

Messiah is identified with such a figure in 1 Enoch 37–71 (cf. 4 Ezra, SibOr 5), while the development of these figures is particularly prominent in the Qumran writings, and some at least of them may be implicitly messianic. It is not necessarily the case that these heavenly figures simply replace a human, earthly Messiah; they may be held together as mutually compatible, as some of the Qumran texts (and arguably also 4 Ezra, SibOr 5, 1 Enoch) show. Nevertheless, there is a clear tendency (in apocalyptic texts especially) for the emphasis to be placed increasingly on transcendent figures, at the expense of any concentration on immediate, earthly messianic hopes, although again it must be emphasized that no simple, direct contrast (between present and future, earthly and heavenly) can be drawn⁷⁴.

The implication of this evidence, then, is that the imposing of transcendent categories on Jewish messianic hope is a secondary development rather than being an integral or important part of messianism as such. The further implication is that it is deliberately intended to push Jewish messianic hopes in a particular direction; for the most part, certainly, they are not removed from an eschatological frame of reference, but the imminent and this-worldly nature of the messianic expectations is certainly diminished. This line of argument, I would certainly concede, may on the one hand posit too consistent and specific a popular Jewish messianic hope, and on the other underestimate the possibility that transcendent categories may be more integral to some of these messianic figures than I have allowed; there is indeed no reason as such why transcendent and specifically this-worldly emphasis should be incompatible. Nevertheless, it seems to me necessary to posit and understand a 'hidden agenda' of these lines of development of Jewish messianic belief, and to ask about their implications, especially in relation to popular hope and modes of effecting change in this, in something of the way that I have sketched out above. There were, of course, other possible ways within Judaism for dealing with popular messianic hope that threatened to flare up in a politically and socially dangerous form. One possibility was to ignore it or play it down to the extent of effectively removing it from the agenda altogether.

* This is probably the case in one or two of the works that I have touched on already, for example 1 Maccabees. It also appears to be what has happened in the Mishnah, where messianic expectation is set aside almost completely, to the extent that even when it reappears in the Talmud, it does so only in an aetiolated and non-specific manner⁷⁵. The Targums, with their prolific development of messianic reference that I have noted already (2.10. above), would appear to represent a contrast to this development in much of Rabbinic

literature. Even here, however, it should be noted that in Onkelos and Targum Jonathan of the Prophets, the 'official' Targums more subject to Rabbinic control than the others, the messianic development is much less marked; the very lavish developments in Pseudo-Jonathan, by contrast, belong to a tradition that otherwise reflects much more contact with popular Jewish belief, is little constrained by official controls and for the most part is probably considerably later. Yet even in Pseudo-Jonathan, as also the Palestinian Targums of the Pentateuch in general, there are indications of attempts to play down messianic hope and defer speculation (see note 75, below), and the same may be true of the LXX in some cases. Overall, clearly, the political context (above all of Roman domination), the disastrous failure of specific messianic movements and the particular concerns and self-interest of the dominant ruling-group (for example, the Rabbis) could all conspire to marginalize messianic hope, or at least its concrete expression and embodiment.

To pursue this line of enquiry further would require proper investigation and analysis as far as possible of the social, economic and political situation of the society as a whole at the time when these works were produced and of those responsible for producing them. This is particularly difficult in the case of the apocalypses especially, since it is very hard to ascertain any clear information about those who produced these works, and their social setting, but potentially it is worth assessing the correlation of the particular ideology and the socio-economic situation, and the significance of this for the nature (or lack) of messianic expectation. It is in any case notable that at least some of those works that are engaged in defusing messianic hopes, or spiritualizing or 'transcendentizing' them, are precisely those that contain the most highly developed intermediary concepts (not least, of course, with Philo himself). All this, however, also points to the need to gain a clearer and fuller picture of intermediary and transcendent figures in the Jewish sources for this period, which is the theme of the next section.

3. Jewish Mediatorial Figures

In contrast to the relative dearth of references to messianic expectation in this period, there is a very striking development and proliferation of mediatorial figures. Again, as with 'messianic', the term 'mediatorial' (and more especially other terms, such as 'intermediaries' and 'hypostatizations') poses problems of definition, which will be taken up briefly in the discussion at the end of this section.

⁷⁴ Cf. HENGEL 1983b, 676.

⁷⁵ See esp. NEUSNER 1987. For the way that some of the Pentateuchal Targums at Gen 49.1 (PsJ, Neof, Fragment Targums) attempt to play down or ignore messianic speculation, cf. CHESTER 1986, 185–191.

3.1. *Philo*

3.1.1. Conf 146: And if there happens to be anyone who as yet is unfit to be called a Son of God, let him make every effort to take his proper place under (God's) first-born Logos, the one who is the chief elder among the angels, the archangel so to speak, who has many names. For he is called 'the Beginning', and the Name of God, and Logos, and the Man after his image, and 'he that sees', that is, Israel.

Her 205: To the Archangel and Logos, who is the chief elder, the Father who has begotten all has given the special prerogative to stand on the border and separate the creature from the Creator. This Logos is both the one who supplicates constantly to the Immortal for afflicted mortality and also he who acts as the ambassador of the ruler to the subject.

Philo is the most prolific source we possess of mediatorial concepts, and these two passages merely indicate some of the main concepts⁷⁶. Both are centered on the Logos, which is itself central to the whole of Philo's thought. In fact Philo's 'system' is deliberately conflate and synthesizing, drawing its categories from early middle Platonism, Stoicism, and other strands of Greek thought and philosophy, as well as scripture and Jewish tradition. But the most striking feature here is the way he makes use particularly of developed Jewish angelological traditions, which assume great prominence and importance in the Second Temple period. Hence to call the Logos 'chief elder (or eldest) of the angels' and 'archangel' (or 'chief of the angels') is to give it an extremely elevated status in the heavenly realm, a position otherwise most commonly associated with Michael⁷⁷. So also to have 'many names' is itself an indication of heightened position, and is a designation used of God himself. These many names (as specified in Conf 146) themselves individually also suggest that the Logos is accorded an extraordinarily high position, in context of other developed Jewish traditions. Thus the designations as 'firstborn' and 'beginning' are both drawn from a tradition of interpreting Gen 1.1 and Prov 8.22–23, which we are familiar with otherwise from developed Wisdom traditions⁷⁸. Although for the most part Philo takes over and applies to the Logos traditions that have been developed otherwise independently in relation to Wisdom, he does both specifically identify the Logos with Wisdom (All I. 65) and also uses Wisdom itself as a personified, mediatorial figure. Not surprisingly, therefore, there is considerable overlap between what is said of the Logos and what is said of Wisdom. Thus, for example, Wisdom also is said to be 'many-named', its designations include 'beginning', 'image' and 'vision of God', and it is portrayed as active and instrumental in creation (Virt 62; Her

⁷⁶ On Philo's developed concepts, cf. further HEGERMANN 1961, 6–87; WEISS 1966, 204–211, 248–282; MACK 1973; SEGAL 1977, 159–181; DEY 1975; FOSSUM 1985, 197–204; SCHÜRER-VERMES-MILLAR 1973–87, vol. III.2, 881–885.

⁷⁷ The precedent for this is set already by Dan 10; 12.1–4; cf. also esp. 2 Enoch; TestAbr A.

⁷⁸ Cf. WEISS 1966, 204–208, 265–272.

199; Fug 109). Distinctively (representing her feminine nature, that is, in contrast to the masculine Logos), Wisdom is also portrayed as the 'mother and nurse' of mankind (Conf 49; Ebr 31), and the Mother of the world (with God as the Father, or Wisdom's Husband), but also as the daughter of God.

The main emphasis, however, throughout Philo's writings, is not on Wisdom but on the Logos. The portrayal of the Logos in Conf 146 as 'the man after the image (of God)' derives from Gen 1.26–27, and sets the Logos in the sphere of developed Adam and heavenly Man traditions (cf. also e.g. Op 134; All I. 31, 53 ff., 88 ff.; II. 4)⁷⁹. But in the immediately following passage in Conf (147), Philo specifically calls the Logos '(God's) invisible image' and 'the eldest-born image of God' (for this direct identification of Logos and image, compare also, for example Spec I. 81; Fug 101; Som I. 239; II. 45). Thus also (Conf 97) Philo calls the Logos God's 'image', and sets it as the mediator between God and the world; especially striking is All III. 96 where the Logos is specifically equated with the 'image' of Gen 1.26–27, with God as its 'paradigm', while the Logos correspondingly is made the 'paradigm' for the rest of creation (the same basic idea is also found in Her 230–231). In the messianic passage at Conf 62–63, Philo makes the heavenly Man identical with the divine image, without specific reference to the Logos. This serves to confirm that it is heavenly Man/Adam speculation that provides one main framework of reference for Philo's portrayal of the Logos. The identification of the Logos with the Name of God (that is, the unique divine name, the Tetragrammaton), also sets the Logos in a further sphere of developed Jewish tradition⁸⁰, while the designation of the Logos as 'Israel, the one who sees' (sc. 'God') is probably to be related to another strand of angelological interpretation⁸¹, which (as we have noted) is an important category in general for Philo's attributing elevated status to the Logos.

There are many other remarkable terms used of the Logos; thus, for example, it is said to be the 'shadow' of God, and the 'High Priest'. Again using developed Wisdom tradition, Philo also speaks of the Logos as instrumental in creation (for example, All III. 96), specifically as the 'instrument' by which God created the world (Migr 6; compare also Fug 95), and uses the same word (*διακοσμέω*) of the Logos creating (/setting in order) the world as he uses of God ordering the heavens (Op 20; 53). The same terms are used of both the Logos and God otherwise, while not only is the Logos specified as divine (e.g. Migr 67) and eternal (Quaest in Ex II. 117), but it is even spoken of as a 'second God' (*δεύτερος θεός*; Quaest in Gen II. 62).

⁷⁹ Cf. FOSSUM 1985, 266–271.

⁸⁰ Cf. FOSSUM 1985, 106–112, 335–336.

⁸¹ Cf. the interpretation of the name Israel, in relation to the angel Jacob-Israel, as 'a man seeing God' in the Prayer of Joseph, 3.3.2, below.

Thus the very elevated concepts and terminology used of the Logos seem in some respects at least to set it virtually on a par with God. The Logos is pre-existent, operative in creation, and effectively the representation of God. It also takes over the role of the divine Wisdom, is identified with the figure of the heavenly Man/Adam, and is represented as the archangel, the supreme being apart from God in the heavenly realm. It is notoriously difficult, however, to know precisely how to evaluate Philo's language and ideas here, as throughout his works. Thus, for example, it is not always clear that his use of λόγος is meant to represent the 'Logos', as a technical term. Equally problematic is the fact that since Philo's 'system' is so conflated and his works are so voluminous, it is not possible to establish a single, consistent philosophy; this is scarcely surprising since, as we have already noted, Philo fuses together various concepts drawn from different philosophical and biblical traditions, but it poses obvious problems for the interpretation both of individual passages and of his thought as a whole. It can, however, be said that clearly for Philo the Logos is not identical with God, and in some sense at least is obviously subordinate to him (thus, for example, All II. 86: God is the primary being, the Logos second to him). In fact the concept and figure of the Logos is to some extent caught up in the tension of Philo's thought as a whole; that is, the question he grapples with of how the perfect, eternal God can come into relation with the imperfect world in *any* sense⁸². Hence the Logos, as Philo's main mediatorial figure, is both the aspect of God's activity and relation vis-à-vis the world, but also a figure separate from God. Nevertheless, the terms in which the Logos is portrayed remain, on any showing, quite remarkable. Even if Philo's conception of it is not internally consistent, a number of passages can scarcely be understood except on the basis that the Logos properly belongs in the heavenly world alongside God, and should be given the names, attributes and roles that are normally ascribed to God himself.

Logos and Wisdom are not the only developed mediatorial figures in Philo's writings; he also speaks of 'powers' and 'logoi'⁸³, that is, angelic and heavenly powers who assist in the creation (thus e.g. Op 79–82; Conf 171–182). But Philo also gives individual human figures very heightened position; thus Moses is designated 'chief prophet and chief angel', and spoken of as 'god' (referring to Ex 7.1), while Abraham is said to be 'equal to the angels'. Thus again the importance of angelological categories for Philo is apparent.

3.2. *Wisdom*

As we have seen, Philo draws on developed Wisdom traditions and uses Wisdom itself as an important mediatory figure. The basis for the developments

⁸² Cf. ZELLER 1923, 413–429; SCHÜRER-VERMES-MILLAR 1973–87, vol. III.2, 880–885.

⁸³ Cf. SCHÜRER-VERMES-MILLAR 1973–87, vol. III.2, 881–884; WEISS 1966, 272–275; FOSSUM 1985, 197–204.

Philo is able to use are to be found already in the highly personified portrayal of Wisdom in Prov 1–9, above all 3.19–20 and 8.22–31, where Wisdom is said to be pre-existent (in the sense of being created before the rest of the created order) and to be instrumental with God in the work of creation, while in Job 28, Wisdom is given a mysterious but cosmic nature⁸⁴. These themes are developed further in the two hymns to Wisdom in Ben Sirah 1.1–10 (especially 1.4) and 24. Thus Wisdom's preexistence is stressed (1.4; 24.9), while in 24.3–6 its cosmic role is described and it is made clear that it properly belongs in heaven (24.4). At the same time, however, Wisdom is set on earth, limited to Israel and identified with Torah. These specific themes are also taken up in Baruch 3.9–4.4, where, although Wisdom's cosmic role is still in view, the main emphasis is on Wisdom belonging to Israel alone and being identified with Torah; but again there is at least the implication that Wisdom's proper place is in heaven. In the short, isolated wisdom poem in 1 Enoch 42, the main emphasis is on Wisdom's failure to find any dwelling-place on earth, but again it is made clear that Wisdom's true home is in the heavenly world, set alongside the angels.

The most interesting development, however, indeed the climax of at least one strand of the Wisdom tradition, is represented by Wisdom of Solomon 7–9, especially 7.22–8.1 and 9.1–12. Thus 7.25–26:

She is an exhalation from the power of God, and a pure effluence from the glory of the Almighty; therefore nothing defiled enters into her. She is an effulgence of everlasting light, an unblemished mirror of the active power of God, and an image of his goodness.

These five designations (ἀτμός, ἀπόρροια, ἀπαύγασμα, ἔσπετρον, εἰκών) following the series of twenty-one epithets in vv. 22–24) set Wisdom in a quite remarkable relationship to God. It is not that Wisdom is made identical with God, but all these terms are certainly to be understood in a very developed and heightened sense. We have already seen that Philo uses 'image' to help suggest a very close relationship between the Logos and God; he also speaks similarly of Wisdom as the 'mirror' of the powers of God (Quaest in Gen I. 57). But although Philo also uses the first three terms here to denote what emanates from the Logos, and uses the corresponding verbs to speak of the Logos itself as emanating from God, he does not use the nouns themselves directly of the Logos⁸⁵. Thus in speaking of Wisdom as 'exhalation' (ἀτμός literally 'vapour'), 'effluence' (ἀπόρροια) and 'effulgence' (ἀπαύγασμα), the writer at least in this respect goes beyond anything in Philo in the elevated position he ascribes to Wisdom.

⁸⁴ On the whole development of Wisdom speculation, cf. HENGEL 1973, 153–175; HEGERMANN 1961; WEISS 1966, 189–211.

⁸⁵ Cf. WINSTON 1979, 59–63, 184–186.

9.4,9–10: Give me wisdom, who sits beside your throne... 'And with you is wisdom, who knows your works, and was present when you were making the world, and who understands what is pleasing in your eyes, and what is right according to your commandments. Send her forth from the holy heavens, and send her from your throne of glory...

Clearly here Wisdom is pre-existent, and active in the creation of the world (so also 9.2: 'By your wisdom you formed man', parallel to 'who made all things by your word' in 9.1). The really striking feature, however, is the description of Wisdom as the companion of God's throne. There are certainly parallels in Greek (Platonic and Stoic) philosophical literature for much of the terminology of vv. 4,10 in *general* terms⁸⁶, but to do justice to the distinctive themes and expressions in these verses, we need to look to developed Jewish angelological and visionary, apocalyptic traditions (including those relating to Ezek 1.26). Thus on this basis, Wisdom clearly belongs not simply within the heavenly world in general (a theme already established within Wisdom tradition, for example Ben Sirah 24), but on the throne of glory, alongside God. It is from this position of supreme importance in the heavenly realm that Wisdom has to be sent to assist mankind, and the use of this 'sending' formula again reflects developed angelological tradition⁸⁷.

3.3. Apocalyptic and related material

3.3.1. Apocalypse of Abraham

This apocalypse (probably from first century AD Palestine), is especially remarkable for its portrayal of the angel Iaoel, whom God sends to lead Abraham up into the heavenly realm. The name Iaoel itself is described as 'Iaoel of the same name, by virtue of my ineffable name' (10.3; cf. 10.8: 'I am Iaoel, and I was called so by him who causes to shake those with me on the seventh expanse, on the firmament, a power by virtue of his ineffable name in me'), while in 17 Iaoel teaches Abraham to recite a hymn of praise to God, including the refrain '... Eli, eternal, mighty one, holy, Sabaoth, most glorious, El, El, El, El, Iaoel...' (17.13). Thus the name Iaoel (probably made up of the two divine names YHWH and El) has God's name within it and is itself one of the titles used of God in direct invocation of him (so also in Apoc Mos 29.4). From here it does not seem such a great step to the depiction of Metatron, in the much later 3 Enoch (12.5), as 'the lesser YHWH' 'because my name is in him' (citing Ex 23.21)⁸⁸. Iaoel is sent in the likeness of a man (10.4; cf. the 'one like a son of man' in Dan 7.13), but he is also depicted (11.2–3) in terms which

⁸⁶ Cf. WINSTON 1979, 202, 205.

⁸⁷ On this formula, cf. SCHWEIZER 1966, 199–210; BÜHNER 1977.

⁸⁸ Cf. ALEXANDER 1977, 156–180; FOSSUM 1985, 297–301, 318–319.

bear some resemblance to the description of the Ancient of Days (that is, God) in Dan 7.9 (cf. Rev 1.14), while in ch. 18 Iaoel appears at the very least to be set alongside the throne of fire⁸⁹. The complex imagery and poetic, extravagant language of the work as a whole make it difficult for us to be certain exactly what is meant; but at the very least it can be said that the angel Iaoel is portrayed in terminology usually reserved for God alone.

3.2.2. Prayer of Joseph

'I, Jacob, who am speaking to you, am also Israel, an angel of God and a ruling spirit... But I, Jacob, who men call Jacob but whose name is Israel am he who God called Israel which means, a man seeing God, because I am the firstborn of every living thing to whom God gives life.'

The brief section that is all we now possess of this text⁹⁰ then describes the angel Israel descending to earth in the form of Jacob, and his struggle with Uriel⁹¹, culminating in his claim:

Are you not Uriel, the eighth after me? and I, Israel, the archangel of the power of the Lord and the chief captain among the sons of God? Am I not Israel, the first minister before the face of God?

The succession of epithets shows that Jacob-Israel is not only pre-existent, but is also supreme, apart from God, in the heavenly realm, set above all other angels; his earthly manifestation in the form of Jacob is merely temporary (cf. e.g. Ben Sirah 24; 1 Enoch 42). There are thus obvious points of contact here with developed Wisdom tradition, while the majority of the epithets are also used by Philo to designate the Logos. But in fact these epithets, as indeed the text as a whole (including, for example, the confrontation with Uriel), are to be connected especially with Jewish apocalyptic and angelological traditions. In context of these, Jacob-Israel is accorded an extraordinarily elevated position in the heavenly realm. This text is remarkable, then, for the way in which it portrays a human figure, Jacob, as exalted to supreme heavenly rank, and for the specific terms with which this human-angelic figure is described.

3.3.3. Apocalypse of Zephaniah

In this fragmentary work (probably from Egypt, not later than the early first century AD) the prophet is first taken up into the fifth heaven, where he sees 'angels who are called "lords", and the diadem was set upon them in the holy spirit and the throne of each was sevenfold more brilliant than the rising sun'.

⁸⁹ Cf. ROWLAND 1982, 101–103; FOSSUM 1985, 320; but against their interpretations, cf. HURTADO 1988, 86–90.

⁹⁰ The brief fragments are contained in early patristic citations, esp. Origen, Comm. on John. For full discussion of the text, cf. J. Z. SMITH 1968, 253–294.

⁹¹ Cf. SCHÄFER 1977.

Then, as the angel leads him through the heavenly world, the seer apparently twice mistakes angels for God himself:

6.4–5: I thought that the Lord Almighty had come to visit me. Then when I saw, I fell on my face before him to worship him.

6.11–14: Then I arose and stood, and I saw a great angel standing in front of me with his face shining like the rays of the sun in its glory; his face was like the face of a man perfected in its glory. And he had what looked like a golden girdle upon his breast, and his feet were like bronze melted in a fire. And when I saw him, I rejoiced, for I thought that the Lord Almighty had come to visit me. I fell on my face and worshipped him. He said to me, Give devotion to (God). Do not worship me. I am not the Lord Almighty, but I am the great angel, Eremiel...'.⁹²

This is very close to the vision of the angel in Dan 10.5ff., and also the vision (and interpretation of Dan 10) in Rev 1.13ff. (for the prohibition to worship, cf. Dan 10.11; Rev 19.10). Thus this text presents us with angels whose titles and especially appearance can cause them to be confused with God himself and induce worship of them.

3.3.4. *Joseph and Aseneth*

14.2–4: And Aseneth kept on looking, and behold, next to the morning star, the heaven was torn open, and a great and unutterable light appeared. And Aseneth saw, and fell on her face on the ashes. And a man came to her from heaven, and stood by her head; and he called to her and said, Aseneth, Aseneth.

14.6–11: And the man called her a second time and said, Aseneth, Aseneth. And she said, Behold, here I am, Lord. Tell me who you are. And the man said, I am the chief captain of the house of the Lord and the commander of the whole host of the Most High. Arise and stand on your feet, and I will tell you what I have to say. And Aseneth lifted her head and saw, and behold, there was a man like Joseph in every respect, with a robe and a crown and a royal staff, except that his face was like lightning, and his eyes were like the light of the sun, and the hairs of his head like flames of fire from a burning torch, and his hands and feet like iron shining forth from a fire, and sparks shot forth from his hands and feet. And Aseneth saw, and fell on her face at his feet on the ground. And Aseneth was filled with great fear, and all of her limbs trembled. And the man said to her, Have courage and do not be afraid, but arise and stand up, and I will tell you what I have to say.

JosAs 14–15 describes Aseneth's vision of a 'man' descending from heaven. The 'angelophany' here is portrayed in very vivid terms; although the 'man' is exactly like Joseph, his appearance (as the initial impact of the vision itself) is so dazzling that Aseneth falls down to worship him. The heavenly man describes himself not only as 'the chief of the house of the Lord', but also as 'commander-in-chief of the whole host of the Most High'; these are terms known otherwise

mainly with reference to the angel Michael⁹². This self-designation is repeated in ch. 15, where Aseneth worships the heavenly figure, who refuses to disclose his name, but says only that it is written in the book of the Most High. Thus this remarkable section, quite untypical of the rest of the work, presents us with what in its manner of description is very close to a theophany; as in the Apocalypse of Zephaniah, the appearance of the heavenly figure is itself sufficient to induce worship. But, in contrast to some of the other texts in this section (e.g. Prayer of Joseph), the figure is clearly an angel (in fact an archangel, who announces himself as chief of the heavenly retinue), who belongs fully from the start in the heavenly realm, but takes on human form and descends to earth.

3.3.5. *11QMelchizedek and other Qumran Texts*

The very fragmentary 11QMelch contains a remarkable portrayal of Melchizedek, especially lines 9–16:

For he has decreed a year of good favour for Melchizedek, [...] and the holy ones of God (El) to a reign of judgement, as it is written concerning him in the songs of David, who said, Elohim has taken his place in the council of God (El); in the midst of the gods (elohim) he gives judgement. And it was concerning him that he said, Return to the height above; El (God) will judge the peoples. And as for what he said, How long will you judge unjustly and lift up the face of the wicked? Its interpretation concerns Belial and the spirits of his lot [who...]. And Melchizedek will exact the vengeance of the judgements of God [...] from the hand] of Belial and from the hand of all [the spirits of his lot]. And all the gods (el) of [...] are for his help [...] all the sons of... This is the day of [...] concerning which he said [...] through Isa]iah the prophet, who said, [How] beautiful are the feet of the herald who proclaims peace, who brings good news, who proclaims salvation, who says to Zion, Your God (Elohim) reigns.

The effect of this is that Melchizedek 'is associated with the deliverance of divine judgement, with a day of atonement, with a year of Jubilee, and with a role that exalts him high above the assembly of heavenly beings'⁹³. It appears that the *Elohim* (l. 10) of Ps 82.1 is applied specifically to Melchizedek, who is also set alongside (if not above) the 'holy ones of God' and above the 'assembly of YHWH'. It is also implied (on the basis of Ps 82.2) that there is a visionary understanding of Melchizedek's throne being set in the highest heaven. Not only is Melchizedek also said to effect atonement, he is referred to as 'herald'

⁹² Cf. PHILONENKO 1968, 178; on the text as a whole, cf. also esp. BURCHARD 1965; BURCHARD 1970, 59–105.

⁹³ FITZMYER 1971, 253; on the text as a whole, cf. also esp. VAN DER WOUDE 1965, 354–373; MILIK 1972, 95–144.

and 'anointed with the spirit', which thus links the two messianic passages, Isa 52.7 and 62.1. Thus we are presented here with a heavenly, quasi-divine figure who at the same time has at least messianic traits, if he is not actually a messianic figure as such, so that there are obvious links with figures and themes treated in the first section of this essay. Some of the content here (for example, deliverance and Jubilee) suggests a specifically earthly, political, this-worldly messianic reference, although these themes could be simply stereotyped or spiritualized. At any rate, what is above all striking about this text is that passages of scripture that speak about God are now applied directly to Melchizedek, who also assumes God's role as judge and the role of atoning for sin. Thus an earthly figure is given an extraordinarily exalted position, and apparently accorded divine status and functions. It has to be said that the fragmentary nature of the text means that we cannot be completely certain of its meaning, but potentially it is of very great significance.

Brief reference has already been made (2.2.5., above) to other important heavenly figures who are also agents of deliverance in the Qumran texts; thus the Prince of Light(s) (Angel of Truth) in 1QS, 1QM and the Testament of Amram (4QAm) is portrayed throughout as a transcendent, angelic being set in dualistic opposition to Belial (Melchiresa / Angel[Prince] of Darkness). In 1QM the Prince of Light is apparently identical with the majestic angel for the rule of Michael, while in 11QMelch it is possible that Melchizedek is to be identified with Michael⁹⁴, and that in 4QAm that the Prince of Light is to be seen as Melchizedek/Michael⁹⁵, while there is possible allusion to Melchizedek in the Qumran Angelic Liturgy (4QShirShabb⁹⁶; these fragments are in any case important as a witness not only to the importance of developed angelological interest at Qumran, but also for interest in speculative interpretation of the throne-chariot vision of Ezek 1)⁹⁷, but the specific identification of Michael and Melchizedek is found only much later in Rabbinic tradition⁹⁸, and cannot simply be assumed for the Qumran evidence. At any rate the strong emphasis on heavenly, transcendent figures who effect deliverance on behalf of God is clear. The potential importance of the development of this category has to be taken seriously especially in relation to messianic expectation, as we saw in the first section. In at least some cases the remarkable ways in which these figures are portrayed can be used to shift the emphasis of messianic hope away from the present age and world (or society).

⁹⁴ So VAN DER WOUDE 1965, followed by many other scholars.

⁹⁵ Cf. KOBELSKI 1981, 24–36.

⁹⁶ Cf. NEWSOM 1985, 133–134.

⁹⁷ Cf. ROWLAND 1982, 16, 86, 221–222.

⁹⁸ Cf. FITZMYER 1971, 255.

3.3.6. *Testament of Abraham*

Recension A 11–13 of this text (probably from Egypt at the end of the first century AD) portrays the archangel Michael conducting Abraham in his visionary journey through the heavenly realm, where he sees first a 'wondrous man' seated on a throne of gold and adorned in glory, and is told that it is 'the first-formed Adam'. He then sees, in 12.4 ff.:

... a terrifying throne with the appearance of terrifying crystal, flashing like fire. And upon it sat a wondrous man, bright as the sun, like unto a son of God.

This figure is sitting in judgement, with table, papyrus, ink and pen before him, to record good and evil deeds. Then it continues in 13.1 ff.:

And Abraham said, My lord, Commander-in-chief, who is this wondrous judge? And who are these recording angels? And who is the angel like the sun who holds the scales? And who is the fiery angel who holds the fire? And the Commander-in-chief said, All-pious Abraham, do you see the terrifying man who is seated on the throne? This is the son of the first-formed Adam, who is called Abel, whom the wicked Cain killed. And he sits here to judge the whole creation, examining both righteous and sinners; for God has said, It is not I who judge you, but every man shall be judged by man.

The text makes it clear, certainly, that Abel's judgement is only the first of three (the subsequent two being carried out by Israel and God). Nevertheless, again a human figure is given extraordinarily exalted status, and sits on the throne of judgement, while the portrayal of Adam is only a little less striking; the description of him seems very close to that of a divine figure. Indeed, in comparison with them both, even the figure of the archangel and commander-in-chief Michael, who plays a dominant role in the work as a whole, appears much less impressive.

3.3.7. *Ezekiel the Tragedian*

The *Exagoge* of Ezekiel (probably from second-century BC Alexandria) contains a remarkable passage (68–89), uncharacteristic of the rest of the work, in which Moses describes a vision of himself sitting on a throne in heaven⁹⁹. Thus we find in lines 68–82:

I saw on the top of Sinai what seemed to be a throne,
so enormous that it touched the clouds of heaven.
On it there sat a man (lit. 'light') of noble appearance,
wearing a crown, and with a sceptre in one hand,

⁹⁹ For discussion (and conflicting interpretations), cf. e.g. VAN DER HORST 1983, 21–29; JACOBSON 1983.

and with the other hand he summoned me.
 I approached and stood in front of the throne.
 He handed me the sceptre, and commanded me
 to mount the throne, and gave me the crown.
 Then he withdrew from the throne.
 I looked out on the whole earth all around,
 the things under it, and those high above the heaven.
 Then a whole host of stars fell at my feet,
 and I counted up their number;
 they passed by me like armed ranks of men.
 Then in terror I awoke from the dream.

Thus we are presented with a picture of Moses ascending from earth to take God's place on the heavenly throne, if only temporarily; further, in his vision Moses sees what is above, below, before and after. This is made still clearer in the immediately following lines (82–89), in Jethro's interpretation of the vision (thus 87–89: 'As for seeing the whole inhabited earth, and things below and things above the heaven, you will see things present, past and future'). That is, Moses' dream and powers include the whole scope of apocalyptic and visionary interest¹⁰⁰. The most remarkable feature of this text remains, however, the way in which a human figure is elevated to the heavenly world and replaces God on the throne.

3.3.8. *1 Enoch and Enoch Traditions*

I have already noted for 1 Enoch that within the Similitudes (37–71), the main emphasis falls on the Chosen One; of this figure it is said that he will sit on the throne of glory at the final resurrection and judgement, to reveal the divine secrets and to exercise judgement. Thus, for example:

51.3: And in those days the Chosen One will sit on my throne, and from the counsel of his mouth there will flow all the secrets of wisdom, for the Lord of Spirits has appointed him and glorified him.

61.8 (cf. 45.3): And the Lord of Spirits set the Chosen One on the throne of glory, and he will judge all the works of the holy ones in heaven above, and in the balance he will weigh their deeds.

We have also seen that the Chosen One is specifically identified with (that) Son of Man. This latter figure is seen (at the start) alongside God, resembles both a human being and the angels, opens up the divine secrets, and is given a name before creation; he is then seen sitting on the throne of glory, having been concealed from the beginning, and exercises judgement. Yet although the Chosen One is the focal point of the work, and the Son of Man, Servant and

¹⁰⁰ Cf. ROWLAND 1982, 75–189.

Messiah are all variously intended to refer to this same figure, the really striking feature in the climax of this section (71), as we have already seen, is that it is Enoch himself who is given elevated status and acclaimed as the 'Son of Man' (71.14). Thus these important themes are, in this respect, all subsumed in what is (at least partly) a 'Heavenly Man' figure, specifically identified with (the man) Enoch. Thus we find an obvious point of contact with the various other human figures (Moses, Abel, Abraham, Adam) who are taken up into heaven and given elevated status.

The exaltation of Enoch is not of course confined to this work. Thus TestAbr B 11.3 speaks of Enoch as 'the teacher of heaven and earth and the scribe of righteousness' (at the same time as portraying Abel as judge in heaven), while 2 Enoch 21.3; 22.6 pictures Enoch standing in front of the face of the Lord forever. Still more striking is 2 Enoch 22.8–10:

And the Lord said to Michael, Go, and strip Enoch of his earthly clothing, and anoint him with my holy oil, and put him into the clothes of my glory. And Michael did so, just as the Lord had said to him. He anointed me and he clothed me. And the appearance of that oil is greater than the greatest light . . . And I looked at myself, and I had become like one of his glorious ones, and there was no observable difference.

With this can be compared the similar passage in Asclsa 9.9, which describes Abel and Enoch as 'like the angels who stand there in great glory'. 2 Enoch 24.1–3 pictures the Lord summoning Enoch to sit on his left, with Gabriel, and revealing all his secrets to him, while 64.5 (longer recension) calls him 'the one who carried away the sin of mankind'. It is easy enough to see how the Enoch-Metatron figure of 3 Enoch could develop from such a basis. As Alexander says: 'If the Hekhaloth mystics received Enoch traditions like those in Slav. Enoch 22, they could easily have interpreted them to mean that Enoch was changed into an archangel'¹⁰¹; it is also easy to see how such figures could be understood as having divine or quasi-divine status.

3.3.9. *2 Enoch*

Some relevant material from 2 Enoch (concerning the Enoch traditions) has been referred to immediately above. Also notable is 71.33–34 (longer recension):

Behold, Melchizedek will be the head of the thirteen priests who existed before. And afterward in the last generation, there will be another Melchizedek, the first of twelve priests. And the last will be the head of all, a great archpriest, the Word and

¹⁰¹ ALEXANDER 1977, 161.

Power of God, who will perform miracles, greater and more glorious than all the previous ones.

Here then Melchizedek is given very exalted status and titles. Also striking is the developed tradition concerning Adam in 30.11–12 (longer recension):

And on the earth I appointed him to be a second angel, honoured and great and glorious. And I appointed him to be a king, to reign on the earth, and to have my wisdom. And there was nothing to be compared to him on earth, even among my creatures that exist.

It has to be said that the longer recension of 2 Enoch drawn on here (as also in 3.3.8) is rather later in date, at least as far as the present form of the text and tradition is concerned; nevertheless, the tradition for the most part is unlikely to be later than the early second century AD, and it is still therefore of considerable significance for the discussion here. We have already seen that Philo draws on very developed Adam/Heavenly Man traditions in his concept of the Logos. So also ApocMos 39.3 portrays Adam sitting on Satan's glorious throne, while in the Life of Adam and Eve 13–15 Michael commands all the angels to worship Adam, as being the image of God. These are simply some of the indications in a number of texts of the very high position accorded Adam¹⁰².

3.3.10. Testament of Moses

1.14: But he did design and devise me, who was prepared from the beginning of the world, to be the mediator of his covenant.

10.2: Then will be filled the hands of the messenger, who is in the highest place appointed, and he will at once avenge them of their enemies.

These two passages indicate something of the remarkable way in which the Testament of Moses speaks of elevated figures within the heavenly world. The first refers to Moses, not only stressing his mediatorial role, but also apparently attributing to him pre-existence. In the latter, the messenger is probably to be understood as Michael, who is thus given not only elevated position but also a militant role as well.

3.4. Conclusions

Clearly, throughout these texts, there is a striking succession of mediator figures and concepts, even though we have only skimmed the surface of the available material. It is also clear that there are several different, although related and overlapping, developments. Thus:

¹⁰² Cf. further, Fossum 1985, 266ff.

3.4.1. Personified Concepts

Both Wisdom and Logos undergo very marked development in this period¹⁰³. Thus Philo speaks of the Logos in a number of passages apparently as an independent agent or being, virtually on a par with God (a 'second god'), fulfilling many of the same functions, while the most important development using Wisdom itself is the Wisdom of Solomon, both in the extraordinarily high-flown description of 7.24–25, but also above all in the portrayal of Wisdom as the companion of God's throne (9.4ff.). For both Philo and Wisdom of Solomon the use of developed angelological traditions is integral and important, to enhance the significance of Logos and Wisdom respectively.

3.4.2. Exalted Human Figures

Several (important biblical) human, earthly figures are to be included in this category: thus Abel, Abraham, Adam, Enoch, Jacob, Melchizedek, Moses. Especially striking, for example, is the way that titles and functions used of God himself are applied directly to Melchizedek in 11QMelch (cf. also 2 Enoch), and the position of Jacob-Israel as the leading angel (along with the other terms used to describe him) in the Prayer of Joseph. But all these figures are given a very heightened position and role in the heavenly realm, and (variously) corresponding functions; thus, for instance, Moses, Abel and Adam are all portrayed sitting on a throne (in the case of Moses, at least, God's own throne) in judgement, while the implications of the way in which Enoch is associated with other developed traditions are very far-reaching.

Throughout, developed angelological traditions and categories are of central and crucial importance to the enhanced status of these figures. Indeed, much more might have been said about Heavenly Man and Son of Man traditions. Thus, for example, I have only referred in passing to the 'one like a son of man' in Dan 7.13, which is the basis of the developed Enoch Son of Man tradition. The interpretation of the Daniel passage (like much else of the Son of Man material) is of course still disputed, and it is not possible to discuss it in detail here; but it certainly seems most plausible to me that already in Dan 7.13 it is intended to be an individual angelic figure (set in parallel to, but not identical with, the 'saints of the Most High'), and this is equally so of early developments from it¹⁰⁴. Along with the importance of the Danielic Son of Man for developed Heavenly Man and angelological traditions, there is also the question of whether he can be seen as a messianic figure as well (as again it certainly

¹⁰³ I have deliberately eschewed here discussion of Memra and Skekinah. On these, cf. Moore 1922, 41–85; for brief review of more recent discussion, with bibliography, cf. Chester 1986, 293–324.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Rowland 1982, 178–189; contrast Casey 1980.

becomes at an early stage; cf. for example 1 Enoch)¹⁰⁵; if so, the close connection in some cases between messianic and mediatorial figures and their potential importance, a point already raised in the first section, would again be an issue raised by this text.

3.4.3. Angelic Figures

The texts that we have examined reveal a number of angelic figures who are described in quite extraordinary terms. Most striking of all is Iaoel (in ApocAbr), but in several other texts as well (e.g. ApocZeph, JosAs, TestMos) an individual angel appears to be not only an independent figure in the heavenly realm, but also scarcely distinguishable from God. In addition, of course, there are the various human figures (e.g. Jacob, Adam, Enoch) who are given angelic or quasi-angelic form and function in the heavenly world. Even so, however, I have hardly touched on the bulk of angelological developments in this period¹⁰⁶. There is a sheer plethora of angelic figures and functions in many texts (e.g. 1,2 Enoch), and I have simply concentrated on some of those whose role and designation are especially apposite to our purpose. Nevertheless, at least brief reference should be made to the figure of Michael, who plays a dominant role, for example, in TestAbr and ApocMos, and features prominently in many other texts, often designated as the chief angel (or archangel), with the leading role (as 'commander-in-chief of the heavenly host'). To make brief reference to Michael in this way does, however, risk serious distortion in another direction, since, contrary to the impression often given, Michael is not the only leading angel or chief angel as such. Other figures are also given this designation, as we have already seen for example with the Logos in Philo. It is clearly the case that in the majority of texts, and in an increasing proportion of the developing tradition, Michael does assume the leading role, but this fact should itself make us more alert to the originally greater variety of supremely exalted angelic and related figures.

It must be emphasised again that these three categories (developed Wisdom *tradition, exalted human figures, angelic figures) all overlap and are bound up together to some extent¹⁰⁷. The important point is that they can all be used and fused together to give an enhanced portrayal, and it may well be mistaken to try to isolate one particular category as alone important in relation to a particular text or figure. Certainly, as we have noted throughout, angelological themes

¹⁰⁵ Cf. e.g. HORBURY 1985, for a review of the discussion and issues involved, and further bibliography.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. e.g. BARBEL 1964, 1–33; SCHÄFER 1975, 9–40.

¹⁰⁷ This point is also recognized by HURTADO 1988, 17–18, who attempts a working classification of the material.

are in many ways the most pervasive and developed, and their importance can hardly be exaggerated.

All this, of course, raises the question of what assessment we should make of these various categories. For example, are Wisdom and Logos to be understood as vivid personifications, denoting aspects of God's activity? Or are they to be seen as hypostatizations, that is, independent beings who mediate between the heavenly and earthly worlds¹⁰⁸? Certainly it seems scarcely adequate to describe Wisdom and Logos (at least in the fully developed form of the Wisdom traditions) as merely means of speaking of God's immanent activity in the world; equally, it seems difficult to avoid designating them as hypostatizations, although the misleading implications and false claims often associated with the use of this term are of course to be rejected. Thus, for example, I would not want this term (or the term 'intermediary' either) to be taken to imply that there is by this stage in Judaism a doctrine of God as remote from the world and unable to be active directly within it (although the question of exactly *how* God comes into contact with the world is certainly involved)¹⁰⁹. One important issue is how these developed concepts, as also the elevated and angelic figures, stand in relation to God; whether, for example, any of them are to be seen as identical, in being, role or function; whether they represent a challenge or complement to God's sole rule and supreme position, and how precisely we are to conceive of the situation in the heavenly world, with the co-existence of exalted beings alongside God.

The discussion of these and related issues goes back a long way¹¹⁰, but is still by no means a settled question. In a recent treatment of the problem¹¹¹, Hurtado uses the category primarily of Jewish 'divine agency' figures to characterise these developments, and has argued that as such they are important as the immediate background for the development of New Testament christology, especially in allowing early Christians both to remain true to the pure monotheism of contemporary Jewish faith but also to develop a binitarian understanding of the significance of Jesus. In contrast to other recent discussions¹¹², however, Hurtado is not prepared to allow any kind of 'binitarian' developments or compromising of monotheism within Judaism itself. He sees the issue of *worship* as crucial; that is, none of the elevated figures of the first century AD (and around) in Judaism are worshipped directly, he claims; this is a distinctive development in the case of Jesus within early Christian circles (that is, at an early stage within Palestine, not in later Hellenistic communities), and represents a 'mutation' of existing Jewish monotheism and associated traditions of

¹⁰⁸ Cf. e.g. WEISS 1966; HURTADO 1988.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. the discussion on Philo, above; cf. also WEISS 1966, 183 ff.

¹¹⁰ Cf. e.g. BOUSSET-GRESSMANN 1926, and the criticism by HURTADO 1988, 22 ff.

¹¹¹ HURTADO 1988; cf. esp. 17 ff., 49 ff.

¹¹² Cf. e.g. SEGAL 1977; FOSSUM 1985; ROWLAND 1982.

exalted figures. As far as first century Judaism itself is concerned, he argues, none of these elevated figures, whether personified divine attributes (Wisdom, Logos), exalted patriarchs (especially Moses, Enoch) or chief angels (Michael, Melchizedek, Iaoel) are given status that puts them in any sense in competition with God. They *function* as 'grand viziers', or supreme officials of God's court (mainly on the basis of good Old Testament precedent), but receive their authority and status directly from God, and do not belong to any category that puts them on the divine side of the equation.

Not least of the merits of Hurtado's discussion is the serious consideration he gives to exalted Jewish figures, and the emphasis he lays on the importance of developed Jewish angelology for the understanding of New Testament christology. Also welcome is his emphasis on worship and specific religious setting for evaluating the significance of these themes, in contrast to abstract ideological formulations. Nevertheless, I am not fully persuaded that his assessment of the significance of some of these exalted figures does real justice to the evidence. His constant emphasis on *functional* categories (that is, his assessment throughout in terms of the role of 'grand vizier', even where it may not be entirely obvious in the text) involves a failure to raise the corresponding question of whether functional attributes necessarily preclude ontological status. They can hardly be mutually incompatible, presumably, since they are combined in New Testament portrayals of Jesus.

It is indeed precisely in the context of christological debate in the last few decades that the point has been emphatically made that no firm dividing line can be drawn between what is 'functional' and what is 'ontological'¹¹³. Hence to insist on limiting the discussion exclusively to functional analysis, in the way that Hurtado does, is unsatisfactory; the question of the ontological implications of his functional analysis, and the corresponding ontological status of the figures he discusses needs to be raised. Again Hurtado may appear convincing in claiming that worship is the decisive criterion for evaluating status, but it is not clear that he has taken full account of reference to worship of angels or exalted figures in some of these texts (e.g. JosAs; VitAd), or has explained adequately the various prohibitions against worshipping angels¹¹⁴. It is not clear, however, that worship should be the decisive criterion; it could equally be argued that attributes and functions (and their corresponding ontological status) may be determinative for attributing divinity, although that need not be limited exclusively to that one being.

There are further, larger issues involved, which cannot be discussed here; for example, whether strict monotheism is universal within Judaism in the first

¹¹³ Thus e.g. RAHNER 1961; RAHNER 1966; RAHNER 1975; MACKINNON 1976; LASH 1980 show clearly, in their different ways, some of the underlying issues involved in christological discussion of this kind.

¹¹⁴ Cf. HURTADO 1988, 28–35.

century (or, indeed, this period as a whole), and what developments within the heavenly world and godhead could be tolerated, at least by some Jews. Hurtado himself is prepared to allow that angels may have been worshipped (and thus, effectively, divinized) by some Jewish groups, but not that monotheism could have been compromised on a large scale. Any such developments would probably have had a very limited following, but that would not in itself imply a diminution of their significance or that they would be found only in 'fringe' groups within Judaism; not least because, in view of the complex, diffuse nature of Judaism pre-70, it would not be easy to decide what precisely might constitute a 'fringe'. The occurrence of the 'two powers in heaven' formulation¹¹⁵, associated especially with R. Elisha b. Abuya, although it cannot be used as evidence for binitarianism or ditheism within Judaism as early as the first century, should at least caution us against supposing that such views would only manifest themselves in small conventicles completely cut off from the mainstream of Judaism. At any rate, even leaving aside Wisdom and Logos, in the texts discussed in this section there are several exalted human and angelic beings who seem to stand so much on the side of God that it is very difficult to be certain whether they are in the end intended to be divine or not; but they are at least set in very close relation to God, and the difference vis-à-vis God appears to be one of degree not of kind. They are thus theologically very confusing, certainly within the context of a strict monotheism; their power, authority and character do indeed, as far as we can tell, derive from God, but it is very easy to see how confusion about their precise status could develop. At the very least then (and here, again, in agreement with Hurtado), the development of exalted human and angelic figures is potentially of very great importance for the understanding of early christological developments.

4. Pauline Christology

The issue that now concerns us is how these categories of Jewish messianic expectation and mediatorial figures help inform our understanding of Pauline christology. In attempting to assess their significance, however, we need to be clear that it cannot be a question of simply trying to match up (isolated) elements of Paul's usage with (isolated) elements of any of the texts thus far referred to. It is necessary, therefore, to be careful about implying too simplistic and direct, even causal, a connection (for example, in terms of Paul 'borrowing from' or being 'influenced by' a specific text, or even concept). Nevertheless, and despite the paucity of information on specifically Diaspora developments,

¹¹⁵ Cf. SEGAL 1977 for full discussion and further references.

an attempt can still be made to show where, how and why Paul fits within this overall context.

4.1. *Paul and Messianic Expectation*

Paul uses Χριστός more frequently than any other christological title. But in fact it is used almost entirely as a proper name, (often in combination with Ἰησοῦς), not as a title as such¹¹⁶. Thus we are confronted with a curious phenomenon: this title (or term) Messiah/Χριστός, for which we have struggled to find more than a handful of instances in the plethora of Jewish texts over the course of three centuries (many of them directly concerned with the final age and events, and hence where one could naturally expect them to include some reference to a messianic scenario), now occurs more than 200 times in the (not especially extensive) writings of a Jew of the mid-first century AD, but it turns out to be mainly bland and apparently insignificant in the way it is used.

The reason why Paul uses this term so much, of course, is that for him as for the other early Christians the Messiah, Jesus, has already come. But that obviously still begs the question: why is so little meaning and content now attached to this fundamental datum of the faith? Here certainly the point needs to be made that Paul in his writings clearly takes over this usage of Χριστός as a proper name (not title) as something already established and understood. It is also clearly the case that in his original preaching (of which we know very little), set primarily amongst Gentiles in the cities of the Roman Empire, the use of Χριστός (understood simply as 'smeared with oil') would hardly commend itself as a main positive and distinctive designation of Jesus. For both these reasons, that is, caution is needed in attributing too much significance to Paul's usage, at least for what it can tell us distinctively about Paul himself, and full allowance must be made for the constraints of inherited tradition and changed cultural and linguistic situation. (That is not, of course, to suggest anything like the outmoded distinction between Judaism and Hellenism or Palestine and the Diaspora; as far as the Eastern Mediterranean at least is concerned at this stage, the cultural and linguistic situation is in many ways homogeneous.)¹¹⁷

Nevertheless, the problem still remains. Even if, that is, there seem to be good reasons why Χριστός, from an early stage, should not have been used by Paul with distinctive force, the whole phenomenon of Paul's usage, of which this is part, still needs to be explained. That is, it is not simply the fact that this term is scarcely used by Paul as a title (and that thus to this extent reference to the 'Messiah' drops out), but also that Paul appears to say almost nothing otherwise that is distinctively messianic, or that reflects the full force of the fact

that the Messiah has come and the messianic age should have arrived. There are a few exceptions to this: e.g. 1 Cor 15.24–28, where Christ is portrayed as handing over the (messianic) kingdom to God, 2 Cor 5.10, where Christ is set on the judgement-seat (a role that Paul assigns to God in Rom 14.10) and also, perhaps, 1 Thess 4.13–18; 2 Thess 2.1–12, although much of this can be seen as more general eschatological material, involving a heavenly or mediator figure more generally, without specific messianic reference. Χριστός clearly is used to denote the Messiah (that is, it is used as a title, not simply as a proper name) in a few instances. Thus, for example, at Rom 9.5 Paul concludes his list of the benefits that God has given to the Jews: 'from them is Christ (the Messiah) according to the flesh...'. Again, however, these instances do not represent or develop distinctively messianic themes in relation to Jesus.

Along with all this, there is the further, related issue of the relative dearth of reference in Paul's writings to the kingdom of God. Again, of course, it can quite properly be maintained that Paul would be unlikely to make great use of this term as his work moved increasingly out into the gentile mission, since it would not convey anything specific or distinctive enough. Once more, however, the point has to be made both that the usage where it occurs in Paul is limited and mainly insignificant in nature, compared with Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom as a central and important part of his message, and also, still more decisively, that not only is the terminology of the kingdom for the most part infrequent and unimportant in Paul, but as well that the real thrust of Jesus' proclamation and vision of the kingdom is hardly represented in Paul otherwise either, although this could certainly have been achieved without drawing on the term 'kingdom' itself.

Thus if we have to reckon with Paul standing heir to an originally messianic or millenarian movement, with very concrete expectations of transformations to be effected in the messianic age, that is, of changes to be brought about on earth in the near future, then the question becomes more pressing. The precise nature of this characterization of the Jesus movement, and the particular labels used, are of course open to question, but it seems to me quite plausible (using the methods and terminology of social anthropology) to categorize it as such a movement, implying imminent expectation of the ushering in of the messianic kingdom, or millenium, on earth, and involving specific hopes of change in society as a whole¹¹⁸.

In that case, however, we are caught up still more sharply with the question of what has happened in Paul to the fulfilment of the specific messianic hopes. How and why, that is, has he managed to circumvent or ignore this kind of tradition and expectation almost entirely? It can, of course, certainly be claimed that Paul does *not* lose hold of this tradition entirely. Thus, for

¹¹⁶ Cf. HENGEL 1983a, 65–77; MACRAE 1987, 171–172.

¹¹⁷ Cf. HENGEL 1974; HENGEL 1989b.

¹¹⁸ Cf. e.g. GAGER 1975, 20–37; ISENBERG 1974, 26–46.

example, in Rom 8.18–39 he provides a striking vision of the messianic age and cosmic transformation, while Gal 3.28 can be seen as capturing at least something of the radical implications of the messianic age and hope (although if so, this has already been qualified by the time of 1 Cor 12.13). But even in the case of Rom 8, the vision is set now on a cosmic and future level, no longer tied to the specific transformation of the present earth, or society, as something to be realised in the immediate future. Probably in Rom 8 Paul reflects something of the same tension vis-à-vis messianic hope as he does otherwise for eschatology more generally.

It is *not* the case, however, that Paul has simply abandoned the specific messianic hope completely. Rom 8 itself is evidence against that conclusion, while Paul's use of Χριστός on a large scale would also seem perverse on that interpretation of the matter, as would the specific interpretation in the case of 1 Cor 15, 2 Cor 5, 1 Thess 4 and Rom 9, already referred to. Rather, I suggest, Paul has deliberately 'defused' or 'neutralized' the messianic hope (thus, in some respects, it is a process analogous to that which we find in Philo). That is, the terminology is kept, especially the term 'Messiah'/Χριστός, but the sense is changed. Probably Paul undertakes this 'neutralizing' of the tradition both because the messianic kingdom has not manifested itself, contrary to what had been anticipated, and also because the radical implications of this messianic hope would present problems for him, especially as he and the Christian movement moved more and more into the main centres of the Roman Empire. Thus to retain or develop an emphasis of this kind would mean, for Paul and his churches (as relatively small and scattered groups set within large urban centres), focussing on something that was in practice incapable of being realised within society, and also potentially politically embarrassing.

Hence I would also see the most probable interpretation of 1 Cor 15.24–28 to be that the handing-over of the kingdom probably takes place in the heavenly world, and is set in quite general terms. Nevertheless, it needs to be said that it is possible to understand the reference in v. 24 ('when he will have abolished all rule and all authority and all power') to be to the establishment of the messianic kingdom on earth, involving the overthrow of oppressive Roman rule and domination. This could receive support from the reference in v. 25 to Christ, as Messiah, reigning (on earth) until all his enemies are defeated, and only at that point (when the messianic kingdom and, implicitly, divine rule are fully and finally established on earth) handing this kingdom and victory over to God (v. 24). Even so, it is notable that the emphasis as far as the 'enemies' to be defeated are concerned is on death, however much this may be dependent on the particular content of the argument in 1 Cor 15 as a whole.

Thus the question cannot be considered merely in terms of the 'delay of the Parousia' or similar motifs; instead, it belongs integrally to the larger question of how the original messianic, millenarian movement changes into something –

on the surface at least – very different within a very short period. And in attempting to explain this, the change from χώρα to πόλις, from rural Galilee to the urban centres of the Roman Empire, with the concomitant changes in social, economic and political factors, is also of crucial importance. These again, however, are larger issues that I can only touch on here and not discuss properly; hence also I have to beware of prejudging too many questions¹¹⁹. But certainly if we today are haunted, as I believe we should be, by Martin Buber's indictment of Christianity ('How can you say the Messiah has come, when the world is still like this?'), then we also have to recognise that this problem goes back as far as Paul. Nor, of course, is it only in the present century that this issue has been explicitly raised as far as the Christian faith is concerned. It is also a question that recurs constantly in the early centuries AD, not least within internal Christian debate and especially in the attempts by some of the Church Fathers to play down or reject the widespread popular Christian understanding of the messianic kingdom as imminent and this-worldly¹²⁰.

The question raised in these Church Fathers is very close to the problem involved in what I have described as the paradox of Paul's usage of Χριστός; that is, the way in which he uses the term Χριστός (Messiah) prolifically, but with little or no reference to the concrete, specific realization of the messianic age and messianic hope. Thus the question is raised, both in relation to Jewish messianic hope in general and also (for Paul especially) of what is meant by messianism (and the proclamation of the imminent arrival of God's kingdom on earth), and of how concrete a reality it is understood to be. Thus Paul is strikingly similar to those writers in the Patristic period who were concerned to diminish emphasis on a material kingdom, and may indeed be a helpful precedent for them in shifting the emphasis of messianic expectation to a different realm. If this question is thus pushed back as far as Paul, then we are faced with the further paradox, at least on the surface, of a line of development that proceeds from a charismatic messianic movement, whose leader is apparently reluctant to be acclaimed as Messiah, to the leading propagator of the movement within a decade or two shifting the whole emphasis away from the main thrust of the messianic movement itself. That is, it appears that we no sooner gain clear sight of a specifically messianic movement before it disappears into something quite different. Yet this is not as strange as it sounds, since it is a common fate of messianic (and millenarian) movements to be very short-lived in their original or 'pure' form, yet also for important elements of the movement to continue at least latently within the society; and the debate within the Patristic period that I have already referred to is itself evidence both of this and

¹¹⁹ Cf. further e.g. THEISSEN 1982; MEEKS 1983, for discussion and bibliography.

¹²⁰ Cf. e.g. WILCKEN 1986; HORBURY 1988; of course, as they show, at this early stage also, it is not simply an internal Christian debate, but the cause of charges levelled against Christians by Jews and the subject of internal Jewish debate as well.

also of the fact that Paul is not representative of at least some developments out of the original Jesus movement.

Further, from the evidence that I have discussed in the first two sections of this essay, it is clear that Paul is in good Jewish company in being instrumental in changing the emphasis of the movement, just as the Patristic evidence shows that he comes increasingly to be in good Christian company as well. It is not just Philo who provides a precedent for this, but also some of those texts where messianic figures are made heavenly and transcendent. As I have indicated already, it is not always or necessarily the case that setting a messianic figure in the heavenly realm involves a dematerializing or spiritualizing of the messianic hope, but it is the most plausible explanation in at least some cases. Hence again the question has to be raised, as it has been expressed by one writer¹²¹, of what the price of messianism is, and whether Paul is prepared to pay it. This in turn raises, as I have suggested, the issue of what happens to the proclamation of the kingdom in Paul. It is not simply that this central emphasis of Jesus' message is unhelpful for the communication of the gospel in a Gentile context, but that it is potentially disastrous for the whole Pauline mission, since it could be seen as politically threatening and subversive, especially for the Romans faced with the turmoil of first-century Jewish resistance movements and dissident threats. Yet precisely here it can be argued that the early Christian movement, to be true to its origins, should be more subversive both socially and politically than Paul is prepared to allow it to be.

It is easy enough to see the problem for Paul, and to sympathize with both his dilemma and his solution. That is, he is prepared to compromise the nature of the original movement and message in order not to risk compromising or ruining the urgent task of world-wide mission, especially for the sake of a message that would be largely misunderstood and which could not in any case bring about the changes it looked for. Nor again is Paul unique in this; he can be seen, in his attempts to accommodate the movement and message to its new setting of the urban world of the Roman Empire, to be a further example of what is described, from one theoretical framework, as the 'routinization of charisma'¹²², that is, making an extraordinary event and movement part of the ordinary, everyday world again. Yet we should not allow this kind of analysis and description, and the recognition that Paul is merely one instance of that common phenomenon, the need to come to terms with the world, to blunt this fact: that there is an underlying problem of compromise, or risk of compromise, of a fundamental thrust of the original gospel message and its threatening nature. That, then, may in this case be the price of messianism that Paul is either not prepared or not able to pay.

¹²¹ Thus TAUBES 1982.

¹²² See for example the discussion in WEBER 1968, 243–254, 1111–1157; cf. also e.g. HILL 1973.

Χριστός is not, of course, the only christological term Paul employs; he also, for example, uses κύριος extensively and υἱὸς θεοῦ in a limited but highly significant way¹²³. But it is precisely here that the most striking aspect of Paul's usage is the close links with developed mediator and related concepts. That is, as I have already argued, a fundamental aspect of Paul's christology is the development away from specific messianic hope in a very different, elevated direction. And here, the resources Paul draws on and the kind of ideology he finds it congenial to take over and adapt derive much more obviously from the developed Jewish tradition of mediator figures than from 'messianic' tradition strictly speaking (although of course it is precisely the linking together of these two strands in some Jewish texts, for example 1 Enoch 37–71, that we have noted and seen to be significant already). That is, the varieties of developed Jewish traditions relating to individual exalted human and angelic figures, mediating between the divine and human worlds and coming to earth for at least temporary sojourn and specific purpose, allow Paul the possibility of moving the tradition about Christ to that level, and thus putting him 'out of reach' of the difficult questions that remain, above all, what has happened to the concrete realization of the messianic kingdom.

4.2. Paul and Mediator Concepts

Paul is not the only witness to the use of developed mediator figures in the New Testament; the Fourth Gospel, Hebrews and Revelation are other obvious examples¹²⁴. But I have already suggested that these figures play a significant part in what may be termed the positive aspects of the development of Paul's christology; correspondingly, therefore, I attempt here to show, within the limited space available and from a relatively small selection of Paul's christological formulations, something of the importance for these of the kind of mediatorial concepts that we have been considering.

4.2.1. 1 Cor 1.24,30

In these two verses, Christ is specifically identified with the divine Wisdom (1.24: Χριστὸν θεοῦ δύναμιν καὶ θεοῦ σοφίαν; 'Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God'). In fact some care is needed in interpreting them, since Paul's argument here is to an extent ad hoc; that is, he is taking up terms used by the Corinthians themselves, and wisdom is for them particularly important. It is also the case that at 1.30 the list extends beyond wisdom to include 'righteousness, sanctification and redemption', and Christ is scarcely identified with

¹²³ Cf. HENGEL 1976; KRAMER 1966.

¹²⁴ Thus e.g. Jn 1.1–18; Heb 1.1ff.; Rev 1.12ff.

those. Nevertheless, Paul's usage here undoubtedly reflects developed Wisdom tradition (and 1.24, along with 1.18, may also reflect heightened traditions concerning the divine Power). That Paul deliberately uses developed Wisdom traditions is also clear from 1 Cor 8.6, where Christ is presented as the mediator of creation ('one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things'), in the same way that Wisdom is said to be (e.g. Prov 8.22ff.; Ben Sirah 24; WisdSol 9.2). Further, at 1 Cor 10.4, Paul (or more precisely, probably, the interpretive tradition he is taking over) identifies Christ with the rock of Ex 17; thus similarly Philo identifies this same rock of the wilderness wandering with both the Logos and Wisdom.

Thus Paul is clearly aware of developed traditions concerning Wisdom, and uses them variously in working out the significance of the crucified Jesus¹²⁵; although again, since all these instances occur in 1 Cor (where as we have noted wisdom in a different sense is a key issue, and central to the Corinthians' own claims), caution is needed about arguing for it as particularly distinctive as far as Paul is concerned. In fact, however, there are other indications (as we shall see) that Paul makes conscious, deliberate use of Wisdom categories. One striking instance, from outside Corinthians but at least within the Pauline tradition, is the reference to '...the mystery of God, that is, Christ, in whom all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hidden' (Col 2.2–3), attributing to Christ everything that belongs to the developed figure of Wisdom. But bound up with Wisdom here are themes from speculative or angelological traditions, and that takes us further into Paul's usage, with a useful reminder that there is considerable overlap of these various themes and traditions.

4.2.2. Rom 8.3–4/Gal 4.4

In both these passages Paul speaks of God sending his son (implicitly, into the world) in order to effect salvation. The same stereotyped expression for God sending his son is frequent in the Johannine literature (e.g. Jn 3.17; 1 Jn 4.9). In Rom 8.3 the verb Paul uses is the aorist participle of πέμπω (πέμψας), while in Gal 4.4 it is the aorist indicative of ἐξαποστέλλω; John reflects the same usage (that is, having ἀποστέλλω in the straight indicative, πέμπω in the participial, form), but it is doubtful that the sense is intended to be significantly different. It does, however, serve to confirm that what we have in these two passages is a fixed formula¹²⁶ (with small, insignificant variations in the Greek), not originating with Paul but taken over by him. In context of developments within Judaism more generally, this formula can be seen to have clear links with Wisdom traditions; thus there is the same basic scenario of being sent to earth

¹²⁵ Cf. e.g. DUNN 1980, 176–196; HENGEL 1976, 66–76.

¹²⁶ Cf. the works cited in note 87, above.

for a specific purpose, that we find, for example, in Ben Sirah 24 and 1 Enoch 42. But it is also closely related to the kind of tradition represented by Wisd 9.10, which has the specific phrase 'Send forth (wisdom) ...'. Here it is not only a matter of God sending Wisdom, but also of sending specifically from heaven (or the heavenly world). This is of course very clearly implied also in Ben Sirah and 1 Enoch, but here the point is not only specifically spelt out but is also linked directly with angelological themes. It is then reasonable to set these passages in Paul in relation to angelological traditions as well (simply the sending of the angel/messenger does already itself suggest a point of contact), and the significance of this usage may be correspondingly enhanced. But even the links simply with the Wisdom tradition are sufficient to indicate that what is implied here is the pre-existence of the Son in the heavenly world, and the sending forth from there at a specific time and for a specific purpose¹²⁷. The emphasis in 8.3–4 is on the Son of God; this is also the case at Rom 1.3–4, where Paul again takes over an (early Palestinian) formula; in speaking of Jesus being 'appointed Son of God with power', it probably denotes his transformation into the heavenly realm, and being given a role by God in that way¹²⁸.

4.2.3. Col 1.15–20

As with some other passages considered in this section, it is a moot point how much this hymn contributes to our understanding of distinctively Pauline christology, since it represents an existing composition taken over (and expanded) by the writer, and the writer of the letter may well in any case not be Paul¹²⁹. It does at least, however, have clear connections with other (genuinely) Pauline passages, and it contains a succession of striking phrases, again with obvious links with developed Wisdom tradition. Thus, for example, the use of 'image' (εἰκὼν) applies to Christ the term that is used (as we have seen) in a very heightened sense of Wisdom at Wisd 7.26 and of the Logos by Philo. The use of 'πρωτότοκος' in the parallel phrase 'firstborn of all creation'/'firstborn from the dead' brings to mind the πρωτόγονος that Philo employs of the Logos. Again, the descriptions of Christ as both pre-existent and also active in creation (vv. 16–17), both represent features that we have seen to belong to the developed Wisdom figure. Indeed, the way that Christ's relation to the created order is described, along with the use of ἀρχή (v. 18), suggests the deliberate use of developed interpretations of Prov 8.22ff. linked directly with Gen 1.1¹³⁰.

¹²⁷ Cf. HENGEL 1976, 11; HANSON 1982, 59–62.

¹²⁸ Cf. HENGEL 1976, 59–66; HURTADO 1988, 95.

¹²⁹ But cf. HENGEL 1983, esp. 30–47, 78–96, for cautionary arguments against separating off early Christian hymns and other so-called 'pre-Pauline' material too clearly from Paul and his own creative christological contribution probably operative at a very early stage.

¹³⁰ For developed interpretation, cf. BURNEY 1926, 160–177.

Yet in what it says, this hymn goes beyond Wisdom traditions alone. Thus, for example, the 'firstborn of all creation' has its closest links with the 'firstborn of every living thing' in the Prayer of Joseph¹³¹. This points to a close association with angelological traditions, a link which is also indicated in Colossians otherwise. Thus ch. 2 makes clear that the 'false philosophy' is primarily concerned with speculation about the heavenly world and its contents, including the status of exalted angels; the writer is probably engaged in arguing against the view that Christ is only one of several angelic or heavenly beings, but to do so he has to use angelological themes and terminology. Certainly the way that he speaks (v. 19) of 'all the fulness dwelling in' Christ, and even more strikingly in 2.9 'in him dwells all the fulness of the godhead bodily' suggests an attempt to counteract a view that the divine πλήρωμα is shared equally by a number of heavenly figures, by taking up this term and emphatically linking it to Christ alone. Possibly also, in this context, the use of 'image' could be linked with a tradition that sets the 'image' of Gen 1.26 closely in relation to the 'throne of glory' of Ezek 1.26, although since for this it is necessary to adduce the evidence of the Pentateuchal Targums, caution is obviously needed as far as interpreting Paul's usage is concerned¹³².

It is, however, worth noting that at Rom 8.29 ('... he also foreordained to be conformed to the image of his son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren') Paul specifically links πρωτότοκος (which we have already seen to be closely related to the elevated, angelological themes of PrJos) with εἰκών, in a passage which is predominantly couched in speculative, apocalyptic language otherwise. In light of these traditions, it is also worth asking what sense the 'conformed to the body of his glory' at Phil 3.21 might have, even though εἰκών is not used there. The whole passage 2 Cor 3.7–4.6 would also repay further investigation, with these themes in view; for the present it must suffice to refer simply to 4.4 ('... the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God...') and 4.6 ('... it is God, who said, Let there be light, who shone in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ'), where again the close connection between 'image' and 'glory', along with the further modes of description, can hardly be explained simply in the usual categories of Wisdom tradition.

4.2.4. Phil 2.5–11

It is especially in the latter part of this hymn¹³³ which Paul incorporates here that we find themes of immediate interest to us; but already in v. 6 the reference to 'being in the form of God' (with the further reference to 'equality with God') indicates an exalted view of Christ. Certainly μορφή is not simply interchangeable with εἰκών, nor does it represent so developed a usage, but again it brings us into close contact with developed traditions relating to Gen 1.26 (Adam)¹³⁴. This is further borne out by the use of σύμμορφος at Rom 8.29 in direct connection with εἰκών (cf. Phil 3.21, linked with 'glory'). In vv. 9–11 we encounter the theme of the exaltation of an earthly figure, familiar to us from 1 Enoch 71 (and other of the texts we have noted), where a human figure is given an exalted position in the heavenly realm, or else restored to the position that has properly belonged to him from the beginning. Here also Jesus is given the supreme divine name κύριος, clearly related to the theme of the angelic or exalted being possessing the name of God, as we have seen in the case of Iaoel in ApocAbr (and, later, with Metatron in 3 Enoch), while it is also (as with much else in the hymn) integrally connected with developed Adam speculation¹³⁵. Thus in this hymn, Jesus is clearly portrayed as possessing both human and divine form, nature and name, and is set as mediator between the two.

4.2.5. 1 Cor 15.45–49

Paul here again, more clearly than anywhere else, uses developed Adam traditions¹³⁶, relating to Gen 1.26–27 (and indeed to the other main aspect or 'pole' of the Adam tradition, with the citation from Gen 2.7, in order to establish the exalted position of Christ as final Adam in contrast to the first). The specific reference to the 'image' (v. 49) might also seem closely related to the way in which Philo uses both Adamic and Wisdom traditions together of the Logos. But in speaking of the 'man from heaven' (v. 47) and 'the image of the heavenly man' (v. 49), Paul probably takes up the tradition of the heavenly Son of Man, familiar to us already from a number of texts (Dan 7.13; 1 Enoch 37–71; 4 Ezra 13; cf. SibOr 5), and central to the christology of the Fourth Gospel (e.g. Jn 3.13), but here brought into integral connection with the developed Adam tradition as well.

There is of course a great deal more material from Paul that could be referred to here. How, for example, should we interpret Gal 4.14 ('but you received me

¹³¹ This was first noted long ago by WINDISCH 1914, 225.

¹³² For discussion of the significance of the 'image' usage, cf. JERVELL 1960; ELTESTER 1958; but they do not discuss the Targumic evidence, the most striking instance of which is the developed interpretation variously represented in some of the Pentateuchal Targums (Neof, Ps-J, Fragment Targums) at Gen 28.12, where the angels ascend and descend to see 'the image of a righteous man engraved on the throne of glory'.

¹³³ For discussion of the interpretation and significance of the hymn, and further bibliography, see e.g. MARTIN 1967; HOFIUS 1976.

¹³⁴ Cf. FOSSUM 1985, 293–297.

¹³⁵ Cf. DUNN 1980, 114–125; FOSSUM 1985, 293–297; KIM 1981, 260–267.

¹³⁶ Cf. BARRETT 1962; FOSSUM 1985, 294; HENGEL 1976, 75–76.

as an angel [?messenger] of God, as Christ Jesus')? Or (reverting to Colossians) how should Col 3.1 ('seek the things that are above, where Christ is, seated at the right hand of God') be understood, in context of the various references to exalted human or angelic figures set in a similar position in the heavenly world, in several of the texts noted above? But without multiplying examples in Paul, it can in any case be said that these references to exalted mediator and related figures applied to Christ should hardly surprise us, in view of the concepts and traditions already developed and 'available' when Paul wrote. Nor should it seem to us strange that Paul makes these concepts apply directly to the figure of the Messiah, since it is already apparent from a number of texts (e.g. parts of the Qumran writings, Philo, 1 Enoch; cf. 4 Ezra, SibOr 5) that the Messiah or a closely related figure is interpreted by means of heavenly or transcendental categories; this is a process which is probably under way from at least the second century BC onwards, and (as I have argued already) it corresponds precisely to Paul's method and purpose in dealing with one main aspect of the messianic tradition that he inherits.

Nevertheless, what should still strike us as astounding is the fact that Paul can apply these terms and traditions to a human figure not from the remote past (or biblical tradition) but from contemporary history and experience. This is something that is unique to the New Testament, in context of Jewish usage, and since Paul's letters are the earliest documents within that corpus, it is worth asking whether this phenomenon can be explained. One starting point might be the way in which Paul describes his own conversion experience in Gal 1.12 ('For I did not receive [the gospel] from a man, nor was I taught it, but [it came to me] through a revelation of Jesus Christ') and 1.15–16 ('But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb and called me through his grace, to reveal his son in me...'). Here Paul's use of both ἀποκάλυψις and ἀποκαλύπτω suggests that his account of his Damascus road experience is intended to be understood as what might be termed a 'christophany', akin, that is, to an angelophany, in which he has a vision of the exalted Christ in the heavenly world¹³⁷.

That it is not too fanciful to think of Paul having a visionary experience of this kind is clear from Paul's account of his own mystical, apocalyptic journey to the 'third heaven' in 2 Cor 12¹³⁸. Hence it is plausible to suggest that one reason

¹³⁷ Cf. KIM 1981, 55 ff., 223 ff. Paul's own (in some respects enigmatic) version can of course be supplemented by the fuller and less allusive accounts of his visionary encounter with Christ on the Damascus Road given in three separate passages in the Acts narrative (9.3–8; 22.6–11; 26.12–18), provided that allowance is made for the secondary and stereotyped nature of these. Paul does himself of course make a further brief allusion in 1 Cor 15.8 to his dramatic experience, but without further indication of the nature of the vision, of the kind that we find in Gal 1; 2 Cor 3–4 and the other passages referred to here.

¹³⁸ Cf. KIM 1981, 223–257; SEGAL 1986, 555–580.

that Paul can so readily apply to Christ the terminology used of exalted mediator concepts and heavenly figures may be precisely because this corresponds, as much as any verbal description or tradition available to him could, to what he has himself experienced. In that case, it is also plausible to argue that Paul may have filled out the rather terse account of his conversion experience (provided merely in passing) in Gal 1 with more detailed descriptions of his vision of the exalted Christ, and that this is what we find in some of the passages we have already referred to; thus, for example, the reference in 2 Cor 4.6 to 'the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ' could be understood in this way, perhaps (with 4.4 as well) linking developed traditions of Gen 1.26 and Ezek 1.26, because Paul's vision may have been of the exalted Christ on the throne of glory. This is already to go beyond the evidence, although it would be worth considering the whole of 2 Cor 3–4 (as well as, e.g. Rom 8.29; Phil 3.21; 1 Cor 15.49) in this context. But if the basic point is tenable, that Paul's conversion experience involves a vision of the exalted Christ in heaven, it becomes relatively easy to account, on one level at least, for Paul's development of these concepts in relation to Christ.

Thus what is posited here is that Paul becomes a member of a Jewish messianic sect (in which Jesus is claimed to be the Messiah) by means of a dramatic, socially and cognitively dislocating experience which shows, unassailably for him, that Jesus is exalted in the heavenly world. Hence for Paul the claims about Jesus have now to be given credence, and to be viewed positively not negatively; but equally, for Paul, Jesus is clearly a figure of the heavenly world, and thus fits a messianic category already developed within contemporary Judaism, where the Messiah is a human or angelic figure belonging (at least within the visionary experience or the particular point of the tradition) in the heavenly world, a figure who at the same time has had a specific, limited role on earth. Hence it is clear how, and to an extent why, we find in Paul developed angelological, wisdom and exalted human traditions used in relation to Jesus.

Obviously this reconstruction begs a number of questions; thus, for example, we find that apparently similar developments in the way that Jesus is portrayed have already taken place before Paul (as, for instance, in the christological hymns Phil 2.6–11; Col 1.15–20 taken over in the Pauline corpus), and this is still more the case in the New Testament outside of Paul's writings (as, most obviously, in Jn 1; Heb 1). It would obviously be absurd to claim that the understanding of Jesus in this way in all these cases derived from a visionary experience of the exalted Jesus in the heavenly world; indeed, it is precisely the kind of allusions to this experience which we can find in Paul's writings that are lacking in these other texts. Similarly, in the case of the Jewish texts that I have discussed, it would be misleading to imply that the highly developed portrayal of human figures in the heavenly world always arises out of a vision of this kind; it is not even clear that this is so for all the (visionary) apocalyptic works. That

is, a visionary experience is not prerequisite for the portrayal of exalted human figures in the heavenly world in general, or of Jesus as one particular instance of this. The point is indeed, in one sense at least, that this kind of category was available as a resource well before Paul's time, and could be taken up in a variety of ways, and for a variety of reasons, in Jewish texts, as well as by Paul and other early Christian writers. It may be that Paul's visionary experience simply provided him with the impetus to go in a direction that he would have taken in any case. Along with this, it is possible that Paul knew, or had received from the Jerusalem community, specific traditions concerning Jesus, although we can know little about this. Nevertheless, it is still quite remarkable that Paul can speak in this way of a contemporary human figure, and for him his visionary experience of the exalted Christ in the heavenly world is clearly seminal for his understanding and formulation of this.

The fact that this positive development, of applying to Christ traditions of exalted transcendent figures, also happily corresponds to his negative purpose of defusing a main part of the messianic tradition is, I have suggested, something that requires further investigation. That is, Paul became a member of a Jewish sect that not only claimed Jesus to be the Messiah but which also had as a central part of its tradition the message of God's kingdom about to come on earth, in material form, in continuity with, but also radical transformation of, the present order. Thus the effect of the way Paul draws on both developed Jewish traditions and his own visionary experience is not only to present an extraordinarily exalted picture of Jesus, but also to diminish the emphasis of the messianic kingdom to come on earth. Hence, again, it would also be important to examine the precise social setting to which these developed concepts, along with titles such as 'Son of God' and *κύριος*, may belong; or, more precisely, what kind of social reinforcement they may be intended to effect, and what correlation there may be between them (and the ideology they represent) and the social and economic situation in which Paul brings them into use. But that is yet another question that lies beyond the scope of the present paper.

Diskussion

O. BETZ: Zum 1. Teil des Referats: Die messianischen Interpretationen des Alten Testaments in den Targumim mußten stärker in die Untersuchung einbezogen werden, als es im Referat geschah. Zum 2. Teil des Referats: Wenn Jesus nicht als Messias am Kreuz gestorben wäre, wäre die Betonung des „Kreuzes“ bei Paulus umsonst. Der positiven Entwicklung der Christologie durch die Aufnahme der Traditionen von den himmlischen Mittlergestalten wird man nicht so einfach eine

negative Entwicklung durch das Entschärfen irdischer messianischer Erwartungen gegenüberstellen können.

Der REFERENT: Die messianischen Texte der Targumim sind signifikant. Im Referat ist bisher nur auf Gen 28 hingewiesen worden. Die Targumim kann man jedoch nicht als unabhängige Traditionen betrachten. Man kann dieses Material nicht benutzen ohne weitere Belegstellen aus der früheren Zeit, sondern man muß sich dabei darüber im klaren sein: Wenn man die zeitliche Grenze für die zum Thema herangezogenen Texte im 1. und 2. Jh. n. Chr. zieht, ist die Targumtradition ausgeschlossen; ihre schriftliche Fixierung liegt später. Die Targumim setzen jedoch die Tendenz zur Transzendierung weiter fort, was sich an den Begriffen *Memra*, *Shekinah* und *Yeqara* z. B. zeigen läßt. Zum zweiten Problem: Es ist der provozierendste Punkt im Referat, der nur kurz behandelt wurde. Das Problem liegt nicht so sehr darin, daß der Messias gekreuzigt wurde und auf diese Weise starb, sondern darin, daß eine irdische Gestalt, ein menschlicher Zeitgenosse, und nicht eine Gestalt aus der alttestamentlichen „Urgeschichte“ sich zu einer transzendenten, himmlischen Mittlergestalt entwickelt. Den Gekreuzigten sieht Paulus als Messias und spricht vom Sühnetod Christi, aber warum redet er nicht davon, daß das messianische Zeitalter gekommen ist?

P. SCHÄFER stimmte dem Referenten darin zu, daß es im frühen Judentum kein einheitliches Messiasbild gab. Jedoch möchte er deutlicher als der Referent betonen, daß sich die verschiedenen Vorstellungen auch bei den Entwürfen, die sich mit einer irdischen Gestalt beschäftigen und mit einer irdischen Verwirklichung der Heilszeit rechnen, nicht auf den Begriff „Messias/Χριστός“ eingrenzen lassen. Als Beispiel nannte P. SCHÄFER neben Dan 7 den Hohenpriester bei Ben Sira: Man sollte Ben Sira nicht ausschließen, sein Bild des Hohenpriesters trägt messianische Züge.

Der REFERENT: Er hat den Hohenpriester bei Ben Sira beiseite gelassen; darüber, ob er messianische Züge trägt, könnte man streiten.

Der Einwand von E. OSBORN, wie man denn, wenn die Messiasvorstellungen so vage waren, wissen konnte, daß Jesus von Nazareth der Messias sei, bzw., daß er es nicht sei, wurde vom REFERENTEN mit dem Hinweis beantwortet, daß die verschiedenen Konfigurationen und Erwartungen vorgegeben waren; die Bündelung der verschiedenen Vorstellungen in einer Person aber sei schwer erklärbar.

Dazu P. SCHÄFER: Die Vorstellungen waren keineswegs vage, sondern recht konkret, aber eben sehr verschieden.

M. HENGEL: Es gibt aus der Diaspora noch mehr Belege für messianische Erwartungen. Die Septuaginta ist in der ägyptischen Diaspora die wichtigste messianische Textsammlung. Und hier wiederum ist die griechische Fassung von Num 24 sehr viel stärker auf eine messianische Gestalt bezogen als der hebräische Text. So war Num 24 auch für Philo von Alexandrien wichtig. Der messianische Aufstand in der ägyptischen Diaspora 115–117 n. Chr. setzt die Virulenz massiver politischer Erwartungen voraus. Die messianische Literatur war aus politischen Gründen Untergrundliteratur. Daß diese Literatur die Erwartungen der Volksmeinung und breiter Kreise spiegelt, und für wie gefährlich diese Hoffnungen gehalten wurden, zeigen

die Belege bei Josephus, Tacitus und Sueton über die zweideutige Weissagung von einem Weltherrscher, der aus Judäa hervorgeht. Wahrscheinlich geht das auf Num 24 zurück.

Paulus hat die messianische Hoffnung nicht allegorisiert wie Philo und die politische Dimension nicht neutralisiert, sondern auf die Spitze getrieben und intensiviert durch das Paradox: Der Gekreuzigte ist der Erhöhte. In seiner Berufungsvision sah Paulus den erhöhten, gekreuzigten Christus inthronisiert zur Rechten Gottes auf dem Merkabah-Thron.

Der REFERENT: Die Septuaginta-Traditionen sollen in das ausgearbeitete Referat eingearbeitet werden. Zum zweiten Punkt: So aufschlußreich es ist, um die Entwicklung der messianischen Gestalt zu verstehen, das Bild vom gekreuzigten, zu Gottes Thron erhöhten Messias zu sehen, – daß ein Individuum auf Gottes Thron sitzt, ist vielleicht ein Bild für das, was Paulus auf Erden erwartet –, so muß man doch daran festhalten, daß bei Paulus die Implikationen der messianischen Hoffnungen in einem politischen und sozialen Sinn fehlen, denn er erwartet keine irdische Erlösgestalt für die Zukunft.

M. HENGEL: Die Frage Bubers nach dem messianischen Reich ist keine Frage an Paulus, sondern an uns. Paulus war überzeugt: Der Herr kommt.

P. STUHLMACHER: Ist es nicht eine Verkürzung der paulinischen Christologie, wenn man sie nur den jüdischen Erwartungen gegenüberstellt? Die Bindung des Paulus an die Jerusalemer Gemeinde und ihre Jesustradition muß sehr viel stärker betont werden, denn der historische Paulus bemühte sich mit seiner Kollekte um die Jerusalemer Gemeinde und die Anerkennung durch den Herrenbruder Jakobus. Von seinen Kontakten zu Jakobus, Petrus und Johannes spricht Paulus ausdrücklich. Röm 9–11 ist der Haupttext für die Messiaserwartungen des Paulus, – 1. Thess 2,14.15 wird damit korrigiert.

Der REFERENT betonte dagegen, daß er weder in Röm 9–11 eine Beziehung zur jüdisch-messianischen Hoffnung als einer irdischen Erwartung finden könne, noch in Röm 11,26 gar den Haupttext für die Messiasvorstellung des Paulus sehe.

K. W. M.

Response

It will be clear to anyone who has read the preceding essay and discussion that I have attempted to take account of some of the points raised by the discussion in the revised version of the essay. It might be helpful, however, to indicate briefly here what I have tried to deal with and what I have not. Thus in response to the points raised about the lack of reference to the Septuagint and Targums, as far as messianic interpretations are concerned, I have now included sections 2.9 and 2.10. At the same time, however, I have reaffirmed my misgivings about including Targumic material in this discussion, on the grounds that all the relevant Targumic texts in written form are much later than the end of the first

century AD, which I have set as the rough terminus for my discussion, and that the interpretations which they contain cannot be dated back independently to within this period or as directly relevant to it. Since I have made this point in the main body of the essay and in the discussion, and since I have set out my reason and conclusions more fully elsewhere, I will not say more here. It should, however, be added that there is a strong and influential school of thought that holds that much Targumic material, especially in the Pentateuchal Targums and Targum Jonathan of the Prophets, goes back to a very early date and is potentially of very great significance for the interpretation of the New Testament.

There seem to me to be two further main substantive points arising from the discussion: that is, the criteria for defining 'Messiah' or 'messianic', and the question of the relation of Paul's christology to Jewish messianic expectation. These two points are, as I see it, both interrelated and also of fundamental importance; but it is precisely the importance and complexity of these issues that prevents me from dealing with them at all adequately here. Thus the point that Peter Schäfer makes, that the Jewish material with messianic connotations is much more wide-ranging than that which I have included, raises issues of considerable significance for the essay as a whole. That is, the working definition of 'Messiah' and 'messianism' that is used potentially limits the texts and evidence that will be drawn on, while this body of evidence will itself inevitably largely determine the picture of messianism that emerges. It is not easy to escape from this vicious circle. To do so in a pre-emptive way, for example by limiting the texts to those that specifically use the term 'messiah', is, as I have said in the essay (and here, of course, I am in full agreement with Peter Schäfer), simply to beg the question. There really is no alternative to examining carefully all potentially relevant texts, with the concomitant recognition that both the selection of texts and the conclusions drawn will to some extent be governed by a preconceived definition. All this, of course, is only another way of saying that I see the question of definition as central, not peripheral, to the issues I am discussing in the essay, but precisely for that reason it requires careful and detailed consideration. I very much regret that I cannot undertake that definitional enquiry here, and hope that I will be able to do so properly before long.

The relevance of this definitional question for the consideration of Paul's christology is again obvious, since I wish to argue that Paul deliberately moves away from what is involved in Jewish messianic hope and Jesus' proclamation. It is of course scarcely surprising that my criticisms of Paul should themselves provoke criticism within a German Lutheran context. There are at least two main points at issue here: the first is whether I have characterized satisfactorily the kind of Jewish messianic hope that Paul stands heir to, particularly in relation to the proclamation of Jesus and the Jesus movement, and the second is

whether I have done justice to Paul's christology. Or to put it another way perhaps, whether I have set up a model of messianism which is theologically crude and simplistic and then criticized Paul for not conforming to it. The first point is, of course, complex and disputed, and I regret that I have not been able here to argue in detail for my understanding of the Jesus movement and Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom as being centrally concerned with the radical transformation of society in the new age that is about to arrive. It is perhaps worth emphasising, however, with reference back to the question of the definition of messianism, that I am not claiming that this is the only possible form of Jewish messianic hope, but rather that it is this particular kind of messianic movement that Paul stands heir to. Secondly, then, as far as Paul is concerned, I do not wish in any sense to deny the extraordinarily profound theological developments in Paul's christology. This is above all the case for the way in which Paul uses Jewish mediatorial and visionary categories to interpret the significance of the crucified messiah; this is completely unparalleled in Judaism, where these categories otherwise are applied only to great figures of ancient Jewish tradition, not to contemporary individuals, still less one who has suffered the ignominious death of crucifixion. All that I am concerned to ask is what of significance concerning the distinctive understanding of the messiah and the messianic kingdom has been lost in the process. As far as the relation of Paul to the Jerusalem community and the associated Jesus tradition is concerned, I am still not persuaded of the extent or significance of this; but that is a further point which needs fuller discussion than I can provide here.

Andrew Chester

Bibliography

- ALEXANDER, P. S. 1977: "The Historical Setting of the Hebrew Book of Enoch", in: *JJS* 28 (1977) 156–180.
- ALLEGRO, J. M. 1956: "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature", in: *JBL* 75 (1956) 174–187.
- APPLEBAUM, S. 1951: "The Jewish Revolt in Cyrene in 115–117 and the subsequent recolonization", in: *JJS* 2 (1951) 177–186.
- 1979: *Jews and Greeks in Ancient Cyrene* (SJLA 28), Leiden 1979.
- BARBEL, J. 1964: *Christos Angelos: die Anschauung von Christus als Bote und Engel in der gelehrten und volkstümlichen Literatur des christlichen Altertums*, Bonn 1964.
- BARRETT, C. K. 1962: *From First Adam to Last*, London 1962.
- BEASLEY-MURRAY, G. R. 1947: "The Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", in: *JTS* 48 (1947) 1–12.

- BIDEZ, J. and CUMONT, F. 1938: *Les Mages Hellénisés. Zoroastre, Ostanès et Hystaspes d'après la Tradition Grecque*, vol. 1 (Introduction), vol. 2 (Les Textes), Paris 1938.
- BOUSSET, W. and GRESSMANN, H. 1926: *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*, HNT, Tübingen 1926.
- BROOKE, G. J. 1985: *Exegesis at Qumran. 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (JSOTSS 29), Sheffield 1985.
- BROWN, R. E. 1957: "The Messianism of Qumran", in: *CBQ* 19 (1957) 53–82.
- 1966: "J. Starcky's Theory of Qumran Messianic Development", in: *CBQ* 28 (1966) 51–57.
- 1969: "The Teacher of Righteousness and the Messiah(s)", in: M. BLACK (ed.) *The Scrolls and Christianity*, London 1969, 37–44.
- BRUCE, F. F. 1960: *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*, London 1960.
- BUCHANAN, G. W. 1978: *Revelation and Redemption. Jewish Documents of Deliverance from the Fall of Jerusalem to the Death of Nahmanides. Introduction, Translation, Conclusion and Notes*, Dillsboro 1978.
- BÜHNER, J. A. 1977: *Der Gesandte und sein Weg im 4. Evangelium* (WUNT 2.2), Tübingen 1977.
- BURCHARD, C. 1965: *Untersuchungen zu Joseph und Aseneth* (WUNT 1.8), Tübingen 1965.
- 1970: *Der dreizehnte Zeuge* (FRLANT 103), Göttingen 1970.
- BURNEY, C. F. 1926: "Christ as the ἀρχή of Creation", in: *JTS* 27 (1926) 160–177.
- BURRIDGE, K. 1969: *New Heaven, New Earth. A Study of Millenarian Activities*, Oxford 1969.
- CAQUOT, A. 1966: "Ben Sira et le Messianisme", in: *Semitica* 16 (1966) 43–68.
- CASEY, M. 1980: *The Son of Man: the Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7*, London 1980.
- CHARLES, R. H. 1913: *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English, with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books*, London, vol. I: *Apocrypha*, vol. II: *Pseudepigrapha*, 1913.
- CHARLESWORTH, J. H. 1979: "The Concept of the Messiah in the Pseudepigrapha", in: *ANRW* II 19.1, Berlin 1979, 188–218.
- 1983–85: *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, London, vol. 1 (Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments), 1983, vol. 2 (Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works), 1985.
- 1987: "From Jewish Messianology to Christian Christology", in: J. NEUSNER, W. S. GREEN and E. S. FRERICHs (ed.): *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* 1987, 225–264.
- CHESTER, A. 1986: *Divine Revelation and Divine Titles in the Pentateuchal Targumim* (TSAJ 14), Tübingen 1986.
- 1990: "The Sibyl and the Temple", in: J. A. EMERTON and W. HORBURY (ed.), *Templum Amicitiae. Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel*, Sheffield 1990.
- COLLINS, J. J. 1974: *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism* (SBLDS 13), Missoula 1974.

- 1983: “Sibylline Oracles”, in: CHARLESWORTH (ed.) 1983–85, vol. 1 1983, 317–472.
- 1987: “Messianism in the Maccabean Period”, in: NEUSNER, GREEN and FRERICHs (ed.) 1987, 97–109.
- COPPENS, J. 1968: *Le Messianisme Royal* (Lectio Divina 54), Paris 1968.
- 1974: *Le Messianisme et sa Relève prophétique* (BETL 38), Gembloux 1974.
- DAVIES, P. R. 1983: *The Damascus Covenant. An Interpretation of the “Damascus Document”* (JSOTSS 25), Sheffield 1983.
- DE JONGE, M. 1953: *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of their Text, Composition and Origin*, Leiden 1953.
- 1966: “The Use of the Word ‘Anointed’ in the Time of Jesus”, in: NT 8 (1966), 132–148.
- DE SAVIGNAC, J. 1959: “Le Messianisme de Philon d’Alexandrie”, in: NT 4 (1959), 319–324.
- DEY, L. K. K. 1975: *The Intermediary World and Patterns of Perfection in Philo and Hebrews* (SBLDS 25), Missoula 1975.
- DÍEZ MACHO, A. 1960: “The recently discovered Palestinian Targum: its antiquity and relationship with the other Targums”, in: SVT 7, Congress Volume, Oxford 1959 (1960), 222–245.
- DIMANT, D. 1984: “Qumran Sectarian Literature”, in: M. E. STONE (ed.): *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (CRINT 2.2), Assen 1984, 483–550.
- DUNN, J. D. G. 1980: *Christology in the Making. A New Testament Enquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*, London 1980.
- EISSFELDT, O. 1965: *The Old Testament: An Introduction*, ET Oxford 1965.
- ELTESTER, W. 1958: *Eikon im Neuen Testament*, Berlin 1958.
- FITZMYER, J. A. 1971: *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, London 1971.
- FOSSUM, J. E. 1985: *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord. The Origins of the Idea of Intermediation in Gnosticism* (WUNT 1.36), Tübingen 1985.
- FUKS, A. 1961: “Aspects of the Jewish Revolt in AD 115–117”, in: JRS 51 (1961) 98–104.
- GAGER, J. G. 1975: *Kingdom and Community. The Social World of Early Christianity*, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1975.
- GINZBERG, L. 1976: *An Unknown Jewish Sect*, ET New York 1976.
- GOLDSTEIN, J. A. 1987: “How the Authors of 1 and 2 Maccabees Treated the ‘Messianic’ Promises”, in: J. NEUSNER, W. S. GREEN and E. S. FRERICHs (ed.): *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* 1987, 69–96.
- GREEN, W. S. 1987: “Introduction: Messiah in Judaism: Rethinking the Question”, in: J. NEUSNER, W. S. GREEN and E. S. FRERICHs (ed.): *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* 1987, 1–13.
- GRIFFITHS, J. G. 1983: “Apocalyptic in the Hellenistic Era”, in: D. HELLHOLM (ed.): *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*, Tübingen 1983.
- HANSON, A. T. 1982: *The Image of the Invisible God*, London 1982.
- HECHT, R. D. 1987: “Philo and Messiah”, in: J. NEUSNER, W. S. GREEN and E. S. FRERICHs (ed.): *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* 1987, 139–168.

- HEGERMANN, H. 1961: *Die Vorstellung vom Schöpfungsmittler im Hellenistischen Judentum und Urchristentum* (TU 82), Berlin 1961.
- HEINEMANN, J. 1977: *Prayer in the Talmud. Forms and Patterns* (Studia Judaica IX), Berlin 1977.
- HENGEL, M. 1974: *Judaism and Hellenism. Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*, ET London 1974.
- 1976: *The Son of God. The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion*, ET London 1976.
- 1983a: *Between Jesus and Paul. Studies in the Earliest History of Christianity*, ET London 1983.
- 1983b: “Messianische Hoffnung und politischer ‘Radikalismus’ in der ‘jüdisch-hellenistischen Diaspora’”, in: D. HELLHOLM (ed.): *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*, Tübingen 1983.
- 1989a: *The Zealots. Investigations into the Jewish Freedom Movement in the Period from Herod I until 70 A.D.*, ET Edinburgh 1989.
- 1989b: *The ‘Hellenization’ of Judaea in the First Century after Christ*, ET London 1989.
- HILL, M. 1973: *A Sociology of Religion*, London 1973.
- HOPIUS, O. 1976: *Der Christushymnus Philipper 2,6–11* (WUNT 1.17), Tübingen 1976.
- HOLM-NIELSEN, S. 1977: *Die Psalmen Salomos* (JSHRZ 4.2), Gütersloh 1977.
- HORBURY, W. 1985: “The Messianic Associations of the Son of Man”, in: JTS 36 (1985) 34–55.
- 1988: “Messianism among Jews and Christians in the Second Century”, in: *Augustinianum* 28 (1988) 71–88.
- HORSLEY, R. A. 1984: “Popular Messianic Movements Around the Time of Jesus”, in: CBQ (1984) 471–495.
- HORSLEY, R. A. and HANSON, J. S. 1985: *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs. Popular Movements in the Time of Jesus*, Minneapolis 1985.
- HURTADO, L. W. 1988: *One God, One Lord. Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*, London 1988.
- ISENBERG, S. R. 1974: “Millenarism in Greco-Roman Palestine”, in: *Religion* 4 (1974) 26–46.
- JACOBSON, H. 1983: *The Exagoge of Ezekiel*, Cambridge 1983.
- JERVELL, J. 1960: *Imago Dei; Gen 1.26f. im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen* (FRLANT 76), Göttingen 1960.
- KIM, S. 1981: *The Origin of Paul’s Gospel* (WUNT 2.4), Tübingen 1981.
- KIPPENBERG, H. 1983: “‘Dann wird der Orient herrschen und der Okzident dienen’, Zur Begründung eines gesamt Vorderasiatischen Standpunktes im Kampf gegen Rom”, in: N. W. BOLZ and W. HÜBENER (ed.): *Spiegel und Gleichnis*, FS J. Taubes, Würzburg 1983, 40–48.
- KLAUSNER, J. 1956: *The Messianic Idea in Israel: From its Beginning to the Completion of the Mishnah*, ET London 1956.
- KOBELSKI, P. J. 1981: *Melchizedek and Melchireša’* (CBQMS 10), Washington D.C. 1981.
- KRAMER, W. 1966: *Christ, Lord, Son of God* (SBT 50), ET London 1966.

- KUHN, H.-W. 1958: "Die beiden Messias in den Qumrantexten und die Messiasvorstellung in der rabbinischen Literatur", in: ZAW 70 (1958) 200–208.
- KUHN, K. G. 1957: "The Two Mesiahs of Aaron and Israel", in: K. STENDAHL (ed.): *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, New York 1957, 54–64.
- LASH, N. 1980: "Up and Down in Christology", in: S. SYKES and D. HOLMES (ed.): *New Studies in Theology* 1, London 1980.
- LAURIN, R. B. 1963–64: "The Problem of Two Messiahs in the Qumran Scrolls", in: RQ 4 (1963–64) 39–52.
- LEVEY, S. H. 1974: *The Messiah: An Aramaic Interpretation. The Messianic Exegesis of the Targum*, Cincinnati 1974.
- LIVER, J. 1959: "The Doctrine of Two Messiahs in Sectarian Literature of the Second Commonwealth", in: HTR 52 (1959) 149–185.
- LOHSE, E. 1971: *Die Texte aus Qumran*, Darmstadt 1971.
- LUST, J. 1985: "Messianism and Septuagint", in: J. A. EMERTON (ed.): *Congress Volume: Salamanca* 1983 (SVT 36), Leiden 1985, 174–191.
- MACK, B. L. 1973: *Logos und Sophia. Untersuchungen zur Weisheitstheologie im hellenistischen Judentum* (SUNT 10), Göttingen 1973.
- 1987: "Wisdom Makes a Difference: Alternatives to 'Messianic' Configurations", in: J. NEUSNER, W. S. GREEN and E. S. FRERICHS (ed.): *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*, Cambridge 1987, 15–48.
- MACKINNON, D. M. 1976: "The Relation of the Doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation", in: R. W. A. MCKINNEY (ed.): *Creation, Christ and Culture. Studies in Honour of T. F. Torrance*, Edinburgh 1976, 92–107.
- MCMANARA, M. J. 1978: *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch*, Rome 1978.
- MACRAE, G. 1987: "Messiah and Gospel", in: J. NEUSNER, W. S. GREEN and E. S. FRERICHS (ed.): *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*, Cambridge 1987, 169–186.
- MARTIN, R. P. 1967: *Carmen Christi: Philippians 2.5–11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship*, Cambridge 1967.
- MEEKS, W. A. 1983: *The First Urban Christians. The Social World of the Apostle Paul*, New Haven 1983.
- MESHORER, Y. 1967: *Jewish Coins of the Second Temple Period*, Jerusalem 1967.
- MILIK, J. T. 1959: *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (SBT 26), London 1959.
- 1960: "Review of P. Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual of Discipline. Translated and Annotated*", in: RB 67 (1960) 410–416.
- 1972: "Milkî-Sedeq et Milkî-reša' dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens (1)", in: JJS 23 (1972) 95–144.
- MOORE, G. F. 1922: "Intermediaries in Jewish Theology", in: HTR 15 (1922) 41–85.
- MOWINCKEL, S. 1956: *He that Cometh*, ET Oxford 1956.
- MÜLLER, U. B. 1972: *Messias und Menschensohn in jüdischen Apokalypsen und in der Offenbarung des Johannes*, Gütersloh 1972.
- MUÑOZ LEON, D. 1970/72: "La esperanza de Israel. Perspectiva de la espera mesiánica en los targumim palestinos del Pentateuco", in: *SemBibEsp* 30 (1970/72) 49–91.

- NEUSNER, J. 1987: "Mishnah and Messiah", in: J. NEUSNER, W. S. GREEN and E. S. FRERICHS (ed.): *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*, Cambridge 1987, 265–282.
- NEUSNER, J., GREEN, W. S. and FRERICHS, E. S. 1987: *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*, Cambridge 1987.
- NEWSOM, C. 1985: *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSS 27), Atlanta 1985.
- NICKELSBURG, G. W. E. 1981: *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah. A Historical and Literary Introduction*, London 1981.
- 1987: "Salvation with and without a Messiah: Developing Beliefs in Writings Ascribed to Enoch", in: J. NEUSNER, W. S. GREEN and E. S. FRERICHS: *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*, Cambridge 1987, 49–68.
- NIKIPROWETSKY, V. 1970: *La Troisième Sibylle* (Études Juives 9), Paris 1970.
- NOLLAND, J. 1979: "SibOr iii.265–94: an Early Maccabean Messianic Oracle", in: JTS 30 (1979) 158–167.
- PÉREZ FERNÁNDEZ, M. 1981: *Tradiciones Mesiánicas en el Targum Palestinense. Estudios exegéticos*, Valencia/Jerusalem 1981.
- PHILONENKO, M. 1968: *Joseph et Aséneth: Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes* (SPB 13), Leiden 1968.
- RAHNER, K. 1961: *Theological Investigations* 1, ET London 1961.
- 1966: *Theological Investigations* 4, ET London 1966.
- 1975: *Theological Investigations* 13, ET London 1975.
- ROWLAND, C. 1982: *The Open Heaven. A Study of Apocalyptic in Early Judaism and Christianity*, London 1982.
- RYLE, H. E. and JAMES, M. R. 1891: *Psalmi Salomontos. Psalms of the Pharisees, commonly called The Psalms of Solomon*, London 1891.
- SCHÄFER, P. 1975: *Rivalität zwischen Engeln und Menschen. Untersuchungen zur rabbinischen Engelvorstellung*, Berlin/New York 1975.
- 1977: "The Rivalry between Angels and Men in the Prayer of Joseph and Rabbinic Literature", in: *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, Jerusalem 1977, vol. III, 511–515 (Heb).
- 1981: *Der Bar Kochba-Aufstand: Studien zum zweiten jüdischen Krieg gegen Rom* (TSAJ 1), Tübingen 1981.
- SCHOLEM, G. 1961: *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, ET New York 1961.
- 1971: *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality*, New York 1971.
- 1973: *Sabbatai Sevi: The Mystical Messiah 1626–1676*, ET London 1973.
- SCHUBERT, K. 1957: "Die Messiaslehre in den Texten von Chirbet Qumran", in: BZ 1 (1957) 177–197.
- SCHÜPPHAUS, J. 1977: *Die Psalmen Salomos: Ein Zeugnis Jerusalemer Theologie und Frömmigkeit in der Mitte des vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts* (ALGHJ 7), Leiden 1977.
- SCHÜRER, E. 1901–1909: *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, Leipzig (4th edition): vol. 1 1901, vol. 2 1907, vol. 3 1909.
- SCHÜRER, E., VERMES, G. and MILLAR, F. 1973–87: *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135)*. A New English Version

- revised and edited by G. VERMES and F. MILLAR (and others), Edinburgh, vol. I 1973, vol. II 1979, vol. III.1 1986, vol. III.2 1987.
- SCHWEIZER, E. 1966: "Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund der 'Sendungsformel' Gal 4.4f. Rm 8.3f. Joh 3.16f. I. Joh 4.9", in: *ZNW* 57 (1966) 199–210.
- SCHWIER, H. 1989: *Tempel und Tempelzerstörung: Untersuchungen zu den theologischen und ideologischen Faktoren im ersten jüdisch-römischen Krieg* (66–74 n. Chr.) (NTOA 11), Freiburg/Göttingen 1989.
- SEGAL, A. F. 1977: *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* (SJLA 25), Leiden 1977.
- SHAROT, S. 1982: *Messianism, Mysticism and Magic: a Sociological Analysis of Jewish Religious Movements*, Chapel Hill 1982.
- SHINAN, A. 1979: *The Aggadah in the Aramaic Targums to the Pentateuch*, Jerusalem 1979 (Heb.).
- SJÖBERG, E. 1946: *Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch*, Lund 1946.
- 1955: *Der verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien*, Lund 1955.
- SMEND, R. 1906: *Die Weisheit des Jesu Sirach*, Berlin 1906.
- SMITH, J. Z. 1968: "The Prayer of Joseph", in: J. NEUSNER (ed.): *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough* (SupNumen 14), Leiden 1968, 253–294.
- SMITH, M. 1959: "What is Implied by the Variety of Messianic Figures?", in: *JBL* 78 (1959) 66–72.
- SPARKS, H. F. D. (ed.) 1984: *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, Oxford 1984.
- STADELMANN, H. 1980: *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter* (WUNT 2.6), Tübingen 1980.
- STARCKY, J. 1963: "Les quatre étapes du messianisme à Qumran", in: *RB* 70 (1963) 481–505.
- STEGEMANN, H. 1967–69: "Weitere Stücke von 4QpPsalm 37, von 4QPatriarchal Blessings und Hinweise auf eine unedierte Handschrift aus Höhle 4Q mit Exzerpten aus dem Deuteronomium", in: *RQ* 6 (1967–69) 193–227.
- STONE, M. E. 1968: "The Concept of the Messiah in IV. Ezra", in: J. NEUSNER (ed.): *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough* (SupNumen 14), Leiden 1968, 295–312.
- 1987: "The Question of the Messiah in 4 Ezra", in: J. NEUSNER, W. S. GREEN and E. S. FRERICHS (ed.): *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*, Cambridge 1987, 209–224.
- TALMON, S. 1987: "Waiting for the Messiah: The Spiritual Universe of the Qumran Covenanters", in: J. NEUSNER, W. S. GREEN and E. S. FRERICHS (ed.): *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*, Cambridge 1987, 111–137.
- TAUBES, J. 1982: "The Price of Messianism", in: *JJS* 33 (1982) 595–599.
- THEISSEN, G. 1982: *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity*, ET Edinburgh 1982.
- THRUPP, S. L. (ed.) 1962: *Millenial Dreams in Action: Studies in Revolutionary Religious Movements* (Comparative Studies in Society and History, Suppl. II), The Hague 1962.
- VAN DER HORST, P. W. 1983: "Moses' Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist", in: *JJS* 34 (1983) 21–29.
- VAN DER WOUDE, A. S. 1957: *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran*, Assen 1957.

- 1965: "Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran-Höhle XI", in: P. A. H. DE BOER (ed.): *Oudtestamentische Studien XIV* (1965) 354–373.
- VERMES, G. 1987: *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, London³ 1987.
- WCELA, E. A. 1964: "The Messiah(s) of Qumran", in: *CBQ* 26 (1964) 340–349.
- WEBER, M. 1968: *Economy and Society. An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, ET Berkeley/Los Angeles 1968.
- WEISS, H.-F. 1966: *Untersuchungen zur Kosmologie des hellenistischen und palästinischen Judentums* (TU 97), Berlin 1966.
- WILCKEN, R. L. 1986: "Early Christian Chiliasm, Jewish Messianism, and the Idea of the Holy Land", in: *HTR* 79 (1986) 298–307.
- WINDISCH, H. 1914: *Die göttliche Weisheit der Juden und die paulinische Christologie*, Leipzig 1914.
- WINSTON, D. 1979: *The Wisdom of Solomon. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Anchor Bible 43), Garden City, N. Y., 1979.
- WORSLEY, P. 1968: *The Trumpet Shall Sound: A Study of 'Cargo' Cults in Melanesia*, London² 1968.
- YADIN, Y. 1963: *Finds from the Bar-Kochba Period in the Cave of Letters*, Jerusalem 1963.
- 1967: *Bar Kochba*, London 1967.
- ZELLER, E. 1923: *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, vol. III.2 Leipzig⁵ 1923.