15:23-30.¹⁷³ Thirdly, arguing against this writing being a pseudepigraphon in turn requires a relatively early date being attributed to it. An early date is supported by the lack of familiarity this composition shows with any of the gospels.¹⁷⁴ Fourthly, the social and religious circumstances reflected in this epistle mirror what is known about Palestine before 70 CE: the theology is undeveloped and the Christology understated. Moreover, the destruction of Jerusalem receives no mention, and Martin goes as far as to suggest that the conflicts mentioned in James 4:1 are best assessed and placed in the period leading up to the 70 CE revolt.¹⁷⁵ Finally, the Jewish tone of this writing appears to reflect a close acquaintance with Palestine.¹⁷⁶ This latter point is particularly applicable to this thesis because it may be argued that James' Jewish affiliation is further demonstrated when the Jewish wisdom trajectory it participates in is recognized, and this trajectory is the same one as that which *4QInstruction* also belongs to.

Whether James the brother of Jesus is the author or not affects how James is dated. Josephus, Allison notes, records the story of James' execution: the high priest Ananus had him stoned in the year 62 CE.¹⁷⁷ Therefore, according to this understanding, the Letter of James must have been written some time before this

¹⁷² For overviews of what we know of this historical James see R. B. Ward, "James of Jerusalem in the First Two Centuries," 779-812; Painter, *Just James*; Chilton and Evans, *James the Just and Christian Origins*; Hartin, *James of Jerusalem*. Cf. Allison, *James*, 5-6.

¹⁷³ J. B. Adamson, *The Epistle of James* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 21-24, argues this point at length. Also see Zahn, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 119; D. G. McCartney, *James* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 25-26; S. McKnight, *A Letter of James* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 24-25. Painter, *Just James*, 245-246, raises the possibility that the author of Acts had a hand in editing James' epistle. Also see Bauckham, "James and the Gentiles (Acts 15:13-21)."

¹⁷⁴ For Mayor, *The Epistle of St. James*, ixii, this writing looks like the "reminiscence of thoughts often uttered" by Jesus, thoughts that sank "into the heart of the hearer" James, who reproduced them "in his own manner".

¹⁷⁵ R. P. Martin, "The Life Setting of the Epistle of James," 97-103.

¹⁷⁶ See Mayor, *The Epistle of St. James*, cxxiv-cxxv; Johnson, *The Epistle of James*, 120-121; McCartney, *James*, 24-25.

¹⁷⁷ See Josephus, *Ant.* 20. 200-203. Allison, *James*, 6.

date. Consequently, a tentative date of the mid-late 50s CE is possible, but if James is considered pseudepigraphical, any date up until the mid-second-century is equally possible. This thesis, however, favours an early date for James. The rationale behind this argument is James' apparent participation in the same Jewish wisdom trajectory as *4QInstruction*, and the view that it makes more sense, in terms of its content, to understand this writing as being on the cusp of early Christianity. Similarly, Penner argues that various categories, such as the categorization of James as a "Hellenistic wisdom text", have been considered key in terms of dating this writing to the late first or second-century CE. Penner rightly maintains that such categories must now be considered inadequate because they are guilty of de-emphasizing the non-sapiential material in the epistle.¹⁷⁸

In terms of this present work, it is important to note that how James is dated is not hugely important; that is to say, the possible significance of reading James in light of *4QInstruction* does not hinge on whether James is dated early or not. However, this thesis also argues that while the scholarly understanding of the categories of wisdom and apocalyptic have improved considerably in recent years, much of this analysis has not yet reached or adequately been applied to the categories of Christian wisdom and Christian apocalyptic. Therefore, attributing a date to James seems necessary in terms of demonstrating what, chronologically speaking, is being inferred when this work refers to these categories when speaking about Christianity.

2.2.2.2. The Recipients and Occasion of the Letter of James

The exact identity of James' audience is not central to this thesis, but as we shall see, the question of their identity comes into focus on occasion (see §5.1.1.1 – 5.1.3.). Most significantly, the group(s) in view in James 1:1 are representative of those James considers as having access to revelation (1:5), and being given the "implanted *logos*" (1:21). Moreover, it is this group who, if they lived in accordance with James' instructions, have the potential to inherit the crown of life (1:12) and to avoid the fate of the wicked (5:7-11). Hence questions

¹⁷⁸ Penner, *The Epistle of James and Eschatology*, 257-258.

concerning the identity of those in James 1:1 are important and have the potential to offer us further insight when engaging with this epistle.

James 1:1 makes clear that it is addressed to “the twelve tribes in the dispersion [ταῖς δωδεκα φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ]”. The meaning of this phrase is returned to in §5.1.1. – 5.1.3. This section is concerned with James’ recipients, that is, whether anything definitive may be discerned in terms of their socio-religious identity and gender, and the possible occasion, and place of authorship. These issues are inevitably linked to the larger questions concerning this composition’s date and authorship.¹⁷⁹

Richard Bauckham notes that, unlike the Pauline corpus, after 1:1 “James makes no factual statement about his addressees at all. Everything is hypothetical.”¹⁸⁰ While Bauckham’s statement concerning James 1:1 is accurate, it is possible to make a number of tentative, but credible, suggestions concerning James’ intended audience from this verse. The majority of commentators identify the recipients of this writing as dispersed Jewish-Christians living outside of Palestine.¹⁸¹ Allison’s position is noteworthy: he argues that James 1:1 is addressed to Jews in the diaspora. These Jews, he argues, do not necessarily have to be understood as being Christian.¹⁸² Douglas Moo reads James’ use of “diaspora” language in light of the scattering of the Jerusalem church in Acts 8:1; 11:19.¹⁸³ Dibelius, on the other hand, suggests the phrase δώδεκα φυλαῖς refers to Christians who are considered the “spiritual Israel”, and the inclusion of διασπορᾷ is thus taken figuratively by him to refer to the “wandering people of God”, those who are not at home in this world but whose real home exists in heaven.¹⁸⁴ *Contra* Dibelius, this thesis argues that the use of diaspora language in

¹⁷⁹ When discussing the provenance of James, Kloppenborg notes that James’ consideration is as both social register and social location, “and in the more general sense of geographical location.” Kloppenborg, “The Provenance of James,” 1.

¹⁸⁰ Bauckham, *James*, 26-27.

¹⁸¹ So Davids, *James*, 63-64; Martin, *The Epistle of James*, 8-10; Bauckham, *Wisdom of James*, 16; Moo, *The Letter of James*, 23-24, 50; Hartin, *James*, 25-27.

¹⁸² Allison, *James*, 116. Similarly see Kloppenborg, “Judeans or Judean Christians in James?” 113-135.

¹⁸³ Moo, *The Letter of James*, 50.

¹⁸⁴ According to this understanding, Christians are in exile from their heavenly home, Dibelius, *James*, 66-67.

James extends beyond metaphor; that is to say, the author's inclusion of "diaspora" is deliberate and represents a literal designation that serves to capture a sense of eschatological restoration that lies at the very core of 1:1 (see §5.1.2.).

In terms of the gender of James' recipients, the inclusion of ἀδελφοί in 1:2 implies that it was male recipients who James primarily had in mind. Moreover, L. William Countryman notes that James' damnation of his recipients as "adulterous women" in 4:4 suggests that his audience were predominantly male and might have thus possibly posed a double insult.¹⁸⁵ Countryman notes that this image is based "on the long-standing Hebrew use of 'harlotry' as a synonym for the worship of foreign gods, but James quickly shifts to the imagery of friendship, recalling his earlier reference to Abraham as 'the friend of God' (2.23)."¹⁸⁶ The gender of James' recipients is not exactly a central concern of this thesis, but it is interesting that the author of *4QInstruction* also seemingly envisages a largely, if not exclusively, male audience. As was previously stated, James and *4QInstruction* share numerous basic commonalities and this may be another one.

The Letter of James may be considered as unusual because, although it takes the form of a letter, it does not contain traits commonly associated with a typical Christian letter (e.g., travel plans, and/or prayer requests). The inclusion of ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ in 1:1 may be seen as providing the best hermeneutical tool in terms of understanding how this letter operates; namely, it is a "diaspora letter".¹⁸⁷ Lockett notes that such diaspora letters were frequently sent "from a central religious authority in Jerusalem to geographically removed communities, usually with the intent of encouraging them not to assimilate to their surrounding cultural context and to disseminate official information."¹⁸⁸ The opening of

¹⁸⁵ L. William Countryman, "James," in *The Queer Bible Commentary* (eds. Deryn Guest et al; London: SCM Press, 2006), 716-723, 719.

¹⁸⁶ Countryman, "James," 722.

¹⁸⁷ There seems to have been a tradition of Jewish authorities in Jerusalem sending letters to communities in the Diaspora; e.g. see Jer 29:1-28 (Babylon); 2 Macc 1:1-9, 10; 2:18 (Egypt); 2 Bar 78-86 "from Baruch to the nine and a half tribes who were across the river".

¹⁸⁸ Lockett, "Necessary but not Sufficient," 78.

James is broad, and this broadness and/or vagueness extends throughout the epistle, which in turn easily lends itself to this “diaspora letter” interpretation.¹⁸⁹

The phrase “the twelve tribes in the diaspora” is largely understood as being inclusive, and as being representative of Christians and Jews, but whether in fact Gentiles were included remains a topic of debate.¹⁹⁰ For example, on the one hand, Allison argues that there is nothing in James that suggests a Gentile audience, whereas much of its content implies a Jewish one.¹⁹¹ Similarly, Countryman argues that there is nothing, in terms of content, to suggest that Gentiles are included.¹⁹² However, on the other hand, Bauckham interprets the canonical order of the “Catholic Epistles” as being significant to their meaning; that is to say, he maintains that the immediate placement of 1 Peter after James is deliberate, the aim of which is to emphasize the inclusion of Gentiles into the eschatological people of God.¹⁹³ While much of 1 Peter’s content, especially 1:14 and 4:3-4, indicate that at least some of its addressees were Gentile, more caution is needed in terms of concluding that such a straightforward parallel exists between these two writings.¹⁹⁴ Furthermore, the place of James and 1 Peter

¹⁸⁹ Johnson also acknowledges this struggle to identify particular groups or communities in James, noting; “When the text itself reveals little specific information about its social world, the investigator becomes more dependent on theoretical models concerning social groups and their development,” and the hypothetical nature of James “raises severe doubts concerning the usefulness of the search.” Johnson, *Brother of Jesus*, 103.

¹⁹⁰ Bauckham asks; “When James is read in its canonical context in the New Testament, does it still only address Jewish Christians or can it be heard also be Gentile Christians as addressed to them?” He concludes that James’ inclusion in the New Testament canon suggests that this writing was “understood to address Gentiles as well as Jewish Christians.” See Bauckham, *James*, 28, 112-113. This topic is returned to in Chapter Five.

¹⁹¹ He notes that James 2:21 refers to Abraham as “our father” without any hint that the expression is being used in a transferred sense, while 2:19 makes clear that the addressees’ faith is clearly embodied in the *Shema* (cf. Deut 6:4). Furthermore, all the moral exemplars are figures from the Jewish tradition (e.g. Abraham, Rahab, the prophets), while Gentiles are never referred to, Allison, “The Fiction of James,” 545-546.

¹⁹² Countryman, “James,” 717.

¹⁹³ Bauckham, *James*, 156-157.

¹⁹⁴ For example, some scholars prefer to discuss James 1:1 and 1 Peter 1:1 together because of the inclusion of “diaspora” in both, but this betrays an underlying assumption that the two are so

in the canon cannot be seen as representative of the authors' original views in terms of who is included and/or not included in their respective audiences. Referring to the generalized and hypothetical nature of James, Lockett notes:

It is unlikely that any particular event or specific local crisis initiated the letter's composition. Rather than offering teaching that meets the needs of a particular movement, the Epistle of James offers instruction that the author envisions as useful for Jewish Christians in the diaspora anywhere and at any time—thus envisioning a broad—yet not indeterminate—audience and situation.¹⁹⁵

One thing we may say with some degree of certainty is that, like *4QInstruction*, some of James' recipients are too dealing with material poverty. That these people are treated fairly is presented as being a central concern for James (e.g. Jas. 2:1-8). Moreover, in James 1:9 it is the poor who is promised exaltation, whereas the rich are told they will “disappear like a flower in the field” (Jas. 1:10). The topic of poverty is outside the parameters of this work, but in this present context it is helpful to note briefly that, as is the case in *4QInstruction*, the categories of “rich” and “poor” in James refer to more than socio-economic status.¹⁹⁶

Determining where this writing was originally written and from where it was sent is no easy task. Kloppenborg notes that “given the laconic nature of James,” it is difficult to identify its geographical location “with any certainty”.¹⁹⁷ That being said, Jerusalem, Palestine generally, Syria, and Rome are all put forward as possible locations (see below). Questions relating to the place of authorship are inevitably linked with those concerning its authorship. For example, if we consider that James the brother of Jesus is the author, then this in turn lends itself to the suggestion that this letter was written and sent from

readily comparable, and fails to take into account that “diaspora” does not represent or mean the same in both. See §5.1.1.

¹⁹⁵ Lockett, “Necessary but not Sufficient,” 81. Cf. Bauckham, *James*, 28.

¹⁹⁶ See David Hutchinson Edgar, *Has God not Chosen the Poor? The Social Setting of the Epistle of James* (JSNTSup 206; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001); Patrick A. Tiller, “The Rich and Poor in James: An Apocalyptic Ethic,” 169-180.

¹⁹⁷ Kloppenborg, “The Provenance of James,” 1.

Jerusalem because there is no textual evidence to suggest that this James ever left Palestine. In light of this observation Hartin and James Dunn propose that James has a Jerusalem provenance,¹⁹⁸ but other scholars such as Peter Davids and Johnson are content to opine that James wrote and sent this letter from somewhere in Palestine.¹⁹⁹

Recent scholarship on James has focused upon and identified its so-called urban environment, and in turn this urban environment is considered as indicative of its provenance. Therefore, Alicia Batten, Sophie Laws, and David Kaden are all proponents of the view that James 1:1 is representative of Jewish-Christians living in an urbanized environment somewhere outside of Palestine, but differ in terms of the exact location. In the case of Batten, she lists what she considers to be the presence of urban imagery throughout James (e.g. “crown” in 1:12; a man with gold rings and fine clothes in 2:2; courts in 2:6; teachers in 3:1; would-be merchants in 4:13; as well as garments of gold and silver of the rich in 5:2-3), and argues that “none of these things would be common in a rural village but more recognizable in a larger urban centre.”²⁰⁰ She considers that James’ use of refined Greek, his awareness and reformation of Hellenistic philosophical concepts,²⁰¹ and his apparent knowledge of the problems associated with city life,

¹⁹⁸ Hartin, *James of Jerusalem*, 27; James G. Dunn, *Beginning from Jerusalem* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 1128.

¹⁹⁹ Johnson, *The Epistle of James*, 120; Davids, “Tradition and Citation in the Letter of James,” 113-126.

²⁰⁰ Batten, “The Urbanization of the Jesus Tradition,” 84. See also her “The Urban and Agrarian in the Letter of James,” *JECH* 3.2 (2012): 4-20 which serves as a more focused discussion of rural and urban imagery in James.

²⁰¹ Batten notes the parallels between some of James’ ideas and those of Stoic teachers and views this as a further indication of an urban audience. Batten, “The Urbanization of the Jesus Tradition,” 85-87. Kloppenborg explores the similarities between Stoic psychagogy and James 1:2-15. According to Kloppenborg, James transforms Q’s teaching about asking and receiving (Q 11:9), which would have been more appropriate in the Palestinian countryside. The emphasis then shifts from material concerns to philosophical ones; the Q saying is changed to suit James’ desire to stress the nature of God in comparison to the one who is doubled-minded (διψυχία) (1:8). For Kloppenborg, this reformations of Q, in James, would make more sense for “those circles of educated or semi-educated Judeans, probably urban, who understood the Torah to be consistent with the best of Greek philosophy . . . “ See John S. Kloppenborg, “James 1:2-15 and Hellenistic Psychagogy,” *NovT* 52 (2010), 37-71, 71.

all point to an urban audience.²⁰² In her earlier doctoral work, Batten suggests Rome as the likely location of the audience, but later revised her view and most recently argues that James is addressed to a more general urban setting.²⁰³ Batten's views are built upon those of Matt Jackson-McCabe who, in his monograph, reminds the reader that people at this time were not living in isolated communities; on the contrary, they often lived in large city centres, undoubtedly maintaining certain practices and identities, but also participating in public life and enjoying the culture and the intellectual richness that a cosmopolitan setting furnished.²⁰⁴ In view of this, Batten therefore argues that James is written to city-dwellers and that the author shapes his sources in such a way that they are "urbanized", but that he "includes the occasional agrarian image because those who live in the country are exhibiting the type of life . . . that the author wishes to promote."²⁰⁵

Laws, Kaden and Allison, however, all affirm a Roman provenance for James. Each of their arguments are based on the conviction that this writing portrays a Roman influence and this influence is seen as indicative of its place of authorship. For example, Laws bases her argument on the verbal and thematic parallels between James and the *Shepherd of Hermas*, the latter of which was almost certainly composed in Rome in the second-century CE and proposes that "James was known in Rome at the time of Hermas."²⁰⁶ Laws' argument for the

²⁰² For example, in the case of problems associated with city living, Batten discusses the scene described in Jas. 2:1-13. She argues that such scenes were more common to an urban environment. Furthermore, James' denunciation of the rich (e.g. 2:6) would resonate more with an urban audience, because as such, wealthy people tended to live in cities. See Batten, "The Urbanization of the Jesus Tradition," 85-90.

²⁰³ See her earlier views in "The 'Epistle of Straw' Reconsidered" [Toronto University of St. Michael's College, 2000], 235-241, as opposed to her revised monograph; *Friendship and Benefaction in James*, 183.

²⁰⁴ Matt Jackson-McCabe, *Logos and Law*, 27. Also see Philip A. Harland, *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 200-210.

²⁰⁵ Batten, "The Urbanization of the Jesus Tradition," 79.

²⁰⁶ Laws comments, "That the epistle of James had its origin in some part of the Roman Christian community is a plausible, if not provable, hypothesis." Laws, *The Epistle of James*, 26. See

Roman provenance of James is particularly noteworthy because it is largely based upon her reflections on the similarities between *Mandate* 9 and James 1:8 in terms of the condemnation of the “διψυχία” and the effect of prayer (see §6.4.2.). Similarly, Kaden considers the verbal and thematic overlap between James and the early second-century CE Stoic Epictetus who was based in Rome.²⁰⁷ The similarities between James and the latter, he maintains, suggest a closer literary relationship than mere familiarity with stock Stoic expressions.²⁰⁸ Moreover, he judges the economic situation outlined in James 2:1-7 to be hypothetical, and argues that the picture of the emerging audience is one of bourgeoisie middle-class. He proposes that such an audience would commonly be found in Rome in the second-century CE.²⁰⁹ One might question the appropriateness of Kaden’s use of “bourgeoisie middle-class language”, and how applicable it actually is when describing an ancient (hypothetical) community setting.

Allison equally understands James as having Roman provenance and this is based largely on his views concerning the pseudepigraphical nature of this writing (see §2.2.2.1. above). However, the rationale behind Allison’s argument is circular. If James is taken to be a pseudepigraphon, then the prescript of James (i.e. Jas. 1:1) cannot be relied upon as an index of its provenance.²¹⁰ For Allison,

Carolyn Osiek, *A Commentary on the Shepherd of Hermas: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999), 18.

²⁰⁷ See A. A. Long, *Epictetus: A Stoic and Socratic Guide to Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

²⁰⁸ For example, Kaden notes that both James and Epictetus share an interest in deeds and works as external evidence of the control one exercises over the internal self. Furthermore, just as Epictetus refers to Socrates as a sage worthy of veneration throughout his writings, James presents Abraham and Rahab as idealized models of praxis (Jas. 2:23. 25; *Diss.* 2:6. 26). In addition, “perfection” of the self appears to be the goal of both writers (*Diss.* 1:4, 19, 21; Jas. 1:4; 3:14; 5: 14). See Kaden, “Stoicism, Social Stratification, and the Q Tradition,” 106-115. Although Kaden’s presentation of the similarities between these writings is striking, his overall thesis is not compelling. It seems likely that some form of a literary relationship between these writings exists, however, this argument is not dependent or reliant on a Roman provenance.

²⁰⁹ Kaden, “Stoicism, Social Stratification, and the Q Tradition,” 115-119.

²¹⁰ Kloppenborg notes that the logic of pseudepigraphy asserts that “neither the ostensible author is the real author, nor are the ostensible addressees the actual intended addressees.” Kloppenborg, “The Provenance of James,” 6.

Rome makes the most sense when determining the place of authorship. He cites numerous reasons for this assessment, which include: (1) the so-called close parallels between James and 1 Peter, the latter which is largely considered to have been written in Rome; (2) the close linguistic parallels between James and to *1 Clement* and the *Shepherd of Hermas*, both of which come from Rome; and (3) James' possible awareness of Pauline theology and possibly even of Romans, which would have been widely known and used among the Christian communities in Rome.²¹¹ However, this thesis considers a Roman provenance as unconvincing. Noted previously is that James was widely neglected until the third-century CE, and therefore, this presents a major difficulty to those who argue for its supposed Roman provenance. James was not attested before Augustine and we are thus justified in asking: if Rome served as James' place of composition, then why do we not see it being referenced more (in Rome and other places) before the third-century CE?²¹² Davids and Johnson offer a solution: James was written and sent from somewhere in Palestine, but it is difficult to step outside completely from the Jerusalem provenance hypothesis.²¹³ Moreover, if we agree with Lockett's proposal that James is best interpreted as a "diaspora letter", then a provenance in Jerusalem certainly makes sense.

²¹¹ See Allison, *James*, 95-98.

²¹² It is helpful to note that Allison acknowledges this objection, but counters that the "Roman church was not a monolithic entity, and there is no reason to imagine that the project of one of its Jewish Christian groups would have been welcome by all of its Gentile groups . . . [James'] writings, although composed in Rome, were not read and copied by the dominant Christian movement that opposed him." See Allison, *James*, 97-98. Allison's argument is intuitive, but it is difficult to align it with his earlier one concerning the close parallels between James to 1 Peter, *1 Clement* and the *Shepherd of Hermas*. It would seem then that Rome may be cited in terms of close parallels to other Roman writings, but Rome, as a location, is irrelevant in terms of representing or explaining James' neglect in the early church. Also see Kaden, "Stoicism, Social Stratification, and the Q Tradition," 99-100, n.8. Kaden also acknowledges the problems associated with a Roman provenance, but argues that James' silence before the third-century CE may be attributed to early Christians' doubting its authenticity on account of this writing's lack of direct Christian material.

²¹³ That this letter was composed in Jerusalem is consistent with the traditions of James illustrated in Acts and Galatians.

Conclusions: The Provenance of the Letter of James

Part Two of this chapter introduces the reader to the Letter of James. The controversies in terms of this writing's reception, and the complexities associated with its provenance, are presented. In some respects, one may consider much of this material as being surplus to the topic of this present work. However, I would counter argue that the above presentation is made necessary by the lack of agreement and inconsistency that still remains in James scholarship. Therefore, outlining how this present work understands James in terms of its author, date, and recipients seemed required in terms of grounding or situating the subsequent arguments that will be made in relation James throughout the remainder of this thesis. Moreover, while James is no longer the victim of scholarly neglect, discussing its contentious historical reception allows the reader to see why it is only in recent decades that scholarly attention has come to investigate its generic form and theoretical framework.

The above presentation has also noted a number of basic commonalities between *4QInstruction* and James in term of their content, and their emphasis on instruction. While it is important to remember that *4QInstruction* and James are not the same, in terms of form, the identification of these basic commonalities are beneficial in terms of beginning to alert the reader to the possibility that these writings are participating in a multifaceted trajectory of the same tradition, namely wisdom. Moreover, the identification of basic commonalities allows us to see that in fact, little separates them. Both writings appear to be addressed (primarily) to men. Both authors appear to have a specific group and/or groups in mind. And finally, the theme of poverty seems to have been important for both authors. The inclusion of *4QInstruction's* otherworldly *topoi* is also presented above, and the decision to include this material in this chapter is based on the commonly held view that *4QInstruction* combines wisdom and apocalyptic elements. The former is now a well-established reading of *4QInstruction*; however, the same cannot be said for James. Therefore, the next chapter discusses themes that are present in James, but which are not typically characterized as sapiential. The aim of this discussion will be to demonstrate further that James is participating in the same trajectory of wisdom literature as *4QInstruction*.

Conclusions

Chapter Two introduces *4QInstruction* and James. A thorough history of research was offered for both writing, as was a detailed discussion concerning issues relating to the provenance of both. All of this material is important in terms of not only introducing the reader to *4QInstruction* and James, but also in terms of establishing a theoretical framework for going forward. It was also noted that *4QInstruction* and James are different in terms of form; while the former is representative of instructional literature, the latter is an epistle. It is imperative that their formal difference be noted, most especially for a study such as this one that proposes to read James in light of *4QInstruction*. However, it is equally important to note that their formal difference does not weaken the basis for this study. Rather, it forces us to engage with the form of both writings, and enables us to see that the idea of instruction is central to both.

This thesis proposes to read James in light of *4QInstruction*, considering the latter text to be an example of a Second Temple text in which sapiential and apocalyptic elements are combined. It is hoped that this will have a positive effect on James' interpretation, leading to an improved understanding of James' framework and influence. As has now been established, much of this thesis is concerned with the relationship between wisdom and apocalyptic. This chapter has demonstrated the applicability of James to this present thesis, and the lacuna in current scholarship has been identified.

Chapter Three: James' Apocalyptic Perspective: Eschatological Emphasis

Introduction

In Chapter Two, attention was paid, amongst other things, to *4QInstruction's* participation in a specific Jewish sapiential trajectory. Goff's argument that *4QInstruction* is a wisdom text with an apocalyptic worldview was presented and affirmed.¹ This current chapter explores whether the same might be said about James. To be more specific, the Letter of James is explored in light of the expansion or the development of the category of wisdom and its amalgamation of apocalyptic constructs outlined in Chapter One, the aim being to demonstrate further the applicability of James to this overall study.

To achieve this, all scholarly work that has sought to make sense of James' inclusion of wisdom, eschatological, and apocalyptic traits will be presented and assessed. The former will serve to establish that James belongs to a distinct trajectory in terms of the development of early Christian wisdom literature. Part One focuses on how James has (recently) come to be seen as an example of where the categorical and boundaries between wisdom and apocalyptic are blended. Part Two is then concerned with examining the theoretical worldview of James. Much of this analysis will stem or emerge from the dominant understanding and critical assessment of *4QInstruction's* content and influence. Moreover, both James' portrayal of the opposition between the world and God, and its emphasis on eschatology, are also explored.

3.1. Conflicted Boundaries in James

Part Two of Chapter Two presented the reception of James. At the time I noted that the decision to include such material is based upon my argument that James' controversial historical reception, and its widespread neglect, has contributed to questions concerning its genre and theoretical framework only coming to the scholarly fore in recent years. While the diversity of wisdom literature has come to be recognized by many scholars, the possible significance that James may hold in terms of this wider wisdom discussion has only been recognized by a small number of scholars. In Part One of this chapter the scholarship that has

¹ See Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*.

recognized James' importance for the wisdom and apocalyptic discussion is hence presented.

3.1.1. *Conflicted Boundaries*

In Chapter Two the works of Hartin and Penner were mentioned. Hartin's monograph emphasizes the wisdom of James in light of Q traditions,² whereas Penner views the eschatological mindset of the Jamesian community as a dominant backdrop against which James should be read.³ Moreover, Penner's argument that the categorization of James as a "Hellenistic wisdom text" needs to be re-examined, was also included.⁴ Hartin and Penner's works are particularly significant for this present study because they are the first to consider seriously the generic and theoretical framework of James.

In 2005 a collection of essays entitled *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism* was published.⁵ This publication is a compendium of some of the papers presented over the previous ten years at the SBL Wisdom and Apocalyptic Group.⁶ Two of the essays are particularly relevant to this present discussion: those of Hartin and Patrick A. Tiller discuss the Letter of James. Hartin examines and applies the relationship of wisdom, eschatology, and apocalypticism to the letter and maintains that eschatology provides the backdrop for many of its ethical teachings.⁷ While Hartin acknowledges that James conveys an awareness of the apocalyptic imagination, it is notable that he argues that this writing also demonstrates a distancing from apocalyptic thinking in two ways: (1) the belief that the eschatological age has already arrived (Jas. 5:9); and (2) while the coming age brings judgment, the overwhelming ethos of the writing suggests that this coming age is to be approached with joy and happiness, not fear and trepidation. In this way, Hartin maintains that a slight nuance separates James from other "apocalyptic" writings, one such example being the *Epistle of*

² Hartin, *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus*.

³ Penner, *The Epistle of James and Eschatology*.

⁴ Penner, *The Epistle of James and Eschatology*, 257.

⁵ Wright and Wills, eds., *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism*.

⁶ The significance and contributions of this group were outlined in §1.4.

⁷ Hartin, "'Who is Wise and Understanding among You?'" (James 3:13): An Analysis of Wisdom, Eschatology, and Apocalypticism in the Letter of James," 149-168, 157-160.

Enoch. In the case of the *Epistle of Enoch*, the apocalyptic revelatory genre unites the wisdom, prophetic and eschatological material, whereas it is wisdom in James, Hartin maintains, that provides the overarching genre that brings together the prophetic and eschatological material. Despite this, Hartin agrees that James shares some aspects of some thought patterns present in an apocalyptic worldview.⁸

Tiller, who is largely responding to Hartin, discusses the categories of rich and poor in James in terms of both categories as representative of an apocalyptic ethic.⁹ He argues that, while James is deliberately adopting an apocalyptic construction of reality, unlike other apocalyptic authors, James' use of this construction aims to help his recipients understand their place in an apocalyptically defined-universe.¹⁰ The observation that James has an apocalyptically-defined universe is particularly noteworthy in this present context and is returned to below.

The essays by Hartin and Tiller are especially significant because they begin to demonstrate that the categories of wisdom, eschatology, and apocalyptic are all present in James. However, their lack of engagement with *4QInstruction* stands out and is a lacuna that this thesis seeks to fill. Hartin's essay is especially helpful because it reaffirms the hybrid nature of genre, and the now widely challenged idea of pure traditions, and it reiterates that categories such as wisdom, eschatology, and apocalyptic are heuristic tools. Apart from an article by Lockett published in 2005 (i.e. the same year as *Conflicted Boundaries*), *4QInstruction* and James have never been discussed or assessed in relation to one another.¹¹ It is exactly this lacuna in scholarship that this thesis will remedy. An introduction to the contribution of Lockett's article is warranted because much of the early stages of development of this overall project emerge from his short article.

⁸ Hartin, "Who is Wise and Understanding among You?" (James 3:13): An Analysis of Wisdom, Eschatology, and Apocalypticism in the Letter of James," 161-162, 166.

⁹ Tiller, "The Rich and Poor in James: An Apocalyptic Ethic," 169-180.

¹⁰ Tiller, "The Rich and Poor in James: An Apocalyptic Ethic," 179-180.

¹¹ See Darian Lockett, "The Spectrum of Wisdom and Eschatology in the Epistle of James and *4QInstruction*." In *TynBul* 56 (2005): 131-148.

3.1.2. Darian Lockett

The thesis of Lockett's article is that both James and *4QInstruction* incorporate traditional sapiential themes within an eschatological worldview, and thus James, if understood as wisdom paraenesis, is "not novel in combing these two traditions."¹² Lockett's argument is rightly built upon the understanding that the argument that "the languages of wisdom and apocalyptic assume different views of the world" can no longer be sustained.¹³ Lockett is largely responding to Hartin and Penner (whose contributions have just been outlined in §3.1.1.). While Hartin studies James in relation to Q and argues that the wisdom tradition controls the prophetic and eschatological elements in James,¹⁴ Penner maintains that the eschatological material of this composition shapes and organizes its sapiential traditions.¹⁵ Lockett therefore challenges the works of Hartin and Penner and justifiably argues that both commentators misunderstand the mutual co-existence of sapiential and non-sapiential material in this writing. In addition, he rejects their view that one genre classification of James must suffice.¹⁶ For Lockett then, the presence of sapiential and eschatological material in James "need not be understood as categorically representing different world-views competing in the text, but rather an eschatological orientation within wisdom paraenesis is to be expected in the New Testament period."¹⁷

Lockett's rejection of the idea that wisdom must control eschatology or *vice versa* has since become a well accepted view. While the mutual co-existence of wisdom and eschatological/apocalyptic, whether understood as literary genres and/or worldviews was stressed in Chapter One, Lockett's research presents ideas that had not yet been applied to James.¹⁸ In order to emphasize the mutual

¹² Lockett, "The Spectrum of Wisdom and Eschatology," 131, 133.

¹³ Lockett, "The Spectrum of Wisdom and Eschatology," 133. Lockett credits his understanding of the mutual co-existence of wisdom and apocalyptic to Burton Mack, *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q and Christian Origins* (Shaftsbury: Element, 1993), 31.

¹⁴ See Hartin, *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus*.

¹⁵ See Penner, *The Eschatology of James*.

¹⁶ Lockett, "The Spectrum of Wisdom and Eschatology," 132-133.

¹⁷ Lockett, "The Spectrum of Wisdom and Eschatology," 133-134.

¹⁸ It may be helpful to note that Lockett credits this understanding of the merging of wisdom and eschatology in James to Bauckham and Chueng. See Lockett, "The Spectrum of Wisdom and

co-existence of these two traditions in James, Lockett carries out a comparison of literary forms, thematic content, and motifs of both James and *4QInstruction*. In this present context a number of brief examples of this comparative study will suffice. For example, Lockett notes what he considers to be the similarities between 4Q416 2 iii lines 8-9 and James 5:9 where admonitions and exhortations occur. Moreover, he understands that both *4QInstruction* and James convey the pursuit of wisdom as a central admonition (e.g. in 4Q417 1 i and Jas. 1:5),¹⁹ and the motivation for ethical conduct in both writings is provided by the anticipation of eschatological judgment and reward (e.g. judgment in 4Q418 126 ii 6-7; Jas. 5 and reward in 4Q418 81 lines 4-5; Jas. 1:12).

Lockett's article provides as an excellent departure point for a study of James and *4QInstruction*. However, it neither aims, nor is able to serve, as an in-depth or exhaustive treatment of this topic. Therefore, limitations and problems arise in terms of Lockett's methodology, analysis, and conclusions, some of which are important to note in this present context. For example, the manner in which Lockett carries out his analysis may be described as being over simplistic and succumbing to a taxonomical study of genres. Lockett identifies several formal features as being present in both James and *4QInstruction*, but notes that the genesis for this identification is based upon Gammie's characterization of the secondary genre of paraenetic literature, which Gammie bases upon taxonomical considerations.²⁰ Moreover, nowhere throughout the article does Lockett differentiate or offer us an explanation as to how he understands the categories of "eschatology" and "apocalyptic". The latter is especially problematic because he appears to use these two terms interchangeably.²¹ It is fair to say that Lockett's article is about wisdom and eschatology, not wisdom and apocalyptic. In addition, it may be argued that the problems present in Lockett's article can be

Eschatology," 134; Bauchkam, *James*, 34; Luke Cheung, *Genre, Composition and Hermeneutics of James* (Cumbria: Paternoster Press, 2003), 48.

¹⁹ It is interesting to note that *4QInstruction* and James' emphasis on the pursuit of wisdom is the focus of Chapter Four of this thesis.

²⁰ Lockett, "The Spectrum of Wisdom and Eschatology," 137; John G. Gammie, "Paraenetic Literature: Towards the Morphology of a Secondary Genre," *Semeia* 50 (1990): 41-77.

²¹ The importance in terms of offering transparency in terms of language was outlined in Chapter One of this dissertation.

explained by the changing nature of how the categories of wisdom, eschatology and apocalyptic were being assessed, and the application of these categories to James being in the very early stages of development. Despite these criticisms, Lockett's article made a substantial contribution, especially to understanding James. This contribution is found in Lockett's conclusion:

. . . both texts incorporate traditional sapiential wisdom concepts with an eschatological understanding of the world . . . Therefore, to pit wisdom and eschatological elements against one another or to postulate an overarching framework within which one element (eschatology) brackets the other (wisdom, again. Cf. Penner) does not fit with what we know about wisdom teachings from Qumran. Such moves betray an assumption that the elements are not compatible. Rather we must think of a continuous spectrum, a sliding scale, in which elements of traditional wisdom and eschatological worldviews are inter-mingling . . . it was a recognized move within the general milieu of Second Temple Judaism to mix or incorporate sapiential motifs to include an eschatological view of reality.²²

If the word "eschatology" is replaced with "apocalyptic" in the above quotation, Lockett's conclusions are representative of the methodology and viewpoint taken here. This idea of "a continuous spectrum" serves to reinforce the conclusions of Chapter One, while also leading to the remaining analysis of the "world" of James and *4QInstruction* (discussed below) and the thematic discussion that follows in Chapters Four, Five, and Six. These three latter chapters are concerned with examining a specific topic in relation to each writing, or to be more specific, a topic or subject matter is investigated in James, then assessed in *4QInstruction* (among other examples), and then our attention returns to James to see if any new insight(s) have been gained.

A central argument of this thesis is that reading James in light of *4QInstruction* will lead to a more nuanced understanding in James, but it may be necessary to first justify the rationale behind this comparison. In some respects, the rationale behind this comparison has already been justified because it has been established that various commentators were using the same terms and applying the same modes of analysis to both *4QInstruction* and James. However,

²² Lockett, "The Spectrum of Wisdom and Eschatology," 147-148.

in order to reinforce this justification even further, and to demonstrate the initial significance *4QInstruction* may have for James, a discussion of the otherworldly theoretical framework of both writings is now presented.

3.2 The Apocalyptic Perspective of *4QInstruction* and James

The otherworldly nature of *4QInstruction* and James is the focus of this section. This discussion is necessary in order to observe and argue that atypical sapiential motifs occur in both of these writings. To be more specific, James' inclusion of non-sapiential themes and motifs demonstrate that James, as a writing, moves beyond the parameters of traditional wisdom. In Chapter One two points were stressed: (1) that the nature of genres is one of evolution; and (2) that while genres are modern heuristic tools, they equip the modern reader with the means to engage with and interpret literature. With these conclusions in mind, this section therefore intends to draw out further the otherworldly content of *4QInstruction* and James. It is important to note that the aim of this section is hence not to disqualify either writings participation in the wisdom sphere/tradition, but to observe that *4QInstruction* operates within a wisdom trajectory, in which ideas and themes that could be considered non-traditional in terms of wisdom are included. The below examination will allow us to determine whether this understanding of *4QInstruction* has any significance when it comes to interpreting James.

The following analysis will serve to highlight the otherworldly character of *4QInstruction* and James; however, it is important to remember that similarities do not necessarily suggest more than general patterns and trajectories. While *4QInstruction* explicitly portrays the orchestration of the cosmos, the perceived reality of the world of James may only be inferred. So, while the cosmological framework set out by the author of *4QInstruction* is not directly comparable with that of James, it is argued that *4QInstruction* and James are centred around the ideas of eschatological reward and punishment. In this present context, it is the emphasis on eschatology in both writings that makes them comparable.

3.2.1. The Cosmos and Eschatology in 4QInstruction

Using language associated with cosmology is appropriate when discussing *4QInstruction*. This is because the first nine lines of 4Q416 1, largely considered to represent the opening of this composition,²³ discuss the creation and subsequent orderly structure of the cosmos, and for this reason the cosmology, and as we will soon see, the eschatology of *4QInstruction*, are seen to be embedded into the writing. 4Q416 1 and 4Q418 126 project a message that one is better able to understand the nature of God by understanding the regularity and structure of the cosmos, an idea also encountered in Sirach.²⁴ It is to these two references (i.e. 4Q416 1 and 4Q418 126 and their depiction of the orchestration of the cosmos) that our attention now turns.

In the case of 4Q416 1 lines 1-9 are clearly concerned with heavenly phenomena, while eschatological judgment is described in the following eight lines.

4Q416 1 1-17 Translation²⁵

1 every spirit
2 And to *order* His (?) *good pleasure*
3 season by season
4 according to their *host* [צבאם] to *r[ule]* by dominion. *And to . . . For kingdom*
5 and kingdom, *For pr[ovince and province]* (?), *For each man and man*
6 according to the *poverty* [מהסור] of their *host* [צבאם]. [And the judgment of all
of them *beings to Him vacat* (?)]
7 *But* the host of the Heavens [וצבא השמים] He has *established* on . . . *vacat* (?) . .
. and luminaries
8 *for* their portents. And signs of [*their*] *fe(stivals . . . they shall proclaim*
9 each to the other. And all their *visitation* (?) . . . *they shall recount*
10 From Heaven He shall pronounce judgment upon the *work* of wickedness, But
all His faithful Children will be accepted with favour by [Him]

²³ 4Q416 1 is credited as representing the beginning of *4QInstruction* because of its unusually wide margin (i.e. approximately 3cm). See DJD 34: 82-83; Harrington, *Wisdom Texts*, 41. This prevalent position was originally challenged by Elgvin, "An Analysis of 4QInstruction," 97-98. In *To Increase Learning*, 181-182, Tigchelaar thoroughly critiqued Elgvin's objections; however Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 5-6, indicates that, in private correspondence between himself and Elgvin, Elgvin has now changed his opinion and agrees with the reconstruction proposed by the editors of DJD 34. Cf. Goff, *4QInstruction*, 45.

²⁴ See Sir 39:12-15; 42:15-43:33. See also 4Q417 1 i line 27.

²⁵ Translation from DJD 34: 82-83.

11 *the end. And they shall feel dread. And all who defiled themselves in it (sc. wickedness) shall cry out in distress. For the heavens shall fear [*
 12 *The [se]as and the depths fear, And every spirit of flesh will be destroyed (?). But the sons of Heave[n] sh[all rejoice in the day*
 13 *[when it (sc. wickedness) is ju]dged, And (when) all iniquity shall come to an end, Until the epoch of tru[th] [ועד ושלם קץ] will be perfected [forever, And there will endure*
 14 *in all periods of eternity. For He is a God of fidelity. And then of old, (from) years of [eternity*
 15 *So that the righteous may distinguish (?) between good and evil, So that . . . every judgme[ent] the creator of*
 16 *[the in]clination of flesh is He (?), And from understand[ing*
 17 *His creatures, for . . .*

The combination of cosmology and eschatology in 4Q416 1 lines 1-17 is noteworthy and leads Goff to argue that these themes “compliment one another and establish a theological framework for the rest of the composition that stresses eschatological recompense as an expression of God’s dominion over the natural order.”²⁶ Similarly, Wold maintains that 4Q416 1 lines 1-9, along with lines 15-17, emphasize the importance of discerning the created order for the purposes of ethical behaviour, and this, he maintains is suggestive of “the importance of creation in the document as the basis for the instruction to follow.”²⁷ Wold’s understanding of lines 1-9 and 15-17 is reminiscent of Hartin’s interpretation of James outlined in §3.1.1.

In 4Q416 1 lines 1-9 God’s control of the entire cosmos is stressed. These lines draw on the seven-day creation account in Genesis.²⁸ Therefore, Goff suggests that כל רוח in line 1 is best understood as a reference to winds as opposed to spirits, and that the inclusion of לתכן הפצ' in line 2 is a reference to the

²⁶ Goff, *4QInstruction*, 45; cf. Rey, *4QInstruction*, 261-275; Wold, *Women, Men and Angels*, 90. Similarly Harrington notes: “It would appear that the wisdom instructions that follow in the main part were intended to help the one who is being instructed both to align himself with the correct order of the cosmos (as discerned from Genesis 1 and probably on the basis of a solar calendar) and to prepare for the divine judgment when the righteous will be vindicated and wickedness will be destroyed forever. If fragment 1 of 4Q416 is indeed the beginning of the great sapiential instruction, then it must have provided the theological perspective in which the sage’s advice on various issues was to be interpreted. And that perspective was cosmic and eschatological.” Harrington, *Wisdom Texts*, 41.

²⁷ Wold, *Women, Men and Angels*, 91.

²⁸ Cf. Wold, *Women, Men and Angels*, 90.

idea that the structure of the cosmos is an expression of God's desire for order.²⁹ Taking the cosmological imagery at play in these lines, Goff's suggestions are convincing. While 4Q416 1 line 3 seems to refer to the regularity of the heavenly bodies, lines 4-5 reflect upon the universal scope of God's dominion. The inclusion of צבאם in lines 4, 6 and 7 is noteworthy; Strugnell and Harrington suggest that it is angels who are being referred to in these lines.³⁰ This argument is supportable because when the word צבאם occurs in other DSS (e.g. in 1QM xii, 1), its surrounding context implies that angels are in view.³¹ Moreover, the presence of angels in *4QInstruction* is not only affirmed, but their inclusion takes on an important pedagogical significance elsewhere in the composition (e.g. 4Q418 69 ii lines 12-15). Therefore, that angels are mentioned in relation to the ordering of the cosmos may be seen as serving to establish and demonstrate their significance throughout this composition. However, it may also be noted that while the superiority of the angels to humanity is being inferred, God's regulation of them is affirmed in lines 6-7.³² In fact, Tigchelaar goes so far as to suggest that the purpose of these lines is to emphasize the fidelity of heavenly bodies.³³ The mention of the luminaries in line 7, along with the wondrous signs of line 8, further serve to underscore the astronomical significance of this column. Moreover, the reference to the luminaries may resonate with one who is

²⁹ Cf. Goff, *4QInstruction*, 46-47.

³⁰ DJD: 34, 84.

³¹ Cf. Goff, *4QInstruction*, 47. See also 1 Kings 22:19.

³² In relation to the "poverty [מחסור] of the hosts of heaven" Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 179, proposes that מחסור could here be an error for מסחור, in the sense of the latter depicting "commerce", and thus so understood this term would convey an astronomical meaning (i.e. the circuits of the heavenly bodies). However, מחסור as it is written, seems to accord with the rest of the 4Q416 1 line 6 which asserts that the "regulation" (משפט) of the angels belongs to God. In *4QInstruction*, 48, Goff suggests that the original text might have stated that whatever the angels might need, God would provide, in order to ensure the regularity of the motions of heavenly bodies. While this is an interesting suggestion, it remains too speculative.

³³ Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 193: "The emphasis is not on God's orderly rule, but on the heavenly bodies' obedience: in accordance with their determined tasks they run their courses. This topic is common in Early Jewish literature, but whereas in other texts the simile is used in a more general sense (nature obeys God's laws, so you should too). Instruction stresses in its other parts that every living being has been allotted his or its own position in life and tasks."

familiar with James and his description of God as the “Father of lights’ in 1:17 (cf. Gen 1:14).³⁴

4Q416 1 lines 10-17 provide an account of God’s eschatological judgment (cf. 4Q418 69 ii). Goff comments; “By being preceded by the cosmological material in the column, divine judgment is construed as an inevitable and inherent aspect of the natural order.”³⁵ 4Q416 1 line 10 makes clear that God will judge, while lines 11-12 emphasize the destruction of the fleshly spirit (i.e. the wicked). It is interesting to note that the phrase “epoch of truth” seemingly conveys that judgment will occur at a specific time. Moreover, 4Q416 1 line 13 makes clear that it is not only those considered wicked who will be destroyed, but also iniquity (i.e. evil) itself.³⁶ While the fidelity of God is emphasized in line 14, the ability of the righteous to distinguish between good and evil is stressed in line 15 (cf. 4Q417 1 i). This ability, providing it is acted upon, means that the righteous people are provided with the means to avoid eschatological judgment.

4Q418 126 i+ii lines 1-9 is another instance in *4QInstruction* where the structure of the created order is portrayed, and as in 4Q416 1 lines 10-17, this portrayal is immediately followed by lines where God’s distribution of eschatological recompense to the righteous and wicked is described.

4Q418 126 i+ii 1-9
Translation³⁷

1 *n*]ot one from all their host [צבאם] will cease
2 . . . in truth from the *possession* of every *secret* of men
3 [*For*] with a true e[ph]ah and right weight [באפה] God has *meted* out all
4 He has *spread* them out, In truth has He established them, And *by those* that
delight in them *are they studi*[ed]
5 everything will be hidden, And furthermore they *have* (*will*) not come into
being without His good pleasure, And *apart from* [His} wis[dom [ומחוכמתו]
6 judgment, To *repay* vengeance to *the masters* (*workers*) of iniquity, And
punishment with *re*[compense to
7 And to shut (the door) on (i.e. imprison) the wicked, But to raise up the head of
the poor, [*And to show forth His faithfulness to them, And his mercies*]

³⁴ Cf. DJD 34: 85.

³⁵ Goff, *4QInstruction*, 49.

³⁶ The topic of evil is returned to in Chapter Six.

³⁷ Translation from DJD 34: 352.

8 In glory everlasting [בכבוד עולם] and peace eternal [שלום עד], And to separate the spirit of life [ורוח יסחי] [from every spirit of darkness]

9 all the children of *Eve*, And on the might of God and the abundance of His glory Together with His bounty [they shall muse

Heavenly hosts (i.e. צבאם) and their role are the subject of line 1. It may be the case that the noun צבאם is deliberately ambiguous but the above discussion of 4Q416 1 line 4 supports interpreting it in terms of the author evoking the celestial bodies of angels, and hence in this present case it seems that their obedience is being emphasized.³⁸ Lines 3-4 refer to the ordering of the cosmos; the inclusion of *ephah* (איפה) in line 3 is particularly striking and may refer to God's fair and balanced scales during creation.³⁹ This idea of God's scales is reminiscent of *I Enoch* 43:2 which refers to the righteous balance among God's angels.⁴⁰ It may be argued that 4Q418 126 i+ii line 5 is the most significant because we find that nothing comes into being without God's will and wisdom.⁴¹ It is interesting to note that the phrase used to denote revelation in *4QInstruction*, the רז נהיה, is not explicitly mentioned in this instance, most especially because 4Q417 1 I lines 8-9 suggest that God created the world by means of the רז נהיה.⁴²

As was the case in 4Q416 1 lines 10-17, the emphasis switches from cosmology to eschatology in 4Q418 126 i+ii lines 6-9. For example, line 6 refers to the “masters of iniquity”, presumably a phrase used by the author to denote the wicked, and deliverance of judgment upon this group is stressed. Lines 7-8 portray the contrasting fates of the wicked and the righteous. While the first half of line 7 prescribes the imprisonment of the wicked (cf. 4Q418 69 ii 6),⁴³ its

³⁸ Cf. *I Enoch* 2:1; 41:5; 69:20; 72-82.

³⁹ The phrase “ephah of truth” is also found in 4Q418 81 line 9 and refers to the divine disclosure of heavenly revelation to the addressee. Presumably this heavenly revelation included knowledge about the cosmos. See DJD 34: 358-360. Also see Rey, *4QInstruction*, 257.

⁴⁰ George W. Nickelsburg and James C. Vanderkam, *I Enoch* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 58 translate *I Enoch* 43:2 as “I saw a righteous balance, how they are weighed according to their light, according to the breadth of their spaces and the day of their appearing (I saw how) their revolution produces lightning, and their revolution is according to the number of angels, and they keep their faith with one another.”

⁴¹ Cf. Sir 42:20-21; 1QH^a 18:4.

⁴² This phrase is discussed in §4.2.2. – 4.2.3.

⁴³ It is reasonable to suggest that line 7 depicts the wicked being shut away in Sheol. See 4Q418 127 2. Cf. 1QH^a XI line 19.

second half together with line 8 refer to the exaltation of the poor and the everlasting peace to which they can look forward.⁴⁴ Goff appropriately notes that the emphasis of line 8 is on the eschatological future of the righteous.⁴⁵ The end of line 8 notably mentions the separation of the “spirit of life” (רוח היים) from every “spirit of darkness” and may be understood as referring to the moment of physical death after which the addressee will attain eternal life. This emphasis on separation is similar to 4Q418 81+81a lines 1-2 in terms of the stress the author places on the addressee being separated from the spirit of flesh (רוח בשר).⁴⁶

Both in 4Q416 1 lines 1-17 and in 4Q418 126 i+ii lines 1-9 the themes of cosmology and eschatology are combined. Most especially in the case of 4Q416 1 which, as noted above, is considered by most commentators to represent the opening of *4QInstruction*, a cosmological framework is set out but this is immediately followed by one of eschatological judgment. That this same idea occurs again in 4Q418 126 ii lines 1-9 is significant. The portrayal of the creation of the cosmos indicates just how central creation is to *4QInstruction*,⁴⁷ and the immediate inclusion of eschatological judgment makes it an integral part of the cosmos. The judgment and subsequent destruction of the wicked is affirmed, while the eschatological rewards to which the righteous can look forward to are also stressed. The exaltation of the poor in 4Q418 126 i+ii line 7 is particularly noteworthy, most especially as this idea of the poor being the ones who are eschatologically exalted is also the case in the Letter of James (James 1:9; 2:5; cf. 4Q416 2 iii 11-12).⁴⁸

4Q416 1 and 4Q418 126 i+ii demonstrate that eschatology is a crucial motif in *4QInstruction*. Discussing judgment under the umbrella of eschatology,

⁴⁴ Cf. 1QH^a XIX lines 29-30.

⁴⁵ Goff, *4QInstruction*, 282.

⁴⁶ See §2.1.3.2 and §5.2.2.

⁴⁷ The positive portrayal of creation accords with the ethos of *4QInstruction*, most especially 4Q417 1 i lines 8-9 which states that the רז נהיה was involved in creation.

⁴⁸ It is notable that the subject of “money”, or more specifically, the subject of riches and poverty, is one of the most frequently encountered in Jewish wisdom literature: issues relating to money can be found in traditional sapiential writings such as Sirach and Proverbs. For more on this see J. D. Pleins, “Poverty in the Social World of the Wise,” *JSOT* 37; (1987): 61-78. The theme of poverty in relation to *4QInstruction*, and whether a literal or a metaphorical reading of it is more applicable was discussed in §2.1.3.4.

Lange proposes that the writing's references to judgment represents the "eschatologizing" of the traditional *Tat-Ergehen-Zusammenhang* of biblical wisdom.⁴⁹ In this sense, the final punishment of the wicked in *4QInstruction* may be compatible with the assertion encountered throughout traditional biblical wisdom that the wicked be destroyed.⁵⁰ Similarly, Elgvin observes that, although *4QInstruction* stresses the inevitability of judgment, it shows "no clear signs of a *Naherwartung*"; that is to say, no imminent sense or clear signs are portrayed that the world is coming to an end. If the eschatology of *4QInstruction* is understood in these terms, this is contrary to what we encounter in James where the judgment is portrayed as imminent (e.g. Jas. 5:9). Moreover, Elgvin has argued that *4QInstruction* attests a form of "realized eschatology".⁵¹ Elgvin defends this sense of "realized eschatology" by making reference to 4Q416 2 iii lines 11-12:

4Q416 2 iii 11-12

Translation⁵²

11 And praise His name continually, For out of poverty he has lifted up they head, And with *the nobles* [נדיבים] has He made thee to be seated, And over a glorious *heritage*
 12 has he placed thee in authority; Seek out his good will continually. Thou art needy; do not say 'I am needy, and I *will* n[ot]

Elgvin interprets these two lines portraying the addressee's present affinity with the angels, and this, he argues, is an example of *4QInstruction*'s "realized eschatology".⁵³ This interpretation is dependent on translating נדיבים as angels, but this translation is also suggested by Wold.⁵⁴ It may be helpful to note that the *Thanksgiving Hymns* also makes reference to a type of communion between the addressee and the angels,⁵⁵ but Collins points out that the realized eschatology of *4QInstruction* "falls short of the level of participation in the angelic life that we

⁴⁹ Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 305.

⁵⁰ Cf. Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 170.

⁵¹ Elgvin, "Early Essene Eschatology," 144-145.

⁵² Translation from DJD 34: 113.

⁵³ It may be helpful to note that 4Q418 81+81a lines 4-5 make clear that the addressee will also join the angels after death.

⁵⁴ Wold, "Metaphorical Poverty," 147.

⁵⁵ See, for example 1QH^a xix lines 4, 9-10.

find in the Hodayot.”⁵⁶ Collins’ view may be accurate, but it does not diminish the sense of realized eschatology in *4QInstruction*. Our attention will shortly turn to James but it is important to keep the idea of “realized eschatology” in mind, because it may not be exactly analogous with what we see going on in James. In addition, 4Q416 2 iii lines 11-12 also alludes to the exaltation of the poor and, while this may be metaphorical, as we have seen, the idea that the poor are exalted has a parallel with James.

Eschatology plays a central role in the interpretative framework of *4QInstruction*. However, the use of eschatology is relatively different to that of apocalyptic works such as Daniel or *1 Enoch*. For example, *4QInstruction* shows no interest in enumerating the periods of history.⁵⁷ Moreover, as noted by Goff, the motifs that are commonly associated with eschatological urgency are absent from *4QInstruction*.⁵⁸ Therefore it is possible to argue that *4QInstruction*’s unique employment of eschatology, most especially its close association with cosmology, may be attributed to the author’s desire to stress the importance of its teachings in relation to ethical instruction and revelation. In this sense, the instructions of this composition are being given an eschatological motivation.

3.2.2. The World and Eschatology in James

The author of the Letter of James explicitly states that the world, that is the present earthly world, is antithetical to the purposes of God.⁵⁹ For example, James 3:17 states; “But the wisdom from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, willing to yield, full of mercy and good fruits, without a trace of partiality or hypocrisy.” By contrast, in James 3:15 earthly wisdom is described as being “demonic” (δαίμονιώδης), an attribute that is especially striking when the theme

⁵⁶ Collins, “The Eschatologizing of Wisdom,” 57, n. 41.

⁵⁷ A central motif of the *Apocalypse of Weeks* is a description of the events that occur in each of its ten weeks of history. No such equivalent timetable appears to present in *4QInstruction*. Moreover, unlike Daniel, *4QInstruction* never calculates a specific date on which this eschatological scenario is to begin. (Dan 8:14; 12:11-12). Cf. Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 193.

⁵⁸ Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 194.

⁵⁹ Similar sentiments are also expressed in 1 John 2:15-17; cf. 1 John 5:19.

of evil in James is taken into account.⁶⁰ In this present context, however, it may be helpful to note that heavenly wisdom is to be understood as the opposite of earthly wisdom, both in terms of its effect and origin (cf. 1:17). That heavenly wisdom is pure signals that it is free from this-worldly contamination, and is thus representative of sincerity and total allegiance to God. John Elliot notes:

The distinction between divine wisdom ‘from above’ and devilish wisdom ‘from below’ is significant conceptually and socially. Conceptually, the distinction between above and below demarcates and contrasts two distinct and opposing realms of the cosmos in terms of a spatial perspective. Accordingly, for James, space rather than time, as in other Christian writings, becomes the dominant perspective for viewing issues of human allegiance, good and evil, purity and impurity.⁶¹

Similarly James 4:4 also presents an opposition between God and the earthly world:

“Adulterous women! Do you not know that affection for the world is hatred of God? [οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι ἡ φιλία τοῦ κόσμου ἐχθρα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν;] Therefore whoever chooses to be a loving friend of the world, sets himself up an enemy of God [ὅς ἐὰν οὖν βουληθῆ φίλος εἶναι τοῦ κόσμου, ἐχθρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ καθίσταται].”⁶²

James 4:4 expresses the author’s disdain for this world; whoever is a friend of the world is in turn not a friend of God’s. James 3:17 and 4:4 serve as two examples to demonstrate that a this-worldly versus otherworldly dichotomy permeates or operates throughout this epistle and lies behind its message. For James, while the world refers to the physical earthly (i.e. this worldly) world, it also includes the entire cultural system that is associated with it. Johnson

⁶⁰ This topic is discussed in Chapter Six.

⁶¹ John H. Elliot, “The Epistle of James in Rhetorical and Social Scientific Perspective: Holiness-Wholeness and Patterns of Replication,” *BTB* 23 (1993): 71-81; 77 (emphasis original). While Elliot’s comments are helpful it may be argued that Elliot posits too sharp a distinction between space and time in James. Cf. Lockett, “God and ‘the World,’” 150.

⁶² Translation from Countryman, “James,” 719. Countryman argues that James conveys his audience as being predominantly male, and 4:4 thus serves as a staggering insult to them in terms of his characterization of the audience as “adulterous women.” Also see Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 259.

therefore argues that, for James, the world is “a system of untrammelled desire and arrogance.”⁶³ Similarly Moo comments; “The ‘world’ is a common biblical way of referring to the ungodly worldview and lifestyle that characterizes human life in its estrangement from the creator.”⁶⁴ In his 2008 article “God and the World”, Lockett discusses the portrayal of the opposition between God and the world and argues that, in describing the world, “James calls forth a new identity for his readers and articulates a theological construct of reality.”⁶⁵ He discusses the five occurrences of “world” (κόσμος) (i.e. 1:27; 2:5; 3:6; 4:4 [2x]), and one occurrence of “earthly” (ἐπίγειος) in 3:15, noting how these terms are used to express the opposite to God’s standard of measure (cf. God’s *ephah* of 4Q418 126 i+ii line 3). James 1:27, for instance, refers to the need to keep oneself unstained from the world, and, for James, this is achieved by keeping particular boundaries between themselves and the influence of the world.⁶⁶ Hence, friendship with the world is, in James’ view, the ultimate betrayal of God and, Lockett maintains that it “constitutes an alliance with a system of valuation set against God.”⁶⁷

Despite the negative portrayal of the world, it is important to note that the creator (i.e. God) is nevertheless to be understood positively. For example, in 3:9 James refers to creation being in the likeness of God. Moreover, 1:17 states: “Every good favour and every perfect gift is from above, coming down from the Father of Lights [καταβαῖνον ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν φώτων] with whom there is no variation or shadow of change.” The description of God as the “Father of lights” can be understood as referring to Gen 1:14-19 where God is portrayed as creating the luminaries.⁶⁸ In some respects, this allusion to Gen 1:14-19 is reminiscent of 4Q416 1 line 7. Interestingly, Allison comments: “For James’ readers, the lights in the sky were not inanimate objects but living beings, to be identified with

⁶³ Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 210.

⁶⁴ Moo, *The Letter of James*, 97.

⁶⁵ Lockett, “God and ‘the World,’” 145.

⁶⁶ See 1 Enoch 48:7.

⁶⁷ Lockett suggests that the language of unfaithfulness in 4:4 is used to render imagery associated with Israel’s covenant relationship with God. Lockett, “God and ‘the World,’” 154.

⁶⁸ Cf. Psalm 136:7.

angels and/or departed saints.”⁶⁹ Allison’s comment serves to emphasize further the otherworldly dimension(s) operating throughout this writing.

In the case of James 1:17, it may be argued that this verse presents a sharp contrast between the creator and created things. Johnson’s view is that the “text opposes the steadfastness of God to the changeableness of creation, exemplified by the heavenly bodies”.⁷⁰ Similarly, Lockett maintains that James marks the vacillation of the created order, especially the luminaries, in contrast to God’s steadfastness, and “God, as creator of the luminaries, exists in the highest heavenly sphere and remains constant in contrast to the movement of the created lights.”⁷¹ The following verse (i.e. Jas. 1:18) refers to humanity “as a kind of first fruits of his creation”, a reference that may possibly be seen as evoking themes associated with both creation and redemption.⁷²

James’ reference to the world above and below might be seen as being indicative of a temporal sphere operating in this epistle. Similarly, in 3:6 *Gehenna* is mentioned in relation to the perils of the tongue. James 3:6 states:

“And the tongue is a fire; the tongue is the world of wickedness established among our members, polluting the whole body and setting ablaze the cycle/wheel of a (human) life/birth, whilst being set on fire by Gehenna [καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα πῦρ ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας ἡ γλῶσσα καθίσταται ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν, ἡ σπιλοῦσα ὅλον τὸ σῶμα καὶ φλογίζουσα τὸν τροχὸν τῆς γενέσεως καὶ φλογιζομένη ὑπὸ τῆς γεέννης].”

⁶⁹ Allison, *James*, 273.

⁷⁰ Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 197.

⁷¹ Lockett, “God and ‘the World,’” 150.

⁷² For example, it may be argued that the reference to God as “Father of lights” is deliberately included to remind the readers of the Jewish morning prayer where the role of God as creator and redeemer is emphasized. See Lockett, “God and ‘the World,’” 151. It is interesting to note that this association with the Jewish morning prayer is also made by Allison but in *James*, 284, he suggests that it may be interpreted in terms of giving thanks to God for his election and redemption of the twelve tribes from Israel. This former observation has led Moo to argue that the language of 1:18 is capable of both a cosmological application and a soteriological reading (cf. 5:7-11). See Moo, *The Letter of James*, 79.

This occurrence of *Gehenna*, often translated as Hades, is deserving of comment.⁷³ Γέεννα is understood as being the antithesis of heaven, a place of end-time punishment, and is commonly imagined as being a place of fire.⁷⁴ *Gehenna*, so understood as the antithesis of heaven, may therefore be interpreted in comparable terms as the place where the wicked are said to perish in *4QInstruction* (cf. 4Q418 126 i+ii line 7; 4Q418 69 ii line 6). In relation to James, while Mayor and Moo interpret this reference to *Gehenna* as indicating the source of the tongue's power for evil,⁷⁵ Bauckham has challenged this position arguing that *Gehenna* was not considered to be the location of the devil or forces of evil in the first century CE:

[Gehenna] is the place where the wicked are punished, either after the last judgment or (a view which seems to have been emerging during the first century) after death. Its angels are terrifying and cruel as they are servants of God, executing God's judgment on sin. They are not the evil angels who rebel against and resist God. These evil angels, with Satan or the devil at their head, will at the end of history be sent to their doom in Gehenna, but they are not there yet. Rather, they inhabit the terrestrial area from earth to the lowest heavenly sphere. (It is with this area that James associates them when he contrasts the wisdom that comes from heaven with false wisdom that is earthy (ἐπίγειος πῖγειος) and demonic (δαμονιώδης), [3:15].⁷⁶

The inclusion of Γέεννα in James 3:6 serves to reaffirm the importance of the heavenly/otherworldly realm for James. Moreover, this understanding adds clarity to the differentiation between earthly and heavenly wisdom, and the negative attributes associated with the former.⁷⁷ The inclusion of Γέεννα makes James' audience aware of the location of future judgment, a fate that they need to strive to avoid, while also reinforcing the allusions to the demonic and evil forces

⁷³ The word Gehenna, appears only in James 3:6 and the Synoptics, most often Matthew. See Matt 5:22, 29-30; 10:28; 18:9; 23:15, 33; Mark 9:43-47; Luke 12:5. Cf. Allison, *James*, 540.

⁷⁴ For example see 1 *En* 10:6; 54:1-2; 90:24-25; 100:9; Matt 5:22; Mark 9:47; 4 *Ezra* 7:36-38; 13:10-122. Cf. Allison, *James*, 140, n. 197.

⁷⁵ Mayor, *The Epistle of James*, 114.

⁷⁶ Richard Bauckham, "The Tongue Set on Fire by Hell (James 3:6)" in *The Fate of the Dead: Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 119-131, 120.

⁷⁷ See §4.1.2.

that are present in the world (cf. 4:7).⁷⁸ Lockett describes the cosmology of James as being “integrated into a theological understanding of the universe where individuals must stand free from ‘the world’ in order to be totally devoted to God.”⁷⁹

If Γέεννα is understood as the destination of where the wicked are punished, the tongue’s association with this place is all the more striking.⁸⁰ Moreover, this occurrence of γέεννα also serves to emphasize the theme of eschatological judgment in this writing. This emphasis on judgment needs to be interpreted against the eschatological backdrop of this writing. For example, James 5:8-9 states: “You also must be patient, make your hearts resolute, for the coming of the Lord has drawn near (or is near). Do not, brothers, blame each other, lest you be judged. Look! The judge is standing at the gates.” James 5:8-9 is particularly noteworthy because it portrays the eschatological expectations that are present in this writing; it demonstrates a sense of imminence on the part of the author and hence, unlike *4QInstruction*, the eschatology of James is not yet realized. Eschatological reward and punishment are portrayed as being in the future, but the sense of nearness expressed in 5:8-9 may lead us to suggest that this future is considered to happen very soon. Therefore, apocalypticism also categorizes how the author understood the present (e.g. Jas. 5:9).

Eschatological judgment awaits the wicked and in the context of James, especially in light of James 5:1-6 (cf. 4:13-17), it is the rich who are portrayed as being wicked. While this group may be rich in terms of this worldly possessions, an eschatological role reversal awaits and this will make them poor in terms of heavenly rewards. Discussing James 2, Tiller notes that the exhortation of impartiality is distinctive because it is shaped not only by conventional eschatology, but also by the author’s apocalyptic interpretation and subsequent application of the counters of reality. The theological foundation, he argues, of James 2 is “provided by the apocalyptic division of the cosmos into above and below (3:15), God and the world (4:14), God and the devil (4:7; 3:15), and the

⁷⁸ These active, demonic forces are discussed in §6.5.3.

⁷⁹ Lockett, “God and ‘the World,’” 155.

⁸⁰ The subject of the evils of the tongue will be returned to in Chapter Six.

contrast between desire . . . and truth (1:14:18; cf. 4:1-4).”⁸¹ James’ objections are based on the entire cosmic structure which he considers as being opposed to God (4:4).

It is thus the poor who can look forward to an otherworldly inheritance, and this is reminiscent of what we saw in 4Q418 126 i+ii line 7. The poor may possess few this-worldly possessions but this has resulted in them remaining steadfast to God, and living an ethical life. Therefore, the poor are rich in otherworldly terms (2:5). The contrasting fates of the rich and poor are adequately summed up in James 1:9-11:

9. And let the humble brother take pride in his high position, [Καυχάσθω δὲ ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὁ ταπεινὸς ἐν τῷ ὕψει αὐτοῦ], 10. And the wealthy in his humiliation, [ὁ δὲ πλούσιος ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει αὐτοῦ], for like a wild flower/flowering grass he will pass away [ὅτι ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου παρελεύσεται]. 11. For the sun rises with its scorching wind/heat and withers the grass, and its flower falls and the beauty of its appearance perishes, and this is the wealthy man who wastes away in his pursuit of riches.

For James, the importance that the rich attribute to this-worldly possessions, and to making money (4:13), results in them being distracted and distanced from proper, ethical living. For example, the author accuses the rich of oppression and blasphemy in 2:6-8 (cf. 4:13-17; 5:1-6). The emphasis the rich place on money and worldly possessions also indicates an attachment to this world, a world that we have already seen is to be understood as being opposed to the purposes of God. Moreover, the reference in James 1:11 to the scorching heat and the rich ultimately withering away serves to evoke imagery associated with the burning fires of *Gehenna*. It is against this backdrop that James’ teaching concerning the partiality that should be shown towards the poor in 2:1-8 needs to be interpreted. Although materially poor, they are rich in faith (2:5). James 1:9 refers to the eschatological exaltation of the poor (cf. Isa 40:2-9). Similarly, Tiller argues that James’ emphasis is on those who are poor from a this-worldly point of view, but are nonetheless God’s heirs.⁸² Kamell helpfully comments that, in James, “one’s

⁸¹ Tiller, “The Rich and Poor in James,” 176.

⁸² Tiller, “The Rich and Poor in James,” 171-172. Cf. 1 Cor 1:27 and Matt 5:3; Luke 6:20.

relationship to money is a litmus test for one's relationship with God".⁸³ Those who have a close relationship with money are far away from God. By this reasoning, it is the poor then, and all those closely associated with this group, who can look forward to the crown of life promised in James 1:12.

The Crown of Life [τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς] in James 1:12

The expression "the crown of life" (i.e. τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς) occurs in James 1:12 in the midst of the discourse on trials. It is to be understood as the future, otherworldly reward coming to those who have successfully endured the trials mentioned in James 1:2-4; 13-15. It may be helpful to note that, in the wisdom tradition, imagery and motifs associated with the crown are sometimes used to indicate the bestowal of wisdom.⁸⁴ In the case of apocalyptic and related literature, similar imagery is frequently used to denote the afterlife or new age.⁸⁵ For example, Wis 5:15-16 refers to the "glorious crown", a crown that is only promised to the righteous.⁸⁶ In light of James' simultaneous participation with the wisdom and apocalyptic traditions it seems fair to say that the reference to the crown of life may be viewed in relation to both of these traditions; namely, as is the case in Wis 5:15-16, James is using a familiar sapiential motif to express the eschatological reward his audience can look forward to if they do not fail in the face of trials. This otherworldly reward is dependent on each individual's righteousness; as will be made clear in Chapter Four, for James, being and/or remaining righteous is made possible through one's adherence to revelation. God is the patron of all gifts; it is God who gives wisdom, and it is God who makes otherworldly rewards available to the righteous (cf. 1:17).

⁸³ Maruan J. Kamell, "The Economics of Humility: The Rich and the Humble in James," in *Engaging Economics* (eds. B. W. Longenecker and K. D. Liebengood; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 157-175, 157.

⁸⁴ See Prov 4:9; 14:24; Sir 1:18; 6:31; 15:6.

⁸⁵ See 1QH^a IX line 25; 1QS IV lines 7-8.

⁸⁶ In the New Testament, imagery associated with crown is also used to express posthumous reward but this is sometimes in the context of victorious athletes or military achievements. Therefore, crown imagery is often used when denoting martyrdom. For example, Heb 2:9 states that Jesus was crowned with honour and glory for suffering death. For more on this see David E. Aune, *Revelation 1-5* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1997), 167.

It is even more noteworthy than that this exact phrase (i.e. τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς) occurs *verbatim* in Rev 2:10, and this occurrence is also in the context of enduring trials:

“Do not fear what you are about to suffer. Look! The devil is about to throw some of you into prison, so you may be tested, and for ten days you will have tribulation. Be faithful unto death, and I will give you the crown of life [δώσω σοι τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς].”⁸⁷

That the occurrence of the “crown of life” is *verbatim* to that in James 1:12 is significant, most especially as these are the only two instances where this exact phrase is found in the NT.⁸⁸ Moreover, that the subject matter in both instances is comparable, is also striking. At the very least, it certainly serves to demonstrate further James’ association or close ties with the apocalyptic sphere. The meaning of the expression appears to be the same in both; both instances are referring to otherworldly rewards if one remains faithful and steadfast. The inclusion of “life” in this reward’s designation implies that it is eternal life to which allusion is being made.

Eschatology in 4QInstruction and James

These sections have sought to emphasize analogies present in *4QInstruction* and James. Generally speaking, these analogies are representative of an apocalyptic influence. This is achieved by focusing on the presence of eschatology in both writings. It has been demonstrated that eschatology is a key component in both compositions; however, each author uses the theme of eschatology in a different way, or at least, it is fair to say that a slight nuance separates the two. In the case of *4QInstruction*, we saw that it has a realized eschatology, whereas instances in James (e.g. 5:9) convey a type of imminence. Similarly, the idea of eschatological judgment of the wicked is common to both: James refers to an

⁸⁷ The term στέφανος (i.e. crown) also occurs in Rev 3:11; 6:2. Moreover, the term διάδηματα (i.e. diadem or crown) is found in Rev 12:3; 13:1; 19:12.

⁸⁸ While James 1:12 and Rev 2:10 represent the only two occurrences of the “crown of life” in the NT, Aune notes that analogous expressions occur elsewhere in the NT. For example, an “imperishable wreath” is mentioned in 1 Cor 9:25; a “crown of righteousness” in 2 Tim 4:8; and an “unfading crown of glory” in 1 Peter 5:4. See Aune, *Revelation 1-5*, 167.

agent of judgment and the coming of the Parousia, while the opening of *4QInstruction* (4Q416 1 lines 10-17) refers to the eschatological destruction of the wicked. *4QInstruction*'s early inclusion of eschatological judgment may be viewed in contrast to James' early inclusion of eschatological restoration, if James 1:1 is understood in these terms.⁸⁹ If James 1:1 is read in terms of evoking imagery associated with the eschatological restoration of the twelve tribes, 4Q416 1 lines 10-17 are clearly concerned with foretelling the eschatological destruction of the wicked. It may be argued that, in terms of content, *4QInstruction*'s eschatological opening parallels the end of James: that is to say, if James 1:1 is read in terms of evoking imagery associated with eschatological restoration, the end of this letter (i.e. Jas 5:19-20) concludes by referring to those who stray from the truth being forever lost in the dispersion. In other words, eschatological judgment is inferred. However, the suggestion or likelihood of eschatological imagery behind James 1:1 serves to demonstrate that, like the author of *4QInstruction*, eschatology was also at the forefront of the author's thinking, but unlike *4QInstruction*, the eschatological imagery at the opening of this composition is that of eschatological reward, not judgment. Therefore, it may be argued that the early inclusion of eschatology in both writings demonstrates the concern that James has for humanity, a concern that is warranted because, as Chapter Six of this thesis examines, both *4QInstruction* and James conceive of active, evil forces in the world that are adverse to God's purpose.

However, notable parallels also exist between the two writings: the addressees of both *4QInstruction* and James are clearly promised eschatological rewards (e.g. 4Q418 126 i+ii lines 7-8: Jas. 1:12), and the acquisition of these rewards is dependent upon correct ethical behaviour, and as we shall see, ethical behaviour and right living is informed by revelation.⁹⁰ The alternative is destruction. As we have just seen, a location for judgment is mentioned in both: *Gehenna* in James 3:6 and an "eternal pit" in 4Q418 69 ii line 6. The centrality of judgment to both seemingly suggests that each author's individual aim is to instruct his audience on correct, ethical living as a means to avoid eschatological

⁸⁹ This is discussed in Chapter Five, esp. §5.1.2.

⁹⁰ See Chapter Four.

judgment. In the case of James, Allison argues that the author takes human fear and hope for granted, building on the former to incentivize his recipients to act ethically, and on the latter by promising fulfillment in the kingdom of God.⁹¹

It is possible that both compositions' emphasis on judgment may indicate that it was considered an integral component of the natural order by both authors. The former appears to be particularly the case in *4QInstruction* where the scenes of eschatological judgment immediately follow those describing the orchestration of the cosmos. While this is not directly analogous to what we see happening in James, the worldview that the author projects, coupled with the message he portrays of pending judgment, is also implied. Both authors portray a concern for human beings and their eschatological future, and both writers are clear that eschatological judgment awaits the wicked in the hereafter.

The opposition between the world and the purposes of God conveyed in James is striking, but this understanding of the world helps us better understand and make sense of the importance of the otherworldly wisdom in James 1:5. While otherworldly wisdom will be the focus of the next chapter of this thesis, in this present context it is important to note that it is the bestowal of this otherworldly wisdom that makes the avoidance of eschatological judgment all the more possible. This is true of both *4QInstruction* and James. The pursuit of wisdom is not represented as being easy, but each set of recipients have been equipped with the means to live in harmony with God's cosmos, and if this is achieved, otherworldly rewards are promised. The apocalyptic influence of both compositions, especially that of James, is hence stressed throughout the remainder of this thesis.

Conclusions

Part One of this thesis (i.e. Chapters One to Three) has sought to offer an informed *status quaestionis*. In the case of this present chapter, the presence of eschatology in both *4QInstruction* and James was presented. The aim of the above discussion was twofold: (1) to identify one notable analogy these two writings share in terms of their content and influence, and (2) to explicate James' applicability and relevance to this overall study. It is fair to say that both

⁹¹ Allison, *James*, 94.

eschatological reward and punishment are present in both writings. Moreover, it is this sense of eschatological reward and punishment that serve as motivation for proper ethical living and underscores the importance of pursuing wisdom.

The contributions of Lockett were presented above in §3.1.2. Lockett's article represents an important entrée in terms of noting the relevance of *4QInstruction* for the study of James. However, it is important to note that Lockett's article only serves as a starting point. This thesis currently represents the first lengthy effort to discuss James in relation to *4QInstruction*. As we have just seen, eschatology plays a central role in terms of the interpretative framework of both writings. The former is important in terms of identifying a notable commonality between the two writings, and for justifying the foundations of this study. However, Part Two of this thesis aims to improve the reading and interpretation even further. To do this, important themes associated with the apocalyptic tradition such as revelation and evil are discussed in James in light of a critical assessment of these same topics in *4QInstruction*. Therefore, our attention will now turn to discussing the theme of revelation in James (i.e. Chapter Four), the recipients of this revelation (i.e. Chapter Five), and how evil can impede a person's pursuit of revelation (i.e. Chapter Six). The General Conclusions will outline how this analysis has progressed the interpretation of James.

Chapter Four: Revelation:

Understanding Revelation and its Relationship to Νόμος in James in Light of *4QInstruction*

Introduction

Keeping the overarching question of this thesis in mind, that is assessing James in light of *4QInstruction* in view of the scholarly reassessments of the categories of wisdom and apocalyptic in early Judaism, our attention now turns to the revealing of wisdom in James. Throughout this chapter, the apocalyptic tradition's affiliation with wisdom, and the revelation of wisdom, are stressed.¹ Therefore, this chapter argues that reading James in light of *4QInstruction* has the potential to enhance our understanding of James in terms of its portrayal of the revealing of wisdom, the latter which is spoken about in terms of revelation.

The theme of revelation is examined, and how the pursuit of and adherence to this revelation relates to the Mosaic Torah. This chapter is in four parts. Part One examines the theme of revelation in James, namely σοφία ἄνωθεν. Special attention is thus paid to James 1:5 and 3:13-18. Similarly, Part Two considers the same theme in *4QInstruction*: an in-depth discussion of חזון ההגו and רז נהיה is offered. A critical assessment of 4Q417 1 i lines 1-9 and lines 13b -18 are presented. In other words, both Parts One and Two investigate whether anything definitive might be said about the nature of revelation. When exploring the nature of revelation, an important sub-question emerges: how are we to understand the relationship between this revelation and that of the Torah? This line of enquiry is the focus of Parts Three (James) and Four (*4QInstruction*).

The Revealing of Wisdom and its Association with the Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition

In the introduction of a recent (2017) edited volume entitled *The Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition and the Shaping of New Testament Thought*, its editors, Reynolds and Stuckenbruck discuss the possibility of considering the disclosure of the cosmos and of wisdom as “apocalyptic.” They maintain: “Wisdom and the

¹ E.g. in *1 En* 32:1-6 Enoch is shown the Tree of Wisdom from which the holy ones eat and learn wisdom, and in *Dan* 9:22; 12:10 the prophet is presented as the recipient of wisdom.

revelation of wisdom have long been recognized as contributing, in some way, to Jewish apocalyptic tradition.”² For instance, they note the *Book of Luminaries* (82:2 cf. 5:8) where the angel Uriel tells Enoch; “Wisdom I have given to you and to your children and to those who will be our children so that they may give this wisdom which is beyond their thought to their children for generations.” Moreover, the editors note Argall’s evaluation of this Enochic reference; Argall contends: “The phrase ‘to give wisdom’ is a technical expression for Enoch’s revelation.”³ The editors go on to emphasize the close relationship between revealed cosmology and wisdom, noting; “Information about nature itself is considered wisdom that is revealed (Job 38:1-4; Ps 19:1-2; Sir 1:3; Wis 7:17-21).⁴ And referring back to Käsemann’s infamous statement (cf. §1.3.2.), they ask: “Is Jewish apocalyptic thought the mother of early Christianity not merely regarding the resolution of time but also regarding hidden cosmology and wisdom that is revealed to the righteous?”⁵

In many respects, this chapter may be viewed as taking the editors’ question as its starting point; however, much of the critical assessment carried out throughout this chapter had been completed before this volume was published. The close association between revealed wisdom and revealed cosmology is helpful, most especially when 4Q417 1 i lines 1-9 come into view later in §4.2.3. However, the idea of wisdom being revealed to the righteous, and the apocalyptic tradition’s influence in terms of this overall concept, may be considered as central to the arguments presented in this chapter, and Chapter Five, and as also reaffirming the thought or rationale behind much of their analysis. It is important to note that this current chapter stresses the revelatory nature of wisdom. Therefore, terms such as “revelation”, “revealed wisdom”, and “wisdom revealed” are used when describing the wisdom on offer in both James and *4QInstruction*. The use of these terms is deliberate because they are evocative of the apocalyptic tradition, and their use thus serves to emphasize

² Reynolds and Stuckenbruck, eds., *The Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition*, 7.

³ Randal A. Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative Literary and Conceptual Analysis of the Themes of Revelation, Creation, and Judgment* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 33-35. Cf. Reynolds and Stuckenbruck, eds., *The Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition*, 7.

⁴ Reynolds and Stuckenbruck, eds., *The Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition*, 8.

⁵ Reynolds and Stuckenbruck, eds., *The Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition*, 9.

further the close ties that both James and *4QInstruction* share with a sapiential trajectory in which apocalyptic tenets have become affiliated. However, this common use of terminology does not indicate that the wisdom of James is analogous to that of *4QInstruction*'s, and in fact, these terms are nuanced further later. For now, it is important to note that the nuances, similarities and differences in terms of these two writings' portrayals of wisdom are signposted throughout, and the significance that this may have for James is explored.

4.1. The Revealing of Wisdom in James

Part One of this chapter explores the revelation of wisdom in Letter of James. An attempt is made to investigate the nature of the revelation. An examination of the essence of what is being revealed in James 1:5 is required. For example, is this revelation representative of God revealing special insight, knowledge, or perhaps new commandments that relate to or enable one to live rightly? The below analysis is shaped with these various possibilities and lines of inquiry in mind. Secondly, a discussion of James 3:13-18 and the significance of the differentiation between earthly and heavenly wisdom is offered. As we shall see, internal and external obstacles effect this revelation, and it is therefore necessary to highlight these obstacles.

4.1.1. The Nature and Purpose of Revelation in James

4Q417 1 i lines 1-9 and 4Q417 1 i lines 13b-18 are crucial for the study of revelation in *4QInstruction* (cf. §4.2). The first passage includes a description of the scope of meaning of the רז נהיה, and similarly, reasonable inferences can be made about the חזון ההגו in the second passage.⁶ James, on the other hand, does not contain any explicit descriptions of the nature of revelation, but an analysis of how revelation functions and what it enables its recipients to do may provide insights. In this way, it may be possible to say something substantial about what is at the core of this revelation.

James 1:5 reads: “If any of you is lacking in wisdom [ὕμῶν λείπεται σοφίας], ask God, who gives to all generously and ungrudgingly [αἰτεῖτω παρὰ

⁶ A thorough discussion of *4QInstruction*'s revelation and the meaning of רז נהיה and חזון ההגו is included in §4.2.

τοῦ δίδοντος θεοῦ πᾶσιν⁷ ἀπλῶς⁸ καὶ μὴ ὄνειδίζοντος], and it will be given to you [καὶ δοθήσεται αὐτῷ].”⁹ James 1:5 makes clear that it is God who gives wisdom. This idea of the “giving” of wisdom brings Argall’s earlier evaluation of the phrase “to give wisdom” being a technical expression for Enoch’s revelation to mind.¹⁰ James 1:5 may then be understood as emphasizing that it is God who gives/reveals wisdom. Similarly, Mariam Kamell Kovalishyn argues that James 1:5 “shows influence of the apocalyptic genre, wherein the visionary would be plead for God’s revelation, and in response to their fervency, a vision would be granted”¹¹

The heavenly origins of God’s giving of wisdom are affirmed in James 1:17: “Every generous act of giving, with every perfect gift, is from above [ἄνωθεν ἐστίν], coming down from the Father of Lights, with whom there is no variation or shadow due to change.”¹² Kamell Kovalishyn argues that the connection between σοφία and 1:17 is supported by the three uses of ἄνωθεν in

⁷ πᾶσιν is not to be understood as universal, it refers to those who ask in faith (cf. Jas 1:6-8). Cf. Allison, *James*, 173.

⁸ The word ἀπλῶς has provoked much discussion. Dibelius shows that it can have two meanings: (1) in/with kindness or (2) unreservedly. He opts for latter translation, as does Davids. See Dibelius, *James*, 77-79; Davids, *The Epistle of James*, 72. Cf. Hartin, *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus*, 87.

⁹ James 1:5 reminds a number of scholars of LXX 2 Chron 1:7-13 as three key words run throughout both: σοφία, αἰτέω and δίδωμι. For Kloppenborg, for example, the similarities between James 1:5 and LXX 2 Chron 1:7-13 suffice that the author of James “has constructed the ethos of the speaker by invoking the figure of Solomon, who stands behind ‘James’ and whose virtues James evinces: he, like Solomon, knows *how* to obtain wisdom-by prayer to a god who rewards ungrudgingly; he, like Solomon, shows an abiding concern for the poor and he understands that justice involves defending the poor against rich aggressors; and he, besting the Deuteronomist’s Solomon, is insistent that wisdom must always be practiced in the context of Torah observance.” Kloppenborg, “Discourse Analysis,” 265.

¹⁰ Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach*, 33-35.

¹¹ Mariam J. Kamell Kovalishyn, “James and Apocalyptic Wisdom,” in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition and the Shaping of New Testament Thought* (eds. Benjamin E. Reynolds and Loren T. Stuckenbruck; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2017), 293-306, 295.

¹² Davids argues that, in James, a parallel is present between desire’s actions leading to death and God’s actions leading to life. This is similar to Romans 7-8 where evil seems to function as the counterforce to the evil *yetzer* and to produce life where death once reigned. Davids, *James*, 55. See Chapter Six.

James; she notes that it first appears in connection with the good gifts in 1:17, while in both 3:15 and 3:17 the adverb is paired with wisdom (i.e. σοφία ἄνωθεν).¹³ That this wisdom has been revealed and its otherworldly origins have been established in turn indicates that the apocalyptic topos of revelation is interwoven into the discussion. James' participation in the apocalyptic sphere is thus affirmed.

For Bauckham, the wisdom of James is “a creative development of the Jewish wisdom tradition decisively inspired and shaped by the wisdom of Jesus”,¹⁴ but notes that the idea of having to ask for wisdom (i.e. 1:5), breaks with convention.¹⁵ Traditional Jewish literature typically emphasizes a long and intensive search for wisdom (e.g. Prov 2:1-5; 8:34; Sir 6:18-37; 39:1-7; Wis 6:9-16), whereas this is not the case in James.¹⁶ For now, it is interesting to signpost a difference between James and *4QInstruction*; that is to say, the two writings differ on this point because the addressee of *4QInstruction* is exhorted to continually pursue the רז נהיה. The former instruction may be seen in terms of being more representative of this long and intensive search for wisdom. However, as will be established, other dimensions of *4QInstruction's* portrayal of wisdom are far from what one comes to expect of the realm of traditional wisdom literature.

¹³ Kamell Kovalishyn, “James and Apocalyptic Wisdom,” 296.

¹⁴ Bauckham describes his aim as establishing whether James' wisdom has been decisively shaped by the distinctive character and emphasis of Jesus. He concludes: “our account of the way James' wisdom corresponds to the major characteristics and points of focus and emphasis which give the Synoptic teaching of Jesus its distinctiveness has included virtually every significant topic and concern in the letter of James.” See Bauckham, *James*, 107. However, in the case of Jas 1:5, Allison argues that it represents a separation from the Jesus tradition. Jas 1:5 is similar to Matt 7:7-8 and Luke 11:9-10, and Allison therefore asks why, in Jas 1:5, did the author not write “If any of you lacks in wisdom, let him, as our Lord Jesus taught, ask God, who gives to all men generously and ungrudgingly, and it will be given to you”? Maybe James did not appeal to Jesus as an authority for his sentences because Jesus was not an authority recognized by all of his audience.” Dale C. Allison, “The Audience of James and the Sayings of Jesus,” in *James, 1&2 Peter and Early Jesus Traditions* (eds. Alicia Batten and John S. Kloppenborg; London: Bloomsbury, 2014), 58-77, 77. See §5.1.1.

¹⁵ Bauckham, *James*, 111.

¹⁶ Bauckham, *James*, 96. Cf. Wis 7:7.

Similarly, Hartin argues that the portrayal of wisdom being a gift from God in 1:5 is consistent with the Jewish wisdom tradition,¹⁷ and hence he considers 1:5 as bolstering the view that “God is always committed to his people and they can always be confident in approaching him.”¹⁸ Penner’s analysis focuses on the occurrence of 1:5 and what precedes it. According to Penner, it can be reasonably inferred from 1:2-4 that the double-minded who request wisdom will be denied as this group is unrighteous and underserving of God’s wisdom.¹⁹ While Penner’s argument is supportable, it is surprising that, considering the focus his monograph places on eschatology, he does not engage with the revelatory nature of this wisdom.

Kamell Kovalishyn’s contribution was mentioned above, and in this present context, it may be considered especially significant because she is one of the few scholars who seriously engages with the apocalyptic dimension of 1:5. Already noted is her reasoning that the idea of having to ask for wisdom, which is present in James 1:5, conveys an apocalyptic genre influence, but equally noteworthy is her argument that while wisdom cannot be directly identified with the intermediaries of apocalyptic literature, “it is significant that James very clearly highlights that one *cannot* understand God’s will and ways without his wisdom, which only comes from his presence.”²⁰ For Kamell Kovalishyn then, wisdom in James is a medium of transformation and thus takes on the role of an otherworldly mediator.²¹ Therefore, when discussing the wisdom present in James, she refers to it as “apocalyptic wisdom.”

As such, a person can come to know and follow the path of righteousness through the revelation that is offered in 1:5. While James makes clear that one asks for wisdom, nowhere in the writing are we informed how wisdom is received, that is, by what means God gives wisdom. Despite this ambiguity James leaves the reader with the impression that God can somehow instruct the

¹⁷ See Sir 1:1. 26, 17:11; 24:2; 39:6; Wis 7:7, 15; 8:21; 9:4.

¹⁸ Hartin, *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus*, 87.

¹⁹ Penner, *James and Eschatology*, 203. See §6.4.

²⁰ Kamell Kovalishyn, “James and Apocalyptic Wisdom,” 298.

²¹ Kamell Kovalishyn, “James and Apocalyptic Wisdom,” 298.

faithful.²² A similar theme is encountered in the Hebrew Bible where this idea develops into an eschatological expectation.²³

Kamell Kovalishyn's contributions remind us that, in James, the exhortation to ask for wisdom occurs immediately after the mention of ongoing trials (1:2-4), which seems to imply that this wisdom provides an antidote to such trials.²⁴ Therefore, James 1:5 is best interpreted in relation to its surrounding verses, *contra* Dibelius who argues that any connection between 1:2-4 and 1:5-8 is purely superficial.²⁵ Allison maintains that while "vv.2-4 culminate in talk of 'perfection' (ἔργον τέλειον, τέλειοι), vv. 5-8 close in talk of being 'double-minded' (δίψυχος), and the latter is, in James, the opposite of the former."²⁶ To be "perfect" is to be "complete", "whole", and "undivided", while the opposite to this is being "double-minded" and suffering divided faith and/or loyalties. 1:2-4 and 1:5-8 may thus be considered as portraying the contrasting traits and personalities of those among James' audience. 1:2-4 sets up the ethical and eschatological goal, while 1:6-8 warns of all that stands in the way of reaching this goal.²⁷

Understood in the above terms, it is reasonable to suggest that 1:5 is the most important verse within this pericope because it refers to the means as to how one may become/remain "complete" and avoid being "double-minded". People of divided loyalties will not be included among God's righteous community (cf. §6.2.2.). James 1:2-8 speaks of testing and trials, but enduring these trials and remaining steadfast is made possible through the revelation of 1:5.²⁸ Successfully enduring these tests and trials demonstrates an unwavering

²² Philo displays a similar thinking. See Philo, *Cher*, 127-128. Cf. Allison, *James*, 177.

²³ E.g. see Isa 2:2-4; 3:20-21; Jer 31:31-34.

²⁴ See §6.2.

²⁵ Allison, *James*, 77.

²⁶ Allison, *James*, 166.

²⁷ Cf. Allison, *James*, 166.

²⁸ A number of scholars have speculated as to whether James 1:2-8 is responding to a particular situation. Macknight, for example, suggests these verses are referring to "those Jews who were not resolved whether they would adhere to the law or the gospel", while Martin supposes that "the readers are facing real problems arising from persecution". See James Macknight, *A New Literal Translation from the Original Greek of all the Apostolical Epistles* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books House, 1841), 587; Ralph P. Martin, *James* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1988),

loyalty to God on the part of the recipient,²⁹ and leads to a “perfected work” (cf. 1:22-25).³⁰ Allison’s description of the wisdom of 1:5 is worth noting; he describes it as “a gift, enabling one, notwithstanding circumstances, to know and, above all, to do God’s will.”³¹ Therefore, in James, wisdom is a gift from God (cf. 1:17), and may also be viewed as an intermediary to reveal his will and character. The revelation of James 1:5 does more than provide information; on the contrary, it encourages action in terms of doing the *logos* and enables wise living.

Throughout James there is an emphasis on doing: revelation enables one to live wisely, and in this sense, revelation may be considered ongoing. 1:22-25 makes clear that acting in accordance with this revelation is more important than hearing it (i.e., it credits doers who act and condemns hearers who forget).³² Similar to 1:2-8, in 1:22-25 two types of people are being compared.³³ The author is clear that being a doer is the favoured option.³⁴ Allison argues that the central point of these verses is to teach “that knowledge without corresponding action is worthless.”³⁵ It is thus credible to suggest that the revelation of 1:5 provides the recipient with a fuller understanding of the importance of the required corresponding actions, while also providing a better understanding of

17, respectively. Cf. Allison, *James*, 166. It needs to be noted that such suggestions remain guesswork.

²⁹ Arguing James 1:2-4, 12 is representative of the opening of the main body of James, Penner suggests the overall theme of the epistle is summarized in these verses; the writer is concerned with the end time trials in which the readers find themselves in. If the believer endures the trials, then steadfast results; testing takes place to affirm one is loyal to what has been revealed by God (cf. Deut 8:2; Jer 12:3; Prov 17:3). In *James and Eschatology*, 200, he writes: “The testing is intended to prove (δοκιμιον, δόκιμος) that the faith of the individual is pure and unfaltering so that the believer may be saved at the judgment which is soon to take place.” Similar themes are also encountered in the second chapter of Sirach, but a fundamental difference exists, in Sirach the vindication of the righteous is portrayed as occurring in this-worldly terms, whereas in James these themes are placed in an eschatological context (e.g. see Jas 1:12).

³⁰ Cf. Allison, *James*, 156.

³¹ Allison, *James*, 170.

³² Cf. Matt 7:24-27; Luke 6:47-49; Rom 2:13.

³³ Moo regards 1:22 to be “the best known verse in the letter.” Moo, *The Letter of James*, 89.

³⁴ Cf. Davids, *The Epistle of James*, 98.

³⁵ Allison, *James*, 323.

this external knowledge (3:13). In other words, the revelation appears to have a cosmological dimension and is not abstract. The knowledge that this revelation offers may include some kind of information concerning ethical and moral instructions, but also seems to extend beyond this. Being aware of and informing one's actions in light of these moral instructions will result in the addressees receiving eschatological rewards (cf. 1:12),³⁶ and being included in God's righteous community.³⁷

The emphasis James places on action is noteworthy. This suggests that revelation in James is interwoven with positive action. This is an important point of comparison with *4QInstruction* because, as we shall see (in §4.2.3.), revelation in *4QInstruction* is also linked with distinguishing between good and evil, and with living wisely. Hence, in *4QInstruction*, the idea of action is also key (e.g. 4Q417 1 i lines 6-8). Therefore, at this point we can tentatively argue that living a wise life is portrayed by both of these authors, but especially by James, as being achieved by ethical actions that are informed by God's revelation. If revelation is understood in this way then this does not necessarily mean that this revelation only contains some kind of knowledge *per se*; while it seems to be the case that this revelation provides knowledge that enables one to discern between right and wrong and act accordingly, it is equally possible that the request for revelation in 1:5 also conveys a genuine request on the part of a recipient asking for God's assistance to live wisely. The exact form that this assistance takes on remains somewhat ambiguous, but its presence is nonetheless affirmed.

4.1.2. James 3:13-18: Two Kinds of Wisdom

In James 3:13-18 a distinction is made between earthly and heavenly wisdom:

13. Who is wise and understanding among you? Show by your good life that your works are done with gentleness born of wisdom. 14. But if you have bitter envy and selfish ambition in your hearts, do not be boastful and false to the truth. 15. Such wisdom does not come down from above, but is earthly,

³⁶ Davids suggests that this pericope (Jas 1:22-25) envisages a future eschatological blessing. Davids, *The Epistle of James*, 100.

³⁷ See Chapter Six.

unspiritual, devilish [ἀλλὰ ἐπίγειος, φυχική δαιμονιώδης]. 16. For where there is envy and selfish ambition, there will also be disorder and wickedness of every kind. 17. But the wisdom from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, willing to yield, full of mercy and good fruits, without a trace of partiality or hypocrisy [πρῶτον μὲν ἀγνή ἐστίν, ἔπειτα εἰρηνική, ἐπιεικής, εὐπειθής, μεστή ἐλέους καὶ καρπῶν ἀγαθῶν, ἀδιάκριτος, ἀνυπόκριτος].

In these six verses wisdom is described as coming from above (ἄνωθεν) and is presented as ideal and superior to earthly wisdom.³⁸ Σοφία ἄνωθεν is described in terms of being pure, gentle and without a trace of hypocrisy. Bauckham notes that σοφία ἄνωθεν is described using seven attributes (i.e. πρῶτον μὲν ἀγνή ἐστίν, ἔπειτα εἰρηνική, ἐπιεικής, εὐπειθής, μεστή ἐλέους καὶ καρπῶν ἀγαθῶν, ἀδιάκριτος, ἀνυπόκριτος) is deliberate on the author's part because seven "is the number of perfection or completeness."³⁹ Dibelius was uncertain why purity was listed first among the adjectives, commenting that it "does not fit with the train of thought",⁴⁰ but Ropes' argument that the other adjectives "stand over against ἀγνή, the quality from which they all proceed"⁴¹ makes sense and is hence more convincing. Σοφία ἄνωθεν is pure because it is free of this-worldly contamination (cf. §3.2.2.).

Kamell Kovalishyn notes that the description of heavenly wisdom in James 3:17 almost echoes that of *I Enoch* 42:1-3:

Wisdom did not find a place where she might dwell, so her dwelling was in the heavens. Wisdom went forth to dwell among the sons of men, but she did not find a dwelling. Wisdom returned to her place, and sat down in the midst of the angels. Iniquity went forth from her chambers, those whom she did not seek she found, and she dwelt among them like rain in a desert and dew in a thirsty land.⁴²

³⁸ The description of heavenly wisdom in James 3:17 resembles the description of the twenty-one qualities of wisdom in in Wis 7:22-23, although different adjectives are used.

³⁹ Bauckham, *James*, 77.

⁴⁰ Dibelius, *James*, 152.

⁴¹ Ropes, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of St. James*, 259.

⁴² Translation from Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *I Enoch*. Cf. Kamell Kovalishyn, "James and Apocalyptic Wisdom," 296.

At this point it needs to be noted that I am not suggesting that James is condemning proverbial wisdom. On the contrary, it is adherence to such proverbial wisdom that indicates that one is to be included among the righteous community. However, in James, there appears to be a special emphasis on this wisdom's otherworldly origins. Inclusion amongst the people of God involves revelation and this is followed by right action. Right action is informed by ethical exhortations about this-worldly matters (e.g. controlling one's speech 3:5 or having no regard for wealth 5:1-2), and this is facilitated by the revelatory wisdom of 1:5. However, the emphasis James places on σοφία ἄνωθεν and its implied superiority requires further comment. This superiority of σοφία ἄνωθεν is affirmed, Kamell Kovalishyn suggests; "illustrated in the brilliant way the author never once names the anti-wisdom of James 3:14-15. He fails to provide a noun, forcing the reader to fill in the gap."⁴³

James 1:13-15 refers to the wars that are raging internally among James' audience, and the insufficiency of the human condition in general is evoked (cf. Jas 4:1). In this present context, the reference to lacking in wisdom in 1:5 warrants a brief comment. The idea of lacking wisdom may be understood in relation to James' negative anthropology; that is to say, James considers human nature to be inherently flawed or lacking. Revelation helps humanity, which is weak, to live rightly in a world full of internal and external evils (e.g.. 1:14. 4:7).⁴⁴ All of this highlights the need for an otherworldly force to help humanity, a force that cannot be tarnished. For James, the manifestation of this force is the revelation of 1:5. James 1:13 makes clear that such internal struggles are not the result of God because "God cannot be tempted by evil and he himself tempts no one."⁴⁵ This defense of God is significant as it is God who reveals wisdom in 1:5, the heavenly (i.e. otherworldly) origins of this revelation are established in 1:17, and the superiority of this heavenly wisdom is affirmed in 3:17. James' portrayal of humanity infers that humanity is led astray by internal desires. These internal desires seemingly have both internal and external consequences (Jas 4:1-2), and may be understood as obstacles along the path of living a wise life.

⁴³ Kamell Kovalishyn, "James and Apocalyptic Wisdom," 297.

⁴⁴ The topic of internal and external evils in the Letter of James will be returned to in greater detail in Chapter Six, esp. §6.4. – 6.5.

⁴⁵ See §6.4.1.

Revelation hence provides the perfect antidote to this, and it enables one to perform wisdom faithfully and to live in accordance with God’s cosmos. In this way, the revelation of James may be viewed in terms of being internalized; the receipt of this revelation has an internal dimension that helps annul such internal struggles (cf. 1:14). As revelation is an otherworldly force, it cannot be corrupted (cf. 1:17) and it empowers one to become “whole” (cf. 1:4). As a result, living life in accordance with σοφία ἄνωθεν can potentially do away with these aforementioned internal and external struggles, or at least the receipt of this revelation makes one more equipped to deal with them. However, human responsibility is not annulled. A person must ask for this revelation and in turn it is their responsibility to act upon it.⁴⁶ This demonstrates that the acquisition of otherworldly wisdom comes with responsibilities; in James, this responsibility entails firstly asking for this wisdom, and then acting rightly and living wisely. As §4.2. will now demonstrate, the acquisition of wisdom in *4QInstruction* also comes with responsibilities.

4.2. The Revealing of Wisdom in *4QInstruction*

In this section I examine the depiction of revelation throughout *4QInstruction*, and offer an excursus on its nature. In *4QInstruction* two terms are used to represent revelation: they are חזון ההגו (“vision of Hagu”) and רז נהיה (“mystery of being”). These translations will be explained and justified below (§ 4.2.1 – 4.2.2). In addition, an attempt will be made to discern the specifics of this revelation by offering a detailed assessment of 4Q417 1 i lines 1-9 in §4.2.3. The analysis here focuses on interpreting חזון ההגו and רז נהיה. Moreover, the possible reasons as to why the author places so much emphasis on revelation will also be addressed.

4.2.1. *4Q417 1 i lines 13b-18 and חזון ההגו*

4QInstruction is an exceptionally difficult composition to offer an adequate interpretation of, but this is nowhere more the case than when 4Q417 1 i lines

⁴⁶ The Jewish tradition often conveys God giving wisdom to the deserving faithful. See 1 Kgs 3:9-12; 2 Chron 1:7-13; Prov 2:6; Wis 7:7; 8:21; 9:4, 9-10, 17; *1 En* 101:8. Cf. Allison, *James*, 170, n. 45.

13b-18 are in focus. The reason for this is because it is one's reading of these lines that determines whether they perceive all of humanity as having been created with access to revelation and consequently having the potential to avail of its associated benefits, or if in fact these lines are drawing upon the two creation accounts in Gen 1-2, the inference being that a dualistic portrayal of humanity is present. In turn, this pericope makes us question whether a division among humanity is expressed. Therefore, how one evaluates this passage largely depends on how one views the deterministic outlook of this document overall. It is thus not surprising to learn that these six lines remain the most disputed within *4QInstruction* scholarship.⁴⁷ This section reviews and engages with central scholarship on this passage, while also attempting to situate the discussion within the parameters of this chapter.

4Q417 1 i lines 13b-18
Translation⁴⁸

13b And then thou shalt know about the glory of [*His*] *m[ight. Toge]ther* with His marvelous mysteries and the *mighty acts He has wrought*. But thou,

⁴⁷ 4Q417 1 i 13-18 is a passage that very often leads to terse discussion which is not helped by its poor material condition, that is to say, much of the ink has become eroded from the skin of 4Q417 resulting in many letters being only partially preserved. This has made it very difficult to decide the strokes of many of the letters. See DJD 34: 143. For this reasons and others this passage has been at the centre of many discussions. Representative examples include; Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran*, 52-56; Elgvin, "The Mystery to Come," 113-150, 139-147; Collins, "In the Likeness of the Holy Ones," 608-619; idem, "The Mysteries of God, Creation and Eschatology in 4QInstruction and the Wisdom of Solomon," in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Florentino García Martínez; BETL 168; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 287-305; idem, "Interpretations of the Creation of Humanity in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Biblical Interpretation of Qumran* (ed. Matthias Henze; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 29-43; Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 80-126, idem, *Discerning Wisdom*, 26-39, idem, "Genesis 1-3 and Conception of Humankind in 4QInstruction, Philo and Paul," 114-125; Werman, "What is the Vision of Hagu?" 125-140; Wold, "The Universality of Creation," 211-226; Macaskill, *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology*, 77-83; Rey, *4QInstruction*, 277-306; Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, "'Spiritual People,' 'Fleshly Spirit,' and 'Vision of Meditation': Reflections on 4QInstruction and 1 Corinthians," in *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament* (ed. Florentino García Martínez; STDJ 85; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 103-118.

⁴⁸ Translation from DJD 34:155.

14 O understanding one, study (*inherit?*) thy reward, Remembering the re[*quital, for*] it comes. Engraved is the/thy ordinance/destiny. And ordained is all the punishment.

15 For engraved *is* that which is ordained by God *against* all the *ini[quities]* of the children of שׂוֹת, *And* written in His presence *is* a book of memorial

16 of those who keep His word. *And that is* the appearance/*vision of the meditation* [חזון ההגו]⁴⁹ on a book of memorial [לספר זכרון]. *And He* /שׂוֹת(?) *gave* it as an inheritance to אנוש *Together with* a spiritual people [עם רוח]. F[ס]r

17 according to the pattern of the Holy Ones [קדושים] *is his* (man's) fashioning. *But* no more [ועוד לוא] *has* meditation been given to *a* (?) fleshly spirit [רוח בשר], *For it* (sc. flesh) *knew/knows* not the difference between

18 [goo]d and evil according to the judgment of *its* [sp]irit. *vacat* *And* thou, O understanding child, gaze on the mystery that is to come, *And* know

4Q417 1 i lines 13b-18 portray the bequeathing of the אנוש to חזון ההגו. Matters concerning elucidation are complicated by the mention of חזון ההגו (“vision of Hagu”) in line 16. This phrase occurs nowhere else in the Hebrew of the period. Indeed, Goff concedes that the term “vision of Hagu” is obscure, but argues that the author assumes his audience knew what the “vision of Hagu” meant.⁵⁰ A ספר ההגו “book of Hagu” is found in the *Damascus Document* (e.g. CD x 6, xiii 2; cf xiv 8), which seems to be concerned with the basic covenant principles.⁵¹ This distinguishes it from the “vision of Hagu”, because in 4Q417 1 i חזון ההגו and רז נהיה do not appear to be written down; both are forms of heavenly revelation. The complexities of understanding the relationship between חזון ההגו, רז נהיה and the Mosaic Torah are examined in §4.4., but in this present context it is reasonable to propose that there is some connection between *4QInstruction's* חזון ההגו and the

⁴⁹ Strugnell and Harrington translate חזון ההגו as “vision of mediation”. The translation “Vision of Hagu” is used throughout this thesis but either translation is equally appropriate.

⁵⁰ Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 32.

⁵¹ The identity of the *Book of Hagu* has been debated among scholars. While Lawrence Schiffman and Harmut Stegemann propose it is identical with the *Pentateuch*, a theory that is not wholly convincing, others such as Baumgarten and Davies suggest the *Book of Hagu* was the code for sectarian halakhah. See Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 44, n. 144; Harmut Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus* (Freiburg: Herder, 1994) 162; Joseph M. Baumgarten, *Studies in Qumran Law* (Leiden: Brill, 1977), 16, n.13; Philip R. Davies, “The Temple Scroll and the Damascus Document,” in *Temple Scroll Studies: Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll. Manchester, December 1987*. (ed. George J. Brooke; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 201-210. Although all of these are interesting options, none are especially compelling.

Qumran community's ספר ההגו, even if one is written and the other not.⁵² That there may be some affiliation between the Qumran community's ספר ההגו and חזון ההגו is based upon their shared vocabulary, and that these two sources provide some kind of knowledge or instruction.

Generally speaking the term "Hagu" is enigmatic, but it most likely derives from the verb להגות, meaning "to meditate, ponder".⁵³ It is a reference to some form of otherworldly revelation. Werman considers Hagu as a form of revelation and suggests it is linked with "a mental concentration of predestined history" and the ability "to look with the mind's eye was not given to all but only to the one who was created with a spirit patterned after the angels."⁵⁴ Since a critical edition of *4QInstruction* became available in 1999, there have been several efforts to understand the חזון ההגו. Strugnell and Harrington argue that it refers to a theurgic or otherworldly act that provides access to the "book of remembrance" mentioned after in line 16.⁵⁵ Understanding it in similar terms to the רז נהיה, Elgvin considers the חזון ההגו as "an apocalyptic, visionary book which reveals salvation history from creation to the last days."⁵⁶

A "book of memorial" is mentioned in relation to the חזון ההגו in 4Q417 1 i line 16, and most commentators therefore agree that it is associated with the

⁵² A ספר ההגו is also referred to in the *Rule of the Congregation* where it is stated that group members are to be trained in the ספר ההגו and "statutes of the covenant" (IQSa i lines 6-7). Its reference here serves to further differentiate the ספר ההגו from the חזון ההגו as there is an inferred implication that the ספר ההגו is written down. However, it is noteworthy that the ספר ההגו was viewed as a requirement for the community leaders in terms of providing instruction. It is interesting to note that Elgvin argues that the ספר ההגו "is a strong indication of some kind of sectarian provenance for 4QInstruction [*sic*]." Elgvin, "An Analysis of 4QInstruction," 93.

⁵³ Cf. Matthew J. Goff, "Recent Trends in the Study of Early Jewish Wisdom Literature: The Contribution of 4QInstruction and Other Qumran Texts," *CurBR* 7 (2009): 376-416, 383. It is used with this meaning in the Hebrew Bible (e.g. Isa 1:1; Dan 9:24; Sir 36:20). Cf. Goff, *4QInstruction*, 162.

⁵⁴ Werman, "What is the Book of Hagu?" 138.

⁵⁵ DJD 34; 155.

⁵⁶ Elgvin, "An Analysis of 4QInstruction," 94. It is interesting to note that Lange understands the vision of Hagu as a heavenly form of torah, a view that is based on his understanding of the phrase "engraved is the statute" of 4Q417 1 i line 14. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 62. Lange's argument remains unlikely as the torah does not appear to be a major theme in *4QInstruction*. See §4.4.2.

book of memorial in Mal 3:16. The book of memorial in Mal 3:16 lists the righteous before God. The possible connection between the book of memorial in Mal 3:16 and the חזון ההגו may then suggest the latter is a heavenly vision of the knowledge that this book of memorial contains.⁵⁷ 4Q417 1 i lines 15 and 17 make clear that the בני שות and the רוח בשר are considered unrighteous and will be judged, whereas the context of 4Q417 1 i lines 13b-18 suggests that it is אנוש who is/are righteous; namely, it is to this person/group of humanity that this form of revelation is given. Therefore, how one interprets אנוש is vitally important and shapes how one understands this passage thereafter. The various translations of אנוש are outlined in Chapter Five (§5.2.1.), but in this present context it is important to note that 4Q417 1 i lines 13b-18 portrays the bequeathing of a heavenly form of revelation to either humanity or a select group of humanity.

While offering a precise explanation of the חזון ההגו remains difficult, based upon its seemingly close affiliation with the “book of memorial” in Mal 3:16, it is reasonable to propose that the חזון ההגו is concerned with otherworldly matters. Moreover, its apparent close affiliation with Mal 3:16 suggests that the disclosure of its content, as Goff notes, “probably included an assertion of divine judgment.”⁵⁸ The “vision of Hagu” may therefore be spoken about and understood in apocalyptic terms. It is significant that “the vision of Hagu” and the “mystery of being” are both referred to in the same column of *4QInstruction* (i.e. 4Q417 i). This is even more noteworthy because this represents the only occurrence of the “vision of Hagu” in this writing. Similarly, Goff argues that “the ‘vision of meditation’ in 4Q417 1 i line 16 should not be thought of as a distinct revelation in addition to ‘mystery of being’, but rather as a veiled reference to it.”⁵⁹ Goff’s argument is persuasive. At the very least, these two forms of revelation appear to be closely related based on their close proximity to one another in 4Q417 1 i.

⁵⁷ Cf. Goff, *4QInstruction*, 160.

⁵⁸ Goff, “Recent Trends in the Study of 4QInstruction,” 383.

⁵⁹ Goff, *4QInstruction*, 162.

4.2.2. רז נהיה

As seen in §4.1., the revelation of James 1:5 aids its recipients in terms of living a wise life. The רז נהיה, on the other hand, enables its addressees to distinguish right from wrong, but this extends beyond moral conduct. Hence, a slight nuance may be seen as separating the two because *4QInstruction* suggests that the acquisition of the רז נהיה offers insight about the divine framework in which the human realm may be understood.⁶⁰ In terms of *4QInstruction*, the רז נהיה is vitally important. For Goff, the רז היהג represents an appeal to otherworldly revelation.⁶¹ This expression is included at least twenty times throughout the composition,⁶² and this serves to demonstrate its importance for the author. To underscore the importance of the רז נהיה, Kister has suggested that an appropriate title for this composition would be חכמת רז נהיה.⁶³ Concerning רז נהיה, Harrington wrote: “It is so frequent in the work that when we find either word alone and need to fill in a lacuna, we can add the missing word with some confidence.”⁶⁴ Apart from the phrase being found twice in one passage of *Mysteries*, where it is associated with eschatological judgment (1Q27 1 i line 3 [par 4Q300 3 3]), and once in the *Community Rule*, where it used by the speaker to describe his reception of revelation (1QS xi lines 3-4), the phrase is otherwise unattested and unknown.

The word רז (*râz*) is of Persian provenance and occurs numerous times throughout Second Temple literature, commonly in reference to higher revelation or mystery.⁶⁵ For example, it is encountered in the second chapter of Daniel in

⁶⁰ Some of this language is borrowed from Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 62.

⁶¹ Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 13.

⁶² E.g. 4Q415 6 line 4; 4Q416 2 i line 5; 4Q416 2 iii line 9, line 14, line 18, and line 21; 4Q417 1 i line 3, line 6, line 8, line 18, and line 21; 4Q417 1 ii line 3; 4Q418 77 2 line 4; 4Q418 123 ii line 4; 4Q418 172 line 1; 4Q418 184 line 2; 4Q423 4 line 1, and line 4. Moreover, this phrase is reasonably reconstructed in 4Q415 24 line 1; 4Q416 17 line 3; 4Q418 179 line 3; 4Q418 190 lines 2-3; 4Q418 201 line 1; 4Q418c line 8; 4Q423 3 line 2; 4Q423 5 line 2; and 4Q423 7 line 7. Cf. Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 13, n.19.

⁶³ Menahem Kister, *The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*, (vol. 1; Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben Zvi, 2009 – in Hebrew), 304. Cf. Goff, *4QInstruction*, 14.

⁶⁴ Harrington, “The Raz Nihyeh in a Qumran Wisdom Text,” 550.

⁶⁵ Raymond E. Brown discerns what he considers to be four different categories of *râz*: (1) mysteries of divine providence – the secret is thus related to the providence that God shows *vis-à-*

relation to the content and interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream.⁶⁶ *I Enoch* 106:19 employs the word in reference to the knowledge revealed to Enoch by the angels.⁶⁷ As noted by Shaul Shaked, however, this Persian loan word can also denote an actual hidden cause.⁶⁸ While acknowledging the cosmological and eschatological implications of this word, Elliot R. Wolfson notably petitions for an added dimension to be considered; that is, the ontological dimension, a facet in which he maintains both the cosmological and eschatological are grounded. For Wolfson, the word רז denotes "the 'being' of the divine image, a mystery that consists in the fact that the 'being' of this image is in the image of being (be)coming what is to be."⁶⁹ In terms of *Yahad* literature, this word becomes a central phrase in the vocabulary used by the community at Qumran in reference to the mysteries or secrets of God.⁷⁰ In addition, it is interesting to note that the word רז appears to have been censored by the rabbis because of its sectarian and apocalyptic connotations.⁷¹ נהיה is a Niphal participle of the verb היה ("to be"), and it would seem that נהיה is intended to signify the entire scope of history: the

vis angels, humankind, and Israel; (2) mysteries of the sect's interpretation of the law; (3) cosmic mysteries; and (4) evil mysteries. See Raymond E. Brown, *The Semitic Background of the Term "Mystery" in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968), 22-30.

⁶⁶ Dan 2: 18-19, 27-30, 47 (2x); 4:6. It should also be noted that this is its only occurrence in the Hebrew Bible.

⁶⁷ Cf. 4QEn 5 ii lines 26-27. It is helpful to note that the latter follows the reconstruction by George W. E Nickelsburg, *I Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of I Enoch, Chapters 1-36, 81-108* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 537. The expression is also found in the *Hodayot* (1QH^a 10 line 13).

⁶⁸ Shaked writes: "the word rāz is used several times in the Pahlavi books in connection with a group of religious mysteries, which seem to be usually related to the fields of creation and eschatology as well as to the knowledge of the proper way of fighting the demons. However it is also important to note that this word does not necessarily designate in many of its occurrences a secret piece of knowledge or a doctrine which must be kept hidden; it seems often to denote a hidden cause, a latent factor, a connection which is not immediately evident." Shaul Shaked, "Esoteric Trends in Zoroastrianism," *PLASH* 3 (1969): 175-221.

⁶⁹ Elliot R. Wolfson, "Seven Mysteries of Knowledge: Qumran E/Sotericism Recovered," in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honour of James L. Kugel* (ed. Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman; JSJup 83; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 177-213, 181.

⁷⁰ E.g. see 1QH^a i line 11; viii lines 5-6, and 11; ix line 23; xii lines 13 and 20.

⁷¹ In contrast to the numerous admonitions to meditate hidden mysteries, rabbinic literature warns against engaging in such speculations. Cf. Elgvin, "The Mystery to Come," 139.

past, present and future. Such a use and/or understanding is encountered in numerous places (e.g., 1QS iii line 13 – iv line 26; xi line 11, and lines 17-18). As we shall see below, the scope of this term has proven itself difficult and thus many translations have been offered.⁷²

De Vaux, in an early analysis of the Cave 1 text of the *Book of Mysteries* (1Q27) argued that the רז נהיה should be translated as “le mystère passé”,⁷³ while Milik’s edition of 1Q27 translates the phrase “le mystère futur”.⁷⁴ Alexander Rofé proposes that נהיה is best construed as a perfect, rather than a participle, and thus translates it as “the mystery of what has happened”.⁷⁵ Similarly, James Duguid offered a syntactical study of the Niphal of היה at Qumran, and proposed that a more accurate translation of the רז נהיה is “the mystery of what happens”.⁷⁶ Strugnell, Harrington and Elgvin translate the רז נהיה as the “mystery that is to come”,⁷⁷ whereas Collins and Goff opt for “mystery that is to be”.⁷⁸ Since determining the chronological scope of the רז נהיה has proven difficult (e.g. 4Q417 1 i lines 3-4 and 4Q418 123 ii line 3), particularly in terms of its translation, a rendering that avoids a single tense is most convincing. García

⁷² Notable is Bilhah Nitzan’s position; she renders the רז נהיה as the “mystery of what is to come into being,” which she relates to the cosmological and eschatological secrets of God’s hidden wisdom beyond human knowledge. Bilhah Nitzan, “The Idea of Creation and Its Implications in Qumran Literature,” in *Creation in Jewish and Christian Tradition* (ed. Henning G. Reventlow and Yair Hoffman; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 240-264, 250-252.

⁷³ Roland de Vaux, “La Grotte des manuscrits hébreux,” *RB* 66 (1949), 605. De Vaux’s opinion is based on biblical examples where the Niphal of the verb היה refers to a complete action (e.g. Prov 13:19; Judge 20:3). Cf. Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 33.

⁷⁴ DJD 1: 104.

⁷⁵ Alexander Rofé, “Revealed Wisdom: From the Bible to Qumran,” in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20-22 May, 2001* (STDJ; 51; eds. John J. Collins, Gregory E. Sterling and Ruth A. Clements; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 1-12, 2.

⁷⁶ James Duguid, “The Mystery of What Happens: The Niphal of היה in Second Temple Literature” (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of SBL, Boston, MA, 20 November 2017).

⁷⁷ Harrington notes that he and Strugnell were following Milik’s lead of “le mystère futur”. Harrington, “Raz Nihyeh,” 551; Elgvin, “An Analysis of 4QInstruction,” 80-81.

⁷⁸ See Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 121-125; Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*, 51-54.

Martínez, Tigchelaar, Rey and Wold are all proponents of the translation “the mystery of existence”,⁷⁹ and while this translation is on a solid footing, I consider the translation “the mystery of being” to be more appropriate because it seems more loyal to the inclusion of the Niphal participle of the verb *היה* in the phrase.⁸⁰ The translation “the mystery of being” is hence used throughout.

The inclusion of *רז נהיה* in 1Q27 1 i line 3, where it is associated with eschatological judgment, has led some scholars to consider it in terms of the created order (e.g. 4Q417 1 i lines 8-9). For example, Collins, Goff and Rey argue that the *רז נהיה* refers not just to a future, but also to a deterministic plan that structures the entire scope of creation, from creation to judgment.⁸¹ Goff argues: “4QInstruction puts forward a deterministic conception of the natural order. It teaches that history and creation unfold according to a divine plan established by God, disclosed to the intended addressee as a revealed truth (4Q417 1 i lines 10-11).”⁸² This deterministic view is called into question later. Elgvin interprets the *רז נהיה* in terms of being a reinterpretation of the divine Wisdom of Proverbs 1-9.⁸³ Interestingly, Harrington suggests that the *רז נהיה* should be associated with a specific literary unit,⁸⁴ but his suggestion is not compelling because *4QInstruction* never indicates that the “mystery of being” is written down. In this present context, it is important to note again that the

⁷⁹ See García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 2, 859; Rey, *4QInstruction*, 304; Wold, *Women, Men and Angels*, 20-24.

⁸⁰ However, it is acknowledged that little separates the terms “mystery of being” and “mystery of existence”.

⁸¹ Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*, 122; Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*, 37; Rey, *4QInstruction*, 337.

⁸² Goff, “Recent Trends in the Study of 4QInstruction,” 381.

⁸³ Elgvin, “Wisdom and Apocalypticism,” 235.

⁸⁴ In regard to the meaning of the *רז נהיה*, Harrington concludes that “it seems to be a body of teaching . . . It concerns behaviour and eschatology . . . an extrabiblical compendium – most likely something like the Maskil’s instruction in 1QS 3,13-4,26 [*sic*]. Or it could be the ‘Book of Meditation’ (1QSa 1,6-8) [*sic*] by which the prospective member of the movement is to be instructed (at home?) between the ages of ten and twenty. Or perhaps it may be the ‘Book of Mysteries’ (1Q27; 4Q299-301) with which it is already associated by use of the term *raz nihyeh* and its content to some extent.” Harrington, “The *raz nihyeh* in a Qumran Wisdom Text,” 552-553.

“mystery of being” and the “vision of Hagu” are best understood as heavenly forms of revelation.

The inclusion of the word זר in *4QInstruction* is indicative of an apocalyptic influence. However, it is important to note, as Goff does, that although *4QInstruction* epistemology is apocalyptic, there are important differences between its use of revelation and that of apocalypses. These differences are important to acknowledge because they may be seen as reinforcing *4QInstruction*'s participation in a wisdom trajectory that is influenced by the apocalyptic category, while as also highlighting *4QInstruction*'s separation from fully fledged apocalyptic literature. Goff notes:

4QInstruction has no otherworldly journeys or angels disclosing secrets to a visionary. It has no lengthy accounts of visions. There is minimal description of the content of the vision of Hagu. The teachings of 4QInstruction are not presented as revelatory discourses from the mouth of an angel. Its instruction is not inspired speech.⁸⁵

Mentioned above is that this word is found in apocalyptic works such as Daniel and Enochic literature where it represents the actual acquisition of knowledge.⁸⁶ The term appears most frequently in Daniel 2 where Nebuchadnezzar has a troubling dream that he wishes to have interpreted.⁸⁷ The Babylonian wise men are unable to provide a sufficient explanation of this dream, claiming that such knowledge is un-attainable by any human (Dan 2:11). Fearing persecution, Daniel beseeches God to disclose “this mystery” (i.e. זר) to him, in order to save his own life and that of his colleagues (Dan 2:18). Daniel's request is granted by God, but even while revealing the interpretation of the dream to Nebuchadnezzar, Daniel is keen to emphasize that it is God who made known or revealed its interpretation (Dan 2:27-30).⁸⁸ Samuel Thomas argues that the underlying motive of the story in Daniel is to “demonstrate the effectiveness of

⁸⁵ Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 52-53.

⁸⁶ Cf. Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 47.

⁸⁷ Dan 2 and 4 fall into the genre of the ancient Near Eastern “court-tale” and likely reflect the fourth or third-century BCE traditions about Daniel the sage. This topic is discussed in more detail in John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 38-52.

⁸⁸ Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 92.

God's revelation and inspiration over against the futile divinatory methods of Babylonian occult artists".⁸⁹ At this point, it is helpful to signpost a resonance with our earlier discussion of James 1:5 (§4.1.1.); the idea of God-given wisdom, and an emphasis on mysteries from above being made available through genuine request, is comparable to the exhortation to request wisdom in James 1:5. This point of comparison serves to highlight further James' affiliation with the apocalyptic category.

Likewise, in the Enochic literature available in Aramaic the word *râz* is used to describe knowledge transmitted from the heavenly realm.⁹⁰ It is noteworthy that both Daniel and Enoch are sages who have access to higher wisdom, but the wisdom they acquire is not a product of their own intellectual capacity.⁹¹ In other words, this wisdom is revealed to them. In many respects, this may be viewed in stark contrast to the traditional sapiential perspective where typically wisdom is perceived as coming from contemplation of the world.⁹² While the former idea, that is that wisdom is perceived as coming from contemplation of the world, is not entirely absent in *4QInstruction* (e.g. 4Q417 1 i lines 7-9), there is an emphasis on the otherworldly nature of the *רז נהיה* that is not frequently encountered in traditional sapiential literature.

Taking all of the above into consideration it is fair to say that *4QInstruction's* use of *רז* attests to an esoteric tradition, one through which comparisons can be drawn with Daniel and Enochic literature. Throughout *4QInstruction*, wisdom is acquired through contemplation of the *רז נהיה* (e.g.

⁸⁹ Samuel L. Thomas, *The "Mysteries" of Qumran: Mystery, Secrecy, and Esotericism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature Press, 2009), 117.

⁹⁰ E.g. *1 En* 106:19; cf. 4QEn^c 5 ii 26-27; cf. 93:2; 103:2. See J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments from Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976). Cf. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*, 49.

⁹¹ Collins, "The Sage in Apocalyptic and Pseudepigraphical Literature," in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (eds. John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue; Winoma Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 343-354.

⁹² Perhaps an exception to the above statement is the book of Job. The God of Job is portrayed as a revealer of secrets but there seems to be a great deal of knowledge that God does not want to reveal to Job (e.g. Job 38). Similarly, Ben Sira depicts God as revealing secrets but these are not understood in the same way as is often the case in apocalyptic literature.

4Q417 1 i 25-27).⁹³ The occurrence of the phrase in 1QS xi lines 3-4 is significant, especially when one realizes this is a central *Yahad* document, in which the speaker goes on to make the bold claim that the special access given to him by the divine being gives him wisdom, knowledge, and prudence hidden from others (נסתרה מאנוש).⁹⁴ The phrase may have similar implications or connotations in *4QInstruction*. The importance for the *mebin* to pursue the רז נהיה cannot be understated; numerous exhortations are included throughout the composition and thus serve to underscore its importance. Notably, 4Q418 123 ii line 4 makes clear that the “mystery of being” has already been revealed or disclosed to the addressee. The *mebin* is thus frequently reminded to “gaze upon” (נבט),⁹⁵ “examine” (דרש), “meditate” (הגה), and grasp (לקח) it.⁹⁶ Moreover, Goff notes that the frequency in which נבט is encountered in relation to the “mystery of being” may suggest that gazing upon this mystery may have been a type of visionary experience.⁹⁷ Now that it has been illustrated that the theme of revelation lies firmly at the centre of *4QInstruction*, our attention turns to 4Q417 1 i lines 1-9 where the scope of the knowledge contained in the רז נהיה is conveyed.

4.2.3. 4Q417 1 i lines 1-9 and the Scope of רז נהיה

4Q417 1 i is particularly important to the assessment of the “mystery of being” in *4QInstruction*. While lines 13b-18 were discussed in §4.2.1., and are returned to in §5.2.1., this section examines the first nine lines in which the enormity of knowledge made available through continual contemplation of the רז נהיה is made

⁹³ It should be noted that the phrase “you shall not search out . . .” from 4Q417 1 i line 27 is found verbatim in Num 15:39. This suggests that the author used the Torah as a source for his teaching. See DJD 34: 168. See §4.4.1.

⁹⁴ Cf. Thomas, *The “Mysteries” at Qumran*, 160.

⁹⁵ 4Q416 2 i line 5 (par 4Q417 2 i line 10); 4Q417 1 i line 3, and 18 (par 4Q418 43 line 2, and line 14). See also 4Q418 123 ii line 5. Cf. Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 38. Cf. *1 En* 103:2.

⁹⁶ See 4Q416 2 iii line 9 (par 4Q418 9line 8), 4Q418 43 line 4 (par 4Q417 1 i line 3), and 4Q418 77 line 4. See Elgin, “The Mystery to Come,” 133. Cf. Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 38.

⁹⁷ Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 38.

clear. Presented below is Strugnell and Harrington's translation of 4Q417 1 i lines 1-9.

Translation⁹⁸

1 And] *thou, O underst[a]nding one*
2 . . . gaze thou on, [And] on the wondrous myster[ies of the God of the
Awesome Ones thou shalt ponder. The *beginnings of*
3 And gaze on the [רז נהיה] and the deeds of old, *On what* is to be, And
what is to be
4 and *in what*]for *ev[er* [
to what
5 is, And what is to be *in what*] . . . in every[]act and a[ct
6 And by day and by night meditate upon the *mystery that is to come* [ברז נהיה]
And study [דורש] ⁹⁹ (*it*) continually. And then thou shalt know truth and
iniquity, wisdom חכמה
7 and foolishness) *thou shalt [recognize], every ac[t]in all their ways. Together*
with *their* punishment(s) *in all ages everlasting, And the punishment*
8 of eternity. Then thou shalt discern between *the [goo]d and [evil according to*
their] deeds For the God of knowledge is the *foundation* of truth And *by/on the*
mystery that is to come [וברז נהיה]
9 He has *laid out* its (= truth's) *foundation* [את אושה] And its deeds [He has
prepared with all wis]dom [חכמה] And with all[c]unning has He fashioned it,
And the *domain* of its *deeds (creatures)*

4Q417 1 i lines 1-9 describes the רז נהיה in terms of containing knowledge concerning the past, present and future, and seem to infer that such knowledge would be inaccessible if not for the רז נהיה. For example, 4Q417 1 i lines 3-5 connect the knowledge of the “mystery of being” with the orchestration of the cosmos and the eschatological future that awaits, while the opportunity to learn polar opposites such as truth and iniquity, wisdom and folly (lines 6-7), good and evil (line 8) is also conveyed.¹⁰⁰ Such knowledge would allow the *mebin* to identify what is perceived as wicked behaviour. That such knowledge has been

⁹⁸ Translation from DJD 34: 154.

⁹⁹ In 4Q417 1 I line 6 Strugnell and Harrington translate דרש as “study”, but a more appropriate translation of this verb is “to seek”. Therefore, it may be more correct to interpret this line in terms of exhorting the addressee to continually seek the רז נהיה.

¹⁰⁰ The occurrence of חכמה in 4Q417 1 i lines 6 and 9 is deserving of further comment. While the רז נהיה appears to transcend traditional wisdom, the latter ability to help learn polar opposites is indicative that the two are closely linked. According to the concordance included in DJD 34: 555, חכמה and its derivatives occur eleven times in *4QInstruction*: 4Q416 2 ii line 12; 4Q417 1 i lines 6 and 9; 4Q418 8 line 3; 4Q418 81+81a lines 15 and 19; 4Q418 102 a+b line 3; 4Q418 126 ii line 5; 4Q418 137 line 2; 4Q418 139 line 2; 4Q418 b 1 line 4.

revealed to the addressee is best understood in terms of further demonstrating that he has access to the necessary tools to avoid being grouped among those considered *רוח בשר*. In addition, line 6 exhorts the reader to meditate on the *רוח נהיה* day and night. The latter exhortation appears to be an allusion to Psalm 1:2b where one is instructed to meditate on the torah day and night. While the relationship between revelation and torah is addressed below (§4.4.2.), in this present context it is worth noting Wold's observation that the notion of meditation (*הגה*) has been introduced, and thus by continually seeking, the addressee is able to know the difference between truth and foolishness.¹⁰¹

Significantly, lines 8-9 suggest that God created the world by means of the "mystery of being". It would seem that by presenting the act of creation as a mystery, these lines simultaneously declare and highlight God's overwhelming power. The assertion of line 9 seemingly recalls Prov 3:16 in which it is stated that God created the world "with wisdom" (*בהכמה*),¹⁰² but instead of world, line 9 refers to the "foundations of truth". The inclusion and use of the "mystery of being" in lines 8-9 serves to emphasize the otherworldly aspect of its knowledge. Wisdom, as found in *רוח נהיה*, is the cosmic order and (in line 9) is equated with truth. Creation follows this order. From creation, we may infer something about truth and also the *רוח נהיה*.

Throughout *4QInstruction*, the *רוח נהיה* typically denotes the otherworldly revelation by way of which the *mēbin* acquires knowledge, whereas in this instance (i.e. 4Q417 1 i line 9), it appears to refer also to the content of that which is being revealed (i.e. the nature of creation and God's dominion over it).¹⁰³ Appropriately Goff observes that the *רוח נהיה* "is the medium and the message. The *mēbin* can obtain deep insights into reality through the study of the mystery that is to be [*sic*] because God used this mystery to create the world."¹⁰⁴ According to this reading, the *רוח נהיה* includes a cosmological dimension.

The *רוח נהיה* refers to both the means by which the addressee can gain access to this revelation and the actual content of this otherworldly revelation. Elgvin suggests observance of the *רוח נהיה* allows one to "walk" (*התהלך*) in

¹⁰¹ Wold, "Universality of Creation," 213.

¹⁰² Cf. Goff, *4QInstruction*, 150-151. Cf. Job 28; Bar 3:9-4:4; Wis 6:12-11:1; *I En* 42.

¹⁰³ Cf. Goff, *4QInstruction*, 151.

¹⁰⁴ Goff, *4QInstruction*, 151.

harmony with God’s cosmos and leads to eternal life with the angels.¹⁰⁵ 4Q418 184 line 2 makes clear that this revelation has already been revealed, and therefore the responsibility of learning its contents lie with its recipients.¹⁰⁶ As was the case in James 1:5, human responsibility is not annulled, but in *4QInstruction* this responsibility refers to seeking revelation, whereas in James it involves acting wisely. While we have seen that the choice of verbs used when instructing the addressees to pursue revealed wisdom serve to emphasize the importance of this task, these verbs also appear to convey a level of urgency on the part of the author. Preservation of an individual’s exalted status is dependent on his or her own pursuit of and adherence to revelation, and it is clear that the author considers the maintenance of this loftier status as being of the utmost importance [cf. 2.1.3.2.]. Therefore, it is not surprising that a level of urgency is evoked. By using language that evokes urgency, it seems that the author is hoping to awaken a sense of necessity among his audience. Revelation enables its recipients to maintain their superior status and to keep also their place among this faithful community.

Comment: James’ Revelation in Light of 4QInstruction

At the outset, it is important to state that I am not arguing the σοφία ἄνωθεν of James and the רז נהיה of *4QInstruction* (and by extension the חזון ההגו) are directly analogous with one another. While 4Q417 1 i lines 1-9 establish the apocalyptic scope of the רז נהיה, and it is stated that God established truth by this mystery, no such claims or descriptions are made in relation to the σοφία ἄνωθεν of James. Moreover, while σοφία ἄνωθεν in James helps one lead a wise life, it may be inferred from *4QInstruction* that the “mystery of being”, and by extension the “Vision of Hagu”, enable one to understand why this is the right thing to do. In this way, a slight nuance separates each writing’s presentation of portrayal of the revealing of wisdom and what it enables. That being said, the emphasis that both writings place on revelation is significant.

¹⁰⁵ Elgvin, “The Mystery to Come,” 134. Cf. 1 Cor 3:1-7.

¹⁰⁶ Pursuit and acquisition of revelation is portrayed as the most important task in *4QInstruction*. In this sense it shares similarities to *I En* 93:10, in which God reveals his secrets to the elect at the completion of an age of evil. The question of election, and whether it is appropriate in terms of *4QInstruction*, is addressed in Chapter Five, esp. §5.2.1.

However, important commonalities exist between these two entities that allow us to interpret the σοφία ἄνωθεν in James through a new lens. So what are some of these important commonalities? Firstly, there is an emphasis on both of *4QInstruction*'s forms of revelation and σοφία ἄνωθεν as being God-given (i.e. they are both revealed). Secondly, both forms of revelation are perceived as external, but upon their receipt, they become internalized. Thirdly, revelation is represented in both compositions as necessary for living a wise life. It is therefore possible to question if the continual exhortations to pursue the רץ נהיה רץ parallel James' views of the perfect law in 1:25. Action in relation to revelation is emphasized in both writings. Moreover, the difficulties associated with acquiring revelation are portrayed in both compositions: the harsh conditions of the metaphorical garden of 4Q423 1, 2 i 1-2 (see §5.2.3.) may parallel the difficulties of being a doer in James (1:22-25). James 1:5 makes clear that it is the addressees' responsibility to ask for wisdom. Similarly, human responsibility is not annulled in *4QInstruction* because this writing contains numerous exhortations indicating that it is the *mebin*'s responsibility to pursue revelation.

So what does this tell us about James? In other words what (new) information does all of the above analysis provide? In straightforward terms, it provides context when interpreting James 1:5 and validates Kamell Kovalishyn's description of James' wisdom as "apocalyptic wisdom".¹⁰⁷ She notes:

James highlights the necessity of wisdom, for no one can reach the intended goal of becoming τέλειος without it. Wisdom is given by God to those who pray and seek him, comes down from his heavenly abode, and reveals God's ways to God's people. It seems accurate to understand wisdom as the necessary teacher and empowerer so that humans may be able to understand the way of pleasing God. As a result, wisdom becomes the necessary intermediary that teaches the correct perspective on trials, on wealth, on oppression, on endurance, on faithfulness, and on judgment and mercy. The necessity for obtaining wisdom and for acting accordingly gains momentum from the warnings of death and judgment that permeate that text (1:9-11, 12-15; 2:8-13; 3:6-9; 4:1,12, 13-17; 5:1-6, 7-12, 19-20).¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁷ See Kamell Kovalishyn, "James and Apocalyptic Wisdom," 293-306.

¹⁰⁸ Kamell Kovalishyn, "James and Apocalyptic Wisdom," 305-306.

When James is analyzed in isolation, 1:5 is often noted as being different in terms of the sapiential tradition.¹⁰⁹ Asking for wisdom as opposed to wisdom being given does not conform to the wisdom tradition generally. In fact, as was discussed above, the idea of asking for wisdom or knowledge resonates more with the apocalyptic sphere. The idea of wisdom being available through genuine request has parallels to Daniel 2 where Daniel beseeches God to disclose a mystery. Moreover, the portrayal of God being the giver of wisdom once again brings to mind Argall's evaluation of the expression "to give wisdom" as denoting Enoch's technical expression for revelation in the *Book of Luminaries* (82:2 cf. 5:8).¹¹⁰ These two examples indicate an apocalyptic influence on James' exhortation in 1:5 and serve to strengthen further the rationale behind reading James in light of *4QInstruction*, the latter understood as participating within a specific wisdom trajectory in which apocalyptic motifs are also included.

This thesis assesses James in light of the reassessments of the categories of wisdom and apocalyptic in early Judaism, but as has been demonstrated, much of this analysis stems from a critical assessment of *4QInstruction*. In terms of this current chapter, the critical evaluation of the portrayal of wisdom in *4QInstruction* allowed further commonalities and apocalyptic influences to be identified in James. That the portrayal of the bestowal and acquisition of wisdom is not synonymous in James and *4QInstruction* is not a cause for concern; on the contrary, the differences identified allow us to appreciate just how diverse and multifaceted this wisdom trajectory is. Equally, the similarities identified provide us with an opportunity to recognize that these two writings are operating within the same literary trajectory. Therefore, the centrality of the portrayal of revelation for the trajectory that James and *4QInstruction* are participating in is stressed, but the task remains of establishing how this revelation may be understood in relation to the authority of the Mosaic Torah. It is to this complex topic that our attention now turns.

¹⁰⁹ See Bauckham, *James*, 96.

¹¹⁰ Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach*, 33-35.

4.3. Revelation and the Authority of Νόμος in James

Part Three considers the relationship between revelation and νόμος in James. It is interesting to note that this particular line of enquiry has proven to be especially complex. Therefore, it is first necessary to offer an excursus of James' understanding of νόμος (§4.3.1.), and our attention then turns to how νόμος may be understood in relation to the revelation of James 1:5 (§4.3.2.).

4.3.1. James' Understanding of Νόμος

James 1:5 conceives of one lacking wisdom as a real possibility (§4.1.2.). While lacking may be understood in terms of pointing to James' negative anthropology (i.e. he considers humanity to be weak and the revelation of 1:5 may thus be understood as guiding humanity in living a wise life), the idea of lacking in wisdom may also have implications when assessing how this revelation is linked to the Mosaic Torah. Numerous scholars have demonstrated that various Hebrew Bible passages exert influence over this epistle,¹¹¹ and therefore the aim of this

¹¹¹ Examples include: Allison, *James*, 50-54, and Wiard Popkes, "James and Scripture: An Exegesis on Intertextuality," *NTS* 45 (1999): 213-229, 214. Allison discusses the use of scriptures in James and argues that, given the brevity of James, "the extent to which our book [the Epistle of James] manages to cite, refer to, allude to, or otherwise borrow from books that belong to our Bibles is striking." Allison identifies what he considers to be James borrowing/summarizing/alluding from the scriptural tradition in the following places: (1) from the Pentateuch: borrowing from LXX Gen 1:11 in 5:18; borrowing from LXX Gen 1:26-27 in 3:7-9; quotation from LXX Gen 15:6 in 2:23; summary of LXX Gen 22:1-19 in 2:21-23; citation of LXX Exod 20:13-14 (cf. Deut 5:17-18) in 2:11; allusion to Lev 19:13; Deut 24: 14-15 in 5:4; allusion to Lev 19:15 in 2:1, 9; allusion to Lev 19:15-18 in 4:11-12; citation of LXX Lev 19:18 in 2:8; and allusion to Deut 6:4 in 2:19. From the Former Prophets; summary of episode in LXX Josh 2:1-22 in 2:25; and summary of episode in LXX 1 Kgs 17-18 in 5:17-18. From the Latter Prophets: borrowing from LXX Isa 5:7-9 in 5:4; borrowing from LXX Isa 32:15-20 in 3:18; borrowing from LXX Isa 40:6-7 in 1:9-11; borrowing from LXX Jer 5:24 in 5:7; borrowing from LXX Jer 12:3 in 5:5; borrowing from LXX Ezek 33-34 in 5:19-20; and borrowing from LXX Hos 14:10 in 3:13. (2) from the Psalms and Wisdom Literature: citation of LXX Prov 3:34 in 4:6; borrowing from Prov 10:12 (non LXX form) in 5:20; summary of Job in 5:11; borrowing from LXX Wis 2 in 4:13-5:6; borrowing from Sir 2 in 5:10; and borrowing from Ecclus 5:11-12 in 1:13. See Allison, *James*, 50-54. Popkes also discusses James' use of scripture. Popkes' study is different to that of Allison's in terms of how he approaches the topic. He describes his concern as being threefold. Firstly, he investigates what it is that James incorporated into this epistle.

section is not to further affirm the authority of these scriptural passages, and that of the Mosaic Torah in general, but to investigate how the authority of the Mosaic Torah is to be understood in relation to the revelation of 1:5. Assessing the relationship between revelation and Mosaic Torah in James is important to this present discussion. The same relationship is explored later when *4QInstruction* is in view (§4.4.2.), and it will be interesting to see if the critical assessment of *4QInstruction* will add further clarity when discussing this complex relationship in James.

The difficulty with understanding James' use of νόμος lies in the text itself. James appears to depict the Mosaic law as normative for Christian life (e.g. Jas 1:25; 2:12), but references to νόμος immediately follow examples derived from the Mosaic Torah and a demand for its perfect obedience.¹¹² Moreover, understanding νόμος is further complicated with its equation with λόγος: these two terms appear to be used interchangeably in James. For example, λόγος is discussed in 1:18-23, but in 1:22-25 the author switches from λόγος to νόμος in a way that makes us understand the latter in terms of the former.¹¹³ Therefore,

Secondly, he asks where he got it from, and thirdly, he inquires how he made use of it. Popkes notes that James presupposes enough knowledge on the part of his audience to keep any reference to scripture brief (e.g. the inclusion of ἡ γραφήν in 2:8, 23; 4:5, fulfilling the νόμος βασιλικός in 2:8 or the allusions of Exod 20:13 cf. Deut 5:17 in 2:11) (215-216). Popkes identifies what he refers to as James' non-references; he proposes that 1:2 presupposes Sir 2, whereas 1:13-15 is found in similar form in Sir 15:11. He maintains that these "non-references" offer an insight into the sources James might have used and had at his disposal (220). Much of Popkes' analysis becomes preoccupied with identifying the means by which James used his source(s), but nonetheless he reaches five conclusions. Firstly, James' knowledge of the LXX, pertaining to his inclusion of quotations, allusions and examples, is secondhand. Secondly, James appears to have had some concept of "scripture" and thus Popkes suggests that we may speak of a limited concept of canon. Thirdly, the author makes combative use of scripture, especially in the refutation of the seemingly Pauline tradition. Fourthly, the inclusion of allusions and examples demonstrate that James had more biblical and intertestamental information at his disposal than he explicitly indicates. Fifthly, James was very well prepared for writing this epistle, collecting material by taking notes from various sources, such as Jewish, Christian and secular (228-229).

¹¹² Some of this language is borrowed from Mariam J. Kamell, "Incarnating Jeremiah's promised new covenant in the 'Law' of James," *EvQ* 83.1. (2011): 19,28, 19.

¹¹³ Cf. Kamell, "Incarnating Jeremiah's promised new covenant in James," 22.

establishing what James means when he uses these two terms is essential. For example, does νόμος refer to the Mosaic law, or is its meaning more open to debate? Similarly, does λόγος refer to a Christianized understanding of the Stoic λόγος,¹¹⁴ as wisdom,¹¹⁵ or as a modified understanding of the Mosaic law?¹¹⁶ From the outset, it is important to note that “torah” is not directly evoked as a category in James,¹¹⁷ but its authority is nonetheless affirmed.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁴ See Laws, *A Commentary on the Epistle of James*, 83; Jackson-McCabe, *Logos and Law*, 138; Dibelius, *James*, 116-120.

¹¹⁵ See Hartin, *James and the Q Sayings*, 111; *idem*, *James*, 79-80; Timothy B. Cargal, *Restoring the Diaspora: Discursive Structure and Purpose in the Epistle of James* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 90.

¹¹⁶ Ropes, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of James*, 173.

¹¹⁷ Similarly, Q does not thematize torah, but through the association it makes with Jesus and hypostatized wisdom, Q presents the comparable viewpoint of a unique manifestation of heavenly wisdom in a particular locale (e.g. Q7:35; 11:49-51). Christ is also associated with divine wisdom in 1 Cor 1:30. Cf. Goff, “4QInstruction and the Sayings Source Q,” 661.

¹¹⁸ Included in James 3:7-9 is an allusion to Gen 1:26-27. Cf. Allison, *James*, 52. The thematic allusion to Gen 1:26-27 in James occurs during a description of the uncontrollability and evils of the tongue. It is with the same tongue that one can potentially bless God and curse other human beings; that is to say, it is this same tongue that curses those whom God has blessed (cf. Gen 1:28). The contrast between blessing and cursing might be understood as conventional; for example, Gen 12:3; 27:29; Num 23:25; 24:9-10; Deut 30; Pslam 62:4; Prov 3:33; 1Qs 2:10 2 En 52. Cf. Allison, *James*, 550, n. 262. The mention of the taming of wild beasts and of everyone being made in the likeness of God’s image deliberately brings the first creation account to mind. McCartney argues that the reference of the taming of beasts intentionally reflects upon the created order of Gen 1:26, and when it is interpreted together with Gen 1:28, James 3:7 may then be interpreted as granting humanity a dominion over all other creatures. James is thus contrasting human success (i.e. their authority over beasts) to human failure (i.e. their inability to control their tongue). McCartney, *James*, 191. Moo, *The Letter of James*, 161, appears to offer a more nuanced reading; Moo notes that James uses both a present and perfect tense when describing the taming of the beasts, and this, he suggests, deliberately points to the situation in Gen 1 where dominion is both an accomplished fact by divine declaration (1:26) and a mandate for humans continually to fulfill, while Allison, *James*, 551, argues that the reference to Gen 1:26-27 reaffirms the divine image of humanity and also suggests that cursing human beings might thus be understood as contradicting a divine act. It would thus seem that James is intentionally echoing the Genesis creation account to demonstrate the graveness of those who curse human beings. The inclusion of an allusion to Gen 1:26-27 in the context of describing sinful behaviour is noteworthy because James is using an example from torah to describe acting wrongly, but he is

Wisdom has a number of connotations in the Hebrew Bible. For example, wisdom is often portrayed as relating to God in terms of producing obedience to his commands (e.g. Job 28:28; Prov 1:7).¹¹⁹ Significantly, wisdom also came to be identified with torah (e.g. Sir 24:23; Bar 3:29-4:1), and its role in creation was affirmed in various writings (e.g. Wis 7:22; 8:1). Moreover, in some sapiential circles there is an underlying concept of God's mysteries. For example, wisdom is described in terms of being hidden (נעלמה) or concealed (נסתרה) in Job 28:10-21. Taking all of these scriptural references into account, we may thus observe or propose that there is an underlying assumption that not everything is revealed to Israel through the medium of the torah. Indeed, Deut 29:29 makes clear that the hidden things (הנסתרות) belong to God, but revealed things (הנגלות) belong to humanity.

In apocalyptic literature wisdom is understood in terms of being an eschatological gift to the righteous (e.g. Bar 59:7; Eth Enoch 5:8).¹²⁰ Therefore, the present age has two contrasting groups: (1) the wicked commonly portrayed as the rich, who live in luxury and persecute the other group; and (2) the righteous who are wise, and who suffer now but whose reward will be great in the eschatological age. In some literature found at Qumran, wisdom may be perceived as hidden knowledge, knowledge that includes God's eschatological plan. Consequently, this means that it includes more than the torah offers. Nevertheless, torah and its proper interpretation are included in terms of making

not teaching about torah *per se*. Moreover, he is not equating wisdom and torah. On this occasion, James' view of humanity might be described as being optimistic in the sense that the divine image of humanity is being reaffirmed, but the author's need to prohibit cursing may also indicate his belief that this audience are acting contrary to God's plan. Acting wisely is essential in terms of maintaining one's place among God's faithful community, and this is made possible by the revelation of 1:5. A final point on James' allusion to Gen 1:27-27 is warranted; Gen 1-3 plays a definitive role in *4QInstruction's* interpretation. While James' use of Gen 1 is not analogous with that of *4QInstruction's*, the presence of the opening of Genesis in both writings is noteworthy. See §4.2.1. and §5.2.1.

¹¹⁹ A thorough analysis of wisdom (i.e. in terms of genre, worldview and content) was offered in Chapter One.

¹²⁰ Cf. Davids, *James*, 52-53.

one wise.¹²¹ In regard to the synoptic gospels, Jesus is frequently portrayed as the one who possesses wisdom or who is the mouth of wisdom.¹²² Moreover, in the New Testament generally, wisdom may be almost understood as the skill required for living in light of the eschaton.¹²³ With this variety of possible understandings in mind, our attention now turns to evaluating the relationship of James' revealed wisdom to the authority of the torah in his writing.

Before we can proceed any further, clarification of how νόμος in James is to be understood is necessary; there remains an ambiguity as to whether νόμος should be understood as simply denoting the torah or if it is referring to something else entirely. With this in mind, James' use of νόμος will now be discussed, as well as more specific phrases such as “the perfect law, the law of liberty” [νόμον τέλειον τὸν τῆς ἐλευθερίας] (1:25)¹²⁴ and “the royal law” [Εἰ μέντοι νόμον τελεῖτε βασιλικὸν] (2:8). This analysis will help to provide further insight when explaining God's description in 4:12: “There is one lawgiver and one judge; he who is able to save and to destroy” [εἷς ἐστὶν [ὁ] νομοθέτης καὶ κριτὴς ὁ δυνάμενος σῶσαι καὶ ἀπολέσαι].

The “the perfect law, the law of liberty” is referred to in James 1:25 in the context of the comparison of two types of people: (1) doers who act and; (2) hearers who forget. Davids notes that being a doer is the preferred option,¹²⁵ while similarly Allison argues that the central point of these verses is to teach “that knowledge without corresponding action is worthless.”¹²⁶ This inclusion of νόμος has led some commentators to suggest that James is referring here to the torah and endorsing torah observance, that is, he is telling his audience to be doers of the law. This interpretation makes sense, especially as various Hebrew Bible passages speak of doing the law (e.g. Deut 28:58; 29:28), which the LXX

¹²¹ Wisdom is not personified, it is mediated through God's spirit. For example, in 1QH^a xii lines 11-13 wisdom is mediated from God to the Teacher of Righteousness and he thus passes it to the *Yahad*. In this sense, the Teacher of Righteousness and the community are collectively understood as “the wise.” Cf. Davids, *James*, 53.

¹²² Matt 11:19/Luke 7:35; Matt 12:42/Luke 11:31; Matt 23:24/Luke 11:49; Matt 11:25-30/Luke 10:21, 22.

¹²³ E.g. see Col 1:9; 3:16; 4:5.

¹²⁴ Cf. Psalm 19 and 119 celebrate the law as a gift from God.

¹²⁵ Davids, *The Epistle of James*, 98.

¹²⁶ Allison, *James*, 323.

translate literally as ποιητής νόμου (e.g. 1 Macc 2:16; Sir 19:20; Rom 2:13).¹²⁷ In view of this, Allison argues that to do the word is to do the torah, that is, to obey the commandments of God, and that the law of freedom in v.25 is best interpreted as an expression of the Mosaic Torah as a liberating gift.¹²⁸ *Contra* Allison, Moffatt maintains that the law of freedom is referring to the gospel revelation as a rule for life.¹²⁹ Similarly, Davids interprets it as the new law brought about and perfected by Christ (cf. Matt 5:17).¹³⁰ However, is there something more substantial to be said about this phrase in James 1:25?

Jackson-McCabe argues that James' understanding of νόμος is indebted to Stoic philosophy. He considers James' interpretation of law as being derived from the Stoic identification of human reason as a divinely-given natural law. In other words, he maintains that the *implanted logos* (1:21) and the law are equated with one another in James, and that this equation is rooted in the Stoic theory of natural law.¹³¹ This Stoic influence, according to him, is conveyed in the epithets James uses when describing the law. For example, James speaks of νόμος as being "perfect" (1:25) and "royal" (2:8).¹³² However, Jackson-McCabe also

¹²⁷ Cf. Davids, *The Epistle of James*, 96.

¹²⁸ Allison also maintains that the ποιηται λόγου of 1:22 is analogous to 4:11's ποιητής νόμου. See Allison, *James*, 325, 342.

¹²⁹ Moffatt, *The General Epistles*, 28.

¹³⁰ Davids, *The Epistle of James*, 99.

¹³¹ Jackson-McCabe, *Logos and Law*, 30-86.

¹³² Jackson-McCabe notes that, although a similar analogy of the law being perfect may be found in LXX Psalm 18:8, the epithet τέλειος is best understood in light of the equation of the law with the *implanted logos*. He refers to ancient authors such as Philo and Justin who include comparable views of the law. The theme of perfection emerges elsewhere in James in association with *logos* and the resistance of desire (e.g. 3:2) and notes that "this is reminiscent of the complete self-mastery, which, for the Stoic, comprises the true freedom of the sage." *Logos and Law*, 153. In relation to the description of the law being "royal", Jackson-McCabe concedes there is some ambiguity surrounding whether it is referring to the "law of freedom" (1:25), or the whole law (2:10) which we have seen is a reference to Lev 19:18. He points out, if we are to read the description of the law being royal as a reference to the law of freedom in 1:25, then this "has good Greek and Stoic precedents." E.g. see *4 Macc* 14:2. He comments: "Understood in this light the law of James would be described as 'royal' inasmuch as obedience to it renders one 'kingly,' just as obedience to the 'perfect law, the law of freedom' renders one 'perfect' and 'free.'" 153-154.

argues that despite this Stoic influence, James' portrayal of νόμος contains an adherence to traditions that would have been alien to Stoicism. This is especially the case, he suggests, with regard to the functioning epithets James used to describe λόγος (e.g. the author's inferred suggestion that the *logos* can be heard, and in some sense, received).¹³³ That James seemingly conceives of λόγος in terms of being received is, Jackson-McCabe advances, indicative that it has some external, verbal form.¹³⁴

James 2 is centred around νόμος. Johnson offers an in-depth analysis of James 2 and identifies much of it as deriving or being rooted in Lev 19.¹³⁵ He identifies seven possible allusions between Lev 19 and James. They are: (1) Lev 19:12 in 5:12; (2) Lev 19:13 in 5:4; (3) Lev 19:15 in 2:1, 9; (4) Lev 19:16 in 4:11; (5) Lev 19:17b in 5:20; (6) Lev 19:18a in 5:9; and (7) Lev 19:18b in 2:8.¹³⁶ Moreover, he argues that James 2:8 is best understood as a direct citation because, in 2:8, the author accurately quotes from a LXX version of Lev 19:18b, hence the inclusion of ἡ γραφή. What is more striking, according to Johnson, is

¹³³ Jackson-McCabe argues that the divergences between Stoicism and James are not demonstrative of the author's misunderstanding of Stoicism, but are representative of him having shaped this thought in light of the coming of Jesus. This is especially the case in "hearing and doing" the *logos* (1:25). The concept of "doing" the *logos* would have been foreign to Stoic principles, and rather reflects a Semitism. Cf. Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 206-207. It is thus in Jewish and Christian literature that one finds the "word and deed" theme expressed in terms of "hearing and doing". See LXX Deut 30:8-20; Ezek 33:30-32; Sir 3:1; Matt 7:24-27; Luke 6:46-49; Rom 2:13. Jackson-McCabe goes on to note that, although James' notion that the *implanted logos* can be "heard" and "done", this, he argues, "derives ultimately from Jewish rather than Stoic usage, his use of language nonetheless confirms that, quite like the Stoics, *he conceives of the logos precisely as a law.*" Jackson-McCabe, *Law and Logos*, 136.

¹³⁴ See Jackson-McCabe, *Logos and Law*, 154.

¹³⁵ For Johnson, the identification of the use of Leviticus 19 in Pseudo-Phocylides serves as a helpful analogy when discussing its use in James. See Luke Timothy Johnson, "The Use of Leviticus 19 in the Letter of James," *JBL* 101/3 (1982): 391-401. Also see *idem*, *James*, 30-32.

¹³⁶ It is interesting to note that the only verse missing from this section of Leviticus is Lev 19:14. Although no adequate explanation can be offered for the omission of Lev 19:14, Johnson is nonetheless confident in his assertion that regarding the "Royal Law" by which Christians were to live, and the "Law of Liberty" by which they were to be judged, as "explicated concretely not only by the Decalogue (2:11), but by the immediate context of the Law of Love, the commands found in Lev 19:12-18." See Johnson, "The Use of Leviticus 19 in the Letter of James," 399.

that James places this quotation in the framework of partiality in judgment, which demonstrates a clear allusion to Lev 19:15, while three verses later (i.e. Jas 2:11), he combines it with a reference from the Decalogue, following the order of the commandments found in one manuscript tradition of the LXX for Deut 5:17-18 and Exod 20:13.¹³⁷ Johnson considers 5:4 to be another certain allusion to Lev 19:13, although this is dependent on one agreeing that James makes other allusions to Lev 19 in 2:1, 8 and 9.¹³⁸ Finally, he makes the case for considering 4:11, 5:9, 5:12 and 5:20 as all being thematic allusions to Lev 19:12-18; however, he describes 5:9 and 5:20 as being tentative.¹³⁹

In light of the direct citation in 2:8, and the seven possible allusions to Lev 19, Johnson expresses confidence in concluding that James made conscious and sustained use of Leviticus 19 in his letter. The authority of the torah is therefore affirmed. Pertinently, according to this reading, James understood the law of love (2:8-13), explicitly in the context of Lev 19:12-18, and therefore Johnson reasons, “keeping the law of love involves observance of the *commandments* explicated by the Decalogue (2:11) and Lev 19:12-18 in their entirety. Given the connection James draws between Lev 19:18 and Lev 19:15 in 2:9, this conclusion appears certain.”¹⁴⁰ For Johnson then, James considers Lev 19:12-18 as an accurate exposition of the law of love, but not, by itself, an adequate one. Therefore, its inclusion in James is representative of it having been filtered through the Christian tradition. For example, partiality is incompatible with faith in Jesus (Jas 2:1), while the prohibition of slander and judging recalls Jesus’ command against judging (Matt 7:11), and is reaffirmed by James’ inclusion of κριτής in 4:12, which points to 5:9b where the coming of the judge

¹³⁷ Johnson, “The Use of Leviticus 19 in the Letter of James,” 393.

¹³⁸ Johnson argues that in 5:4, James melds Isa 5:9 (LXX) to the Lev 19:13 reference. Johnson concedes that although the language of 5:4 is not particularly close to Lev 19:13, he considers the allusion to be secure because of what he describes as the “cluster effect”. He writes; “we know of the deliberate allusions in 2:1,8 and 9, and can therefore more readily assume James’ use of the levitical allusion here.” See Johnson, “The Use of Leviticus 19 in the Letter of James,” 394.

¹³⁹ Johnson proposes that possible allusions may be identified between: (1) Lev 19:12 and 5:12; (2) Lev 19:13 and 5:4; (3) Lev 19:15 and 2:1, 9; (4) Lev 19:16 and 4:11; (5) Lev 19:17b and 5:20; (6) Lev 19:18a and 5:9; and (7) Lev 19:18b and 2:8.

¹⁴⁰ Johnson, “The Use of Leviticus 19 in the Letter of James,” 400.

refers to Jesus.¹⁴¹ In conclusion, Johnson understands James' use of Leviticus 19 in terms of James engaging in "halachic midrash", as well as re-shaping the inheritance of the torah. The idea of the inheritance of the torah being re-shaped or altered is significant and will be returned to later (§4.4.2.) when our attention turns to 4Q416 2 iii lines 15-19.

As noted above, the νόμον τέλειον τὸν τῆς ἐλευθερίας is first encountered in 1:25, and subsequently referred to in 2:12 where the recipients are warned that they should "speak and act as those who are to be judged by the law of freedom". This warning appears in the conclusion of an extended admonition against acts of partiality (2:1-13),¹⁴² and significantly, it occurs immediately after an argument intended to convey that partiality is a transgression of the law (2:8-11; cf. Lev 19:18).¹⁴³ Jackson-McCabe thus notes: "If, then, this warning is to make any sense in its context, the 'law of freedom' . . . must be the same law which excludes acts of partiality."¹⁴⁴

¹⁴¹ Johnson, "The Use of Leviticus 19 in the Letter of James," 400-401.

¹⁴² James 2:1-13 depicts a hypothetical scene in which the author is condemning the favoritism that is often shown to the rich, especially when it is at the expense of the poor and that the most likely setting for this scene is a synagogue located in the diaspora. *Contra*, Davids in "Palestinian Tradition in the Epistle of James," 46, argues that the synagogue is best understood to be characteristic of Palestine. E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ 175 B.C. – A.D. 135*, (eds. Emil Schürer, Géza Vermes, and Fergus Millar; 3 Vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1973-1987), 440, however maintains that the use of synagogues had entered Diaspora discourse by the first-century CE. A synagogue is taken to depict a building/assembly where prayer and worship took place; it is understood as a place for reading and studying the scriptures. See Luke 4:17; Acts 13:14-15. Moreover, the synagogue also served as a place where community disputes were settled, a point which led R. B. Ward to suggest that James 2:2-4 depicts a court scene. He primarily discusses this scene in terms of early Christianity. Roy Bowen Ward, "Partiality in the Assembly: James 2:2-4," *HTR* 62 (1969): 87-97. Ward's thesis has appealed to many commentators of James; e.g. see Davids, *James*, 109; Johnson, *The Epistle of James*, 223-224; Penner, *James and Eschatology*, 269-270.

¹⁴³ It is interesting to note that it is the poor who are in focus in James 2:1-13. The poor are victimized throughout James but we know that it is also the poor whom God has chosen to inherit his kingdom (Jas 2:5). See §2.2.2.2.

¹⁴⁴ Jackson-McCabe, *Logos and Law*, 155.

Dibelius insisted that “the law of freedom” does not refer to the Mosaic Torah, but to rather Christianity “as a new law”.¹⁴⁵ Jackson-McCabe, however, rejects Dibelius’ interpretation based on the specific reference of the love command in 2:8 to the torah, which he reads as a clear signal that it is the scriptural commands that are in view.¹⁴⁶ Moreover, as mentioned previously, Johnson demonstrated that the LXX order of Lev 19:18 is followed in 2:8.¹⁴⁷ Despite this, the exact relationship between the “law of freedom” and the torah is unclear; while the prohibition of 2:8 may be directly viewed in relation to the teaching of partiality, it can also be interpreted as conveying that partiality is a transgression, not only because it is prohibited by the torah, but more specifically because it is excluded by the love command. For example, Johnson argues that the author of James regards the torah (and Jewish scriptures generally) as something that only lays out concrete examples of what “the law of love” (i.e. Lev 19:18) requires.¹⁴⁸ While the emphasis on loving one’s fellow human being is undoubtedly to be understood in relation to the emphasis in the Jewish and Christian traditions,¹⁴⁹ it is uncertain whether the author of James considers this command as a summary of the torah. And if this is the case, what does this mean for how James views the other commandments of the torah?¹⁵⁰

The apparent inconsistencies in vv. 2:8, 10 and 11 complicate the interpretation of James 2:1-13 further. It is not clear whether the “royal law” of 2:8 corresponds with keeping the “whole law” in 2:10, since 2:11 appears to assume a condition in which one command is kept and another is broken. Jackson-McCabe opines that the argument in these verses moves from specific commands (love of neighbour and partiality in 2:8-9), to the statement of a general principle (2:10), and back to specific commands (murder and adultery in

¹⁴⁵ Dibelius, *James*, 18, Dibelius suggested that both the “law of freedom” and the author’s silence on matters such as circumcision, diet and Sabbath were decisive in this respect. Dibelius’, *James*, 119. Jackson-McCabe notes that elsewhere Dibelius suggests that the “core” of the “Christian law” was the “ethical teaching of the old Jewish law.” Dibelius, *James*, 143. Cf. Jackson-McCabe, *Law and Logos*, 155, n.86.

¹⁴⁶ Jackson-McCabe, *Logos and Law*, 156.

¹⁴⁷ Cf. Johnson, “The Use of Leviticus 19 in James,” 391-401.

¹⁴⁸ Johnson, “The Use of Leviticus 19 in James,”. Cf. Jackson-McCabe, *Law and Logos*, 156.

¹⁴⁹ See Deut 6:5; Luke 10:25-28; Matt 22:32-40; Gal 5:14.

¹⁵⁰ See Jackson-McCabe, *Law and Logos*, 168.

2:11) “in order to support the claim that showing partiality – even paradoxically if one ‘keeps the whole law’ by loving one’s neighbour renders one a transgressor of the law.”¹⁵¹ From this reading, one may infer that while James regards the love command as being a summary of the whole law,¹⁵² he nonetheless presents a situation in which the love command is kept while another of the commands is broken (i.e. showing partiality) in order to demonstrate that one is a transgressor of the law despite his or her observance of Lev 19:18. Notably, James’ inclusion of *κατὰ τὴν γραφὴν* explicitly situates this command within the written law. Jackson-McCabe also adds that the command of 2:8 is directed to those in 2:19 who believe God is one (cf. Deut 6:4-9), and he thus considers these two verses (i.e. 2:8, 19) as going a long way in clarifying James’ interest in the love command.¹⁵³ He argues: “summary or not, merely to love one’s neighbour is not necessarily to keep the ‘whole law’. Attention to this command alone, therefore, is not sufficient grounds for confidence in the face of coming judgment which will be executed by the standard of the whole ‘law of freedom’ (2:12) . . . and one which will be, potentially, ‘merciless’” (2:13).¹⁵⁴

Jackson-McCabe’s equation of *λόγος* with *νόμος* is compelling, but his hypothesis that James’ understanding of the two and their subsequent use is rooted in Stoic philosophy is less so because it may be accused of failing to look beyond Stoic philosophy. While it appears to be the case that Stoic philosophy influenced James, many of the ideas or patterns identified by Jackson-McCabe as belonging to Stoicism can also be attributed to or situated within the Jewish Wisdom tradition.¹⁵⁵ Bringing *4QInstruction* into conversation below will demonstrate this, and may also provide the foundation for further insight.

¹⁵¹ Jackson-McCabe, *Law and Logos*, 171.

¹⁵² Paul seems to have a similar interpretation of the love command being a summary of the whole law. See Rom 13:8-9.

¹⁵³ He notes that these two commands (i.e. love of neighbour and belief that God is one) are singled out by the Gospel writers as being the two most important passages of the law. See Mark 12:29-30. Jackson-McCabe, *Law and Logos*, 175.

¹⁵⁴ Jackson-McCabe, *Law and Logos*, 176.

¹⁵⁵ It is important to make clear that Jackson-McCabe recognizes that included in James are ideas that would have been alien to Stoicism, but he attributes these divergences to the epistle’s message having been influenced by the coming of Jesus, and does not explore their relevance in terms of the Jewish Wisdom tradition. See Jackson-McCabe, *Law and Logos*, 136.

It is reasonable to propose that James' inclusion and use of νόμος had the Mosaic Torah in mind, but his overall outlook of the torah had been re-shaped or re-defined in light of the coming of Jesus. While Johnson does not refer to Stoicism, he reaches a similar conclusion: he too suggests that James is re-shaping the inheritance of the torah in light of the Christian message. That James' perspective of the Mosaic Torah has been altered is noteworthy, but its authority is nonetheless affirmed; this is seemingly why James refers to God as the only "lawgiver" and bases his condemnation of judging one another in the law (Jas 4:11-12). Similarly, partiality is condemned in 2:8 because it is contrary to torah, and it thus prevents one from living a wise life.

However, James' precise understanding of the law remains ambiguous. For example, James 2 makes reference to four commands (i.e. love, partiality, adultery and murder), but despite his affirming these commands, it is impossible to draw any firm conclusions because they are not representative of the entire torah, but rather are isolated examples.¹⁵⁶ Similarly, central tenets of torah observance such as Sabbath, diet, and circumcision are not mentioned in James.¹⁵⁷ On the other hand, there is nothing in James to suggest that he rejected the observance of the Mosaic law. On the contrary, it is difficult to read James 2:14-26 as anything other than James' affirmation that salvation is also dependent on works (ἔργα) of the law, and not by faith (πίστις) alone, as Paul claims.¹⁵⁸ However so interpreted, it is fair to say that 2:14-26 serves to affirm

¹⁵⁶ Jackson-McCabe comments: "One cannot, therefore, make facile conclusions regarding the author's interpretation of particular aspects of this body of legislation based simply on his general allegiance to it." Jackson-McCabe, *Law and Logos*, 177.

¹⁵⁷ The non-inclusion of central tenets of torah observance may also suggest that such matters were not among James' foremost concerns.

¹⁵⁸ These thirteen verses of James remain the most written-about and disputed among Jamesian scholarship because in them, James appeals to Abraham to teach that justification is by works and not by faith alone, while Paul (i.e. in Romans 3-4 and Galatians 2-3) by contrast, appeals to Abraham to teach that justification is not by works but by faith. Some examples include: Wiard Popkes, "Two Interpretations of 'Justification' in the New Testament," *ST* 59 (2005): 129-146; Batten, *Friendship and Benefaction in James*, 134-143, Dale C. Allison, "Jas 2:14-26: Polemic Against Paul, Apology for James," *Ancient and New Perspectives on Paul* (eds. T. Nicklas, A Merkt, and J. Verheyden; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 123-149; *James*, 425-508; R. B. Compton, "James 2:21-24 and the Justification of Abraham," *DBSJ* 2 (1997): 19-45;

further the importance of action. Jackson-McCabe hence argues that James' law is the torah, but strong conclusions regarding the precise position of the author require, as he notes, "more information regarding him and his intended audience than we currently possess."¹⁵⁹ James' discernment of torah, and how he prioritizes various commandments, has been altered in light of Jesus.

In this present instance it is important to signpost that similarities exist between James and *4QInstruction* in terms of the torah being altered: while the respective portrayals and understanding of the Mosaic Torah in these writings are not identical, both authors' understanding of it has been changed. In the case of James, it has been adapted in light of the Christian message. In *4QInstruction* the Mosaic Torah is assessed in light of the prevalent apocalyptic mindset of the writing (see §4.4.2.). Therefore, it may be argued that the altering of torah is indicative of the wisdom trajectory in which these two writings are participating.

4.3.2. Revelation and Νόμος in James

The exhortation of 1:5 complicates the relationship between the authority of the torah and revelation in James. This instruction implies that the revelation on offer exceeds that of the torah, otherwise the exhortation of 1:5 would have simply read: "if you are lacking wisdom, read the torah". In other words, revelation is credited as the means to becoming wise, not just the torah. The Mosaic Torah is instruction and commandments, and although in the sapiential tradition wisdom is often equated with the torah,¹⁶⁰ as we have just seen in the previous section, this is not the case in James. It is thus possible that the revelation of 1:5 is to be interpreted as an addition to the torah, and it may thus possibly take on the form of "new commandments" that further enhance the torah. Similarly, it is also possible that the revelation of 1:5 supersedes the torah. The analysis to follow explores these various lines of enquiry.

Matt Jackson-McCabe, *Logos and Law*, 243-253; Davids, *The Epistle of James*, 119-134; K. Jason Coker, "Nativism in James 2:14-26: A Post-Colonial Reading," in *Reading James with New Eyes: Methodological Reassessments of the Letter of James* (eds. Robert L. Webb and John S. Kloppenborg; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 27-48.

¹⁵⁹ Jackson-McCabe, *Law and Logos*, 185.

¹⁶⁰ E.g. see Sir 24:23-29.

Jackson-McCabe’s analysis provides insight into the relationship between these two entities. It has previously been pointed out that, in James, there is an emphasis on doing (i.e. right action – see §4.1.1.). This may suggest that revelation enables one to perform wisdom faithfully, and in this way, revelation may be perceived as ongoing. As was seen, Jackson-McCabe argues that James’ equation of the “law of freedom” with the “implanted logos” is indicative of its Stoic influence, but its emphasis on it being “heard” and “done”, and its ability to “save souls” is representative of it having been filtered through religious and historical convictions that are alien to Stoicism.¹⁶¹ He refers to Philo, Justin and the authors of *4 Maccabees* who assume that the *logos* has an external, verbal form, and interprets this as being analogous to James’ equation of the “law of freedom” with the torah.¹⁶² James emphasizes that one must be a doer as well as a hearer of the *logos* because merely to hear is to deceive oneself (παραλογιζόμενοι) for it is through doing (ἐν τῇ ποιήσει) that one will become blessed (Jas 1:22, 25).¹⁶³ On account of the imminent eschatological judgment foretold in the epistle (Jas 5:9), correct understanding of the *logos* is essential because it has the ability to save souls. Therefore, James’ description of God as “law giver and judge”, and his affirmation that it is only God who can save and destroy, is once again noteworthy.

Also deserving of further comment is the command in James 1:21: “δέξασθε τὸν ἔμφυτον λόγον”. This exhortation is especially difficult because the author is instructing his recipients to receive something that he tells them has already been implanted.¹⁶⁴ The idea of the *logos* being implanted serves to emphasize its internal dimension. The concept of implanting *logos* may thus suggest that James believed that at the time of creation, all of humanity were implanted with the *logos*: this would mean that the *logos* is universal.

¹⁶¹ Jackson-McCabe, *Logos and Law*, 186.

¹⁶² For Jackson-McCabe’s analysis of Philo, Justin and the authors of *4 Maccabees*, see his *Logos and Law*, 87-135.

¹⁶³ Cf. Rom 2:13.

¹⁶⁴ Similar expressions and sentiments are also encountered in Acts and the Pauline letters, and refer constantly to an initial acceptance of the Christian proclamation, the “gospel”. See 1Thess 1:6; Acts 8:4-14; 11:1. Cf. Luke 8:3; Mark 4:16. Cf. Jackson-McCabe, *Logos and Law*, 190, n. 292.

Alternatively, James 1:21 may also indicate that James conceived of a select group who were made with the *implanted logos*, and hence it is only this group who has the ability to receive it. If the latter is the case this would in turn mean that the address of James 1:1 is exclusive, and the revelation of James, and indeed all its instructions, could not be understood as being universal. The universality or exclusivity of this epistle's address and its subsequent instructions will provide an interesting point of comparison when *4QInstruction*. This topic is returned to in Chapter Five.

This association between *logos* and creation is brought about in James 1:18; God “gave birth to us by a means of a *logos* of truth (λόγῳ ἀληθείας) so that we are a sort of ‘first fruits’ of his creatures.” In early Christian literature, it is not uncommon to encounter the idea of “rebirth” being used to express the Christian experience; new members consider themselves as having been “reborn”.¹⁶⁵ Jackson-McCabe raises the possibility that, in view of 1:18, the *implanted logos* may therefore be seen as an analogous divine substance in Stoic terms, which is implanted by God in a select group at creation in connection with a new creation, and “whose ethic . . . is understood to coincide with the Torah.”¹⁶⁶ The idea of the torah being “implanted” on the hearts of people is reminiscent of Jer 31:31-35.¹⁶⁷ If this reading were accepted then this in turn would mean that the “twelve tribes” in James 1:1 are those, and only those, whom James considered as having the *implanted logos*. In light of the coming eschatological judgment, it is thus all the more imperative that they conform to

¹⁶⁵ E.g. 1 Pet 1:23-25.

¹⁶⁶ Jackson-McCabe, *Logos and Law*, 191.

¹⁶⁷ Jer 31:31-35 reads: “The days are surely coming, says the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah. It will not be like the covenant that I made with their ancestors where I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt – a covenant that they broke, though I was their husband, says the Lord. But this is the covenant that 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 on their hearts, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. No longer shall they teach one another, or say to each other ‘know the Lord’, for they shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest, says the Lord; for I will forgive their iniquity and remember their sin no more. 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 wave roar – the Lord of hosts in his name.” (Translation from NRSV).

their supposed inborn ability and “hear” and “do” the *logos*. However, as Jackson-McCabe also notes, the view that the *logos* of James is innate is difficult to support; the representation of ἔμφυτος λόγος and νόμος throughout the epistle seems to denote something given to all people during God’s initial creation of humanity.¹⁶⁸

Similarly, when discussing the implantation of the λόγος, Kamell also refers to Jer 31:27-35, esp. v. 33. She maintains that a new covenant is portrayed in Jeremiah, and in it, salvific overtones are present that parallel James’ description of the λόγος as being able to save your souls (1:18).¹⁶⁹ She suggests that Jer 31:27-34 provides a background for James as it presents a new relationship between God and his people.¹⁷⁰ Therefore, for Kamell, the *logos* is the law and the “word of truth” may be understood as referring to the content of the new covenant on people’s hearts so they are brought about into a new relationship with God, and are his “first fruits” (1:18). The “implanted word” is best interpreted, she argues, as referring to God’s promise to Jeremiah (Jer 31:33). She concludes: “If James understood his time as the fulfillment of the New Covenant, then he did not advocate a ‘legalistic’ obedience to a rote law, but instead the active reception of God’s covenant within themselves that would produce lives of obedience to God’s commands.”¹⁷¹ For James, it would seem that ἔμφυτος λόγος and νόμος find expression in the written torah, piety of which demands both action and hearing. Moreover, to be counted among the righteous on the day of eschatological judgment is predicated on observance of all the commandments, not just observance of love (Lev 19:18; cf. 2:11), even if it were considered a summary of the entire law.

James differentiates between the *logos* being implanted and being received; that is to say, they occur separately. Interestingly, Jackson-McCabe suggests that the receiving of the *logos* may be understood as an analogy of the hearing of the *logos* in 1:22-25,¹⁷² and while his contributions remain valuable, they have limitations. He does not explore how 1:5 may fit into this discussion.

¹⁶⁸ Cf. Jackson-McCabe, *Logos and Law*, 192.

¹⁶⁹ Kamell, “Incarnating Jeremiah’s promised new covenant in James,” 25.

¹⁷⁰ Cf. Matt 26:28; Mark 14:24; Luke 22:20.

¹⁷¹ Kamell, “Incarnating Jeremiah’s promised new covenant in James,” 27.

¹⁷² Jackson-McCabe, *Logos and Law*, 189.

In addition, Jackson-McCabe does not investigate whether anything substantive can be said about the relationship of revelation to λόγος, and by extension, the authority of the νόμος. The emphasis James places on doing the *logos*, alongside my proposal that revelation enables one to act wisely, suggests that one (i.e. revelation) facilitates the correct “doing” of the other (i.e., *logos*). Moreover, it can also be argued that the deliberate emphasis on the *logos* being implanted and received serves to convey that it has both an internal and external dimension, much like revelation. If the revelation, in whatever form it might take, is understood as assisting one in living wisely, this revelation may thus be considered in terms of enabling the recipients to discern νόμος correctly. Therefore, the revelation of 1:5 facilitates the *logos* being received in 1:21. The exhortation of 1:5 may be interpreted as the author instructing the recipients, who are currently lacking in wisdom, to ask for wisdom because this wisdom allows them to receive the *logos*, and in turn this assists them to live a wise life.

Lockett examines law and wisdom in James but does so in conjunction with analyzing the theme “wholeness” or “perfection”, considering them to be inherently linked.¹⁷³ This is especially interesting when the description of one “lacking in wisdom” in James 1:4-5 is taken into account. He argues that, rather than a religious perfectionism, the wholeness to which James calls his readers is characterized especially by the concern for holiness articulated in Lev 19 and the humility noted in Prov 3.¹⁷⁴ He notes how several commentators have linked the concept of wholeness to knowing and practicing the law and the working of wisdom.¹⁷⁵ Consequently, he maintains “wholeness”, “law”, and “wisdom” “constitute the hermeneutical key for understanding the argument and theological perspective of James”.¹⁷⁶ He identifies Lev 19:18b and Prov 3:34 as “key passages” that shape how James understands the law and wisdom of Israel generally, while James’ understanding of wholeness is grounded by such an

¹⁷³ Darian Lockett, “Wholeness in Intertextual Perspective: James’ Use of Scripture in Developing a Theme,” *MTJ* 15.2 (2016): 92-106.

¹⁷⁴ Lockett, “Wholeness in Intertextual Perspective,” 93.

¹⁷⁵ Representative examples include Laws, *A Commentary on James*, 28-32; Hartin, *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus*, 199-217; Bauckham, *James*, 165-168, 177-184; Moo, *The Letter of James*, 45-46. Cf. Lockett, “Wholeness in Intertextual Perspective,” 94, n.3.

¹⁷⁶ Lockett, “Wholeness in Intertextual Perspective,” 94.

understanding of Israel's scriptures.¹⁷⁷ He categorizes the τέλ-word group as key indicators of the importance of wholeness or perfection, and considers James placement of τέλ-related words to be strategic. For example, James uses τέλειος to modify both "law" (1:25; 2:8) and indirectly "wisdom" (i.e. the wisdom of 1:5 is cast as the solution for anyone who lacks τέλειος in 1:2-4).¹⁷⁸ Lockett advances:

By implication the one possessing wisdom is also one who is "perfect" or whole before God. Furthermore, the δῶρημα τέλειον ("perfect gift") that comes from the Father of lights in 1:17 is thematically connected to "wisdom from above" in 3:17. That is, "wisdom" is that "perfect gift" that comes from above originating with the Father of lights. Thus, "work," "faith," "law," and "wisdom" are either designated as τέλειος or, in the case of wisdom, characterised as God's remedy for one lacking τέλειος . . . James seems to not only view the law and wisdom as "whole" or "perfect," but also as agents of wholeness for God's people.¹⁷⁹

Lockett also considers there to be a deliberate relationship between "perfection" and "purity".¹⁸⁰ For example, James contrasts worthless religion with pure and steadfast religion (θρησκεία καθαρὰ καὶ ἀμίαντος), while maintaining "pure" religion includes keeping "oneself unstained (ἄσπιλον) from the world".¹⁸¹ In this present context it is interesting to note James' inference that this world is not pure, a point which may also be indicative of Stoic influence. If purity and perfection are equated with one another, then the author's affirmation that the revelation is otherworldly is all the more salient (1:5, 17). In addition, as previously noted, there is an emphasis on "wisdom from above" characterized as being "pure" (ἀγνή).¹⁸² Therefore, according to Lockett, both law and wisdom

¹⁷⁷ Lockett, "Wholeness in Intertextual Perspective," 94.

¹⁷⁸ Jackson McCabe maintains that James equates the *implanted logos* and the law with one another, and therefore he argues that the epithet τέλειος is best understood in light of this equation. Jackson-McCabe, *Law and Logos*, 152.

¹⁷⁹ Lockett, "Wholeness in Intertextual Perspective," 96.

¹⁸⁰ See Lockett, *Purity and Worldview in the Epistle of James*, 21-25; *idem*, "Wholeness in Intertextual Perspective," 96-97. Bauckham, *James*, 165, also connects the language of purity to wholeness or perfection.

¹⁸¹ See §3.2.2.

¹⁸² Cf. Lockett, "Wholeness in Intertextual Perspective," 97.

provide the antidote to one who is considered “lacking”; that is to say, law and wisdom enable one to be whole. He concludes: “Perfection is the goal and Torah and Wisdom, as read through the lens of Messiah Jesus, are the means to that goal.”¹⁸³

Lockett’s analysis is helpful, especially his assessment of wisdom and law working alongside one another resulting in lacking and imperfection being remedied. However, Lockett’s failure to offer any clarification in terms of how he understands νόμος is problematic. That being said, we may nevertheless infer from his work that he considers mere torah observance to be incapable of making one “whole” or “perfect”; that is, wisdom is also necessary. At this point we may thus suggest that the relationship between revelation and the authority of the νόμος in James is best understood in terms of revelation as a necessary addition to torah. Living a wise life is dependent on asking for wisdom (1:5) and on action (i.e. being a doer of the law 1:22-15; 2:8). The perceived negative anthropology of 1:5 suggests that James considered observance of torah (interpretation of which had been altered in light of Jesus) as secondary to revelation. We may thus propose that the representation of torah in James is similar to that which we see among some Qumran discoveries (e.g. 1QH^a xii:11-13). As such, questions may be asked about possible similarities or differences with the portrayal of revelation in *4QInstruction*. It is to this that our attention will now turn.

4.4. Revelation and Torah in *4QInstruction*

4QInstruction uses scripture; for example, we have already seen that Gen 1-3 plays a definitive role when interpreting 4Q417 1 i lines 13b-18, and §5.2.3. explores how the Garden of Eden (i.e., Gen 2) serves as a metaphor for the wisdom cultivating garden portrayed in 4Q423 1, 2 i lines 1-4. Moreover, 4Q418 81+81a lines 4-5 contain clear allusions to Num 18:20 and Deut 10:9. This section is not concerned with the use of scripture in *4QInstruction*, but rather aims to investigate how Torah is understood in this writing, and how we are to understand its authority in relation to the continuous exhortations to pursue revelation.

¹⁸³ Lockett, “Wholeness in Intertextual Perspective,” 106.

4.4.1. 4QInstruction's Understanding of Torah

Like James, “torah” is not directly evoked as a category in *4QInstruction*; therefore, investigating how it might fit into the overall framework of this composition is also complex. As we have already seen, in the sapiential tradition, wisdom and torah are frequently associated with one another,¹⁸⁴ but like James, this is not the case in *4QInstruction*. Only thirty percent of this composition remains, and it thus needs to be discerned whether the absence of torah may be attributed to over two-thirds of this document not being preserved, or if in fact the torah is purposefully not being referred to.¹⁸⁵

4QInstruction and Sirach are considered by some to be contemporary with one another, and thus discussing how torah is treated in Sirach and comparing our findings to *4QInstruction*, may provide insights. Proposing that Sirach and *4QInstruction* emerge from the same scribal school, Rey considers the relationship between wisdom and torah to be the same in both writings.¹⁸⁶ However, it is very difficult to lend support to Rey's suggestion. Wisdom and torah are equated to one another in Sirach (e.g. Sir 24:23-29 where torah is a product of the descent of Lady Wisdom, and wisdom is the personification of torah),¹⁸⁷ whereas this is not the case in *4QInstruction*. Moreover, there is no equivalent to רז נהיה in Sirach. Indeed, Sir 3:21-24 suggests that the esoteric nature of the רז נהיה is something that Ben Sira would not have approved of.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁴ See Sir 15:1; Sir 24:23-39.

¹⁸⁵ Cf. Wold, *4QInstruction: Divisions and Hierarchies*, 127.

¹⁸⁶ Rey, *4QInstruction*, 334.

¹⁸⁷ See also Sir 15:1. Moreover, most remarkable is the appreciation that, as Alastair Hunter notes: “Ben Sira is using wisdom to validate Torah, not the other way around – a remarkable reversal of what would seem to be the priorities of the heart of Jewish values from the time of the great synagogue.” Alastair Hunter, *Wisdom Literature* (London: SCM Press, 2006), 199-200.

¹⁸⁸ While Wright interprets Sir 3:21-24 as warning to his students not to investigate the secrets of the created order, Aitken highlights the ambiguity of these lines and notes that in the very next chapter (Sir 4:18), it is claimed that wisdom will reveal all of her secrets. Crucially, the same Hebrew root found in Sir 3:21-24 (i.e., נסתרות) is used. See Benjamin G. Wright, “‘Fear the Lord and Honor the Priest’ Ben Sira as Defender of the Jerusalem Priesthood.” in *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research* (ed., Pancratius C. Beentjes; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997), 208-212; Aitken, “Apocalyptic, Revelation, and Early Jewish Wisdom Literature,” 189, respectively. It

Taking into account the central place the torah has in Sirach, it is reasonable to propose רז נהיה occupies a similar position in *4QInstruction*. However, as we shall see, this observation has its limitations. Harrington compares Ben Sira to *4QInstruction* and argues the affirmation of the authority of the רז נהיה throughout *4QInstruction* “stands in contrast to Ben Sira’s method of wisdom instruction practically from human experience (the usual source of sapiential teachings) and creation, and the Torah and Israel’s history.”¹⁸⁹ Similarly, Kampen argues that the absence of the torah in *4QInstruction* is a major distinction between it and Ben Sira,¹⁹⁰ while Wold suggests that their dissimilar views on torah are a substantial wedge between the two writings.¹⁹¹ Lange, on the other hand, argues that the “mystery of being” indicates that *4QInstruction* exhibits “eine Verbindung von Weisheit und Tora”,¹⁹² and therefore considers the רז נהיה as thematically similar to Sirach 24 and Baruch 3:9-4:4. Lange presents it as being typologically similar to the Rabbi’s understanding of the torah, in which the רז נהיה is a divine ordering principle.¹⁹³ Lange’s reading of 4Q417 1 i line 6 exemplifies his assessment of the torah in *4QInstruction*. It reads: “יומם ולילה הגה ברז נהיה” (day and night meditate upon the ‘mystery of being’).” As discussed in §4.2.3., the phrase “יומם ולילה” is also encountered in Psalm 1:2 in relation to the need for constant study of the torah. Lange thus identifies what he considers to be a link or parallel being made by the author in relation to the רז נהיה and torah, and thus views the two as being analogous.¹⁹⁴ Lange’s identification of a link being made here between torah and

needs to be noted, however, that Ben Sira establishes or attributes the origins of wisdom to God and the heavens in 24:3-4.

¹⁸⁹ Harrington, “Two Early Approaches to Jewish Wisdom,” 35.

¹⁹⁰ John Kampen, *Wisdom Literature: Eerdmans Commentary on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011).

¹⁹¹ Wold, *4QInstruction: Divisions and Hierarchies*, 158.

¹⁹² Lange, *Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination*, 48.

¹⁹³ *Bereshit Rabbah* 1 interprets Proverbs’ declaration that God made the world with wisdom as a proof-text for the view that God used the torah to create the world. The torah is the template according to which the created order was fashioned. Lange, *Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination*, 90. Cf. Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 70.

¹⁹⁴ Lange, *Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination*, 62.

רז הנהי is convincing, but the idiom “day and night”, is very common,¹⁹⁵ and it is possible to propose that its occurrence here serves to emphasize or reaffirm to the *mebin* the importance of the pursuit of the “mystery of being” by evoking terminology associated with torah. This is an example of where scripture is being re-written in *4QInstruction* to exemplify the author’s message. Therefore, comparing the רז הנהי of *4QInstruction* to the loftier status of torah in Sirach only serves to demonstrate dissimilarities between these two compositions: Sirach and *4QInstruction* do not have similar conceptions of the relationship of wisdom and torah.

4.4.2. Revelation and Torah in 4QInstruction

When investigating the relationship between revelation and the authority of the νόμος in James, an apparent tension was noted: the author’s instruction of 1:5 (i.e. to ask for wisdom if wisdom is lacking) seemed to imply that the revelation contained and/or included something that was not included in the νόμος (see §4.3.2.). It is noteworthy then that a comparable tension is encountered in 4Q417 1 i line 6. This is an instance in *4QInstruction* where scripture has been re-written and the subject of the instruction has been replaced with the רז הנהי: the reference to torah has been omitted. At the very least, this seems to infer a tension between torah and the רז הנהי. Indeed, this is exactly how Elgvin interprets it; he considers this insertion of the רז הנהי as being indicative of *4QInstruction’s* association with apocalypticism because apocalyptic circles primarily refer to secrets not contained in the torah.¹⁹⁶ Similarly, in a

¹⁹⁵ The idiom “day and night” is well known in the Hebrew Bible as a term that expresses continual action. E.g. see Isa 34:10, 60:11, 62:6; Jer 9:1; 14:17, 16:13. It is interesting to note that the phrase also occurs in the NT to refer to constant prayer. See Luke 2:37, 18:7; 1 Thess 3:10; 1 Tim 5:5.

¹⁹⁶ Elgvin comments: “to a large degree the *raz nihyeh* occupies the role of hypostatic Wisdom: it conveys divine revelation to man and provides the means for the right relation to God and fellow man. We therefore suggest that the *raz nihyeh* represents an apocalyptic reinterpretation of the concept of divine Wisdom that stresses the esoteric nature of God’s revelation.” Torleif Elgvin, “Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Early Second Century BCE,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* (eds. Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emmanuel Tov, and James C. Vanderkam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 226-247, 231.

forthcoming monograph by Wold a chapter is devoted to the relationship between revelation and torah in *4QInstruction*. Wold's work concentrates on the perceived hierarchy of authorities in this writing. For him, *4QInstruction* does not exhibit any interest in torah as a theme in its own right.¹⁹⁷ While *4QInstruction* may be seen to be instructing its addressee to follow the commandments, Wold argues, "truly understanding God's ways is only possible through revelation".¹⁹⁸

It remains to be established if a tangible tension between revelation and torah exists in *4QInstruction*, but it is important to note that the insertion of רז נהיה at the expense of the torah in 4Q417 1 i line 6 is striking. Harrington discusses the relationship of the רז נהיה and torah in *4QInstruction*. He notes: "Sapiential Work A lacks any personification of wisdom and any extended meditation on wisdom (unless the "mystery that is to be/come [the רז נהיה] plays an analogous role." ¹⁹⁹ Unfortunately, Harrington does not develop his conclusions any further. Goff does not consider the רז נהיה as displacing the torah since it is a source for instruction, but comments that *4QInstruction's* "reception of the Torah is colored by an appeal to revelation beyond that of Sinai."²⁰⁰ Similarly, Kamell briefly treats this topic in her doctoral thesis; she recognizes the apparent tension between a mystery that has already been revealed and the torah, referring to it as "interesting", and argues that wisdom and torah have been replaced by this mystery (i.e., the רז נהיה) "which claims superiority to that which was earlier revealed. The author(s) link the created order of the world, with legal,

¹⁹⁷ Wold investigates the two supposed occurrences of the "hand of Moses" (ביד משה) with the aim of demonstrating whether this expression explicitly evokes the torah when used in *4QInstruction*. He argues that this expression is not found in 4Q423 11, and despite this expression being included in 4Q418 184, he disagrees with Strugnell and Harrington and maintains it is not preceded by "he spoke". Therefore, Wold interprets its occurrence as being a signal to judgment, and not as evoking the torah as is suggested by Strugnell and Harrington, in DJD: 34, 408. See Wold, *4QInstruction: Divisions and Hierarchies*, 129-135.

¹⁹⁸ Wold, *4QInstruction: Divisions and Hierarchies*, 135, 141.

¹⁹⁹ Harrington, "Two Early Approaches to Wisdom," 127.

²⁰⁰ Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 72-73. In *Discerning Wisdom*, 28-29 Goff re-addresses the relationship of the question of torah in *4QInstruction* and concludes: "it is possible that *4QInstruction* [*sic*] appealed to the Torah as an authoritative source. But there is simply not enough evidence for this position."

judgment order, all contained within one mystery which, like the Torah in Sinai, the wise individual will study.”²⁰¹

In this present context, it is important to highlight an interesting point of comparison with James: this possible tension between revelation and torah in *4QInstruction* is reminiscent of our earlier discussion on the *implanted logos* in James in §4.3.1. As discussed there, despite the author’s affirmation that this *logos* has been implanted, the recipients are also exhorted to receive it (Jas 1:21). When discussing this tension in James, it was suggested that interpreting 1:5 as a request for revelation, and consequently understanding 1:5 in terms of facilitating the receipt of the *logos* in 1:21, may explain this apparent textual ambiguity. In turn, this would mean that torah is not replaced in James, as much as revelation is seen as being a necessary addition to torah. A worthwhile line of enquiry is whether something similar may be said about the relationship between revelation and torah in *4QInstruction*.

James 1:5 refers to the idea of a person “lacking”. In §4.3.2. it was suggested that revelation may thus be understood as a necessary addition to νόμος in James. Similarly, in *4QInstruction* the author is exhorted to “gaze upon” (נבט), “examine” (דרש), “mediate” (הגה), and “grasp” (לקח) the רז נהיה, not the torah. This suggests that, in *4QInstruction*, the ability to be entirely wise is found outside of the torah, because רז נהיה is clearly represented throughout *4QInstruction* as being outside of the torah.

It is important to state that the רז נהיה is an authoritative voice outside of and beyond the author and humanity. That the רז היה is an external force might be considered as being comparable with the stress the author of James places on its revealed wisdom being heavenly (3:13).²⁰² However, this does not necessarily mean we are to conclude that the torah is rejected in this writing; on the contrary, torah was obviously used and held in high esteem by its author as is demonstrated in the definitive role the interpretation of Genesis 1-3 plays in terms of this composition’s thought formation. However, the emphasis and urgency that the author places on the pursuit of the רז נהיה, and the description of

²⁰¹ Kamel, “The Soteriology of James in Light of Earlier Jewish Wisdom Literature and the Gospel of Matthew,” 54.

²⁰² See §4.1.2.

the understanding it offers (e.g. 4Q417 1 i lines 1-9) suggests that it contains knowledge outside of the torah. In this way, like the σοφία ἄνωθεν of James, the רז נהיה of *4QInstruction* may be considered as a necessary addition to the torah. The significance of this addition is illustrated by the author's insertion of it at the expense of the torah in 4Q417 1 i line 6.

Comment: Revelation and Νόμος in James in Light of 4QInstruction

The challenges of interpreting James' understanding of revelation and νόμος remain complex, but the commonalities identified in *4QInstruction* allow us to see that the complexities between revelation and Mosaic Torah is indicative of how law was being conveyed of at this time. In other words, the complexities of this relationship may also be indicative of the sapiential trajectory that James and *4QInstruction* are participating in. The above analysis of *4QInstruction* thus provides a different analogue when understanding James' notion of *implanted logos*. Significant parallels exist between James and *4QInstruction* in terms of the specifics of the relationship between revelation and the authority of the law.

In terms of James, it is argued that revelation is best interpreted as a necessary addition to the Mosaic Torah, and it is fair to say that this interpretation is strengthened by the critical analysis of this same question in *4QInstruction*. Therefore, what does this allow us to say about the relationship between revelation and νόμος in James? I would argue that the analysis of *4QInstruction* enables us to see that the complexities between revelation and law are not unique to James. Moreover, I would propose that, in James, torah will not make you whole (cf. Jas 1:5), but living a wise life in accordance with the revelation of 1:5 and observing the torah, will (cf. Jas 3:17). Finally, if a hierarchy of authority between revelation and law is demanded, the necessity of revelation suggests that revelation is more important, but torah is also necessary.

Conclusions

Throughout this thesis it is argued that James and *4QInstruction* belong to a distinct multifaceted trajectory in the development of Jewish and early Christian wisdom traditions. Keeping this overarching question in mind, this chapter examines the theme of revelation in James, and how it is to be understood in relation to νόμος. The overall aim of this thesis is to progress the study of James,

and therefore in terms of the above discussion, what new insights have been gained? It is my argument that the above presentation enables us to recognize the centrality of the concept of revelation for James, while also underscoring the importance of σοφία ἄνωθεν for those who wish to live faithfully.

In terms of the content of *4QInstruction* and James, revelation is understood to represent a significant analogy in both. It is argued that the significance of James' emphasis on revelation would not be so evident if it were not for the inclusion of *4QInstruction*. At the very least, the inclusion of *4QInstruction* brings the concept of revelation in James into sharper focus. The emphasis on σοφία ἄνωθεν being heavenly (i.e. Jas 1:17) suggests an apocalyptic influence that is also encountered in *4QInstruction*'s presentation of the "mystery of being" and the "the vision of Hagu". Similarly, the exhortation to ask for wisdom in James 1:5 may be understood in this way. In §4.1.1. Kamell Kovalishyn's understanding of σοφία ἄνωθεν was discussed. She too understands σοφία ἄνωθεν as having an apocalyptic influence. However, it is important to note that her conclusions do not emerge as the result of a discussion of the concept of revelation in *4QInstruction*. It is interesting that both she and I come to the same conclusions, but the means of getting there are different. If James and *4QInstruction* are understood as belonging to a distinct multifaceted trajectory in the development of Jewish and early Christian wisdom traditions as this thesis proposes, this chapter serves to demonstrate that this trajectory places a huge emphasis on the concept of revelation.

This chapter does not intend to serve as the final word when it comes to explaining the apparent tension between σοφία ἄνωθεν, νόμος, and λόγος in James. However, the identification of the same complexities in *4QInstruction* opens up the possibility that this tension was indicative of how law was being conceived of at this time. While this does not exactly help us interpret how σοφία ἄνωθεν is to be understood in relation to νόμος in James, the suggestion that σοφία ἄνωθεν may be understood as being almost superior, and as a necessary addition, is supported by bringing *4QInstruction* into the discussion. Having demonstrated how important living in accordance with σοφία ἄνωθεν is in terms of James' overall message, our attention now turns to examining to whom, for James, this wisdom is (conceivably) available to.

Chapter Five: Recipients: Inclusive or Exclusive Community?

Introduction

In Chapter Four the theme of revelation was examined, and it was suggested that, in terms of James, σοφία ἄνωθεν enables wise living and doing the *logos*. Moreover, it may also be inferred that doing revelation is important because, living in accordance with revelation, results in one being included among the righteous and hence being part of God’s faithful community. With this in mind, this chapter has two primary research questions: firstly, who is given revelation? Secondly, in terms of the faithful communities portrayed in James and *4QInstruction*, is the language of “inclusion” or “exclusion” more appropriate? In other words, is it a matter of “getting in” or “staying in”? This chapter explores the recipients of revelation of James in light of *4QInstruction*. As a result, it is important to note that Chapters Four and Five of this thesis are closely associated with one another.

James 1:1 and 4Q417 1 i lines 13b-18 are largely in view in Parts One and Two. James 1:1 reads: “Ἰάκωβος θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ χαίρειν.” This verse has attracted a large amount of scholarly attention because both the author and recipients of this epistle are identified, and therefore, it is reasonable to assume that much can be discerned about the epistle as a whole from this verse. An examination concerning the identity of the addresses, and the various applicable interpretations is offered, as well as noting the relevance of these interpretations for this current study. Similarly, 4Q417 1 i lines 13b-18 has also been the focus of many scholarly contributions. This is because one’s interpretation of these lines decides whether one conceives of all of humanity having access to revelation, or if it is depicting a dualistic portrayal of creation based on Gen 1-2. In addition, 4Q418 81+81a lines 1-2 and 4Q423 1, 2 i lines 1-4 are discussed in terms of highlighting the superior status of *4QInstruction’s mebin*. Finally, our attention returns to James to see if any new insights have been gained.

5.1. The Recipients of Revelation in James

James 1:1 is examined under a number of headings in Part One. These subdivisions are demonstrative of how modern scholarship has typically engaged with and interpreted this verse. To start, the phrase the “twelve tribes in the Diaspora” is investigated. Questions concerning whether this phrase and the verse (i.e. Jas 1:1) itself are best understood in literal (i.e. depicting those Israelites who are no longer resident in their ancestral tribal allotments) or in metaphorical terms (i.e. depicting “Jewish-Christians” in terms of the church being the embodiment of new Israel) are explored. Moreover, the eschatological reading of this verse is also presented and analyzed. The scriptural allusions between James 1:1 and LXX Isa 49:5-6, and its significance in terms of this verse’s association with the patriarch Jacob, and his connection to the twelve tribes of Israel, is also assessed.

Comment on the Phrase “The Twelve Tribes in the Diaspora”

The phrase “ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ” has been interpreted in a variety of ways. Some scholars have questioned whether the twelve tribes were actually in existence in the first-century CE. As a result, this has led some scholars to understand James 1:1 as denoting an ideal. While the existence of the twelve tribes is affirmed in the Hebrew Bible,¹ their precise location was unknown and it seems that most were considered to be in exile. Ed P. Sanders identifies the re-establishment of the twelve tribes as being a major hope that was widespread in first-century CE Palestine.² The sought-after re-establishment of the twelve tribes may be viewed in reference to the Assyrian assault of 722 BCE through which the Northern Kingdom of the Israelite confederation was destroyed. As a result, only two tribes remained: Judah and Benjamin. Members of these two remaining tribes, who came to be called Jews after the name of the

¹ See Deut 30:1-5; 1 Chron 16:35; Ps 106:47; 147:2; Isa 11:11-13; 27:12-13; 43:5-6, 14-21; 49:6; 56:8; 60:3-7; 66:18-24; Jer 23:8; 29:10-14; 31:1, 8, 10; 32:37-41; Ezek 11:17-20; 20:33-44; 28:25; 34:11-16; 36:24; 37:11-28; 39:26-27; 47-48; Hos 11:11; Zech 2:6; 3:20; 8:7; 10:6-12; 2 Macc 1:27; 2:7, 18. For non Hebrew Bible references see Allison, *James*, 130, n. 120.

² Sanders identifies three others: (1) the subjugation or conversion of the Gentiles; (2) for a new, purified, or renewed temple; and (3) for purity and righteousness in both worship and morals. Ed P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE – 66 CE* (London: SCM Press, 1992), 289-290.

southern kingdom of Judea, often looked forward to an eschatological restoration of the twelve tribes of Israel. Descendants (usually considered to be represented as the ten tribes) of those who had been deported by the Assyrians in the eighth-century BCE were still living outside of Palestine. Bauckham notes how descendants of the “lost” ten tribes came to form an important part of the eastern Diaspora.³ The hope for the restoration of the twelve tribes was so prevalent that Sanders refers to it as “common”, writing:

The general hope for the restoration of the people of Israel is the most ubiquitous hope of all. The twelve tribes are sometimes explicitly mentioned and often indirectly referred to (e.g. by the name “Jacob”), but sometimes the hope is stated more vaguely: the children of Israel will be gathered from throughout the world. In such instances we cannot be sure that the lost ten tribes were explicitly in mind, though it seems likely enough; in any case the reassembly of the people of Israel was generally accepted.⁴

It would thus seem that the desire for the re-establishment of the twelve-tribe structure was well known. Moreover, the association of restoration with the name “Jacob” is particularly provocative in this present context; in Isa 49:6 the re-unification of the twelve tribes is expressed by speaking of “Jacob”, the father of the twelve tribes.⁵ In light of this, the address in James 1:1 may then suggest that the author is setting himself up as a Jacob-like figure; like Jacob, he wants to bring about the re-unification of the twelve tribes and this will be achieved under the Greek version of all-important name (i.e. Ἰάκωβος).

While discussing the phrase “ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ” it is interesting to note that its final clause, that is “in the Diaspora”, has led some scholars to make comparisons between James 1:1 and 1 Peter 1:1, especially among those who claim that “diaspora” is applicable of a metaphorical reading.⁶

³ Bauckham, *James*, 15.

⁴ Sanders, *Judaism*, 290-291.

⁵ Sanders notes that all four hopes identified above are portrayed in Isaiah. For example, the re-establishment of the twelve tribes is conveyed in Isa 49:6a, while the subjugation of the Gentiles is expressed in Isa 60:6b, 12. The purity of the temple is referred to in Isa 54:12, while the purity of God’s kingdom is mentioned in Isa 60:21. Sanders, *Judaism*, 290.

⁶ E.g. see Bauckham, *James*, 15; Davids, *The Epistle of James*, 63-64. It is important to note that often the word διασπορά carries a negative sense; that is, the scattering of God’s people as

The latter designates its addressees as ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς Πόντου, Γαλατίας Καππαδοκίας Ἀσίας καὶ Βιθυνίας, and whose content, especially in 1:14 and 4:3-4, indicate that at least some of its addressees were Gentile.⁷ However, it remains to be seen if Gentiles were included among James' audience (cf. §2.2.2.2.). While this link between James and 1 Peter cannot be dismissed entirely, it betrays an underlying assumption that the two are so readily comparable because both compositions make reference to the Diaspora in their opening verse. For example, 1 Peter's inclusion of "Diaspora" cannot be viewed in exclusively metaphorical terms inasmuch as it also has a literal geographical connotation. Additionally, Kloppenborg observes that, while 1 Peter 1:1 shows that Diaspora was metaphorically applied to the Jewish movement in Roman Asia by the end of the first-century CE, James' additional qualification of ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς is, according to Kloppenborg, "hardly susceptible to a metaphorical interpretation. The designation 'the twelve tribes' *always* refers to collective Israel and is never transferred to the church."⁸ It is to the merits of a metaphorical reading versus a literal reading of James 1:1 that our attention now turns.

5.1.1. James 1:1: Literal or Metaphorical Address?

James 1:1 may be read either literally or metaphorically. In terms of a metaphorical reading, this is frequently encountered in modern commentaries where James 1:1 is read in terms of being a metaphor for members of the Jesus movement who resided outside of Palestine.⁹ Dibelius suggests the phrase δώδεκα φυλαῖς refers to Christians who are considered the "spiritual Israel", and the inclusion of διασπορᾶ is thus taken figuratively by him to refer to the

punishment for their sins. Moreover, the diaspora appears to have also been understood as a place of suffering. See Allison, *James*, 128. Cf. Jas 5:19-20.

⁷ For more on 1 Peter see Paul J. Achtemeier, *1 Peter: A Commentary on First Peter* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996).

⁸ John S Kloppenborg, "Diaspora Discourse: The Construction of Ethos in James," *NTS* 53 (2007): 242-270, 244 (emphasis original). In the NT the term appears only in Q 22:30 (Matt 19:28; Luke 22:30); Acts 26:7; James 1:1 and Rev 21:12.

⁹ E.g. see Dibelius, *James*, 66-67; James Moffatt, *The General Epistles: James, Peter and Judas* (New York: Doubleday, 1928), 6; Davids, *The Epistle of James*, 63-64; Bauckham, *James*, 15-16.

“wandering people of God”, those who are not at home in this world but whose real home exists in heaven.¹⁰ Similarly, for Moffatt, the twelve tribes are “a figurative term for catholic Christianity as the true Israel, living for the time being in a strange world, far from its true Fatherland.”¹¹ It is accurate to say that Christians recognized themselves as the true heirs of the Jewish faith (Rom 4; 1 Cor 10:18; Gal 4:21-31; Phil 3:3). For Bauckham, James 1:1 is best understood as addressed to Jews in both the eastern and western Diaspora.¹² He maintains that the inclusion of the phrase δώδεκα φυλαῖς would not be lost on Jewish ears.¹³ It evoked the hope of the re-gathering of all the tribes in the land of Israel by God in the Messianic Age. According to Bauckham, early Jewish Christians thought of themselves as “the nucleus of the Messianic renewal of the people of Israel which was under way and would come to include all Israel. In a sense they were the twelve tribes, not in an exclusive sense so as to deny other Jews this title, but with a kind of representative inclusiveness.”¹⁴

Alternatively, there are those scholars such as Davids, Allison and Kloppenborg who argue that James 1:1 is best interpreted literally, or as a literal designation at least, and hence taken at face value; that is to say, James is addressed to Jews living in the Diaspora.¹⁵ In relation to the inclusion of

¹⁰ According to this understanding, Christians are in exile from their heavenly home. Dibelius, *James*, 66-67.

¹¹ Moffatt, *The General Epistles*, 6.

¹² Bauckham argues that the only natural interpretation of the phrase “to the twelve tribes in the diaspora” is that it refers to all members of the people of Israel who lived outside the land of Israel. It is, according to Bauckham, these people that James is addressing. Bauckham, *James*, 15.

¹³ Bauckham notes that there is a tendency among NT scholars and historians of early Judaism to think of the Jewish Diaspora as being primarily the western Diaspora (i.e. the Jews who lived in the Mediterranean area). Bauckham is keen to point out that the eastern Diaspora also existed and consisted of Jews living in lands across the Euphrates, to the east of the Roman Empire. According to Bauckham, the eastern diaspora was just as important. Bauckham, *James*, 15.

¹⁴ Bauckham, *James*, 16.

¹⁵ See Davids, *The Epistle of James*, 63-64; Dale C. Allison, “The Fiction of James and its *Sitz im Leben*,” *RB* 108 (2001): 529-570; John S. Kloppenborg, “Judeans or Judean Christians in James?” in *Identity and Interaction in the Ancient Mediterranean* (eds. Zeba A. Cook and Philip A. Hartland; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007), 113-135; *idem*, “Diaspora Discourse,” 242-270. Arguments favouring a literal reading may be considered an articulation of an earlier view expressed by Arthur. T. Cadoux. He comments: “The Church (i.e., Christianity) has

διασπορᾶ, Davids maintains that it would be unwise to look past the literal meaning of this phrase and therefore argues: “the most natural way of reading this phrase is as an address to the true Israel (i.e. Jewish Christians) outside of Palestine (i.e. probably in Syria and Asia Minor).¹⁶ In the case of Allison, he wishes to challenge the prevalent view that the expression ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾶ is a reference to Jewish Christians, or the Christian church universal, and proposes James 1:1 is best read as being largely addressed to Jews (i.e. non-Christian Jews).¹⁷ His inclusion and emphasis on non-Christian Jews is noteworthy and is built upon the following four grounds: firstly, this is what 1:1 actually says and depicts. Secondly, James contains neither Christian salutation nor Christian benediction. Thirdly, he claims James 4-5 makes more sense if these chapters are addressed to Jews outside of the church. Fourthly, James 2:1-7 refers to a “synagogue” as the meeting place for the addressees. Throughout the NT a synagogue always denotes a Jewish assembly or place of gathering.¹⁸ Moreover, there is nothing in James, according to Allison, to suggest a Gentile audience, whereas much suggests a Jewish one (cf. §2.2.2.2.).¹⁹

It is interesting to note that Allison considers the Christianity behind James as being a “close relative” of the Christianity reflected in Matthew and proposes that James emerges “from a group that, in its place and time, whether that time was before or after Matthew, was still seeking to keep relations

inherited the privileges of Israel . . . if they found a circular letter beginning, ‘My dear fellow Jews,’ they would unhesitatingly conclude that it was written by a Jew to Jews; nor is there less reason for taking the address of this Epistle to mean what it says; while that it was originally taken to mean so would account for its early neglect by the growing Gentile Church, and possibly for its place next to the Epistle of the Hebrews.” Arthur. T. Cadoux, *The Thought of St. James* (London: James Clark & Co, 1944), 11.

¹⁶ Davids, *The Epistle of James*, 63-64.

¹⁷ However, it is important to note that Allison also comments: “James undoubtedly intended for Christians to read his book.” Allison, “Audience of James,” 77.

¹⁸ See Allison, “The Fiction of James,” 534-536.

¹⁹ Allison notes that Jas 2:21 refers to Abraham as “our father” without any hint that the expression is being used in a transferred sense, while Jas 2:19 makes clear that the addressee’s faith is clearly embodied in the *Shema* (cf. Deut 6:4). Furthermore, all the moral exemplars are figures from the Jewish tradition (e.g. Abraham, Rahab, the prophets), while Gentiles are never referred to. Allison, “The Fiction of James,” 545-546.

irenic.”²⁰ With this in mind, he considers 4QMMT as supplying a close parallel to James.²¹ Unlike the majority of the DSS, this document addresses “outsiders” and appears to have intended to be read outside as well as within its community of origin. 4QMMT is framed in terms that may, in principle, be persuasive to any Jew, appealing primarily to the Mosaic law. 4QMMT may thus be considered as having been written at a time when the Qumran community was still hopeful of reconciliation with an established opposition (i.e. most likely the Jerusalem authorities), and speaks in language understandable to all Jews. Nevertheless, its purpose is clearly to describe sectarian laws. If 4QMMT is understood this way, and if we agree with Allison’s reading of James, the analogy between the two is striking.²² Similarly, and in this context, it is interesting to note that although Lockett argues James is addressed to Jewish-Christians in the Diaspora, he too recognizes and acknowledges that the generalized feel of this writing would have “enabled a broader field of communication for them as several audiences would have been able to read and understand the text ‘for them’ in some way or

²⁰ Allison, “The Fiction of James,” 566. Allison argues that Matthew is best understood as reflecting the tensions between certain Jewish-Christians and the emerging post-70 rabbinic authorities and whatever synagogues they might have had influence over. For more on this see W. D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964).

²¹ According to Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell. eds. *Qumran Cave 4* (DJD 10: Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 121, 4QMMT was written by the Qumran community “to an individual leader and his people Israel, with an exhortation to follow their own lead in certain points of Zadokite praxis.” Moreover, they go on to describe the relations between the Qumran group and this other group as being “relatively serene”.

²² Allison, “The Fiction of James,” 567-568. Additionally, in Johannine scholarship it is often argued that John’s gospel attests to the existence of a Jewish group who attended synagogue and believed in Jesus. However, this group did not proselytize. For more on this see J. Louis. Martin, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1978). Allison speculates that this epistle might have emerged from a group such as the above-mentioned Jews in John, writing: “This coheres with the supposition that [James’] writing is in part a sort of apology. It has a two-fold audience – those who share the author’s Christian convictions and those who do not. And it has a two-fold purpose – edification for the former and clarification for the latter . . . James reflects a first-century Christian group still battling for its place within the Jewish community, a Christian group that wishes to remain faithful members of the synagogue, to be . . . both Jew and Christian.” See Allison, “The Fiction of James,” 570.

other.”²³ If we agree with Allison and Lockett’s interpretations of James 1:1, we are met with an overwhelming feeling of inclusiveness in terms of Jewish identity, but whether this inclusiveness spread to Gentiles is uncertain.

Similarly, Kloppenborg argues that the “twelve tribes” reference is best understood in its ordinary sense, as a designation of collective Israel, and “Diaspora” then needs to be understood geographically, denoting Judeans residing outside of Eretz Israel.²⁴ However, for Kloppenborg, the addressees of James are exclusively Jewish. His argument is built upon four points. Firstly, he interprets the faith versus works content (Jas 2:14-26) in terms of the writer being aware, as were others, of the “Pauline” distinction between faith and works, and undertaking to offer his own answer on the matter to Judaism in general.²⁵ Secondly, the statement of James 1:18 might be understood in connection with v.21, which seemingly refers to the Mosaic law, observance of which, as Philo also declares,²⁶ constitutes Judeans “as a kind of first fruit” because of the exceptional laws they follow.²⁷ If this reading is upheld, there is then no reason to restrict this letter to members of the Jesus movement. On the contrary, these addressees are Jews such as Philo addresses, and for them Torah observance distinguished them from others, “even though all received the

²³ See Darian Lockett, “‘Necessary but not Sufficient’: The Role of History in the Interpretation of James,” in *Explorations in Interdisciplinary Readings: Theological, Exegetical, and Reception-Historical Perspectives* (eds. Robbie F. Castleman, Darian Lockett, and Stephen O. Presley; Eugene: Pickwick Publications, 2017), 69-90, 81.

²⁴ Kloppenborg, “Judeans or Judean Christians in James,” 119.

²⁵ These four points are also covered in his article “Diaspora Discourse,” 246-250.

²⁶ See *Spec. leg.* 4. 180.

²⁷ Jackson-McCabe notes that the “word of truth” of 1:18 is similar to the *implanted word* of 1:21 in the sense that both reflect a philosophical notion of law originally conceived as being “implanted” by God in humanity. He writes: “The context in which reference [to birth by a word of truth] is made indicates that [James] considers this *logos* to be the common possession of all humanity rather than the peculiar possession of Christians. While comparison with other Christian literature reveals that the author’s characteristic supernatural and ethical dualism, as well as his remarkable hostility toward ‘the word’, are quite at home within early Christian thought, there is no indication in his letter that he, like Paul and the other of 1 John, consider the *logos* which is ‘able to save souls’ to be the unique possession of Christians.” Jackson-McCabe, *Logos and Law*, 238.

‘implanted *logos*’ and can potentially be born of the *logos* of truth.”²⁸ Third, the reference to blaspheming in James 2:7 has been taken by many commentators to refer to Jesus, and possibly was performed at the baptismal rite.²⁹ However, Kloppenborg points out it is not clear that the name is in fact Jesus, and nor is the phrase attested elsewhere in connection to baptism in the first two centuries CE. Finally, the fourth reason noted by Kloppenborg is the possible interpolation of James 2:1. If ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is omitted, only one direct mention of Jesus remains (i.e. Jas 1:1). Kloppenborg therefore notes that the force of his argument is “to suggest that the writer identifies with the Jesus movement and addresses fellow Judeans precisely as a member of that movement.”³⁰ If one agrees that James is addressed to Jews, the highly Jewish texture of this epistle makes sense.³¹ Moreover, it is conceivable that these Jewish literary devices and rhetoric are used to emphasize the hope for ingathering of the righteous people before the final judgment (Jas 5:9). Kloppenborg’s thesis is innovative, but it is also quite extremist. It seems likely that Jewish-Christians were also in James’ purview.

It is difficult to look past a literal reading of James 1:1, especially when one realizes the problem with reading and interpreting the twelve tribes in exclusively metaphorical terms.³² A metaphorical reading is further complicated when one realizes that the twelve tribes were technically still in existence when this letter was penned. Moreover, the insistence of attributing an overtly Christian meaning to this address, an address that blatantly exhibits such Jewish influence, seems questionable.³³ This strengths of a literal address are returned to below, but in this present context, it is important to note that James 1:1 also has

²⁸ Kloppenborg, “Judeans or Judean Christians,” 124.

²⁹ An example of one such commentator is Mayor, *St. James*, 89.

³⁰ Kloppenborg goes on to comment: “The fictive address had the function of promoting James’s credentials not merely among homeland Jews, but also Jews – that is, precisely among those with whom Paul came into occasional contact.” Kloppenborg, “Judeans or Judean Christians,” 134-135.

³¹ On this point Kloppenborg notes that if James was addressed to Jews in general then this “might account for the fact . . . that James fails to invoke specifically Christian beliefs and practices where one might otherwise expect it.” Kloppenborg, “Diaspora Discourse,” 251.

³² See Allison, *James*, 129-133.

³³ Cf. Lockett, “Necessary but not Sufficient,” 81.

an eschatological dimension. Below in §5.1.2. the deafening eschatological overtones of this verse, overtones that are at the core of this epistle’s message, are discussed, but in this present context it may be noted that Penner’s argument that “it is the eschatological character of this expression [James 1:1] which needs to be emphasized, not necessarily its precise designation” is most helpful and astute.³⁴ Keeping Penner’s argument in mind, it is to the eschatological overtones of James 1:1 that our attention will now turn.

5.1.2. James 1:1: Eschatological Significance

That James 1:1 evokes eschatological imagery is argued by Jackson-McCabe, Allison and Marcus, and to a lesser extent by Hartin.³⁵ Jackson-McCabe argues that any “attempt to read [James] 1:1 apart from the interest in the twelve tribes of Israel . . . seems to be on the face of it rather arbitrary.”³⁶ In light of this, he proposes that the opening address of James is best understood in the context of the widespread hope for eschatological restoration, and James 1:1 may thus be identified as a highly effective and significant address to this writing. The mention of the twelve tribes, according to him, connotes the view that God’s promise to Israel is yet unfulfilled, while at the same time, it sounds a note for hope in the future particularly in light of the preceding reference to Jesus as

³⁴ Penner, *James and Eschatology*, 183.

³⁵ Matt Jackson-McCabe, “A Letter to the Twelve Tribes in the Diaspora: Wisdom and ‘Apocalyptic’ Eschatology in the Letter of James,” *SBL Seminar Papers 1996* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 504-517; Allison, “The Fiction of James and Its *Sitz im Leben*,” 529-570; Joel Marcus, “The Twelve Tribes in the Diaspora (James 1:1),” *NTS* 60 (2014): 433-447; Hartin, *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus*, 78. It is interesting to note that this position is challenged by Shlomo Pines. He maintains that these addresses “are clearly supposed to be contemporaries of the author of the Epistle.” See Shlomo Pines, “Notes on the Twelve Tribes in Qumran, Early Christianity and Jewish Tradition,” in *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity. Presented to David Flusser on the Occasion of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday*. (eds. Ithamar Gruenwald, Shaul Shaked and Gedaliahu G. Stroumsa; Tübingen Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 151-154, 154.

³⁶ Jackson McCabe goes on to comment: “when [Jas] 1:1 is viewed in this context, it emerges as a highly evocative address that, from a deuteronomic perspective, both connotes a present state in which the promises of God remain unfulfilled and, especially in connection with Χριστός, it sounds a note of eschatological hope.” Jackson-McCabe, “A Letter to the Twelve Tribes,” 510.

Χριστός.³⁷ According to this composition (e.g. Jas 4:4), the world is thoroughly corrupt and antithetical to the purposes of God (cf. §3.2.2.). However, the mention of the twelve tribes in James 1:1 serves to remind the recipients that the present situation will not endure indefinitely. This situation will be reversed by a supernatural event that will entail judgment. The overall context of James suggests that the “rich” (2:5-7) will be destroyed and the fate of the “poor” will be reversed, their inheritance is the promised kingdom of God (cf. Jas 1:12).³⁸ Similarly, Hartin proposes that James’ address suggests a deuteronomic perspective of the author; however, he understands this to imply that Christians are already restored.³⁹ To summarize: while Jackson-McCabe interprets the address of James as representing the potential for the fulfillment of God’s promise to Israel in light of the impending eschatological judgment, Hartin understands it as portraying that Christians (i.e. the church as true Israel) are the restoration of the people of God.

Allison notes that, although the phrase αἱ δώδεκα φυλαί equates to שְׁנַיִם עָשָׂר שְׁבִטִים and is a common way of referring to all of Israel,⁴⁰ its qualification ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ is without parallel.⁴¹ Taking into account the writing’s inclusion of moral exhortations, and its apparent conviction that the end is near (Jas 5:9), and since “Israel’s repentance before the end was a stock item of Jewish eschatology”, Allison is a proponent of the suggestion that James can be read “in the light of the hoped-for ingathering of the twelve tribes at the consummation”.⁴² According to this reading, the hoped for ingathering of the twelve tribes is most applicable to Jews, although Jewish-Christians were most

³⁷ The hope for the re-unification of the northern and southern kingdoms is often expressed alongside the expectation of a Davidic king/messiah. This is especially the case in Ezekiel. See Ezek 47:13-14, 21-23; 45:8; 48.

³⁸ Cf. Jackson-McCabe, “A Letter to the Twelve Tribes,” 515.

³⁹ Hatin writes: “The epistle issues a call to those who are a part of this community to lead a life worthy of their having experienced God’s call to salvation, as those whom God has restored.” Hartin, *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus*, 78.

⁴⁰ See Gen 49:28; Exod 24:4; 28:21; 39:14; LXX Josh 4:5; Ezek 47:13; 1QM iii line 14; v lines 1 and 2; 4Q4379 1 line 5; 4Q158 4 line 3; 11Q Temple v line 7. Allison, *James*, 128, n. 102.

⁴¹ Allison, *James*, 128.

⁴² Allison, *James*, 133.

likely also to have been in his purview. This reading coheres with the possible allusion to LXX Isa 49:5-6 outlined below (see §5.1.3.).

Marcus agrees with Allison's argument that the reference to the "twelve tribes in the dispersion" invokes ideas about the ten lost tribes, but disagrees with his conclusion in terms of it being a deliberate reference to a *Jewish* entity. Rather, Marcus proposes that the remainder of those included in the restored Israel are Gentiles who had lost their Israelite identity while living in the Diaspora. It is these Gentiles, Marcus contends, that represent the remaining ten tribes but have been reawakened by their encounter with Jesus' message. The main difference between Allison and Marcus is that they disagree over whom this verse is addressed to. For Allison, James 1:1 is addressed to Jews and Jewish-Christians who make up the twelve tribes, whereas Marcus considers Gentiles to be in view also. In other words, Allison views 1:1 as an eschatological return of the ten lost tribes in primarily Jewish terms while Marcus interprets it as the eschatological conversion of Gentiles who embody those ten tribes. Marcus refers to texts such as *Ant* 11.133 and *4 Ezra* 13:39-47 where the apparent inaccessibility of the ten lost tribes is highlighted⁴³ and asks, "does the author of James . . . conceive as the Lost Tribes as reachable? If not, why does he bother to write (or pretend to write) to them?"⁴⁴ Marcus considers the identification of Gentile converts as a plausible answer to the previous question. He argues:

Gentile proselytes to Christianity, in other words, *are* the Ten Lost Tribes, who reveal that they are such precisely by responding to the good news about the Messiah of Israel. One advantage of this interpretation lies in its ability to provide a better explanation for James' confidence that he can address all the Israelite exiles without resorting to a magic carpet: the Ten Lost Tribes are not destroyed, nor far away in some Never Never Land beyond the

⁴³ Both *Ant* 11.133 and *4 Ezra* 13:39-47 claim that the ten tribes are somewhere beyond the Euphrates, but neither author seems to believe they are reachable. According to Michael E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Ezra* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 400, 404, the passages from *4 Ezra* and *Josephus* are the first developed traditions about the withdrawal of tribes to a farther land and their eventual return, a motif that later becomes common in rabbinic Judaism.

⁴⁴ Marcus, "The Twelve Tribes in the Diaspora (James 1:1)," 438.

Euphrates or the Sambatyon River, but very close, indeed as close as the nearest Gentile Christian.⁴⁵

Marcus notes numerous biblical references that he considers to be further indicative of the belief that the Ten Lost Tribes were hidden in plain sight (e.g. Isa 27:12-13; Zech 10:6-12). These textual references appear to situate the exiles living in known places among the heathen, and therefore some references seemingly express anxiety that the Israelite identity will be lost (e.g. Hos 7:8; 8:8). Marcus hence argues: “but if the Ten Lost Tribes are in the known world, and if they are not conspicuous there as Jews, they must have become so assimilated that they are now indistinguishable from Gentiles.”⁴⁶ In addition, Marcus briefly discusses John 10:14-16 suggesting that it may provide an analogy to his reading of James 1:1. He considers John 10:14-16 to be based on Ezek 34-37 which promises a new Davidic Messiah, and portrays the merging of two pieces of wood, one from the southern kingdom and the other from the northern kingdom, as being a symbol for God’s imminent ingathering of the exiles and restoration of the united kingdom.⁴⁷

Although Marcus’ thesis is at times compelling, his overall argument that Gentile Christians embody the ten lost tribes, is difficult to support.⁴⁸ For example, he traces the linkage of the Twelve Tribes with Gentile proselytes back to Paul’s treatment of the eschatological fate of “all Israel” in Rom 11:25-27, the inclusion of which is a nod to a recent article by Jason Staples, the content of which Marcus finds convincing.⁴⁹ While Staples’ argument may be persuasive in

⁴⁵ Marcus, “The Twelve Tribes in the Diaspora (James 1:1).” 438.

⁴⁶ Marcus, “The Twelve Tribes in the Diaspora (James 1:1).” 440.

⁴⁷ Marcus, “The Twelve Tribes in the Diaspora (James 1:1).” 444.

⁴⁸ Via email communication on June 5th 2016 between Allison and myself, Allison refers to Marcus’ article but reinforces his position. Having read Marcus’ article, he remains unconvinced that Gentiles are included among the audience of James.

⁴⁹ In “The Twelve Tribes in the Diaspora (James 1:1),” 438, n.20 Marcus writes, “In making this suggestion, I am following the lead of Jason Staples . . .” See Jason A. Staples, “What do Gentiles have to do with ‘All Israel’?” A Fresh Look at Romans 11:25-27,” *JBL* 130/2 (2011): 371-390. Staples discusses Rom 11:25-27 and investigates what Paul meant when he refers to “all Israel”. For Staples, the term “Israel” is polyvalent and it can have a variety of meanings. “Israel” necessarily includes Jews but is not limited to the Jews, while “all Israel”, he contends, is more specific and refers to the twelve tribes as a whole (p. 376). He notes this distinction seems

terms of Paul's inclusions of Gentiles, it is important to remember that his analysis is applicable to Romans, and perhaps even to Paul generally, but it does not necessarily infer that the same can be said in relation to James. Moreover, Staples' discussion is based on offering an explanation of the word "Israel" in Rom 11:25-27, but notably, this word does not occur in James 1:1. Although a correlation can reasonably be made between Israel and Diaspora, such a connection does not appear to be substantive enough to argue that James' use of Diaspora equals Paul's use of Israel, *contra* Marcus.

Bauckham identifies the eschatological significance of James 1:1 and, like Marcus, interprets this verse in terms of the eschatological restoration (or inclusion) of Gentiles. Bauckham's argument is innovative; he argues for the canonical context of James within so-called Catholic Epistles, and maintains that the inclusion of 1 Peter immediately after James serves to demonstrate the inclusion of Gentiles among the eschatological people of God. He advances:

If we read the catholic epistles in the order which at an early date came to be the accepted canonical order, with James in first place

to have been upheld by Josephus and the Qumran community where a general expectation of the eschatological restoration of the northern tribes is often encountered. Therefore, Staples considers it probable that Paul continued in this vein and made the same distinction when choosing his language. For example, he notes that in Romans 9:6 Paul makes it clear when he says "Israel," he does not restrict this meaning to ethnic Jews, nor does he think all those born Jews are "Israel" (378). Moreover, when describing himself Paul does not use the generic term "Jew"; rather, he identifies himself as "of the nation of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin." (Phil 3:5; Rom 11:1; 2 Cor 11:22). In addition, on p. 379 Staples argues Paul deliberately frames his own ministry with deliberate echoes of the prophet Jeremiah: Rom 11:13 echoes Jeremiah's commissions as "prophet to the nations" in Jer 1:5. If this is the case, this is then especially suggestive when one considers that Jeremiah's prophecy primarily concerns the reconstitution of all of Israel.⁴⁹ Although Gentiles are not mentioned in Jeremiah's prophecy, Staples proposes that faithful Gentiles (i.e. those "with the law written on their hearts" Rom 2:14-15) are the returning remnant of the house of Israel, united with the faithful from the house of Judah (i.e. the "inward Jews" of Rom 2:28-29). Therefore, for Staples, Paul's use of "all Israel" in Romans 11:25-27 is a reference to Jews and Gentiles alike. On p. 383 he writes: "It is precisely at this point that Paul is simultaneously the most continuous and discontinuous with traditional Judaism. He continues to preach God's special election of Israel, the lasting value of Israel's covenant, and the restoration and ultimate salvation of Israel; but he extends this election to Gentiles . . . In this sense, Paul's gospel could accurately be called 'messianic new covenant Israelitism'".

and 1 Peter immediately following, then we read first a letter addressed only to Jewish Christians as the twelve tribes in the Diaspora and then a letter apparently addressed only to Gentile Christians as ‘exiles of the diaspora’, to whom defining descriptions of Israel as God’s people are applied. One effect is to portray the inclusion of Gentiles in the eschatological people of God, which retains through its Jewish Christian members its continuity with Israel and yet is also open to the inclusion of those who had not hitherto been to God’s people (1 Pet 2:10). The inclusion of Gentiles in the eschatological people of God is thus portrayed in the catholic letters in their own way just as clearly as the Pauline corpus, reminding us that this was not confined to the Pauline mission but also happened, for example, in the church of Rome quite independently of Paul but in relationship with the mother church in Jerusalem . . . Gentile Christians, finding themselves addressed as ‘exiles in the diaspora’ are [thus] encouraged to find James’ letter to the twelve tribes in the Diaspora also addressed to them by virtue of their grafting into the root of Israel (Rom 11:17). It is theirs too, not as a Gentile appropriation of the Jewish inheritance but as the root into which they have been engrafted.⁵⁰

Bauckham convincingly argues for the inclusion of Gentiles in *vis-à-vis* the NT canon, but does this necessarily extend to an accurate interpretation of James? While the NT canon may deliberately emphasize the inclusion of Gentiles, we cannot determine whether this was James’ intention. What we can say with some confidence is that the mention of “the twelve tribes” in James 1:1 deliberately evokes imagery that signals the coming of the eschatological restoration to the recipients; that is to say, the present earthly situation will be reversed and a time of future judgment is on its way. The entire epistle permeates with this same message. This reading is reinforced by the inclusion of Χριστός in 1:1.⁵¹ In light of this immanent eschatological event, one’s pursuit of and adherence to revelation is all the more pressing. Being included among the faithful means inheriting “the crown of life” (Jas 1:12), whereas being included among the wicked means judgment (Jas 5:9). It is in accordance with this overall interpretation of James that the eschatological significance of James 1:1 is considered as being most important.

⁵⁰ Bauckham, *James*, 156-157.

⁵¹ Cf. Jackson-McCabe, “A Letter to the Twelve Tribes,” 515.

5.1.3. James 1:1: Scriptural Allusion to Isaiah 49:5-6

In the parameters of this present discussion it is noted that James 1:1 contains a seemingly deliberate allusion to Isa 49:5-6, the latter which envisages the eschatological restoration of the entire Jewish people.⁵² As we have just seen (i.e. §5.1.2.) a similar vision is also found in James. Moreover, James' reference to himself as "slave" (δοῦλος) serves to reinforce further this allusion as Deutero-Isaiah more than once identifies the suffering servant as Ἰακώβος (e.g. Isa 44:1-2, 21; 45:4; 48:20).⁵³ It is apparent that the author of this epistle believed the end was near (Jas 5:9), and it is therefore imperative for the author to signal it was time for those he considered to be righteous to be gathered back in. In this way, James may be read as the same sort of writing as 2 Bar 78-87; namely, an attempt to encourage the dispersed tribes to repent in preparation for the approaching day of judgment.⁵⁴ This sense of being gathered back in is frequently encountered in the NT and commonly spoken about in relation to the number "twelve". As there were originally twelve tribes of Israel, this number carries a sense of wholeness or completion. For example in the NT, the Q tradition includes Jesus' promise that his *twelve* disciples will judge the *twelve* tribes of Israel, which may be understood as an explicit reversal of Jewish expectation as the disciples are now the judges.⁵⁵

⁵² See John D. W. Watts, *Isaiah 34-66* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2005), 730-734. Isa 49:5-6 reads: "And now the Lord says, who formed me in the womb to be his servant, to bring Jacob back to him, for I am honoured in the sight of the Lord, and my God has become my strength, he says, 'It is too light a thing that you should be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the survivors of Israel; I will give you as a light to the nations, that my salvation may reach to the end of the earth.'" (Translation from NRSV).

⁵³ *Contra* Allison, *James*, 125, Isa 49:5-6 does not seem to be an instance when the suffering servant is identified as Ἰακώβος. However, the other occurrences of the slave being identified as Ἰακώβος suggest that James is deliberately drawing upon Isa 49:5-6 in 1:1.

⁵⁴ Cf. Allison, *James*, 133.

⁵⁵ See Matt 19:28; Luke 22:30. Penner argues that the Lukan version of this passage is particularly interesting in relation to the study of James: the judging of the twelve tribes of Israel in 22:30 is connecting those "having remained throughout" with Jesus in his trials. Penner notes that the same words and cognates appear in James 1:1-4. He comments: "It is not suggested that James 1:1-4 is based on the Lukan text or vice versa, only that the conjunction of the themes in both texts is quite striking, and since they occur in Luke in an eschatological context, the occurrence in James may well be likewise." Penner, *The Epistle of James and Eschatology*, 182.

For James, Christ makes the ingathering of the righteous possible. Although this is never directly stated in the composition, this is the most likely explanation of the eschatological imagery evoked in James 1:1. Moreover, this may explain the inclusion of “Christ” in this verse. Similarly, *4 Ezra* 13:12-13, 39-50 makes reference to the Messiah returning tribes to their land.⁵⁶ If the proposal put forward by Allison is supported, that is to say that it is a Jewish-Christian composition written by a Jew, it is thus possible to attribute its highly Jewish feel and character to its intended audience.⁵⁷ The allusion to Isa 49:5-6 serves to deliberately remind this Jewish and Jewish-Christian audience of the eschatological restoration of the entire Jewish people, a core Jewish belief. In James’ view, this eschatological restoration is even more imminent through the coming of Jesus. As Jewish-Christians have already recognized Jesus as the Messiah, their place has already been established among God’s righteous community, and hence this group is not directly in James’ view. Therefore, we might suggest that James’ focus is non-Christian Jews because the author wants to highlight what he considers to be the urgency of this group being gathered into God’s righteous community (cf. 1:1) in light of the immanent return of the judge (Jas 5:9). In this way, the “judge” of James 5:9 may also be interpreted as being God or Jesus.

James 1:1: Then who has Access to Revelation?

In §5.1.1. – 5.1.3. the various interpretations of James 1:1 are presented. But, what is the significance of a literal reading of James 1:1 over a metaphorical one? In other words, in terms of this present work, why does this matter? In simplistic terms, how one interprets James 1:1 has implications in terms of who we understand as being instructed to ask for wisdom in James 1:5. In other words, it is my argument that an accurate interpretation of James 1:1 will help to provide insight in terms of the ethnic group or groups that James perceived of as having access to σοφία ἄνωθεν. This is important because it is access to and

Furthermore, Revelation envisages a sealing of the twelve tribes, or their representatives, for deliverance in Rev 7:4-8. Cf. Laws, *The Epistle of James*, 48.

⁵⁶ Cf. Allison, *James*, 133.

⁵⁷ See Allison, “The Fiction of James,” 529-570; *idem*, “The Audience of James,” 58-77; Kloppenborg, “Judeans or Judeans Christian,” 113-135; *idem*, “Diaspora Discourse,” 242-270.

living in accordance with σοφία ἄνωθεν that enables one to be included among God’s faithful community.

If James 1:1 is taken at face value, that is, if it is interpreted literally then this would mean that James is addressed to Jews. Given that James is a Christian writing, a rational or common-sense approach would demand that the phrase “twelve tribes in the Diaspora” is thus referring to Jewish-Christians, but Allison’s argument that James’ address includes non-Christian Jews is innovative. He argues:

My suggestion, inferred from the character of James as a whole, is that its author wished his work to find an audience beyond the church, wished that it be heard not just by Christians but also by Jews who did not follow Jesus, Jews whose sympathy he hoped to win or maintain.⁵⁸

If James 1:1 is understood in these terms this would in turn mean that James’ address is somewhat exclusive in the sense that it is not extended to Gentiles. That James was written with an aim of maintaining irenic relations with the non-Christian Jews, as proposed by Allison, certainly bolsters the view that James did not have Gentiles in mind when he penned this epistle.⁵⁹ According to this interpretation, the potential or possibility of “getting into” this faithful community is open to Jews and non-Christian Jews, but not to Gentiles. Therefore, understood in these terms, the address of James 1:1 is not universal.

However, those who champion a metaphorical interpretation of James 1:1 may in turn argue for the possible universality of James 1:1. For example, we saw that Bauckham recognizes the Jewish significance of the phrase “ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ”, but for him this phrase represents a sort of inclusiveness. Bauckham investigates whether there are any continuities between James and Jesus’ teachings, and he identifies one as a sense of renewal and

⁵⁸ Allison, “The Audience of James,” 75.

⁵⁹ Allison comments: “In such a context, it would have made good sense to emphasize convictions rooted in the common religiosity of the wisdom literature, to uphold the importance of obedience to Torah, to affirm that followers of Jesus did not – as was no doubt rumoured of them – oppose faith to good works, and to omit potentially divisive Christian affirmations.” Allison, “The Audience of James,” 75.

reconstruction.⁶⁰ For Bauckham, the renewed Israel comprises of Jesus' disciples, and those who already live under the rule of God. As such, the latter contrast with the Gentiles.⁶¹ However, according to Bauckham, the Messianic renewal of Israel has the Messianic redemption of the whole world as its goal. Therefore, according to Bauckham, James is not:

designed to draw a sociological boundary between insiders and outsiders in order to reinforce the Christian community's sense of identity. There is no discussion of how the readers should relate to non-Christian neighbours, household structures or political authorities, such as is found in several other New Testament letters. The only 'outsiders' to whom reference is made are the rich, but whether they are outsiders or (sociologically) insiders is notoriously hard to determine, since James' concern is rather that the values they espouse are those of the world, not of God's kingdom. The concern is not with sociological boundaries but with values.⁶²

Therefore, if James 1:1 is read metaphorically, the address is conceivably open to Gentiles. In other words, the possibility of "getting into" and being part of this faithful community is extended to Gentiles. If this is the case, this may be seen as confirming Marcus' thesis discussed above.⁶³ That James 1:1 deliberately evokes imagery associated with the eschatological restoration of Israel seems certain, especially in light of its scriptural allusion of Isa 49:5-6 outlined in §5.1.3., and it is these eschatological overtones that make determining the recipients of revelation all the more pressing.

In this present work, it is argued that arguments favouring a literal interpretation of James 1:1 are more convincing (see §5.1.1.). This is based on the overtly Jewish tone of this writing. Indeed, much more of the content of this writing suggests a Jewish/ Jewish-Christian audience, and not a Gentile one. It is possible that James' non-inclusion of Gentiles may account for James' unpopularity among the early church for so long.⁶⁴ Therefore, at this present time

⁶⁰ See Bauckham, *James*, 97-108.

⁶¹ Bauckham, *James*, 99-100.

⁶² Bauckham, *James*, 106-107.

⁶³ Marcus, "The Twelve Tribes in the Diaspora (James 1:1)", 433-447.

⁶⁴ Cf. Cadoux, *The Thought of St. James*, 11.

we may tentatively conclude that James 1:1 envisages the eschatological restoration of the Jewish people. For James then, this community comprises of Jewish-Christians. That non-Christian Jews were also included seems likely. In other words, the opportunity to join or get into the faithful community of James is open to Jews and Jewish-Christians. Continued inclusion in this faithful community is predicated on asking for wisdom in James 1:5, because σοφία ἄνωθεν enables wise living and the doing of the *logos*, both of which are considered essential, and perhaps even urgent, in light of the eschatological overtones of this epistle. While eschatological restoration is promised to the faithful (i.e. Jas 1:1), being forever lost in the dispersion awaits the wicked (i.e. Jas 5:19-20). However, it is important to note that the request for wisdom in James 1:5 must be made in faith (cf. Jas 1:6 αἰτείτω δὲ ἐν πίστει). Perhaps one may thus infer then that, for James, it is only Jews and Jewish-Christians who can ask in faith. Even if the former is not an accurate inference, it seems to be the case that this invitation or opportunity is not extended to Gentiles. In this sense, the projected community of James is not entirely inclusive or universal. Our attention now turns to *4QInstruction* to see if a similar picture emerges, and if this has any implications in terms of our reading of James.

5.2. The Recipients of Revelation in 4QInstruction

Our attention now turns to investigate whether anything definitive might be said about the recipients of the revelation in *4QInstruction*. While James 1:1 is clearly addressed to “ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ”, and it is true that *4QInstruction*’s addressees is frequently referred to as a *mebin* (§2.1.3.1.) 4Q417 1 i lines 13b-18 portrays the bequeathing of חזון ההגו (i.e. one form of heavenly revelation in *4QInstruction*) to אנוש. Therefore, how אנוש is translated is crucial. Much of this below analysis is taken up with addressing questions concerning determinism and whether revelation is universal or not. Moreover, discussions of 4Q418 81+81a lines 1-2 and 4Q423 1, 2 i lines 1-are also offered because they may provide further insight when examining the recipients of this writing. This chapter concludes by returning to James and asking whether any new insights have been gained in light of how *4QInstruction* conceives of access to revelation. At the very least, it is hoped that this critical assessment of *4QInstruction* will add further context when discussing the conceptual recipients of James 1:1.

5.2.1. Interpreting אנוש

As will soon become clear it is not unfair to suggest that how one chooses to translate אנוש is among the most important interpretational decision they will make in regards to understanding 4QInstruction. This is because it is to this person/group of humanity that *the Vision of Hagu* is given. Three translations are possible, they are: (1) Enosh; (2) Adam; and (3) humanity. A translation of 4Q417 1 i 13b-18 is offered in §4.2.1., but in the interests of clarity, a translation of lines 15-18 is again presented below:

4Q417 1 i lines 15-18

Translation⁶⁵

15 For engraved *is* that which is ordained by God *against* all the *ini[quities]* of the children of שוה, *And* written in His presence *is* a book of memorial
16 of those who keep His word. *And that is* the appearance/*vision of the meditation* [חזון ההגו]⁶⁶ on a book of memorial [לספר זכרון]. *And He* /שוה(?) *gave* it as an inheritance to אנוש *Together with* a spiritual people [עם רוח]. F[ס]ר
17 according to the pattern of the Holy Ones [קדושים] *is his* (man's) fashioning. *But* no more [יעוד לוא] *has* meditation been given to a (?) fleshly spirit [רוח בשר],
For *it* (sc. flesh) knew/knows not the difference between
18 [goo]d and evil according to the judgment of *its* [sp]irit. *vacat* *And* thou, O understanding child, gaze on the mystery that is to come, *And* know

It is possible to translate the אנוש of 4Q417 1 i line 16 as the patriarch Enosh. With some hesitation Strugnell and Harrington support the “Enosh” translation noting that although “the reference to the specific Enosh remains unexpected here . . . such a role for him is conceivable in early haggada.”⁶⁷ The editors’ main rationale is that אנוש should not be read as a reference to humankind in general. Similarly, Lange maintains that אנוש may be understood as denoting the proper name of the antediluvian patriarch Enosh.⁶⁸ Lange reads these lines as depicting the רספ ההגו, a heavenly book first revealed to Enosh, as embodying the sapiential order of creation and referring to a pre-existent heavenly form of the torah. At first, Lange’s argument seems plausible, especially in view of the possible correlation between the ספר והגה and חזון ההגו

⁶⁵ Translation from DJD 34:155.

⁶⁶ Strugnell and Harrington translate חזון ההגו as “vision of mediation”. The translation “Vision of Hagu” is used throughout this thesis but either translation is equally appropriate. Cf. §4.2.1.

⁶⁷ DJD 34: 164.

⁶⁸ Langle, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 86-92.

outlined in §4.2.1., however, the differences between these two entities make Lange’s reading difficult to support. Likewise, Brooke supports reading this as a reference to the patriarch Enosh, and justifies this with reference to the proceeding context where there is mention of the sons of Seth.⁶⁹ Tigchelaar also interprets 4Q417 1 i lines 13b-18 as the bequeathing of the *Vision of Hagu* to Enosh with the understanding that God bestowed a special kind of insight on humanity.⁷⁰

The above translation of Enosh is dependent on translating בני שית as the “sons of Seth” in line 15 of 4Q417 1 i. While the connection of Enosh to Seth needs no further explanation, this translation of line 15 is difficult to support. 4Q417 1 i line 15 states that the בני שות will be judged by God for their iniquities, but as Seth is portrayed as an overwhelmingly positive figure in Second Temple literature (cf. Gen 5:1), it is thus difficult to understand why he would come to be associated with judgment in this line. In view of this, the translation of the בני שות in line 15 as “sons of Sheth”, a tribe whose proclamation of their destruction is made explicit in Num 24:17, is more compelling.⁷¹ The supposed close ties between Enosh and Seth in these lines hence disappears. Moreover, it is important to note that the patriarch Enosh is never associated with revelation in early Jewish literature,⁷² and nor is he generally used as an isolated example of

⁶⁹ George J. Brooke, “Biblical Interpretation in the Wisdom Texts from Qumran,” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (eds. Charlotte Hempel, Armin Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 201-222, 213.

⁷⁰ It should be noted that although Tigchelaar translates אנוש as Enosh, he appears to use Enosh and humanity interchangeably. See Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, “‘Spiritual People,’ ‘Fleshly Spirit,’ and ‘Vision of Meditation’: Reflections on 4QInstruction and 1 Corinthians,” in *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament* (ed. Florentino García Martínez; STDJ 85; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 103-118, 112.

⁷¹ Cf. Goff, *4QInstruction*, 158.

⁷² Frey’s reading of אנוש is noteworthy. He argues it denotes humanity and the patriarch Enosh. He cites *Jub* 4:12 which mentions Enosh being the first human being to invoke the name of the Lord. He writes: “This passage seems to refer to a mythological tradition of the fall of angels during the time of the sons of Seth, which presented Enosh and the עם רוח, the ‘people of the spirit’ as the only pious of their time.” Jörg Frey, “The Notion of Flesh in 4QInstruction and the Background of Pauline Usage,” in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Oslo*

righteousness. Taking all of this into account, the translation of אנוש as the antediluvian Enosh is not persuasive.

Another option is to translate אנוש as Adam. Collins and Goff are proponents of this view. This translation is conceivable, especially when 4Q423 1, 2 i lines 1-4, where the addressee has been given metaphorical authority over the Garden of Eden, is taken into account (see §5.2.3.), however, it is important that a distinction be made between metaphor and literal translation (cf. 5.1.1.). In the case of Collins, he chooses to translate אנוש as the first man, “Adam” arguing that 4Q417 1 i lines 13b-18 depicts two creations. According to Collins, there are two pre-determined groups of humanity and both are being portrayed and contrasted against one another in this pericope: “the spiritual people” (עם רוח) and the “fleshly spirit” (רוח בשר). He proposes that “Adam” is created in the likeness of the Holy Ones (i.e. קדושים in line 17) which he views as a paraphrase of Gen 1:27 where Adam was created in “the image of God” (בצלם אלהים), with אלהים understood not as God but a regular plural, signifying angels.⁷³ It is to this “Adam” together with the עם רוח that the חזון ההגו is being given. According to this reading, it is possible to view these lines as depicting the restoration of the original knowledge given to Adam in the garden. The creation of אנוש and the spiritual people is described as a fashioning (יצר) by angelic beings. The רוח בשר are those who fail to distinguish between right and wrong and are represented in Gen 2.⁷⁴ Therefore, when interpreting 4Q417 1 i lines 13b-18 Collins sees two creations and two pre-determined groups of peoples; the עם רוח share in the likeness of the holy ones, whereas the רוח בשר do not.⁷⁵

Goff has further articulated Collins’ view arguing this pericope may be grounded in Gen 1-2 and portrays two creations and the two pre-determined groups of humanity. According to Goff, the author of *4QInstruction* roots the formation of two distinct types of people in the creation of humankind and this is exemplified by the text’s allusions to Gen 1-3. He translates 4Q417 1 i lines 16-17 as: “He bequeathed it (the vision of Hagu) to אנוש together with a spiritual

1998 (eds. Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez, and Eileen M. Schuller; STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 197-225, 219.

⁷³ Collins, “In the Likeness of the Holy Ones,” 615.

⁷⁴ Collins, “In the Likeness of the Holy Ones,” 615-618,

⁷⁵ Cf. Wold, “The Universality of Creation,” 217.

people, be[cau]se he fashioned him according to the likeness of the holy ones”.⁷⁶ Goff accepts Collins’ translation of אָנוּשׁ of the first man “Adam”, and defends this position with reference to 1QS iii lines 17-18 where he maintains the same phrase is used to allude to the first man Adam.⁷⁷ Therefore, according to this reading, the עַם רֹוה⁷⁸ were created in a way that makes them similar to the angels. He notes: “they have a תְּבִינָה, or ‘form,’ that is like the angels,”⁷⁸ and by implication, Adam was fashioned like the angels.⁷⁹ It is possible that the view that Adam acquired angelic wisdom may derive from Gen 3:5.⁸⁰ Goff notes that in contrast to the god-like Adam of Gen 1, the Adam in Gen 2 is earthly. For example, in Gen 2:7 Adam’s base and earthly nature is stressed.⁸¹ He comments: “If כְּתִבְנִית קְדוּשִׁים should be associated with the expression בְּצֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים from Genesis 1:27, רוּה בִשָׂר perhaps paraphrases the phrase חִיָּה נֶפֶשׁ from Genesis 2:7.”⁸² 4Q416 1 line 12 affirms that it is the רוּה בִשָׂר who will be destroyed in the final judgment, while in 4Q418 81+81a lines 1-2 the addressee is told he has

⁷⁶ Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 84.

⁷⁷ Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 96. It is interesting to note that Wold disagrees with Goff’s argument that the first man Adam is being referred to in 1QS iii lines 17-18, and rather Wold understands these lines as referring to the creation of humanity as opposed to Adam. Wold, “Universality of Creation,” 218.

⁷⁸ Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 97. See also Collins, “In the Likeness of the Holy Ones,” 613 where he points out that the word (i.e. תְּבִינָה) is used in Ezekiel and the Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice to refer to angels. See Ezek 10:8; 11Q17 viii lines 3-4.

⁷⁹ Adam is often associated with angelic wisdom in early Jewish texts. E.g. *Jubilees* depicts the angels as teaching in the garden (3:15), while the *Treatise of the Two Spirits* associates heavenly revelation with Adam (1QS iv lines 22-23). Cf. Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 97-98.

⁸⁰ In Gen 3:5 the serpent tells Eve “for God (אֱלֹהִים) knows that when you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God (כְּאֱלֹהִים), knowing good and evil.” In the LXX the latter is translated as “like divine beings” which seems to suggest that whoever translated this verse seemed to think that the knowledge of good and evil would make Adam like the angels. Cf. Goff. *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 98.

⁸¹ Gen 2:7 reads: “then the Lord God formed man (הָאָדָם) from the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being (חִיָּה נֶפֶשׁ)”.

⁸² Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 98. Elgvin understands the phrase יִצְרָה קְדוּשִׁים יִצְרָה as a conflation of Gen 1:27 and 2:7, arguing that *4QInstruction* did not interpret Genesis as attesting the creation of two Adams, but as one. See Elgvin, “An Analysis of 4QInstruction,” 91. However Elgvin’s point appears to be here irrelevant as this conflation is being used with the intention of demonstrating two different types of humanity (if applicable), not two different Adams.

been separated from this group (see §5.2.2.). Therefore, according to this reading, while the עֵם רֹחַ correspond to the god-like Adam and are in the likeness of the angels, the רֹחַ בֶּשֶׂר do not share this likeness and/or are created without the ability to know the חֶזוֹן הַהִגּוֹ. Hence, like Collins, Goff finds in *4QInstruction* a “double predestination” where there are two contrasting types of humankind based upon two creations in Gen 1-2.⁸³ Moreover, both point to later rabbinic works where Adam is associated with the heavenly realm.⁸⁴ 4Q417 1 i lines 17-18 state that the רֹחַ בֶּשֶׂר cannot distinguish between good and evil, whereas it can be reasonably inferred that the עֵם רֹחַ can. In Chapter Four it was established that the חֶזוֹן הַהִגּוֹ and the רִז נְהִיָּה allow one to distinguish between good and evil, and this reaffirms that the רֹחַ בֶּשֶׂר are no longer given revelation, rendering them unable to be able to distinguish between good and evil.⁸⁵ Goff argues: “It can be deduced further that this knowledge is inscribed in the heavenly book of remembrance. This suggests that the knowledge of good and evil . . . also signifies broad insights into the nature of reality and God’s deterministic plan that shapes it, which is inscribed in this book.”⁸⁶

The suggestion of translating אָנוּשׁ as Adam cannot be definitely ruled out. Furthermore, it provides a useful explanation as to why there are two creation accounts and why there appears to be two different sets of people in the world. It would seem that during the Hellenistic period references to the Genesis creation stories became the means through which authors articulated their struggles with understanding the duality of the human condition, and the numerous allusions to it in this and other texts most likely demonstrates the centrality of this issue for

⁸³ This might be seen as analogous to Philo, who presents a contrast between the original human of Genesis 1 and the mortal of Genesis 2-3, the latter who lacks the necessary discernment and comes from the earth. He famously reads the Genesis creation accounts as indicative of a double creation. See *Opif*, 134-135. Cf. Adams, *Wisdom in Transition*, 261.

⁸⁴ E.g. 1QS iv lines 22-23 include a portrait of the interrelated subjects (the righteous elect, Adam, and the angels) where the chosen group receives the “wisdom of the sons of heaven” in order to achieve the “glory of Adam”. See Collins, “In the Likeness of the Holy Ones,” 616-617. Similarly, Goff refers to *Jubilees* 3:15 which depicts the angels teaching Adam in the garden and *2 En* 30:11 where Adam is referred to in angelic terms. Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 97, n. 77.

⁸⁵ The topic of evil will be returned to in Chapter Six.

⁸⁶ Goff, *4QInstruction*, 164.

many people.⁸⁷ As Collins and Goff argue, the duality of creation is manifest in this document through the division of the עַם רֹוּחַ and the בֶּשֶׂר רֹוּחַ, and therefore the subsequent argument of viewing this against the backdrop of the two creation accounts has merit. However, whether this neat division in terms of the creation of humanity (in *4QInstruction*) actually exists remains questionable. Furthermore, although translating אָנוּשׁ as Adam is plausible, a more likely and compelling option is available (see below). Finally, it is important that the full implications of this interpretation are recognized. If these lines are read as the bestowing of revelation to the spiritual people only, this in turn means that the revelation of *4QInstruction*, at least in terms of the *Vision of Hagu*, is not universal, and hence, everything, according to *4QInstruction*, is pre-determined. Therefore, the recipients of *4QInstruction*'s revelation are exclusive.

A third suggestion in terms of translating אָנוּשׁ is offered by Elgvin, Wold and Rey. While all agree choose to translate it as “humanity”, little agreement can be found among their respective analyses. Elgvin opts to translate אָנוּשׁ as man/mankind arguing it carries this meaning when encountered in three other instances in *4QInstruction*.⁸⁸ Likewise, translating אָנוּשׁ as humanity, Wold views all of humanity being created in the likeness of the holy ones and not just the עַם רֹוּחַ, *pace* Collins and Goff.⁸⁹ Rey does not offer any analysis on translating אָנוּשׁ as “Adam” but argues it is best translated as “humanity” (i.e., l’homme). He reasons that אָנוּשׁ is well attested at Qumran and in particular *4QInstruction* (e.g. 4Q416 2 ii line 12; 4Q418 77 line 3) to describe humankind. In addition, he maintains that the common-sense meaning of “humanity” is the most appropriate in the context of this pericope.⁹⁰

Initially the translation “humanity” may be seen as causing a tautological problem; that is, it is problematic to read this line as the giving of הַזִּוּן הַהַגּוּ to

⁸⁷ See 1Cor 3:1; 15: 45-49; Gal 5; Philo, *Leg*, 1.31. Cf. Goff, “Genesis 1-3 and Conceptions of Humankind in *4QInstruction*, Philo and Paul,” 122-123.

⁸⁸ According to Elgvin, אָנוּשׁ is best translated as “man” in 4Q418 55 line 11; 4Q418 77 line 3 and 4Q416 4 lines 11-12. Additionally, Elgvin hypothesizes that this phrase always carries this meaning in Qumran literature (e.g. 1QS xi lines 5-6), although he notes a lacuna in 4Q369 might be an exception to this. Elgvin, “The Mystery to Come,” 143, n. 78.

⁸⁹ Wold, *Women, Men and Angels*, 139.

⁹⁰ Rey, *4QInstruction*, 281.

humanity *and* the spiritual people since presumably the latter phrase denotes one category of humankind.⁹¹ Indeed, Goff argues: “If אנוש refers to humankind in 4Q417 1 i 16, this line states that humanity receives the vision of Hagu. This accords poorly with the assertion of line 17 that the vision is not given to the fleshly spirit.”⁹² In his more recent work Wold has addressed this tautological issue; by expanding upon Werman’s work, he calls into question the existence of the category of the spiritual people. As the spiritual people are considered by most as denoting a category of humanity, this is especially challenging. Werman proposes an alternative reading by focusing on the correlation the scribe added to line 16. Werman reads עם רוח as an attributive of אנוש rather than translating the first עם as the preposition “with” and the second עם as the noun “people”.⁹³ That is to say, she translates עם רוח as “a people with a spirit” as opposed to “with spiritual people”. Werman’s translation is persuasive as this in turn would mean that all of humanity, that is to say, a humanity with a spirit, were fashioned in the likeness of the holy ones and thus given access to Hagu.⁹⁴

In his 2005 monograph Wold translates ועוד לוא in line 17 as “but no more” and reasons that the הזון ההגו is no longer given to the fleshly spirit.⁹⁵ However it remains unclear as to when the fleshly spirit came to be separated. For Rey, the separation can be defined in terms of those who succeeded or failed in terms of pursuing the רז נהיה. As discussed in §4.2.2. – 4.2.3. the רז נהיה includes knowledge concerning good and evil. Its adherence therefore allows one to live in harmony with the cosmos.⁹⁶ By implication, this means that the fleshly spirit represent those who have failed in this endeavor. Goff notes that the fall is not directly alluded to in *4QInstruction*, but suggests if ועוד לוא is translated as “but no more”, this might be a veiled reference to Adam’s expulsion from

⁹¹ This problem was originally identified by Strugnell and Harrington. See DJD 34: 165.

⁹² Goff, “Adam, the Angels,” 17.

⁹³ Werman, “What is ‘the book of Hagu?’” 137.

⁹⁴ Perhaps it should be noted that while Fletcher-Louis analysis does not match Werman’s, he also expresses doubt or hesitation in using the phrase “spiritual people” arguing: “in English parlance this expression is weaker than is demanded by the sharp contrast with ‘spirit of flesh’”. See Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 117.

⁹⁵ Wold, *Women, Men and Angels*, 99.

⁹⁶ Rey, *4QInstruction*, 304.

Eden.⁹⁷ However, there remains an ambiguity as to when the separation of the רוח עם⁹⁸ and רוח בשר actually took place. Werman's translation might provide a solution to this problem. If we adopt the translation "a people with a spirit", in turn the category of "spiritual people" disappears, and therefore the need to explain this separation no longer applies. Moreover, if the category "spiritual people" is not found here, it is not found elsewhere in *4QInstruction* or the whole of early Jewish literature, calling its very existence into question. Convincingly, Wold advances:

What is left in the vision of Hagu passage is an explanation that a segment of humanity has lost access to revelation. The reason for this is given in lines 17-18, and the statement "according to the judgment of its spirit" tells us that the fleshly spirit was "spiritually" capable to distinguish between good and evil . . . It is not that a contrast between divisions of humanity is not present in the vision of Hagu, but rather it is not evoked with these two categories and the (non-existent) category רוח עם should not be used to depict a clear-cut binary relationship with the spirit of flesh here or elsewhere in the document.⁹⁸

In relation to the expression וְעוֹד לֹא, Wold expertly notes that it has been too often glossed over.⁹⁹ For example, Rey renders this line "He did not give the vision to the fleshly spirit" ("Mais il n'a pas donné la vision à un esprit charnel") but offers no explanation or justification.¹⁰⁰ As we have just seen, Goff translates the phrase לֹא וְעוֹד as "but no more",¹⁰¹ while Tigchelaar opts for "moreover".¹⁰² Adams applies a different reading; he chooses to read the phrase as "still" or "not

⁹⁷ Goff, *4QInstruction*, 166.

⁹⁸ Wold, "The Universality of Creation," 221-222.

⁹⁹ Wold, "The Universality of Creation," 220.

¹⁰⁰ Rey, *4QInstruction*, 281.

¹⁰¹ It is interesting to note in his earlier work Goff preferred to translate לֹא וְעוֹד as "moreover". See Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 84; *idem*, *Discerning Wisdom*, 30. However, he has since revised his position. See Goff, "Adam, the Angels," 13; *idem*, "Genesis 1-3 and Conceptions of Humankind in 4QInstruction, Philo and Paul," 118. In the latter reference Goff notes (118) that "4Q417 1 i 17 may imply that at one point the fleshly spirit possessed Hagu but the vision was later taken away from it. This line would then contain an indirect reference to Adam's removal from the garden and thus the tree of life and the tree of knowledge of good and evil."

¹⁰² Tigchelaar, "Reflection on 4QInstruction," 106.

yet”, maintaining this “conveys a continual holding of insight from the ‘fleshly spirit,’” which he further views as a “resolute denial by God that began at creation.”¹⁰³ Strugnell and Harrington’s rendering of the phrase as “but no more” seems to be most on the mark, and this in turn implies that the fleshly spirit are no longer given the *הזון ההגו*. This former meaning implies there was a time when those now considered fleshly spirit possessed this knowledge; or to be more precise, there was a time when everyone possessed this special wisdom, but some went astray which resulted in them being designated as fleshly and losing their access. If this is the case, Wold notes, the sharp distinction “between the two divisions of humanity must be found somewhere other than a spiritual creation on one hand, and a fleshly creation on the other, in which this latter segment of humanity was ontologically excluded from creation.”¹⁰⁴

An explanation as to why the fleshly spirit lost access to revelation can be found in 4Q417 1 i line 18: it is because they did not distinguish between good and evil according to their spirit. This is to say that the *רוח בשר* were spiritually capable of doing so, but failed and succumbed to their fleshly desires. Wold interprets *רוח* as being indicative of a person’s character generally. For him, the beginning point for everyone is “spirit” in terms of gaining knowledge, but failure to maintain this “spirit” leads to it becoming a “spirit of flesh”.¹⁰⁵ This may account for the numerous concerns for the preservation of the *mebin*’s spirit encountered throughout (e.g. 4Q416 2 ii lines 6-7). Therefore, the designation *רוח בשר* is speaking in terms of their human condition. Wold’s suggestion that this may account for the deliberate emphasis of humanity with a spirit in line 16 hence makes a lot of sense.¹⁰⁶ The *רוח עם* have preserved their elevated status, and by extension, their access to revelation.

While it remains difficult to adequately articulate the status of the addressees of 4Q*Instruction*, I argued previously (§2.1.3.2.) that discussing this

¹⁰³ According to Adams, a similar example of this construction of the meaning can be found in 2 Chron 20:33: “Yet the high places were not removed: the people had not yet set their hearts upon God of their ancestors.” Adams, *Wisdom in Transition*, 258.

¹⁰⁴ Wold, “The Universality of Creation,” 221.

¹⁰⁵ See Benjamin Wold, “‘Flesh’ and ‘Spirit’ in Qumran Sapiential Literature and Its Background to the Use in Pauline Epistles,” *ZNW* 106/2 (2015): 262-279, 265-267.

¹⁰⁶ Wold, “The Universality of Creation,” 222.

group using terms such as exaltation or elevation is most appropriate. Election implies a deterministic reading and such readings become problematic when the translation “humanity” is considered to be more compelling. Translating אנוש as humanity understands that in the beginning, all of humanity were originally given access to revelation. Consequently, a deterministic reading is not applicable. It is inappropriate or misguided to understand the loftier status of this addressee in terms of his access to revelation because in the beginning all had such access. In other words, access to revelation is not demonstrative of election, but loss of revelation is representative of the loss of one’s exalted status. A dualistic portrayal of humanity in terms of creation is not being expressed in this composition, *contra* Collins and Goff. In the beginning, all of humanity were given access to this revelation, but some succumbed to fatigue and failed in their pursuit. This resulted in them losing access to this revelation and being designated as “fleshly”. *4QInstruction* makes clear that being labeled as “fleshly” is something the *mebin* should avoid at all costs as such people stand condemned at the final judgment (4Q416 1 line 12). It is interesting to note that the author conveys a subtle difference between the רז נהיה and the חזון ההגו. While the *mebin* is continually instructed to study or contemplate the רז נהיה, lines 13b to 18 4Q417 1 i appear to be more concerned with who has access to the חזון ההגו. Hence the primary concern of 4Q417 1 i 13b-18 may be described as detailing who still has access to revelation. Moreover, 4Q417 1 i 16 makes clear that the *Vision of Hagu* has already been revealed.

4QInstruction presents all of humanity as having the ability of being able to differentiate between good and evil and to act wisely in the beginning; however, only a percentage of humanity have actually acted in accordance with this revelation, thereby maintaining their place among God’s faithful community. At this point, it is important to signpost an interesting parallel with James: while it is the case that both writings portrays revelation as enabling its recipients to live in harmony with God’s cosmos and hence be included God’s faithful community, in *4QInstruction* being included among this community seems to be a matter of “staying in”, whereas in James, the emphasis appears more to be on “getting in” or joining. Therefore, in *4QInstruction* revelation enables the maintenance of exaltation, whereas in James revelation empowers the recipients to join God’s faithful community. *4QInstruction* may then be understood as

addressed to those who have continued to maintain their exalted status, but this continuance is dependent on their action to pursue wisdom. They are the manifestation of the faithful community. Preservation of their exalted status is representative of them being special. This is why such an urgency to pursue revelation is portrayed throughout the document.

If *אנוש* is taken to mean humanity, the only division present in this pericope is between those who have remained vigilant in their pursuit of wisdom, and those who have had this privilege taken away as their vigilance wavered. The *רוח בשר* are now denied access to revelation. While the question of whether Gentiles are included in this faithful community will be addressed in the concluding section of this chapter, in this present context it needs to be noted that in *4QInstruction*, as was the case in James, we see the author's perception of a faithful Israel community, and it may hence be understood as being made up of those whom the author considers as being separate from the rest of faithless Israel. In this present context, it is thus interesting to note that it is possible that a division is being portrayed between faithful and faithless Israel.

5.2.2. 4Q418 81+81a lines 1-2: Separation of the Addressee from the *רוח בשר*

According to the convincing interpretation suggested by Wold, 4Q417 1 i lines 13b-18 state that in the beginning, all of humanity were given access to revelation. However, 4Q417 1 i lines 17-18 also note that this revelation is no longer given to the *רוח בשר* because they did not distinguish between good and evil according to their spirit. The separation of the *mebin* from the *רוח בשר* is brought into sharper focus in 4Q418 81+81a, as is his exaltation.¹⁰⁷ A primary objective of *4QInstruction* may be described as instructing or warning the *mebin*

¹⁰⁷ Wold identifies a number of similarities between 4Q417 1 i lines 13b-18 and 4Q418 81+81a: both contain notions of inheritance, and perhaps most importantly, both conceive of a division between the addressee and the fleshly spirit. See Wold, *Women, Men and Angels*, 107-108. Wold also identifies some similarities between 4Q418 81+81a and creation in Genesis. For example, in 4Q418 81 + 81a 1-2 the addressee is exhorted to distinguish (הבדיל) between the fleshly spirit so that he might be separate (הבדל) from all that God detests. The Genesis 1 creation account uses the same verb (בדל) on a number of occasions (e.g. Gen 1:4, 6-7, 1). Moreover, he argues an explicit allusion to creation is present in the phrase *עשה כול*. Although this phrase does not occur verbatim in Gen 1-3, the verb *עשה* itself does occur repeatedly in the acts of creation (e.g. Gen 1:7, 11, 12, 16, 25, 26, 31; 2:2, 3, 4, 18).

not to become part of the רוח בשר (cf. 4Q416 1 line 10-17). Avoiding this fate is made possible through one's pursuit of revelation. In 4Q418 81+81a lines 1-6 the author emphasizes the addressee is to separate from those considered fleshly.¹⁰⁸ Presented below is Strugnell and Harrington's translation of the first six lines.

4Q418 81+81a 1-6

Translation¹⁰⁹

1 [for the utterance of] thy lips. *He has* opened up a spring So *that* thou [ואתה] mayest bless the Holy Ones [קדושים], And (*so that*) *as* (*with*) an everlasting fountain *thou* mayest praise *His* n[ame. The]n has He separated thee [הבדילכה] from every
 2 fleshly spirit [רוח בשר], *So that thou mightiest* be separated from every thing that He hates, *And* (*mightiest*) hold thyself aloof from all that *His* soul abominates. [Fo]r He has made everyone,
 3 And has made them to inherit each his own inheritance [נהלתו]; *But* He is thy portion and thy inheritance among the children of *mankind* [בני אדם], [And over] his (*Adam's?/God's*) [in]heritance has He *set them* in authority. *But* thou
 4 by (doing) this honour Him, By consecrating thyself to Him, Just as He has appointed thee as a *Holy of Holies* [לקדוש קודשים] [*over all the*] *earth*, And (just as) among all the[Go]dly [Ones]
 5 has He cast thy lot, And has magnified thy glory greatly. He has appointed thee for Himself as a first-born among [בכור ב] [] *sa*[ying] 'I will bless thee'
 6 And My bounty to thee I will give. As for *thee*, *do not* My good things belong to thee? Yes, in faithfulness to Me walk thou continually[]

¹⁰⁸ It is important to note that 4Q418 81+81a describes differing levels of exaltation within the *mebin's* community. For example, line 3 stresses that the *mebin* has a different inheritance than the בני אדם, and yet the latter group are also understood as being righteous. In his "Is the 'Firstborn Son' in 4Q369 a Messiah? The Evidence from 4QInstruction," *RevQ* 29/1 (2017): 3-20, 4-5, Wold suggests that *4QInstruction* may be understood as an address to initiates who are at differing stages of discipleship. He maintains that the use of singular subject "you" [אתה] in these lines should not be overlooked. For Wold, the use of this second person singular does not apply to all within the *mebin's* community because members acquire revealed wisdom in differing degrees. *4QInstruction* addresses a variety of people in different positions. For example, immediately preceding the address of the exalted figure in 4Q418 81+81a is instruction in relation to one doing manual labour (lines 15-16). See Wold, *4QInstruction: Divisions and Hierarchies*, 98. Cf. Wold, "'Flesh' and 'Spirit' in Qumran Sapiential Literature," 273. Here Wold comments: "Since 4QInstruction is interested in different members of the group, including women, one way to interpret 4Q418 81+81a is as one Maskil instructing another in the role of Maskil."

¹⁰⁹ Translation from DJD 34: 302-303.

This separation of the *mebin* from the *רוח בשר* is crucial for understanding the status of the addressee.¹¹⁰ Additionally, 4Q418 81+81a makes clear that it is God who separated the addressee from this other group.¹¹¹ Similar to the *Vision of Hagu* passage (i.e. 4Q417 1 i lines 13b-18), 4Q418 81+81a has been interpreted differently by various scholars. For example, in light of Goff's reading of 4Q417 1 i lines 13b-18 it is not surprising to learn that he considers this passage to be a further indication of two creations and of two groups of humanity. Goff understands the *רוח בשר* to be representative of non-elect humanity, and therefore the emphasis on the *mebin* being separate from this group is indicative of the elect status he possesses. For Goff, the *mebin* is included among the *spiritual people*. Therefore, the reference to the *mebin* in relation to the *קודשים* (line 1) and the special inheritance he will receive, are best understood, according to him, in terms of being demonstrative of his continued election (line 3).¹¹²

While it is argued that the exaltation of the *mebin* is expressed throughout this pericope, the language of election is once again rejected. Moreover, the existence of the “spiritual people” as a category is called into question in §5.2.1. However, it is clear that 4Q418 81+81a are affirming the *mebin's* superior or exalted status. For example, the *mebin's* glory is magnified and he is set among the angels (lines 4-5), he is described as a “first born” [בכור] (line 5), and is told he will inherit an “inheritance” from God (line 3), and will have authority over this inheritance (line 6). These designations have served as a vocal point for a number of scholars. For example, Lange identifies the concept of “first born” as an allusion to Num 18:20 and suggests that it “should be interpreted as describing the election of either Aaron or Aaronite priests”,¹¹³ while similarly

¹¹⁰ See also §2.1.3.1.

¹¹¹ In *To Increase Learning*, 232, Tigchelaar notes that the separation of the *mebin* from the *רוח בשר* is intended in a theological sense as opposed to a physical one.

¹¹² Goff, *4QInstruction*, 242-246.

¹¹³ Lange's argument that the addressee of *4QInstruction* is an Aaronic priest is in four parts: (1) 4Q418 81+81a line 4 speaks of God placing the addressee “at the holiest of holy things” (לקדוש); (2) the mention in line 1 of praising God as an eternal well/spring may be seen as an allusion to the priestly praise of God in the temple; (3) line 3 exhorts the addressee to keep separate from the fleshly spirit using the term *גור* which is often carries priestly connotation in post-exilic literature; and (4) that in line 7 when the *mebin* is instructed to *דרוש משפטיו* which denotes a specific priestly function. Armin Lange, “The Determination of Fate by the Oracle of

Tigchelaar interprets the separation of the *mebin* from the רוּחַ בָּשָׂר and the implied superiority of his status in light of the biblical allusion to inheritance in line 3, and considers it as depicting a priestly address. He comments:

The phrase ‘he has separated you from every spirit of flesh’, may be interpreted in the light of line 3 וְהוּא חֲלַקְכָּהּ וּנְחַלְתָּכָה בְּתוֹךְ בְּנֵי אָדָם which quotes the promise of Aaron in Num 18.20. In Num 8.14 and 16.9 the same verb הַבְדִּיל is used with regard to the Levites, where it is said they have been separated from the midst of the Israelites, or the congregation of Israel. Deut 10.8-9 combines these concepts: בַּעַת הַהוּא הַבְדִּיל יְהוָה אֶת שְׁבַט הַלְוִי: ‘at the time the Lord set apart the tribe of Israel’ for several cultic tasks, followed in verse 9 by עַל כֵּן לֹא הָיָה לְלִי חֶלֶק וּנְחִלָּה עִם אֶהְיֶה וְנִחַלְתִּי הוּא נִחַלְתִּי. Just as בְּנֵי אָדָם in line 3 replaces the biblical בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, so רוּחַ בָּשָׂר replaces בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל or עַדַת יִשְׂרָאֵל in this phrase. In other words, רוּחַ בָּשָׂר and בְּנֵי אָדָם seem to be synonymous in this fragment.¹¹⁴

Tigchelaar’s identification and interpretation of these lines is not wholly convincing. For example, reading the terms רוּחַ בָּשָׂר and בְּנֵי אָדָם as synonymous is not plausible. 4Q418 81+81a lines 1-2 clearly state that the *mebin* is not the רוּחַ בָּשָׂר, while line 3 depicts the addressee as being among (בְּתוֹךְ) the בְּנֵי אָדָם. Therefore, these phrases cannot be understood as depicting the same category of humanity.¹¹⁵ The term בְּנֵי אָדָם appears to be used to denote humanity in general, while we know that the רוּחַ בָּשָׂר represents those who have gone astray and are now considered wicked. Moreover, these lines appear to be more concerned with distinguishing the *mebin* from a portion of humanity (i.e. the fleshly spirit) and not communicating a priestly division. Fletcher-Louis also understands the emphasis on the separation of the addressee and the “fleshly spirit” to be indicative of the addressee having a “transcendent ontology”, and thus likely to be a priest.¹¹⁶ While it would seem that priestly language is being deliberately evoked in this passage, it is best understood as a means of further emphasizing

the Lot in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Mesopotamian Literature,” in *Sapiential. Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organisation of Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998: Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet* (eds. Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez; STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 39-48. 40-48.

¹¹⁴ Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 232.

¹¹⁵ Cf. Wold, *Women, Men and Angels*, 169.

¹¹⁶ Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 182-183.

the superiority of the addressee in relation to the *רוּחַ בִּשְׂר*, and not as anything else *contra* Lange, Tigchelaar, and Fletcher-Louis. It would seem that the separation of the *mebin* is what the author considers as most important.

Strugnell and Harrington propose 4Q418 81+81a is addressed to both an exalted figure and a class of humanity of a lesser status, but consider the identification of the *mebin* as a “first born” as “a little surprising”, and as “holy of holies” as “not impossible”.¹¹⁷ In a recent article, Wold refers to an influential study by Kugel in which Kugel highlights that the phrase “first born” (בֶּן בְּכוֹר) refers to “Israel” or a “faithful figure”.¹¹⁸ Wold identifies Kugel’s analysis as valuable because it serves to underscore the distinction that the author of *4QInstruction* appears to be once again making between faithful and faithless Israel. For Wold then, 4Q418 81+81a is addressed to an exalted figure(s) “who stands between the superior and exemplary holy ones (‘angels’) and a faithful community (‘men of good pleasure’).”¹¹⁹ Wold also discusses the occurrence of בְּכוֹר in 4Q418 81 line 5 in connection to 4Q416 2 ii line 14 and maintains that the inclusion of this phrase indicates that the speaker of *4QInstruction* understands himself as a *maskil* who addresses “understanding ones” who aspire to grow in their faithfulness to wisdom. In turn, the *mebin* has the potential to serve as a sage. The occurrences of בְּכוֹר set alongside its placement in 4Q369, Wold argues, serves to further stress the exaltation of the addressee in terms of being a most holy *maskil* with expansive authority over God’s treasures.¹²⁰ Similarly, Elgvin suggests that the addressees of *4QInstruction* may be considered as the manifestation of an elevated end-time community estranged or separated from the faithless Israel that will exist forever. Whichever way one chooses to interpret the בְּכוֹר, the superiority of the one being addressed is certain.

¹¹⁷ DJD 34: 305.

¹¹⁸ See Wold, “Is the ‘Firstborn Son’ in 4Q369 a Messiah? The Evidence from 4QInstruction,” *RevQ* 29/1 (2017): 3-20. Cf. James Kugel, “4Q369 ‘Prayer of Enosh’ and Ancient Biblical Interpretation,” *DSD* 5/2 (1998): 119-148, esp. 119-120.

¹¹⁹ Wold, *Women, Men and Angels*, 178-179.

¹²⁰ Wold comments: “‘firstborn son’ may refer to more than just an eschatological messianic deliverer or the nation of Israel, it is also used with priestly connotations to refer to becoming a sage.” Wold, “‘Is the Firstborn Son’ in 4Q369 a Messiah? The Evidence from 4QInstruction,” 16.

If one reads *the Vision of Hagu* pericope (i.e. 4Q417 1 i lines 13b-18) as describing the creation of humanity and the giving of revelation to all, then 4Q418 81+81a reaffirms that the *mebin*, as a recipient of revelation and having acted in accordance with it, is separated from those considered fleshly. As things currently stand, he can look forward to an inheritance because he is considered a “first born”. The exaltation of this addressee is further highlighted in line 4, which states that the addressee has been established among the “lot” (גורל) of the angels. In this present context it is important to note that the *mebin*’s association with angels implies or suggests the inheritance he can expect will include the same benefits the angels currently enjoy.¹²¹ In addition, the biblical allusions to Num 18:20 and Deut 10:9 may be interpreted in terms of representing the eschatological inheritance the righteous can look forward to.¹²² In this present context, it is the distinction made between the addressees (i.e. all differing levels represented in these lines) and the רוח בשר that is most important.

The רוח בשר are representative of all things God hates (4Q418 81+81a line 2) and it is imperative that the addressees remain separate to this group. In this way, the רוח בשר of *4QInstruction* may be seen as comparable to the rich in James (i.e. Jas 5:1-6). Additionally, 4Q418 81+81a lines 1-6 make clear that the *mebin*’s inheritance is not guaranteed. On the contrary, it is predicated on maintaining his place among the faithful community. Much like James, revelation enables one to be faithful and/or to perform wisdom faithfully. Therefore, one’s inheritance is not predetermined, but rather, one’s fate/inheritance is merit based. In light of this, the inadequacy of the language of election is once again stressed.

5.2.3. 4Q423 1, 2 i lines 1-4: Stewardship over the Garden of Eden

Our attention now turns to 4Q423 1, 2 i lines 1-4. In these lines the loftier status of the addressee is portrayed alongside the importance of pursuing wisdom and its associated difficulties. In 4Q423 1,2 i lines 1-4 we encounter the Garden of Eden being used as a metaphor for procuring wisdom and as describing the human condition. In metaphorical terms it would seem that failure to tend to the

¹²¹ See 4Q418 55, 69 ii.

¹²² Cf. Elgvin, “Wisdom and Apocalypticism,” 245-246.

garden results in one being labeled as fleshly. According to Strugnell and Harrington 4Q423 1, 2 i 1-4 read:

Translation¹²³

1 [] and every fruit that it produced and every tree [כל עץ] which is good,
pleasing to give knowledge. Is [it] not a ga[rden of pastu]re
2 [and pleasant]to [gi]ve great knowledge? He has set you in charge of it to till
and guard it. An [enjoya]ble g[arden]
3 [the earth,] thorns and thistles will sproth forth for you, and its strength it
will not yield to you, []
4 [] in your being unfaithful

Text-critically, the issue as to whether 4Q423 1 and 4Q423 2 i should be considered as the same column emerge.¹²⁴ The join is presented in the main text because it is argued that it provides further insights in terms of the exalted status of the *mebin*. Moreover, Wold notes that, “even without the join there is good reason to view that this metaphor draws heavily on the creation narrative of Genesis.”¹²⁵ Although short, this fragment(s) makes the remarkable claim that the *mebin* has been given authority over the Garden of Eden. For Goff, this authority over the Garden of Eden is further indicative of the *mebin*’s elect status and being likened to Adam.¹²⁶ Goff argues that the *mebin*, like Adam, “can attain the knowledge of good and evil . . . This knowledge is not understood in 4QInstruction as simply knowing right from wrong . . . this knowledge denotes the acquisition of wisdom in a broader sense, an understanding of the created

¹²³ Translation from DJD 34: 508.

¹²⁴ Strugnell and Harrington endorse the join in DJD 34: 506. Similarly, in *Women, Men and Angels*, 113, Wold also endorses the join, while Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 141, expresses caution. Perhaps skepticism regarding this join is warranted because the putative join is distant, meaning that the two pieces do not directly fit together. Goff, *4QInstruction*, 350, n.6 notes that if the join were to be granted, then this in turn would mean that 4Q423 2 i would attest the left edge of the column and its margin. But one is then immediately left with the problem that the first four lines of the constructed column are markedly shorter than the following lines. See Plate 30 in DJD 34. It is difficult to accept the join when the lengths of the lines are so inconsistent; however, as noted in the main text, it is clear that these lines are drawing heavily on the Genesis creation account.

¹²⁵ Wold, “The Universality of Creation,” 221.

¹²⁶ Goff, *4QInstruction*, 290.

order and the divine deterministic scheme that guides it.”¹²⁷ Moreover, according to Goff, the harsh conditions of the garden (i.e. קוץ ודרדר יהתצמ) in line 3 are best understood as making clear that the garden can produce “thorns and thistles”.¹²⁸ Therefore, for Goff, 4Q423 1,2 i lines 1-4 might be viewed as describing a garden that is shoddy and in poor condition. Since this garden may be viewed as a metaphor for the acquisition of wisdom, this may then be seen as referring to the *mebin*'s failure to achieve the pedagogical goals of the composition and his elect status as being in jeopardy.¹²⁹

However, this thesis has continually rejected the language of election and therefore it is argued that these lines depict the continued exaltation of the *mebin*. Lexically and conceptually, this passage draws heavily on the Garden of Eden account in Genesis, and it is accurate to say that these lines serve as a description of the human condition as opposed to a redefinition of Adam.¹³⁰ The *mebin* is not Adam, but their situations are similar.

As Wold argues, *4QInstruction* makes clear that pursuing and acquiring wisdom is the most imperative task.¹³¹ The importance of maintaining this wisdom-producing garden therefore cannot be overestimated.¹³² To summarize Wold, in Genesis, once Adam has eaten from the tree, a series of well-known curses ensue (Gen 3:14-19), and he is ultimately expelled from the garden (Gen 3:23), and by way of direct speech from God in Gen 3:22, God tells Adam he

¹²⁷ Goff refers to the *Treatise of the Two Spirits* where he argues the possession of the knowledge of good and evil is associated with a deterministic understanding of creation. See 1QS iv lines 24-26. Moreover, he claims that the view that the *mebin* can obtain revealed knowledge about the created order is consistent with several other Jewish texts that associate Adam with angles. For example see 1QS iv lines 22-23; CD iii line 20; 1QH iv line 27. Goff, *4QInstruction*, 293.

¹²⁸ Goff refers to the *Hodayot* where the collapse of a garden is described using the terminology “thorns and thistles” as a means of emphasizing the importance of revelation. See 1QH^a xiv lines 25-28. Goff, *4QInstruction*, 296.

¹²⁹ Goff, “Adam, the Angels and Eternal Life,” 7; *idem*, *4QInstruction*, 295.

¹³⁰ Both Gen 2:9; 3:6 and 4Q423 1 line 1 use the phrase נהמד (meaning desirable in terms of making one wise), but an additional adjective is found in 4Q423 1 line 1 in the form of נעים (meaning lovely or delightful).

¹³¹ Wold, “The Universality of Creation,” 223.

¹³² In 4Q418 69 ii lines 10-11 the *mebin* is warned not to become weary in pursuing wisdom.

now knows good and evil “like one of us”.¹³³ However, as Wold also notes the circumstances are not the same in 4Q423 1, 2; it is not clear how the author of *4QInstruction* conceives of the prohibition in Gen 2:17, but in this metaphor God does not appear to be forbidding the *mebin* eating from the trees since this would contradict the theology of the document because actively pursuing knowledge is viewed as positive.¹³⁴ The *mebin* has not been expelled from the garden. On the contrary, he is encouraged to tend and keep it.¹³⁵ In addition, a less subtle difference between 4Q423 1, 2 and Gen 2:9 exists: in Gen 2:9 it is only the one tree that makes one wise, while in *4QInstruction* it is the produce of every tree (כל עץ) that is desirable for making one wise.¹³⁶ In *4QInstruction*, there is thus no indication of any prohibition of eating from any of the trees, in contrast to Gen 2:17.¹³⁷ Even more noteworthy is that a similar omission is also found in Sirach’s account of the creation of humankind,¹³⁸ suggesting as Wold points out that “an interpretation of the Garden of Eden account is known where, in contrast to some traditions, partaking from the tree of knowledge is positively conceived”.¹³⁹

¹³³ Wold, “The Universality of Creation,” 223.

¹³⁴ Wold, “The Universality of Creation,” 224.

¹³⁵ It is reasonable to assume that the knowledge available in the garden includes good and evil. If fragment 2 is joined to 4Q423 1, line 7 mentions “[rejecting] the veil and knowing good”. This makes sense as *4QInstruction* relates the knowledge of good and evil to the רז נהיה in 4Q417 1 i lines 6-8.

¹³⁶ Cf. Wold, *Women, Men and Angels*, 115. Goff notes that the description in terms of the beauty of every wisdom producing tree is similar to the trees that Enoch visits on his travels. See for example *1 En* 24:5; 32:5. Cf. Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 100. It is interesting to note that *1 Enoch* mentions a “Garden of Righteousness” in 32:6; 60:23 and 77:3.

¹³⁷ This omission is found in other sapiential texts. E.g. 4Q303 viii-ix; 4Q305 ii line 2. See DJD 20: 153 and 158, respectively.

¹³⁸ In Sir 15:14 Ben Sira declares that God created the first human (האדם) at the beginning and left him יצרר. Despite its negative connotations in certain passages (e.g. Gen 6:5; 8:21), יצר for Ben Sira seems to designate an individual’s natural disposition, or the each person’s ability to make the right choices, or at least avoid the wrong ones. Cf. Adams, *Wisdom in Transition*, 185. See Chapter Six, esp. 6.1.3.

¹³⁹ Wold, *Women, Men and Angels*, 116. Sir 17:7 reads, “He filled them with knowledge and understanding, and showed them good and evil.” Similarly 1QS iv 26; 4Q300 iii line 2 and 4Q305 ii line 2 preserve a positive view of attaining knowledge of good and evil. See also

Furthermore, Elgvin proposes that the Garden of Eden metaphor might be associated with the Temple and this might explain the transition to *every tree* being a wisdom-bearing tree in *4QInstruction*.¹⁴⁰ If this is the case, it would seem then that the author of *4QInstruction* is reacting to more than the creation narrative of Genesis.

Therefore, the Garden of Eden serves as a metaphor to demonstrate the vastness of the knowledge this *mebin* has access to, while also making clear that the pursuit of revelation is not an easy task. Much like tending this metaphorical garden, the pursuit of revelation requires hard work. However, despite the associated difficulties of the task, the *mebin* is expected to make every effort to rise to the challenge and to not become weary (cf. 4Q418 69 ii lines 10-11). If this challenge is not met, the garden will fall into disarray and therefore the “thorns and thistles” may represent an inversion to the idyllic setting of Eden. The chaos of the garden is also representative of failure on the part of the *mebin* to acquire knowledge. In this respect, Eden might be viewed as a metaphor for the human condition: Eden represents both the right and wrong paths. The failure to cultivate wisdom will result in the privilege of having authority over this garden being taken away; the *mebin* will be thus labeled as “fleshly”, and as we now know, revelation is no longer given to the *fleshly spirit* (4Q417 1 i line 17). Moreover, while the addressee is likened to Adam, it does not seem the *mebin* is meant to understand himself as a restoration of Adam, and that of his knowledge, as the fall is never depicted in *4QInstruction*.

Only one word survives from line 4 (במועלכה) meaning “in your unfaithfulness”, and it is not immediately clear how it relates to the preceding description of the garden. If one accepts the view that all of humanity were originally given access to revelation, and therefore rejects the pre-deterministic view most often articulated and applied by Collins and Goff, this reference to “unfaithfulness” is therefore not meant to be read as evoking the fall. As we have seen, there does not seem to be a prohibition and hence the mention of “unfaithfulness” in this line is most likely a reference to those who are failing in

Wold’s “Metaphorical Poverty,” 150-152. It is important to note that Sir 17:7 is not preserved in Hebrew.

¹⁴⁰ Torleif Elgvin, “Wisdom, Revelation and Eschatology in an Early Essene Writing,” in *SBL Seminar Papers, 1995* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 440-463.

maintaining the garden. In this sense, unfaithfulness may be understood in terms of failing in their pursuit of wisdom.

Rey understands *4QInstruction* as offering sapiential universal instruction to all of humanity and argues that election does not separate humanity.¹⁴¹ Rey's interpretation is not wholly supportable. While it is true that I also consider election as not separating humanity, *4QInstruction* is being addressed to a group who we know from 4Q418 81+81a lines 1-2 have been separated from the *רוח בשר*. As a result, *4QInstruction* cannot be understood as being addressed to all of humanity since it is addressed to a group who have remained faithful.

In conclusion, the *mebin* is entrusted to “till” and “keep” (לעבדו ולשמרו) the garden. The utilization of the vocabulary appears to have a *double-entendre*. Firstly, the same verbs are used in Gen 2:15 in relation to Adam's command, and in this instance they appear to emphasize further the addressee's exalted status while alluding to the “Adam-like” state that has been bestowed upon him. Secondly, the sense of responsibility or work they induce is most likely intended to evoke or remind him of his pursuit of the acquisition of wisdom. The *mebin*'s stewardship over the garden is deliberately meant to reiterate the special status of the *mebin*, while also stressing that access to this form of supernatural revelation is not simply a gift. Although the *רוח נהיה* is not mentioned in this fragment, it is reasonable to argue that it is alluded to in line 2. Much like his pursuit of revelation, the addressee's authority over the garden is something that requires constant work and maintenance. The associated challenges of keeping the garden are exemplified in 4Q423 1, 2 line 3 where the harsh conditions of the garden are portrayed. For example, this line includes *קוץ ודרדר תצמיח* (“thorns and thistles it will sprout”). These same conditions are mentioned in Gen 3:18, and are used to describe the curse on man, but in this instance, Gen 3:18 is further combined with Gen 4:12 (i.e. the curse on Cain) in the end of the line with the inclusion of “its strength will not yield to you”. Clearly, this cannot be understood as a curse for eating the trees since procuring the knowledge of the difference between good and evil is positively viewed.¹⁴²

¹⁴¹ Rey, *4QInstruction*, 338.

¹⁴² Cf. Wold, *Women, Men And Angels*, 116.

In regard to 4Q423 1, 2 i lines 1-4, the *mebin* has maintained his exalted status and this is why he is portrayed as having a stewardship over the Garden of Eden in the first place. However, he should not become complacent as his membership in this faithful community is subject to the continual adherence to the instructions of this document and the pursuit of revelation, which is similar to what we encounter in James. The failure to cultivate wisdom results in one being labeled as fleshly and being considered unfaithful. In many respects, the future continual possession of Eden represents the successful acquisition of wisdom by the addressee and it is reasonable to suggest that this can only be achieved through רז נהיה and חזון ההגו. But the somewhat chaotic representation of the garden in these lines may suggest that the *mebin*'s exalted status is in jeopardy.

Recipients of Revelation: Non-Inclusion of Gentiles

Parts One and Two of this chapter outline the various ways the recipients of James and *4QInstruction* may be interpreted, but the question remains; in terms of James, what new information does the above analysis provide? On the surface, the address of James 1:1 appears to be universal and inclusive, because, after all, all twelve tribes of Israel in the Diaspora (i.e. ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ) are addressed. Moreover, it is accurate to say that James 1:1 evokes an idealized view of Israel, and this address is thus representative of James' perception of a faithful community. However, the apparent inclusivity of this idealized view of Israel appears to break down when the Jewish connotations, in terms of its representation of Jewish identity, of this phrase are fully realized. Therefore, how Gentiles fit into faithful community is less certain and remains open to interpretation.

When our attention turned to *4QInstruction*, a significant commonality with James was identified: it too portrays a faithful Israelite community (i.e. 4Q418 81+81a lines 1-6). Moreover, that *4QInstruction* depicts the giving of revelation as being universal in 4Q417 1 i lines 16-18 was also argued. This allowed for another parallel between *4QInstruction* and James to be highlighted: revelation (i.e. σοφία ἄνωθεν in James and רז נהיה and חזון ההגו in *4QInstruction*) are both considered to be pivotal in terms of being included among God's faithful community. Moreover, the continued acquisition of this wisdom is not conveyed as an easy task. This is especially made clear in *4QInstruction* (i.e.

4Q423 1, 2 i lines 1-4). But, despite the parallels these two writings share in relation to the role revelation plays in terms of the formation of the faithful community, it is true to say that a subtle, but noteworthy, difference separates their understandings of said faithful communities: *4QInstruction* is concerned with the *mebin* maintaining his place among the faithful, whereas James is more preoccupied with one joining or getting into this community. For James, the joining of this community is all the more pressing in light of the coming judgment (i.e. Jas 5:9). The eschatological restorative overtones of James 1:1 are best interpreted in this way. In other words, for James it is imperative that his recipients are included among the faithful because he is trumpeting that the eschatological restoration of Israel is imminent (1:1).¹⁴³

But then, who does James consider to be among the faithful? §5.1.1. outlined how James 1:1 may be interpreted in either literal and metaphorical grounds, and the relevance of either for this present study was also discussed. It was argued that it is best to take James 1:1 at face value: that is, it is best interpreted literally, and as a result, Gentiles are not included. James is reliant on Jewish ideas and Jewish scripture. For him then, his conception of a faithful community is unlikely to have included Gentiles, or at least his thinking does not appear to conceivably stretch to Gentiles.¹⁴⁴ Therefore, James is understood as being addressed to Jews and Jewish-Christians, but not to Gentiles. As a result, James' representation of a faithful community, and by extension his portrayal of access to revelation, is not entirely inclusive.

In terms of this present chapter, what conversations then, if any, does the critical assessment of *4QInstruction* inform in relation to James. As previously noted, *4QInstruction* also conveys a faithful Israelite community, and this writing leaves us with the impression that the author is making a distinction between faithful and faithless (see §5.2.2.). It is fair to say that, for the author of

¹⁴³ Cf. 1Thess 4:16.

¹⁴⁴ However, Job is referred to in a positive context in Jas 5:11. This is noteworthy because, more often than not, Job was thought of as a Gentile (e.g. see Job 42). Moreover, his Gentile status is implied a by a number of traits: (1) he hails from “the land of Uz” (Job 1:1); (2) he is not given a genealogy; and (3) any reference to Israel’s history is omitted in Job. Similarly Jas 2 commends the Gentile Rahab, as well as Abraham, who was a Gentile by birth, while Elijah, who preached to Gentiles (e.g. 1 Kings 17:1-16) is also praised. Cf. Allison, *James*, 720.

4QInstruction, the category of faithful is most applicable to Jews, but it does not necessarily follow then that faithless are seen as Gentiles. Rather, if *4QInstruction* is understood as being addressed to a specific community (see §2.1.3.2.), the divisions of faithful and faithless may be understood in terms of the author's beliefs of divisions among Jews. Whether Gentiles entered the author's consciousness is impossible to tell, but there is nothing in *4QInstruction* to suggest they did. But the same rationale cannot be applied to James because, given the environment of first-century CE Palestine, the question of Gentiles would certainly have entered James' consciousness. Therefore, when it comes to James, the critical assessment of *4QInstruction* offers us a prism against which the questions of the recipients of revelation in James can be viewed through. That Gentiles did not enter the author of *4QInstruction's* consciousness is a reasonable conclusion, but the same cannot be said for James. As a result, the discussion of *4QInstruction* underscores James' non-inclusion of Gentiles.

Conclusions

Chapters Four and Five of this thesis are closely linked with one another. If, as Chapter Four argues, revelation is a central concept present in James and *4QInstruction*, Chapter Five examines who may access this revelation. In the case of James, Chapter Four argues that σοφία ἄνωθεν enables wise living. The inference is that living in accordance with σοφία ἄνωθεν results in one being included among God's faithful. Therefore, it is suggested that revelation plays a formative role in terms of who is included among the faithful and the importance of its pursuit is hence stressed. When the author exhorts the addressee to ask for wisdom in James 1:5, who or what ethnic group(s) does he have in mind? The former question shapes the contextual analysis presented throughout this chapter.

It accurate to say that the “Ἰάκωβος θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ χαίρειν” of James 1:1 and the bequeathing of “the vision of Hagu” to שׂוֹר in 4Q417 1 i lines 13b-18 are not exactly analogous with one another. However, keeping the comparative orientation of this overall thesis in mind, an addressee, or group of addressees, is identified in both writings. The numerous options for translating שׂוֹר have consequences for interpreting the possible formative role that revelation occupies in *4QInstruction*. In other words, how revelation is understood in terms of the

formation of the faithful community in *4QInstruction* has the potential to bring these two writings closer, or can force us to acknowledge a significance difference between these writings' theologies. For example, if we agree with Goff and Collins that אָדָם is best translated as "Adam", and in *4QInstruction* we encounter a highly deterministic framework, then according to this interpretation the pursuit of and the adherence to the "mystery of being" and the "vision of Hagu" do not play a role in the formation of the righteous group. After all, everything is predetermined. On the other hand, if one follows Wold, revelation is given to humanity and hence plays a crucial role in determining who is part of the righteous community or being disassociated from it. It is my argument that Wold's interpretation of *4QInstruction* is comparable to the role of revelation in James in terms of revelation having a seminal role enabling its recipients to be included among God's faithful community. It is unlikely that this formative role of revelation in James would be so discernible if it were not for the inclusion of *4QInstruction*.

Chapter Five argues that James 1:1 is best interpreted literally; that is to say, it is addressed to Jews and Jewish-Christians. Moreover, the eschatological overtones of this verse are significant and make the pursuit of σοφία ἄνωθεν all the more important and urgent. The possible reasons behind the non-inclusion of Gentiles have been outlined above, but the consequences of this are important to note: if Gentiles are not included, this means that the revelation of James is not universal. In addition, the address of James 1:1 must then be understood as being somewhat exclusive. While Marcus and others make compelling arguments for the inclusion of Gentiles in James, it is difficult to look past the overtly exclusive Jewish overtones of δοῦλος ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ. If all of humanity is given meditation in *4QInstruction* and revelation serves to distinguish the righteous from the wicked; are gentiles in view, or is this simply a way to distinguish between the faithful of Israel and wayward Israelites? The question of Gentile inclusion in *4QInstruction* is possibly even more ambiguous than in James, but this comparative exercise has allowed us to identify that both writings appear to be making a distinction between faithful and faithless Israel, even if both authors conceive of these groups differently. Whatever the case, both the pursuit of wisdom, and being included among God's faithful, need to be considered as being central instructions in either writing. With this in mind, our

attention finally turns to the question of evil in Chapter Six. One's pursuit of wisdom, and by extension their inclusion among the faithful, is further complicated by the presence of active internal and external evil forces in the world.

Chapter Six: Humanity's Proclivity to Sin and Evil:

An Obstacle in the Pursuit of Wisdom in James in Light of *4QInstruction*

Introduction

Understanding how evil was understood by ancient authors remains a complex and challenging subject. How evil was conceived of by ancient authors has ramifications in terms of our understanding and assessment of the otherworldly paradigm of compositions. While keeping the many associated complexities of this subject in mind, this chapter explores the closely associated topics of sin and evil in James, and the conceptions/traditions that may have influenced this author. This is important because James portrays humanity as having an apparent proclivity to sin and evil, and this assessment of humanity is pertinent to this thesis in terms of evaluating the potential obstructions one may experience in terms of their pursuit of wisdom. To be more specific, this chapter argues that one's pursuit of wisdom may be hindered by their own proclivity to sin and evil, and hence this proclivity to evil has consequences in terms of the recipients' pursuit of wisdom and their inclusion among God's faithful community. This proclivity to sin and evil has internal and external dimensions, and both of these factors, alongside the understanding that both are ongoing and continuous, may be understood to place one's pursuit of wisdom in jeopardy.

As was the case in previous chapters, this overall topic will be achieved by discussing James in relation to *4QInstruction*, based on the understanding that *4QInstruction* serves as one example of a transitional wisdom text against which James may be assessed. The aim is to demonstrate various instantiations of ancient Jewish traditions or interpretations concerning sin and evil between these two writings that help us to interpret James. It is in five parts. Part One explores how ancient authors accounted for the existence of sin and evil in the world. Therefore, the Jewish concept of יצר will be in focus. In Part Two a systematic discussion of James 1:12-15, and how numerous commentators have interpreted these verses, is offered. The question of *4QInstruction's* evil inclination, and whether it is to be interpreted in internal or external grounds, or both, will comprise of Part Three. Part Four investigates the question of internal evils in James; detailed excurses of key terms in James 1:14, 1:8, and 4:8 are thus presented. Finally, Part Five discusses James' portrayal of external evils.

Many commentators find it difficult to explain or make sense of James' inclusion of internal and external evils. Important questions emerge such as: is sin best viewed in terms of a negative anthropology and akin to the Jewish understanding of one's inclination to evil? Or, might sin be attributed to external (non-sapiential) forces? Or, are both understandings of sin applicable and are they thus working simultaneously? If the latter, how are these simultaneous forces to be explained and/or aligned? Bringing *4QInstruction*, amongst other Qumran writings, into the discussion may provide insights when attempting to make sense of these competing, co-existing forces of evil in James. These questions will therefore guide our analysis with the intention of being able to draw some conclusions in terms of what all of this means for one's pursuit of wisdom.

6.1. Evil Inclination

Part One of this chapter explores the question of how ancient authors accounted for the existence of sin and evil in the world. While much of the below analysis will be taken up with assessing the seemingly inherent proclivity of humanity towards sin and evil, it soon becomes apparent that questions relating to God's part in this, if any, and the presence of otherworldly beings (i.e. especially demons) in these paradigms, also come into play. This analysis provides the broader context when our attention turns to assessing these complex topics in James. In addition, three excurses will be offered: on Qumran, Sirach, and Philo. This overview does not intend to be exhaustive, but rather to highlight the nuances that are pertinent for the parameters of this chapter.

6.1.1 The יצר

The anthropological concept of the יצר (i.e. the *yetzer*), commonly associated with rabbinic thought, attempts to provide the (biblical hermeneutical) means for explaining the existence of evil in the world.¹ The root יצר appears in the Hebrew

¹ Much of this chapter is taken up with discussing the rabbinic concept of the יצר. The focus on יצר is warranted because it is widely attested in literature from the second-century BCE and accounted for the existence of evil in the world, but it is important to note that ancient authors also offered other explanations. For example, the *Book of Watchers* in *1 En* 1-36 provides one such possible explanation; the story of the sons of God in Genesis 6 was expanded on, and

Bible approximately seventy times, usually in verbal forms, and as Ishay Rosen-Zvi notes, it “denotes the creating, fashioning, and designing of objects (mostly made of clay). Such a fashioning can be ascribed to both humans and God, and indeed the creation of humanity and the world at large is described with verbs derived from this root.”² The יצר is first found in the second chapter of Genesis where it refers to the formation of man (i.e. v.7), and later to the formation of animals and birds (v.19). While it is the case that no verse in the Hebrew Bible directly treats יצר in terms of an evil entity, the two occurrences of it in Gen 6:5 and 8:21 may be read as indicating a more nuanced meaning where it seems to refer to human mental faculty.³ The יצר comes to be associated with human thoughts or dispositions and tendencies, and this contributes to the understanding that the human יצר is inherently bad, or even evil (i.e. hence the existence of the so-called יצר הרע).⁴ In twenty-first century scholarship it is generally agreed that

various kinds of evil (e.g. violence, fornication, astrology) were attributed to the fallen angels. While the creator is not credited with being the origin of sin, this writing also implies that the problem of evil is not entirely human. See Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 80-84.

² Ishay Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires: “Yetzer Hara” and the Problem of Evil in Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), 3. The noun יצר indicates the result of the craft or creation. For its use in relation to pottery see Isa 29:17; for creation of the world cf. Jer 10:16 and Isa 45:7; for the fashioning of humanity cf. Gen 1:27 and 2:7.

³ Only two instances in the Hebrew Bible (i.e. Isa 26:3; 1 Chron 29:18) use יצר in a definite negative context. Cf. Collins, “Interpretations of the Creation of Humanity in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 34. For an alternative position see Noam Mizrahi, “Reconsidering the Semantics of the Yēser in Classical Biblical Hebrew,” in *The Origins of the Origins of Evil* (eds. James Aitken, Ishay Rosen-Zvi and Hector Patmore; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming), 1-28, who has recently challenged the prevalent position that יצר contains a “psychologized” or “internalized” dimension in the classic Hebrew Bible corpus. For example, Mizrahi contends that the יצר of Gen 6:5; 8:21 should not be read as mere synonyms, as is commonly done, but rather the יצר of this verse is God’s learning experience; in other words, God realizes that it is not only professional expertise that render humans products as evil, but rather human skills in general. Mizrahi’s thesis is compelling, but its outcome does not effect or change how “evil inclination” is treated in this chapter because it appears that the psychological dimension of the יצר had been established by the time of *4QInstruction*. Mizrahi’s argument does, however, make us question where this psychological understanding of יצר comes from. I am grateful to Prof. Noam Mizrahi for kindly sending me a copy of his article before it has been published.

⁴ The term “yetzer (*ha*)ra” (i.e. יצר הרע), meaning “evil yetzer”, appears only a small number of times before rabbinic literature (e.g. Gen 6:5; 8:21), but it is important to note that in these verses

the יצר is regularly associated with one's evil inclination, a concept that seems to have particularly flourished or developed in later rabbinic thought. However, scholarship is divided on whether the rabbinic יצר includes an anthropological duality in which good and evil יצרים struggle within the human heart, or whether a single, evil יצר is at war within its host. Moreover, some overload the term with Hellenistic concepts, such as self-control, while others consider the term as a reference to fallen nature, sin, and demonic influence.⁵ It is argued in §6.1.2. and §6.3. that the occurrence of יצר in Sirach and *4QInstruction*, respectively, denotes free-will or humanity's proclivity to sin. If the former is found to be the case, this in turn indicates that the יצר was an established tradition frequently used in second-century BCE Palestine.⁶

In recent scholarship, יצר has come to be more associated with the psychology of the inner man: the internal battle involving the development of the mind, the control of sexual desire, and the unification of the self.⁷ It is from within these parameters that Michael Satlow has described the יצר as the "irrational animal part of man" that must be controlled by the "rational".⁸ But most recently these prevalent views and approaches to the יצר have been

the יצר is associated with the heart. Also see Deut 31:21; Pslam 103:14; 1 Chron 28:9; 29:18; Isa 26:3.

⁵ Ellis, *The Hermeneutics of Divine Testing*, 48-58, provides a good overview of the leading scholarship, and its divergences carried out in relation to יצר. I refer to the main contributors in the main text, but for a fuller discussion see Frank Chamberlin Porter, "The Yecer Hara: A Study of the Jewish Doctrine of Sin." *Biblical and Semitic Studies: Classical and Historical Essays by the Members of the Semitic and Biblical Faculty of Yale University* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901), 91-158. The discovery of the DSS also influenced how the יצר was understood; see J. P. Hyatt, "The View of Man in the Qumran Hodayot," *NTS* 2 (1955): 276-284; Roland E. Murphy, "Yēser in Qumran Literature," *Bib* 39 (1958): 334-344.

⁶ Cf. Johan Cook, "The Origin of the יצר הטוב and יצר הרע," *JSJ* 38 (2007): 80-91.

⁷ In this way, Ellis, *The Hermeneutics of Divine Testing*, 53, notes how special emphasis is regularly given to parallels within Hellenistic literature and philosophies that reject the body for the sake of the soul.

⁸ Michael Satlow, "Male and Female They Created Her," in *Continuity and Renewal: Jews and Judaism in Byzantine-Christian Palestine* (ed. Lee I. Levine; Jerusalem, Yad Ben Zvi; 486-505), 497.

challenged by Rosen-Zvi. In a series of articles,⁹ which culminated in a monograph length work,¹⁰ he questions this psychological approach. The יצר, Rosen-Zvi argues, has come to be viewed as analogous with lower parts of the human, rather than to external demons such as *Mastema*, *Belial*, and *Satan*. Rosen-Zvi wishes to refute this approach and rather demonstrates that the יצר is best understood as part of the biblical and post-biblical search for the sources of human sinfulness. “Rabbinic *yetzer*” he argues, “should not therefore be read in the tradition of the Hellenistic quest for control over lower parts of the psyche, but rather in the tradition of ancient Jewish and Christian demonology.”¹¹

It is Rosen-Zvi’s thesis that the יצר is a component of the ontology of evil. By this he means that the יצר “is a sophisticated antinomian enticer, struggling to trap humans”, and serves as one of many explanations the ancient authors had for the source of human sins.¹² His aim is to dissociate the יצר with the discourse of “divided self”, and to relocate firmly it in the demonological tradition. This latter point, that is that the יצר may be located in a specific demonological tradition is, Rosen-Zvi maintains, a concrete historical claim; he argues that it is possible that this location of the יצר may be traced to the evolution as part of a historical process of internalization of cosmic forces. As is argued below (i.e. §6.1.2.), this latter point is particularly applicable when discussing Qumran. However, Rosen Zvi’s acknowledgement or admission must also be noted; the framework of demonology only gets one so far. The יצר is not a cosmic being (i.e. like Satan), but is fully internalized and resides in the human heart.¹³ His analysis, therefore, aims to serve as a dual contextualization both as part of ancient demonology and of processes of internalization. He argues that the discourse pertaining to the יצר warrants reexamination and/or reevaluation in terms of being “not only as a part of ancient demonic traditions but also as

⁹ Some include: Ishay Rosen-Zvi, “Bilhah the Temptress: The ‘Testament of Reuben’ and ‘The Birth of Sexuality’”. *JQR* 96: 65-94; *idem*, “Refuting the *Yetzer*: The Evil Inclination and the Limits of Rabbinic Discourse,” *JSJTP* 17: 117-142.

¹⁰ Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*.

¹¹ Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 6.

¹² Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 6.

¹³ Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 7.

opposition to them; accepting forces that lead humans astray only in the form of an internalized battle inside the heart, leaving no place for external forces.”¹⁴

One final observation of Rosen-Zvi’s contribution is warranted; that is, he challenges the generally held model that the rabbinic יצר functions as a dualism between good and evil. He highlights the absence of the so-called יצר הטוב in the majority of Second Temple and Rabbinic sources, and rather contends that these sources hold to a single, evil *yetzer* (i.e. the יצר הרע).¹⁵ Divine intervention and Torah observance, are, he maintains, the means through which the rabbis taught that the יצר could be controlled.¹⁶

The contributions of Rosen-Zvi are particularly valuable because he successfully highlights how a radical transformation takes place in terms of its understanding between the biblical and Rabbinic יצר. Moreover, Rosen-Zvi demonstrates how an examination of the Qumranic יצר may contribute to the understanding of the same term in Rabbinic literature.¹⁷ While Rabbinic literature is not in focus in this present work, it is my argument that Rosen-Zvi’s rationale can also be applied when discussing the possible influence of the יצר to the author of the Letter of James. This is returned to below (see §6.4.1 – 6.4.2.).

It may be helpful to note finally that Rosen-Zvi is largely responding to (and ultimately rejecting) Cohen Stuart, who generally contends that the evil inclination, (i.e. יצר הרע) only arises after the second-century CE.¹⁸ It is important

¹⁴ Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 8.

¹⁵ The idea that there were two inclinations, one good and one bad, partly came about on account of there being two *yods* in the verb in Gen 2:9 (i.e. וייצר). See Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 81; Cook, “The Origin of the יצר הטוב and יצר הרע,” 81-82.

¹⁶ Before Rosen-Zvi’s work the absence of the so called good inclination was generally explained in terms of defeating the evil inclination as being more important. See Ellis, *The Hermeneutics of Divine Testing*, 54. The rejection of two יצרים is *contra* Solomon Schechter, *Aspects of Rabbinic Theology* (2nd ed.; New York: Schocken, 1961), 243; Alden L. Thompson, *Responsibility for Evil in the Theodicy of IV Ezra: A Study Illustrating the Significance of Form and Structure for the Meaning of the Book* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), 51.

¹⁷ Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 44.

¹⁸ According to Cohen Stuart, this concept of evil inclination needs to be distinguished entirely from pre-rabbinic use of the term. See G. H. Cohen Stuart, *The Struggle in Man Between Good and Evil: An Inquiry into the Origin of the Tanninic Concept of Yeser Hara* (Kampen: Kok, 1984).

to note that much of Rosen-Zvi's analysis centres on two Tannaitic rabbinic schools, and while such an investigation, that is one that focuses on Rabbinic Judaism, may be outside the remit of this current study, the fruits of this inquiry, especially Rosen-Zvi's identification of the יצר at Qumran as a backdrop to his overall study, lead to a number of notable observations in terms of Qumran studies and Second Temple literature generally.¹⁹ These observations are outlined in the following sections where the role and interpretation of the evil inclination at Qumran, Sirach and Philo are assessed.

6.1.2. יצר at Qumran

Rosen-Zvi observes that the first significant use of יצר, as well as the first known occurrence of the idiom יצר הרע, are found at Qumran.²⁰ Similarly Tigchelaar

¹⁹ Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 45-53, 62-63 explores the rabbinic schools of Akiva and Ishmael. In the case of the former (i.e. Akiva) he notes that the יצר is portrayed in terms of the manifestation of a normal human tendency, while in the case of the latter (i.e. Ishmael), the יצר as an internalized demonic agent that actively entices its human host to sin. In other words, the יצר is a demon that inhabits the human heart (cf. Gen 6:5; 8:21), and this results in a life-long struggle in which the human host has to work tirelessly to prevent the יצר from being victorious; the יצר is demonic yet-fully internalized.

Moreover, Rosen-Zvi argues that the ancient Jewish demonology supplies the closest parallel to the function and characteristic of the Rabbinic יצר. This יצר may be located in a process of internalization of demons that preserves demonic traits while locating them inside the human mind. Similar ideas are encountered in some Christian traditions: for example, Rom 7 where sin (ἁμαρτία) is portrayed as a hypothesized entity, or the *Shepherd of Hermas* which presents two angels (ἄγγελοι) residing in the human heart (in *Mandate* 6), and these two angels appear (partially at least) to be interchangeable with desires (ἐπιθυμίας) (*Mandate* 12). While these two examples are not analogous with the rabbinic יצר, these are examples of some of the existing traditions that the Rabbis reconfigured and intensified when creating their solution/explanation to the problem of evil. See Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 26-35, 53-58. In addition, it may be noted that while this understanding of the demonic internalization of the יצר is at the centre of Rosen-Zvi's analysis, he is keen to point out there is a clear distinctiveness or definite division between the יצר discourse and the treatment of "classic" demons. In *Demonic Desires*, 43, he notes: "Demons are an integral part of their [human's] normal experience, but they also have no role in their account of the source of human sinfulness."

²⁰ Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 45-46 goes on to note that the phrase *yetzer ra* 'does not appear in the Bible, where *yetzer* never stands alone (but with "heart" or "thoughts"), and "evil" appears

notes that the noun יצר is found seventy-six times in non-biblical DSS,²¹ and that more than half of these occurrences are found in 1QH^a.²² The sheer number of occurrences of יצר in the *Hodayot* is significant, and perhaps even more noteworthy is that the vast majority of these occurrences are negative.²³ Rosen-Zvi therefore argues that, in the *Hodayot*, the יצר is not essentially evil, “but an expression of the basic shameful state of humans, creatures of clay.”²⁴ Rosen-Zvi pays special attention to 1QH^a viii 6 and argues that the use of the word מזומה, translated as “plot”, in association with the יצר reveals “the *yetzer* is an independent component, with sinister intent.” According to Rosen-Zvi, the phrase יצר רע, which will be discussed later when *4QInstruction* is in view (see §6.3.3.), is best understood in parallel terms.²⁵ However, evaluating the יצר at Qumran is far from straightforward. For example, there is a dual appearance of the demonic *yetzer*: (1) as characterizing evil opponents in *Jubilees* 35:9 (1Q xviii 3-4); and (2) as residing in hearts of the members of the *Yahad* (e.g. 1QS iv 23). Hence, it is fair to say that the demonic *yetzer* is meant to explain the *Yahad*’s members temptation to sin.²⁶ For Rosen-Zvi: “The carnal, evil, and even demonic *yetzer* thus serves as an alternative explanation for the sinful consciousness of the members of the *yahad* [*sic*] which could not be understood in light of cosmic dualism alone.”²⁷

as a predicate adjective of *yetzer* rather than part of a set phrase. . . it is most doubtful whether *yetzer ra* is attested at all in contemporaneous texts outside Qumran.’

²¹ Cf. Martin G. Abegg, et al., eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance. Volume One: The Non Biblical Texts from Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 319.

²² Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, “The Evil Inclination in the Dead Sea Scrolls, with a Re-edition of 4Q468 (4QSector text?)” in *Empsychoi Logoi: Religions Innovations in Antiquity: Studies in Honor of Peter Willem van den Horst* (eds. A. Hourman, A. de Jong, and M. Misset-van de Weg; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 347-357, 348.

²³ For example see 1QH^a xv lines 3-4, 19 20. See also Eugene H. Merrill, *Qumran and Predestination: A Theological Study of the Thanksgiving Hymns* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 38.

²⁴ Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 49.

²⁵ Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 50.

²⁶ See also Jutta Leonhardt-Balzer, “Evil at Qumran,” *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity* (eds. Chris Keith and Loren T. Stuckenbruck; WUNT 417; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016): 17-33.

²⁷ Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 51.

Tigchelaar suggests that the few explicit references to “evil inclination” in the DSS are reflective of two things: (1) an influence of Gen 6:5 which relates “evil inclination” to “thoughts of the heart”; and (2) a new development where the “evil inclination” is personified possibly in the form of a spirit.²⁸ In relation to this latter point, Tigchelaar argues that the personification of the “evil inclination” is part of a broader tendency to personify virtues and vices. Moreover, according to Tigchelaar, this personification has become part of a broader dualistic system (e.g. 4Q436).²⁹ For example, drawing on the work of David Flusser,³⁰ Tigchelaar refers to the use of elements from Psalm 51 in 4Q436 1 i-ii, and a rebuke of the “evil inclination”, which results in sin being demonized.³¹ Likewise, Rosen Zvi discusses 4Q436 1 i line 10 noting that once again the יצר is not identified with the human heart, but proposes that in this instance the occurrence of יצר רע is best understood as denoting an evil tendency rather than a demonic being.³² This idea of the יצר being both internalized in the heart, and yet also demonized, coupled with the need for it be actively fought against or rebuked (e.g. in 4Q436 1 i-ii), is significant.³³ In this regard, the *yetzer* at Qumran may thus be understood in both internal and external terms.

Evaluating the role of the *yetzer* at Qumran will be especially pertinent to discussion later when *4QInstruction* is in focus. As we have just seen, the phrase יצר רע occurs in 4Q436 1 i line 10. It also occurs in 11QS xix lines 15-16.³⁴ In the case of 4Q436 1 i line 10, the speaker praises God for giving him a pure heart and for removing the יצר רע from him.³⁵ Similarly, 11Q5 xix lines 15-16 does not seem to present the יצר רע in terms of being a reified being, unlike later rabbinic

²⁸ Tigchelaar, “Evil Inclination,” 352.

²⁹ Tigchelaar, “Evil Inclination,” 353, suggests that 4Q436 might be seen as the backdrop for the Rabbinic association of the evil inclination with sexual urge.

³⁰ See David Flusser, “Qumran and Jewish Apotropaic Prayers,” *IEJ* 16 (1966): 194-205, 204.

³¹ Tigchelaar, “Evil Inclination,” 352-353.

³² Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 47.

³³ Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 52, that the “evil heart” in *4 Ezra* is a culmination of the process of how the *yetzer* was interpreted at Qumran.

³⁴ The phrase יצר רע is also found in 4Q422 1 line 12. The related phrase יצר אשמה, translated as “guilty inclination” appears in the *Damascus Document*. See CD ii line 16. Cf. Goff, *4QInstruction*, 180; Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 49-50.

³⁵ Cf. Goff, *4QInstruction*, 180.

literature, but it is nonetheless set within a strong demonological semantic field.³⁶ Therefore, we might tentatively conclude that, at Qumran, the phrase יצר רע is loyal to its biblical roots, but it demonstrates an evolution in terms of understanding the יצר; that is to say, it is now considered separate from the human heart and is featured in a demonological semantic field (e.g. temptation, dominion, and banishment).³⁷ The יצר רע that we encounter at Qumran is in its early stages of development, in terms of reification and internalisation; that is to say, at Qumran the evil inclination starts to be understood as residing internally in humans, but it becomes a demonic, antinomian being.

At Qumran, therefore, the evil inclination is considered extraneous to the person. However, it is possible for the evil inclination to be rebuked. Moreover, it is best conceived as an active, external force that entices one to sin. Rosen-Zvi's conclusion of the יצר at Qumran is succinct and helpful. He notes: "At Qumran *yetzer* is the source of human sinfulness, in both its demonological context – as a counterpart for Satan, Belial, and the spirits of impurity – and in an anthropological one – as a component of human depravity."³⁸ It is important to keep this idea of the *yetzer* in mind later when our attention turns to the possible presence of evil inclination in James. To conclude then: at Qumran, the *yetzer* may be understood as having an internal and external dimension, the latter which is representative of a demonological field.

6.1.3. יצר/ διαβουλίον in Sirach

The inclusion of Sirach in this present discussion is particularly interesting because it serves to demonstrate that the idea of יצר was at home in the so-called "wisdom tradition", and this in turn easily lends itself to the proposal that it is present in James all the more convincing, especially when James is grouped or classified by most commentators as wisdom literature.³⁹ Moreover, and perhaps more importantly, including Sirach in turn means we are given the opportunity to

³⁶ See Flusser, "Qumran and Jewish Apotropaic Prayers," 194-205. Cf. Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 48.

³⁷ See Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 48-49.

³⁸ Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 52.

³⁹ Cf. Joel Marcus, "The Evil Inclination in the Epistle of James," *CBQ* 44 (1982): 606-621, 607, makes the same point.

investigate how humanity's tendency or potential to sin was being documented in terms of the Hebrew and Greek languages in the second-century BCE. Ben Sira's (i.e. the author's) views concerning humanity's potential to sin are expressed in Sir 15:11-20. These verses are presented below, but in the context of this present discussion it is suggested that one gives special attention to v.14.

11. Do not say, "It was the Lord's doing that I fell away"; for he does not do what he hates. 12. Do not say, "It was he who led me astray"; for he has no need of the sinful. 13. The Lord hates all abominations; such things are not loved by those who fear him. 14. **It was he who created humankind in the beginning, and he left them in the power of their own free choice [יִצַר/ διαβουλίου].** 15. If you choose, you can keep the commandments, and to act faithfully is a matter of your own choice. 16. He has placed before you fire and water, stretch out your hand for whichever you choose. 17. Before each person are life and death, and whichever one chooses will be given. 18. For great is the wisdom of the Lord, he is mighty in power and sees everything; 19. his eyes are on those who fear him, and he knows every human action. 20. He has not commanded anyone to be wicked, and he has not given anyone permission to sin.⁴⁰

It is hence the case then that when one is trying to evaluate Ben Sira's, and by extension, his grandson's views in relation to humanity's potential to sin, two nouns are relevant: יִצַר in the Hebrew and διαβουλίου in the Greek. A general discussion of יִצַר and how it may be understood is provided in §6.1.1., and how this may be applicable to Ben Sira will be outlined below, but first deciphering what διαβουλίου means is necessary. As seen above, the NRSV translates it as "own free choice", but how adequate a translation this actually is remains open to debate. Liddell and Scott's lexicon include the lexical form, i.e. τό διαβούλιον, and translate it as "debate" or "deliberation".⁴¹ Taking this into account a more accurate translation of διαβουλίου may therefore be "through self-deliberation". The Greek of Sirach 15:14 reads: "αὐτὸς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐποίησεν ἄνθρωπον καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὸν ἐν χειρὶ διαβουλίου αὐτοῦ." Therefore, I would suggest the

⁴⁰ Translation from NRSV, emphasis mine. It is important to note that in this instance the Greek text (i.e. Sirach) follows the Hebrew (i.e. Ben Sira). Alternative translations of Sir 15:14 are offered in the main body of the text.

⁴¹ Henry George Lidell and Robert Scott. "See διαβουλ-ιον τό," *Greek-English Lexicon*, 390.

following translation: “He it was who in the beginning created man, and left him in the hand of his self-determination.”⁴²

It is helpful to note that, in this instance, the numbering of the Hebrew and Greek composition follow one another. The Hebrew of Ben Sira 15:14 reads: אלהים מבראית [א] ברא אדם וישתיהו ביד חותפו ויתנהו ביד יצרו. A more exact translation of this verse may thus be: “God made humanity from the beginning and put him into the hand of his power and gave him into the hand of his own desire.”⁴³ There is a shade of variation between these two renderings (i.e. יצר and διαβουλίου), but the nuance operating behind the use of the two appears to be the same: God made humanity, and while this humanity has been created with the potential to sin, this potential to sin is not outside a person’s control, or at least their remit to try (cf. James 1:13).

Ellis notes that Sirach 15:11-20 demonstrate a reticence, on the part of Ben Sira, to identify God as ὁ πειράζων (i.e. tester),⁴⁴ which he suggests, may be indicative of the author’s concern to portray God as fair in all matters concerning judgment.⁴⁵ Rather, the role of ὁ πειράζων, Ellis maintains, falls to wisdom (e.g. Sir 4:17; 6:20-21). The author of Sirach rejects the notion that humanity have sinned on account of divine agency, and rather places the responsibility entirely on the person and their own individual יצר/διαβούλιον. This is bolstered, Ellis argues, by allusions to the Genesis creation account in Ben Sira 15:11-20, esp. v. 14, thereby extending the implications of man’s original created state to this present audience.⁴⁶

⁴² Translation mine.

⁴³ Translation adapted from <http://www.bensira.org/navigator.php?Manuscript=A&PageNum=11>. Accessed on March 7th, 2018.

⁴⁴ Ellis notes that while God is mentioned in relation to testing in Sir 2:1; 33:1; 34:10; 44:20, Ben Sira never directly names God as the agent responsible for testing. See Ellis, *The Hermeneutics of Divine Testing*, 76.

⁴⁵ Throughout Sirach God is positioned as the judge in the heavenly court (esp. Sir 1:8). There is an emphasis on God’s judgments as being fair and impartial; see Sir 16:11; 17:20; 18:13; Sir 35. Ellis, *The Hermeneutics of Divine Testing*, 77.

⁴⁶ Ellis, *The Hermeneutics of Divine Testing*, 80, notes: “All, including Adam, have a choice to either obey or disobey the divine law. Further, any person can ‘keep the commandments’ (15:15), choosing ‘fire and water’ ‘life and death’ (15:17). Those who fear the Lord, hold on to the Law (15:11), keep the commandments and ‘act faithfully’ (πίστιν ποιῆσαι) will obtain wisdom (15:10,

But, how exactly are we to understand the יצר in Ben Sira?⁴⁷ Various views are possible. For example, Murphy argues the יצר of Ben Sira is primarily based on the evil inclination.⁴⁸ Similarly, Collins maintains that it is referring to the basic faculty for human reason, and may thus be viewed in terms of “naive volunteerism”.⁴⁹ When discussing Ben Sira 15:11-20, Miryam Brand contends that the author is seemingly responding to a Judean development based on broader Hellenistic thought that assumed a deterministic underlying human agency.⁵⁰ Ben Sira 15:14, she argues, forms the cornerstone of interpreting how Ben Sira conceives of sin; this verse describes the relationship between God, the human and the יצר of the human being in a manner that will absolve God of responsibility for human sin. Building on Di Lella’s work,⁵¹ Brand maintains that the meaning of the יצר is made clear in the Genizah manuscripts by the addition of a gloss.⁵² The inclusion of this gloss is, she maintains, demonstrative of the later editor’s wish to illustrate the nature of the יצר describing it in terms akin to

a ‘crown of rejoicing’ (στέφανον ἀγαλλιάματος, 15:16), and finally ‘life’ (15:17).” It is interesting to note the parallels between the “crown of rejoicing” (στέφανον ἀγαλλιάματος, 15:16) and the “the crown of life” (τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς) of James 1:12. See Chapter Three.

⁴⁷ There are other instances or allusions to the concept of יצר in this writing; e.g. see Sir 21:11; 27:5-6, but Sir 15:11-14 offers us the most insight when determining Ben Sira’s views on human inclination.

⁴⁸ Murphy, “Yēser in Qumran Literature,” 334-338.

⁴⁹ Collins, “Interpretations of the Creation of Humanity in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 34; *idem*, *Jewish Wisdom*, 83-87.

⁵⁰ Miryam T. Brand, *Evil Within and Without: The Source of Sin and Its Nature as Portrayed in Second Temple Literature* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 96-97: “The prevalence of determinism in Greek and Hellenistic thought was not exclusive to Stoic views; it later extended to Platonic and Aristotelian philosophy as well. The focus in Hellenistic determinism was not the determinism of human sinfulness but, frequently, the determinism of human actions. This may have been transposed to Jewish thought to include the act of sinning itself. It is the idea that actual sins are determined by God that Ben Sira finds objectionable.” Cf. James 1:13.

⁵¹ See Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Hebrew Text of Sirach: A Text Critical and Historical Study* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1966), 121-125.

⁵² It is important to note that the gloss identified by Brand is restricted to the verse she classifies as 15:14_{add} and to the expression “וישתייהו ביד הוהתפּוּ”. According to Brand, the gloss at 15:14_{add} serves to identify “the yēser as an anthropomorphic ‘snatcher’ . . . [it] is not motivated by Ben Sira’s intent to distance God from sin, but rather by a later editor’s wish to illustrate the nature of the yēser.” See Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 99-100.

the Rabbinic understanding of this term.⁵³ Its occurrence in Ben Sira 15:14, she argues, “reflects the moral choice of the human being in keeping with biblical use [Gen 6:5; 8:21], and *denotes human character*.”⁵⁴ Ellis, on the other hand, interprets it as being internalized into the human heart (cf. Gen 6:5; 8:21), where human volunteerism is hampered by certain demonic traits (cf. Sir 3:23; 5:2). It is his view that this author portrays observance of the law as providing the tools for controlling one’s יצר, but adherence to the law is nonetheless dependent on each individual’s own choice (Sir 21:11; 44:20; cf. Jas 2:8).⁵⁵ In regard to the arguments put forward by Brand and Ellis, Brand’s is more convincing because of the emphasis Ben Sira places on human choice in Ben Sira 15:14. Moreover, it is unclear that Ben Sira viewed the heart in terms of being consumed by demonic traits, but Ellis’ suggestion that Ben Sira portrays observance of the law as providing the tools for controlling one’s יצר, is accurate.

Sir 15:11-20 does not express a tendency toward sin; God has allowed for humans to be swayed by their own character, and humans are free to make their own choice.⁵⁶ The former understanding contains striking parallels to what we

⁵³ Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 104, notes that in the LXX *yētser* is translated as *diaboulion*, the latter which explicitly expresses the ability to deliberate between good and evil, as in Sir 17:6. She goes on to note (on p. 105) that “by interpreting *yēser* as *diaboulion*, the translator has distanced God further from the responsibility of human sin. Surrendering humans to their character may indicate that human character is determined by God. In contrast, *diaboulion* signifies the human capacity for free choice, and therefore *cannot* be determined.” (Emphasis original.)

⁵⁴ Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 101. (Emphasis original.) Cf. Sir 27:6.

⁵⁵ Ellis, *The Hermeneutics of Testing*, 84-93. Similarly Rosen-Zvi argues that the study of the Torah is presented as one of a list of “war tactics” that one can implement to overcome one’s own יצר in some tannaitic literature. See Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 16-35.

⁵⁶ When discussing how Ben Sira possibly conceives of sin it is to Sir 15:11-20 that most scholars turn; however, a passage which seems to contradict all of the above analysis, or at least serves to demonstrate the author’s lack of concern for the apparent contradictions in his work, is Sir 33:7-15. In Sir 33:7-15 the author’s aim seems to be to explain election, and within this context, he explains evil-doers as part of the natural dichotomy of the universe, which allows sinners to continue in the universe, often doing so successfully, as part of the universe’s “harmony of opposites”. In this way the universe is depicted as dualistic and deterministic, and while this is consistent with Pythagorean ideas, it is inconsistent with the content of Sir 15:11-120. Sirach contains other references that are, on the surface at least, also difficult to reconcile: e.g. Sir 17:31;

see going on in James 1:13-15, and its portrayal of creation is similar to what we have already seen in 4Q417 1 i lines 13b-18 in Chapter Five: everyone is made equal and given the same potential to pursue wisdom, but this pursuit is dependent on their own individual choice (see §5.2.1.). Incidentally, *4QInstruction* states that revealed wisdom allows one to distinguish between good and evil (4Q417 1 i lines 1-9). Moreover, it is interesting to note that Ben Sira does not reflect upon the evil agent within the “fall tradition”. Collins suggests this omission might be due to Ben Sira’s wish to emphasize human responsibility for transgression rather than any external agency.⁵⁷

The presentation of the יצר in Ben Sira and διαβουλίου in Sirach is noteworthy; God is cleared in terms of the existence of sin, but the יצר/διαβουλίου is attributed to him. In this way the author of Sirach manages to simultaneously connect and distance God from sin.⁵⁸ The יצר/διαβουλίου is not directly equated with sin, but if acted upon it will lead to sin, which in turn will ultimately lead to death (Sirach 15:17). Moreover, a demonological paradigm is ruled out. Ben Sira’s understanding of sin is interesting and is important to keep in mind when the same questions are being explored in relation to the context of the Letter of James in Part Four of this Chapter.

6.1.4. ἐπιθυμία in Philo

Marcus first argued that Philo provided justification for assessing ἐπιθυμία in James with יצר *vis-a-vis* Philo.⁵⁹ He proposes a similarity in the use and/or interpretation between Philo’s use of ἐπιθυμία to that in James 1:14.⁶⁰ Philo is

25:24. Despite these contradictions it needs to be noted also that Sir 21:21 and 23:2-6 seem to accord with the content of Sir 15:11-20. For more on this see Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 106-118. On 119, Brand helpfully notes that the “inconsistencies” of ancient texts “allowed for flexibility when faced with the variety of human experience and enabled a complex worldview.”

⁵⁷ Collins, “Interpretations of the Creation of Humanity in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 34. However also see Sir 22:27-23:2, a passage that takes on the form of an apotropaic prayer, where classical demonological language is ascribed to the body parts. Cf. Ellis, *The Hermeneutics of Divine Testing*, 82. Note the negative portrayal of the mouth and tongue in Sir 22:27 is similar to the sentiments we see in James 3:6. See §6.5.3.

⁵⁸ Cf. Marcus, “The Evil Inclination of James,” 608.

⁵⁹ See Marcus, “The Evil Inclination of James,” 605-621.

⁶⁰ Marcus, “The Evil Inclination of James,” 613-615.

(obviously) writing and thinking in Greek, and Marcus' attempt to link Philo's use of ἐπιθυμία to James' use of the same word, and to understand this in terms of the Jewish concept of יצר, is hence deserving of attention. Whether Marcus' attempt is successful remains open to debate, but as we shall see in §6.4.1. James' choice of ἐπιθυμία is unusual and is not encountered elsewhere in the LXX. Moreover, it may also be helpful to note that there is no direct Greek equivalent for the Hebrew term יצר because no specific rendering appears to have been able to successfully capture all the shades of its meaning. Therefore, a variety of Greek words are used. For example, when discussing Sir 15:14 (LXX) above in §6.1.3., we saw that διαβούλιον was used. It is for this reason that bringing Philo into this discussion, as Marcus helpfully did, may provide further insight because Philo uses ἐπιθυμία, and related words, throughout his corpus when discussing humanity's proclivity to evil. Indeed, Allison notes that it is Philo who, in *Spec.* 4.84 labels ἐπιθυμία as "the fountain of all evils".⁶¹

The inclusion of Philo offers us an Alexandrian counterpart to our discussion, and his views concerning cosmology may also prove to be particularly illuminating to James and *4QInstruction*.⁶² Moreover, Philo also provides us with a sharp contrast to how sin was interpreted at Qumran because Philo, like Ben Sira, rejects demonology as an explanation for human sinfulness. When discussing the story of the Watchers in terms of being a common etiological explanation for sin in Second Temple literature, Archie Wright helpfully comments: "Philo is not willing to accept this rationale and chose to explain the struggles of humanity in light of individual responsibility to overcome the temptations of evil."⁶³

⁶¹ Allison, *James*, 251; Allison notes that Philo repeats this sentiment elsewhere e.g. *Decal* 142, 173. See *James*, 251, n. 233.

⁶² Discussions concerning Philo's understanding of evil have been included in many extensive treatments regarding the metaphysical concept of evil; e.g. see Oliver Leaman, *Evil and Suffering in Jewish Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 33-47; David Runia, "Theodicy in Philo of Alexandria," in *Theodicy in the World of the Bible* (eds., A. Laato and J. C. de Moore; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 576-604.

⁶³ Archie T. Wright, "Some Observations of Philo's *De Gigantibus* and Evil Spirits in Second Temple Judaism," *JSJ* 36 (2005): 471-488, 487. E.g. see *De Spec. Leg.* 1 89. Cf. Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 54.

Marcus' study, as just noted, is particularly valuable because his discussion focuses on discussing the evil inclination of James in relation to Philo (among other writings).⁶⁴ Marcus highlights Philo's warnings of the evils associated with desire. For example, *Spec. Leg* 4 14-16 is a homily against desire, describing it as "the fountain of all evil" and "a battery of destruction of the soul". The latter is particularly illuminating when assessing James' statement that desire leads to sin in 1:15.⁶⁵ Philo uses a variety of images to illustrate this point, but most notably he refers to them as acting like military commanders in *Migr. Abr.* 11, and this, Marcus notes, is similar to what we see in James 4:1 where disputes warring among the community members are mentioned.⁶⁶ Moreover, *Spec. Leg.* 4:15 refers to the effect of desire of the tongue once again reminding the reader of James 3:1-12.⁶⁷ It is interesting to note that the perils of the tongue in relation to one's evil inclination are mentioned in both Sir 22:17 and *Spec. Leg.* 4:15, especially as we see similar sentiments expressed in James 3:1-12 (cf. 4Q418 222 lines 1-4).⁶⁸

As was the case in Sirach, Philo also emphasizes, Brand argues, the human responsibility for sin, but extends this analysis further by also emphasizing the human capability to prevent it. For example, as is the case in Sirach, God is distanced from the responsibility of sin (cf. Jas 1:13). To reinforce God's disassociation from sin, Philo describes moral evil as inherently human in *Fug.* 79-80, and goes as far as to limit God's providence in Prov. 2.82.⁶⁹

⁶⁴ Marcus, "The Evil Inclination of James," 613, notes that while much of Philo is obviously influenced by Stoicism, the emphasis Philo places on the *voluntariness* of desire is more indicative of Jewish thought (e.g. *Dec.* 28 §142). It is Marcus' argument that the latter is analogous with what we see going on in James.

⁶⁵ Marcus, "The Evil Inclination of James," 613.

⁶⁶ Marcus, "The Evil Inclination of James," 614.

⁶⁷ Marcus, "The Evil Inclination of James," 614-615, notes other instances such as *De spec. leg* 4:14 §83 and *De dec.* 28 §150 where Philo compares ἐπιθυμία to a fire corrupting the whole body, which is similar to Jas 3:16.

⁶⁸ 4Q418 222 line 2 is especially interesting: DJD 34: 437 translate it: "[he]ar his spirit. And the outpouring of his lips do not . . .]

⁶⁹ Philo's view of the human origin of sin is further delineated in *Det.* 122. Moreover, this same writing offers an explanation of Gen 5:29. It reflects a negative view of human tendencies and is indicative of Philo's general pessimistic view of human choice and free will, the latter that

However, a notable difference between Sirach's and Philo's teachings on the origin of sin arises: in *Fug.* 79-80 Philo juxtaposes his assertion that no bad thing can come from God, while Sirach 15:11-20 appears to be satisfied with the claim that God would not create what he hates. Brand notes that this slight nuance or contrast between the two might be "the result of Philo's philosophical approach contrasted to Ben Sira's more anthropomorphic view of God."⁷⁰ For now it is helpful to note that Philo's juxtaposition seems to accord more with James' sentiments in 1:17, than it does with Sirach.

While the topic of probation is the focus of Ellis' monograph, he makes the decision to include Philo into his discussion because he maintains that the specifics of probation are folded into Philo's broader treatment of the metaphysical problem of evil.⁷¹ Like Brand, Ellis refers to *Fug.* 79-80 in terms of Philo affirming God's distance from sin and argues that "Philo's question of evil hinges on whether God can legitimately discipline his people through intermediaries without compromising his essence."⁷² These intermediaries were present at the moment of creation, acting as intermediary actors (e.g. *Conf.* 179-182), who were assigned with the task of making the mortal part of the soul. According to Philo, the soul was destined to receive good and evil, and thus the evil part can be attributed to these intermediaries, and not to God (see *Fug.* 71-72). Who exactly these intermediaries were remains slightly ambiguous, but *Sonn.* 1:69 refers to God sending his "word" (i.e. *logos*) or "angels".⁷³ Significantly, Ellis notes that, similar to Sirach, Philo rejects the demonic paradigm and deliberately chooses to explain the struggles of humanity in light

coincides with the idea of a human "evil inclination". See Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 119-121.

⁷⁰ Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 120.

⁷¹ Ellis, *The Hermeneutics of Divine Testing*, 98.

⁷² Ellis notes that Philo never specifically addresses whether God's biblical role as ὁ περᾶζων is questionable. He comments: "The problem of the acceptable roles in probation is answered by Philo's broader cosmology of divine transcendence and intermediation, rather than through a direct apologetic." Ellis, *The Hermeneutics of Divine Testing*, 100.

⁷³ Ellis, *The Hermeneutics of Divine Testing*, 101, notes that these cosmic actors are found across Philo's corpus, especially in the *Questions in Genesis and Exodus*, and the *Allegorical Commentary*.

of one's own individual responsibility to overcome the temptation of evil.⁷⁴ He comments:

God's ontological transcendence demands a distance from the base natural substance of humanity, to the point that even in the act of creation God utilized intermediary agents (the angels, the Logos, etc.) to form the natural substance of humankind. The resulting irrational part of the human constitution serves as the source of evil into this irrational part of the human soul, rejecting external demonic influences.⁷⁵

Philo's understanding of human nature, and its weaknesses, is significant because it draws from both biblical and philosophical traditions. Just as was the case in Sirach, Philo rules out a demonological paradigm, but Philo's description of sin as inherently human in *Fug* 79-80 serves to distance God from sin further. In this present context it is important to note that, in light of the above analysis, it is argued that Marcus' argument that Philo provides justification for assessing ἐπιθυμία in James with צרִי *vis-a-vis* Philo is convincing. Philo's description of ἐπιθυμία is similar to what James says the ἐπιθυμία in 1:14 leads to.

Comment on the Inclination to Evil

This section has sought to offer background and build upon observations before proceeding to discuss the understanding of evil in the Letter of James and *4QInstruction*. Much of the above analysis has centred on the Jewish concept of יצר, the latter which originated from a more nuanced interpretation of Gen 6:5; 8:21. Despite its various applications and interpretations, the יצר served as a means of explaining humanity's proclivity to sin and evil. The final section presented Philo's inclusion and use of ἐπιθυμία, and outlined how this may also be understood in relation to humanity's proclivity to evil. The reason for this analysis becomes clear when our attention turns to assessing the same question in James and *4QInstruction*; namely, how are evil and divine agency understood?

⁷⁴ This is, Ellis notes, despite the fact that Philo was aware of the paradigm of demonic cosmology; for example, Philo refers to Satan in *Spec. Leg.* 1:89. *The Hermeneutics of Divine Testing*, 102.

⁷⁵ Ellis, *The Hermeneutics of Divine Testing*, 105.

6.2. James 1:12-15: God Tests but does not Tempt

James 1:12-14 has particularly puzzled commentators of James. These verses read:

12. Blessed is the man who endures trial [πειρασμόν], for when he has stood the test he will receive the crown of life [τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς] which God has promised to those who love him. 13. Let no one say when he is tempted 'I am tempted by God'; for God cannot be tempted with evil and he himself tempts no one [ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ἀπειραστός ἐστὶν κακῶν, πειράζει δὲ αὐτὸς οὐδένα]; 14. but each person is tempted when he is lured and enticed by his own desire [ὑπὸ τῆς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας].⁷⁶ 15. Then, when that desire has conceived [εἶτα ἡ ἐπιθυμία συλλαβοῦσα], it gives birth to sin, and that sin, when it is fully grown, gives birth to death.

These verses, in association with 1:2-4,⁷⁷ state that any person who endures trials is blessed because such trials result in personal wholeness (cf. 4Q418 172 4), and that these trials cannot be attributed to God, because God tempts no one.⁷⁸ The latter declaration, defending divine integrity, is particularly noteworthy because it seems to present an exegetical problem; that is to say, the stories of Adam and Eve (Gen 2-3), Abraham's near sacrifice of Isaac (Gen 22:1),⁷⁹ and the sufferings of Job, to name but a few, all portray, on the surface at least, God as tempter.⁸⁰

⁷⁶ It is interesting to note that Jas 1:13-14 are the antithesis of v.12. Cf. Allison, *James*, 223.

⁷⁷ Jas 1:2-4 reads: "Count it all joy, my brethren, when you meet various trials [πειρασμοῖς], for you know that the testing of your faith [τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως] produces steadfastness. And let steadfastness have its full effect, that you may be perfect and complete, lacking in nothing."

⁷⁸ The idea of trials (πειρασμοί) leading to perfection is also seen in 1 Pet 1:6-7. Cf. Rom 5:3-5. In relation to the defense of divine integrity a similar message is also seen in 1 John 2:16-17.

⁷⁹ Martin notes how Gen 22 is changed and almost rewritten in *Jub* 17.16. While it is still God who tests Abraham, as documented in *Jub* 17.17-18, it is Prince Mastema who the greatest test is attributed to. We may infer from this that there was a widespread tradition in which God's involvement, or non-involvement, whichever the case may be, in human trials was actively being discussed. See Martin, *James*, 34.

⁸⁰ Moreover, in the Hebrew Bible God is frequently portrayed as being responsible for testing: see Gen 22:1; Exod 16:4; 20:20; Deut 8:2; 13:4 Psalm 26:2; Judges 8:25; Wis 3:5-6. In later Judaism there is a tendency to attribute this testing to a source, usually the devil: see 2 Sam 24:1; 1 Chron 21:1 1QM xvi - xvii. Likewise, one immediately thinks of instances in the NT where God tempts: e.g., the temptation of Christ in the gospel tradition or Paul's warring demonic powers (Eph 6:12). When discussing this exegetical problem Davids comments: "It would be

However, when the above excurses of Ben Sira, Qumran and Philo are taken into account (i.e. §6.1.2. – 6.1.4.), this exegetical problem seems less problematic. These excurses demonstrate that such indictments of divine character, their refutation, and the defense of divine integrity were all common in Second Temple literature. This is especially the case with Sirach, but it remains to be seen just how similar Sirach and James' views on humanity's proclivity to sin and evil actually are: it is important to remember that a demonological paradigm is ruled out by the author of Sirach, whereas as we shall see below, this does not appear to be the case in James (e.g. Jas 2:19, 4:7).

In light of Chapter Three (esp. §3.1.1. and 3.1.2.), the defense of God and his disassociation with sin/evil, outlined in James 1:12-14, is noteworthy. James 1:5 makes clear that it is God who reveals wisdom and this revealed wisdom may be understood as being heavenly (cf. 1:17). In light of this reading, it is fair to argue that this wisdom provides a solution to the failings of the human condition. Therefore, it is imperative for the author to separate the origins of evil from the giver of revelation. James clearly conceives of internal (Jas 1:12-15) and external troubles (Jas 1:2-4; 4:1), and while the wisdom of 1:5 enables one to perform wisdom faithfully, it also provides one with the proper tools making them equipped to deal with such trials, and ultimately to overcome them. In this sense, the heavenly wisdom in James has both an internal and external dimension. In other words, σοφία ἄνωθεν empowers one to become "whole" (cf. 1:4), and the emphasis James places on action in relation to the pursuit of σοφία ἄνωθεν may thus be understood in terms of or in relation to the constant battle against evil.

6.2.1. History of Interpretation

In light of the excurses offered above (i.e. §6.1.2. – 6.1.4.) we will now investigate how James 1:12-14 has commonly been interpreted. In other words, how does James conceive of sin within his cosmology? Does James conceive of a negative anthropology: is sin (i.e. acting contrary to God's cosmos) to be

wrong to consider this a theodicy: James is not explaining how a good God can permit evil, but whether God is the efficient cause of the impulse to abandon the faith. His focus is practical rather than theoretical." Davids, *James*, 81.

understood in terms of originating from within the human psyche (i.e. Jas 1:14), and as being akin with the Jewish concept of יצר of Second Temple literature generally? Or are other external forces at work (e.g. the devil [διάβολος] is in Jas 4:7)? If both explanations suffice, that is that James' presentation of sin has an anthropological and demonological dimension, how are we to explain or align these two constructs?

It may be helpful to note that James 1:2-4 and 1:12-15 are both concerned with the theme of testing, and much of recent scholarship on James has hence discussed whether a sort of literary unity between these two sections might be identified.⁸¹ Dibelius, arguing that James is a collection of loosely connected paraenetic sections, proposes that any supposed connection between 1:2-4 and 1:12-15 is superficial.⁸² Against this are a number of modern commentators such as Johnson and Allison who argue in favour of a type of literary unity existing/operating between these pericopae; that is to say, the purpose of the trials is made clear in 1:2-4, and God's association (or disassociation in this case) to such trials is portrayed in 1:12-14.⁸³ Martin disagrees with a close reading of the two pericopae arguing that a difference separates the two. He argues that James 1:2-4 is concerned about suffering in the face of persecution, whereas James 1:12-14 are discussing moral perfection rather than testing *per se*.⁸⁴

However, it is my view that a type of literary unity between James 1:2-4 and 1:12-15 appears certain on account of their parallel content. In relation to these two pericopae, it seems to be the case that a semantic shift occurs in terms of there being a move from test (Jas 1:2-4) to temptation (Jas 1:12-15). Ellis notes that many commentators "understand vv.2-3 (and probably v.12) to reference common 'tests' or 'trials' enacted through divine agency, in contrast to

⁸¹ If a general structural unit is allowed from Jas 1:2-14 scholars have also attempted to locate the *Sitz im Leben* or the event described in these verses; for example Laws, *Commentary on the Epistle of James*, 3, attempts to define suffering broadly in terms of economic and social disadvantages, while Allison, *James*, 225, questions whether these trials can be read as paralleling the great tribulation or messianic woes that precede the return of Jesus in the Gospels, Paul, 1 Peter and Revelation.

⁸² Dibelius, *James*, 71.

⁸³ See e.g. Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 203; Allison, *James*, 225.

⁸⁴ Martin, *James*, 30. Cf. John S. Kloppenborg, "James 1:2-15 and Hellenistic Psychagogy," *NovT* (2010): 37-71, 65-70.

vv.13ff where psychological or spiritual enticement to evil thought and sin, i.e. ‘temptations’ are enacted without divine agency.’⁸⁵ Similarly, Allison notes an “imbedded distinction” between “God testing or trying with hope of a good outcome, vs. the devil who tempts with nothing save an evil end in view”.⁸⁶ Johnson sees “testing” as the external threat in view through v.12, whereas vv.13-15 examines the “internal psychological division that such trials create”.⁸⁷ Davids’ interpretation of these units remains unique; he insists on a consistent semantic meaning across 1:2-14 suggesting that in v.13 the author is describing “tests” of v.2, whereas v.12 is an “enticement to abandon God”.⁸⁸ Alternatively, Kloppenborg suggests these verses may be understood in terms of achieving moral progress, the latter being comparable with Stoic ethical teaching.⁸⁹ However these verses are interpreted, it is clear that they lie at the centre in terms of how James conceives of sin and evil.

At this point it may be helpful to note that the theme of testing is also present in *4QInstruction*. The addressee’s life is not easy, and it appears that he is experiencing real material hardship (cf. §2.3.4.). For example, numerous passages of *4QInstruction* indicate that the addressee was in need of credit (e.g.

⁸⁵ Ellis, *The Hermeneutics of Divine Testing*, 20. Ellis goes on to note that the shift between lexemes and their underlying semantic roles is almost universally justified by a “corresponding grammatical shift from the substantive πειρασμός (vv. 2, 3, 12) to the verbal πειράζειν (vv.13-14).

⁸⁶ Allison, *James*, 225.

⁸⁷ Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 192.

⁸⁸ Davids, *The Epistle of James*, 81-82. Here Davids’ analysis is based on his earlier work in which he reads Jas 1:13 as “God ought not to be tested”, drawing from the divine commandment in Deut 6:6. See Peter H. Davids, “The Meaning of ΑΙΕΙΠΑΣΤΟΣ in James 1:13.” *NTS* 24/3 (1978): 391-410.

⁸⁹ Kloppenborg, “James 1:2-15 and Hellenistic Psychology,” 57, 68. In the conclusion (70-71) to this article Kloppenborg notes that his task was to point out that the author of this epistle “reveals an array of interests in psychagogy and the care of the soul” which characterized various strains of Hellenistic philosophy of the early Roman period. He goes on to note that this array of interests in psychagogy “permits us to suggest a social location of James within those circles of educated or semi-educated Judeans, probably urban, who understood the Torah to be consistent with the best of Greek philosophy, and indeed urged that the ideals of popularized Platonism and Stoicism could best be met by adhering to the Torah, conceived as ‘the law of perfect freedom’ and the ‘implanted logos’.”

4Q417 2 i lines 20-24), but ethical behaviour on the part of the *mebin* is nonetheless expected. He is instructed to be honest and pay off his debts promptly, even though lines 25-27 go on to state that the creditor may not show the same attitude towards him. While this is not directly synonymous with what we see going on in James 1:12-15, in that *4QInstruction* does not depict temptation *per se*, the hard life of the addressee may be viewed along the same lines as the tests faced by James' audience in James 1:2-5. Notably, while discussing the eschatological framework of James, Penner argues that the theme of testing can "become intertwined with expectations of a great day of judgment and reversal, and how the present can come to be viewed as a time of 'tribulation before the end'".⁹⁰ Even more noteworthy is that Penner goes on to link this idea of testing and eschatology to the יצר הרע at Qumran, suggesting that the latter may be interpreted in terms of the members of the *Yahad* needing to purify their hearts before the coming eschatological trials.⁹¹ Chapter Three of this thesis argued (esp. §3.2.) that eschatology is a prominent theme in both James and *4QInstruction*, and consequently, Penner's comments appear to be all the more appropriate. At the very least, this idea of testing serves as (another) analogy between these two writings.

At first the apparent rejection of God as tempter in James 1:13 seems particularly striking, especially in light of various Hebrew Bible passages where the opposite is portrayed (e.g. Exod 16:4; 20:20; Judg 8:25 cf. Sir 15:11-14).⁹² Understanding James 1:13 is dependent on two tasks: firstly, all appropriate lexical and semantic roles of *πειράζει δὲ αὐτὸς οὐδένα* need to be considered; and secondly, how this concept of testing/trials/probation fits into the wider cosmological framework of this epistle needs to be assessed. Ellis notes that three translations of 1:13 *πειράζει δὲ αὐτὸς οὐδένα* are possible: (1) God cannot be

⁹⁰ Penner, *The Epistle of James*, 191.

⁹¹ Penner cites 1QS iv line 20 and 4Q417 ii as to possible examples. See Penner, *The Epistle of James*, 192.

⁹² While the claim that God is not the tempter is striking, Dibelius helpfully notes that later wisdom literature sometimes took issue with the attribution of temptation to God. Dibelius, *James*, 91. Kloppenborg, "James 1:2-15 and Hellenistic Philosophy," 66, suggests that this taking issue with attributing temptation to God may be explained by the influence of Hellenistic philosophy. See Sir 15:11-12.

solicited/tempted by evil;⁹³ (2) God is inexperienced by evil; and/or (3) God ought not to be tempted by evil persons.⁹⁴ Davids supports the third option arguing that James is recalling the divine command of Deut 6:16,⁹⁵ but Allison rejects Davids' suggestion maintaining that a semantic shift has already occurred in 1:13 and the emphasis has thus shifted from testing to tempting.⁹⁶ According to these readings, in 1:13 James is attempting to convey the understanding that God tests, but does not tempt, and therefore evil cannot be attributed to God (cf. Jas 1:17). Ellis, on the other hand, rejects that any semantic shift occurs in these verses, and opines that such an identification "seems little more than a legitimisation of the interpreter's own solution to a theological or biblical tension in the text, a solution invariably well-stocked with the interpreter's theological and hermeneutical predications".⁹⁷ Rather, Ellis argues that operating throughout this writing is what he coins to be a type of "reader-aware approach". For example, in 1:2 James exhorts his readers to consider it joy when trials are endured, and the benefits of such trials are made clear in 1:12 with the mention of the crown of life, or when the audience may wonder if God is responsible for such trials, the author immediately mirrors this claim and follows with an apologetic to rebuke such thinking in 1:13.⁹⁸ Ellis' argument is convincing, especially when the entire otherworldly framework of the letter is taken into account, but it is difficult to see why Ellis considers it necessary to dismiss the so-called semantic shift in 1:2-4, 12-15.⁹⁹ Neither argument is exclusive of one another, and the so-called semantic shift, supported by the majority of commentators on James, is equally compelling.

The idea of God as tester but not as tempter is important. Noting the biblical and theological tensions of 1:13, McKnight supports the understanding

⁹³ This translation is supported by Laws, *Commentary on the Epistle of James*, 71; Dibelius, *James*, 121-122.

⁹⁴ Ellis, *The Hermeneutics of Divine Testing*, 21-22.

⁹⁵ Davids, "The Meaning of ΑΙΠΕΙΡΑΣΤΟΣ in James 1:13." 392.

⁹⁶ Allison, *James*, 242.

⁹⁷ Ellis, *The Hermeneutics of Divine Testing*, 26.

⁹⁸ See Ellis, *The Hermeneutics of Divine Testing*, 26-27.

⁹⁹ See also Nicholas Ellis "A Theology of Evil in the Epistle of James: Cosmic Trials and the *Dramatis Personae* of Evil," in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity* (eds. Chris Keith and Loren T. Stuckenbruck; WUNT 417; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 262-281.

of God as tester, but fails to actually explain the reasons behind why James may be doing this.¹⁰⁰ Davids, on the other hand, discusses the possible use of the pseudepigrapha in the writing, and notes that reference to specific Hebrew Bible passages, especially in 1:13, is indicative of James' awareness of Jewish traditions that allow him to reinterpret the original citation. Davids argues that 1:13 is demonstrative that "he apparently feels no tension between it [1:13] and Gen 22.1."¹⁰¹ This, he suggests, may indicate that James had prior knowledge of *Jubilees* 17.17-18, or at the least tradition(s) behind it.¹⁰² Davids is joined by Ellis in agreeing that the idea of re-interpretation or re-written Bible is of central importance, but Ellis wishes to develop Davids' analysis further. While James' denial of divine agency remains striking, it is fair to say that it clearly indicates that the author was aware and influenced by post biblical traditions where new nuances were being applied.

Divine integrity is upheld in James 1:13 and it is thus appropriate that the following verse states each person is *πειράζεται* "when he is lured and enticed by his own desire [*ἐπιθυμία*]" . Walter Wilson argues that this verse:

highlights how the human choice made one way or the other, sets in motion a chain of events that determines one's final destiny . . . The decision that confronts the human self in its experience of evil, then, is presented as a decision between endurance and desire.¹⁰³

James 1:14 is central when assessing James' understanding of evil. If sinful behaviour cannot be attributed to God (1:13), Ellis then appropriately questions who is the agent that the author intended to be the substitute for divine agency. For example, might an external demonic agent be understood as acting upon the human psyche, or is this verse best understood as affirming that evil behaviour is indicative of an internal anthropology (akin to the Jewish understanding of

¹⁰⁰ McKnight, *Letter of James*, 17, 115.

¹⁰¹ Peter H. Davids, "The Use of the Pseudepigrapha in the Catholic Epistles," in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Literature* (eds. James H. Charlesworth and Craig A. Evans; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 228-245, 230.

¹⁰² Davids, "The Pseudepigrapha in the Catholic Epistles," 229.

¹⁰³ Walter Wilson, "Sin and Sex and Sex and Sin: The Anthropology of James 1:12-15," *HTR* 95/2 (2002): 147-168, 159.

יצר)?¹⁰⁴ Or, might both internal and external forces be understood to be at play? Rosen Zvi's contributions (outlined above) widen the margins when assessing how ancient writers understood evil, and we may therefore also speculate as to whether James conceives of evil internally, but that this is also coupled with external, demonological forces. Before assessing James 1:14 in detail, our attention first turns to *4QInstruction* and its interpretation/understanding of evil. It is hoped that such a discussion will offer further insight when assessing this complex question in James.

6.3. Evil Inclination in *4QInstruction*: Internal and External?

Part Three of this chapter examines the role of יצר in *4QInstruction*. In §6.1.2. the topic of the יצר at Qumran generally was addressed, and as a result this part and its associated sub-sections, focus on *4QInstruction* exclusively. The decision to do this is based on the overall topic of this thesis and its overarching view that reading the Letter of James in light of *4QInstruction* is beneficial in terms of understanding the former.

In *4QInstruction* the noun יצר occurs seven times: 4Q416 1 line 16; 4Q417 1 i lines 9, 11, 17; 4Q417 1 ii line 12; 4Q418 43-45 i line 13; 4Q418 217 line 1, the last of which has no meaningful context.¹⁰⁵ Verbal form of the root יצר occurs in 4Q417 1 i 17 (i.e. יצרו) when describing the “fashioning” of the עם^{עם} like the angels.¹⁰⁶ It is my argument that discussing these יצרים, particularly its/their portrayed association with flesh, will provide insights when considering the internalisation of evil in this composition. The association or connection made in *4QInstruction* between the יצר and flesh (i.e. 4Q416 1 line 16 refers to the יצר בשר) brings to mind the commonly held view of the binary antithesis between flesh and spirit in this writing.¹⁰⁷ This topic will be returned to below.

¹⁰⁴ Ellis, *The Hermeneutics of Divine Testing*, 22.

¹⁰⁵ For a more informative list see DJD 34: 558.

¹⁰⁶ Several other verbal occurrences of יצר are also included in *4QInstruction*; e.g. see 4Q416 2 iii line 17; 4Q418 69 ii line 6.

¹⁰⁷ Tigchelaar, “Evil Inclination,” 352, maintains that this personification of the “evil inclination” is part of the broader attested tendency to personify virtues and vices. Moreover, this personified “evil inclination” may be representative of the broader dualistic system. See 4Q436. This antithesis between “flesh” and “spirit” is also encountered in Pauline literature; for example see 1

6.3.1. 4Q417 1 i lines 9, 11, 17-18

4Q417 1 i remains one of the most written about columns of *4QInstruction*. In Chapter Five this column was discussed in detail when adjudicating whether revelation is universal or given to an elect (i.e. pre-determined) group of humanity, and also what this revelation is in terms of what it offers to its recipients (see §5.2.1.). When discussing the concepts of “spirit” and “flesh” in *4QInstruction*, it is commonly argued that these categories are representative of a binary antithesis between two groups of humanity; however as we saw, this apparent binary antithesis only occurs in 4Q417 1 i lines 13b-18. That this binary opposition only occurs once in *4QInstruction* seems remarkable, but it is less remarkable if we understand the $\text{רוח} \text{עם} \text{נִבְּרָה}$ to mean “a people with a spirit”, and not “spiritual people”. Consequently, the binary relationship between spirit and flesh, in terms of denoting different groups of humanity, at least, disappears.¹⁰⁸

Thess 5:23; Gal 4:29; 6:1; 1 Cor 2:10-3:3. The presence of this binary opposition between spirit and flesh in Paul has led some scholars to investigate whether Paul himself formed this antithesis, or if he adopted – at least some of its aspects – from an earlier tradition, perhaps Palestinian Jewish sapiential traditions. For this reason 4Q417 1 i line 13b has often been spoken about in relation to various extracts of the Pauline corpus. See Goff, Goff, “Being Fleshly or Spiritual,” 41-59; Frey, “The Notion of ‘Flesh’ in 4QInstruction and the Background of Pauline Usage,” 197-226; idem, “Flesh and Spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and the Qumran Texts: An Inquiry into Pauline Usage,” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (eds. Charlotte Hempel, Armin Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 367-404; Tigchelaar, “Reflections on 4QInstruction and 1 Corinthians,” 103-118. See also Wold, “‘Flesh’ and ‘Spirit’ in Qumran Sapiential Literature as the Background to the Use in Pauline Epistles,” 262-279, who fundamentally disagrees with this supposed antithesis.

¹⁰⁸ *Contra* Goff, “Being Fleshly or Spiritual,” 41-59, who understands 4Q417 1 i 13b-18 as depicting a double creation (i.e. “spiritual people” and “fleshly spirit”) and therefore understands the $\text{רוח} \text{בִּשְׂר}$ as a reference to Adam as a fallible human being in Gen 2-3. In this instance Goff’s analysis on “spirit” and “flesh” and his proposed understanding is offered in relation to 1 Cor 3 and 15. Similarly, Frey, “The Notion of ‘Flesh’ in 4QInstruction and the Background of Pauline Usage,” 197-226, discusses the negative use of “flesh” in *4QInstruction*. Frey’s discussion focuses on Gal 5:17 and Rom 8:5. In terms of *4QInstruction* he maintains that there is a clear link between the term “flesh” to sin and iniquity, and the notion of human inability to grasp God’s revelation (220-221). See also Tigchelaar, “Reflections on 4QInstruction and 1 Corinthians,” 103-118. Tigchelaar’s contribution engages with Frey and argues that the two types of humanities in *4QInstruction* should not be compared with the distinction in 1 Cor 3:1 between fleshly

Therefore, to reaffirm one of the central arguments of Chapter Five: a dualistic understanding of humanity in *4QInstruction* is rejected. While a binary opposition between flesh and spirit is present in *4QInstruction*, it is only being used to denote righteous and wicked behaviour, and not anthropological groupings.¹⁰⁹

4Q417 1 i is included into this present discussion because this column contains three occurrences of יצר. The first two are included in lines 9 and 11, and may be viewed as being relatively benign, and consequently warrant only brief comment. Line 9 is translated as follows: “He has *laid out* its (= truth’s) *foundation*, *And its deeds* [He has *prepared with all wis*]dom. *And with all[c]unning has He fashioned it* [יצרה], *And the domain of its deeds (creatures)*”.¹¹⁰ Similarly, line 11 reads: “in the [fashion (inclination)] of *their/his* understanding [מבינתם]. *And He will/did expound* for *m[an . . .]* *And in abundance/property/purity of understanding were made kn[own the se]crets of*”.¹¹¹ Collins interprets these lines in terms of *4QInstruction*’s possible depiction of the good inclination, arguing that people “can resist the evil inclination, and exercise at least a measure of free choice.”¹¹² Similarly, Cook argues that the word יצר is used in the DSS in association with external forces, those of good and evil, and in the case of *4QInstruction*, he agrees with Collins’ argument that the יצר can be either good or bad.¹¹³ In light of Rosen-Zvi’s convincing rejection of the so-called יצר הטוב on account of its explicit absence in Second Temple literature (see §6.1.1.), I consider Collins and Cook’s views to be unconvincing. It is more appropriate to say that these instances do not provide

(σαρκίνους) and spiritual (πνευματικοί) types of people, but rather with physical (φυσικοί) and spiritual (πνευματικοί) kinds of people. Despite the variations in their arguments, Goff, Frey and Tigchelaar all apply a dualistic understanding of humanity to *4QInstruction*. Also see Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 125-126.

¹⁰⁹ It is interesting to note that the term רוה בשר is also present in 1QH^a v lines 30-31; cf. 1QS xi line 9 where it appears to denote humanity in general, but it is also portrayed as being opposed to God’s spirit. Cf. Tigchelaar, “Reflections on 4QInstruction and 1 Corinthians,” 110.

¹¹⁰ Translation from DJD 34: 155.

¹¹¹ Translation from DJD 34: 155.

¹¹² Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 126.

¹¹³ Cook, “The Origin of the Tradition of the יצר הטוב and יצר הרע,” 89-90.

much insight when discussing the possible internalisation of evil in *4QInstruction*. With this in mind we turn to lines 17-18:

Translation¹¹⁴

17 according to the pattern of the Holy Ones [קדושים] *is his* (man's) fashioning [יצר]. *But* no more [ועוד לוא] *has* meditation been given to *a* (?) fleshly spirit [רוח בשר], For *it* (sc. flesh) knew/knows not the difference between
18 [goo]d and evil according to the judgment of *its* [sp]irit [כמשפט רוחו]. *vacat*
And thou, O understanding child, gaze on the mystery that is to come, And know

In 4Q417 1 i lines 17-18 it is made clear that elder's (i.e. humanity's) fashioning (יצר) is in the pattern of the holy ones, usually taken to mean angels (cf. 4Q418 81+81a lines 4-5). Moreover, as discussed in Chapter Four, *meditation* (i.e. revelation) is no longer given to the רוח בשר because this group of humanity has failed to distinguish between good and evil according to the judgment of their spirit. As previously stated, my interpretation of these lines, and of 4Q417 1 i lines 13b-18 generally, is directly indebted to Wold, and indirectly to Werman; these lines depict the universality of creation (see §5.2.1.).¹¹⁵ In particular, lines 17-18 refer to all of humanity's inclination as being angelic, or otherworldly, in the beginning. Consequently, the characterization of the *fleshly spirit* may therefore be understood as a wayward segment of humanity who have failed in terms of their pursuit of wisdom (cf. 4Q418 69 ii lines 11-15). Instead of a binary opposition between "fleshly spirit" and "spiritual people", the existence of which is rejected in Chapter Five of this thesis, Wold argues that the author is deliberately emphasizing that humanity has a spirit, and therefore exhibited throughout this writing is a concern for the maintenance of one's spirit (e.g. 4Q416 2 ii lines 6-7; 4Q416 2 iii line 6).¹¹⁶ This potential to corrupt one's spirit in *4QInstruction* might be compared to James' concern of a person not being whole or perfect. The emphasis on humanity's inclination as being angelic serves to further highlight the exalted status of the recipient(s) of *4QInstruction*, while

¹¹⁴ Translation from DJD 34: 155.

¹¹⁵ See Wold, "The Universality of Creation," 211-226; Werman, "What is the Book of Hagu?," 125-140.

¹¹⁶ Wold, "'Flesh' and 'Spirit.'" 266-267, 276-277.

also demonstrating the enormity of what the *רוח בשר* have lost. For Wold then, the *ביצר מבינתם* of 4Q417 1 i line 11 must be read in relation to the *יצר* of humanity presented in 4Q417 1 i line 17; it is a “description of how God ordered the universe and why all of humanity is held to account for its actions.”¹¹⁷ Therefore, the *יצר* of understanding directly relates it being fashioned in the likeness of angelic beings.

6.3.2. 4Q416 1 line 16: *יצר בשר*

The term flesh (*בשר*) is closely associated with evil throughout *4QInstruction*. For example, we now know the *רוח בשר* are characterised in terms of their opposition to God and their inability to discern between good and evil, the latter an attribute of the *רוז נהיה* (e.g. 4Q417 1 i line 8)¹¹⁸. Similarly, we know from 4Q417 1 i line 17 that this same group (i.e. *רוח בשר*) no longer receive the *vision of Hagu*. In addition, 4Q416 1 line 12 makes clear that the *רוח בשר* stand eschatologically condemned and it is them who will be destroyed at the final judgment. It is in this context that the emphasis of the addressee being separated from the *רוח בשר*, resulting in the addressee being “separated from everything that God hates” in 4Q418 81+81a 1-2, is best interpreted (cf. §5.2.2.).¹¹⁹ “Flesh” has undoubtedly a negative association or connotation in this writing, but it is its particular association or connection with the *צרי* in *4QInstruction* that is in focus here.

4Q416 1 line 16 refers to the *יצר בשר*, usually translated as an “inclination of flesh” or “fleshy inclination”. Included below is a translation of 4Q416 1 lines 12-16 where the *יצר בשר* is referred to. In addition, the *רוח בשר* are also mentioned: the proximity of these two terms (i.e. the *יצר בשר* and *רוח בשר*) is noteworthy.

¹¹⁷ Benjamin Wold, “Demonizing Sin? The Evil Inclination in 4QInstruction,” in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity* (eds. Chris Keith and Loren T. Stuckenbruck; WUNT 417; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 34-48, 45.

¹¹⁸ See 3.2.2 – 3.2.3.

¹¹⁹ The emphasis on the *mebin* being separated from all that God hates (i.e. the *רוח בשר*) in 4Q418 81+81a 1-2 is reminiscent of the antithesis we see between the God and the world in James, esp. 4:4. Cf. §3.2.2.

Translation¹²⁰

12 The [se]as and the depths fear, and every spirit of flesh [כל רוּחַ בָּשָׂר] *will be destroyed*. But the sons of Heave[n] [וּבְנֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם] *sh[all rejoice in the day]*

13 [when it (sc. wickedness) is ju]dged. And (when) all iniquity shall come to an end. *Until* the epoch of tru[th] will be *perfected [forever, And there will endure*

14 in all periods of eternity. For He is a God of fidelity. And from *of old, (from)* years of [eternity]

15 So that *the righteous may distinguish (?)* between good and evil, *So that . . . every judgem[ent the creator of]*

16 [the in]clination of flesh [יֵצֵר בָּשָׂר] is He (?). And *from* understand[ing]

The destruction of the רוּחַ בָּשָׂר (i.e. the segment of humanity who have failed in their pursuit of wisdom and are thus considered wicked) is made abundantly clear in lines 12-13. The רוּחַ בָּשָׂר are contrasted with בְּנֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם, the latter which can be reasonably be interpreted as a reference to angels (cf. 4Q418 126 i-ii lines 1-16). Significantly, we once again encounter an emphasis on the ability of the righteous, the group of humanity whose spirit has not become fleshly, to distinguish between good and evil. The ability to make this distinction, and living in accordance with it, is evidently considered of vital importance to the author. The wicked fail to make this distinction and “hold fast to wickedness” (4Q418 69 ii line 8). In relation to the יֵצֵר בָּשָׂר of line 16, Strugnell and Harrington maintain it is referring to the “deterministic inclination of the flesh”.¹²¹ Wold, on the other hand, rejects such a deterministic framework and argues that the יֵצֵר בָּשָׂר is “more sensical as a nomenclature for the wayward similar to ‘spirit of flesh’ in the vision of Hagu [4Q417 1 i 13b-18] passage.”¹²² Goff notes that an echo of this phrase is found in 4Q417 1 ii line 14; this line refers to “בלוא נבונות בשר” translated in DJD 34 as “without his/the understandings of the flesh”.¹²³ For Goff the “understandings of the flesh” is best

¹²⁰ Translation from DJD 34: 83. Frey notes that the exact meaning of the phrase כִּי יֵצֵר בָּשָׂר הוּאָה remains unclear. He cautiously suggests that this phrase might be linked with the rabbinic concept of the יֵצֵר הָרַע, and whether this might be related in any way to the idea of sinful flesh. Frey, “Flesh and Spirit,” 394. Scholarship has progressed since the publication of Frey’s article and it is now commonly agreed that the author is deliberately denoting the idea of sinful flesh, and this is indicative of the traditions that later contributed to the rabbinic understanding of the evil inclination.

¹²¹ DJD 34: 8.

¹²² Wold, “‘Flesh’ and ‘Spirit.’” 269.

¹²³ DJD 34: 170.

interpreted as denoting ways of thinking that lead to wrong behaviour that should be resisted.¹²⁴ In this way, the “fleshly spirit” and “understandings of the flesh” may be viewed as being closely associated with one another, or at the very least, the latter might be viewed as being a characteristic of the former. The mention of *יצר בשר* is best interpreted as a warning to the *mebin* to maintain his elevated status (cf. 4Q418 81+81a 4-5). While it appears to be the case that differing levels of exaltation appear to exist among the audience of *4QInstruction*, these lines emphasize the special or higher status of members among *4QInstruction*'s audience (cf. 2.1.3.2.), and therefore in this instance, the *יצר בשר* serves to remind also the *mebin* of the insubordinate group of humanity who stand eschatologically condemned, and among those who God hates.

6.3.3. *4Q417 1 ii line 12: יצר רע*

The term *יצר רע* (i.e. no definite article) commonly taken to mean “evil inclination” occurs in 4Q417 1 ii line 12. However, the editors of DJD 34 posit that the expression also appears in line 13.

Translation¹²⁵

12 Let not the thought of an evil *inclination* [*יצר רע*] mislead thee
 13 thou shalt *faithfully* seek. Let not the th[ought of an evil *inclination*] mislead thee [תפתכה]
 14 without *His appointing/* the understandings of the flesh [*בלוא נבונות בשר*]. Let not there *lead* th[ee] *astr[ay]*

While Tigchelaar maintains that this reference in line 12 is too fragmentary to identify whether it is a general reference to evil inclination or is a more specific referring to sexual desire,¹²⁶ Strugnell and Harrington associate this verse with the Jewish *יצר* that can lead a person to sin.¹²⁷ Rosen-Zvi notes that in 4Q417 1 ii line 12 the *יצר* stands alone in terms of being removed from the heart, something that is also the case in rabbinic literature.¹²⁸ Moreover, he adds that unlike other

¹²⁴ Goff, *4QInstruction*, 182.

¹²⁵ Translation from DJD 34: 170.

¹²⁶ Tigchelaar, “Evil Inclination,” 350.

¹²⁷ See DJD 34: 170; Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran*, 56.

¹²⁸ Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 45, notes that in rabbinic literature the *יצר* is also separated from the heart. Compare Deut 11:16 and *Sifre Deut* 43.

examples (e.g. *Jub* 35:9), the יצר is not ascribed to evil people alone, and in this sense the יצר רע may be understood, he maintains, as “an active agent that can entice people to evil. This wording must assume at least some measure of separation between humans and their יצר as well as a measure of activism on behalf of the יצר.”¹²⁹ This idea of the *yetzer* being separate from the human being is particularly noteworthy. If we agree with Rosen Zvi’s interpretation, this in turn means that no one is then immune or exempt from the יצר רע, that is to say, it is an active, external force that entices someone to evil.¹³⁰

The inclusion of יצר רע, here translated as “evil inclination” in *4QInstruction* is particularly significant because it does not appear in the Hebrew Bible. Indeed Rosen-Zvi notes that it is doubtful whether this phrase is attested in texts outside of Qumran.¹³¹ Cook refers to the occurrence of יצר רע in 4Q417 1 ii line 12 as being “conspicuous”, and as clearly referring to the “evil inclination”.¹³²

This supposed evolution of the phrase יצר רע at Qumran thus suggests that its occurrence in 4Q417 ii line 12 may be interpreted in this same context; the יצר רע of line 12 may thus, as Rosen-Zvi argued, be understood in terms of an active, external force.¹³³ Wold, however, is unconvinced and maintains that it is unclear that this phrase is best understood in the same semantic field as the *Plea for Deliverance* and *Barkhi Nafshi*. He asks; “Is there a demonic opponent in *4QInstruction*, or is this simply an expression of sin?”¹³⁴ While Wold’s caution is justified, and it may in fact be more accurate to read 4Q417 1 ii line 12 as an expression of sin, a close reading of this line does suggest that the יצר רע has an external dimension.¹³⁵ Moreover, while it is true that demons are not explicitly mentioned in *4QInstruction*, the confirmed role and positive affirmation of

¹²⁹ Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 46.

¹³⁰ Cf. 4Q184 1 17.

¹³¹ Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 46.

¹³² Cook, “The Origin of the Tradition of the יצר הטוב and יצר הרע,” 89-90.

¹³³ Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 46.

¹³⁴ Wold, “Demonizing Sin?” 40.

¹³⁵ It is important to note that Wold’s distrust of this suggestion is not absolute. In fact, he later comments; “Rosen-Zvi may be correct. There may be a reference to an active force misleading the righteous. However, I do not see any other reference to this outside of 4Q417 1 ii.” See Wold, “Demonizing Sin,” 47.

angels throughout this composition (e.g. 4Q418 81+81a) strongly suggests that the inclusion of demons in the same composition is not outside the realms of possibility. In this instance, it appears to be the active role of this *yetzer* that is the author's main concern.

Goff discusses the verb connected to the יצר רע in 4Q417 1 ii line 13 where the *piel* of פתה is used. He notes that this verb is sometimes translated as “to persuade”, with a connotation of deceit (e.g. Psalm 78:36; Ezek 14:9), and also “to entice” (e.g. 1 Kgs 22:19, 22), or “to seduce”, the latter usually interpreted in terms of association of sex and the יצר (e.g. 11QT lxvi lines 8-9).¹³⁶ In regard to 4Q417 1 ii line 12, Goff proposes that this line “shows concern that the *mebin* could find wicked thoughts produced by an evil inclination tempting”, but considers this column as “too fragmentary to allow solid conclusions”.¹³⁷ Most interestingly, however, he cautiously concludes that 4Q417 1 ii may attest to a dualistic opposition not between good and evil inclinations, but between an evil inclination and God. In light of Rosen-Zvi's rejection of two opposing יצרים (outlined above), Goff's suggested opposition is all the more convincing, and it is reminiscent of the antithesis between God and the world in James (see §3.2.2.).

This is the only occurrence of the phrase יצר רע in *4QInstruction*, and as a result, it is difficult to discern its explicit meaning or function; that is, it is not made clear whether this phrase is to be understood as an inherent part of the human condition (e.g. Sir 15:14), or whether it is external but approaches and almost inhabits a person (e.g. 1QH^a xv lines 6-7). However, in light of Rosen-Zvi's analysis of the יצר at Qumran, interpreting the יצר רע of 4Q417 1 i line 12 as an internal component of humanity, separate from the heart, but operating in a demonological field seems to be most convincing. On account of the fragmentary nature of *4QInstruction*, we can only speculate in terms of this so-called demonological field, but the presence of angels and exhortations concerning their emulation (4Q418 81+81a 1,11) make suggestions concerning the inclusion of a counterforce in this writing all the more plausible. In addition, the occurrence of יצר רע in 4Q417 1 ii line 12 may signify or contain a genuine request for divine

¹³⁶ Goff, *4QInstruction*, 180.

¹³⁷ Goff, *4QInstruction*, 181.

assistance in the struggle against it (cf. Jas 1:5).¹³⁸ Therefore, in the case of 4Q417 1 ii line 12, we may tentatively conclude that the יצר רע is best interpreted as being both internalized and demonic.

Comment: The יצר (and יצר רע) in 4QInstruction

The active role of the יצר in *4QInstruction* is hence affirmed. The occurrence of the יצר רע is especially significant and marks one of the earliest occurrences of this phrase. Much of the above analysis agrees with Rosen Zvi's understanding of the יצר at Qumran, and applies, as he does, this rationale to *4QInstruction*. Therefore, the יצר is internalised, but it is understood to operate within an active, external, demonological field. In this sense the יצר רע of *4QInstruction* has both an internal and external dimension. This former understanding of the יצר (i.e. internalised but yet demonic) is particularly noteworthy when James comes into view. Our attention now returns to James to see if *4QInstruction*'s understanding of evil, and humanity's proclivity to evil, can shed any light on James' appraisal of the same topic. The following sections will focus specifically on the ἐπιθυμία of 1:14, the divided nature of humanity in 1:8, 4:8, and the mention of demons and the devil in 2:19 and 4:7.

6.4. Internal Evils in James

Part Four of this chapter examines the internal evils presented in the Letter of James. In order to establish how James conceives of evil, internally speaking, a detailed analysis of key terms are necessary and are hence provided: (1) the ἐπιθυμία of James 1:14; and (2) the διψυχία of James 1:8, 4:8. While the ἐπιθυμία of James 1:14 was discussed in §6.2.1., in terms of how James 1:12-15, as a pericope has been interpreted by James commentators, it is argued that returning to it in light of the discussion of *4QInstruction*'s צרי has the potential to provide further insights.

6.4.1. The Ἐπιθυμία in James 1:14 (cf. 1:15, 4:2)

It is important to note that the noun ἐπιθυμία occurs in James 1:14, while its the cognates ἐπιθυμία and ἐπιθυμέω occur in 1:15 and 4:2, respectively.¹³⁹ Based on

¹³⁸ Cf. Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 50.

the justification that James is a relatively short writing, that ἐπιθυμία (and related verbs) occurs three times suggests that this was an important theme for the author. In this way, interpreting the ἐπιθυμία of James 1:14 is crucial when determining how James conceived of evil, or to be more specific, humanity's inclination to sin. The ἐπιθυμία of James 1:14 is usually taken to denote that which stands in juxtaposition to God's non-involvement in 1:13, and hence is commonly interpreted as a negative characterization of humanity that leads one to sin.¹⁴⁰ James 1:14 is especially illuminating because it appears to internalize evil as the source of trial, enticement, deception, and finally death-producing sin (Jas 1:15-16). At first it may appear difficult to explain this internalization of evil in James 1:14, especially when the (external) references to evil such as demons (in 2:19), and the devil (in 4:7), are considered. This struggle is made even worse when the devil is portrayed as an active agent working in concert with the impure heart of the δυνωχία, and must therefore be resisted, is also taken into account.¹⁴¹ In other words, it is difficult to explain or align this internalization of evil when, in the same writing, active, external evil forces are also being referred to.¹⁴² However, it is my view that this task is made somewhat more manageable when we realize that a similar picture also emerges at Qumran. Therefore, it is my argument that understanding the role of *yezter* at Qumran (outlined above in

¹³⁹ Cf. Allison, *James*, 244.

¹⁴⁰ The ἐπιθυμία and its cognates appear in the Septuagint: (1) ἐπιθυμέω, meaning to set one's heart upon, to long, to desire, in Gen 31:30; 49:14; Exod 20:17; 34:24; Isa 58:11; (2) ἐπιθύμημα, -ατος, an object of desire, in Num 16:15; 1 Kings 21(20):6; Isa 27:2; 32:12; Exod 24:16; (3) ἐπιθυμητής, -οῦ, meaning one who lusts, one who longs for, one who desires, in Num 11:34; Exod 26:12; Prov 1:22; (4) ἐπιθυμητός, -ή, -όν, meaning to be desired, in 2 Chron 20:25; 32:27; 36:10; Isa 32:14; Jer 12:10; (5) ἐπιθυμία, -ας, meaning desire, yearning, lust, in Gen 31:30; 49:6; Num 11:4, 34, 35; 2 Chron 8:6. In the NT, the meaning of ἐπιθυμία is somewhat ambivalent; for example, in Luke 22:15 (cf. Phil 1:23) it has positive connotations, but in Rom 7:17-23; Gal 5:16-21; 1 Thess 4:5; Eph 2:3 it carries a sense of "evil desire, lust, false ambition".

¹⁴¹ Cf. Ellis, *The Hermeneutics of Divine Testing*, 171.

¹⁴² With this in mind, Ellis questions if the ἐπιθυμία functions as the fisherman or as the bait, asking: "Is the human inclination the reified or least personified agent of testing, or is it the location from which cosmic forces act?" Moreover, he suggests that 1:14 could likewise read as the author emphasizing how or by what means each one is tested: that is, through the universal human emotion of desire. Ellis, *The Hermeneutics of Divine Testing*, 171-172.

§6.1.2.), and in *4QInstruction* specifically (§6.3.1. – 6.3.3.) will help us explain or align these apparent contrasting explanations in James.

It is therefore significant that the ἐπιθυμία of 1:14 is commonly understood in terms of the rabbinic יצר, and thus as enticing someone to evil. For example, noting that ἐπιθυμία is a feminine noun, Martin interprets its passive role, in terms of the idea of the ἐπιθυμία giving birth to sin, and this being dependent on the Jewish-rabbinic discussion of the “evil impulse” (יצר הרע).¹⁴³ For Davids, a counterforce is needed that channels and limits the evil impulse into doing good. He suggests that this counterforce may take the form of the law, the good impulse, or the Holy Spirit. He argues that while sin represents an act of transgression in James 2:9; 4:17; 5:15-60, 20; in James 1:15, immediately after the occurrence of the ἐπιθυμία in 1:14, it denotes a personified, conceptual reality that leads to death, the opposite to the “crown of life”, which is promised to the righteous in 1:12.¹⁴⁴ Davids’ position is somewhat convincing, but his reference to the good impulse, that is the יצר הטוב, is problematic, and needs to be re-examined in light of recent publications.¹⁴⁵ In light of Chapter Four, where the theme of revelation in James was explored, it is my view that if the ἐπιθυμία of 1:14 is understood in terms of the Jewish concept of יצר, then the revelation of 1:5 may then be viewed as the manifestation of such a counterforce (cf. 1:21). Similarly, Ben Sira 21:11 suggests that one’s own יצר can be defeated by law-observance,¹⁴⁶ and in this present context it is interesting to remember that, for Ben Sira, wisdom is personified in the law (Sir 24).

Allison offers an original interpretation of James 1:14 based on his reading of 1:15; he argues that the phrase “εἶτα ἡ ἐπιθυμία σπλλαβοῦσα” is clearly alluding to a sexual act, and this he maintains, is obvious from the following τίκται.¹⁴⁷ As Allison notes, this is significant because the Jewish idea of the *yetzer* is often associated with sexual impulse (see §6.1.1.). Allison concedes that there appears to be many nuances operating in this verse, but

¹⁴³ Martin, *James*, 30-32; 36-37.

¹⁴⁴ Martin, *James*, 37. The “crown of life” was discussed in Chapter Three.

¹⁴⁵ See Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*.

¹⁴⁶ Marcus notes that the Syriac of *tou ennoēmotos* was *yetzer*. See Marcus, “The Evil Inclination in James,” 610.

¹⁴⁷ Allison, *James*, 251.

suggests that Psalm 7:14 (“See how they conceive evil, and are pregnant with mischief, and bring forth lies.”¹⁴⁸) may, in this instance, have informed James.¹⁴⁹ Allison’s argument is interesting and reinforces the argument that the Jewish concept of יצר was at the forefront of James’ thinking. Moreover, Allison notes that the יצר was commonly associated with topics that conveniently appear to be of great interest to James such as being perfect (e.g. James 1:4, 2:22, 3:2), being deceived (James 1:16, 26; 3:17), and being double-faced (James 1:8, 4:8 – see §6.4.2.).¹⁵⁰

Equally, Marcus identifies the ἐπιθυμία of 1:14 with the יצר, but acknowledges this translation is never used in the LXX. Consequently, he considers it necessary to draw attention to examples outside of the LXX; for example, he notes the occurrence of יצר בשר in 1QH^a x 13 and refers to David Flusser’s suggestion that a connection may be made between it and the ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκός in Galatians 5:16.¹⁵¹ Significantly, he also notes the use of יצר in CD iii lines 2-3 where the resistance of Abraham’s guilty inclination is joined with him being a “friend of God”, and suggests an analogous reading between this and James 2:23. In addition, he proposes that the יצר in CD iii lines 2-3 may be understood in terms of a “spirit” and this, he maintains, indicates that it is the יצר which is in view in James 4:5.¹⁵² Marcus’ overall identification of the ἐπιθυμία in 1:14 is convincing, but aspects of his argument remain weak, especially his

¹⁴⁸ Translation from NRSV.

¹⁴⁹ Allison, *James*, 252.

¹⁵⁰ In terms of the *yetzer* being associated with being perfect, see e.g. CD ii lines 15-16 or *Shepherd of Hermas* (*Sim.* 5.3.6); for being deceived see 1QH^a xxi lines 9-10 and *Shepherd of Hermas* (*Sim.* 6.2.1), and for being double-faced see T. Ash. 3.2. See Allison, *James*, 247, n. 202-204.

¹⁵¹ Marcus, “The Evil Inclination,” 611; cf. D. Flusser, “The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauling Christianity,” 255.

¹⁵² Marcus, “The Evil Inclination in James,” 613, also suggests for the *Yahad* the יצר may be understood as a form of idolatry; in CD xx lines 9-10 those who have “put idols” in their heart” are identified with those who have gone “in stubbornness of their heart”. The latter expression, Marcus argues, is synonymous with the יצר of 1QS v lines 4-5. He notes that this association of the יצר with idolatry may offer some meaning to James 4:4.

reliance on dated sources,¹⁵³ and his views regarding the now disputed concept of the טובה יצר.¹⁵⁴ While I argue that some of Marcus' views now require corrections, it is important to remember that this article was written in 1982, i.e. before Rosen-Zvi's re-examination of the *yetzer* (presented in §6.1.1.) had been carried out. Therefore, it is fair to say that Marcus deserves much credit, and his inclusion of Qumran materials is helpful. In light of Marcus' inclusion of Qumran materials, I would therefore propose that similarities exist in terms of *4QInstruction's* warnings or misgivings concerning the יצר, especially in 4Q417 1 i line 12, and the direct link James draws between the ἐπιθυμία and death producing sin. Moreover, Flusser's suggestion that a connection might be made between the יצר בשר in 1QH^a x 23, and the ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς in Gal 5:16, is especially illuminating when the occurrence of יצר בשר of 4Q416 1 line 16 is taken into account.

While Marcus may be challenged for drawing an overtly neat or straightforward link between Philo's use of the ἐπιθυμία and its use in James 1:14 (see §6.1.4.), it is difficult to dispute the similarities he draws and the overall applicability in terms of its use by both authors. For example, Philo's discusses the effect of the ἐπιθυμία and links it to the tongue, and this is similar to what we see in James 3:1-12. Philo's comparison of the ἐπιθυμία in *De spec. leg.* 4.14 §83 and *De dec.* 28 §150 as a "creeping sickness" which spreads throughout the entire body resulting in no part of it being safe, is insightful. The former reference is all the more significant when Philo goes on to link it to fire, which is similar to James 3:6. Similarly, Philo stresses the voluntary nature of the ἐπιθυμία, and this, Marcus proposes, has an analogue in James.¹⁵⁵

In §6.1.3. the Hebrew and Greek nouns יצר and διαβούλιον of Sirach were both examined. Marcus' contribution is helpful because he also discusses

¹⁵³ E.g. Marcus refers to F.C. Porter's work in the very first page of his article, and I have counted over eleven citations to Porter throughout.

¹⁵⁴ Near the end of Marcus' essay he acknowledges the absence of the so-called good יצר in James, but suggests "it may have something to do with James' unwillingness to ascribe to human beings an inherent inclination to good." See Marcus, "The Evil Inclination," 621. In light of recent scholarship, and the fact that most commentators reject the יצר הטוב, some of Marcus' views require corrections.

¹⁵⁵ See Marcus, "The Evil Inclination in James," 613-615,

Sirach's views concerning humanity's potential to sin, and draws similarities to that of James. It is Marcus' view that many similarities exist between James' use of ἐπιθυμία in 1:14 and Sir 15:11-20.¹⁵⁶ This is especially the case, he argues, with Sir 15:14, noting how it "assigns *ultimate* responsibility for sin to God and yet distances God somewhat from sin by ascribing *direct* responsibility for it to the *yēser*."¹⁵⁷ Marcus notes that both the author of the Hebrew Ben Sira and the author of James absolve God of the existence of sin in the world, but also that both authors ultimately admit that it is God who is responsible for the existence of the יצר in the world (Ben Sira 15:15; James 4:5).¹⁵⁸ Marcus' identification of the separation of God from sin in both Ben Sira and James is helpful and noteworthy. Finally, Marcus argue there are two further significant parallels between Ben Sira and James: (1) both authors make clear that God has also made the facilities available where one can thereby make a choice and reject this evil inclination (Sir 15:16-17; Jas 4:6-7); and (2) the יצר is not equated with sin in either, but the יצר leads to sin (Sir 15:20; Jas 1:14).¹⁵⁹ The documentation of the יצר, and how it is presented in terms of leading to sin, is notable: only if acted upon, the יצר leads to sin, which in turn leads to destruction and death (Sir 15:17; cf. Jas 1:14-15; 4Q418 69 ii lines 8-9). Marcus' argument is successful in terms of drawing out the similarities between Ben Sira's application of *yetzer* in Sir 15:11-20 and James' presentation of the ἐπιθυμία in 1:14.

In relation to the supposed similarities between James and Philo in terms of their joint use of ἐπιθυμία, Kloppenborg briefly speculates as to whether James presupposes what he coins as "Philo's Platonizing anthropology" and wonders if the ἐπιθυμία may be understood as "the irrational third division of the

¹⁵⁶ Many parallels exist between Sir 15:11-20 and James, esp. 1:12-18: (1) both use wisdom imagery to describe God (Sir 15:18-19; Jas 1:17); (2) both stress that God is not the cause of sin (Sir 15:11-13, 20; Jas 1:14-15), but rather a human being's own evil desire is the cause of sin (Sir 15:15; Jas 1:14-15). In addition, both Sir 15:15-17 and Jas 2:8 present observance of the Law as a possible and commendable goal. See Marcus, "The Evil Inclination of James," 608.

¹⁵⁷ Marcus, "The Evil Inclination of James," 608. Emphasis original.

¹⁵⁸ Marcus, "The Evil Inclination of James," 608.

¹⁵⁹ Marcus, "The Evil Inclination of James," 609.

soul, along with the higher divisions of τὸ θυμικόν and τὸ λογικόν.” For Kloppenborg, the ἐπιθυμία has the potential to corrupt the soul.¹⁶⁰

Interestingly Rosen-Zvi briefly discusses *The Shepherd of Hermas*, the latter which he considers to be especially informative when discussing the יצר. His inclusion *The Shepherd of Hermas* is particularly noteworthy to this present discussion in terms of the close parallels many commentators draw between it and James.¹⁶¹ He discusses Mandate 6 where the shepherd instructs Hermas regarding the two angels (i.e. one of righteousness and one of wickedness) living in his heart, and argues, “the similarity to the tannaitic *yetzer* is unmistakable.”¹⁶² Rosen-Zvi argues that this writing’s unequivocal internalization of the two angels is unique, and this is all the more insightful when the twelfth mandate of *Hermas* is taken into account: two desires (ἐπιθυμῖαι) appear instead of these angels, but are described in a remarkably similar fashion.¹⁶³ While it is too simplistic to suggest that these angels and desires in *The Shepherd of Hermas* are cognate, their close association, coupled with the similarities in terms of their description to the יצר, is remarkable. For Rosen-Zvi, *the Shepherd of Hermas* thus presents an intermediate stage of internalization: two angels reside in the heart and these angels are (partially at least) interchangeable with desires (ἐπιθυμῖαι), which he considers to be especially relevant when reconstructing the development of early rabbinic discourse.¹⁶⁴ At the very least, this use of ἐπιθυμῖαι in this later writing adds weight when arguing that its occurrence in James 1:14 is best interpreted in terms of the rabbinic יצר.

Understanding the ἐπιθυμία of James 1:14 in terms of the Jewish discourse of יצר is convincing. It is my argument that when James refers to “ὅτι τῆς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας” in 1:14, it is the Jewish concept of evil (i.e. the יצר הרע) that primarily influenced his thinking. Whether this application and analogous

¹⁶⁰ Kloppenborg, “James 1:2-15 and Hellenistic Psychagogy,” *NovT* 52 (2010): 37-71, 47.

¹⁶¹ For a more informative discussion proposing that a literary dependence exists between James the *Shepherd of Hermas* (i.e. the former serving as a source for the latter). See Mayor, *The Epistle of St. James*, Ixxiv; Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 75-79, the latter which argues that literary dependence is “virtually certain”.

¹⁶² Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 55.

¹⁶³ Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 56.

¹⁶⁴ Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 57.

reading of the ἐπιθυμία with the צר is intentional, on the part of James, is impossible to tell, but the above assessment and the similarities between the two indicate that interpreting the ἐπιθυμία in light of this tradition makes the most sense. Moreover, it provides clarity or context when interpreting James 4:5: “Or do you suppose it in vain that the scripture says; ‘He yearns jealously over the spirit which he has made to dwell in us [πρὸς φθόνον ἐπιτοθεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα ὃ κατώκησεν ἐν ἡμῖν]’”, particularly if this verse is understood as referring to humanity’s inner failings or weaknesses.¹⁶⁵ In addition, it may provide context to the inner disputes among the community in James 4:1, and it is noteworthy that James uses a cognate of ἐπιθυμία when outlining the sinful behaviour of the recipients in 4:2. Although James’ anthropology may seem negative, especially

¹⁶⁵ Appropriately, in *James*, 611, Allison refers to this verse as “one of the most challenging lines in early Christian literature.” Allison’s characterization of this verse is justified; matters of elucidation are complicated in terms of its proper translation and which scriptural source, if any, is being quoted. Moreover, Jas 1:17 refers to the goodness of all of God’s giving. Therefore, trying to align and/or explain 4:5 in light of the message of 1:17 is less than straightforward. In relation to the former stumbling block, Jeremy Corley, in “The Spirit and Friendship with God in the Letter of James” (paper presented at Maynooth University, Ireland. May 2017), 1-16, 3, opts to translate 4:5 as “or do you suppose that the scripture says vainly: ‘The Spirit he has made to dwell in us yearns jealously?’” This translation makes more sense because why would God yearn with jealousy for something he created? But the question then becomes to whose spirit is reference being made: God (i.e. the divine spirit) or humanity? That 4:5 is referring to God’s spirit is not widely held, but see Corley, “The Spirit and Friendship with God in the Letter of James,” 9-11. Similarly, Allison also interprets τὸ πνεῦμα as denoting the Holy Spirit, because he finds an allusion to the story of the Spirit being given to the Israelite elders in Num 11:24-29, but because the wording of the allusion does not match Num 11, he proposes that the reference is to a lost *Book of Eldad and Modad*, mentioned in the second-century CE *the Shepherd of Hermas* (Herm. Vis. 2.3.4 [7:4]). See Allison, *James*, 617-621. However, the majority of scholars argue it is humanity’s spirit that is being referred to here. For example, Johnson, *The Epistle of James*, 281, provides two options: (1) the spirit of 4:5 may be referring to the life breath that God gave to humanity at creation in Gen 7:15; 45:27; (2) or this spirit may be an indication of the gift God gave to humans by way of prophecy or wisdom (see esp. LXX Exod 31:3; 35:31; Deut 34:9; Isa 11:12). Laws, *A Epistle on the Commentary of James*, 158, suggests the reference to spirit in James 4:5 is “probably to be taken as a statement or question about the envious longing of the human spirit.” In light of the above excursus on the צר the preferred view of this work is that the πνεῦμα is best interpreted as referring to the inadequacies of the human spirit. Also see Marcus, “The Evil Inclination in James,” 613.

1:14, his emphasis on free will is important, and it serves to project some optimism on the part of the author. He is warning his audience about the perils of internal evil. If one succumbs to one's own desires, one is more susceptible to this external evil forces (cf. 4:7). James' emphasis on the interiority of evils is also encountered in 1:8 and 4:8, verses to which our attention will now turn.

6.4.2. The Διψυχία in James 1:8; 4:8

James 1:8 and 4:8 offer further insight when discussing James' anthropology because both verses are concerned with the topic of being double-faced, a motif that Penner characterizes as being important for the author because it appears at two crucial junctions in the writing.¹⁶⁶ James 1:8 states: "For that person must not suppose that a double-minded man [δίψυχος ἀκατάστατος], unstable in all his ways, will receive anything from the Lord." This verse is particularly noteworthy because the implication is that the "double-minded" man has not and/or will not receive revelation, meaning he will never be perfect [τέλειοι] and complete [όλόκληροι] (cf. 1:4). Commentators such as Johnson and Davids read 1:8 in light of the anthropological description of 1:6-7; the divided nature of humanity seemingly renders it unstable, and this is contrasted with God's unchanging nature in 1:17.¹⁶⁷ Similarly, 4:8 pronounces: "Draw near to God and he will draw near to you. Cleanse your hands, you sinners, and purify your hearts, you men of double mind [καὶ ἀγνίσατε καρδίας δίψυχοι]." Significantly, the latter reference occurs immediately after the exhortation to resist the devil, the possible inference being that one is less able to resist the devil if he is of double mind. Commenting on James 4:8 Lockett notes: "As one approaches God greater purification is necessary while the further away from God (near the world/devil) defilement is assumed."¹⁶⁸ This is why the reader is exhorted to "keep oneself unstained from the world" (Jas 1:27 cf. §3.2.2.).

From the outset it is important to note that the noun "διψυχία" is unattested before James, and therefore its precise meaning requires further

¹⁶⁶ Penner, *James and Eschatology*, 201.

¹⁶⁷ See Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 174-184; Davids, *Commentary on James*, 74.

¹⁶⁸ Lockett, *Purity and Worldview in the Epistle of James*, 135.

comment.¹⁶⁹ Two translations are possible: (1) “double-natured” and/or “double-mindedness”; and (2) “double-souled”. Whichever translation a commentator finds most convincing tends to illustrate the commentator’s own interpretative framework; that is to say, the former translation easily lends itself to a Jewish application, whereas the latter is often understood in terms of Hellenistic philosophy.¹⁷⁰ In reference to the former understanding, Allison suggests that the noun “διψυχία” represents the Jewish idiom לב ולב (i.e. double heart), noting that in Rabbinic literature the heart is closely related to the יצר הרע.¹⁷¹ The double heart represents divided loyalties; the person who has a double heart exists in two competing worlds.¹⁷² In the context of James, it is fair to say that these competing worlds entail faith vs. doubt (cf. 1:4-6, 23; 2:14-26; 3:9-10), but a fundamental demand of the Shema (i.e. Deut 6:5) is that God should be loved with all of the person’s heart, that is, the single, undivided heart.¹⁷³ James expects the same of his audience and therefore, for James, the single-minded person is pure and the ideal.¹⁷⁴ Similarly, Penner also notes that διψυχία may be seen as synonymous with the Jewish idiom בלב ולב.¹⁷⁵ For example, he refers to 1QH^a xii 14 where the wicked are described as having a double heart, and notably discusses *I Clem* 23.1-5 where the theme of double-mindedness surfaces in an eschatological context. This passage reads: “wretched are the double-

¹⁶⁹ Despite this being the case, James did not coin the term. The roots of this term have thus far remained undiscovered; however, it is fair to say its background lies in Jewish theology. In the Hebrew Bible one is instructed to love God with a whole heart (e.g. Deut 6:5; 10:10), and this is set against a hypocritical or double heart (e.g. Ps 12:1-2; Chron 12:33; Sir 1:28-29; 2:12-14). This concept is also witnessed in both its positive and negative forms in the DSS (e.g. 1QS ii lines 11-18; v lines 4-5; 1QH^a iv 13-14). Cf. Davids, *Commentary on James*, 74; Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 181. Moreover, its cognates διψυχέω and διψυχία occur in early Patristic literature (e.g. *I Clem* 11:2; 23:2; *2 Clem* 11:2.) See Allison, *James*, 186.

¹⁷⁰ It may be helpful to note however, that Allison points out that in the LXX of Deut 6:5 the “whole heart” and “whole soul” appear to be synonymous, so it would seem to follow that a “double heart” entails a “double soul”. Allison, *James*, 187.

¹⁷¹ Allison, *James*, 186-190. The idea of a “double heart” (לב ולב) is attested in Qumran literature: see 1QH^a xii (4) 14; 4Q542 1 1.9. Also see *I En* 91:4.

¹⁷² Cf. 1 Kgs 18:21; Matt 6:24; Luke 16:13; Rev 3:15-16.

¹⁷³ See Allison, *James*, 186-190.

¹⁷⁴ Cf. Col 3:22.

¹⁷⁵ Penner, *James and Eschatology*, 201.

minded (ταλαίπωροί εἰσιν οἱ διψυχοί) for they are the ones who doubt that judgment will come upon humankind.”¹⁷⁶ This eschatological context appears to be synonymous with that of James (e.g. Jas 5:9).

If the διψυχία is interpreted in relation to the ἐπιθυμία of 1:14, the latter being understood as a reference to the יצר הרע, this may mean that James understood those in 1:8 (cf. 4:8) as having given into their evil inclination.¹⁷⁷ Similarly, Marcus reaches a similar conclusion; while discussing the *Testament of Twelve Patriarchs*, he argues that people who serve their ἐπιθυμία are described as “διπρόσωποι” meaning “double faced”, which is particularly insightful in light of James’ characterization of humanity in 1:8 and 4:8.¹⁷⁸ Moreover, the mention of purity in 4:8 may be a deliberate ploy on the part of the author to remind the audience of the attributes of heavenly wisdom in James 3:17. It is also interesting to note, as Rosen-Zvi and Cohen do, that this term also occurs in *the Shepherd of Hermas*, where it is seen as a severe obstacle to the service of God, specifically associated with “evil desire” residing in humans.¹⁷⁹

The διψυχία of 1:8 and 4:8 may also be interpreted in view of its connotations to Hellenistic philosophy. Kloppenborg, for example, translates διψυχία as “double souled”, and proposes that James illustrates an elaboration of two of Jesus’ sayings present in Q (i.e. Q 11:9-10 “in” Jas 1:5-8 and Q 6:22-23 “in” Jas 1:2-4; 12:15). This, he argues, is reflective of the philosophical ideals in relation to the concern and nurture of the soul that were prevalent in Hellenistic Judaism during the early Roman period.¹⁸⁰ Kloppenborg notes that God’s

¹⁷⁶ Penner, *James and Eschatology*, 202.

¹⁷⁷ It may be helpful to remember the close association between the heart and the יצר in the Hebrew Bible.

¹⁷⁸ See Marcus, “The Evil Inclination in James,” 616-617. See *T. Ash.* 3:1-2.

¹⁷⁹ Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 56; Cohen Stuart, *Struggle*, 151. It is interesting to note that Laws cites the inclusion of διψυχία in *Mandate 9 of the Shepherd of Hermas* when arguing that James has a roman provenance. See Laws, *James*, 24-45.

¹⁸⁰ See Kloppenborg, “James 1:2-15 and Hellenistic Psychagogy,” 39-71. It is important to note that Kloppenborg identifies what he considers to be parallels or analogous readings between James and the likes of the works of Philo and *4 Maccabees*, and the thought of Plato, Zeno, Arius Didymus, and Seneca, but he is not suggesting that the author of James had direct access to them. His thesis is that the epistle reveals an array of interests in psychology and the care of the soul

oneness is contrasted against the double nature of humanity, and argues that if a dualism exists, it is a dualism of the two types of wisdom available to the recipient (cf. Jas 3:13-18 - §4.1.2.). He rejects the idea that James is referring to the יצר and rather argues that for James, that which stands in the way of a virtuous life is pleasure and desire (Jas 4:3; cf. 4:1).¹⁸¹ According to this reading, James means to instruct his readers on the cultivation of single-mindedness. The trials of 1:2 thus provide the means for moral perfection and personal virtue, but since these trials arise naturally from within, they need to be embraced as an opportunity for the growth of the soul.¹⁸²

Similarly, George van Kooten, wishing to confirm Kloppenborg's thesis, argues that James' portrayal of the διψυχία of humanity is compatible with Greek reflections on the divided self, especially those of the Platonists.¹⁸³ He suggests that this "double-mindedness" is not equated with sin; on the contrary, humans only sin when they actively give into their internal desires (Jas 1:14-15). Van Kooten's article provides a helpful overview of the possible Greek perspectives and nuances operating behind διψυχία. His thesis is that James was aware of the Jewish concept of יצר, and deliberately chose to transfer it over to the Greek notion of double-heartedness. At first, van Kooten's proposition is convincing; however, his understanding and application of the Jewish doctrine of the inclination of evil is problematic. For example, he continually refers to two opposing יצרים, an understanding that is considered dated in light of recent publications (cf. §6.1.1.). Moreover, and perhaps more alarmingly, his analysis does not provide a sustained discussion of the ἐπιθυμία in 1:14.

that characterized Hellenistic philosophy at this time, and as a result, many similarities may be traced between James and the above sources.

¹⁸¹ See Kloppenborg, "James 1:2-15 and Hellenistic Psychagogy," 46. He also rules out the suggestion of the Pauline σάπξ.

¹⁸² Cf. *Spec. Leg.* 4. 79-81.

¹⁸³ George van Kooten, "The 'Two Inclinations' and James' Anthropological Designation of Humankind as 'Double-minded' (δίψυχος): A Greek Perspective," in *The Origins of the Origins of Evil* (eds. James Aitken, Ishay Rosen-Zvi and Hector Patmore; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming), 1-20. The basic notion of the divided person is seen in Plato's "twofold-man" in *Rep.* 397E. Cf. Johnson, *The Letter of James* 181. Cf. Sir 1:28. I would like to thank Prof. van Kooten for kindly sending me a copy of his paper before it was published.

Despite my criticisms of van Kooten’s article, his (and Kloppenborg’s) basic thesis that James reveals a Hellenistic philosophical influence is persuasive. In James 1:8 and 4:8, the author refers to the divided nature of humanity, and the suggestion that James’ views may be influenced by the Hellenistic idea that the spirit is made up of a rational and irrational soul is credible.¹⁸⁴ James 1:21 is calling for the salvation of souls, and although the *logos* has been implanted by God (Jas 1:18), we know from 4:4-5 that God yearns with jealousy because he has to compete with the world, a world that is often antithetical to his purposes. According to this reading, James employs the anthropological concept of “double-souled” or “double-minded” in 1:8 to make his audience aware of their present state, and also to effectuate action. Care of the soul, according to James, is made possible by receiving and acting in accordance with the *implanted logos* (1:21).¹⁸⁵ To represent failure in terms of not *doing the logos* James describes such people in terms of being “like those who look in a mirror, for they look at themselves, and, on going away, immediately forget what they look like” (1:22-23).¹⁸⁶

In light of this assessment, a Hellenistic influence upon James seems certain; however, the *Sitz im Leben* of this writing also needs to be taken into account. Throughout this thesis the Jewish nature of this epistle was emphasized and, leading on from this, I suggest that the Jewish understanding of יצר and the Hellenistic notion of the divided self are not mutually exclusive. In fact, it is more than credible to suggest that in this writing we encounter a blurring or merging of these two concepts and, therefore, van Kooten’s contribution is most helpful.¹⁸⁷ However, the *διψυχία* in James 1:8 and 4:8 is best interpreted in relation to the *ἐπιθυμία* of 1:14, and the latter may be viewed as directly shaped or influenced by the Jewish understanding of evil inclination, *contra* Kloppenborg. Therefore, it is hence argued that, in James, one is considered double natured when one has succumbed to one’s evil inclination. Or, perhaps it

¹⁸⁴ See George von Kooten, “Human Being,” *OEBE* 1: 394-405.

¹⁸⁵ See Jackson-McCabe, *Logos and Law*.

¹⁸⁶ This imagery is similar to Plato; see *Alc. Maj.* 132c-133c, and is also encountered in some Tannaitic literature. See Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 32-33.

¹⁸⁷ Similarly Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 7, argues that all Greek imagery should not be set aside in order to explain the *yetzer* in its proper demonological context.

is more accurate to argue that humanity is considered double natured because each person is continually fighting an internal battle to not be enticed by their יצר רע. As is the case with much of Second Temple literature, it is also the case in James that the יצר רע is actively enticing one to sin, but the message of James can be considered as being all the more urgent because the “judge is standing at the gates” (Jas 5:9; cf 1:16).

6.5. External Evils in James

The concept of evil being internalized in James has been established. In the broadest terms evil may be considered as anything that destroys life; James makes clear that giving into one’s own ἐπιθυμία will give birth to sin, and this in turn leads to death (1:15). The inclusion of Qumran in §6.1.2. and *4QInstruction* specifically in §6.3.1. – 6.3.3., into the above discussion helps to contextualize the internalization of evil in James. As we have seen, at Qumran the יצר is interpreted as being internalized, but separate from the heart, while also operating in a demonological field.¹⁸⁸ However, perhaps the most valuable insight we gained from the discussion of the יצר at Qumran is that it relates to the internalization and externalization of evil which are not mutually exclusive.¹⁸⁹ Therefore, at Qumran the *yetzer* may be considered in both internal and external terms, and it is my view that this understanding also extends to *4QInstruction* (see §6.3.3.) In addition, it is my argument that this observation is directly applicable when attempting to make sense of the ἐπιθυμία of 1:14 (cf. 1:8; 4:8) and the simultaneous presence of external evil forces in James. In light of this, Ellis’ argument is especially helpful; he proposes that the divine role of ὁ περιάζων in James is mitigated through a combination of an elevated anthropology and heightened demonology. According to Ellis the inner human desire of 1:14:

¹⁸⁸ *4QInstruction*, as it is preserved today, does not include any references to demons or Satan; however, this does not necessarily indicate they were not originally included in the writing. Moreover, the frequent references to angels (i.e. a counter-force to evil) makes the presence of an evil counter-force all the more credible.

¹⁸⁹ In terms of the NT the idea that one must endure internal and external tests is not unique to James; for example, Paul indicates his awareness of the יצר in Rom 7, but in 2 Cor 2:11 he refers to Satan in terms of temptation and apostasy.

falls somewhere along this spectrum: from the *yetzer* as a compromised anthropological target for satanic or demonic attack (akin to *Jubilees*, Qumran sectarian literature, and the *Testaments of the Twelve*) to the more developed quasi-demonic anthropology that resides in an antagonistic position on the human heart, co-operating with satanic forces to destroy its host (so the majority voices within the Tannaitic and Amoraic rabbis).¹⁹⁰

In Part Four of this chapter the internalization of evil in James was outlined and discussed. The aim of Part Five is thus to outline and establish that an external evil paradigm is also operating in this same writing, but to demonstrate that the existence of both internal and external evils is to be expected in light of the above excurses. In fact, the inclusion of internal and external evils is indicative of much of Second Temple literature.

6.5.1. James 2:19: “Even the Demons Believe”

External evil forces are referred to in James 2:19; “You believe that God is one; you do well. Even the demons believe – and shudder [καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια πιστεύουσιν καὶ φρίσσουσιν].” The opening of this verse is clearly a reference to the *Shema* (i.e. Deut 6:4); that is to say, the monotheistic confession of Judaism is the inspiration behind this opening clause. This verse is set within a pericope that outlines James’ teachings concerning the importance of faith and works, and it is primarily concerned with eschatological salvation. Moreover, the oneness of God is being emphasized in James 2:19; this oneness may be contrasted with the double nature of humanity in 1:8 and 4:8 (see §6.4.2.)¹⁹¹

It is the occurrence of “δαιμόνια” in 2:19, however, that is of particular interest to this present discussion. In post-exilic Judaism, δαιμόνιον, Allison notes, refers to “malevolent spirits closely associated with Satan”.¹⁹² Φρίσσω, that is the verb used to convey the reaction of the δαιμόνιον, is translated in the NRSV as “shudder”, but perhaps a more appropriate rendering is along the lines of “fearful amazement”. A detailed exegesis of this verse is not necessary, but it is important to note that the author’s direct reference and inclusion of δαιμόνιο is demonstrative that demons were considered as an active, evil force operating

¹⁹⁰ Ellis, *The Hermeneutics of Divine Testing*, 175.

¹⁹¹ See also James 4:12.

¹⁹² Allison, *James*, 477. Cf. LXX Psalm 90:6; 105:37; Bar 4:35; Luke 11:16.

among James' audience. In addition, the supremacy of God is highlighted; that is to say, even the demons, a presumably powerful force in their own right, fear God.

6.5.2. James 4:7: "Resist the Devil"

Both humanity's propensity to evil, and the external, supernatural forces of evil in the world are also acknowledged by James in 4:7: "Submit yourselves therefore to God. Resist the devil, and he will flee from you [ὑποτάγητε οὖν τῷ θεῷ, ἀντίστητε δὲ τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ φεύζεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν]."¹⁹³ It may be argued that 4:7 is best interpreted in light of 1:14; that is, the exhortation to resist the devil is clear, but perhaps this exhortation may be understood in relation to the importance of not being deceived or led by one's own ἐπιθυμία. Likewise, Allison suggests that the exhortation to submit to God may be considered in terms of controlling one's ἐπιθυμία.¹⁹⁴ Davids comments that James "recognizes the power of spiritual-demonic evil behind the internal evil in the person."¹⁹⁵ These interpretations help to align or help us understand the interior and exterior evil forces at work in this epistle. Moreover, we may infer from 4:7 that those who are led astray by their own ἐπιθυμία are more susceptible to this demonic force. It stands to reason if one has failed in terms of suppressing internal evil within themselves, these active, external forces are all the more enticing. Therefore, as was argued above in §6.4.1., the ἐπιθυμία of James 1:14 may be understood as being internalized, but James also makes clear it exists in a world full of external evils and desires. It stands to reason that those who give into their ἐπιθυμία are especially susceptible to the external evil forces in James. Therefore, the ἐπιθυμία is internalized and demonic, and its human host resides in a world full of further external (demonic) tempters.

It is interesting to note that James conveys very little interest in the devil. For example, he never explores the relationship between διαβόλῳ in 4:7 and the δαιμόνιο of 2:19. Allison argues that this unexploration or lack of interest may be attributed to James' simple understanding of the devil as representing the

¹⁹³ Cf. Eph 6:11.

¹⁹⁴ Allison, *James*, 625.

¹⁹⁵ Davids, *James*, 37.

antithesis to divine values.¹⁹⁶ Allison’s argument is convincing, especially when the description of earthly wisdom in 3:15 as being “devilish” is taken into account; that is to say, the devil and earthly wisdom juxtapose God and the heavenly origins of his wisdom (cf. Jas 1:17; 3:17 – see §4.1.2.). Evil has clearly penetrated the audience in this writing. For example, in 4:1 James refers to the disputes among community members as coming from internal cravings (cf. Jas 1:14).

6.5.3. The Tongue as an Instrument of Evil

The representation of the evils of the tongue is commonly met with in wisdom literature (e.g. Prov 10:19; Ecclus 4:29).¹⁹⁷ Correspondently in 3:6 James refers to the evils of the tongue. My translation of James 3:6 was presented in §3.2.2., but in the interests of convenience and transparency, it is again presented below:

“And the tongue is a fire; the tongue is the world of wickedness established among our members, polluting the whole body and setting ablaze the cycle/wheel of a (human) life/birth, whilst being set on fire by Gehenna [καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα πῦρ ὃ κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας ἢ γλῶσσα καθίσταται ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν, ἢ σπιλοῦσα ὄλον τὸ σῶμα καὶ φλογίζουσα τὸν τροχὸν τῆς γενέσεως καὶ φλογιζομένη ὑπὸ τῆς γεέννης].”¹⁹⁸

Culpepper argues that the association made between the tongue and fire may be traced through the term *gehenna*.¹⁹⁹ *Gehenna*, a valley of Hinnom, south of Jerusalem, was credited as the site of sacrifices to pagan gods.²⁰⁰ It was cursed by the prophets,²⁰¹ and in the NT it was depicted as a place of torment (see §3.2.2.).²⁰² Culpepper therefore proposes that the tongue “both introduces the

¹⁹⁶ Allison, *James*, 626.

¹⁹⁷ E.g. see Prov 12:16; 15:1; 18:21; 25:23; 26:20; 29:20; Ecclus 5:14; 14:1; 19:16; 21:26; 27:18; 28:17; 28:25.

¹⁹⁸ Many commentators consider James 3:6 to be difficult to translate adequately. See Ropes, *James*, 233; Dibelius, *James*, 194.

¹⁹⁹ R. Alan Culpepper, “The Power of Words and the Tests of Two Wisdoms: James 3,” *RevExp* 83 (1986): 405-416, esp. 411.

²⁰⁰ Namely, the pagan god, Moloch. See 2 Kgs 16:3; 21:6.

²⁰¹ See Jer 7:32; 19:6; Isa 31:9; 66:24.

²⁰² See Mark 9:43-47; Matt 5:22; 10:28; Luke 12:5.

whole world of evil into our bodies and puts to flame the whole order of life.”²⁰³ Similarly Moo comments: “The power of Satan himself, the chief denizen of hell, gives the tongue its great destructive potential.”²⁰⁴ Culpepper’s views concerning the tongue introducing the body to evil are problematic in light of the more nuanced interpretation of 1:14 outlined above, but his emphasis of the tongue being a source of evil is helpful. In James, the tongue may be understood as operating within the already crowded context of internal and external evils, but its destructive powers are nevertheless very real and need to be taken seriously.²⁰⁵

Likewise James 3:8 states: “but no one can tame the tongue – a restless evil, full of deadly poison.”²⁰⁶ This representation of the tongue in terms of being an evil entity is especially striking because, as James makes clear, it is with this same tongue that one blesses and curses (Jas 4:10): like the person in 1:8, the tongue is also double-minded.²⁰⁷ Boasting is evil (4:12), and one’s inability to control the tongue (i.e. an internal bodily muscular organ) might be compared against one’s inability to control or annul their internal desires, rendering one’s religion worthless (cf. Jas 1:26). Marcus refers to 1QH^a vii line 13 in which the author declares that God knows every יצר of every action and sees every reply of the tongue, and this leads him to propose a link may be forged between James’ concern with the יצר and his diatribe on the tongue (Jas 3).²⁰⁸ Marcus’ proposal is persuasive. It is undeniable that the tongue makes one’s quest to be perfect and

²⁰³ Culpepper, “The Power of Words and the Tests of Two Wisdoms: James 3,” 412.

²⁰⁴ Moo, *The Letter of James*, 126.

²⁰⁵ Cf. Sir 22:27.

²⁰⁶ In Dale C. Allison, “Blessing God and Cursing People: James 3:9-10,” *JBL* 130/2 (2011): 397-405, Allison highlights a striking parallel between the sentiments of James 3:9-10 and the twelfth blessing of the *Birkat ha-minim*, leading Allison to argue that, “James reflects an environment in which some Jews, unhappy with Jewish Christians, were beginning to use the *Birkat ha-minim* or something very much like it.” (here, 399).

²⁰⁷ Cf. Gen 12:3; 27:29; Num 23:25; 1QS 2:10; Rom 12:14; 2 En 52:1-4.

²⁰⁸ Marcus also refers to other DSS: 1QS v lines 3-7 links the circumcising of the foreskin of the *yetzer* to the practice of truth (cf. James 1:18; 3:14; 5:19), and/or CD iii lines 2-3 where Abraham’s resistance of the guilty inclination is joined with his being called a “friend of God” (cf. James 2:23). Moreover, in CD iii lines 2-3 Abraham’s own *yētsēr* is in parallelism with his own “spirit” (James 4:5). Marcus, “The Evil Inclination of James,” 611-613.

whole (cf. 1:2-4) immeasurably more difficult,²⁰⁹ and while James warns of the dangers of the tongue, nowhere does he instruct as to how these evils are to be overcome. At the very least, James' lengthy description of the tongue alerts the readers to the necessity of trying to control one's speech.

Comment: Internal and External Evils in James

For James, the active evil forces made manifest in satan and the demons stand in the way of being close to God, living a moral and virtuous life, and being considered among the righteous when the day of eschatological judgment comes (cf. Jas 5:9). The continued exhortations of this writing demonstrate that James acknowledges that being included among the righteous is made difficult by internal and external temptors, but perseverance and endurance are key (Jas 1:12; cf. 5:11). Among other instructions and attributes James expects his audience to be humble (4:10), to not speak evil against each other (4:11), to love one another (2:8), to ask for wisdom (1:5), and to welcome the *logos* (1:21). If a person manages to endure successfully all of the internal and external obstacles that stand in the way of a righteous life, this person may look forward to the eschatological crown of life (1:12).

Conclusions

How James understood sin and evil remains a complex and challenging subject. However, it is my view that the above analysis adds valuable context and insight when tackling this challenging subject. The inclusion of the excurses on Ben Sira, Philo, and Qumran, help contextualize our discussion. Moreover, these excurses help us recognize the various influences and offer additional examples in terms of how sin and evil were being understood by several authors in Second Temple Judaism. The inclusion of Ben Sira and *4QInstruction* are especially helpful. Ben Sira's inclusion of *יצר/δυσλόγιον* in 15:14 communicates that the questions of sin and evil were at home in the Jewish wisdom tradition. That this is the case is important for this present work where James is largely read in light of the Jewish wisdom tradition. However, while this thesis argues James is

²⁰⁹ In CD ii lines 14:16 a connection is made between rejecting one's own evil inclination and being perfect. Cf. James 1:2-4, 14.

influenced by this wisdom tradition, it also maintains that James, read in light of the identification and discussion of significant analogies in *4QInstruction*, represents a development of this tradition. The wisdom tradition needs to be understood as transitional. The inclusion of *4QInstruction* in this present chapter provides a notable literary example of where the יצר is conceived of internally, but is also understood to operate within an active, external demonological field. The identification of the co-existence of active internal and external evil forces help us explain the internal evil forces present in James, that is the ἐπιθυμία of 1:14, and by extension the διψυχία of James 1:8 and 4:8, and the occurrence of external evil forces such as the mention of the δαιμόνια in 2:19 or the exhortation to resist the devil in 4:7.

Chapters Four and Five of this thesis argue that James and *4QInstruction* rely heavily on the concept of revelation. In the case of James, the pursuit of and living in accordance with heavenly wisdom (i.e. σοφία ἄνωθεν) is key to this epistle's message. Therefore, the internal and external evil forces present in James are understood in terms of being real obstacles that James' audience are faced with. It is possible that these forces work in unison with one another; for example, if one has been enticed by their own ἐπιθυμία, it stands to reason that the lure of the δαιμόνια in 2:19 are all the more alluring. Successfully overcoming these obstacles is imperative for one to be included among God's faithful people. Although James' expresses a clear concern for his audience, his emphasis on σοφία ἄνωθεν, and its shaping ability to be included among God's faithful, may be understood as a counterforce to such evil temptations.

General Conclusions

This Ph.D thesis reads James in light of *4QInstruction*. To be more specific, James is read in light of *4QInstruction* with the understanding that these two writings, in terms of their content and influence, represent two literary examples in which sapiential and apocalyptic elements are combined. The decision to include *4QInstruction* is largely based on the pivotal role it has had in terms of compelling scholars to re-evaluate how the combination of these two categories is explained. The identification of the relevance that *4QInstruction* holds for the study of James is not original to this work; Lockett discussed these two writings in relation to one another in 2005.¹ However, what is novel about this thesis is its effort to move away from issues concerning the literary form of these two writings, and its endeavour to progress our understanding of central concepts of James in light of a critical assessment of these same ideas in *4QInstruction*. At present, no other work of this length exists that examines common analogies between these two writings in terms of their content, and the consequences these analogies may have for improving our overall understanding of James. I consider *4QInstruction* and James as two literary examples of a distinct multifaceted trajectory in terms of the development of Jewish and early Christian wisdom traditions. Moreover, it is also my argument that this trajectory relies heavily on the concept of revelation.

In terms of NT scholarship James has often been the victim of scholarly neglect. It is fair to say that the reasons behind this neglect are multilayered and beyond the remit of this current study; however, it is important to note that this neglect has resulted in a number of openings or voids existing in terms of James' interpretation.² The traditions influencing James' conception of wisdom may be identified as one such opening. For example, the *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* discusses the category of wisdom in the New Testament. Its entry on James is exceptionally short, and is beneficial to include below:

¹ See Lockett, "The Spectrum of Wisdom and Eschatology in the Epistle of James and 4QInstruction," 131-148. Lockett's contribution is discussed in §3.1.2.

² Cf. §2.2.1.1.

The entire Letter of James is a wisdom document in paraenetic style. Since the name of Christ only appears twice, it has been assumed that this was a Jewish writing. However, in addition to these references there is evidence of the transposition of wisdom into Christian thought patterns. In any case, the letter documents the extent to which Christianity was able to remain Jewish wisdom.³

The above citation adequately demonstrates the minimal attention James often receives when it comes to discerning its understanding of wisdom, and the contribution it has to make to our assessment of the category of wisdom in the NT. While the mention of “the transposition of wisdom into Christian thought”, and its ability “to remain Jewish wisdom”, are helpful, this thesis demonstrates that there is much more to be said about James’ use of the concept of wisdom. Keeping the aim of advancing James’ interpretation in mind, these general conclusions seek to outline the fresh insights that have been gained as a result of this study, and how these improve or enhance our reading of James.

Chapters One to Three offer an informed *status quaestionis*. The viability of this project is both outlined and affirmed. In order to contextualize this overall thesis it was important to discuss the theory surrounding the wisdom and apocalyptic traditions. In many respects Chapter One is interdisciplinary because it engages with the various complexities of literary and genre theory, and highlights the problems for those who insist that one genre classification should prevail. It is now generally agreed that genres are best viewed as modern heuristic tools in which an inevitable fuzziness remains. The discovery of prototype theory is helpful because it accounts for, and almost expects, the boundaries of genres to blur and overlap.⁴ The recognition of the acceptance of this blurring and overlapping of generic lines is essential because it characterizes the most common approach adopted by modern scholarship when it comes to explaining the co-existence of wisdom and apocalyptic elements in various writings. It is fair to say that the SBL Wisdom and Apocalyptic Group have often become preoccupied with attempting to define wisdom in terms of genre. Frequently, attached to the identification of this wisdom genre is the

³ Conzelman, H, “Wisdom in the NT,” *IDB*: 956-960, 960.

⁴ Cf. §1.1.5.

understanding that it is characterized by an apocalyptic worldview.⁵ While such a methodology is not entirely incorrect, it runs the risk of limiting the discussion to genre. As a result, this discussion sometimes becomes consumed by the complexities of genre theory and possible associated worldviews. Therefore, it was important for this thesis to move past this methodology, and rather to examine *4QInstruction* and James in terms of their content, and what this might mean for the category of wisdom in general.

In offering a *status quaestionis*, Chapters One to Three seek to problematize modern scholarship's preoccupation with defining and identifying genres. This is particularly applicable to this present work because this is indicative of much of the scholarship surrounding the categories of wisdom and apocalyptic. Notably, the contribution of Weeks is included.⁶ He asks if "wisdom literature" is a helpful categorization. To problematize this theory it was important to first present it, and then to highlight its shortcomings. Because this thesis understands James and *4QInstruction* as literary examples in which sapiential and apocalyptic elements are combined, it was equally important to present how these adjectives are usually understood, and to defend their continued use throughout this work. Wisdom and apocalyptic remain categories of convenience, and their occasional adjectival use throughout this work is considered necessary to explicate certain points.

A presentation of the complexities of genre, particularly the wisdom genre, is also advantageous because it forces us to recognize that, formally speaking, *4QInstruction* and James are not the same. Moreover, the identification of an important macro genre related to the broader category of wisdom emerges, namely that of instruction. The idea of instruction has proven pivotal to how the content of these writings is engaged with throughout this work. However, it remains the case that, in terms of form, *4QInstruction* and James are not the same: *4QInstruction* is best understood as instructional literature, while James is an epistle.⁷ It is true that in terms of genre *4QInstruction* and James are different, but this does not weaken the contextual basis of this study. The identification of

⁵ See Wright and Wills, *Conflicted Boundaries*. Cf. §3.1.1.

⁶ See Weeks, "Is 'Wisdom Literature' A Useful Category?" 3-23.

⁷ See §2.1.1.2. and §2.2.1.3.

their formal differences forces us to move past the question of genre and form, and to assess these two writings in terms of their content. To be more specific, while the idea of instruction is identified as being central to both writings, this thesis is more concerned with the identification and elucidation of significant analogies present in both compositions, and what these analogies might mean of the two compositions' content, especially that of James.

One such significant analogy is the concept of revelation, and as it turns out, instructions relating to the pursuit of revelation are found in both writings. I would argue that, in terms of how this thesis has advanced the interpretation of James, it is the identification of the importance of σοφία ἄνωθεν (i.e. Jas 1:5; 3:13-18; cf. 1:17) to James where most of the advances have been made. James 1:5 exhorts those who are lacking wisdom to ask God: Εἰ δέ τις ὑμῶν λείπεται σοφίας, αἰτείτω παρὰ τοῦ διδόντος θεοῦ πᾶσιν ἀπλῶς καὶ μὴ ὄνειδίζοντος καὶ δοθήσεται αὐτῷ. In this first instance the otherworldly origins of this wisdom are made clear (i.e. this wisdom comes from God), and again affirmed in James 1:17 where every gift is described as coming from above [ἄνωθέν ἐστιν]. Moreover, James 3:13-18 states that σοφία ἄνωθεν is superior to earthly wisdom. Notably, in these verses σοφία ἄνωθεν is characterized as being primarily “pure” [πρῶτον μὲν ἀγνή ἐστιν], whereas earthly wisdom [ἀλλὰ ἐπίγειος] is described as “devilish” [δαιμονιώδης]. It is true that the identification of the emphasis on this wisdom being heavenly is not novel. Indeed, it is accurate to say that the emphasis on its otherworldly origins have been long since noted and discussed by many commentators.⁸ However, my understanding of the implications which σοφία ἄνωθεν may have for other concerns in James, such as the epistle's inferred recipients or the question of evil offers a fresh interpretative angle. This fresh interpretative angle is achieved by considering the theme of revelation in *4QInstruction*, how it concerns other issues such as recipients and evil, and how this might inform our assessment of these same concepts in James. This is where this thesis makes an original contribution.

Kamell Kovalishyn's contribution was noted as being especially helpful.⁹ She too argues that James' presentation of wisdom conveys an apocalyptic

⁸ E.g. see Davids, *James*, 55; Allison, *James*, 169-170.

⁹ Kamell Kovalishyn, “James and Apocalyptic Wisdom,” 293-306.

influence, and while the way in which she and I understand σοφία ἄνωθεν is very similar, her analysis does not emerge from a critical assessment of the concept of revelation in *4QInstruction*. Moreover, Kamell Kovalishyn does not identify, at least to the same extent, the formative role σοφία ἄνωθεν appears to have in James. Indeed, it is the inclusion of *4QInstruction*'s portrayal of revelation in which much of the fruits of this comparative study were located. In Chapter Four an in-depth discussion of the various ways in which the “mystery of being” and the “vision of Hagu” are conceived of were outlined.¹⁰ It was conveyed that, generally speaking, there are two opposing schools of thought. Goff and Collins may be seen as occupying one school,¹¹ while the other is occupied by Wold, and to a lesser extent Elgvin and Rey.¹² If one agrees with Collins and Goff's deterministic understanding of revelation in *4QInstruction*, this in turn means that revelation does not play a formative role in terms of being included among God's faithful community. If, on the other hand, one agrees with Wold, then revelation is considered instrumental in terms of ensuring one remains or becomes faithful and righteous. The different ways revelation is interpreted in *4QInstruction* serve to alert the reader to the possible relevance σοφία ἄνωθεν may hold for James.

This thesis argues that σοφία ἄνωθεν has a formative dimension in terms of ensuring one is included among God's faithful. Human responsibility is not annulled: James makes clear that his audience must ask God for σοφία ἄνωθεν. Receiving and living in accordance with σοφία ἄνωθεν, and by extension doing νόμος and λόγος, mean that one is righteous and is hence included among God's faithful. The urgency of being included among the faithful is underscored throughout this epistle by its eschatological overtones (e.g. Jas 1:1; 5:9). Notably, these eschatological overtones are present in the opening verse of James: Ἰάκωβος θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ χαίρειν. The eschatological restoration of the twelve tribes of Israel is

¹⁰ See §4.2.1. and §4.2.2.

¹¹ See Collins, “In the Likeness of the Holy Ones,” 609-618; Goff, “Adam, the Angels and Eternal Life: Genesis 1-3 in the Wisdom of Solomon and 4QInstruction,” 1-22.

¹² See Wold, “The Universality of Creation,” 211-226; Rey, *4QInstruction*, 283; Elgvin, “The Mystery to Come,” 143.

made explicit.¹³ The eschatological overtones of this verse were presented, as were the merits of a literal reading over a metaphorical one.¹⁴ A discussion of those to whom revelation is made available in *4QInstruction* provided the comparative context within which to investigate this same question in James, and what implications this might have for the question of Gentile inclusion. While the address of James 1:1 and אנוש of *4QInstruction* are not directly synonymous with one another, it was interesting to investigate the consequences that the numerous translations and interpretations of אנוש have in terms of identifying a possible commonality or discontinuity between these two writings.¹⁵ The virtues of interpreting the revelation of *4QInstruction* as being universal and addressed to humanity were outlined, and the inference this might have for James was discussed. In light of Wold's contributions, I agree that *4QInstruction's* address is inclusive. However, in view of the Jewish overtones of James 1:1, and the apparent conformity with Jewish traditions conveyed throughout James (e.g. the emphasis on νόμος). I argue that it is most compelling to view the address of James 1:1 as being addressed to Jews and Jewish-Christians. The address of James is thus somewhat exclusive. The exclusivity of this address is met with when it is recognized that Gentiles do not appear to be in view. While the question of Gentile inclusion remains even more ambiguous in *4QInstruction*, and in fact it is questionable whether Gentiles ever entered the author's consciousness, the idea of a division between faithful and faithless appears to permeate both writings. The inclusion of *4QInstruction* accentuates this idea in James.

For James, the importance of pursuing and living in accordance with σοφία ἄνωθεν cannot be over-estimated. It is in this context that the internal and external evil forces present in James are understood. Giving into these evil forces results in one not being righteous, the inference being that one is not living in accordance with σοφία ἄνωθεν. Some commentators find it difficult to explain the co-existence of these internal and external evil forces in James. It is fair to say that the recent work of Ellis has made a significant contribution in making

¹³ See §5.1.2.

¹⁴ See §5.1.1.

¹⁵ See §5.2.1.

sense of the co-existence of these evil forces in James.¹⁶ While my work does not improve upon Ellis' contribution, I would argue that the inclusion of *4QInstruction*, amongst other writings, provides further context in terms of possibly conveying the concept of an internalized יצר in a demonological paradigm. In addition, it further justifies understanding the ἐπιθυμία of James 1:14 in terms of the Jewish יצר.¹⁷

The originality of this thesis lies in the contextual orientation of the task. Its contribution is encountered in terms of the effort that is made in seeking to adjudicate major debates in James scholarship in light of a critical assessment of these same issues in *4QInstruction*. In relation to the consequences for James, it is my argument that this thesis has successfully provided a new contextual lens through which James may be viewed, and through which revelation is seen to be a dominant concept. This thesis explicates James' emphasis on revelation, and it is my view that this may have potential for other NT texts. For example, James' emphasis on ἄνωθεν, and indeed the רַ language of *4QInstruction*, may very well provide an interpretative key when exploring the ways in which wisdom is understood in Pauline literature.¹⁸ In more general terms, this thesis has demonstrated that wisdom is best understood as a broad category in which many multifaceted works may belong. As a result, *4QInstruction* and James are considered literary examples of a distinct multifaceted trajectory in terms of the development of Jewish and early Christian wisdom traditions, and in which sapiential and apocalyptic elements are combined. Their reliance on the concept of revelation is important, and represents a significant analogy shared by these two writings. This thesis' emphasis on revelation in James provides a more nuanced understanding of James' wisdom, namely the importance of σοφία ἄνωθεν, that has nowhere else been highlighted to the same extent.

¹⁶ See Ellis, *The Hermeneutics of Divine Testing*.

¹⁷ Cf. Marcus, "The Evil Inclination in the Epistle of James," 606-621; Rosen-Zvi, *Denmonic Desires*.

¹⁸ E.g. see Rom 16:25; Eph 3:3-9; Col 1:26.

Bibliography:

- Abegg, Martin G., James E. Bowley, and Edward M. Cook, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance*. 2 Vols. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Achtemeir, Paul J. *1 Peter: A Commentary on First Peter*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.
- Adams, Samuel L. *Wisdom in Transition: Act and Consequence in Second Temple Instructions*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Adamson, J. B. *The Epistle of James*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976.
- Aitken, James K. "Apocalyptic, Revelation and Early Jewish Wisdom Literature." Pages 181-194 in *New Heaven and New Earth Prophecy and the Millennium: Essays in Honour of Anthony Gelston*. Edited by P.J. Harland and C. T. R. Hayward. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Allegro, John M., ed. *Qumran Cave 4 (4Q158-4Q186)*. Discoveries of the Judean Desert 5. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
- Allison, Dale C. "A Plea for Thoroughgoing Eschatology." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 113/4 (1994): 651-668.
- _____. "The Fiction of James and Its *Sitz im Leben*." *Revue Biblique* 108 (2001): 529-570.
- _____. "Blessing God and Cursing People: James 3:9-10." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 130/2 (2011): 397-405.
- _____. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of James*. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- _____. "Jas 2:14-26: Polemic Against Paul, Apology for James." Pages 123-149 in *Ancient and New Perspectives on Paul*. Edited by T. Nicklas, A Merkt, and J. Verheyden. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.
- _____. "The Audience of James and the Sayings of Jesus." Pages 58-77 in *James, 1&2 Peter and Early Jesus Traditions*. Edited by Alicia J. Batten and John S. Kloppenborg. London: Bloomsbury, 2014.
- Amir, Y. "The Figure of Death in the Book of Wisdom." *Journal for Jewish Studies* 30 (1979): 154-178.
- Argall, Randal. *1 Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative and Conceptual Analysis of the Theme of Revelation, Creation, and Judgment*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

- Aune, David. "Oral Tradition and the Aphorisms of Jesus." Pages 227-236 in *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition*. Edited by Henry Wansbrough. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 64. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- _____. *Revelation 1-5*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1997.
- Avigad, N. "The Palaeography of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 56-88 in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin. Jerusalem: Magnes/Hebrew University Press, 1958.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Edited and Translated by Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
- Barclay, John M. G. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE – 117 BCE)*. Berkeley: University of California, 1996.
- Barthelemy D., and J. T. Milik, eds. *Qumran Cave I*. Discoveries of the Judean Desert 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.
- Barton, Stephen C., ed. *Where Shall Wisdom be Found: Wisdom in the Bible, the Church and the Contemporary World*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999.
- Batten, Alicia. *The "Epistle of Straw" Reconsidered*. Ph.D Dissertation: University of Toronto, 2000.
- _____. "God in the Letter of James: Patron or Benefactor?" Pages 63-84 in *The Social World of the New Testament: Insight and Models*. Edited by Jerome H. Neyrey and Eric C. Stewart. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2008.
- _____. "The Jesus Tradition and the Letter of James." *Review and Expositor* (2011): 381-390.
- _____. "The Urban and Agrarian in the Letter of James." *Journal for Early Christian History* 3.2 (2012): 4-20.
- _____. "The Urbanization of Jesus Traditions in James." Pages 78-96 in *James, 1&2 Peter and Early Jesus Traditions*. Edited by Alicia J. Batten and John S. Kloppenborg. London: Bloomsbury, 2014.
- _____. *Friendship and Benefaction in James*. Emory Studies in Early Christianity 15. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017.
- Bauckham, Richard. "James and the Jerusalem Church." Pages 415-480 in *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting*. Volume 4 of *Acts in Its First Century Setting*. Edited by Richard Bauckham. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

- _____. "James and the Gentiles (Acts 15:13-21)." Pages 154-194 in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts*. Edited by Ben Witherington. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- _____. "The Tongue Set on Fire by Hell (James 3:6)." Pages 119-131 in *The Fate of the Dead: Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- _____. *James: Wisdom of James, disciple of Jesus the Sage*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- _____. "For What Offence Was James Put to Death?" Pages 199-232 in *James the Just and Christian Origins*. Edited by Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. *Studies in Qumran Law*. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- Betz, Hanz Dieter. "On the Problem of Religio-Historical Understanding of Apocalypticism." *Journal for Theology and the Church* 6 (1969): 146-154.
- Beyerle, Stefan. "The Book of Daniel and its Social Setting." Pages 205-228 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Vol. 1. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Wisdom and the Law in the Old Testament: The Ordering of Life in Israel and Early Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- _____. *Isaiah 1-39*. The Anchor Bible 19. London: Doubleday, 2000.
- _____. *Isaiah 56-66*. The Anchor Bible 19B. London: Doubleday, 2003.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele. "Qumran: The Headquarters of the Essenes or a Marginal Splinter Group?" Pages 303-309 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Bockmeuhl, Marcus. *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
- Brand, Miryam T. *Evil Within and Without: The Source of Sin and Its Nature as Portrayed in Second Temple Literature*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.
- Brooke, George J. *Exegesis at Qumran. 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 29. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1985.
- _____. "Biblical Interpretations in the Wisdom Texts from Qumran." Pages 201-222 in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*.

- Edited by Charlotte Hempel, Armin Lange and H. Lichtenberger. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Semitic Background of the Term "Mystery" in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968.
- Bruce, Frederick F. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Buss, Martin J. *Biblical Form Criticism and Its Context*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 274. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Butler, Christopher. *The Originality of St Matthew*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951.
- Cadoux, Arthur T. *The Thought of St. James*. London: James Clarke & Co, 1944.
- Calvin, John. *Commentaries on the Epistle of St. James (1551)*. Translated by J. Owen. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948.
- Camp, Claudia. *Wisdom and the Feminine in the Book of Proverbs*. Bible and Literature Series 11. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1985.
- Cargal, Timothy B. *Restoring the Diaspora: Discursive Structure and Purpose in the Epistle of James*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.
- Carleton Paget, James. "James: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary." *Early Christianity* 3/5 (2014): 393-416.
- Cashell-Moran, Helen. "The Significance of the Eschatological Restorative Imagery of James 1:1: Wisdom, Eschatology, and Apocalypticism in James." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta, GA., November 21, 2015.
- Chester, Andrew and Ralph P. Martin. *The Theology of the Letter of James, Peter, and Jude*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Cheung, Luke Leuk. *The Genre, Composition and Hermeneutics of James*. Cumbria: Paternoster Press, 2003.
- Childs, Brevard S. *The New Testament as Canon: An Introduction*. Philadelphia: Fortress. 1984.
- Cohen Stuart, G H. *The Struggle in Man Between Good and Evil: An Inquiry into the Origins of the Rabbinic Concept of Yeser Hara*. Kampen: Kok, 1984.
- Coker, Jason K. "Nativism in James 2:14-26: A Post-Colonial Reading." Pages 27-48 in *Reading James with New Eyes: Methodological Reassessments of the Letter of James*. Edited by Robert L. Webb and John S. Kloppenborg. London: T&T Clark, 2007.

- Collins, John J. "The Court Tales in Daniel and the Development of Apocalyptic." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94 (1975): 230-234.
- _____. "The Jewish Apocalypses." *Semeia* 14 (1979): 21-61.
- _____. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1984.
- _____. "Was the Dead Sea Sect and Apocalyptic Movement?" Pages 25-52 in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.
- _____. "The Sage in Apocalyptic and Pseudepigraphic Literature." Pages 343-354 in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue. Winoma Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- _____. "Genre, Ideology and Social Movements in Jewish Apocalypticism: Appendix. A New Proposal on Apocalyptic Origins." Pages 11-32 in *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium*. Journal for the Study of Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 9. Edited by John J. Collins and James H. Charlesworth. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- _____. "Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility." Pages 165-185 in *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie*. Edited by Leo G. Perdue, Bernard Brandon Scott, and William Johnston Wiseman. Louisville: John Knox, 1993.
- _____. *Daniel: A Commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- _____. "Wisdom Reconsidered in Light of the Scrolls." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 4 (1997) 265-281.
- _____. *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997.
- _____. "In the Likeness of the Holy Ones: The Creation of Human Kind in a Wisdom Text from Qumran." Pages 609-618 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated New Issues*. Edited by D. W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich. Journal for the Study of Old Testament 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- _____. "From Prophecy to Apocalypticism: The Expectation of the End." Pages 129-161 in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism. Vol. 1: The Origins of*

- Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by John J. Collins. London: Continuum, 2000.
- _____. "Qumran, Apocalypticism, and the New Testament." Pages 133-138 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James. C. Vanderkam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000.
- _____. "The Mysteries of God. Creation and Eschatology in 4QInstruction and the Wisdom of Solomon." Pages 287-305 in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Florentino Garcia Martinez. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum Iovaniensium 168. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.
- _____. "Interpretations of the Creation of Humanity in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 29-43 in *Biblical Intepretation at Qumran*. Edited by Matthias Henze. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- _____. "Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Ancient World." Pages 40-55 in *The Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*. Edited by Jerry L. Walls. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- _____. "The Genre Apocalypse Reconsidered." Paper presented at Manchester University, 2009.
- _____. "Eschatology." Pages 594-595 in *Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Edited by John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- _____. "Epilogue: Genre Analysis and the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 17 (2010): 418-430.
- Collins, John J., Gregory E. Sterling, and Ruth A. Clements. *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 51. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Cook, Johan. "The Origin of the יצר הרע and יצר הטוב." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 38 (2007): 80-91
- Corley, Jeremy. "The Spirit and Friendship with God in the Letter of James." Paper presented at Maynooth University, Ireland, May 2017.
- Countryman, L. William. "James." Pages 716-723 in *The Queer Bible Commentary*. Edited by Deryn Guest, Robert E. Goss, Mona Wesa, and Thomas Bohache. London: SCM Press, 2006.

- Crenshaw, James L. "Method in Determining Wisdom Influence Upon 'Historical' Literature." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88 (1969): 129-142.
- _____. "Wisdom in the OT." Pages 952-956 in the Supplementary Volume of *The Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by Keith Crim. Nashville: Abingdon, 1976.
- _____. *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction*. London: SCM Press, 1981.
- _____. "Wisdom Psalms." in *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies* 8 (2000): 9-17.
- _____. "Gold Dust or Nuggets? A Brief Response to Kenneth Kuntz," *Currents in Biblical Research* 1 (2003): 155-158.
- Cross, Frank Moore. "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 74 (1955): 147-172.
- _____. "The Development of Jewish Scripts." Pages 133-203 in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by George Ernest Wright. London: Routledge, 1961.
- _____. *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. 3rd Edition. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- _____. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Crossan, John Dominic. *Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately After the Execution*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999.
- Culler, Jonathan. *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics, and the Study of Literature*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1975.
- Davids, Peter H. "The Meaning of ΑΠΕΙΡΑΣΤΟΣ in James 1:13." *New Testament Studies* 24/3. (1978): 391-410.
- _____. *The Epistle of James: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- _____. "The Use of the Pseudepigrapha in the Catholic Epistles." Pages 228-245 in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Literature*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth and Craig A. Evans. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Davidson, Maxwell. *Angels at Qumran: A Comparable Study of 1 Enoch 1-36, 72-108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran*. *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 11. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983.
- Davies, Philip R. "The Temple Scroll and the Damascus Document." Pages 201-210 in *Temple Scroll Studies: Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll, Manchester, December, 1987*. Edited by George J. Brooke. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.

- _____. "The Scribal School of Daniel." Pages 247-265 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Vol. 1. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Davies, W. D. *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.
- Deal, William E., and Timothy K. Beal. *Theory for Religious Studies*. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Deissmann, Adolf. *Light from the Ancient East*. Translated by L. R. M. Strachan. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1978.
- Derrida, Jacques. "The Law of Genre." *Critical Inquiry* 7/1 (1980): 55-81.
- Dibelius, Martin. *James: A Commentary on the Epistle of James*. Edited by Helmut Koester. Translated by Michael A. Williams. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.
- Di Lella, Alexander A. *The Hebrew Text of Sirach: A Text Critical and Historical Study*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1966.
- DiTommaso, Lorenzo. "Apocalypses and Apocalypticism in Antiquity: Part 1." *Currents in Biblical Research* 7 5 (2007): 235-286.
- _____. "Apocalypses and Apocalypticism in Antiquity: Part 2." *Currents in Biblical Research* 5 (2007): 376-432.
- Deissmann, Adolf. *Light from the Ancient East*. Translated by L. R. M. Strachan; Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1978.
- Duguid, James. "The Mystery of What Happens: The Niphal of הִיָּה in Second Temple Literature." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature. Boston, MA, 20 November 2017.
- Dunn, James G. *Beginning from Jerusalem*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Eisenman, Robert. "Eschatological 'Rain' Imagery in the War Scroll from Qumran and the Letter of James." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 49 (1990): 173-184.
- Elgvin, Torleif. "The Reconstruction of Sapiential Work A." *Revue de Qumran* 16 (1995): 559-580.
- _____. "Wisdom, Revelation and Eschatology in an Early Essene Writing." Pages 440-463 in *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 1995*. Atlanta: SBL Press, 1995.
- _____. "Early Essene Eschatology: Judgment and Salvation according to Sapiential Work A." Pages 126-166 in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert*,

- Jerusalem, 30 April 1995*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Stephen D. Ricks. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 20. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- _____. "Wisdom in the Yahad: 4QWays of Righteousness." *Revue de Qumran* 17 (1996): 205-232.
- _____. *An Analysis of 4QInstruction*. PhD diss. Hebrew University, 1997.
- _____. "The Mystery to Come: Early Essene Theology of Revelation." Pages 113-150 in *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments*. Edited by Frederick H. Cryer and Thomas L. Thompson. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 290. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- _____. "Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Early Second Century BCE." Pages 226-247 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. Vanderkam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000.
- _____. "The Yahad is More than Qumran." Pages 273-279 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- _____. "Priestly Sages? The Milieu of Origin of 4QMysteries and 4QInstruction." Pages 67-88 in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by John J. Collins, Gregory E. Sterling, and Ruth A. Clements. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 51. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- _____. "From Secular to Religious Language in 4QInstruction." *Revue de Qumran* 24/1 (2009): 155-163.
- Elgvin, Torleif, Menachem Kister, Timothy Lim, Bilhah Nitzan, Stephen Pfann, Elisha Qimron, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Annette Steudel, eds. *Qumran Cave 4. Discoveries of the Judean Desert* 20. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Elliot, J. H. "The Epistle of James in Rhetorical and Social Scientific Perspective: Holiness-Wholeness and Patterns of Replication." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 23 (1993): 71-81.
- Ellis, Nicholas. *The Hermeneutics of Divine Testing*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 396. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.
- _____. "A Theology of Evil in the Epistle of James: Cosmic Trials and the *Dramatis Personae* of Evil." Pages 262-281 in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Chris Keith and Loren T. Stuckenbruck.

- Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 417. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.
- Falk, Daniel K. Forentino Garcia Martinez and Eileen M. Schuller, eds. *Sapiential Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 35. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Farrer, Austin. "On Dispensing with Q." Pages 55-58 in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Blackwell, 1967.
- Fishelov, David. *Metaphors of Genre: The Role of Analogies in Genre Theory*. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press, 1993.
- Flensy, David A. *The Social History of Palestine in the Herodian Period: The Land is Mine*. Lewistown: The Edward Mellen Press, 1991.
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T. *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 94. Tübingen Mohr Siebeck, 1997.
- _____. *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 42. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Flusser, David. "Qumran and Jewish Apotropaic Prayers." *Israel Exploration Journal* 16 (1966): 194-205.
- Fowler, Alastair. *Kinds of literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- Fox, Michael V. "Who Can Learn? A Dispute in Ancient Pedagogy." Pages 62-77 in *Wisdom You Are My Sister: Studies in Honor of Roland E. Murphy, O. Carm., on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday*. Edited by Michael L. Barré. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 29. Washington DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1997.
- Fraade, Steven D. *Enosh and His Generations: Pre-Israelite Hero and History in Postbiblical Interpretation*. Chico: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Francis, Frederick O. "The Form and Function of the Opening and Closing Paragraphs of James and 1 John." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentlich Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 61 (1970): 110-126.
- Frey, Jörg. "The Notion of Flesh in 4QInstruction and the Background of Pauline Usage." Pages 197-225 in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for*

- Qumran Studies Oslo 1998*. Edited by Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez, and Eileen M. Schuller. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 35. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- _____. “Flesh and Spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Texts: An Inquiry into the Background of Pauline Usage.” Pages 367-404 in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*. Edited by Charlotte Hempel, Armin Lange and H. Lichtenberger. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002.
- Frow, John. *Genre*. London: Routledge, 2005.
- Gabrielson, Timothy A. “In Search of Common Ground: The Overlapping Ethics of Wisdom and Apocalypticism, with James and 2 Enoch as a Test Case.” Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta, GA., November 21, 2015.
- Gammie, John G. “From Prudentialism to Apocalypticism: The Houses of the Sage and the Varying Forms of Wisdom.” Pages 479-498 in *The Sage in Israel and The Ancient Near East*. Edited by John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- _____. “Paraenetic Literature: Towards the Morphology of a Secondary Genre.” *Semeia* 50 (1990): 41-77.
- García Martínez, Florentino., ed. *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003.
- _____. *Qumran Minora I: Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism*. Edited by Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Goff, Matthew J. *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 50. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- _____. “The Mystery of Creation in 4QInstruction.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 10 (2003): 163-186.
- _____. “Wisdom at Qumran: 4QInstruction and the Hodayot.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 11 (2004): 263-288.
- _____. “Discerning Trajectories: 4QInstruction and the Sapiential Background of the Sayings Source Q.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 124 (2005): 657-673.
- _____. “Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and the Pedagogical Ethos of 4QInstruction.” Pages 57-68 in *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism*. Edited by

- Benjamin G. Wright and Lawrence M. Wills. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium 35. Series Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.
- _____. *Discerning Wisdom: The Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Supplements to the Vetus Testamentum 116. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- _____. "Recent Trends in the Study of Early Jewish Wisdom Literature: The Contribution of 4QInstruction and Other Qumran Texts." *Currents in Biblical Research* 7 (2009): 376-416.
- _____. "Adam, the Angels and Eternal Life: Genesis 1-3 in the Wisdom of Solomon and 4QInstruction." Pages 1-22 in *Studies in the Book of Wisdom*. Edited by Geza G. Xeravits and Jozsef Zsengeller. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- _____. "Qumran Wisdom Literature and the Problem of Genre." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 17 (2010): 315-335.
- _____. *4QInstruction*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature Press, 2013.
- Goulder, Michael D. "On Putting it to the Test." *New Testament Studies* 24 (1978): 218-234.
- Grabbe, Lester L. *The Wisdom of Solomon*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Ground, Vernon C. "Theological Progress and Evangelical Commitment." *Evangelical Theological Society Bulletin* 4 (1961): 69-79.
- Guffey, Andrew. "Faith without Works is . . . Apocalyptic? Apocalyptic Wisdom Between James and Paul." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta, GA., November 21, 2015.
- Gunkel, Hermann. "The Literature of Ancient Israel." Pages 26-83 in *Rethinking the Text: Interdisciplinary and Form-Critical Insights on the Bible*. Edited by Timothy J. Sandoval, Carleen Mandolfo, and Martin J. Buss. Journal for the Study of Old Testament: Supplement Series 384. London: Clark, 2003.
- Harland, Philip A. *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.
- Hanson, Paul D. *Dawn of Apocalyptic*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.
- Hardy Ropes, James. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of James*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1916.
- Harrington, Daniel J. *Wisdom Texts from Qumran*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- _____. "The *Raz Nihyeh* in a Qumran Wisdom Text." *Revue de Qumran* 17 (1996): 449-453.

- _____. "Two Early Approaches to Wisdom: Sirach and Qumran Sapiential Work A." *Journal for the Study of Pseudepigrapha* 16 (1997): 25-38.
- _____. "Ten Reasons Why the Qumran Wisdom Texts are Important." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 4 (1997): 245-254.
- _____. "Wisdom and Apocalyptic in 4QInstruction and 4 Ezra." Pages 343-357 in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez; *Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum Iovanienium* 238. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003.
- _____. "Recent Study of 4QInstruction," Pages 105-123 in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Melanges qumraniens en hommage à Emile Puech*. Edited by F. García Martínez, A. Steudel and E.J.C. Tigchelaar. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 60. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Hartin, Patrick J. "'Yet Wisdom is Justified by Her Children' (Q7:35): A Rhetorical and Compositional Analysis of Divine Sophia in Q." Pages 151-164 in *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Source Gospel Q*. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg. Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1995.
- _____. *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- _____. "Who is wise and understanding among you? (James 3:13): An Analysis of Wisdom, Eschatology and Apocalypticism in the Epistle of James." Pages 149-168 in *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism*. Edited by Benjamin G. Wright and Lawrence M. Wills. *Society of Biblical Literature Symposium* 35. Series Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.
- Heger, Paul. "1 Enoch – Complimentary or Alternative to Mosaic Torah?" *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 41 (2010): 29-62.
- Hellholm, David. "The Problem of the Apocalyptic Genre." *Semeia* (1986): 13-64.
- Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. Vol. 1. London: SCM Press, 1974.
- Hogan, Karina Martin. "The Exegetical Background of the 'Ambiguity of Death' in the Wisdom of Solomon." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods* 30 (1999): 1-24.
- Horsley, Richard A. *Revolt of the Scribes: Resistance and Apocalyptic Origins*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010.

- Horsley, Richard A. and Patrick A. Tiller. "Ben Sira and the Sociology of the Second Temple." Pages 74-107 in *Second Temple Studies III: Politics, Class and Material Culture*. Edited by Philip R. Davies and J. M. Halligan. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Series 340. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- House, Paul H., eds. *Beyond Form Criticism: Essays in Old Testament Literary Criticism*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992.
- Hunter, Alastair. *Wisdom Literature*. London: SCM Press, 2006.
- Hurtado, Larry W. *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.
- Hutchinson Edgar, David. *Has God Not Chosen the Poor? The Social Setting of the Epistle of James*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Hyatt, J. P. "The View of Man in the Qumran Hodayot." *New Testament Studies* 2 (1958): 276-284.
- Jackson-McCabe, Matt. "A Letter to the Twelve Tribes in the Diaspora: Wisdom and 'Apocalyptic' Eschatology in the Letter of James." Pages 504-517 in *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 1996*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- _____. *Logos and Law in the Letter of James*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- _____. *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered: Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- _____. "The Politics of Pseudepigraphy and the Letter of James." Pages 599-623 in *Pseudepigraphie und Verfasserfiktion in frühchristlichen Briefen*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Jens Herzer, Martina Janssen, and Clare K. Rothchild. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 246. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- Jefferies, Daryl. J. *Wisdom at Qumran: A Form Critical Analysis of the Admonitions in 4QInstruction*. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2002.
- Jeremias Jörg. *Theophanie: Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Gattung*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1965.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. "The Use of Leviticus 19 in the Letter of James," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 101/3 (1982): 391-401.
- _____. *The Letter of James: A New Translation with Introduction and Conclusion*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- _____. *Brother of Jesus, Friend of God: Studies in the Letter of James*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

- Kaden, David A. "Stoicism, Social Stratification, and the Q Tradition in James: A Suggestion about James' Audience." Pages 97-122 in *James, 1&2 Peter and Early Jesus Traditions*. Edited by Alicia J. Batten and John S. Kloppenborg. London: Bloomsbury, 2014.
- Kamell, Mariam J. "The Soteriology of James in Light of Earlier Jewish Wisdom Literature and the Gospel of Matthew." PhD Diss. University of St. Andrews, 2010.
- _____. "The Economics of Humility: The Rich and the Humble in James." Pages 157-175 in *Engaging Economics*. Edited by B. W. Longenecker and K. D. Liebengood. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- _____. "Incarnating Jeremiah's promised new covenant in the 'Law' of James." *Evangelical Quarterly* 83.1 (2011): 19-28.
- Kamell Kovalishyn, Mariam J. "James and Apocalyptic Wisdom." Pages 293-306 in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition and the Shaping of New Testament Thought*. Edited by Benjamin E. Reynolds and Loren T. Stuckenbruck. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2017.
- Kampen, John. *Wisdom Literature: Eerdmans Commentary on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.
- Käsermann, Ernst. "Paulus und der Frühkatholizismus." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 57 (1960): 75-89.
- _____. "Zum Thema der urchristlichen Apokalyptik." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 59 (1962): 257-284.
- _____. "The Beginnings of Christian Theology." Pages 82-109 in *New Testament Questions of Today*. London: SCM Press, 1969.
- Kister, Menahem. "Wisdom Literature and its Relation to Other Genres: From Ben Sira to *Mysteries*." Pages 13-48 in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Centre for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by John J. Collins, Gregory E. Sterling and Ruth A. Clements. Studies of the Judean Desert Series 51. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- _____. *The Qumran Scrolls and their World* 2 Vols; Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- _____. "Divorce, Reproof, and Other Sayings in the Synoptic Gospels: Jesus Traditions in the Context of 'Qumranic' and Other Texts." Pages 195-230 in *Text, Thought,*

and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium of the Orion Centre for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, Jointly Sponsored by the Hebrew University Center for the Study of Christianity 11-13 January 2004 Edited by Ruth A. Clements and Daniel R. Schwartz. Studies of the Judean Desert Series, J 84. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Kloppenborg, John S., *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

_____. "Symbolic Eschatology and the Apocalypticism of Q." *Harvard Theological Review* 80 (1987): 287-308.

_____, ed. *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*. Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1995.

_____. *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000.

_____. "Judeans or Judean Christians in James?" Pages 113-135 in *Identity and Interaction in the Ancient Mediterranean*. Edited by Zeba A. Crook and Philip A. Harland. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007.

_____. "Diaspora Discourse: The Construction of Ethos in James" *New Testament Studies* 53 (2007): 242-270.

_____. "James 1:2-15 and Hellenistic Psychagogy." *Novum Testamentum* 52 (2010), 37-71.

_____. "The Provenance of James." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies. University of Victoria, BC. June 2013: 1-57.

Koch, Klaus. *Ratlos von der Apokalyptik*. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1970.

Koester, Helmut. "Apocryphal and Canonical Gospels." *Harvard Theological Review* 73 (1980): 105-130.

Konradt, Matthias. "The Historical Context of the Letter of James in Light of Its Traditio-Historical Relations with First Peter." Pages 101-126 in *The Catholic Epistles and Apostolic Tradition*. Edited by Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr and Robert W. Wall. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2009.

Kooten, George van. "Human Being." Pages 394-405 in vol. 1 of *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Bible and Ethics*. Edited by Robert L. Brawley. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

- _____. “The ‘Two Inclinations’ and James’ Anthropological Designation of Humankind as ‘Double-minded’ (δίψυχος): A Greek Perspective.” in *The Origins of the Origins of Evil*. Edited by James Aitken, Ishay Rosen-Zvi and Hector Patmore. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming.
- Kugel, James L. *Early Biblical Interpretation*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986.
- _____. “The Bible in the University.” Pages 143-165 in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpretation*. Edited by W. H. Propp, B. Halpern, and D. N. Freedman. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- _____. “4Q369 ‘Prayer of Enosh’ and Ancient Biblical Interpretation.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 5/2 (1998): 119-148.
- Lakoff, George. *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About the Mind*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1987.
- Lange, Armin. *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 18. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- _____. “Wisdom and Predestination in the DSS.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995): 340-354.
- _____. “The Determination of Fate by the Oracle of the Lot in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Mesopotamian Literature.” Pages 39-48 in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetic Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organisation of Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998: Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet*. Edited by Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez, and Eileen M. Schuller. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 35. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- _____. “Kriterien essenischer Texte.” Pages 59-69 in *Qumran kontrovers: Beiträge zu den Textfunden von Toten Meer*. Edited by J. Frey and Hermutt Stegemann. Bonifatius: Paderborn, 2003.
- Leaman, Oliver. *Evil and Suffering in Jewish Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Leonhardt-Balzer, Jutta. “Evil at Qumran.” Pages 17-33 in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Chris Keith and Loren T. Stuckenbruck. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 417. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.

- Liddell Henry George, and Robert Scott. *A Greek English Lexicon*. 9th Edition. Oxford: Claredon Press, 1925.
- Lockett, Darian. "The Spectrum of Wisdom and Eschatology in the Epistle of James and 4QInstruction." *Tyndale Bulletin* 56 (2005): 131-148.
- _____. *Purity and Worldview in the Epistle of James*. London: T&T Clark, 2008.
- _____. "God and 'The World': Cosmology and Theology in the Letter of James." Pages 144-156 in *Cosmology and New Testament Theology*. Edited by Jonathan T. Pennington and Sean M. McDonough. New York: T&T Clark, 2008.
- _____. "Wholeness in Intertextual Perspective: James' Use of Scripture in Developing a Theme." *Midwestern Theology Journal* 15.2 (2016): 92-106.
- _____. "'Necessary but Not Sufficient': The Role of History in the Interpretation of James." Pages 69-90 in *Explorations in Interdisciplinary Readings: Theological, Exegetical, and Reception-Historical Perspectives*. Edited by Robbie F. Castleman, Darian Lockett, and Stephen O. Presley. Eugene: Pickwick Publications, 2017.
- Long, A. A. *Epictetus: A Stoic and Socratic Guide to Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Luther, Susanne. "The Evil of the Tongue: Evil and the Ethics of Speech in the Letter of James." Pages 246- 261 in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Chris Keith and Loren T. Stuckenbruck. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 2 417; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.
- Macaskill, Grant, *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- _____. "Creation, Eschatology and Ethics in 4QInstruction." Pages 217-246 in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IQS in Groningen*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Miaden Popovic. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 70. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Macknight, James. *A New Literal Translation from the Original Greek of all the Apostolical Epistles*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books House, 1841.
- Mack, Burton. *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q and Christian Origins*. San Francisco: Harper, 1993.

- Magness, Judi. *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Marcus, Joel. "The Evil Inclination in the Epistle of James." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 44 (1982) 606-621.
- _____. "The Twelve Tribes in the Diaspora (James 1:1)." *New Testament Studies* 60 (2014): 433-447.
- Martin, J. Louis. *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1978.
- Martin, Ralph P. *James*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1988.
- Mayor, Joseph B. *The Epistle of St. James: The Greek Text with Introduction Notes and Comments*. 3rd Edition. London: Macmillan, 1910.
- McCartney, D. G. *James*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- McKnight, Edgar V. *What is Form Criticism?* Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 1997.
- McKnight, S. *The Letter of James*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Meade, David G. *Pseudonymity and Canon: An Investigation into the Relationship of Authorship and Authority in Jewish and Earliest Christian Tradition*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986.
- Medvedev, Pavel M. *The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship: A Critical Introduction to Sociological Poetics*. Translated by A. Wehrle. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.
- Metso, Sarianna. *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*. STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Metzger, Bruce. "Literary Forgeries and Canonical Pseudepigrapha." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91 (1972): 3-24.
- Milik J. T. and D. Barthelemy, eds. *Qumran Cave 1*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.
- _____. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments from Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.
- Miller, Patrick D. *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Miller, Robert J., eds. *The Apocalyptic Jesus: A Debate*. Santa Rosa: Polebridge Press, 2001.
- Mizrahi, Noam. "Reconsidering the Semantics of the Yēser in Classical Biblical Hebrew," in *The Origins of the Origins of Evil*. Edited by James Aitken, Ishay

- Rosen-Zvi and Hector Patmore. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming.
- Moffatt, James. *The General Epistles: James, Peter and Judas*. New York: Doubleday, 1928.
- Moo, Douglas J. *James: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries 16. Westmont: Inter-Varsity Press, 1985.
- _____. *The Letter of James*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Muilenburg James. "Form Criticism and Beyond." Pages 49-70 in *Beyond Form Criticism: Essays in Old Testament Literary Criticism*. Edited by Paul R. House. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992.
- Murphy, Catherine M. *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Qumran Community*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 40. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Murphy, Roland E. "Yēser in Qumran Literature." *Biblica* 39 (1958): 334-344.
- _____. *The Tree of Life: An Exploration of Biblical Wisdom Literature*. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Myllykoski, Matti. "James the Just in History and Tradition (Part One)." *Currents in Biblical Resarch* 5 (2006): 73-122.
- _____., "James the Just in History and Tradition (Part Two)." *Currents in Biblical Resarch* 6 (2007): 11-98.
- Najman, Hindy. *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Neander, A. *Epistle of James Practically Explained*. Translated by H. C. Conant; New York: Sheldon, 1852).
- Newsom, Carol M. "The Sage in the Literature of Qumran: The Function of the *Maskil*." Pages 373-382 in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- _____. *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- _____. "Spying Out the Land: A Report from Genology." Pages 19-30 in *Bakhtin and Genre Theory in Biblical Studies*. Edited by Roland Boer; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007.
- _____. "Pairing Research Questions and Theories of Genre: A Case Study of the Hodayot." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 17 (2010): 270-288.

- Nickelsburg, George W. *A Commentary on the Book of Enoch: Chapters 1-36, 81-108*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- _____. "Wisdom and Apocalypticism in Early Judaism: Some Points for Discussion." Pages 17-38 in *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism*. Edited by Benjamin G. Wright and Lawrence M. Wills. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 35. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.
- _____. "A Response to Sarah Tanzer." Pages 51-56 in *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism*. Edited by Benjamin G. Wright and Lawrence M. Wills. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 35. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.
- Nickelsburg, George W. and James C. Vanderkam. *1 Enoch*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012.
- Nitzan, Bilhah. "The Idea of Creation and Its Implications in Qumran Literature." Pages 240-264 in *Creation in Jewish and Christian Traditions*. Edited by Henning G. Reventlow and Yair Hoffman; Journal for the Study of Old Testament: Supplementary Series 319. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- _____. "The Ideological and Literary Unit of 4QInstruction and Its Authorship." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 12 (2005): 257-279.
- Oeming, Manfred. "Gerhard Von Rad as a Theologian of the Church." in *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 62/3 (2008): 231-237.
- Osiek, Carolyn. *A Commentary on the Shepherd of Hermas*, Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999.
- Painter, John. *Just James: The Brothers of Jesus in History and Tradition*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997.
- Parry, Donald W., and Stephen D. Ricks, eds. *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Studies of the Texts of the Desert of Judah 20. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Parry, Donald W., and Eugene Ulrich, eds. *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*. Studies of the Texts of the Desert of Judah 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Pastor, Jack. *Land and Economy in Ancient Palestine*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Penner, Todd C. *The Epistle of James and Eschatology: Re-reading an Ancient Christian Letter*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplementary Series 121. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

- _____. "The Epistle of James in Current Research." *CRBS* 7 (1999): 257-308.
- Perdue, Leo G. *Wisdom Literature: A Theological History*. London: Westminster: John Knox Press, 2007.
- Perdue, Leo G., Bernard Brandon Scott, and William Johnston Wiseman, eds. *Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie*. Louisville: John Knox, 1993.
- Perrin, Nicholas. "Introduction: Reasons for Questioning Q." Pages 1-12 in *Questioning Q*. Edited by Mark Goodacre and Nicholas Perrin. London: SPCK, 2004.
- Perrin, Norman and Dennis C. Duling. *The New Testament: An Introduction*. 2nd Edition. London: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1982.
- Pleins, J. D. "Poverty in the Social World of the Wise." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 37 (1987): 61-78.
- Pines, Shlomo. "Notes on the Twelve Tribes in Qumran, Early Christianity and Jewish Tradition." Pages 151-154 in *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity. Presented to David Flusser on the Occasion of his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by Ithamar Gruenewalk, Shaul Shaked and Gedaliahu G. Strousma. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992.
- Piper, Ronald A. *Wisdom in the Q Tradition: The Aphoristic Teaching of Jesus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Popkes, Wiard. "James and Parenthesis, Reconsidered." Pages 535-561 in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in their Textual and Situational Contexts*. Edited by Tord Formberg and David Hellhom. Oslo: Aschehoug, 1995.
- _____. "James and Scripture: An Exegesis on Intertextuality." *New Testament Studies* 45 (1999): 213-229.
- _____. "Two Interpretations of 'Justification' in the New Testament." *Studia theologica* 59 (2005): 129-146.
- Porter, Frank Chamberlin. "The Yecer Hara: A Study of the Jewish Doctrine of Sin." Pages 91-158 in *Biblical and Semitic Studies: Classical and Historical Essays by the Members of the Semitic and Biblical Faculty of Yale University*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901.
- Poythress, Vern S. "Three Modern Myths in Interpreting Genesis 1." *Westminster Theological Journal* 76 (2014): 321-350.
- Puech, Émile, eds. *Qumrân Grotte 4 XVIII: Textes Hébreux (4Q521-4Q528, 4Q576-4Q579)*. Discoveries of the Judean Desert 25. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.

- _____. “Les fragments eschatologiques de 4QInstruction (4Q416 1 et 4Q418 69 ii, 81-81a, 127).” *Revue de Qumran* 22 (2005): 89-119.
- Puech Émile and A. Steudel. “Un nouveau fragment de manuscrit 4QInstruction (XQ& = 4Q417 ou 418).” *Revue de Qumran* 19 (2000): 623-627.
- Qimron Elisha and John Strugnell, eds. *Qumran Cave 4. Discoveries in the Judean Desert* 10. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Rad, Gerhard. von, *Old Testament Theology. Volume 1: The Theology of Israel's Historical Traditions*. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. London: Oliver and Boyd, 1962.
- _____. *Wisdom in Israel*. Translated by James. D. Martin. London: SCM Press, 1972.
- Ramm, Bernard. *Christian Views of Science and Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954.
- Reuben Farmer, William. *The Synoptic Problem*. London: Macmillan, 1964.
- Rey, Jean-Sébastien. *4QInstruction: sagesse et eschatologie*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 81. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- _____. “Family Relationships in 4QInstruction and in Eph 5:21-6:4.” Pages 231-256 in *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Robinson, James M. “Logoi Sophon: On the Guttang of Q.” Pages 84-130 in *The Future of Our Religious Past: Essays in Honour of Rudolf Bultmann*. Edited by James Robinson. Translated by Charles E. Carlson and Robert P. Scharlermann. London: SCM Press, 1971.
- Rofé, Alexander. “Revealed Wisdom: From the Bible to Qumran.” Pages 1-13 in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Centre for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20-22 May 2001*. Edited by John J. Collins, Gregory E. Sterling, and Ruth A. Clements. Studies of the Texts of the Desert of Judah 51. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Rosen-Zvi, Ishay. “Bilhah the Temptress: The ‘Testament of Reuben’ and ‘The Birth of Sexuality.’” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 96 (1996): 65-94.
- _____. “Refuting the *Yetzer*: The Evil Inclination and the Limits of Rabbinic Discourse.” *Journal for Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 17 (2009): 117-142.
- _____. *Demonic Desires: “Yetzer Hara” and the Problem of Evil in Late Antiquity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.

- Rowland, Christopher. "The Eschatology of the New Testament Church." Pages 56-72 in *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*. Edited by Jerry L. Walls. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Rogerson, John W. *Old Testament Criticism in the Nineteenth Century: England and Germany*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- Ropes, James Hardy. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of St. James*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1916.
- Runia, David. "Theodicy in Philo of Alexandria." Pages 576-604 in *Theodicy in the World of the Bible*. Edited by A. Laato and J. C. de Moor. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Sacchi, Paolo. *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History*. Journal for the Study of Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 20. Edited by James H. Charlesworth and Lester L. Grabbe. Sheffield: Sheffield Academy Press, 1990.
- Safrai, Ze'ev. *The Economy of Roman Palestine*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Sanders, Ed. P. "The Genre of Palestinian Jewish Apocalypses." Pages 447-460 in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala 12-17 August 1979*. Edited by David Hellholm. Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.
- _____. *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE – 66 CE*. London: SCM Press, 1992.
- Sanders, Jack T. "When Sacred Canopies Collide: The Reception of the Torah of Moses in the Wisdom Literature of the Second Temple Period." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 32 (2001): 121-136.
- Satlow, Michael. "Male and Female They Created Her." Pages 486-505 in *Continuity and Renewal: Jews and Judaism in Byzantine-Christian Palestine*. Edited by Lee I. Levine. Jerusalem: Yad Ben Zvi, 2004.
- Schechter, Solomon. *Aspects of Rabbinic Theology*. 2nd Edition. New York: Schocken, 1961.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. *The Halakhah at Qumran*. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- _____. "4QMysteries: A Preliminary Edition." *Revue de Qumran* 16 (1993): 203-225.
- _____. *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their True Meaning for Judaism and Christianity*. New Haven: Yale University, 1994.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H., and Shani Tzoref, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls at 60: Scholarly Contributions of New York University Faculty and Alumni*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 89. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

- Schneckenberger, M. *Annatio ad Epistolam Jacobi Perpetua cum Brevi Tractatione Isagogica*. Stuttgart: F. L. Loflund, 1832.
- Schürer, Emil. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. – A.D. 135)*. Edited by Emil Schürer, Géza Vermes, and Fergus Millar. 3 Vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1973-1987.
- Scott, Julius J. “Patterns in the Church of Jerusalem as Seen in the Book of Acts.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 18 (1975): 217-227.
- _____. “James the Relative of Jesus and the Expectation of an Eschatological Priest.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 25 (1982): 323-331.
- Setzer, Claudia. *Resurrection of the Body in Early Judaism and Early Christianity*. Boston: Brill, 2004.
- Shaked, Shaul. “Esoteric Trends in Zoroastrianism.” *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities* 3 (1969): 175-221.
- Shanks, Hershel. “Chief Scroll Editor Opens Up: An Interview with Emanuel Tov.” *Biblical Archaeology Review* 28 (May/June 2002), 33.
- Sheppard, Gerald T. *Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct: A Study of the Sapientializing of the Old Testament*. Berlin, De Gruyter, 1980.
- Sinding, Michael. “After Definitions: Genre, Categories, and Cognitive Science.” *Genre* 35 (2002): 181-220
- Sinnott, Alice M. *The Personification of Wisdom*. London: Ashgate, 2005.
- Skarsaune Oskar, and Reidar Hvalvik, eds. *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007.
- Skehan, Patrick W., and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes*. New York: Doubleday, 1987.
- Smith, Jonathan Z. *Map Is Not Territory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- Smith, Morton. “On the History of Apocalytō and Apocalypsis.” Pages 9-20 in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17 1979*. Edited by David Hellholm, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.
- Sneed, Mark. “Is the ‘Wisdom Tradition’ a Tradition?” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 73 (2011): 50-71.
- _____. *Was There a Wisdom Tradition? New Perspectives in Israelite Wisdom Studies*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature Press, 2015.

- Snow Fletcher, LeAnn. "Mercy Triumphs over Judgment: Preaching James as Social Gospel." *Living Pulpit* (2006): 35-39.
- Sparks, Kenton L. *Ancient Texts for the Study of the Hebrew Bible: A Guide to the Background Literature*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2005.
- Speyer, Wolfgang. *Die Literarische Fälschung im Heidnischen und Christlichen Altertum: Ein Versuch Ihrer Deutung*. Munich: Beck, 1971.
- Spitta, F. *Zur Geschichte und Literatur des UrChristentums 2: Der Brief des Jakobus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1896.
- Spurgeon, Charles Hadden, *The Treasury of the Bible*. 8. Vols. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981.
- Staples, Jason A. "What do Gentiles Have to do with 'All Israel'? A Fresh Look at Romans 11:25-27." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 130/2 (2011): 371-390.
- Stegemann, Hartmut. *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täuße und Jesus*. Freiburg: Herder, 1994.
- Stone, Michael E. "Lists of the Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature." Pages 414-452 in *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernst Wright*. Edited by Frank Moore Cross, Weimer E. Lemke, and Patrick D. Miller. Garden City: Doubleday, 1976.
- _____. "The Book of Enoch and Judaism in the Third Century BCE." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 40 (1978): 479-492.
- _____. *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Ezra*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "4QInstruction and the Possible Influence of early Enochic Traditions: An Evaluation." Pages 245-262 in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*. Edited by Charlotte Hempel, Armin Lange, and H. Lichtenberger. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002.
- _____. "Agels and God: Exploring the Limits of Early Jewish Monotheism." Pages 45-70 in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*. Edited by Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy E.. S. North. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Strugnell, John. "Notes en marge du volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan.'" *Revue de Qumran* 7 (1970): 163-276.
- _____. "More on Wives and Marriage in the Dead Sea Scrolls – 4Q416 2 ii 21 and 4QMMT B." *Revue de Qumran* 17 (1996): 537-547.

- _____. "The Sapiential Work 4Q415 ff. and Pre-Qumranic Works from Qumran: Lexical Considerations." Pages 595-608 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Strugnell, John, Daniel J. Harrington, and Torleif Elgvin. eds. *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2, 4QInstruction (MusārLeMēvin): 4Q415ff*. Discoveries of the Judean Desert 34. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.
- Sullivan, Kevin P. *Wrestling with Angels: A Study of the Relationship between Angels and Humans in Ancient Jewish Literature and the New Testament*. Leiden, Brill, 2004.
- Swales, John. *Genre Analysis: Research English in Academia and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Sweeny Marvin A., and Ehud Ben Zvi, eds. *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Tanzer, Sarah. "Response to George Nickelsburg, 'Wisdom and Apocalypticism in Early Judaism'." Pages 39-50 in *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism*. Edited by Benjamin G. Wright and Lawrence M. Wills. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 35. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.
- _____. *Qumran Cave 4 XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*. Discoveries of the Judean Desert 36. Oxford, Clarendon, 2000.
- Theodore Bachmann, E. *Luther's Works 35: Word and Sacrament 1*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1960.
- Thomas, Samuel L. *The "Mysteries" of Qumran: Mystery, Secrecy, and Esotericism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature Press, 2009.
- Thompson, Alden L. *Responsibility for Evil in the Theodicy of IV Ezra: A Study Illustrating the Significance of Form and Structure for the Meaning of the Book*. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.
- Tigheelaar, Eibert J. C. *Prophets of the Old and the Day of the End: Zechariah, the Book of Watchers and Apocalyptic*. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- _____. "Sabbath Halakha and Worship in 4QWays of Righteousness: 4Q421 11 and 13+2+8 PAR 4Q264a 1-2." *Revue de Qumran* 18/71 (1998): 359-372.

- _____. “הבא ביהד” in 4QInstruction (4Q418 64+199+66 PAR 4Q417 1 i 17-19) and the Height of the Columns of 4Q418.” *Revue de Qumran* 18 (1998): 589-593.
- _____. “More Identifications of Scraps and Overlaps.” *Revue de Qumran* 19 (1999): 61-68.
- _____. “The Addressees of 4QInstruction.” Pages 62-79 in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetic Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organisation of Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998: Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet*. Edited by Daniel K. Falk, Florentino Garcia Martinez, and Eileen M. Schuller. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 35. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- _____. *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction*. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 44. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- _____. “Your Wisdom and Your Folly: The Case of 1-4Qmysteries.” Pages 69-88 in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez *Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum Iovanienium* 168. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.
- _____. Review of Daryl Jefferies, *Wisdom at Qumran: A Form Critical Analysis of the Admonitions in 4QInstruction*. *Journal of Dead Sea Discoveries* 12/3 (2005): 372-374.
- _____. “Wisdom and Counter Wisdom-Wisdom in 4QInstruction, Mysteries and 1 Enoch.” Pages 177-194 in *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. *Journal of the Study of Judaism Series* 121. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- _____. “The Evil Inclination in the Dead Sea Scrolls, with a Re-edition of 4Q468 (4Qsectarian Text?).” Pages 347-357 in *Empsychoi Logoi: Religious Innovations in Antiquity: Studies in Honor of Peter Willem van den Horst*. Edited by A. Houtman, a. de Jong and M. Misset-van de Weg. *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums* 73. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- _____. “‘Spiritual People,’ ‘Fleshly Spirit,’ and ‘Vision of Meditation’: Reflections on 4QInstruction and 1 Corinthians.” Pages 103-118 in *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 85. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

- Tiller, Patrick A. “‘The ‘Eternal Planting’ in the Dead Sea Scrolls.’” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 4 (1997): 312-335.
- _____. “The Rich and the Poor in James: An Apocalyptic Ethic.” Pages 169-180 in *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism*. Edited by Benjamin G. Wright and Lawrence M. Wills. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 35. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.
- Tobin, Vincent Arieh. “Myths: Creation Myths.” Pages 469-471 in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt*. Edited by Donald B. Redford. 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Tuckett, Christopher M. *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies in Q*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.
- Tynyanon, Yuri. “The Literary Fact.” Pages 29-49 in *Modern Genre Theory*. Edited by David Duff. Harlow: Longman: 2000.
- Vanderkam, James C., and William Adler, eds. *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.
- Vaux, Roland ed. “La Grotte des Manuscrits Hébreux,” *Revue Biblique* 66 (1949): 589-609.
- _____. *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. London: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- Vermes, Geza. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. New York: Penguin, 1997.
- Veresput, Donald J. “Genre and Story: The Community Setting of the Epistle of James.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 62 (2000): 96-100.
- Wacholder Ben Z., and Martin G. Abegg, eds. Pages 44 – 154 in *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and the Aramic Texts from Cave*. Washington D. C.: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991-1992.
- Wall, Robert W. “James as Apocalyptic Paraenesis.” *Restoration Quarterly* 32 (1990): 11-22.
- Ward, Roy Bowen. “Partiality in the Assembly: James 2:2-4.” *Harvard Theological Review* 62 (1969): 87-97.
- Watts, John D. W. *Isaiah 34-66*. World Biblical Commentary 25. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2005.
- Weeks, Stuart. “Is ‘Wisdom Literature’ A Useful Category?” Pages 3-23 in *Tracing Sapiential Traditions in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by Hindy Najman, Jean-Sébastien Rey and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. Supplements to the Journal of Judaism 174. Leiden: Brill, 2016), 3-23, 16.

- Werman, Cana. "What is the Book of Hagu?" Pages 125-140 in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls – Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Centre for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20-22 May, 2001*. Edited by John J. Collins, Gregory E. Sterling and Ruth A. Clements. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 51. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Wenham, John William. *Redacting Matthew, Mark and Luke*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1991.
- Whybray, Roger M. *Wealth and Poverty in the Book of Proverbs*. Journal for the Study of Old Testament: Supplement Series 99. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.
- Wilson, Walter. "Sin and Sex and Sex and Sin: The Anthropology of James 1:12-15." *Harvard Theological Review* 95/2 (2002): 147-168, 159.
- Winston, David. *The Wisdom of Solomon* New York: Doubleday, 1979.
- Wise, Michael O. "Dating the Teacher of Righteousness and his Movement." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 122/1 (2003): 53-87.
- Witherington, Ben. *Jesus the Sage: The Pilgrimage of Wisdom*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Philosophical Investigation*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1958.
- Wold, Benjamin G. "Reconsidering an Aspect of the Title *Kyrios* in Light of Sapiential Fragment 4Q416 2 iii." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentlich Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 95 (2004): 149-160.
- _____. *Women, Men and Angels: The Qumran Wisdom Document Musar leMevin and its Allusions to Genesis Creation Traditions*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 201. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- _____. "Metaphorical Poverty in Musar leMevin." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 58 (2007): 140-153.
- _____. "Family Ethics in 4QInstruction and the New Testament." *Novum Testamentum* 50 (2008): 286-300.
- _____. "The Universality of Creation in 4QInstruction." *Revue de Qumran* 26/2 (2013): 211-226.
- _____. "'Flesh' and 'Spirit' in Qumran Sapiential Literature and Its Background to the Use in Pauline Epistles," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 106/2 (2015): 262-279.

- _____. "Sin and Evil in James: Sapiential and Apocalyptic." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta, GA., November 21, 2015.
- _____. "Demonizing Sin? The Evil Inclination in 4QInstruction." Pages 34-48 in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Chris Keith and Loren T. Stuckenbruck. WUNT 417; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.
- _____. "Is the 'Firstborn Son' in 4Q369 a Messiah? The Evidence from 4QInstruction." *Revue de Qumran* 29/1 (2017): 3-20.
- _____. *4QInstruction: Divisions and Hierarchies*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 123. Leiden: Brill, forthcoming.
- Wolfson, Eric R. "Seven Mysteries of Knowledge: Qumran E/Sotericism Recovered." Pages 177-213 in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honour of James L. Kugel*. Edited by Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman; Journal for the Study of Judaism" Supplement Series 83. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Wright, Archie T. "Some Observations of Philo's *De Gigantibus* and Evil Spirits in Second Temple Judaism," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 36 (2005): 471-488.
- Wright, Benjamin G. *No Small Difference: Sirach's Relationship to its Hebrew Parent Text*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- _____. "The Categories of Rich and Poor in the Qumran Sapiential Literature." Pages 101-124 in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of The Orion Centre for the Study of Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20-22 May, 2004*. Edited by John J. Collins, Gregory E. Sterling and Ruth A. Clements. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 51. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- _____. "Putting the Puzzle Together: Some Suggestions Concerning the Social Location of the Wisdom of Ben Sira." Pages 89-122 in *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism*. Edited by Benjamin G. Wright and Lawrence M. Wills. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 35. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- _____. "1Enoch and Ben Sira: Wisdom and Apocalypticism in Relationship." Pages 159-176 in *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. Journal for the Studies of Jewish Studies 121. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- _____. "Joining the Club: A Suggestion about Genre in Early Jewish Texts." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 17 (2010): 289-314.

- Wright, Benjamin G., and Claudia V. Camp. "Who has Been Tested by Gold and Found Perfect?": Ben Sira's Discourse of Riches and Poverty." *Henoch* 23 (2001): 153-174.
- Yarbro Collins, Adela. "Introduction: Early Christian Apocalypticism." *Semeia* 36 (1986): 1-12.
- Yardeni, Ada. *The Book of Hebrew Script: History, Palaeography, Script Styles, Calligraphy & Design*. Jerusalem: Carta, 1997.
- _____. *Textbook of Aramaic, Hebrew and Nabataean Documentary Text from the Judean Desert and Related Material*. 2 Volumes. Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 2000.
- Zahn, Molly M. "Genre and Rewritten Scripture: A Reassessment." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 131 (2012): 271-288.
- Zahn, Theodore. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1909.