

Endnotes for Part 3

Chapter 8

1. B. *Tā'an* 19b-20a and cf. *ARN* 6.3 (21a).
2. *Gen R.* 42.1. This, by the way, in the context of an exposition by Rabbi Eliezer b. Hyrcanus ('*Liezer*' – thus!) of Psalm 37:14-14, an exposition extant at Qumran.
3. See *War* 5.24-26 for how the famine began in the purposeful burning of all the stores by John of Gischala and Simon, the Temple Captain and son of the High Priest Ananias, and 5.420-41 and 5.512-18 for the effects of this.
4. Cf. b. *Tā'an* 19b-20a and *ARN* 6.3 with b. *Tā'an* 23a and 1 Kings 17:1-8 and 18:41-19:14.
5. *ARN* 21a.
6. Cf. *ARN* 9 (22b) on Numbers 12:9-15.
7. *War* 2.148-9. For the Prophet Habakkuk, too, as a '*Circle-Drawer*' like Honi in exposition of a passage extant at Qumran (*Habakkuk* 2:1: '*I will take my stand upon my Watchtower*'), see *Tā'an* 23a. For the exposition of this, which has to do with '*the Delay of the Parousia*' and '*the Last Era*', see below, pp. 895-902.
8. These fabulous '*Rich Men*' permeate the historical portions of the *Talmud* and its associated literature; see, for instance, b. *Git* 56a, *Ket.* 66b-67a, *Tā'an* 19b-20a, *ARN* 6.3 (20b-21a), etc. For the New Testament, see in particular Luke 1:53, 6:24, 12:16-21, 16:1-22, 21:1, Matthew 19:23-4, 27:57, Mark 12:41 and pars.; but also see James 1:10-2:6 and 5:1ff.
9. See b. *Tā'an* 19b-20a and *ARN* 6.3 (20b-21a) above. The play of '*Sabī'a*' here is on the Aramaic '*sabbī'a*'/'*satiated*.' Not only is this a usage, as will become apparent, widespread in all our traditions, but in the Syriac and, following that, the Arabic, it is related to immersion as, for instance '*Sabaean*' or '*the Subba*' of the *Marshes*' above.
10. See below, pp. 209-15, 246-50, 256-58, 267-68, 272-280, 300-3, etc. *N. b.*, the pun here in the Greek '*kunes*'/'*kunaria*'/'*kunariotis*' is on the Hebrew word for '*Zealots*' – '*Kanna'im*' and see pp. 384-90.
11. See above, pp. 70-3, 92-101, 109-15, etc.
12. In *Git* 56a, this is also '*twenty-one years*' – in *ARN* 21a this is '*twenty-two*'; in *Lam. R.* 1.5.31, the number give is rather '*ten*' and there are rather '*four councillors*': '*Ben Zizzit, Ben Gorion, Ben Nakdimon, and Ben Kalba Shabua*' (thus).
13. *ARN* 6.3 (21a) and cf. Josephus in *War* 5.24-6 and 5.420-518 above.
14. For this plaque, see *Git* 60a and *Yoma* 37a; for Helen's three successive Nazirite oath penances imposed on her by the Rabbis, see *Naz* 19a-20b – but also see the Fifth-Century Armenian historian Moses of Chorene 2.35. The imposition of these '*oaths*', as we shall see below, certainly seems to have had something to do with an aspect of the charge of '*fornication*'.
15. See *War* 5.147, *Ant.* 20.95, and *E.H.* 2.12.3. In these matters folklore is often an interesting guide. It should be appreciated that this tomb – now known, not incuriously as '*the Tombs of the Kings*' – were in times past known by the Jews of Jerusalem as '*the Cave of Kalba Sabū'a*', a not unimportant testimony to their true identity – see article '*Izates*', *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Jerusalem, 1971.
16. See the pictures we provide of its entrance and interior in Plates 85 and 88.
17. See pp. 207-18, 256-70, 311-14, 365, 393, etc. below and *Ket* 62b-63a and *Ned* 50a. Cf. too *ARN* 20b.
18. This is how he is referred to in *Git* 56a and *Gen R.* 42.1; in *ARN* 20b it is '*Siset Hakkesef*' which implies it has something to do with the '*silver*' (*kesef*) of his wealth – in this case, the '*silver couch*' upon which he reclined '*at the head of the Great Ones of Israel*.' For the former, the name rather is presented as having to do with '*his zizzit*' (fringes) *which used to trail on cushions*' (*keseset*), though '*couch*' and '*cushions*' are hardly very distinguishable.
19. *Ibid.* Either way the name is mysterious and has to do with wealth and luxury just as in *Luke* 16:19 above. In the one derivation he is presented as sitting at the Head of the Jewish nobility; in the other, the Roman – all very peculiar, but obviously a *nom a clef*

- for a very wealthy and famous personage – probably a “*Herodian*” (Agrippa I? II?) or one of Philo’s relatives.
20. *Ket* 66b–67a, 104a, *Git* 56a, and *Lam R.* 1.16.47–49 and see below, pp. 214–23 and variously.
 21. See *War* 1.242, 432–38, *Ant.* 15.81–5, 202–46, etc. and *War* 1.562 and *Ant.* 18.136. For Josephus, these are sometimes transliterated as ‘*Mariamme*’, the translation we have used, for ‘*Marianne*’. There are about four more Herodians by the same name in Josephus. Recently a tomb, which gripped the imagination of the public for which reason it was dubbed ‘*the Jesus Tomb*’, had two such ossuaries inscribed with the names ‘*Maria*’ and ‘*Marianne*’ – the latter of the two being taken by enthusiasts for Mary Magdalene’s remains. But as one can see, ‘*Marianne*’ for ‘*Mary*’ is the widespread usage in Greek works of the period and, therefore, no particular connection with ‘*Mary Magdalene*’ on this basis can be assumed. For mix-ups in the New Testament between the ‘*Mary*’s and ‘*Martha*’s, see Luke 10:38–42 and John 11:1–12:3.
 22. See b. *Tā’an* 19b–20a and *ARN* 6.3 (21a) above for Nakdimon’s ‘*rain-making*’ and ‘*cistern-filling*.’ For his and the other ‘*Rich men*’s grain storage, see *Git* 56a, *ARN* 21a, and *Lam. R.* 1.5.31 above as well. These ‘*miracles*’, of course, parallel (as we shall see below) many of ‘*Jesus*’ reported ‘*water*’ or ‘*oil-filling*’ and ‘*feeding*’ episodes. See, for instance, Matthew 14:15–21/Mark 6:36–44, Matthew 15:32–38/Mark 8:1–20, Luke 9:12–17 on the ‘*feeding of the 4-5000*’ and the ‘*multiplication of the loaves*’, 16:1–12 (‘*Jesus*’ parable about the ‘*baths of oil*’ and ‘*kors of wheat*’ which introduces his versions of the ‘*serving two masters*’/6:13 and the ‘*not one jot or tittle*’/6:17 aphorisms and precedes the ‘*Rich man*’ feeding the ‘*Poor man Lazarus under the table*’ in 16:19–31), and John 2:1–11 and 6:42–26 and see below, pp. 258–64, 405–8, and variously.
 23. B. *Tā’an* 19b–20a and *ARN* 6.3 (21a). It is interesting that the Jerusalem *Talmud Tā’anith* 3.9–10 doesn’t record this episode but only Honi’s similar miracles and, curiously enough, that of his ‘*grandson*’ – also called ‘*Honi*.’ One should also note in this context all the Gospel allusions to ‘*fill*’/‘*full*’ or ‘*being filled*’ – see, for example, Matthew 4:20/Mark 6.42, Matthew 15.37/Mark 7:27 (‘*let the children first be filled*’ – the ‘*Canaanite little dogs*’ episode)/8:8/Luke 9:17, 16:20–21 (the equivalent ‘*Poor Lazarus*’ and ‘*the dogs under the table*’ episode, ‘*desiring to be filled*’ and ‘*full of sores*’), and John 2.7, 6.12–13/6:26 (‘*the Disciples*’ and ‘*the baskets*’ ‘*being filled*’ (cf. Luke 6:21 and Mark 7:27 above), and 21:11 (Peter pulling ‘*the net full of large fishes*’ to land), and 1QpHabxi.14 variously below.
 24. B. *Tā’an* 20a and *ARN* 21a, but where this ‘*filled to overflowing*’ or ‘*overflow*’ referred to in both these Rabbinic contexts is concerned, also see ‘*the twelve baskets full of overflow*’ or ‘*leftover*’ in Matthew 14:20/Mark 6:43/Luke 9:17, ‘*the seven baskets full of the overflow of broken fragments*’ in Matthew 15:37/Mark 8:8 (again referred to in Matthew 16:9–10/Mark 8:19–20) and also discussed pp. 271–80 below.
 25. See *M. Naz* 3:6 and b. *Naz* 19b–20a. According to Rabbinic tradition, she had sworn that if her son (presumably Izates) ‘*returned safely from war*’, she would ‘*be a Nazirite for seven years*’, vividly confirming a passage in Josephus’ *War* 2.313 that ‘*it was the custom for someone in difficulty or danger to undertake a Nazirite vow*.’ Notwithstanding, at the end of that time when she came up to ‘*the Land of Israel*’, she was told by those of ‘*the Beit Hillel*’ (‘*the School of Hillel*’) that vows of that kind observed outside of Palestine where not valid because of the ‘*uncleanness*’ there. Therefore, she would have to do an additional seven years. At the end of this period too, for some reason (it is this which is obscure, but all seem to relate to something sexual), she once again contracted ‘*uncleanness*’ and was instructed to do a third, which she did – but the whole smacks of artificiality and there seems to have been something else at work here and person or persons wishing to keep her in the Holy Land. It was during this time, too, that she was said *inter alia* to have erected a large *sukkah* at Lydda for the Feast of Tabernacles which all frequented (*Tōs. Suk* 1:1 and b. *Suk* 2b–3a – here it is argued that her *Sukkah* was too high – *i.e.*, ‘*over twenty cubits*’ – probably by ‘*the Beit Hillel*’ again, a perfect example of Rabbinic *pipul*). *N.b.* above pp. 101–5 that Lydda would also seem to have been the locale of the crucifixion of the Messiah b. Joseph. It would also appear to be the place where both Rabbis Eliezer b. Hyrcanus and his student Akiba completed their studies. One should also note its importance in the ‘*Peter*’ cycle of stories in Acts both above and below pp. 563–4.
 26. *M. Yoma* 3.10, b. *Yoma* 37a–b, *Tōs. Pe’ah* 4.18, and *ARN* 41.12 (34b), but see *War* 7.148–50 and Plate 113. Josephus’ syco-phantic description of Vespasian/Titus/Domitian’s Triumphal parade here is chilling in the extreme and marks him forever as the turncoat of turn-coats. The portrait of Simon bar Giora’s torture and execution as leader of the Jews anticipates that of ‘*Jesus*’ in the Gospels and makes it plain that Helen’s golden candelabra was deposited in ‘*the Temple of Peace*’ Vespasian immediately had built like Augustus before him in Rome, though the Temple veils and Torah Scrolls he seems to have taken directly into his palace – *ARN* agrees with most of this.
 27. In this context, it is certainly not incurious to remark that Simon *Magus* himself at a chronologically contemporaneous time had a consort or ‘*Queen*’ called ‘*Helen*’ whom early Church Fathers considered no better than a ‘*prostitute*’ and say he picked up ‘*in a*

- brothel in Tyre* (typical theological hyperbole) – see *EH* 2.13.4, Irenaeus, *Ad. Haer.* 1.23.2, Justin Martyr, *First Apology* 1.26, Hippolytus 6.15, and Epiphanius, *Haeres.* 21.2.1–3.6. In Ps. *Rec* 2.8–12, she is called ‘Luna.’ It would seem, however, that the first reference is in Justin (c. 140 CE), aside from the ‘Simon’ in Josephus, and for him Helen has only committed ‘fornication’ or some sexual indiscretion of some kind. It is to Irenaeus (c. 180 CE) we seem to owe ‘the *brothel in Tyre of Phoenicia*’ magnification – as we do much else. But these writers even seem to see her as an incarnation of ‘*Helen of Troy*’ – her archetype – and, therefore seemingly all other ‘*Helen*’s and the Greek epitome of the originator of all female evil. For ‘*Tyre in Phoenicia*’ of course, one should have regard to the story of ‘Jesus’ and the ‘*Canaanite*’/‘*Syrophenecian woman*’ and ‘the dogs under the table’ of Matthew 15:21–8/Mark 7:24–31 referred to variously below.
28. For this golden plaque, see b. *Yoma* 37a, *Git* 60a, and *Tos. Pe’ah* 4:18 – in *Gittin*, the rabbis even find reason to complain about this. It is interesting that in referring to the imposition of another ‘seven year’ Nazirite penance-period on Helen, *Ket* 7a refers to a decision R. Yohanan supposedly gave at Sidon (i.e., ‘*Zaidan*’ or possibly ‘*Beitsaida*’) forbidding ‘performing the first intercourse on *shabat*.’ Whatever one makes of all this, it is probable that the issue necessitating this (at least her so-called ‘third’ Nazirite penance) had to do with perceived sexual impurity of some kind which, in turn, would relate to Helen’s demonstrated interest in ‘the suspected adulteress’ accusation in Numbers preceding the one defining the kind of Naziritism she seemed to be involved in.
29. See *James*, pp. 896–922 and *Ant.* 20.49–53 and 92–104. Also see Moses of Chorene 2.35. It is interesting the amount of space Josephus devotes to the Helen/Izates/Mo-nobazus story. In the first place, it would appear that Helen is on pilgrimage to give thanks for her blessings concerning Izates (thus Josephus) when all these issues pertaining to the famine and her second Nazirite oath occur around 43–47 CE. In the second, one should note the miraculous story centering about Izates birth in Josephus, *Ant.* 20.18–9, for which reason he seems to have been named ‘*Izates*’, which in Persian apparently meant ‘godly being’ or ‘God’; and, finally, the number ‘twenty-four’ Josephus associates with his offspring in *Ant.* 20.92, which carries with it just the slightest echo of the R. Akiba story – not unrelated as I have pointed out to this ‘*Adiabene*’ family – and his ‘24,000 Disciples.’
30. For the ‘*Famine*’, see Josephus, *Ant.* 20.51 and 101 above. Queen Helen seems certainly to have been in the country at the time. For the stopping of sacrifice on behalf of foreigners and the rejection of their gifts, see *War* 2.409–10. The time, therefore, is ‘twenty-one years.’ Of course, Helen was dead by this time, having died around the time of her son in 55CE, but her offspring were not and, as we have seen, were participants in the War against Rome; see *War* 2,520, 4.567, and 6.356.
31. B. *Tā’an* 19b–20a. Here is our number ‘twenty-four’ again, just encountered in the formulaic presentation for the number of Izates’ offspring – both male and female, in Josephus’ *Ant* 20.92 above, should one choose to regard it. Once again, it may simply be accidental, but the number in these various contexts certainly is insistent.
32. See Ps. *Rec.* 1.72, 2.7–11, etc. These are, of course, Roman ‘miles,’ but Epiphanius, under his chapter about ‘*Ossaean*’ gives the equivalent in Greek ‘*shoeni*’, that is ‘twenty-four’ again – 19.4.1. For him, too, the width of this ‘*Standing One*’, who is ‘the *Primal Adam*’ or ‘the *Hidden Power*’ who is ‘the *Christ*’ – n.b. here, too, the derivation of the name ‘*Elchasai*.’ It is difficult to understand what all these overlaps or numerical coincidences might mean, unless it again has something to do with the revolutionary or ‘*Messianic*’ ideology of all these Eastern ‘*bathing*’ groups.
33. See *Ko* 73.1, 74.1, etc.
34. B. *Tā’an* 20a.
35. See *M. Tā’an* 3.8 and b. *Tā’an* 19a and 23a/j. *Tā’an* 3.9–10.
36. This is the position of *M. Tā’an* 3.8, which is further fleshed out in b. *Tā’an* 23a. These texts, the latter of which compares Honi (or ‘*Onias*’ as the case may be) to both ‘the prophet *Habakkuk*’ (*Habakkuk* 2:1: ‘I will stand upon my watchtower and take my stand upon my fortress,’ a passage extant at Qumran introducing 1QpHabvii’s eschatological portions – see below, pp. 895–924) and Elijah, refer to either Honi or others alluding to Honi’s ‘being a son’ of God’s ‘household’ basically initiate the issue of being ‘a son of God’ in the Hebrew/Judaic framework. In the Babylonian *Talmud*, this is connected to the derivative story about Nakdimon making rain (20a) which is itself further fleshed out, as we have seen, in *ARN* 6.3 (21a), which now adds the words ‘the *Glory of my fathers’ house*’ to those just alluded to in *M. Tā’an* 3.8 above. It is not incurious that just following ‘Jesus’ reported allusion in John 2:16–17 to his ‘*Father’s house*’ and ‘his *Disciples*’ application of the passage from Psalm 69:10, ‘*zeal for Your house consumes me*’, to his ‘*cleansing*’ of the Temple, and an allusion to ‘the *sign(s)*’ or ‘*miracle(s)*’ Jesus was doing – most notably, ‘*destroying this Temple and raising it up again in three days*’ (John 2:18–23); John 3:1, probably not unintentionally or unwittingly first introduces the character it calls ‘*Nicodemus*’ (our ‘*Nakdimon*’?), ‘a man of the Pharisees, a Ruler of the Jews’ (thus!), a character missing from the other Gospels and with whom John then pictures Jesus as carrying on quite a sophisticated discussion about Christology, ‘*being born again*’, and ‘*Light*’ theology, which twice employs the phraseology ‘*only begotten*’, present in the Synoptic account of

- Jesus' baptism but, of course, missing from John's (3:1-22). This then is followed by an account – certainly not accidental – of a discussion between Jesus' 'Disciples' and John 'beyond the Jordan' (because Jesus and his Disciples had by that time 'come into the Land of Judea' (cf. CDiv.3 and vi.5 below on 'going out from the Land of Judah') on the subject of exactly who was 'the Christ' (3:26-36), which includes quite a clear allusion to 'the Primal Adam' ideology completely reminiscent of Paul in 1 Corinthians 15:45-50. But more astonishing than any of this and, in our view, definitive of showing the dependence of New Testament versions of 'sonship' on materials of this kind, the words of the prayer Nakdimon is pictured as making in ARN (and, to a lesser extent, both he and Honi are pictured as using in *T'aranith*) to 'fill the cisterns and bring the rain are as follows: 'Master of the Universe, it is revealed and known to You that not for my own Glory did I do this, nor for the Glory of my father's house (does he mean the 'Glory' of his own family or the 'Glory of God's House' – for John's Gospel as for the story of Honi, it is clearly the latter) did I do this, but only for Your Glory I performed it, so that there might be water for the pilgrims.' The use of the word 'Glory' here will have many ramifications in the documents we will consider below. The reader might wish to catalogue these.
37. See Matthew 26:59-67/Mark 14.55-65 and *pars.*, a passage which takes up where John 2:28 leaves off above. Cf. too John 10:29-39, itself beginning with evocation of 'My Father'.
 38. Cf. *Ant.* 14.26-28.
 39. B. *T'aran* 20a.
 40. B. *T'aran* 23a-b. and cf., for instance, the description of James in *Haers* 78.14.1.
 41. *T'aran* 23b and note how this 'Hanin' ('Johni?') is described as 'the son of Honi the Circle-Drawer's daughter' – and note too how this tradition again involves 'little children' or 'school children' who, like 'the people of Jerusalem' in Jerome's tradition about James in *Commentary on Galatians* 1:19 (who, because he was so 'Holy,' used 'to crowd around him and try to touch his garments') – 'take hold of the hem of his garment' or 'his fringes.'
 42. See above pp. 201-2 and *fn.* 27-29 for Helen's three successive 'Nazirite' oaths for some infraction, probably have to do with 'purity,' and her interest in the 'suspected adulteress' passage of Numbers 5:11-31.
 43. See *Ps. Rec.* 1.72 and 2.7 and 12 above, etc.
 44. *Haers.* 19.4.1, which also may be – as we progress – one of the reasons for the constant references to the 'feet' of the Messiah (all that would have been visible, of course, according to this measurement scheme to a mere mortal), to say nothing about the constant allusion to 'standing' in all sources.
 45. B. *Ned* 50a and *Ket* 62b. For Monobaz's connection to R. Akiba, see b. *Shab* 68b.
 46. ARN 6.2 (20b). Later Akiba seems to take a Roman matron as his wife. Had Rachel died? This is all very curious. For relations with R. Eliezer b. Hyrcanus, see, for instance, B.M. 59b, *Hag* 14b, j. *Hag* 2.17 (7b), *Tos. Hag* 2.2, b. *Meg* 3a, etc.
 47. For the New Testament, see Matthew 2:1-12's 'Star in the East,' replete with allusions to 'King of the Jews,' 'the Christ' 'a Leader shall come forth' (cf. the Messianic Leader Prophecy at Qumran), and 'the Star standing over' (i. e., 'the Standing One' ideology again). In the Scrolls, see CDVII.14-21 (which includes Amos 5:26-7 and 9:11 and Numbers 24:17: 'The Star Prophecy'), 1QMxi.5-15 (which again includes 'The Star Prophecy' and Isaiah 31:8: 'Ashur falling by the sword of No Mere Man' – 'The Primal Adam' ideology), 4QFlor.6-13, which includes 2 Samuel 7:11-14 and Amos 9:11, and 4QTest 5-13 (which includes Deuteronomy 18:18-19, 'The True Prophet' Prophecy and Numbers 24:15-17 ('The Star Prophecy' yet a third time) discussed variously in Chapters 21-28 below. For Josephus, see *War* 6.288-314 on 'the signs and portents' accompanying the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple, which include both the portent of 'a star resembling a sword, together with a comet, which stood over the city for a whole year' and the portrait of 'one Jesus, the son of Ananias,' with which we began this work, who directly following the death of James (*Succot*, 62 CE) for seven long years, went around the city crying, 'Woe, woe to Jerusalem,' until he was struck by a projectile and killed himself just before its fall; and ends with the important historical note that 'the thing that most moved the Jews to revolt from Rome was an ambiguous Prophecy (i. e., Isaiah 10:33-34 and Numbers 24:14-17 – 'ambiguous' because it was capable of manifold interpretation and he didn't know whether it applied to Vespasian who destroyed the city or 'a Messianic Leader' of their own) from among their writings that 'a World Ruler would come out of Palestine.
 48. Lam. R. 2.2.4 and j. *T'aran* 4.5 (68a). For the vivid portrayal of this Uprising and the unimaginable casualties sustained, one should read the whole of this section of *Lamentations Rabbah*.
 49. B. *Ned* 50a and *Ket* 62b above.
 50. B. *T'aran* 23b above.
 51. This is rather Gen R. 42.1 which is the same section in which 'Nakdimon' is called 'Nakodimon'; but see also Lam R. 1.5.31, following evocation of the World Ruler Prophecy Isaiah 10:34 ('Lebanon shall fall by a Mighty One') and the story of the various 'woe's' and 'wahi's' and where R. Eliezer and R. Joshua carry R. Yohanan's body out of Jerusalem, just preceding the story of R. Yohanan sending them back in to bring out R. Zadok, as well as Eccles R. 1.8.3-7 where R. Eliezer tells R. Akiba the story he heard from 'Jacob of Kfar Sechaniah' about 'Jesus the Nazoraean' and the picture R. Eliezer's stricter approach to the *Torah* where a Gentile sinning woman wanted to convert than the 'Jesus' prototype R. Joshua.

- Importantly, this story concerns a female proselyte of the type 'Jesus' encounters in Matthew 15:23 and Mark 7:24 in Tyre and Sidon which we will analyze in greater detail as we proceed.
52. Again, the spelling of this in Josephus is rather 'Eleazar' (*Ant.* 20.43), not 'Eliezer' as we have it spelled here. Still his approach echoes that of Eliezer ben Hyranus in the above story in *Eccles.* R. 1.8.4. But these disputes between R. Eliezer and R. Joshua, Yohan ben Zacchai's favorite two pupils, are famous in Rabbinic literature – but, in particular, where 'circumcision' as a *sine qua non* for conversion is concerned, see B. *Yeb* 46a where R. Eliezer specifically takes the position of Josephus' 'Eleazar' here. This is varied somewhat in j. *Kid* 3.14 where R. Joshua is portrayed as also requiring 'baptism' – an interesting addition.
 53. *Ant.* 20.18. It is interesting that here Josephus calls him 'Monobazus surnamed Bazeus', two names which would appear to be the same, however elsewhere in 20.24–26 he is satisfied simply to call him 'Monobazus.' Depending on whether we are looking at a Greek or Latin version of the name Abgar, we encounter 'Agharus' or 'Abgarus' and sometimes even 'Achabus', 'Augurus,' or 'Albanus,' e.g., see Tacitus, *Annals.* 6.44 and 12.12 or, in *ANCL:* Hippolytus on the Twelve Apostles and Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae. These confusions in transliterating Semitic names to Greek or Latin ones are wide-spread and even remarked by authors of the time who comment that the Greeks had a hard time with Arabic or Syriac-based names. It is difficult to know whether Abgar and Monobazus are parallel or identical clusters of names. Moses of Chorene 2.29–35, for instance, thinks Helen's husband is 'Agharus' – so apparently to some extent does Eusebius in *EH* 1.13.1–2.12.1 where, according to some chapter headings, she is 'Queen of the Osthocans' – i.e., 'the Assyrians.'
 54. *War* 2.520.
 55. For the connection of this 'Kenedaeus' with Luke's name for this mysterious 'Kandakes,' Queen Helen's parallel or double, see *James*, pp. 883–88 and 906–22 – but also see Strabo, *Geography* 17.1.54 and Pliny, *H.N.* 6.35 and *Ps.* Philo 25.9–28.10 celebrating 'Kenez' as a quasi-Messiah.
 56. *Loc. cit.* (*War* 2.520 above). The parallel with Leonidas should not be lightly taken. Even 1 Macc. 11:21 considers 'the Jews and the Spartans to be brothers,' a probable confusion with the Mycenaean heritage of the Philistines along the coast.
 57. These allusions to 'filled' or 'full' permeate the Gospels and one should probably catalogue each one of them as we have above, but for a particularly relevant example, see Luke 16:22's 'Poor Man Lazarus longing to be filled from the crumbs that fell from the Rich Man's table' below or the constant 'filling of baskets' (paralleling Nakdimon's 'filling of wells') in Matthew 14–16/Mark 6–8 above,
- In John 12:3, see how 'the house was filled with the odor of the ointment' with which 'Mary anointed Jesus' feet and wiped his feet with her hair' (*sic!*). The most important reference of this kind in the Scrolls occurs in 1QpHabxi.13–4 in interpretation of Hab 2:14–15 about how 'the Wicked Priest walked in the way of satiety' or 'in the way of drinking his fill,' not in the way of drunkenness as most 'Consensus Scholars' mistakenly think, but in 'drinking the Cup of the Wrath of God' which 'would swallow him' – that is, 'the Cup of Divine Vengeance'; cf. Rev. 14:10 and 16:19 ('the Cup of the wine of the Fury of His Wrath').
58. B. *Git* 56a, but see ARN 6.3 (21a) above: 'Whoever entered his house hungry as a dog came away filled.' In these passages, one has to understand that 'sabar'a' is based on the Aramaic 'sabb'a'/'satiated' – in both Arabic and Syriac this usage, as we have seen, is related to 'immersion,' that is, 'immersion in water' or 'baptism.'
 59. Cf. *War* 2.143 and *Ps. Rec.* 1.70 which even includes the 'headlong' language of Acts 1:18's picture of the James-like 'fall' Judas Iscariot takes and for Luke 4:29 what the citizens of Nazareth wish to do to 'Jesus' when he compares himself to Elijah in the matter of rain-making and going to 'Zarepta the widow of Sidon' – another allusion to Queen Helen or Luke's parallel to Matthew 15:22/Mark 7:26's 'Canaanite'/'Greek Syro-Phoenician woman' (also from Tyre and Sidon)? – and Elisha only having 'cleansed' the single leper 'Naaman the Syrian,' i.e., his support in his own alleged home of the Pauline 'Gentile Mission'!
 60. See 1QpHabxi.4–15 and the discussions in *James*, pp. 252–4, 444–50, 504–13, etc., which are extensive and cannot be repeated here in full. The gist of these are also summarized in DSSFC: 'The Final Proof that James and the Righteous Teacher are the Same,' pp. 332–51; also see Appendix, pp. 87–94 in *JJHP:* 'The "Three Nets of Belial" in the Damascus Document and "Ballā"/"Belā" in the Temple Scroll' – pp. 208–17 in DSSFC.
 61. 1QpHabviii.14–ix.5. Here the reference is to how 'the Last Priests of Jerusalem gathered Riches and profited from the spoils of the Peoples,' which is easily interpreted in terms of the predation activities of the Herodians and 'the Men of Violence' in this period – vividly described in Josephus' *Ant.* 20.181–214 in the run-up to James' death and the War against Rome; but, in addition, what 'the Yeter ha-^c Aminim' or 'the Army of the Kittim' do here is, in turn, plunder the High Priests/Last Priests and take it to Rome.
 62. B. *San* 105a–106b. Once one realizes that this 'Bela'/'ballā'/'Balaam' terminology is a blind for Herodians, then a good deal of chronological misinformation and disinformation at Qumran is clarified.
 63. See my Appendix, pp. 87–94 in *JJHP:* 'The "Three Nets of Belial" in the Damascus Document and "Ballā"/"Belā" in the Temple Scroll' and pp. 208–17 in DSSFC above. For Re-

- velation, the references are 2:14ff. and 14.8-13 above, but also see 2 Peter 2:15 and Jude 1:11; at Qumran, see CDIV.14-15 and 1QHiv.10. and 11QTXLVI.10.
64. Cf. Ps. *Rec* 2.4, 3.1, etc. and Ps. *Hom* 2.19-22. The presentation in the *Homilies* is by far the more detailed and itself very curious. It is this presentation that names the Canaanite/Syrophenician woman as 'Justa,' identifying her as 'a Gentile, though living like the Sons of Israel,' by which it seemingly means she kept Jewish dietary laws. Besides her daughter, whom she married to one of the "Poor" (in 3.23 she is identified as 'Bernice'), she is described as having two sons, one of whom seemingly the famous 'Aquila.' These sons she had educated by Simon Magus, who is identified as 'the son of Antonius and Rachel' and 'a Samaritan.' It is in this discussion that Aquila identifies 'Helen' as a 'Queen' and, like Simon and Dositheus, originally one of John's 'thirty' disciples. It was in this manner that she supposedly fell in with Simon not as later Fathers suggest in a brothel in Tyre which seems rather to reflect this story about the Canaanite/Syrophenician woman – thus far the *Homilies*.
65. Ps. *Rec* 1.72-2.1. Here 'Zachaeus' as one of the founding members of the Caesarea Community, but so too are 'Aquila' and his brother, though the story of their mother's conversion is missing. Still Aquila does then tell the story of Simon Magus' origins, which roughly agrees with the one, he is pictured as telling, in the *Homilies* above. 'Zachaeus' also plays a significant role in this part of the *Homilies* 2.1-2.21 where his role as 'a publican' as in the Luke 19:2 is signalled as well. One wonders whether this character has anything to do with the 'Zachaeus' signalled as the father of R. Yohanan b. Zacchai or whether this resemblance is purely coincidental. The matter of 'strangled things' as 'carrion' appears Ps. *Hom* 7.4, 7.8, and 8.19, but *n.b.*, 11.35 where Peter is pictured as a complete 'Jamesian.'
66. 1QpHabxii.3-10; but also see 4QpPs 37ii.10, iii.10, and iv.11 on 'the Church' or 'Congregation of the Poor' and 1QHv.23: 'the Poor Ones of Piety.'
67. 4QpPs37iv.10.
68. 1QpHabxii.2-3, echoed in 4QpPs 37iv.9-10.
69. ARN 6.27 (21a). In *Git* 56a it is 'Ben-Zizzit ha-Keset,' because 'his fringes (zizzit) used to trail on cushions' (*keset*) or 'his seat (*kise*) was among the Great Ones of Rome' – but in both there may be a play on the word '*kesef*' because of all the 'silver' he amassed. Whatever the case, he was clearly an Establishment personality in league with the Romans.
70. See ARN 6.15-17 (20b), b. *Ned* 50a-b, and *Ket* 62b-63a. This 'crown' seems to have related to a youthful prediction about what he would give his wife Rachel that she would wear a crown like the City of Jerusalem – itself relating to his future wealth and fame, For more on this 'crown' or 'Gol-
- den Jerusalem,'* which Rabbi Akiba is said to have given his wife Rachel, see *Shab* 59b. According to ARN 20b, 'before he departed from the world he owned tables of silver and gold and mounted his couch on ladders of gold' – again, typical Talmudic hyperbole. But there is a conundrum here that has not failed to go unremarked among rabbis and scholars, one of the earliest of whom seems to have been R. Luria of Safed in the Sixteenth Century, and that is that, since his wife Rachel, the obvious early source of his early wealth, seems to have disappeared from the traditions to be replaced by the curious story in *Ned* 50b and *A.Z.* 20a of the conversion of a rich and irresistibly beautiful Roman matron, the alleged wife of the Roman Prefect Tinius Rufus (cf. *Git* 90a), whom some traditions even hold responsible for his death; how is this to be squared with his fame as a Jewish Messianist and patriot? In fact, some traditions even claim to know her name, 'Rufina,' which seems suspect in the extreme. In these traditions about R. Akiba, one should also note the mention of one 'Aquila' or 'Onkelos,' whom it calls 'the son of Kalonymus' / 'Kolonikos,' whom many take to be Flavius Clemens or 'Clement' of Pseudoclementine fame, just as in these materials about Peter, Simon Magus, and 'the Church' at Caesarea, itself the largest neighboring town to Samaria – see *A.Z.* 11a, *Git* 56b, *B.B.* 99a, etc. For his interest in the Samaritans ('Cuthaeans'), whom he considered legitimate converts, which would link him further to some of the materials above, see *Kid* 75b.
71. *Ket* 66b and cf. *Lam R* 1.16.48. For Boethus' daughter with her proper name 'Martha,' see *Git* 56a and *Ket* 104a. For Boethus' daughter as 'Miriam,' see *Lam R* 1.16.47.
72. This 'levirite marriage' theme is important in the extreme, particularly as regards Boethus' daughter Martha's marriage to her second (or third) husband, Josephus' friend Jesus ben Gamala – see below, pp. 239-43, 341-4, etc. For the patently tendentious issue of 'levirite marriage,' raised according to Synoptics portraiture by John the Baptist vis-a-vis Herodias marriage to 'Philip,' see Matthew 14:3-4/Mark 6:17-18/and Luke 3:19. But as we have several time pointed out, Herodias did not marry 'Philip' but, by Josephus' testimony, rather another son of Herod himself called 'Herod.' Philip was married to her daughter Salome and it was he, that Josephus specifically informs us, 'died childless'; so here the issue of levirite marriage would have been appropriate. Rather, the issue here seems to have been what Qumran calls 'fornication' and 'divorce' and marrying close family cousins.
73. The point here is that it is Paul in Galatians 2:15 who makes it clear that 'Gentiles' were to be identified with 'Sinners' thereby unraveling this bit of cryptography, which could have been deduced anyhow from his

- doctrine of 'Original Sin' – but the main doctrine at Qumran is the 'Righteousness,' a Righteousness of the Law, which fairly permeates all documents there, to say nothing of its principal sage, *the Teacher of Righteousness*.'
74. *Ket* 62b–63a.
75. 1 Apoc. Jas 31.2–32–10. Of course now, with the recent discovery of the Gospel of Judas, it has been reappropriated to 'Judas' – but however this may be, one or another of these 'brother's was clearly seen as the successor at least as far as 'teaching' or 'Gnosis' was concerned.
76. See *ARN* 4 (20a) and *Git* 56a–b.
77. Cf. pp. 82–8, 131–35, etc. above and my comments on CDIII.2–4 and James 2:20–24 and 4:4.
78. *ARN* 6.3 (20b)
79. For the 'Maschil' or 'Guide' at Qumran, a title of course that develops out of the Biblical Psalms, see in particular 1QSt.1, III.13, VIII.11, etc., but in particular see CDi.7–11 about how God *visited them and caused a Root of Planting to grow* and how *'they knew that they were Sinners; i. e. John's doctrine of 'repentance from sin': 'And they were like blind men groping for the Way for twenty years (more imagery of 'the Way in the wilderness') and God considered their works (Jamesian 'works') and, because they sought him with a whole heart, He raised up for them a Teacher of Righteousness to guide them in the Way of his heart.* Here the language of the 'Guide' and, of course, that of *'being like Blind Men.'* For more on this subject see my Chapter 10: *'Every Plant which My Heavenly Father has not Planted will be Uprooted'*, pp. 256–297 below. One of the reasons we decipher both the euphemisms 'Pharisees' and 'Blind Guides,' as we shall see further below, as *'the Party of the Circumcision of James'* is because Acts 15:1–5, the prelude to *'the Jerusalem Council'*, makes it very clear (as does Paul in Galatians 1–2) that the 'some' who are *'coming down from Judea ('Jerusalem')* and saying that *'unless you are circumcised according to the custom of Moses'* and generally *'troubling'* communities, such as Paul's, were of *'the heresy of the Pharisees.'* As we have been showing above, this also represents a fundamental debate in Rabbinic Judaism of this period.
80. For *'hear and understand'* at Qumran, see for instance these very same passages in CDi.1: *'Hear all you Knowers of Righteousness (the 'Righteousness' doctrine again) and comprehend the works of God'* (the *'works'* doctrine) above and ii.2, including even the idea of *'unstopping your ears'* (cf. Mark 7:32–5 and *pars.* where Jesus cures a deaf and dumb man by *'sticking his fingers in his ears'* and *'spitting on his tongue.'* In Mark, this directly follows his explanation of the *'toilet bowl'* Parable below and the *'Greek Syrophenician woman'* and *'the dogs under the table'* episode and several allusions to *'he who has ears, let him hear.'* In 8:23, after explaining the meaning of his having *'filled'* the baskets, he *'spits into the eyes of a blind man'* – thus!).
81. Matthew 15.20 adds for good measure, *'eating with unwashed hands does not defile the man'*, for him the original issue of the *'Parable'*, while Mark 7:19 makes it clear the point of the whole exercise – reflecting Pauline doctrine in 1 Corinthians 8–11 – was *'to declare all foods clean'*, a point of which Peter was presumably unaware in the *'Heavenly Tablecloth'* episode of Acts 10:14–5.
82. John 11:39: *'he already stinks for it is four days'* (since he has been in the tomb). Here *'Martha'* is described as *'the sister of him who had died.'* Of course, in Luke 16:20's version of Matthew and Mark's *'dogs under the table'* episode, Lazarus (who is portrayed as *'a certain Poor Man... full of sores, desiring to be filled'*) was not yet dead, nor did he have a sister named *'Martha'*; likewise in Luke 10:38–42's version of the *'Martha'* events, only this time she does not have a brother called *'Lazarus'* – only a *'house'* and a sister called *'Mary'* (*'Miriam'*)! Of course, Martha's complaint in John 11:21–22: *'whatever you ask of God, I know He will give it to you'*, reflects almost word-for-word what the Jewish crowd requests of Honi in both *Tāranith* and Josephus, as well as by implication, what Simeon ben Shetah considers God's opinion of Honi to be.
83. One admits the dizzying quality of all this, but this is what the New Testament writers depended on to mystify and overwhelm the untutored. It is important to keep one's eyes on the different usage of *'cask'* and *'flask'* as well as these to *'very precious ointment': 'spikenard ointment of great value'*, and *'alabaster'* when following the path of dependency and variation. Mostly in these episodes, it is *'Judas Iscariot'* (literally *'Judas of Simon Iscariot'*) or *'the Disciples'/ 'they'* doing the *'complaining'* as in John 12:4–7 or Matthew 26:6–13/Mark 14:3–9. Of course, the switches from *'Simon Iscariot'* to *'Simon the Pharisee'* to *'Simon the Leper'* and the constant shell-game going on about the location *'Bethany'* and whose *'house'* it really is – bearing in mind what I have already said above – are a good joke. In John 12:3, of course, it is *'a litre of pure spikenard ointment of great value'* – *'litra'* to appear later in John's picture of Jesus' burial scenario. For its part, to bring all these usages full circle, Luke 7:37 just keeps *'alabaster flask of ointment.'*
84. All these allusions to *'reclining'* are very important and imply in the Greco-Roman-Etruscan style *'dining'* or *'eating.'* This, for instance, is how Josephus depicts Agrippa II as *'reclining'* presumably with his dinner guests on the balcony of his palace overlooking the Temple courtyard and the sacrifices in the all important episode involving the Temple Wall preceding the death of James immediate cause – that is, *'he was reclining and eating while he (and his guests – some of whom presumably 'uncircumcised') gazed on everything being done in the Temple'; Ant.* 20.189–96.
85. Even I am becoming confused here. One

- should have said ‘*Miriam the daughter of Nakdimon ben Gurion*’ – ARN 6.3 (20b), but it is the theme of levirate marriage here regarding both characters which causes the confusion. Boethus’ daughter Martha was also actually was awaiting such permission to marry Josephus’ friend Jesus b. Gamala as noted above. For another version of this tradition regarding Nakdimon’s daughter, see Lam R 1.16.48 and Ket 66b above (repeated in 65a as if it is rather his, that is, ‘*Nakdimon’s daughter-in-law*’). It is in Lam R 1.16.47, preceding this, that Boethus’ daughter like Nakdimon’s is called ‘*Miriam*’ and here the statement is made that ‘*the rabbis granted her two se’ah of wine daily*’, that is while she was awaiting the decision of the *levir*. For traditions incorporating ‘*Martha*’s proper name, see Git 56a and Ket. 104a above. Still, the mix-ups here between the two are widespread and not just because, so often, both are called ‘*Miriam*’ or ‘*Mary*’. In fact, it is the subject of being a ‘*widow*’ and awaiting the decision of the ‘*levir*’ that seems to make it clear we often speaking about ‘*Martha*’ – unless both were ‘*widows*’. Plus, it is not clear which of these two survived the fall of the Temple. At one point, as we shall see, ‘*Martha*’ seems to die in the famine in Jerusalem during the Roman siege; but other traditions imply that she was alive and met a tragic fate afterwards. Nakdimon’s daughter ‘*Miriam*’ does seem to died under terrible stress after the fall of Jerusalem. What is incontestable is that both are clearly well-known enough to have become proverbial – so well-known, in fact, as to have provided a template for Gospel writers, particularly John.
86. See, for instance, 1QpHabx.9 and CDIV. 19–20 and VIII.13, where ‘*the Man of Lying*’ actually is called ‘*the Mattif*’ (from the verb ‘*hittif*’) or ‘*Pourer out of Lying*’ otherwise known as ‘*the Spouter of Lying*’. This is another instance where more precise translations can help precisify possible connections, reformulations, or refurbishments.
87. CDi.14–15. The verb here is ‘*hittif*’, the root of ‘*Mattif*’, making it clear precisely what the ‘*the Man of Lying*’ or ‘*Jesting*’ was actually doing – ‘*removing the boundary markers which the First*’ or ‘*Forefathers had set out as their inheritance*’, i. e., the Mosaic *Torah*. The allusion to ‘*choosing the fair neck*’, which so parallels Jesus’ statement in Luke 10:42 that ‘*Mary has chosen the good part*’, occurs in i.19 and means in this context, ‘*choosing the easiest way*’.
88. This is how it is stated in Mark 14:24 also; in Luke 22:20, this is ‘*poured out for you*’, but cf. CDi.14–15 above on the rise of ‘*the Scoffer*’ or ‘*Comedian who poured over Israel the waters of Lying*.’
- ing’ of this kind is an important infraction. In the first place in CD.III.7–14, ‘*murmuring in their tents*’ (i.e., ‘*in the wilderness*’) against ‘*the Voice of their Maker and the Commandments of their Teachers*’ (i.e., the Mosaic Law) is an severe offence and is to be contrasted with ‘*holding fast to the Commandments of God*’. It ‘*kindles the Wrath of God against their Assembly*’ (in Greek, ‘*Church*’ / ‘*Ecclesia*’) and ‘*because of it their Kings were cut off*’, their *Mighty Ones perished*, ‘*their Land became desolate*’, and ‘*they were delivered up to the sword*’. In 1QSVI–VII, where there is much attention paid to ‘*speaking rudely or impatiently*’ (vi.25–6), ‘*slandering the brother*’ and, worse, ‘*slandering the Mary*’ (vii.15–6), ‘*murmuring against the Foundation*’ or ‘*Leadership of the Community*’ (the meaning is unclear here, but it can be intuited) is punishable by expulsion without possibility of return; ‘*murmuring against one’s fellow without justification*’ is only punishable by ‘*six months penance*.’
2. We have already examined the historicity of ‘*Stephen*’; cf. above, pp. 6–12 and *James the Brother of Jesus*, pp. 606–14. In our view ‘*Stephen*’ is a deliberate fictionalization based on the attack on the Roman Emperor’s ‘*Servant Stephen*’ in this period (note the idea of ‘*servant*’ here) in Josephus and covering up the attack by Paul on James (H.–J. Schoeps was the first to suggest this) in the Pseudoclementine *Recognitions*. One should note that ‘*the stoning of Stephen*’ c. 44–5 CE in Acts is an actual transposition of ‘*the stoning of James*’ in 62 CE in Josephus.
3. See, for instance, Paul in 2 Corinthians 10:12–12:11, who is very upset about the Jerusalem ‘*Super Apostles*’ who are undoing his work in the *Diaspora*, particularly as regards the unnecessary of attachment to the Mosaic Law and ‘*circumcision*’ and even includes allusion to the fact that he ‘*does not Lie*’: ‘*Hebrews are they? So am I. Israelites are they? So am I. The seed of Abraham are they? So am I...but I have worked harder*’, etc., etc.
4. See Ket 62b–63a (here note is one of the episodes where ‘*Rachel falls upon her face and kisses his feet*’), Ned 50a, ARN 4.5 and 6.1 (20a–b), etc.
5. CDxx.17–22. One should pay particular attention to the fact that this is addressed to ‘*the Penitents from Sin in*’ or ‘*of Jacob*’ (James?) ‘*who kept the Covenant of God*’, that is they were ‘*Shomrei ha-Brit*’ or ‘*Keepers of the Mosaic Covenant*’, the definition of ‘*the Sons of Zadok*’ in the Community Rule. Here, too, each is instructed ‘*to speak to his neighbor strengthening his brother to support their steps in the Way of God*’ – a variation on James 2:8’s ‘*Royal Law of Scripture*’ (the *First Love Commandment*); plus n.b., the variation on ‘*the Way in the wilderness*’ terminology. This ends with the promise from Exodus 20:6 that ‘*He does Mercy to the thousands of them that love him*’ (the second of the two *Love Commandments* – cf. James 2:5 on ‘*the Kingdom promised to those that Love Him*’) and his

Chapter 9

1. At Qumran, one should note that ‘*mummur-*

- Keepers for a thousand generations* – again the language of ‘*the Shomrei ha-Brit*’). This is from Ms. B. The same promise is made in vii.4–6 of Ms. A.
6. *Ket.* 66b–67a.
 7. *Haeres.* 78.14.1
 8. *Commentary on Galatians* 1:19 above. This tradition is more or less repeated in b. *Tā’an* 23b in regard to Honi’s grandson, ‘*Hanin*,’ a contemporary of either John the Baptist or James, or both, and here it is the ‘*school children*’ who are substituted for ‘*the People of Jerusalem*’ or the ‘*little children*,’ who as here in Jerome’s tradition, ‘*take hold of the hem of his garment*’ or ‘*his fringes*.’
 9. Aside from the general thrust of the Gospels to give the impression that Jerusalem fell because of the death of Jesus (counter-indicated in Origen, Eusebius, Jerome, *et. al.*), the several pictures of the proclamation of the ‘*coming of the Heavenly Host upon the clouds of Heaven*,’ and the alleged charge against him of ‘*blasphemy*’ (there was no ‘*blasphemy*’ where ‘*Jesus*’ was concerned even in the portrait of the Gospels (which involved pronouncing the forbidden Name of God – unless it be the Honi-like infraction: ‘*speaking to God as a son*’); there was the unique portrait in the Synoptics of ‘*the Devil taking Jesus* and ‘*placing him upon the wing*’ or ‘*Pinnacle of the Temple*’ and ‘*tempting him*’ to ‘*cast himself down*’ (*katabale*) – here the ‘*casting*’ language of all of the James’ death scenarios as well as that of the attack by Paul on James in the Pseudoclementine *Recognitions*. ‘*Jesus*’ response is, of course, the typically wise-guy ‘*You shall not tempt the Lord your God*’ (Matthew 4:5–7 and *pars.* – the reader should not worry about my approach here. *None of these things ever happened!* This is what I have tried to explain as ‘*literature*’ not ‘*history*’).
 10. See, for instance, Matthew 8:2–15, 9:20–31, 14:35–36, and 20:30–34, Mark 3:10–12, 6:55–56, and 8:22–26, Luke 5:12–15, 6:19, 7:1–17, etc. and *pars.*).
 11. 1QpHabxi.4–8. This is, of course, one of the most famous and most labored over passages in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Not only does it contain the ‘*swallowing*’ language and imagery, it also contains both that of ‘*casting down*’ (‘*causing to stumble*’) and ‘*his House of Exile*’ which we shall explain in great detail, below pp. 781–815 and 829–39. It should also be appreciated that, if the ‘*blasphemy*’ trial of James – as reported by Josephus in *Ant.* 20.200–202 – had to do with his entering the Holy of Holies and pronouncing the forbidden Name of God, then this too occurred on *Yom Kippur* (*Yom ha-Kippurim* – the Day of the Atonements in the Habakkuk *Pesher*) and its aftermath.
 12. Lam. R 1.16.47. Though she is called here ‘*Miriam the daughter of Boethus*,’ this must be ‘*Martha the daughter of Boethus*,’ since the matter again clearly involves awaiting the decision of the *levir* in order to marry, Josephus’ friend, Jesus ben Gamala. Here the mix-up in Rabbinic literature between ‘*Miriam*’ and ‘*Martha*’ become patent.
 13. In this same section, for instance, Lam. R 1.16.50 quotes Zechariah 14:4 about how God Himself, whose ‘*feet will stand on that Day upon the Mount of Olives*,’ will take the field against all the Nations after already having recounted how R. Eleazar b. Zadok applied the passage from Deuteronomy 28:56–7 concerning ‘*the tender and delicate woman...who would not set the sole of her feet upon the ground*’ (1.16.47). In the second tradition attributed to R. Eleazar b. Zadok (also quoted in *Ket.* 67a below), where he rather quotes Song of Songs 1.8 and sees her ‘*picking barley corns at Acco*,’ there ‘*the feet*’ are ‘*horses’ hoofs*’ or ‘*feet*’ For *Git* 56a, in a particularly graphic episode which we shall also have occasion to note further below, *Martha the daughter of Boethus*’ (this time the designation is correct) dies during the siege of Jerusalem because she wanted ‘*some fine flour*’ and, when her servant could find none, she ‘*took off her shoes*’ and went out on the street herself, whereupon ‘*some dung*’ (‘*dung*’ will be an ongoing theme) *stuck to her foot and she died*’ (*sic*). Here the passage from Deuteronomy 28:56–57 is rather applied, as we shall see, by R. Yohanan. For *Ket.* 66b–67a, as we shall see as well, it is Nakdimon b. Gurion, ‘*for whose feet woollen clothes were spread, when he walked from his home to the House of Study, which the Poor who followed behind him, then rolled up*.’ This will not be to mention all these ‘*hair-wiping*’ and ‘*foot-kissing*’ episodes in both Gospels and Talmudic literature, already alluded to above and which we shall have occasion to analyse further below. Of course, for Luke 16:21’s ‘*Poor Lazarus under the table*,’ the proverbial ‘*dogs*’ don’t ‘*come and lick his*’ feet, but only rather ‘*his sores*’!
 14. *Ket.* 67a above. This theme of ‘*the Poor*’ will appear over and over again.
 15. Matthew 19:24/Mark 10:25. Of course, the words ‘*Glory*’ and ‘*Glorified*’ appear throughout the Gospels, but the main ‘*glorifying*’ and ‘*glorify*’ appear in Paul – 1 Corinthians 1:31, 5:6, 6:20, 9:15, 10:17; 2 Corinthians 3:7–11, 4:4, 7:4, 9:13, 12:11; Romans 1:17, 8:21, Galatians 1:24, etc. By the same token, see 1QpHabx.10–12 on ‘*the worthless city built upon blood and the Assembly*’ or ‘*Church erected by the Spouter of Lying upon Lying, tiring out (the) Many with a worthless service for the sake of his Glory*.’ One should also note that in *Tā’an* 20a, when Nakdimon allegedly enters the Temple, wraps himself in his cloak, and makes rain; he does so ‘*not for his own Glory nor the Glory of his father’s house, but for (God’s) Glory*.’
 16. As an example of this kind of thing, one should see the way the Man–God or God Dionysus is treated or demands to be treated in Euripides’ *Bacchae* – but this is only one example among many.
 17. See *War* 2.122–23, but also see CDxiii.11–13 on the duties of the Mebakker or Overseer on the matter of property.
 18. There are so many ‘*Ananias*’ es in Josephus

- that it is difficult to count them all. Of particular interest is the 'Jesus son of Ananias,' we cited at the beginning of this book. Also interesting is the 'Ananias' instrumental in the conversion of Queen Helen's household and her favorite son Izates – who in Eusebius is the courier between Jesus and he King in Northern Syria. Where 'Sapphira' is concerned, there are two characters that come to mind – the first is 'Jesus son of Sapphias,' the Leader of the Galilean boatmen and the Party of the Poor on the Sea of Galilee. They poured out their blood until the whole sea ran red. The second is 'Judas Sepphoraeus' who seems to have been the prototype for 'Judas the Galilean' and started the disturbances in Galilee at the end of Herod's life. The reason I call attention to these parallels is because, obviously, none of these things really actually ever happened, anymore than did the 'foot-cleaning'/'hair-wiping' or 'sore-licking' episodes I have already cited above and will cite further below – to say nothing of 'spitting' in someone's eyes or ears or recommending 'eating with unwashed hands' or 'declaring all foods clean,' all the product of Hellenistic 'Mystery-cult' Religion and popular literature or superstition.
19. *Epistle of Peter to James* 5.1.
 20. *Ibid.*, 4.1. For 'the Fountain of Living Waters' at Qumran and, in particular, related to 'the New Covenant in the Land of Damascus,' see CDIII.16–17 and VIII.22–23 and Chapters 21–22 below; for baptism or 'immersion' see 1QSIII.4–9 and IV.20–23, etc.
 21. *Ibid.*, 4.2.
 22. For this kind of language at Qumran, see 1QSIX.3–6, CDVII.4–6, XV.19–20, 1QMVII.5–7, XII.1–10, etc.; of course, the language of 'keeping the Covenant' at Qumran is intrinsic and occurs throughout but, in particular, it is the definition of 'the Sons of Zadok' in 1QSV.2–5 and 8–14 and CDIII.2–20, VIII.1–2 (on 'breaking the Covenant'), XX.17–18, etc.
 23. In particular, see Paul in Galatians 1:20, 2 Corinthians 11:31, and if one wishes from the Pastorals, 1 Timothy 2:7, 4:2, etc.
 24. *Epistle of Peter to James* 4.5
 25. Matthew 26:21–5/Mark 14:18–21.
 26. The 'delivering up' in Hebrew, as we have over and over again emphasized in our works, is an important usage and concept at Qumran, but there it generally means 'being delivered up to the sword' or 'Divine Vengeance' as a result of Communal or historical infractions based on 'backsliding from' and/or not observing 'the Law' ('the Mosaic Law') in as clear-cut and 'Faithful' manner as necessary, not 'delivering up' or 'betraying' (as the case may be) the Messiah Jesus – cf. CDI.4–6, I.17–8, VII.13, etc.
 27. Perhaps the best discussion of this kind of censorship is to be found in Robert Eisler's *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist*, pp. 49–112, London/New York, 1931 with numerous examples and illustrations with particular reference to 'the *Testimonium Flavianum*.'
 28. CDV.6–18. This is a key passage for it explains how the Establishment 'pollutes the Temple,' i. e., because 'they do not separate according to the *Tôrâh*' (i. e., between 'clean' and 'unclean,' 'Holy and profane') and 'they lie with a woman during the blood of her period and each man takes (to wife) the daughter of his brother and the daughter of his sister.' Of course, this can be no other Establishment than 'the Herodian' as I have explained in the Appendix to *JJHP*, pp. 85–94. Other evidences of this concern over 'blood' (as in James' directives to Overseas Communities in Acts 15:21–29 in CDIII.6–6: 'they ate blood and their males were cut off in the wilderness' ascribing the length of the 'wilderness sojourn' after the Exodus to this, and 1QpHabx.5–12, attacking 'the Spouter of Lying (Paul?) for leading Many astray' and 'building a Worthless City upon Blood and erecting an Assembly ('Church') upon Lying for the sake of his Glory, tiring out Many with a Worthless Service and instructing them in works of Lying so that their 'Amal would count for nothing.')
 29. See Matthew 14:13–21, 15:28–16:12, Mark 6:32–44, 8:14–21, etc. and below, pp. 271–80, 298–99, 406–10, and variously.
 30. As should be clear, as in Biblical Naomi and Ruth episode, 'the *Levir*' must give his permission for the new marriage – an idea which seems to have percolated into the John the Baptist episodes in the Synoptics (though it is nowhere stated in so many words, though this is the popular view – only that John 'objected' on the basis that she had been his 'brother's wife'), where John is presented in the Synoptics as raising the issue in the remarriage of Herodias to a second of her ulcers (i. e., both the 'divorce' and 'forbidden marriage with a niece' issues outlined in the Damascus Document above) even though levirate marriage would appear to have nothing to do with the situation (Matthew 14:3–5/Mark 6:17–18/Luke 3:18) – see, for instance, Ket 65a which specifically says that 'the Rabbis granted the daughter-in-law of Nakdimon ben Gurion a weekly allowance of two se'ahs of wine for her spice puddings' because 'she was a woman awaiting the decision of the levir.' In ARN 6.3 (21a) now it is 'the daughter of Nakdimon ben Gurion' and 'she needs a Tyrian Gold Dinar every Sabbath (i. e., 'weekly') just for her spice puddings.' Moreover the comment is added: 'she was then a childless widow awaiting the decision of her brother-in-law (the levir); but in Lam. R 1.16.47–48 above, this is 'Miriam the daughter of Boethus' (sic) as we have seen and now the allowance is rather 'two se'ahs of wine daily' (not 'weekly') because her husband, Josephus' friend Jesus b. Gamala had died! This moves right into the story about 'Miriam the daughter of Nakdimon' and her 'allowance of five hundred golden dinars daily just for her perfume basket' (retold in Ket 66b above). That it is clearly 'Martha' that is so intended in terms of the permission of 'the *Levir*,' if not the widow's allowance, is made clear in

- Yeb.* 61a and *Yom* 18a, where the story of how she bribed the Rabbis to allow how to marry Jesus b. Gamala is told.
31. ARN 6.3 (21a).
 32. *Ket* 66b and *Lam. R.* 1.16.48 above. In *Ketuboth* it is 'four hundred gold dinars daily' while in *Lamentations Rabbah*, it is 'five hundred'.
 33. *Git* 56a,
 34. The plaque in this tomb is nicely described in N. Avigad's article in *Jerusalem Revealed*, ed. Y. Yadin, Jerusalem, 1975, p. 18. There, the names on it make it clear that this is the family of the Boethusians from Egypt who, in fact, were making 'Bnei Hezi' Priestly claims (cf. Nehemiah 10:20) – therefore the name accorded this tomb. Herod imported this clan, which was therefore absolutely beholden to him and the Establishment he created, from Egypt at the end of the previous century after executing his Maccabean wife, the first 'Marianne' / 'Miriam' / or 'Mary' (See *Ant.* 15.320–2), and marrying the second – the 'Boethus' daughter' of a earlier generation – again named 'Marianne' or 'Mary'. Perhaps it is from this that the mix-up between the two names 'Miriam' and 'Martha' stems – not to become too obsessed with it, though John's Gospel clearly is and Luke, to some extent as well. The other two Gospels, clearly, don't even seem to know that these two persons even exist. The traditions regarding the 'casting down' of James or the 'fall' he is pictured as having taken took from 'the Pinnacle of the Temple' or 'the Temple steps' can be found, as we have seen, in Eusebius' *E.H.* 2.1.4, 2.23.18, Jerome's *Vir. ill.* 2, Epiphanius' *Haeres.* 78.14.5–6, and *Ps. Rec.* 1.70.
 35. See *James*, p.p. 455–56.
 36. See above p. 237 and n. 30. The relevant Synoptic passages are: Matthew 14:3–5/ Mark 6:17–18. One should also remark that this is the first 'Joseph and Mary' story. For Herod's execution of his sister's husband 'Joseph' seemingly for adultery with 'Marianne' and the tragic story ultimately of his execution of her as well, see *War* 1.441–43 and *Ant.* 15.64–95 and 202–39 (which for some reason tells the story somewhat less harshly).
 37. *Ant.* 18.136–7. This fact alone undermines the main points of this particular New Testament scenario as, not only secondary, but inaccurate as well despite the attempts by manifold apologists to rescue it by claiming Herod had two sons named 'Philip' and that the 'Herod' who was Herodias' original husband was, in fact, named 'Philip' as well. Notwithstanding, the attempts to which such persons are willing to go to impart historicity to such clearly-damaged narratives often strain credulity.
 38. Of course, it is patently absurd to think that anyone connected to this 'Herod' could have been a members of Paul's incipient 'Antioch Community' – or is it? See above pp. 16–22 and *James*, pp. 98–99, 560–63, and 874 for 'Manaen's' probably mix-up with Paul's associate 'Ananias'.
 39. For these matters, see CDiv.20–v.11, but also the proscriptions in the Temple Scroll, LVII.15–20 on the 'King' having one and only one wife, not divorcing her, and not taking a wife from among the Gentiles and LXVI.15–17 for the general ban on 'niece marriage,' which the Herodians did so promiscuously – but even more germane than any of this, the very words attributed to John the Baptist in Matthew and Mark: 'It is forbidden to take to wife the wife of one's brother and uncover the nakedness of one's brother, the son of his father or the son of his mother. It is unclean.'
 40. This is to be found in ARN 6.3 (21a), but also see *Lam. R.* 1.16.47–48 above.
 41. The 'Tyre and Sidon' references are, of course, to be found in Matthew 15:21/ Mark 7:24 and 31 – in the latter both introducing and following the curing of the Canaanite/Greek Syrophoenician woman's daughter episode. This too is not so surprising as in all contexts – Gospel, Rabbinic, Early Church – the subject is a woman of one kind or another, usually extravagant, but also suffering from 'uncleaness' or an 'unclean spirit.' In Luke 6:17, it is displaced and comes just following the call of the Apostles and just before the first highly-circumscribed version of Matthew's 'Sermon on the Mount' but, interestingly enough, still in the context of 'healing those with unclean spirits' (thus!). The other 'Tyre and Sidon' references are those in Matthew 11:21–2 and *pars.*, condemning Israel and claiming that if 'mighty works' of this kind had been done there, their inhabitants would long ago have believed! But, of course, an obvious truism, since these were not the kinds of 'mighty works' the inhabitants of Judea and Jews in the surrounding areas were expecting. The 'mighty works' they were expecting are better described in the War Scroll from Qumran.
 42. For the 'Tyre' reference in the Simon Magus stories, see above, p. 202 and especially n. 28 – the first of which would appear to be Irenaeus, *Ad. Haer.* 1.23.2, but also a host of others including Hippolytus 6.15.
 43. This is the Judas Iscariot 'betrayal' or 'delivering up' scene in Matthew 27:3–9.
 44. This is *Ket.* 65a but in *Lam. R.* 1.16.47, where 'carpets were laid from the door of her house to the entrance of the Temple so her feet should not be exposed' so she could 'see her husband Jesus b. Gamala reading on the Day of Atonement,' it should be recalled, this was 'Miriam (Martha) the daughter of Boethus'.
 45. This is a position we have reiterated in all our works from MZCQ to JJHP to *James the Brother of Jesus*. For the clear allusion to 'taking Vengeance' for what had been done to 'the Priest' (meaning 'the High Priest'), 'the Righteous Teacher,' see 1QpPs 37II.20 and IV.9–10. The 'paying him his reward' language repeats in 1QpHabXII.2–3 – to say nothing of the picture of James' death in Early Church literature and the quotation there

- of Isaiah 3:10-11 – but here it is for the destruction with which *‘he rewarded the Poor, the name of course of James’ Congregation and ‘the Congregation’/‘Church’* to which almost the whole of the *Peshet* on Psalm 37 is directed. For further analysis, see pp. 780-86 and 804-15 below. For the horrifying circumstances of the deaths of Jesus b. Gamala and Ananus at the hands of *‘the Violent Ones of the Gentiles’*, i.e., Josephus’ *‘Idumaeans’*; see *War* 4.315-25.
46. *Ket*. 65a and *Lam. R* 1.16.48 above. The point is that in the former case, the Rabbis are talking about her *‘two se’ahs of wine daily and ‘her sweetmeats’ or ‘spice puddings’*; in the latter, her *‘five hundred gold dinars daily to be spent on her perfume box.’*
47. *Lam. R* 1.16.47.
48. *Git* 56a. The picture of R. Zadok here is excruciating. *Git* 56b explains how he was restored. No Asclepius-type miraculous cures or the like here. The opposite.
49. *Lam. R* 1.16.48. These *‘barley corns’* or *‘grain’* themes will also reappear in both *ARN* 6.3 (20b-21a) and *Git* 56a *‘Rich Men feeding Jerusalem’* traditions. Of course, we also have similar references in the *‘Jesus’* feeding *‘the Multitudes’* materials in Matthew 14-16 and Mark 6-8.
50. *Ket* 67a and cf. *Lam. R* 1.16.48 above.
51. *Ket* 66b.
52. *ARN* 6.3 (21a). Here again, one should note both the *‘grain’* and *‘dung’* motifs so typical of these Rabbinic accounts. Of course, where the motif of *‘loaves’* in the Gospels is concerned, one has only to note the *‘feeding’* episodes in Matthew 14-16/Mark 6-8 above, but also Luke 9:13-16 and John 6:9-26.
53. *Ibid.* For the burning of the stores episode in Josephus, see *War* 5.24-26 and cf. Tacitus, *Histories* 5.12. For the Talmudic description of such *‘Mourners for Zion who vow not to eat or drink until they have seen the Temple rebuilt,’* see *B. B.* 60b. Also see Benjamin of Tudela, *Travels*, Year 1165, where somewhere in the North Yemen area of Arabia, he claims to see thousands of Jewish *‘Rechabites,’* as he calls them, *‘living in caves and continually fasting,’* being *‘Mourners for Zion’* and *‘Jerusalem’*. But even earlier in these notices in *ARN* about R. Yohanan and Vespasian (4.5 (20a), Yohanan seems to start the tradition of *‘Mourning for Zion’* – viz., *‘When R. Yohanan ben Zachai heard that Jerusalem was destroyed and the Temple in flames, he tore his clothing and his Disciples tore their clothes (note again, R. Yohanan has ‘Disciples’ as well as ‘Jesus’) and they wept, crying aloud and mourning.’* For Talmudic discouragement of such behaviour, which was seen as a form of *‘Naziritism’* (i. e., *‘Rechabitism’*), see *Tā’an* 11a, *Naz* 19a, and *Ned* 10a and 77b. Further to this tradition about the bravery of Jerusalem’s defenders and the extremity of their hunger, *ARN* 6.3 (21a) also provides a tradition about how those stationed on the walls would promise, if given five dates to behead five of Vespasian’s men. When given them, they would go down and capture five heads of the men from Vespasian’s army.
54. *Ket* 66b-67a. It is important to note these references to *‘the Poor,’* which will not only resonate with both the Dead Sea Scrolls and the members of James’ Community – called *‘the Poor’* – but also the complaint of *‘Judas of Simon Iscariot’* (i. e., *‘Simon the Zealot’* – cf. the Apostle lists in Luke 6:15 and Acts 1:13), as we shall enumerate it below in John 12:3-6 when he sees Martha’s sister Mary *‘taking a litre of pure spike-nard ointment of great value’* and *‘anointing Jesus’ feet and wiping his feet with her hair’* (thus!).
55. *Ket* 104a
56. See n. 45 above and *War* 4.315-25.
57. See the picture plates nos. 102-103 and *War* 4.1-83. For Judas’ *‘Gaulonite’* origins, despite his *‘Galilean’* cognomen, and specifically Gamala on the Gaulon, see *Ant.* 18.4.
58. *ARN* 6.1 (20b). It should not go unremarked that this is followed by reference to the same *‘little children’* we shall so often encounter with regard to *‘Jesus’* person and activities, viz.: *‘and if they plead, “Because of our little children,” it should be replied, “Did not R. Akiba have many sons and daughters...?”* Interesting too, this is followed by the statement that *‘he (R. Akiba) was forty years old when he began to study Torah and, by the end of thirteen years, he taught Torah in public.’* The timeframe in this second clause is not unlike Luke 2:46’s picture of *‘Jesus’* teaching the elders in the Temple at the age of *‘twelve’* (we all know that in the *Vita* 9, Josephus claims that he was only *‘fourteen’* when those learned in the Law came to consult him about points of *Torah!*). Furthermore, preceding this in *ARN*, R. Akiba’s training at the feet of R. Eliezer b. Hyrcanus and R. Joshua (probably at Lydda – a tradition attributed to R. Simeon b. Eleazar), is compared to *‘a stone mason’s uprooting a mountain in order to cast it into the Jordan by chipping away at it to bring it down to the size.’* This is followed by how, because of this, R. Akiba was able *‘to bring the hidden things to light,’* all usages with particular import when it comes to looking at parallels regarding *‘Jesus’* in Mark 6-8, Matthew 14-16, etc.
59. It is perhaps germane to point out that where such *‘plots’* or *‘plotting’* is concerned, it is perhaps Paul’s biography more than any other that reflects this (cf. Acts 23:12ff. on how *‘the Jews made a plot, putting themselves under a curse, saying that they would neither eat or drink until they had killed Paul’* – here, of course, not only the language of *‘plotting,’* but also the *‘Nazirite’* language of *‘putting themselves under an oath’* and the all-important allusion to *‘not eating or drinking’* regarding such *‘terrorist’* Nazirite behaviour), not to mention the *‘plotting’* that had to have occurred between Agrippa II and the High Priest Ananus to destroy James. Where this latter is concerned, one should note the language, we shall explore further below, of

- '*zaman*'/'*zammu*' in 1QpHabxii.6 relating to the 'judicial conspiracy' or 'plot to destroy' the Righteous Teacher and his followers among 'the Poor' (also known as 'the Simple of Judah doing Torah') and its reflection in 1QHiv.7ff. referring to 'the Sons of Belial' (probably 'the Herodians') and their 'nets.'
60. We have emphasized this 'do' or 'doing,' meaning 'works of the Torah,' at both Qumran and in the Letter of James in all our work – see, for instance, in *James*, pp. 277–8, 302–308, 854–56, etc. and below, pp. 861–82 and 899–910. One should not ignore the fact that the allusion to 'why are you troubling this woman'/'leave her alone. Why are you troubling her' in Matthew 26:13 and Mark 14:6 is a direct reflection – nay, even a borrowing – from Paul's position on 'circumcision' in Galatians 5:6–14 (ending with the facetious evocation of James' 'Love Commandment' no less): 'You were running well (cf. the material on 'nun-ning' in the Habakkuk Peshet)...but (omin-ously) he who is troubling you shall bear the Judgement' (though slightly different vocabulary, cf. too Galatians 1:7, 5:12, and 6:17) notwithstanding that in Matthew and Mark we are simply dealing with something so trifling as anointing his head 'with an alabas-ter cask' or 'flask of very precious spikenard oint-ment' not 'circumcision or uncircumcision' as in Paul – but this is the way of the Gospel ar-tificers.
61. This 'Memorial' or 'Remembrance' is, of course, directly referred to at the end of the Damascus Document (xx.18–20), where 'God-fearing' or 'God-Fearers' are twice specifically evoked but now, not in the context, of antagonism to the Law, but in that of direct tutelage to observe it – see below, pp. 663–715 and 974–88. In this context, too, one should not forget to remark the allusion in Ps. Rec. 1.71 in the context of the miraculous 'whitening' of the tombs of two of the brothers, demonstrating 'that our brethren were held in Remembrance before God.'
62. CDi.1 and II.1.
63. Here the 'touching,' Elchasaite 'Great Power,' and Asclepius-like 'healing' language is, as usual, remarkable but, also, should one choose to regard it – though once again expressed in slightly different vocabulary in the Greek – the 'troubling' language of Paul in Galatians 1:7, 5:10, 5:12, and 6:17 above. Of course, if this does have any relevance, then it truly comes in an extremely comical yet telling context, i. e., that of the 'healing of unclean spirits' once again. Here, it is the 'clean' vs. the 'unclean' aspect of the language which is determinant.
64. Where this imagery of 'house' is concerned, one should note – again, should one choose to regard it – the 'house' imagery in the Damascus Document (III.19–20: 'and He built a House of Faith for them in Israel which has never stood from ancient times until now' and the all-important xx.10–13: 'the House of the Torah,' repeated two times, as opposed to 'the House of Peleg'/'the House of Separation': xx.22), not to mention Paul's equally important 'House' imagery in 1 Corinthians 3:9–17.
65. Matthew 15:22/Mark 7:26. When considering this 'Greek Syrophenician'/'Canaanite woman' on the 'borders'/'coasts of Tyre and Sidon,' one should not forget the whole tradition of Simon Magus taking his 'mistress'/'Queen' out of a brothel there; and, where 'the dogs' or 'little dogs' are concerned, the connections with Queen Helen's 'Zealotism' (that is, 'kuon'/'kunarion' with 'Canaanean'/'Kanna'im'). Any who would claim the Gospels are unaware of Queen Helen of Adiabene should have regard for Luke 7:11–16's account of Jesus' with a 'touch' resurrecting (note the usual 'coming,' 'standing,' and 'touching' language here) the 'only-begotten son of the widow of Nain' (of course, not only is Izates called Helen's 'only-begotten' in Josephus, but the non-existent 'Nain' is easily recognized as but a contraction of 'Adiabene'). This episode also not only ends with the crowd as usual 'glorifying God' but crying out 'God has visited His People.' This is the same 'Visitation' language that permeates the Damascus Document – see below, pp. 607–36, 675–80, and variously.
66. See *Ant.* 18.4–10, 18.23–25, and *War* 2.18; for the rise of 'the Sicarii' derivative from them and their mass suicide at Masada, see *War* 2.254–57, 7.253–62, and *Ant.* 20.186.
67. We consider the so-called 'Zealot'/'Sicarii' ('Christian')? and 'Messianic' Movements to be identical or synonymous, because of the notice at the end of Josephus' *Jewish War* explaining the fall of the Temple in terms of various signs and prophecies, in which he admits that 'the thing which most inspired the Jews to go to war (with Rome) was an ambiguous prophecy from among their sacred writings (he calls it 'ambiguous' because 'some applied it to one of their own,' but others like himself and R. Yohanan b. Zacchai obsequiously applied it to the rise of Vespasian) that one from their own country would arise to rule the whole habitable Earth' (*War* 6.312–13 above) – see *James*, pp. 171–2, 251–4, 417–19, 678–84, and variously.
68. See, in particular, the many scenes of this kind in Euripides' *Bacchae*, p. 252 and n. 73 below and the kind of respect the Man-God Dionysus is demanding even in disguise from the people of Thebes and the vengeance his followers enact when he does not receive it; for another good example of this kind, see the scene on the huge relief from the Temple of Hathor at Dendera in Egypt, where the famous Cleopatra and her son by Caesar, Caesarion, are depicted as showing just this kind of awe and respect before personalized depictions of the Gods Isis and Horis (and possibly a miniature of Osiris). There are many depictions of this kind in Egyptian tomb paintings and wall reliefs, as there are in many of the seats of Hellenistic Mystery Religions generally.
69. *War* 2.427.

70. For additional 'House' imagery in the Scrolls – this time 'the House of the Torah' – see above, n. 64 and CDxx.10-13.
71. This is how Origen – who himself seems to have mutilated himself as a 'Sicarius' (see Jerome, Letter 84 to Pammachius and Oceanus below, mocking Origen's attempt to make himself 'a eunuch for the Kingdom of Heaven') – uses the term in *Contra Celsus* 2.13.
72. According to Dio Cassius 68.3-4, the ban on circumcision seems to have come into effect under Nerva (96-98 CE). This would make sense as it occurs directly after the troubles with this continuing revolutionary Sicarii agitation. Origen (*Contra Celsus* 2.13 above) says that the judges in his own time were particularly harsh in applying it and few Sicarii in his own time escaped the death penalty. This 'Law,' which was attributed to Publius Cornelius Scipio (therefore its name and perhaps in a kind of satirical reflection that of the Roman Centurion 'Cornelius,' the 'Pious' and 'God-Fearing soldier' in Acts 10:1-11:18, who learns to call 'no man profane and no food unclean' and about whom Peter has to argue with 'those of the Circumcision') was a traditional body of legislation forbidding deliberate mutilation of the flesh, particularly castration, of which 'circumcision' was considered a especially onerous example especially after the War against Rome in 66-73 CE and the Second One in 136-38 CE. For our view of it, see James, pp. 183-84 and 814-16 and below, pp. 963-75.
73. Not only does the man-god Dionysus hold the citizens of Thebes in some contempt for the way he is treated in *The Bacchae*, but he also requires and receives a degree of punishment by his 'Bacchae' (therefore its name) of its ruler Pentheus. In Apuleius' *Golden Ass*, one will also encounter similar if more satirical presentations of man-gods or gods and goddesses, the most impressive of which occurs – at the beginning of the last chapter (Chapter Nineteen) when he 'falls at the feet of the 'Many-Named Goddess' (in this case, Isis). Not only does he 'bathe them with (his) tears,' but he 'prays to her with a voice choked with emotion.' Earlier there are scenes with Osiris and almost every known god or goddess of the ancient world, one of the most striking of which is to be found in Chapter Eight, when Psyche 'falls on her knees' before a representation of Juno, 'the great Jupiter's sister and wife' and, 'wiping away her tears, embraces her, pleading to her.' Even Josephus in *Ant.* 18.65-80, directly following the disputed testimony about 'Jesus' being 'the Christ' (see James, pp. 65-67) provides an odd scene about one 'Paulina,' a devotee of the Goddess Isis, who is willing to totally submit to a man impersonating the Egyptian God Anubis to the extent of sharing his bed. Though many dispute this section since even Tacitus in *Annals* 2.85 implies an earlier date for these things of 19 CE; the reference in the account of 'Ida' (a variation on 'Ioudas?') as the one responsible and the razing of the Temple of Isis ('Isidos' – thus) and the 'casting' (balein) of her statue into the river, not to mention the expulsion of the Jews (Ioudaios) from Rome which follows are nothing if not noteworthy.
74. See Ket 66b and 104a above. This theme of 'self-Glorification' is not far removed from the picture in Matthew 26:11/Mark 14:7/John 12/8 of 'Jesus' allowing the woman from 'Bethany' ('Mary, Lazarus' sister in John'; 'at Simon the Leper's house' in the two Synoptics!) to anoint his head and wipe his feet. Where Luke is concerned, not only does this seemingly purposefully obscure parable in the run-up to its thematically parallel 'crumbs falling from the Rich Man's table' episode include – when approaching a characterization of the illusory nature of 'the Riches the Unrighteous' – the same genre of personage again referred to by the 'Master'/'Lord' denotations in 16:5-8 ('Kurios'/'Kurion'); from the outset in 16:1 it carries the same telltale concern over 'wastefulness' as in the Rabbinic 'Nakdimon'/'Miriam' traditions and these complaints by Jesus' 'Disciples'/'Judas of Simon Iscariot' in the other three gospels. Furthermore, Luke 16:8 even incorporates the important Qumranism 'the Sons of Light,' to say nothing of 'digging' in 16:3 and 'scoffing' in 16:14, we shall see to be so pivotal to crucial contexts in Qumran documents below; also see, pp. 262ff. below.
75. Mark 10:25/Luke 18.25. Aside from these traditions in *Ketuboth*, it should perhaps be observed in passing that ARN 8.8 (21b) conserves a curious tradition that quotes Genesis 24:31 on how 'Laban made room for or 'fed (Abraham's) camels' – the former being interpreted in first clearing out his house of idols! – to show that 'the Righteous of old were Pious, but so were their beasts.' Even this tradition, in addition to 'abjuring idolatry,' contains the usual motifs of 'the Piety of the Righteous,' 'their beasts,' 'not eating and drinking,' and 'straw, barley, and water.' Moreover, if one consults the original passage, one finds – for whatever it's worth – that the next line, Genesis 24:32, even contains an allusion to 'washing their feet.'
76. For instance, 'two by two they went into the ark' in Matthew 19:4/Mark 10:6 is the basis of the ban on polygamy in CDv.1ff. and 'not putting away one's wife and marrying another' in Matthew 19:9/Mark 10:11 is basically reiterated in 11QTLVII.17-20. On the other hand, in both Qumran contexts, the bans are part of 'the Royal' or 'King Law.'
77. The 'Perfection' doctrine is, of course, widespread at Qumran, 'the Perfect of the Way' being, seemingly, another name for the Community and 'Perfecting the Way' being perhaps its principal objective (that is, to seek 'Perfect Holiness'; cf. Paul in 2 Corinthians 7:1) – see 1QS VIII.9-11 introducing the exposition of Isaiah 40:3's 'Prepare in the wilderness the Way of the Lord,' VIII.18-20, VIII.25, and IX.8-9 following it; CD I.20-21

- and xx.1-8, etc.
78. Note too how Paul also quotes this Commandment in Galatians 5:19 against his opponents who are 'troubling' his communities with 'circumcision' and cf. CDVI.14-21: 'to do according to the precise letter of the Torah...., to separate from the Sons of the Pit, to keep away (lehinmazer – i.e., to be a 'Nazirite') from polluted Evil Riches...., to separate between polluted and pure and to distinguish between Holy and profane...according to the Commandment of those entering the New Covenant in the Land of Damascus – to set up the Holy Things according to their precise specifications (this, as opposed to what 'Peter' is pictured as learning – however dissimulatingly – in Acts 10:15 above), to love each man his brother as himself'; and so, here it is, James 2:8's 'Royal Law according to the Scripture.'
79. See War 2.118 and Ant. 18.4-10 above and note that for Judas, 'to pay a tax to the Romans and to submit to mortal men as if to their Lords' (i.e., 'not to call any man Lord') was anathema and the basis of his revolt.
80. War 2.139-40. As Josephus expresses this: 'Before touching the pure food, one is obliged to swear tremendous oaths that he will practise Piety towards God (the First 'Love Commandment') and exercise Righteousness towards his fellow man' (the Second).
81. To understand this and bring it full circle, one should consult Ant. 18.117-118's description of John the Baptist as 'commanding the Jews to exercise virtue both as regards Righteousness towards one another and Piety toward God,' i.e., 'The Righteousness/Piety Dichotomy.' I have also discussed this in James, pp.236-38, 853-55, and variously.
82. Matthew 5:48 and see above, p. 253 and n. 77.
83. ARN 2.5 (18b). The rationale given here for Noah is Genesis 6:9: 'And Noah was a man Righteous and Perfect in his generation'; for Adam, as in 'male and female He created them' above, Genesis 1:28: 'And God created man in His own image.'
84. For James, see Eusebius, EH 2.23.5, Jerome, Vir.ill. 2, and Epiphanius, Haeres. 78/7.7 above. For this passage in Hymns, see vii.17-19: 'You created the Zaddik and from the womb prepared him to stand according to Your will to keep Your Commandments and walk in all (Your pathways) and xvii.30-36: 'You have known me since (the time of) my father and chosen me from the womb...my father did not know me and my mother abandoned me to You. You are a father to all the Sons of Your Truth.'
85. For the 'Judgements' made by the Mebakker at Qumran, see CDXIII.5-19, XIV.8-19, xv.8-17.
86. See Origen, Contra Celsus 2.13 above. As 'Jesus' is presented as putting this in Matthew 19:12: 'There are eunuchs from the mother's womb (it is this which parallels the ARN's list of Patriarchs who 'were born circumcised'), ...eunuchs who were made eunuchs by men (this is something like the parody of Queen Helen's Treasury Agents in Acts 8:27 above), and eunuchs who have made themselves eunuch for the sake of the Kingdom of Heaven.' It is this last, which is not paralleled in the other Gospels, that seems to have played a part in Origen's reported castration. But the material prefacing this on 'divorce' in 19:3-9, which does have a parallel in Mark 10:2-12, to wit, 'Moses allowed you to put away your wives because of the hardness of your hearts' and 'whosoever shall put away his wife and marries another, commits adultery against her' has a negative parallel of sorts from the life of R. Akiba above too in that, seemingly to explain why R. Akiba took a second wife (if he did) and particularly the wife of Tinius Rufus (if he did – much of this seems to have the sound of legend). M. Git. 9.10 (90a) portends to quote R. Akiba on 'divorce' (after 'Beit-Shammai,' which almost exactly replicates Jesus' here, and 'Beit-Hillel') to the effect that 'a man may divorce his wife even if a man finds another more fair than she. Though having the sound of authenticity, the provenance and context of this saying must be seriously questioned because even at Qumran, as we have explained above, 'divorce' was frowned upon – especially where 'the Ruler' was concerned.
87. Letter 84 to Pammachius and Oceanus. Paul's attack here in Romans on those Jews who 'have zeal for God' is very detailed and also reflects his more emotional one on the same group, the one which is disturbing his Communities with 'circumcision' in Galatians 4:16-18 – clearly 'the Party of the Circumcision' or the 'some from James' earlier, i.e., 'those who are zealous to exclude' and, one might add, 'cut off.' Not only does he make it clear, too, that, as at Qumran, the issue is 'Righteousness'; but criticizing Moses' 'Righteousness of the Law' (Romans 10:5) and speaking about those who 'set up their own Righteousness,' 'being ignorant of God's Righteousness,' he quotes similar passages as those in CDVII-viii and xx from Deuteronomy 7:9 about 'living for a thousand years,' 'that the man who practiced these things shall live by them' from Leviticus 18:5.
88. Hippolytus 9.21.
89. See Dio Cassius 68.3-4 and n. 72 above. Here, not only does the 'eunuch' parody the Roman view of 'circumcision' and the fact that Helen's two sons insisted on 'circumcising themselves' despite her opposition; but also 'the Ethiopian Queen' (who did not exist at this time and certainly did not send her 'Treasury Agent' to Jerusalem) plays off 'the Queen of Adiabene' who did exist at that time and did send her 'Treasury Agents' to Jerusalem. As a matter of fact, she sent them further afield to Egypt (therefore the picture in Acts 8:26-40 of Philip's encounter with the 'eunuch' on the road to Gaza when Philip was actually supposed to be going to Caesarea), and Cyprus to buy grain to relieve the Famine).

1. *Ket* 66b-67a. On p. 258, the reference of the note here is to *EH* 4.22.6. In 4.22.1, he implies that this whole testimony is from Hegešippus' *Memoirs*. Since according to this testimony these sects boiled down to 'Essenes, Galileans, Daily Baptists, Masbuthaeans (the same, seemingly, as 'Daily Baptists'), Samaritans, Sadducees, and Pharisees,' it stands to reason, that the 'Galileans' here, obviously named after 'Judas the Galilean,' must be the same as what in other contexts would be called 'Zealots' or 'Sicarii.'
2. See, for instance, *War* 2.259, 2.264-5, and *Ant.* 20.168. For the 'Temple Wall Affair,' which they seem also to have provoked, see 20.189-196; for their barring King Agrippa II and his seeming consort, Titus' future mistress and the profligate Bernice, his sister, see *War* 2.407.
3. In regard to this last, it should be observed that neither James or the Essenes used 'oil' or as Josephus so delightfully puts it in *War* 2.123-24: 'oil they considered a defilement and ...made a point of keeping the skin dry' (i. e., not anointing the skin with oil); for James, see *EH* 2.23.5 and *pars.*: 'he did not anoint himself with oil and he did not use the bath' (i. e., Roman hot baths – he certainly took Essene-style cold baths or immersed himself, as otherwise he could not have gone up to the Temple Mount in the manner described). The issue of 'drinking no wine' is self-evident and we have already covered it in James, as we have many of these matters.
4. For Jesus' 'mother and his brothers' in the Synoptics, see Matthew 12:47/Mark 331-4/and Luke 819-21, but these derogatory or belittling. The issue of 'Glory,' we have already covered to some extent both in Rabbinic literature and at Qumran above and will do so further and in greater detail below; but for the matter of both Nakdimon's and Honi's 'Glory,' see *ARN* 6.3 (21a) and *Tā'an* 19b-20a and 23a, etc. above.
5. See *ARN* 6.3 (21a) and *Tā'an* 19b-20a above. This 'doing' ideology is so widespread at Qumran that it would be hard to catalogue all the instances of it, but see *MZCQ*, pp. 41-3. It is also strong in James 1:22-25, 2:8, 2:13, 4:17, etc.
6. *ARN* 6.3 (21a). One should also note that in these matters relative to the Gospel of John, Nathanael (in our view, the stand-in for James – above, p. 173) will be said to come from 'Cana of Galilee' (21:2). Where the numerous repetitions of the verb 'fill' / 'filling,' etc. are concerned, it should be appreciated that Nakdimon 'fills twelve wells' whereas Jesus 'fills twelve baskets' (John 6:13, Matthew 14:20, Mark 6:7-8:19).
7. James, pp. 842-922.
8. We have already treated these matters in James, pp. 770-83 and see the Papias Fragment 10 in *ANCL*, which states in no uncertain terms that 'Mary,' who was 'the wife of Cleophas or Alphaeus,' 'was the mother of James the Bishop and Apostle, Simon, Thaddaeus, and one Joseph.'
9. This, of course, agrees with Papias above, but now Simon and Judas ('Thaddaeus' in both the 'Apostle lists' of Mark and Matthew) are left out.
10. There is constant slippage here where the names of Jesus' mother and brothers go. To add to the confusion, in Matthew 27:56, she is also called 'the mother of the sons of Zebedee,' unless this is yet another woman or another 'Mary.' It is difficult to say.
11. The interest centering about Mary Magdalene has grown exponentially over the last two decades. This began with the discovery at Nag Hammadi of the Gospel attributed to her, but also with various cryptic references in other documents like the Apocalypses of James to characters seemingly spun off from her. This was fostered by the Feminist Movement, also gaining steam at that time, and several gender-specific authors, who seem to have made Mary their chief interest, and a vast popular literature, stemming from the Baigent-Leigh-Lincoln thriller, Holy Blood, Holy Grail and ending in The Da Vinci Code. It was followed up, more recently, by a parallel-such intellectual gospel, The Gospel of Judas, such as has reached fantastic proportions and this based upon perhaps three references in the received gospels.
12. See b. *Git* 56a, where the amount is the *pro forma* 'twenty-one years'; in *ARN*, 6.3 (21a) this amount changes to 'twenty-two' and it is only *Kalba Sabur'a* own stores alone which 'can supply enough food for every citizen of Jerusalem for twenty-two years'; in *Lam R.* 1.5.31, this is 'ten' – i. e., each of 'the four Councillors' or 'Rich Men' ('Ben Zizzit, Ben Gorion, Ben Nakdimon, and Ben Kalba Shabua' – thus). For Josephus in *Ant.* 20 above, it is rather Queen Helen who is able to do this and in Rabbinic literature the 'twenty-one,' as we saw, is the time of her three successive Nazirite oath periods which the Rabbis imposed upon her – seemingly as a penance – for some reason.
13. 'The Sons of Light' language is a well-known designation in the Scrolls – particularly in 1QS*i.* 9, ii. 16, iii. 24-25, xi. 15, 1QM*i.* 3, 7, 9, 11, CD*xii.* 4-5, etc. The allusion to 'digging' / 'Diggers' ('of the Well') comes in CD*vi.* 3-9 – see below, pp. 662-70. The 'scoffing' language at Qumran, it is to be found in 1QH*ii.* 31 and iv. 9-10 as 'Scoffers of Lying' (*malitzei-chazav*), CD i. 13-15: 'the Scoffer who pours over Israel the waters of Lying, causing them to wander astray in a trackless waste without a Way, bringing low the Everlasting Heights, ... and removing the boundary markers' (the Mosaic Law). Not uninterestingly, this 'nets' / 'malitzim' language is tied to the 'Lazon' / 'Scaffing' in that both are based on the same Hebrew root. Therefore, 'the Scoffer' even 'sets up nets.' This ties in with our Paul as 'Herodian' theorizing below because it is these 'nets' which 'ba-la-'a' / 'de-vour Israel.' Interestingly, too, this is given as a plural in CD*xx.* 34 (*Anshei ha-Chazav*),

- who 'spoke negatively about the Laws of Righteousness and rejected the New Covenant and the Compact which they set up in the Land of Damascus.' These 'have put idols on tier hearts and walked in stubbornness of their heart' (cf. Paul in 1 Corinthians 8:4-7) and 'shall have no share in the House of the Torah.' The Damascus Document could not be more explicit than this.
14. Matthew 15:22/Mark 7:23.
 15. The 'Righteousness' and 'Light' language at Qumran is so widespread that we need not delineate it here. As for the language of 'Servant(s)' or its correlatives it is strong throughout Hymns. In 1QS.3, 'the Prophets' are called 'all His Servants' as they are in 1QpHab.8-9 and vii.5 (in interpretation of Habakkuk 2:2-4); and in CDxx.21, we actually have the language of 'Servants of God.' But perhaps the best examples of these come in the climax of the Habakkuk Peshet which in Columns xii.10-xiii.4 'the Servants of idols' and 'those who but serve stone and wood' ('the idols of the Nations') – basically the contrapositive to Paul here – are being condemned: 'These will not save them on the Day of Judgement.' One should also note the use of this 'Servant' simile in 1QSIx.22 in interpretation of Isaiah 40:3 and in anticipation of 'being a Man zealous for the Law whose Time is the Day of Vengeance.'
 16. The 'cutting off' is an important usage at Qumran as we have seen. Perhaps the most relevant usage of it is to be found in CDii.17-iii.1 where 'the Sons of Noah' are 'cut off' because 'they walked in stubbornness of their heart' and 'did not keep the Commandments of God.' In particular, the Sons of Israel 'were cut off in the wilderness' because 'they ate blood' (important where James' rulings are concerned) and 'murmured in their tents' (CDiii.6-9). Again, in the climax in CDxx.25-6, it is specifically averred that 'with the appearance of the Glory of God to Israel, all among the members of the Covenant who transgressed the boundary of the Torah shall be cut off from the midst of the camp.' Again, one cannot get much more specific than this. Where Paul goes, he is basically using the allusion against his opponents within the Movement – doubtlessly the Jamesian 'Party of the Circumcision,' whom he bitingly wishes 'would themselves cut off.' His sarcasm and intense parody here should again be obvious, as should the double entendre involved.
 17. We have seen the references to 'not anointing themselves with oil' in n. 3 above. For Peter as a 'Daily Bather,' see Epiphanius, *Haeres*. 30.21.1 which is probably based on the numerous testimonies in this regards in the Pseudoclementine *Homilies* we have already alluded to above as well.
 18. An amalgam of CDi.10-11 and ii.7-8, but for 'heart,' see also ii.17-18, iii.5-12 'following the stubbornness of their own hearts', viii.19, xx.33 ('the hearts' of those 'listening to the voice of the Righteous Teacher,' who 'did not desert the Laws of Righteousness,' 'will be strengthened' and 'they will be victorious over all the Sons of the Earth'), 1QSIi.12 (the 'idols upon the heart of the backslider), iii.3 ('no Justification by that which one's stubborn heart permits' – Paul?), 1QpHab.8, xi.13 ('he did not circumcise the foreskin of his heart'), etc.
 19. For this linkage, see CDiv.17-v.11 ('two by two they went into the ark').
 20. Cf. *Ned*. 50a. with John 11:2, 12:3, and Luke 7:38-44.
 21. See ARN 6.3 (21a) above, Lam R. 1.5.31, and Josephus, *War* 5.24-6 and cf. Tacitus, *Histories* 5.12.
 22. See below pp. 312-5, 330-36, 357-58 and *Ket*. 66b-67a, Lam R. 1.16.46-48, and *Git*. 56a. In *Kethuboth*, R. Yohanan is leaving Jerusalem with his Disciples when he sees Nakkdimon's daughter Miriam 'picking barley grains from the dung of Arab cattle,' but R. Eleazar b. Zadok rather sees 'her picking barley grains from among the feet of horses in Acco.' In *Gittin*, Martha the daughter of Boethus goes out in Jerusalem to 'find something to eat' and 'some dung stuck to her foot, so she died.' In *Lamentations Rabbah*, this is rather 'the Romans binding her hair to the tails of Arab horses and making run from Jerusalem to Lydda' and, as we have seen, she is rather 'Miriam the daughter of Boethus,' etc. All of this, both in *Talmud* and Gospels resembles nothing so much as the code one finds in Arab *Sufi* poetry some 10-12 centuries later where words like 'hair,' 'feet,' 'face,' and the like have their own specific mystic meaning and are varied according to the wishes of the poet/narrator (if one looks hard enough, one can also find the same thing in Charles Baudelaire's poetry eight centuries later, obviously influenced by the importation of Arab/Persian Sufi poetry from North African milieux newly connected to France).
 23. *Ned*. 50a. In James 5:9, the exact quote is 'The Judge is standing before the Door' (more 'Standing One' imagery), in *EH* 2.23.8 and *pars.*, the question the crowd supposedly 'cries out' to him on Passover in the Temple is, 'What is the Door to Jesus?' There is also the constant reiteration of the words 'cry'/'crying out,' should one choose to regard it, which also replicates in Acts 7:56-60's picture of 'Stephen' undergoing the same tribulation, 'casting out'/'casting down,' and stoning as James two decades later, upon the picture of which, too, it is obviously based.
 24. See below, pp. 298-315.
 25. Cf. ARN 6.1 (20b) with Matthew 26:11/Mark 13:7/John 12/8. It is more than a little interesting that the 'accusation' (the 'accusation' language is also noteworthy here) in the latter is made by 'Judas ('the son' or 'brother of Simon') Iscariot.' It is interesting too, as already remarked above, that this is followed in ARN by reference to the same 'little children' we shall now consider below, now not those who 'Jesus suffers to come unto him,' but those those of the Rabbis who plead 'we were too Poor' and of R. Akiba himself. It is also followed by the note that

- R. Akiba *'started studying Torah and by the end of thirteen years he taught Torah in public,'* we have already compared above to Luke 2:46's picture of Jesus teaching in the Temple at a not unsimilar age – more parallels.
26. See *Vita* 338–67, in which Josephus makes it clear that Agrippa II is now in retirement in Rome (along with him) and quotes two letters he claims to have received from him.
 27. See below, pp. 289–97 and, for example, CDi.10–12, xii.20–1, xiii.22, 1QSIii.13, ix.12, ix.21, etc.
 28. .CDi.7–8. This is followed by the note about *'remission of sins'* (i.e., knowing they *'were Sinful Men'*) *'being like Blind Men,' 'seeking Him with a whole heart,'* and God *'raising up for them a Teacher of Righteousness to guide them in the Way of His heart,'* i. e., *'the Guide.'* There is also the first note here about God *'visiting them'* – see below, pp. 601–629.
 30. Matthew 18:2–14, 19:13–15, Mark 9:42, 10:14–15, Luke 17:2, 18:16–17, and John 13:33.
 31. See Chapter Nine, n. 76 above and CDiv.20–v.11.
 32. Galatians 5:15. The sarcasm and antipathy of his language here should be clear and it is paralleled throughout the Habakkuk *Peshar* and elsewhere at Qumran in the *'eating'/'consuming'/'swallowing'* language one finds there – cf. 1QpHabvi.5–11, xi.5–15, xii.4–6 even including the language of *'dumb beasts'/'consuming,'* etc. For *'the freedom'* he *'enjoys in Christ Jesus,'* see Galatians 2:5. The butt here is those who wish *'to enslave,'* but *'enslave'* to Mosaic Law not to Rome. He continues this simile in Galatians 4:21–31 after referring now to his *'little children'* (4:19).
 33. The defect here, which was first recognized by A. Von Harnack in *'Die Verklarungsgeschichte Jesu, der Gericht des Paulus'* (I. Kor. 15.3ff.) *under die Beiden Chistusvisionen des Petrus,' Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie,* 1922, pp. 62–80, has to do with two versions of the sighting order in 1 Corinthians 15:6–7: *'first to the Twelve'* (there were only supposed to be *'Eleven'* at the time) and *'then to James, then all the Apostles'* (a redundancy) – the latter obviously being the authentic tradition.
 34. For *'the First'* at Qumran, which usually represents *'the Forefathers who received the Torah,'* see CDi.16: *'the Last'* or *'Last Generation'/'Last Times'* is already making its appearance here in i.11–12, but see also i.4, iii.10, iv.6–9, vi.2, viii.16–17, 1QpHabii.7, vii.2–12, ix.4–5, etc.
 35. Paul also makes this very clear in Galatians 4:24²⁵ where, in relation to the bondservant Hagar *'being Mount Sinai in Arabia'* or *'the Covenant from Mount Sinai which brings slavery,'* he affirms: *'Such things are allegorized,'* plainly harking to Philo of Alexandria's allegorical method of interpretation of Scripture. Did Paul know Philo personally? Possibly. If he was an *'Herodian,'* as we shall argue in this book, then he did most certainly, since one of Agrippa I's daughters was married to Philo's nephew. However, whereas Philo is mainly applying this to what we would call *'The Old Testament,'* as Paul is to some extent here; the difference is that *'The New Testament'* is already applying the method to presentday events.
 36. It is interesting that Luke 18:15 changes the *'little children'* language to *'babes,'* but resumes the *'little children'/'child'* language in 18:16–17. John 13:31–34, though completely befuddled, struggles manfully to reproduce the meaning, combining it with the *'glorified'/'Glorification'* language and James' Royal Law according to the Scripture: *'The Love Commandment': 'Love one another.'*
 37. For this kind of *'Power'* language in the Gospels, see Matthew 9:6–8, 10:1, 24:30, Mark 6:7, Luke 4:6–5:24, 10:19, John 1:12, 10:18, and *pars.* We have discussed the *'Power'* language above, pp. 23–30, 101–4, 129–33, 151–4, etc.
 38. Jerome, *Commentary on Galatians* 1:19
 39. See *Ket.* 63a.
 40. This *'plotting'* language is clear in the Scrolls. See, for instance, 1QpHabxii.2–4 relating to *'the Wicked Priest's'* judicial conspiracy to destroy *'the Righteous Teacher,' 'the Poor,'* and *'the Simple of Judah doing Torah'* or 1QHiv.7ff. relating to *'the Sons of Belial'* (in our view, *'Herodians'*), their *'nets,'* and all *'the Lying Scoffers'* (*Malitzei-Chazav* above), who lead the people astray *'with Smooth Things,' 'give vinegar to the thirsty'* (another favorite Gospel image), and whose *'works are boasting.'*
 41. This is so strange, because in John 12:10–11 it is *'Lazarus'* whom *'the Chief Priests plotted to put to death'* because *'many of the Jews were believing on Jesus because of him';* whereas in the similar passages earlier from 10:45–57, it is Jesus whom *'they'* (particularly Caiaphas) *wanted to put to death'* after the miracle of *'Lazarus'* being raised from the dead. The only word for all this is *'bizarre.'*
 42. See 1QpHabxi.4–xii.10 above.
 43. 1QpHabxi.14–15.
 44. As this reads in Revelation 14:8 and 14:10, *'he shall drink of the wine of the Wrath of God,'* which would *'be poured out full strength into the Cup of his Anger.'* The parallel is so precise that there can almost be no doubt of the literary dependency. One can add to this 14:8: *'she has given to all nations to drink of the wine of the Fury of her fornication'* or 16:19: *'And Babylon the Great was remembered before God to give her the Cup of the wine of the Fury of His Wrath.'* Again, setting aside their playfulness, these correspondences are almost precise
 45. For *'the Poor'* at Qumran, see 1QpHabxii2–10 above, 4QpPs 37ii.10, iii.10, and iv.11 (all actually mentioning *'the Congregation'* or *'Church of the Poor,'* 1QHv.24 (here *'the Ebioniei-Hesed'/'the Poor Ones of Piety'* in a document which also speaks of *'the soul of the Poor One'* in ii.32, iii.25, and v.18), and 1QMxi.9–13, xiii.13–14, CDvi.21, xiii.13, etc. Also see *'The Hymns of the Poor'* – 4Q434–36. For James' Community as *'the*

- Poor*, see Paul in Galatians 2:10, James 2:5, and Eusebius in *EH* 3.27.1 and *pars*.
46. See pp. 277–80 below and Mark 6:38–41/ Matthew 14:17–19/John 6:13 and Luke 9:16.
 47. One should also note the Jewish revolutionary in Libya or Cyrene, known both to Eusebius in *EH* 4.2 and Dio Cassius 68.32 during the uprising in Trajan and Hadrian's time in 115–18 CE, which definitely ended up in the virtual elimination of the Jews of Egypt. Eusebius call his '*Lucius*' ('*Luke*'/ '*Lucius of Cyrene*' – Acts 13:1?), but Dio Cassius makes it clear he was also known as '*Andreas*' or '*Andrew*' ('*Man*'?). Both make it clear that he was considered to be a Jewish '*King*' (i.e., a Messiah) and both call him by the well-known New Testament expression '*King of the Jews*'. For interesting references to both terms in the same context at Qumran, see 1QH.XII.30–32, referring to both '*Righteousness*' or '*Justification*' and '*Perfection of the Way*'.
 48. See *Antiquities* 20.153, 20.195, and *Vita* 16 and Tacitus, *Annals*. 14.64.2 and Dio Cassius 62.13.1–4 (in this account, it is Nero laughing at one Plautus' head that is mentioned).
 49. *Ant.* 20.97–8 and cf. the anachronism in Acts 5:36–7 which is based on a too hasty (or perhaps even a sloppy or inaccurate) reading of these passages in Josephus since, in discussing Queen Helen's famine-relief activities and the crucifixion of Judas the Galilean's two sons, James and Simon which follow in 20.101–103; Josephus then goes on to mention how this same Judas '*had aroused the people to revolt against the Romans at the time of the Census of Quirinius*'.
 50. *Ant.* 20.50–51, repeated in 20.101. Eusebius makes reference to this famine relief directly following, of course, his account if the '*Impostor Theudas*' and Talmudic sources too are much enamored of this theme.
 51. If Paul really was involved in '*famine relief*' activities, as I have argued elsewhere and as Acts 11:28–30 and 12:25 proclaim, then it was as part of these famine relief activities of Queen Helen and her son Izates. The point is that the '*Antioch*' in question had to have been '*Antioch Orrhoë*' or '*Antioch-by-Callirhoe*,' the capital of '*the Great King of the Peoples beyond the Euphrates*' (either Izates or his putative father '*Abgarus*'/'*Agbarus*'), not '*Antioch-on-the-Orontes*' as Acts implies but never specifically says; but I have argued this above, pp. 4–6 and in *James*, pp. 154–59, etc.
 52. The parallel here is fairly strong; cf. CDiv.3 and vi.5. In those two instances it is '*going out from the Land of Judah to dwell in the Land of Damascus*,' but the language parallels are clear since Paul has just gone out to '*those of the Way*' in '*the synagogue of Damascus*' in Acts 8:2, whatever Acts may mean by this.
 53. For '*Thaddaeus*' ('*Judas the brother of James*' in Lukan variations) and '*Theudas*,' see pp. 108–22 above and *James*, pp. 930–35.).
 54. The sequencing here is pretty clear and is followed by Eusebius in *EH* 2.9–11 – not to mention Acts 5–12 in its own tendentious way. Since Josephus is very keen on documenting most of the gruesome executions in this period, there can be little doubt that these two '*brothers*' in these two contexts have to be seen as interchangeable, the one bowdlerizing the other. It is interesting that the '*sign*' Josephus portrays Theudas as claiming to be able to perform is Joshua-style, parting the Jordan River in reverse (i.e., he is a '*Jesus redivivus*' – as we have elsewhere argued) and leading a reverse exodus (into '*the Land of Damascus*' as it were). Elsewhere in *War* 2.259 and *Ant.* 20.167–8, Josephus characterizes these '*signs*,' which '*the Deceivers*' (like '*Jesus*'), '*Impostors*,' and '*Pseudo-Prophets*' were performing was to '*lead the people out into the wilderness*,' there to '*show them the signs of their impending redemption*' or '*freedom*' – a '*freedom*' (i.e., from Rome) Paul totally reverses, allegorizing it into a '*freedom from the Law*' as we have seen.
 55. See, for instance, this kind of language in CDII.14–16 and III.5–12 (here the language is '*walking in the stubbornness of their heart*,' but the effect is the same).
 56. For the story of this plaque, see *Naz* 19b–20a, *Yoma* 37a and *Git* 60a.
 57. In the first place, there were no '*Ethiopian Queens*' at this time called '*Candakes*,' the last documented ones according to Strabo, *Geography* 17.1.54 and Pliny, *H. N.* 6.35, having ruled in '*Nubia*' – the undoubted sources of Acts' malevolent parody here – was killed in approximately 22 BC; and certainly none who sent her '*treasury agents*' up to Jerusalem at this time as Queen Helen had done. In the second place, we have already shown that this episode plays off Josephus' story of the conversion of Queen Helen's two sons who, when reading about the '*circumcision*' by Abraham of his whole household, immediately go out and do likewise – thus, the malevolent parody again here of '*circumcision*' which was looked upon by the Romans in this period, as we have seen in the example of above, as a form of '*castration*'; *Ant.* 20.43–6. *Gen. R.* 46.10 actually knows the passage Helen's two sons were reading at the time, Genesis 17:14. Finally, aside from the possible '*Cananaean*' play, I have already described the possible one on Helen's other descendant, the freedom fighter Kenedaeus, who lost his life in the first engagement of the War against Rome at the Pass at Beit Horon – *James*, pp. 915–922.
 58. See, for instance, the *Epistle of Peter to James* 5.1 introducing the *Homilies*.
 59. This '*holding fast*' is perhaps one of the key usages in CD. See, for instance, CDIII.20, VII.13–4, VIII.2, XIX.14, XX.27, etc. The usages of '*keeping*' and '*breaking*' are so numerous as to be almost inexhaustible, but in 1QSV.1–2 (including an allusion to '*holding fast*') and v.9, '*keeping*'/'*Keepers*' is the definition of '*the Sons of Zadok*'; but for '*keeping*'/'*breaking*' generally, also see CDII. m18–21,

- v.3-4, v.21, vii.6-9 on Deuteronomy 7:9 and again in xx.22 on Exodus 20:6, viii.22, xix.1, xx.25, 1QpHabii.3-6, viii.10, etc.
60. In James, for instance, see 1:26, 2:20, 3:5-8, 3:14, 4:5, 4:8, etc. and in CD, see i.11, ii.18, iii.5, v.12, vi.12 (they 'shall not kindle its altar in vain'), etc. The same imagery abounds in the Habakkuk *Pesher*, Hymns, and more newly-published works such as 4Q434-6 ('*The Hymns of the Poor*') or 4Q416-16 ('*Sapiential Works*.')
61. See *The Republic*, Books II-III (377a-408d) and Book X (595a-609d).
62. Cf. how Paul does this allegorically in Galatians 4:21-31 or in 1 Corinthians 6:12 (also about 'food' and 'the belly')-10:29: '*All things are for me lawful*'; and my conclusion on p. 997 below.
63. The 'walking upright' or 'in Perfection of the Way'/'Perfect Holiness' is absolutely fundamental at Qumran; e.g., 1QSI.15 (here 'walking neither to the right or the left' - cf. Acts 21:24: 'walking orderly keeping the Law'), ii.2, iii.10 ('not straying to the right or the left' again), viii.10, viii.18-25, ix.9, etc.
64. In our view, this is particularly clear in 1QpHabviii.11-13 in its description of how 'the Wicked Priest' profited from 'the Riches of the Men of Violence'/'the Peoples (both referring to Violent Herodians), heaping upon himself iniquitous sinfulness' (i.e., he took their polluted gifts and sacrifices into the Temple), and CDviii.10-11 on 'the Kings of the Peoples' (a term in Roman jurisprudence for ethnic Rulers like the Herodians in the East) and "their wine" is their ways'; see pp. 765-72 and 948-51 below.
65. For 'separating oneself/'themselves' and 'walking in Perfection of the Way' or 'Perfect Holiness' in the context of exegesis of Isaiah 40:3, see 1QSVIII.13-21 above; for the language of 'Nazirism' or 'lehinazzer'/'keeping away from' in the Damascus Document, see CDvi.14-17 ('separate from the Sons of the Pit' and 'polluted Evil Riches'), vii.1 ('and fornication'), and viii.8 (and 'the People'/'Peoples'). In these regards, one should not forget the description of James' directives to overseas communities in Acts 15 and 21, always commencing with the words 'keep away from.'
66. Cf. CDxx.18-21.
67. See p. 280 above. In that instance, the Masoretic only reads: 'they have taught the Commandments of men,' not 'teaching as doctrines the Commandments of men.'
68. It should be appreciated, however, that in Matthew 15:24 the 'house' does reappear, but now it becomes 'not being sent except to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.' One should also note that in Matthew 15:13-14 the language of 'falling into a pit' also occurs, as does 'uprooting plants,' both of which will also recur, as we shall see, in CDi.7 and xi.13.
69. This is recapitulated in CDii.14-15, but now the exhortation includes 'uncovering your eyes that you may see and understand the works of God...in order that you may walk in Perfection in all His ways and not follow after the thoughts of a sinful imagination or fornicating eyes.'
70. In Mark 7:31 it is said that 'he came to the Sea of Galilee,' 'having left the borders of Tyre and Sidon,' but passing 'through the borders of the Decapolis' - a fairly roundabout way to go. In other words, he passed through modern Lebanon, Syria, and the Golan to get to the Decapolis, but how he did this (if he did) is left unexplained. The same goes for Philip in Acts 8:26-40.
71. The language of 'seeking' is widespread in the Damascus Document, which actually starts out in CDi.10-11 stating following the allusions to 'knowing they were Sinners' and 'being like blind men groping for the Way,' that 'God considered their works, because they sought Him with a whole heart and raised up for them a Teacher of Righteousness to guide them in the Way of His heart.' But even more important is the material about 'the Doresh ha-Torah'/'Seeker after the Torah' in CDvii.17-20 in exposition of 'the Star Prophecy' of Numbers 24:17. Here too there is some esoteric language that could possibly be interpreted in terms of 'sign'/'signs' or 'images' in CDvii.14-17; see below, pp. 603-55.
72. In these allusions in Acts, it becomes clear that 'Mark's desertion' of the team (as Paul would have it) to report what was transpiring back to Jerusalem, was not an amicable one; but clearly involved a good deal of ill will - and this in the usually more accurate 'We document.' Here, since Mark 7:1 had already used the verb 'come' to describe the usual 'coming down from Jerusalem,' while Matthew 15:1 had rather expressed this as: 'then come to Jesus from Jerusalem Pharisees and Scribes' (forgetting both the 'some' and the 'down'); to avoid redundancy Mark must now use the basically meaningless phraseology 'there gathered unto him the Pharisees and some of the scribes' - n.b., how Mark has added here the usual 'some' to complete the implication of the 'some from James coming' down from Jerusalem of Paul in Galatians 2:12 and elsewhere in the Gospels as earlier in Mark 14:4 or Luke 19:39 or John 9:40.
73. Even the allusion in Mark 7:21-23 (in this instance, the most prolix Gospel) to the heart's 'evil thoughts, murder, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, railings' as 'defiling the man' recalls the Community Rule's depiction of 'the Spirit of Unrighteousness' or 'of Evil' as: 'greediness of soul, stumbling hands in the service of Righteousness' (cf. Paul in 2 Corinthians 11:15), 'Wickedness and Lying, pride and proudness of heart, duplicity and deceitfulness, cruelty, ill-temper, impatience, much folly, and zeal for lustfulness, works of abomination in a spirit of fornication, and Ways of Uncleanliness in the service of pollution, a Tongue full of blasphemies, blindness of eye and dullness of ear, stiffness of neck and hardness of heart in order to walk in all the Ways of Darkness and Evil inclination' in 1QSiv.9-11; cf. Matthew 15:19 and below, pp. 288-9.
74. That the issue is 'table fellowship with Gen-

- tiles*' is just strengthened by all these allusions to 'blindness' (as in John 9:13-41 above), 'Blind Guides,' and 'hypocrites'/'*hypocrisy*.' At Qumran, as reiterated variously in the Damascus Document, the position is 'doing according to the precise letter of the *Tōrah*' and 'setting up the Holy Things according to their precise specifications' (iv.8, vi.20, xx.6, etc.), whereas in Paul and the New Testament following him, it is 'not to separate Holy from profane' (Acts 10:14-5) and 'all things are for me lawful...eat everything sold in the butcher shop, in no way inquiring because of conscience' (Paul's favorite euphemism for 'the Law' – 1 Corinthians 10:23-5).
75. The reference is to 1QSiv.4 on 'the Two Spirits'. The parallel kind of expressions in Hymns are to be found in ii.15, v.24, ix.3 and 23, xiv.13-14, etc.
 76. See James 3:4-8.
 77. This is the second part of 'the Two Spirits' in the Community Rule above – 'the Spirit of Righteousness' or 'Cleanliness' – 1QSiv.9-11.
 78. Cf. CDi.11-12, xii.20-21, xiii.22-3, 1QHiii.13, ix.12-26, 1QHxii.11, etc.
 79. See James as 'Oblias' or 'Oz-le-Am,' as well as 'a strong Bulwark' in E.H. 2.23.7 and 3.7.9 and *pars*. For the same 'Fortification'/'Tried Wall'/and 'Strengthening' language applied to the Righteous Teacher and Community Council at Qumran, see CDvi.21, xx.33, 1Qsviii.7, 1QHv.38, vii.7-9, ix.8, etc.
 80. 1QsIx.12-14.
 81. For 'the Elect,' see for instance CDiv.3-9, which basically identifies 'the Sons of Zadok' as 'the Elect of Israel...who will stand up in the Last Days (i.e., 'be resurrected' or 'go on functioning') and 'justify the Righteous and condemn the Wicked' (i.e., for all intents and purposes, participating in 'the Last Judgement') or 1QpHabv.4-5 to the same effect. For 'the Way,' see for instance 1Qsviii-ix's exegesis of Isaiah 40:3 on 'the Way in the wilderness,' which includes such expressions as 'walking in Perfection of the Way' (viii.18, 21, and ix.9), 'Perfecting the Way' (viii.25), 'washing their Way' (ix.9), and 'the rules of the Way' (ix.21).
 82. 1QsIx.15-19. This last, of course, means 'loving your neighbor as yourself,' as this is put explicitly in the definition of 'the New Covenant in the Land of Damascus' in CDvi.19-21 as it is the definition of 'the Community of Truth' in 1QsII.24-25 and by implication in 1Qsviii.2 and CDxx.17-18 above – 'the Royal Law according to the Scripture' of James 2:8 and the second of the two 'All Righteousness Commandments' of the 'Hesed'/'Zedek' dichotomy.
 83. CDxx17-20 and meaning, as we have shown in DSSFC, pp. 313-331, 'Gentiles.'
 84. For 'loving God' at Qumran, the first of the two 'All Righteousness Commandments,' see, for example, CDxx.21 and 1QsII.24 (together with 'Righteousness towards one's fellow man' above).
 85. 1QsIx.21-22. This kind of hatred is palpable in the 'blessing and cursing' sections earlier in 1QsII.4-17 and iv.11-19 in discussing 'the Visitation' or 'Judgement upon all who walk' in this manner. One should also note the 'cursing' in a document like 'The Community Council Curses Belial' (4QBer 286-87). Actually this doctrine of 'returning good for evil' seems to go back to Josephus' description of Agrippa I, whom he describes in *Ant.* 19.329-31 as 'scrupulous in keeping the Laws of his country,' 'gentle,' 'benevolent to foreigners,' and 'compassionate to his own countrymen.' In explaining how such behaviour would 'heap coals upon his (detractor's) head' Josephus even applies the Greek term 'chrestos' to him, meaning 'gentle.'
 86. One can see this 'amal' in 1QpHabviii.2-3's interpretation of Habakkuk 2:4: 'the Righteous shall live by his Faith.'
 87. Translators such as Vermes, translate terms of this kind often as 'Precept' or 'Ordinance,' but to do so in this context diminishes the significance of what is being alluded to here. 'Hok'/'Hukkim, just as later in CDvi.9, have to be translated as 'Law'/'Laws.'
 88. One finds similar vocabulary among extreme Fundamentalist Islamic groups like al-Qaida today but, once again, without an echo of non-violence.
 89. 1QsIx.23 – here one has the 'doing' (which is the basis of the 'works'/'Righteousness' ideology) associated with 'the hands' but now, of course, not in the context of 'washing' before eating but rather the attributes of God.
 90. 1QsIx.24. If one wants to see this 'Rechabite' vocabulary of 'commanding,' one should see Jeremiah 35:6-18 on 'the commands the sons of Rechab were commanded to do' (here, even including the 'doing' vocabulary. We have already shown that, according to Eusebius' version of Hegeppus' picture of James death (E.H. 2.23.17), the individual who attempts to interfere in his stoning is identified as 'one of the Priests of the Sons of Rechab, a son of the Sons of Rechab' – which we take to be a euphemism for 'Essene' Priests or 'Nazirite' or 'Nazorean Priests' and an individual whom Epiphanius identifies as James' so-called first 'cousin' or, in our view, his putative second brother Simeon bar Cleophas but, in any event, his successor to Leadership in the Movement he led in Palestine (Haeres., 78.14).
 91. In the incredible hymn attached to the end of the Community Rule in 1QsX-xi, the Council is even pictured as 'joined to the Sons of Heaven' and described as 'a Building of Holiness' and 'an Eternal Planting' or 'Plantation' (xi.8-9, but also see viii.4-9: 'With the existence of these in Israel, the Council of the Community will be established upon Truth like and Eternal Plantation, a House of Holiness for Israel...a Tested Rampart, a Precious Cornerstone, the foundation of which will not shake or sway in their place...a House of Perfection and Truth in Israel'). In so many of these contexts in the Community Rule, the Damascus Document, and Hymns, one encounters the 'laying the Foundations' imagery that Paul

- uses in 1 Corinthians 3:9-14 below as well as the 'building' imagery with which the Habakkuk *Peshet*, as we shall see, attacks the Man of Lying 'who built a worthless city upon blood' – as we shall also see as we proceed, in our view Paul's understanding of 'Communion with the blood of Christ.' This is not to mention the 'God causing a Root of Planting to grow' itself of the Damascus Document which will also be directly parodied, not only in Paul, but here in the Synoptics as well. Nor is this to say anything about the idea of 'God's Building' or 'House' which will be, of course, the very imagery CDIII.19 ('He built for them a House of Faith in Israel') and CDXX.10 and 13 ('a House of the Torah') also uses to describe its view of the Community.
92. CDi.5-8.
 93. See, for instance, 1QSVIII.4-9 and XI.7-9 above and 1QHVI.24-26 and VII.8-9 on 'the Foundation which will be set upon Rock,' 'the Doors of Protection which will not sway' and 'the Tried Wall,' 'Fortified Tower,' and 'Ram-parts' which are 'an Eternal Foundation,' 'Building,' or 'Rock' which also 'will never sway.'
 94. 1 Corinthians 2:6-7.
 95. See 1QSIX.18 and XI.3-19 above, but also see III.23, IV.6 and 18, V.25-6, CDIII.18, 1QM XIV.9-10, XVII.9, etc.
 96. 1QpHabx.9-13.
 97. For these correspondences, see below pp. 919-34 and 982-97.
 98. CDIII.18-20. As this continues, it reads: 'And for them that hold fast to it there will be Victorious Life and all the Glory of Adam will be theirs' (cf. Paul in 1 Corinthians 14:22-15:58 and note both the 'Glory' and Ebi-onite 'Primal Adam' vocabulary there. For this 'Faith' or 'Compact' as 'a House of the Torah,' see CDXX.10-13 above.
 99. CDVII.4-6, XX.10-13 and XX.21-2.
 100. This 'Pit' language is very important and, as we shall see, is duplicated in Matthew 15:14 however tendentiously. Probably the best example of it is to be found in CDVI.12-14, including the 'Nazirite' language of 'keeping away from' and 'separation,' as well as Acts 21:30's 'barring the door,' introducing the definition of 'the New Covenant in the Land of Damascus' in VI.16-18; but also see XIII.14 and XIV.2 and 1QSIX.16-21 above. In my view, the use of it in CDVI is equivalent to 'the Daubers on the Wall' attack on 'the Seekers after Smooth Things,' 'Zaw-Zaw,' and 'the Windbag' / 'Man of Confused Spirit' in IV.19-20 and VIII.12-13/XIX.24-6.
 101. CDXI.13-14.
 102. See our discussion of 'internal' vs. 'external evidence' above, pp. 44-56.
 103. There is some evidence that 'Jesus' (whoever he may have been) came in 19-21 CE. This comes in Eusebius' citation from what he considers to be the fraudulent *Acti Pilati*, which places the crucifixion in that year (*E.H.* 1.9.3-4); but Tacitus, too (*Annals.* 2.85), places the expulsion of the Jews from Rome under Tiberius in most peculiar and suspicious circumstances in this period as well, not later as in Josephus' version of similar events – see *James*, pp. 66 and 863-4. In this manner, the mysterious 'twenty years' in CDi.10 evaporates. Furthermore, this would explain why Paul, who is supposed to be functioning c. 37 CE onwards, knows so little about the 'Christ Jesus' (the eye-witness testimony of whom is almost nil) he is talking about. If there is an 'Historical Jesus' – aside from the Samaritan one – this is probably the best way of understanding him.
 104. See, for instance, 4QFlor.11-13 and CDVII.16-20 and below, pp. 633-45 and 676-86. Cf. too 4QT,5-13.
 105. CDII.9-11.
 106. See, for instance, the document Prof. Wise and myself discovered (4Q285 – we called it 'The Messianic Leader') which identifies 'the Root of Jesse' with 'the Branch of David' and, in turn, 'the Nasi ha-'Edah' / 'the Leader of the Assembly' or 'Church.' This Messianic Leader, of course, then reappears in documents like 4QFlor.11-13 and CDVII.16-20, above, not to mention the interpretation of 'the Shiloh Prophecy' of Genesis 49:10 in 4Q252 or so-called 'Genesis Peshet' – see DSSU, pp. 24-29 and 77-89 and below, pp. 349-55, 638-56, and 674-5. It should be appreciated that the reason we released 4Q285 when we did was because – in attempts to dissimulate and send the public away in other directions – responsible persons were letting it be known that 'there was nothing interesting in the unpublished Scrolls fragments.' We disagreed. Therefore the release – to show that there was. This was the important things. It was not headline-grabbing. The opposite. The preliminary translation (such as it was) was Michael Wise and his University of Chicago team's. We all relied on this. They had their interpretation. I had mine. Mine appears on pp. 24-7 of DSSU. In my personal view, there never was a 'suffering Messiah' at Qumran though, who knows, there might have been.

Chapter 11

1. Cf. CDi.7-9 above for 'God causing a Root of Planting to grow'; for the widespread use of 'Pit' imagery in CD, see VI.15 (in conjunction with the 'Nazirite' language of 'lehinnazer' / 'keeping away from'), XIII.14-5, 1QSIX.16, 21-2, etc.
2. Despite the repetitions, contradictions of locale, and the more elegant manner of expression; the point being made in both Matthew and Mark here (in conjunction with this 'Parable') is the same as what 'Peter' is pictured as having learned for the first time in Acts 10:9-16 and Paul in 1 Corinthians 10:25. The conclusion that 'to eat with unwashed hands does not defile the man' and that 'declaring all foods clean' are to be found in Matthew 15:20 and Mark 7:19 in the text above.

3. See ARN 6.2 (20b). The 'Parable' here (about 'a Stone-Cutter'/'Peter?') is told by one R. Simeon ben Eleazar but, however this may be, the thrust has to do with what R. Akiba did with the teachings of R. Eliezer ben Hyrcanus and his colleague R. Joshua ('Jesus?'); and what the 'Stone-Cutter' did was 'chip away' the 'tiny pebbles' of a great 'mountain' in order 'to uproot it' and 'cast it into the Jordan.' It is this which is compared to what R. Akiba did to the teachings of R. Eliezer and R. Joshua. Here, too, the 'little children' are R. Akiba's 'sons and daughters.' as we have seen and R. Akiba (who is supposed to have been 'forty years old' before he began to study) studies 'thirteen years' before 'he taught Torah to the multitudes' (cf. Luke 2:42-9 above which, to some extent echoing Josephus as well, has Jesus' as 'twelve years old' when he was sitting for 'three days' among the teachers in the Temple and answering their questions).
4. For another one of these 'little ones' episodes – this one quite humorous and combined with the 'Rich Man' motif – see Luke 19:1-10 about one 'Zachaeus,' who was 'a chief tax-collector and a Rich Man' but 'too short' to see Jesus 'in the crowd' (that is, so many people wanted to see him!), so he 'climbed up a sycamore tree' (thus). It's nice to know there were 'sycamore trees' in Jericho at the time but, in any event, the fact that Jesus ends up 'staying at his house' despite the fact 'he was a Sinner,' identifies it with the probably more-historical 'Zachaeus' episode in the Pseudoclementine *Recognitions* 1.73-4, at whose house 'Peter' stays when he is sent to Caesarea by James on his first 'missionary' journey. Also, note the connection with R. Yohanan b. Zacchai's name, should it prove of any relevance.
5. These sorts of 'falling down' at or 'kissing' someone's 'feet' and 'feet' stories generally are to be found relevant to rabbis such as R. Akiba, R. Eliezer b. Hyrcanus, and the like in *Ket* 63a, ARN 6.3 (21a), *Git* 56a, etc. above. It is not incurious that the parallel in Luke to the Rabbinic story of Nakdimon 'filling the lord' or 'master's cisterns' comes in 16:1-8, ending with a telltale allusion to the Qumran-like 'Children of Light.' This story too begins with reference to another 'Rich Man,' 'a master' or 'patron' and, as usual, ends by condemning 'the Pharisees' as 'lovers of money' (thus!). Furthermore, it also introduces the famous Lukan version of Matthew's 'Sermon on the Mount' including 'not serving two masters,' the 'not one jot or tittle disappearing from the Law' material and finally, his version of 'the dogs' episode.
6. It is very strange, but in view of what he says in 1 Corinthians 10:18 introducing this about 'Israel according to the flesh participating with' or 'sharing the sacrifices at the altar' – meaning, 'in the Temple'; it is hard to avoid the conclusion that it is this he then goes on to refer to as 'the cup of demons' or 'the table of demons.'
7. His usage of the word 'conscience' is important. One can find it fully explained in the crucial Corinthians 8:7-12 preceding this. Here, it is used in their context of 'being weak,' 'causing to stumble,' and 'things sacrificed to idols' – all important where Qumran, *Sicarii* Essenes, and the Letter of James are concerned; but one can also find it in Romans 2:14-5 (in connection with 'works of the Law'; 'Doers of the Law being justified,' 'Gentiles,' things 'being written on their hearts,' favorite imageries of his) and 9:1 (in conjunction with 'telling the Truth' again 'and not Lying,' 'the Children of the Promise counting as the seed,' and 'standing').
8. So here now, we have the 'going out' from Mark's 'toilet bowl' excursus or 'Parable' – itself relating, of course, to 'clean' and 'unclean' things and 'purity,' as opposed to Matthew 15:17's 'casting out into' (*ekballetai*), now used to describe the rectification of 'Mary's' 'unclean' state. But in the parallel or similar description of Mary in Mark 16:9 depicting a 'first appearance' to Mary the morning after the crucifixion, this is now reformulated in the manner of Matthew above as 'out of whom he had cast seven demons' (*ekbebekei*) and so our various conundrums and textual interchanges continue – this one more puzzling than ever.
9. 2 Maccabees 7:1-42. Of course, in this episode (again, probably not completely historical and embroidered, but still meant to be moving and to encourage martyrdom for the Laws), each brother is in turn encouraged by the mother to sacrifice himself 'for the sake of His Laws' and the promise being held out is 'resurrection of the dead' or, as this is put here, 'to live again' – an excellent context in which to consider the mass suicide at Masada. Josephus too recounts a similar episode in *War* 1.312-3/*Ant.* 14.420-30 – probably the basis of all the traditions – when Herod is on the way down to take Jerusalem in 37 BC and he encounters 'the cave-dwellers' (whom he calls 'bandits'/'robbers') near Arbela in Galilee and an old man on these cliffs who, despite his efforts to dissuade him (thus!), slays his wife and their seven children and then jumps into the ravine after them.
10. *Par contra*, one should note how in Mark 12:13-18/Matthew 22:15-26 (here the issue is, not surprisingly, whether it is right 'to pay tribute to Rome') and Mark 3:6 (here, again not surprisingly, the Herodians 'plotted with the Pharisees how to destroy him'); 'the Herodians' are listed with the Pharisees (in this, quite realistically) as being among those opposed to 'Jesus' teachings – the only question is, which teachings of 'Jesus,' the real ones or the mythological/literary ones? On the other hand, it should be noted, that it is Paul in Acts 24:10-26:32 who enjoys easy relations with 'Herodians' and, as we have suggested earlier may himself even be an 'Herodian' – cf. Romans 16:7-11.
11. Mark 15:47 also thinks it knows a 'Mary

- the mother of Jesus’.
12. Cf. *James the Brother of Jesus*, pp. 74f., 142–5, 770–83, 842–50, 924–39, etc.
 13. For more of these ‘coming’ episodes, see the incident about the raising or curing of Jairus’ daughter in Mark 5:21–43/Matthew 9:18–26/Luke 8:40–56 below, pp. 309–11 (once again, contrary to normative expectation, Mark is the most prolix of the three; for Matthew 9:18 the ‘little daughter’ is already dead, so it is a raising; while for Mark 5:23 and Luke 8:42, she is only at the point of death, so it is a curing), which leads into the ‘certain woman who had been sick with a flow’ or ‘fountain of blood for twelve years’ who ‘comes’ up to Jesus and ‘touches the fringe of his clothing’. As we shall see below as well, this appears to either play off or pun on Jewish scrupulousness about blood generally and/or CDVIII.22/XIX.34’s ‘fountain of living waters’. Moreover, in all three Gospels, these two follow another peculiar one about ‘coming’ into ‘the country of Gedarra’ in the area of the Decapolis above the Sea of Galilee, where ‘Jesus’ encounters ‘a certain man of the city possessed’ either ‘by demons’ (which later turn out to be ‘legion’ – Mark 5:15) or the usual ‘unclean spirit’ (Mark 5:2), whom he later finds out was named ‘Legion’ – an odd episode indeed.
 14. CDi.18–20 below. Note how this is directed against ‘the Seekers after Smooth things’ and ‘those who chose illusions’ who are then described as ‘justifying the Sinners (Paul’s activities?) and condemning the Righteous,’ and leads into the attack on ‘the life of the Zaddik and all those walking in Perfection’ by ‘those transgressing the Covenant and breaking the Law.’ For another such allusion to ‘leaving’ someone to do something, see 1QS.IX.19–22, which also speaks about ‘walking in Perfection each with his neighbor’ (i.e., ‘the All Righteousness Commandment’/‘the Royal Law according to the Scripture’), ‘making a Way in the wilderness,’ ‘the Guide,’ ‘everlasting hatred for the Sons of the Pit,’ and ‘leaving them to their Riches and the work of their hands like a servant to his master or the meek one to the one dictating to him.’)
 15. CDIV.7–10.
 16. In all such materials, one should note the overlap with the character Josephus calls ‘Eleazar ben Jair,’ a descendant of Judas the Galilean and kinsman of that ‘Menachem’ tortured and probably stoned to death by his opponents on the Temple Mount when he put on the Royal Purple – *War* 2.433–49 and 7.253–399.
 17. This ‘go your way’ allusion is a curious one and we discuss it, pp. 324–26, 331–3, and variously below.
 18. For James’ directives in Acts, see 15:20, 15:29, and 21:25; for Qumran, see CDII.7–9 and III.5–7.
 19. CDV.7 – again the word ‘blood’ is specifically included.
 20. CDVIII.21–24/XIX.33–XX.1, but also see CDVI.14–VII.9 where this ‘Covenant’ is specifically defined.
 21. See below, pp. 910–29 and 979–97.
 22. One can see that this is true from the same kind of statement Jesus makes to characterize the ‘Canaanite woman’ in Matthew 15:28 above – there it is: ‘O woman, great is your Faith.’ One should also note that in that episode, just as the woman ‘having come, did homage’ or ‘bowed down to him’ (here again, just as with the Hellenistic or Greco-Roman ‘Man-God’ stories as, for example, Dionysus in Euripedes’ *Bacchae*) in Matthew 15:25 (in Mark 7:26 she rather ‘falls down at his feet’ as we saw); so too in Mark 5:6 ‘the man with the unclean spirit’ called ‘Legion’ also ‘ran up to him and did homage’ or ‘bowed down to him’ – again as to a Greco-Hellenistic ‘God Man’ (one should also note, as in Acts’ picture of ‘Stephen’ before the Jewish crowd and James in the Temple in early Church literature, this demoniac also ‘cried out in a loud voice’).
 23. See pp. 103–6 above.
 24. See pp. 101–7, 118, and 174–5 and ‘the *Taheb*’s place of activity ‘*Tiathaba*’ above.
 25. In Hebrew, there is also the feminine of ‘lamb’ as in ‘*dorcas*’/‘*doe*’ for ‘*Tabitha*’ above.
 26. *Ned.* 50a. One should note, too, how in this episode in *Nedarim*, R. Akiba is portrayed (as ‘Jesus’ is in the Gospels) as repulsing ‘his Disciples’ when they try to prevent his family (in this case, long-suffering wife ‘Ben Kalba Sabur’a’s daughter’) from approaching him – in the Synoptics, it will be recalled, it was the family that cannot get close to him because of the crowds.
 27. *Ibid.* Cf. Luke 2:4–21. Here it is ‘the Angel of the Lord,’ ‘the shepherds,’ and ‘the multitude of the Heavenly Host’ who take the place of ‘Elijah the Prophet,’ but note here how the last-named preach ‘Glory to God in the Highest and Peace on earth, good will towards men’ (2:14) – however kind-spirited, another reversal to what one might expect to find in the War Scroll from Qumran where ‘the Heavenly Host’ is concerned. As for Elijah, he will then reappear in the descriptions of John the Baptist, either pro or con.
 28. The issue of ‘the son of Joseph’ has particular relevance vis-a-vis the supposed ossuary, we discussed above, pp. 56–64, in the name of ‘Jacob’/‘James the son of Joseph brother of Jesus,’ which recently surfaced. As we pointed out, there would have been numerous ossuaries with the nomenclature ‘son of Joseph’ on them and this was perhaps the only authentic part of the inscription, but where ‘James’ name was concerned, in most classical early Church texts, the name of his father was rather given as ‘Cleophas’/‘Clopas’ probably corrupted into ‘Alphaeus’ or vice versa. Moreover, it also has relevance vis-a-vis the Samaritan Messiah or *Taheb* above, who really would have been a ‘Jesus son of Joseph’ – therefore the patronym vis-a- R. Akiba is all the more convincing or impressive.
 29. *Ket.* 63a.

30. *Ibid.*
31. *Ibid.*
32. See Ps *Rec.* 172–4 above.
33. See Y. Yadin, ‘The Excavation of Masada,’ *Israel Exploration Journal* 15, 1965, pp. 81–2 and 105–8 and *Masada*, London, 1966, pp. 173–90.
34. See, for instance, 4Q521, ‘*The Messiah of Heaven and Earth*,’ Fragment 1, Column 1.12, but there are others.
35. The criticism of him in Lam. R 2.2.4 and j. *Tā’an* 4.5 (68d) for applying the Messianic ‘*Star*’ Prophecy (the probable origin of Bar Kochba’s name) to Bar Kochba by the other rabbis gives some proof of this, as do the tremendous numbers of ‘*his Disciples*’ described above in *Ket.* 62a–63b and *Ned* 50 (seemingly some 24,000!) and the description of his imprisonment and horrific death at the hands of the Romans in *Ber* 61b. In the latter, a ‘*Bat Chol*’ or Heavenly Voice cries out much in the manner of the synoptics: ‘*This is my only begotten son, etc.*’ – only in Akiba’s case, it is: ‘*You are destined for the life of the world to come.*’
36. For John’s teaching ‘*Righteousness towards one’s fellow man*,’ see *Ant.* 18.117; for Josephus’ ‘*Essenes*,’ see *War* 2.139. For James, of course, see 2:8.
37. Hippolytus 9.21.
38. See Lam R. 2.2.4 and *Ber* 61b above and cf. 1QMxI.6–xII.17 and Matthew 24:30/Mark 13:26 and 26:64/14:62 and *pars.*
39. *Ber* 61b–62a
40. CDxx.20–1 and James 2:5 on ‘*loving God*.’ Also see, Josephus’ ‘*Essenes*’ in *War* 2.128–33.
41. *Ket* 62a–63b.
42. See 1QpHabxI.4–8 which even includes a reference to ‘*casting them down*’ (in normative translations, a little misleadingly, ‘*causing them to stumble*’). For James’ *Yom Kippur* atonement, see above, pp. 37–8, 123–35, etc.
43. Lam. R 1.16.47. Though here she is ‘*Miriam*’ / ‘*Mary*,’ in and *Git* 56a (where he death is described quite differently) and *Ket.* 104a, she is quite properly ‘*Martha the daughter of Boethus*,’ as we have seen. In *Yoma* 18a, she bribes Agrippa (obviously Agrippa II – called ‘*King Yannai*’ in *Yeb.* 61a) with ‘*three measures of gold coins*.’
44. Lam. R 1.16.47; cf. *Git* 56a above.
45. Lam. R 1.16.47–8. In *Ket* 67a he rather ‘*sees her picking barley grains among the horses’ hoofs in Acco*.’ This ‘*Zadok*’ is an extremely important name/character in both the Dead Sea Scrolls and Talmudic tradition. For Josephus in *War* 2.451 and 628, he would appear perhaps to be the father of one ‘*Ananias b. Zadok*,’ who is part of a delegation that takes the surrender of the Roman garrison in the Citadel at the beginning of the Uprising and later in Galilee is part of another delegation that relieves Josephus of his alleged ‘*command*’ there. In *Git.* 56a he is someone who ‘*fasts for forty years so that Jerusalem might not be destroyed*.’ In 56b, he is someone on whose behalf R. Yohanan convinces Vespasian (*sic*) to allow him to send back into the city to rescue. In Lam. R 1.16.46, it seems to be his children who are taken captive to Rome and die in each other’s arms (see out dedication page). Having said this, later in *ARN* 16.1 (24b) – which confirms the fact that, though a rabbi, he is of ‘*the High Priestly line*’ and calls him ‘*the greatest man of his generation*’ – he himself is taken captive to Rome and, like Joseph in the Bible, supposedly resists the advances of a high-born Roman matron there.
46. *ARN* 6.3 (21a). In *Git* 56a, as we have seen, he is rather denoted as ‘*Ben Zizzit ha-Kesef*’ / ‘*Silver*’ and this is supposedly because ‘*his fringes (zizzit) used to trail on cushions (Kesef)*’ and here, ‘*his seat (kise) was*’ rather ‘*among those of the Roman Nobility*!’ The folkloric character of these appellations and traditions should be clear as should their ‘*nom-a-clef*’ character; but whoever he was, he was clearly an Establishment character of some kind and, therefore probably an Herodian or one of their hangers-on.
47. *ARN* 4.5 (20a – here the passage cited is Isaiah 10:34, which is also extant at Qumran). See also *Git* 56a–b, which also cites Isaiah 10:34, but clearly with quite a different interpretation; but the episode is so fundamental to Rabbinic tradition that it is also alluded to in Lam. R 1.5.31 and again the citation is Isaiah 10:34. One should also see *Yoma* 21a and 39b.
48. See CDvII.18–9, xix.10–11, and 4Q*Test* 1.12 and cf. below, pp. 632–71, 674–86 and 983–86.
49. This is about the most pro-Roman episode in any of the Gospels or Acts. Here the Centurion is seen as being so respectful of ‘*Jesus*,’ as well he might, that he does not even permit the man/god to enter his house. When one hears that Matthew is the most ‘*pro-Jewish*’ of all the Gospels, one must range against such pronouncements passages such as these. Certainly this episode is meant to conciliate ex-Roman centurions and army members and that the promises ‘*of the Kingdom*’ are now being given over to them – the destroyers of Jerusalem, the Temple, and the Jewish People in Palestine – can hardly be more opportunistic and cynical. Actually the language here matches Paul in Galatians 4:19–31 where somehow he manages to present the Jews ‘*(such things being allegory – sic)*’ as ‘*Hagar*’ because of their attachment to the Law, she ‘*being Mount Sinai in Arabia*.’ This is the kind of ‘*slavery*’ Paul is talking about – therefore he concludes in 4:30 in another tendentious use of Scripture: ‘*Cast out the slave woman*’ and the verb which he uses here, ‘*ekbale*’ is the same verb Matthew 8:12 is applying to ‘*the Children of the Kingdom*,’ i. e., ‘*the Jews*’ and the same one Acts 7:56–7 is applying to what ‘*the Jews*’ do to ‘*Stephen*.’ It is for this reason one calls this episode and its conclusion a pure

- 'Gentile Mission' production. It is also the same verb (in perhaps its original embodiment), as we have seen, that Josephus uses to describe what 'Essenes' do to backsliders, 'cast them out' (*War* 2.143).
50. The use of 'standing' or 'stand up' in the Damascus Document and elsewhere at Qumran is extremely important. Not only does it relate to 'the Standing One' doctrine of the Pseudoclementines, Ebionites, Simon Magus, and others; it also relates to 'being resurrected' and 'the Resurrection' and was, probably based on Ezekiel 37:10-14, the Hebrew way of expressing this. For CD, see iv.3-4, vii.12, vii.19, xiii.23, xiv.19, xx.1, etc. and cf., for example, 4QFlor.10 and i.13 below.
 51. See *Ant.* 20.21 already mentioned above. It is worth cataloguing all the usages of this particular adjective, but one particularly interesting use of it comes in Paul's speech at 'Antioch of Pisidia' in Acts 13:33. This speech is not only addressed to 'God-Fearers' in 33:16 and 26 (Cf. CDxx.18-23), speaks of 'raising up David' and 'his seed' (33:22-3 – cf. 4QFlor.10-13), alludes to 'the Shiloh Prophecy' of Genesis 49:10 and 4Q252v.1-4 (33:28 – note the basic allusion to the Messiah's 'feet' all round), but finally quotes Psalm 2:7 which it translates into Greek as the 'begotten' or 'only begotten son.' This is the same passage quoted in Hebrew 1:5 and 5:5 and, according to Jerome, the Hebrew Gospel of the Ebionites, i. e., the adoptionist 'This is my only-begotten son; on this day I have begotten him, in place of the Synoptic: 'This is my beloved son; in him I am well pleased' of Matthew 3:17 and *pars.*,
 52. This 'offspring of vipers' epithet was originally used by Matthew 3:7 and 12:34 – the first in John's attack supposedly on 'the Sadducees and Pharisees' (Luke 3:7 rather uses it to portray John as attacking the entire 'crowd that came out to be baptized by him' – thus!); the second, and here in Matthew 23:33 (in the context of many other allusions) to portray 'Jesus' attacking only 'the Pharisees' (in our view, as already indicated, in such contexts, a *nom a clef* for James' 'Jerusalem Church' Leadership); but one can find a parallel to it in two places in CD, v.13-17 amid other patently John the Baptist-like allusions and viii.9-12 to attack 'the Daubers on the Wall' and 'the Kings of the Peoples' – in our view, the first being individuals like Paul who claimed to be 'a Pharisee of the Pharisees,' and the second, 'the Herodians' (see pp. 645-86, 765-807, and 950-53 below). We have already noted above the Qumran parallel to Matthew 15:14 and 23:16-24's 'Blind Guides' in CDi.9-11.
 53. Cf. *ARN* 6.2 (20a), *Ned* 50a, and *Ket.* 62b-63a above.
 54. Though in Matthew 24 discards the 'widow's mites' material, not surprisingly it keeps Mark 13's 'going forth out of the Temple' material which Luke 21 neglects. In these series of encounters and allusions from Mark 12-13, Matthew 23-4, and Luke 21, it would be hard to be more anti-Jewish or Judaism than these which show it to be well-established by this time. For Titus' destruction of the entire city, see *War* 7.1-2.
 55. Cf. Mark 12:19, 12:32, 13:1, etc.
 56. This 'leading astray' language is, of course, basic to Qumran and, in particular, the presentation of the position of 'the Man of /' Spouter of Lying' who 'leads Many astray'; cf. CDi.13-16, 1QSIii.22, 1QpHabx.9-13, etc.
 57. One should note that the whole issue of 'the Poor' vs. 'the Rich' is not only paramount at Qumran, but was along with the 'tax' issue and gifts from non-Jewish foreigners in the Temple related to it, the driving issues behind the War against Rome. One can see this in the picture of Agrippa II's last speech to the crowd bent on revolution, where he and his sister (Bernice, later Titus' mistress) are portrayed as 'bursting into tears' and making it clear that they 'have not paid their tribute to Caesar.' It is in continuance of this that Josephus, the Chief Priests, the most prominent Pharisees, and the principal citizens (i.e., 'the Herodians') call stopping sacrifice and refusing gifts on the part of foreigners in the Temple 'a peculiar innovation into their Religion' and an 'Impiety' – thus, setting the stage for and meaning it would ultimately inevitably lead to the destruction of the Temple; cf. *War* 2.426-9 where 'the brigands,' 'Sicarii,' and 'Innovators' burn the palaces of Ananias the High Priest and Agrippa and Bernice and burn the debt records too, 'turning the Poor against the Rich,' and 2.402-417. All of these matters are certainly being alluded to and, to some extent, played on or parodied in these pregnant passages in the Synoptics.
 58. Of course, 'the Poor' (Ebionim, i. e., 'the Ebionites') is a fundamental conceptuality at Qumran – cf. 1QpHabxii.2-7. In fact, 4QpPs37iii.10 and iv.11 makes reference to 'the Congregation' or 'Church of the Poor' on at least two separate occasions even in the extant text.
 59. This passage in 1QpHabvi.7 is of the utmost importance because it makes it clear that the interpretation of 'sacrificing to their standards and worshipping their weapons of war,' that is, 'parceling out their yoke and their taxes (i.e., 'tax farming'), consuming/eating all the Peoples year by year, giving many countries over to the sword,' relates to the Romans – and, in particular, the Imperial Romans – and no one else.
 60. *War* 6.301-09 and see below, pp. 512-48.
 61. Cf. CDi.9-11, xii.20-1, xiii.22, 1QSIii.13, ix.12, ix. 21, etc.
 62. For R. Yohanan's 'woes' upon leaving Jerusalem with his 'Disciple' R. Joshua ('Jesus?') and Vespasian's behaviour, see *ARN* 4.5 (20a) – note here that Isaiah 10:34 (a *Peshet* extant at Qumran) is applied to this fall, as it is by implication at Qumran as well. (Reader note: line editor improperly interrupted footnote sequence here and nn. 63-64 have been overstepped).

65. Cf. CDvi.3-10, vi.19-vii.6, and viii.21-3/xix.31-xx.7 and below, pp. 616-676 and 968-95.
66. For Queen Helen, see Josephus, *Ant.* 20.17-96 and above, pp. 206-16. One should also note the relevance of this individual to a Qumran document like *MMT*; see below, pp. 552-3 and 950-55.
67. See *Ant.* 20.94-96 and *War* 5.55, 119, and 147 and Plates 85-88 of the second picture section.
68. Cf. CDi.7-9.
69. CDi.17, vii.9-13, vii.21-viii.3/xix.5-16, etc.
70. This 'glorying' permeates both the Gospels and Paul's letters; cf. Luke 4:15, 5:26, 7:16, 13:13, 17:15, 23:47, John 7:39, 12:16-28, 13:31-2, 14:13, 15:8, 17:4, and *pars.*; but also see the description of 'the Spouter of Lying' in 1QpHabx.9-13.
71. See CDiii.19, iv.4, vii.18-20, xii.23, xiv.19, etc. and 4QFlor.10-13 and 4QTest.12-3; for 'the True Prophet,' see 1QSix.12 and in 4QTest.5-6.
72. For 'the True Prophet' ideology, see *Ps Rec.* 1.16, 1.40-41, 1.44 and variously/*Ps Hom.* 1.21, 2.4-12, and variously; for Muhammad and the Koran, a good example is 33.1 and 33.30-59; for Mani, see al-Biruni 8.206-9.
73. 1QSix.12 above.
74. See CDxix.2-3 and below, pp. 621-28 and variously.
75. CDiv.14-21 in interpretation of Isaiah 24:17 and viii.12-3/xix.24-6 (while Ms. A has 'one of confused spirit', Ms. B has 'walking in the Spirit').
76. 1QSViii.10-16 in describing the Naziritism and 'Study of the Torah' of 'the Perfect of the Way' and ix.18-24, the necessity of 'separating from any man who has not turned his Way away from all Unrighteousness,' 'eternal hatred for the Men of the Pit,' and 'zeal for the Law' and 'the Day of Vengeance.'
77. For the 'woollen clothes' that were spread beneath Nakdimon's feet while 'the Poor gathered them up,' see *Ket.* 66b and the 'carpets' that were laid from the door of Martha's 'house to the entrance of the Temple so her feet would not be exposed,' see Lam R. 1.16.47 and pp. 228-42 above.
78. For 'the Am ha-Aretz' in the Talmud, see for example, *M. Toh* 7.5-8.5 (and note, in passing, the allusion to 'dog' where 'clean' and 'unclean' foodstuffs are concerned in 8.6), *B.B.* 57b-58a, *Shab* 13a, 15b, 23a, *Pes.* 42b, 49a-49b, and variously; at Qumran, we must have regard for the expressions 'amim' and 'yeter ha-amim' in 1QpHabviii.5-ix.5 and CDviii.5-12/ xix.17-25 and xx.24, pp. 538-46 and 749-65 below.
79. Of course, the incidences of the allusion to 'standing' and its variations, both at Qumran and in the New Testament, must be catalogued as we have done to a certain extent here and above, pp. 115-29, 154-5, 259, 324, etc. and in *James*, pp. 269, 327, 370-78, 449, 700-90, etc.; for 'the Standing One' in the Pseudoclementines and in Elchasaitic ideology, see above pp. 25, 81, 165,-9, 203-7, etc.
80. CDvi.11-17. Importantly, this allusion to 'barring the door' and 'not kindling the Temple altar in vain' from Malachi 1:10, not only is paralleled in the picture in Acts 21:30 of Paul being unceremoniously ejected from the Temple and the doors being 'barred behind him,' but in CD it also forms the introduction of the description of 'the New Covenant in the Land of Damascus' which involves 'setting up the Holy Things according to their precise specification,' 'distinguishing Holy from profane,' 'loving each man his brother as himself' (James 2:8's 'Royal Law according to the Scripture'), and 'separating from all pollutions according to their statute.'
81. Lam R. 1.16.48; for the word 'geviot' for 'corpse' - in this case, the 'corpse' of 'the Wicked Priest,' see 1QpHabix.2; for the transformation of 'looking upon their privy parts' (*me'oreihem*) in received Habakkuk 2:15 to 'their Festivals' (*me'odeihem*), see 1QpHabxi.2-3 and its exploitation - also concerning 'the Wicked Priest' - in xi.4-15, including both allusion to 'Festivals' ('the Day of Atonements') and 'circumcising the foreskin' ('the Wicked Priest's') and pp. 774-834 below.
82. See Lam R. 1.16.47 above and *pars.*
83. *Ket.* 66b. This kind of confusion and/or overlaps between the 'Miriam's'/'Mary's' and 'Martha,' as we have seen, is not surprising. Even in Gospels, 'Mary' says the same thing as 'Martha' (cf. John 11:21 with 11:32 while Luke 10:38-42, while keeping some of the elements envisions a wholly other scenario - see below p. 333).
84. Not only should one correlate all these 'Glorification'/'self-glorying' themes, but the allusions to these 'camel' aphorisms in Rabbinic literature occur in *Ket.* 66b-67a and 104a. For parallels in Lam R., including material about her husband Josephus' friend Jesus b. Gamala (to which the 'camel' aphorism relates as well), see 1.16-47-8 above and *Yoma* 9a and 18a (for more on this 'Jesus,' see *Yoma* 37a, *Yeb.* 61a, and *B.B.* 21a).
85. Since *Ket.* 66b thinks this is 'Miriam the daughter of Nakdimon ben Gurion,' the amounts are quite high and R. Yohanan is pictured as commenting on this, but he sees her just outside Jerusalem as he 'left' the city, as we saw, 'picking barley grains in the dung of Arab cattle' - thus, the reduction in her previous state which these Talmudic traditions seem to revel in presumably because of her former imperiousness - and it is at this point that R. Eleazar b. Zadok is also pictures as applying 'the consolation of Zion' aphorism to her, though he seems to see her 'picking barley grains among the horses' hoofs at Aco' (about one hundred miles further North along the sea coast). For Lam R. 1.16.47. he too applies 'the consolation of Zion' aphorism to 'Miriam the daughter of Boethus' (read 'Martha'), whom he sees, as already remarked, 'the Romans bind her hair to the tails of Arab horses' (n.b., the 'Arab'

- parallel here) *and make run from Jerusalem to Lydda.* In the very next line, he also applies the Song of Songs 1:8 passage to *Miriam the daughter of Nakdimon*' as in *Kethuboth*, but no matter the lack of sympathy is the same. *Ket.* 104a, in applying the 'camel' aphorism to her, makes it clear in the end that this is *'Martha the daughter of Boethus.'*
86. *Ket.* 104a above.
87. See *War* 4.236–325. Here Josephus presents his friend (who had warned him of a plot on the part of Simon ben Gamaliel – the son of Paul's presumable teacher and Pharisee Patriarch in Palestine – to remove him in Galilee; see *Vita* 204) as making a long speech to the Idumaeans to try to dissuade them from joining causes with those Josephus has now taken to calling 'Zealots.' These last – presumably music to Roman ears – he now accuses of all rank of 'Impiety,' 'pollution,' and 'gathering spoils.' But in the end, *'the Zealots'* do finally let them in the city by stealth and together they end up butchering *'Jesus ben Gamala,' 'Ananus ben Ananus,'* and as many of the other High Priests as they can find. There is an error in the text here on p. 334: *'James' judicial murderer'* should read *'Ananus ben Ananus'* not *'Jesus ben Ananias,'* another character entirely and *'the prophet'* who bemoans James' death not his murderer.
88. *Git* 56a, One should note that in the death scenario for *'Martha the daughter of Boethus'* here, though the *'dung'* motif remains, now the scenario is that *'by this time she had taken off her shoes,'* but *'some dung stuck to her foot and she died'* – again to the *'foot'/'feet'* element.
89. *Git* 56a, but in *ARN* 6.3 (20b–21a), where these three are also named, the period is *'twenty-two years'* while in *Lam R.* 1.5.31, where there are *'four councilors'* (*'ben Gurion'* being separated from *'ben Nakdimon'*), the figure is *'ten'* – each is *'capable of supplying the city with food for ten years.'*
90. See Robert Eisler, *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist*, Dial Press, 1931, pp. 252–55.
91. In this regard, one should take seriously Acts (normally rather tendentious before the introduction of *'the We document'* in 16:10, but in this case pretty incisive) 11:26's contention that it was at *'Antioch'* and among the members of Paul's *'Gentile Christian Church,'* that *'the Disciples were first called Christians.'* Of course, that means that in Palestine earlier than approximately the mid-Fifties CE, they were called something else. What was that *'something else'* – *'Nazirites,' 'Essenes,' 'Sicarii'* or *'Zealot Essenes'*? The only problem, as we have tried to call attention to in our first chapters, is which *'Antioch'* are we talking about here?
92. The New Testament knows this category of persons, *'the Herodians'* (Mark 3:6 and 12:13/Matthew 2:16), which we find exceedingly useful as a designation. We take it to mean all those who owe their position to or have an interest in the continuation of the Herodian Establishment. Of course, this *'Peace Party'* do invite the Roman Army into the city, as they did the Seleucids way back in Judas Maccabee's and Alexander Jannaeus' time and as they did to Herod when he was supported by Roman troops in 37 BC, thus bearing out Josephus' again rather tendentious assertion in the Introduction to *The Jewish War* that it was *'the Jews own Leaders who invited the Romans into the country'* – but this was hardly the popular position or the position of the mass (in other words, a very self-serving statement, oft-repeated!).
93. *War* 5.24–26; cf. Tacitus, *Histories* 5.12. For these *'Biryonim,'* one should see the parallel narratives in *Git* 56a and *Lam R.* 1.5.31 above. The Head of these *'Biryonim'* of Jerusalem in *Gittin* is *'Abba Sikra'* – clearly the Leader of the *Sicarii* there and he is designated as R. Yohanan's nephew (*'the son of R. Yohanan's mother's sister'*); but in *Lamentations Rabbah*, he is actually named as *'Ben Battiah'* and portrayed as leading R. Yohanan's coffin, (carried by his two *'Disciples,'* R. Eliezer and R. Joshua) out of the city – a very curious scene indeed.
94. *Git* 56a; for a parallel proper ascription, see *Ket.* 104a above applying the *'camel'* aphorism to her because of her deceased husband, Jesus ben Gamala.
95. *Git* 56a–b.
96. *Git* 56a.
97. *Git* 58a and *Lam R.* 1.16.48.
98. See *Ant.* 20.179–82. He is a curious figure because, though he was appointed High Priest by Agrippa II, he also seems to have been connected to *'the Temple Wall Affair'* in the context of which he was sent to Rome to plead the case with ten others before Nero and his wife Poppea (who for some reason kept him back); cf. *Ant.* 20.189–196 and *War* 2.270. It was directly thereafter that James was stoned under the direction of Agrippa II and a new High Priest he had appointed, Ananus ben Ananus (Ananus the Younger). For the *Talmud*, *Yoma* 9a, Ishmael was High Priest for ten years which, in this context, seems rather implausible but there was also an earlier such *'Ishmael'* in *Ant.* 18.34. In any event, his clan *'the Boethusians'* are named in *'the Zealot woes'* in *Pes.* 57a (as is he) as *'beating the people with sticks.'* Nevertheless he is a contradictory character and at times seems to have had quasi-Zealot sympathies as *'the Temple Wall Affair'* could illustrate and here where he is also called (perhaps erroneously) *'Phineas' Disciple'*). In such a context, in *War* 6.114 he is possibly the one beheaded in Cyrene for unspecified (but obviously seditious) offences, though in the same breath his sons are portrayed as fleeing to the Romans for security.
99. So important do I consider this story to be as illustrative of the times, that I have used it as one of the dedication pieces to this book and explained many of these points in

- pp. xxvii–xxviii of my Preface.
100. Cf. Matthew 3:17/Mark 1:11/Luke 3:22 where the cry ‘*This is My beloved son; in him I am well pleased*’ is actually attributed to ‘*a Voice out of the Heavens*’ or ‘*out of Heaven*,’ i.e., ‘*a Bat-Chol*,’ and Acts 10:13–16: Peter’s ‘*Heavenly Tablecloth*’ vision – also see Jerome’s *Gospel to the Hebrews*.
101. In *Git* 57b, the unnamed woman who encourages her children to martyrdom in the face of the Roman Emperor, also ‘went up onto a roof and threw herself down and was killed’ and in this story too, there is a voice from Heaven which cries out in the words of Psalm 113:9: ‘*A joyful mother of children*,’ but the connection with this one Lamentations *Rabbah* and the one in 2 Maccabees 7 is obvious. These, in turn, are certainly connected with Josephus’ story of how Herod pleads with the father of the seven children in the caves outside Arbela on his way down to take Jerusalem in 37 BC with the Roman General Sossius – *War* 1.309–314 and, in the author’s view (stated several times) parodied by the nonsense story told of the Sadducees in m 22:23–34 and *pars*. In the author’s view, these stories about ‘*Bat-Chol*’ really do give the ethos of this Period and not the more idealized, Greco-Roman ones one finds in the Gospels and the Book of Acts.
102. *Lam R.* 1.16.50–51.
103. *Yoma* 38b.
104. 1QMxi.13–14; for ‘*the Star Prophecy*,’ see 1QMxi.6–7 and CDvii.16–21. Also see 4QTesti.12–13.
- Chapter 12
1. *Git* 56a. This ‘*casting into the streets*,’ of course, recalls Matthew 27:3–7’s picture of Judas ‘*casting the thirty pieces of silver into the Temple*’ (whatever is meant by this – of course, whatever is meant, the reversal of the tragic sense of the Rabbinic is always obvious). This is supposed to fulfill a passage from ‘*the Prophet Jeremiah*’ when, in fact, the passage being quoted is a broadly-doctored version of ‘*the Prophet Zechariah*’ (11:12–13) which does not really have the connotation Matthew is trying to give it (see my ‘*Gospel Fiction and the Redemonization of Judas*’ in *The Huffington Post* (12/19/07). Where Ezekiel goes, at Qumran – to be sure – there is ‘*the Zadokite Statement*’ of Ezekiel 44:15 in CDiii.21–iv.10; but there is also the repeated reference to ‘*the Builders of the wall*’ and ‘*the Daubers with plaster*’ of Ezekiel 13:2–23 (the context of which is ‘*foolish prophets following their own spirit*,’ ‘*empty visions*’ – this is repeated in 1QpHabx.9–13 in the accusations against ‘*the Spouter of Lying*’ of ‘*leading Many astray*’ – and ‘*crying “Peace” when there is no Peace*’) in the several descriptions of ‘*the Liar*’/‘*the Spouter*’/or ‘*the Windbag*,’ ‘*walking in the Spirit*’ or ‘*being of confused spirit*’ in CDiv.20–21, viii.12–13 (Ms. B: xix.24–6), etc., to say nothing of Ms. B. xix.1–4, quoting Ezekiel 9:4’s ‘*putting a mark on the forehead of those who weep and cry*,’ following Zechariah 13:7 and paralleling Ms. A’s quotation of Amos 5:26–7 and 9:11 about ‘*escaping to the Land of the North*’ and ‘*exiling the Tabernacle of your King*’ (interpreted in terms of ‘*re-establishing the fallen Tent of David*’) – all relating to ‘*escaping the Era of the Visitation...with the coming of the Messiah of Aaron and Israel*’; see below, pp. 601–86.
2. *Ant.* 20.145–7 and *Vita* 119. The former also deals with her reputed incest with her brother Agrippa II. For her relationship with Titus Caesar, see Suetonius, Titus 7; Tacitus, *Hist.* 2.2, and Dio Cassius, 66.15 and 18; for a seeming satiric reference to her incest, see Juvenal 6.156–60.
3. See *Yeb.* 61a and *Yoma* 18a. In both, the ‘*King*’ is called ‘*King Yannai*,’ but this is typical of either Talmudic imprecision or disinformation. The ‘*King*’ involved is clearly Agrippa II and Josephus confirms this in *Ant.* 20.213. One should also see *Lam. R.* 1.16.47 where she is called ‘*Miriam daughter of Boethus*’ (sic).
4. Cf. *Yoma* 9a and 18a above. The former statement is literally reproduced in marginal notes of a Sixteenth Century Edition called *Bayit Hadash* with glosses by R. Joel b. Samuel Sirkes.
5. See *Ket.* 104a and cf. too *Ket.* 66b. where a seemingly similar situation regarding extremely high dowries and the like is being told about Nakkdimon’s daughter Miriam, whom R. Yohanan (‘*riding on an ass followed by his Disciples*’ – thus!) sees on his way out of Jerusalem ‘*picking barley grains out of the dung of Arab cattle*. It should also be recalled that in *Lam R.* 1.16.47, it is pointed out that after she married Joshua b. Gamala, ‘*the King*’ (i.e., Agrippa II) ‘*appointed him High Priest*.’ Here too, the question of her maintenance after his death (‘*two se’ahs of wine daily*’) is discussed in the context of the extravagant nature of the widow’s allowance they accorded her and the point about her ‘*once going to see (her husband) reading on the Day of Atonement in the Temple*,’ wherefore ‘*they laid carpets for her from the door of her house to the entrance of the Temple so that her feet might not be exposed – nevertheless they were exposed*.’ This is a marvelous tradition.
6. For these materials about ‘*Martha the daughter of Boethus*’ (sic – really ‘*Miriam*’ as we have seen), called ‘*one of the Richest women in Jerusalem*’ and the story of her death, when she is supposed to have gone out and, when she too off her shoes, ‘*some dung stuck to her foot and she died*’; see *Git.* 56a. It is at this point that R. Yohanan is supposed to have applied the verse from Deuteronomy 28:57: ‘*The tender and delicate woman among you who would not adventure to set the sole of her foot upon the ground*.’ For the parallel material in CD, see xix.9–13 and below, pp. 620–67, etc.
7. For the true picture of the relationship of

- Salome to Philip and John the Baptist generally, see *Ant.* 18.116–19 and 137; for a real picture of levirate marriage issues as they related to the remarriage of Martha the daughter of Boethus and Josephus' friend Jesus ben Gamala, see *Yeb.* 61a, *Yoma* 18a, *Ket.* 104a, and *Lam.* R 1.16.47 above.
8. For the ban on 'niece marriage,' 'close family cousins,' and 'divorce'; see CDIV.17–v.10, VIII.6–7, 11QTLXVI.12–16, etc.; for the 'Simon' in Josephus, see *Ant.* 18.332–4 and Herodian marital practices generally, see *Ant.* 18.130–42 and the Herodian Genealogical chart, pp. 1010–11 below.
 9. For *Sicarii*, see *War* 2.254–57, 425–29, and 4.400–5, *Ant.* 20.186, etc. It is interesting that, as first really observed by Morton Smith, Josephus only begins using the term 'Zealots' in *War* 2.651, long after most of these references. The second such references come in *War* 4.162–365 when, beginning with his discussion of 'the Peace Party' of Ananus ben Ananus, Jesus ben Gamala, Rabban Simeon ben Gamaliel (Paul's alleged teacher's son), and even one 'Gurion,' probably a descendant of the family of 'Nakdimon ben Gurion' above and ending with their alliance with 'the Idumaeans' and other 'brigands,' they destroy such persons as this Ananus, Josephus' friend Jesus ben Gamala, and finally the 'Rich' traitor, Josephus calls, 'Zachariah ben Baris' (cf. Matthew 23:35), whom they slew in the Temple and whose body they 'cast down' into the ravine below. It is passingly odd that these so-called 'Zealots' first really appear in Josephus during the course of this seeming 'vengeance' being taken for the death of persons such as James, the greater part of whose partisans according to Acts 21:21 were made up of 'Zealots.'
 11. It is very important to chronicle these so-called 'Idumaeans' in Josephus and I have done so to some extent in *MZCQ*, pp. 62–3, 95; *JHP*, pp. 26–7, 43, 49–50, 64, 71, *James*, pp. 406–8, 522–7, 814–5, and below, pp. 737–85, etc.; in Josephus, these are chronicled in key passages of the *War* in 4.224–353, 4.566–72, and later in 5.248–9, 358, 6.378–81, and 7.262–74. Aside from Niger of Perea, whose death we have already noted as being perhaps the palimpsest for Jesus' of Scripture; they had two brave leaders, Josephus constantly cites, named 'John' and 'James the son of Sosas,' who seem to have been brothers and who bear an uncanny parallel to the names of the two 'Disciples' of Jesus in Scripture, known as 'John and James the sons of Boanerges'; for these two, see Josephus, *War*, 4.235, 290 (John's death by an 'Arab's' arrow), 521–8, 5.249, and 6.92, 6.148, and 6.360, where he is ultimately arrested by Simon bar Gioras and probably executed. There is also one 'Simon son of Cathlas' and, where 'the Zealots' are concerned, 'Simon and Jude the sons of Ari' (or 'Jairus' – 6.92 and 6.148). Note, too, the plethora of Maccabean and later 'Christian' names throughout these notices.
 12. See *War* 4.224–325 above. He repeats this charge of butchering all the High Priests in *War* 7.267–8.
 13. For *Ben Zizzit*, see *Git.* 56a, *Gen.* R. 42.1, *Lam.* R. 1.5.31, and *ARN* 6.3 (20b–21a). For the famous Talmudic episode where the Rabbis cry out to Agrippa I when he comes to read the Deuteronomic King Law on *Succot* that 'You are our brother, you are our brother, you are our brother' on account of his Piety; see *M. Sota* 7:8 and *pars.* (*Bik.* 3:4 and *Siphre* Deut. 157 on 17:15).
 14. See *Git.* 56a, which here calls 'the Zealots' 'Biryonim' and cf. *ARN* 6.3 (21a), *War* 5.24–6, and *Tacitus*, *Hist.* 5.12
 15. *Git.* 56a. It is here R. Yohanan is pictured as applying the verse from Deuteronomy 28:57 to her pathetic state: 'The tender and delicate woman among you who would not venture to set the sole of her foot upon the ground'; but in *Ket.* 66b, it is rather 'Nakdimon ben Gurion's daughter' Miriam whom R. Yohanan sees 'picking barley grains from the dung of Arab cattle' (again the mix-up between 'Martha' and 'Mary' even in these Talmudic/Rabbinic traditions).
Nonetheless, directly following this, in *Ket.* 67a and repeated verbatim in *Lam.* R. 1.16.47–48 (where she is actually correctly named 'Miriam the daughter of Nakdimon'), it is rather R. Eleazar b. Zadok who is the bearer of the tradition and, as we have seen, what she is doing when he sees her is 'picking barley grains from among the horses' hoofs in *Acco*. Furthermore, it is concerning her fate that the latter allegedly applied the passage from Song of Songs 1:8 (not the one from Deuteronomy 28:57 in the previous tradition): 'O fairest among women, go thy way forth among the footsteps of the flock and feed your bodies' (*geviotayik* and not 'kids' / *gediyotayik* as in the original – at Qumran, one sometimes gets the same sort of tampering with Biblical quotes to develop a preferred exegesis as one does often in the Gospels and in Acts).
In the conversion with R. Yohanan in *Ket.* 66b. (not with Eleazar ben Zadok, as we just saw, as in *Ket.* 67a and *Lam.* R. 1.16.48) as we shall see below, pp. 358–9; not only does Nakdimon's daughter address him as 'Master' (cf. see how in conversation with 'her sister Mary' in John 11:28; 'Martha' refers to 'Jesus' as 'Master'); but the only the only thing she really requests of him (R. Yohanan) – after 'wrapping herself in her hair' and 'standing up' – is 'feed me' (our 'dog' / 'dogs under the table longing to be fed' or *Ben Kalba Sabuf's* 'Poor' / 'the Poor Man Lazarus' at the 'Rich man's door' language in Luke 16 again); however we are clearly dealing with the same episode.
It is here that R. Yohanan enters into his discourse on 'the Riches' of both her father and her father-in-law's houses, noting in an aside to 'his Disciples' how the marriage contract he signed in her regard reckoned her surety at 'one million dinars' and

comparing it, by implication, to her present fallen state.

Here the exchange between R. Yohanan and Nakdimon's daughter – who, to repeat, instead of Lamentations *Rabbah's* and 67a's description of her in the name, as we just saw, of R. Eleazar b. Zadok, as 'picking grain among the horses' hoofs in *Acco*, is now rather 'picking barley grains out of the dung of Arab cattle' – is more detailed and focuses more on the utter reversal of her fortune and the complete obliteration of the 'Riches' of both her father and her father-in-law's house (whoever these may have been – is there a mix-up here, too, with 'Boethus' daughter Martha?').

This kind of confusion and/or overlaps between the 'Miriam's'/'Mary's' and 'Martha' is not, as we have seen, surprising. Even in Gospels, 'Mary' says the same thing as 'Martha' in John 11:21 and 11:32. Moreover, the kind of rebuke 'Jesus' is pictured as giving to all these various complainers is the same, as we have already several times remarked, as in Luke 7:37–49, where it is yet another unnamed woman – simply identified as 'a Sinner' – washing Jesus' feet again (though now 'with her tears') and wiping them with her hair.

.....In parallel materials about R. Yohanan in *Kethuboth* 66b, he is once again pictured, like Jesus in reverse, 'leaving Jerusalem riding upon a donkey while his Disciples follow him' (66b). In this picture, too, of the miserable state to which 'Nakdimon ben Gurion's daughter Miriam' had fallen; the motif of 'her hair' is added as well. To repeat, now 'standing up' to answer the 'Master's' questions, she wrapped (not 'wiped his feet' as in John 11:2, 12:3, Luke 7:37–8, etc.) herself with her hair and stood before him' – here also, two incidences of these 'Standing'/'stood' allusions).

Nor in *Kethuboth* is she explicitly going out 'barefoot' as *Gittin* relates rather of 'Boethus' daughter Martha' above who, as we just saw too, in the picture of her fate is depicted – Rabbinic hyperbole aside – as dying 'when some dung stuck to her foot!' To this heart-rending end, R. Yohanan was also pictured, as we just saw too, as applying the verse from Deuteronomy 28:56 above about 'the tender and delicate woman who would not set the sole of her foot upon the ground,' we have already seen 'R. Eleazar b. Zadok' apply in Lam R. 1.16.47 to 'Boethus' daughter Miriam' (thus!), 'picking grain among the horses' hoofs in *Acco*, but – Rabbinic hyperbole again aside – whose 'hair' the Romans are now pictured as going to 'bind to the tails of Arab horses and make run from Jerusalem to Lydda'!

16. ARN 6.3 (21a) above.

17. In CD (Ms. B) XIX.9–13, the passage being quoted is Ezekiel 9:4 about 'putting a mark on the foreheads of those who weep and cry' (later we shall call such persons 'Mourners for Zion') which is clearly meant to parallel the more detailed quotes from Isaiah 7:17,

Amos 5:26–7 and 9:11, and Numbers 24:17 ('the Star Prophecy') in CD VII.7–21 in Ms. A. Both are in some sense dealing with the 'coming of the Messiah of Aaron and Israel' (singular), the destruction which would be visited upon 'the Backsliders' and 'Evil Ones when God visits the Earth,' and 'the Little Ones' and 'the Meek of the Flock' (Zechariah 13:7) who would escape to 'the Land of the North.' See below, pp. 607–644 and note the parallel with Matthew 27:3–10 about 'Judas Iscariot' (sic) supposedly 'casting the pieces of silver into the Temple,' which thinks it is quoting 'the Prophet Jeremiah' when, in fact, it is quoting a very loose version of 'the Prophet Zechariah' (11:12–13). Still, the ambiance of all these passages have in some sense to do with the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple, the coming of some kind of 'Messiah,' and the 'escape' of some group or other ('the Meek' or 'the Poor?') 'who weep and cry.'

- 17a. Matthew 27:3–10 above and ARN 6.3 (21a). *Git.* 56a, as we have seen, gives a slightly different derivation of his name, i. e., 'Ben Zizzit Hakeseth,' that 'his fringes used to trail on cushions' and 'his seat was among the Nobility of Rome' not 'of Israel.' Who could he be? One of the Herodians perhaps? For the 'cistern' stories about Nakdimon as a kind of 'Honi'/'Elijah redivivus' and his 'daughter's bedspread,' see *Ta'an* 19b and ARN 21a above as well.
18. *Git.* 56a–b.
19. Ephesians 2:19–22, too, continues this metaphor of 'Jesus' or the body of the Community (which in 1 Corinthians is 'Christ Jesus') as Temple and it does so by emphasizing there 'are no longer (any) strangers and foreigners' in 'the Household of God.' Moreover, it also emphasizes 'Circumcision' and 'Uncircumcision' (2:11), 'separation' imagery in a purely allegorical or spiritualized manner (2:12), 'the Blood of Christ' (2:13), 'Peace' (i. e., the Roman 'Pax Romana' – 2:14), and a general plethora of 'Foundation,' 'Cornerstone' (cf. 1QS VIII.7–8 below, where the issue is also spiritualized 'Temple' imagery), and 'building' imagery – all spiritualized.
20. Lam R. 1.5.31 and Eccles. R. 7.12.1.
21. For our comments on these 'Abba' names, as well as more material on 'Jacob of Kfar Sechania' or 'Sihmin,' see above pp. 159–64. One should note, as well, that Lam R. 1.17.52 also knows a rabbi known as 'R. Joshua of Sihmin.'
22. Eccles. R. 7.12. Here, the passage is about 'Ben Battiah' or 'Abba Sikkra,' R. Yohanan b. Zacchai's nephew, 'the Head of the Sicarii in Jerusalem' who in this capacity 'burned all the stores' as we have already seen. But what should have been written here is the Aramaic 'Sikrin,' while instead we find the designation 'Kisrin.' We have already remarked mix-ups like this in the 'Judas Iscariot' designation of the Gospels and the Book of Acts above. Of course the story about 'Jacob' (possibly 'James') is to be found

- in Eccles. R. 1.8.3, A.Z. 17a, and *Tōs. Hul.* 2:24 above. One should also see j. *Shab.* 14.4 (14d). For more on this 'Jacob,' also see A.Z. 27b. While some authorities consider this 'Kisrin' to be 'Katzrin' on the Golan Heights, reconquered from the Syrians in modern times in 1967 and where an archaeological dig has been in progress for some time; others simply identify it as a Hebrew/Aramaic approximation of the coastal town of 'Caesarea. Still 'Kfar Sechania' or 'Silmin' is doubtlessly a Galilean town – and just such a town exists among the Arabs in Galilee today not far from the Sea by that name. For 'Silmin,' see Josephus, *Vita* 188 and 265 and *War* 2.573 and pp. 162–3 above. Also in addition to the Talmudic references there, see j. *Meg* 4:5, 7b.
23. *Git.* 56a–b and cf. *Lam R.* 1.5.31 and *ARN* 4.5 (20a).
24. *Ber.* 62a. This is an amazing passage because, not only does it show the earthiness of the *Talmud* and its concerns for the mundane bodily things such as which way to sit in the privy, how one should behave when one 'consults nature,' or how to indulge in sexual relations (to each such schoolboyish indiscretion concerning which, the narrator replying: 'It is a matter of Torah and I am required to learn'); but it comes right after the gruesomely detailed description of R. Akiba's public death and martyrdom, itself following upon and in exposition of the citation of how one 'should love the Lord your God with all your soul and with all your might' – the 'Piety' Commandment of all our Opposition/Resistance groups.
- 25/55. *Git.* 56a and *Lam R.* 1.5.31. In these presentations, of course, we have what is perhaps the original prototype for 'the Pierced Messiah' material. This is a question that has vexed Qumran Studies ever since Prof. Wise and myself informed the world of the existence of just such a text (4Q285) in the unpublished Qumran manuscripts in 1991 – after we published it, dubbed by popularizers like Hershel Shanks (the Editor of *The Biblical Archaeology Review*), 'The Pierced Messiah'; but which we called 'The Messianic Leader (Nasi)'; cf. *DSSU*, pp. 27–29. For my original interpretation of this text, see the introduction of it in *DSSU*, pp. 24–27 (which I wrote – Prof. Wise and his Team at the University of Chicago doing redactions and translations while I wrote most of the commentaries).
- It is interesting that in the presentation in *ARN* 4.5 (20a), the 'pierced' material is omitted, as is any reference to R. Yohanan's nephew, *Abba Sikeira*/Ben Battiah, the context in which one finds it in the *Gittin* and *Lam Rabbah* presentations above. Nonetheless, the episode does move on to R. Yohanan's anachronistic interview before Vespasian, in which the former does apply to the latter (as Josephus does with slightly more reliability in the *War* 3.399–405), one part of what I have been referring to as 'the Messianic Prophecy,' Isaiah 10:34: 'Lebanon shall fall by a Mighty One.' That passages is introduced by the material about 'a Shoot arising from the Root of Jesse' and both are extant at Qumran – the first in 4Qp1sa^a (161–3) below and the second in 4Q285 above. A second prophecy contributing to this 'Messianic' couplet is 'The Star Prophecy' of Numbers 24:17 which we have referred to variously above, but see pp. 351–57, 408–11, 448–54, 618–86 below.
-Again, to reiterate, Prof. Wise and myself were the first to call attention to this incredibly pivotal fragment buried in the hitherto unpublished materials. To Prof. Wise's Team goes the credit for discovering it and first translating it, though others – also recognizing its importance – have since capitalized on and exploited it for their own purposes (the first, and most notable, perhaps, being, hardly months after we first publically revealed its existence, Prof. G. Vermes of Oxford in 'The Oxford Forum for Qumran Research: Seminar on the Rule of War – 4Q285, *JJS*, 1992, pp. 85–90.
- In that somewhat opportunistic and not very charitable publication, he criticized the translation of Prof. Wise and his team (unaware at the time, perhaps, that I was not among those doing this aspect of the work), as others – like Prof. Wacholder of H.U.C. – had already (perhaps justifiably) done before him; while at the same time giving the impression that he and his colleagues were the ones really bringing this key fragment to the attention of the public. Perhaps as a reward for this, he and his student/associate, P. Alexander, were the ones ultimately given responsibility for 'the *Editio Princeps*' – as he terms it – of this text in *DJD* xxiii by the Qumran 'Editorial Team.'
- Others who exploited the existence of this pivotal fragment included institutions like the Israel Antiquities Authority which, while initially condemning our part in calling attention to and making this fragment public, have made it a featured part of almost every exhibition of the Dead Sea Scrolls they have sponsored ever since at Museums around the world – while all the time, like some others, usually neglecting to acknowledge our part in discovering it and bringing this fragment to the attention of the world – not to mention the published catalogues that usually accompanied these exhibits.
- In their anxiety to usurp and condemn the fact that we originally found this fragment, they almost always misunderstand the purpose of Prof. Wise and myself in revealing the existence of this fundamental fragment (overlooked by 'the Official Team' previously responsible for the publication of the Scrolls for some 35 years) was not to give a definitive final translation; but rather to counter the endless palliatives one was hearing at the time, attempting to discourage the public from inquiring further into the matter of the previously

unpublished Scrolls – namely, that ‘*there was nothing important in the unpublished materials.*’

We disagreed and this was the reason we went public to the press – where they had been handing out these tendentious reports – to counterindicate³ this mantra, citing the existence of this pivotal fragment identifying ‘*the Branch of David*’, the ‘*Shoot from the Root of Jesse*’, with ‘*the Nasi ha-Edah*’. This ‘*Nasi*’, as we have seen, is also mentioned in Column VII of the Damascus Document in connection with the crucial exegesis of ‘*the Star Prophecy*’ of Numbers 24:17, just mentioned above, as ‘*the Sceptre who would arise out of Israel*’. We considered it highly important even if the translation provided by Michael Wise and his associates was only a rough, preliminary at the time. The point of this exercise was to show the world just how important some of the materials to be found in the unpublished corpus actually were – not to provide a final accurate and precise translation. We left this to those obliged to us for having found it.

26. Once again, this has to be seen as Isaiah 10:34-11:5, a *Pesher* concerning which is completely extant at Qumran (4QpIsa^a – also reflected, however fragmentedly in 4Q285 above), augmented by Numbers 24:17, as we just saw, which is found in at least three places in the extant Qumran corpus: the Damascus Document, the War Scroll, and *Testimonia*.

In the first place, it has to be said that in all these contexts at Qumran, ‘*the Nasi ha-Edah*’ / ‘*the Prince of the Congregation*’ is mentioned (in the Isaiah *Pesher*, for instance, however fragmentary, it is in Column II.15); and ‘*the Branch of David*’ in at least two of these, as well as in the Genesis *Pesher* in the exposition there of the ‘*Shiloh*’ Prophecy of Genesis 49:10.

Furthermore, in all the Isaiah *Peshers*, ‘*the Remnant*’, and expression also to be encountered in Columns VII and XIX in the Damascus Document below, and ‘*the Last Days*’ pervasive in the literature, are mentioned repeatedly. Paralleling the Damascus Document too, ‘*the Time of the Visitation*’ is evoked. The enemy are clearly ‘*the Kittim*’ and, not insignificantly, ‘*Lebanon*’ (because of the ‘*whitening*’ imagery) is definitively identified as ‘*the Temple*’. Here, however, the resemblance between these positions and the Rabbinic ends because the interpretation attributed to R. Yohanan (not to mention Josephus) appears to reverse that here at Qumran. This should not be surprising, as one finds the same kind of reversal going on in ‘*Christian*’ literature almost without pause.

Of course, ‘*the Star Prophecy*’ appears as well in Rabbinic literature but, once again, there it is more to belittle it or belittle R. Akiba, otherwise perhaps the most heroic Rabbi in the *Talmud*, because of his perceived application of it to Bar Kochba from which report it would appear certain,

the latter took his name. This is because in most other contexts – such as Lam R. 2.2.4 and b. *Tʿan.* 68d, which tell the whole story of R. Akiba and ‘*Bar Koziba*’ as well as the latter’s death, and the Bar Kochba letters found at Wadi Murabbaʿat – he is called ‘*Bar Kosiba*’, Of course, in Rabbinic literature, not unlike the opponent of the Righteous Teacher in the Scrolls, ‘*Bar Koziba*’ is re-interpreted to refer to ‘*the Liar*’ – an interesting parallel with the documents at Qumran.

27. The point here is that we have actual Rabbinic confirmation that all these allusions – ARN 4.5 (20a), Lam R. 1.5.31, and *Git.* 56a-b – refer to the fall of the Temple in 70 CE and not any earlier one. In fact, as ARN progresses, a number of other prophecies, referring to this event and using this kind of ‘*Lebanon*’ language to refer to the Temple, are listed. One also finds the same sorts of ‘*Lebanon*’ passages in *Yoma* 39b, some also including ‘*cedars*’ language, which almost always refers to ‘*the Temple*’. Another favorite where this kind of imagery is concerned is Zechariah 11:1: ‘*Open your doors O Lebanon that the fire may devour your Cedars.*’

- 28(26). This does begin to undermine the believability of the account in Matthew right from the start, which is largely contradicted in Acts 1:18-20 anyhow (see my ‘*Gospel Fiction and the Redemization of Judas*’ in *The Huffington Post*, 12/19/07 above). But curiously, the account too in Acts 1:20 appears to apply two tendentious prophecies from what it terms ‘*the Holy Spirit by the mouth of David concerning Judas*’ – Psalms 69:29 and 109:8 – to these events concerning Judas’ demise and the immediate alleged election to replace him, where the defeated candidate’s ‘*surname*’ was ‘*Justus*’. We have treated this subject at length in *James*, pp. 154-257, 406-60, etc. and the point basically is that the Greek Acts uses to express Psalm 109:8 (‘*let someone else take his Office*’ – to say nothing of the uncharitability the passage from Psalm 69:25: ‘*let his camp be reduced to ruin; let there be no one to live in it*’ – what does this mean?) is ‘*Episkopon*’, which all will recognize as precisely the position accorded James (where the epithet ‘*Justus*’ is used in sometimes in place of his very name itself) in early Church literature and not either ‘*Judas*’ or his substitutes.

Equally curious, not only is there no description of the missing election of James as ‘*Bishop*’ of the early Church (found in almost all early Church sources), which should have occurred at approximately this time; there is no introduction of who, in fact, this ‘*James*’ actually is, though Acts 12:17 following upon the beheading of the other James and Peter’s alleged miraculous escape from prison, seems to think we either know or should know who he is.

Finally, if we see James as a kind of ‘*Essene*’ or ‘*Rechabite*’, then at this point

- the material from Jeremiah 35:1-19 probably would have been an appropriate text to cite at this point were one interested in citing proof-texts. So here actually 'the Prophet Jeremiah' would have been appropriate whereas in the parallel account in Matthew 27:3-10 above, it would not have been – but rather Zechariah 11:12-13 as we have seen. Of course Zechariah 12:10, cited in John 19:36 (which omits any mention of 'Judas Iscariot' in its discussion of the death of Jesus as do Mark and Luke), the first 'pierced' text in the Gospels, really does find a parallel in the materials about R. Yohanan's escape from Jerusalem in Rabbinic literature as we have seen above.
- 29(27). To show that Paul is aware of this method, see his statement in Galatians 4:27 where, in tendentiously applying Abraham's marital situation in Genesis to that of his congregants 'wish to be subject to the Law' which plays upon the 'freeborn wife' Sarah as opposed to 'the daughter of the slave woman' Hagar who is supposed to stand for 'Mount Sinai in Arabia whose children are in slavery' (sic – i. e., a thinly-disguised aspersion for being subject to 'the Law of Moses'; whereas the real 'Children of the Promise,' meaning his Communities) are 'free'. He therefore quotes again rather tendentiously, but full of ill-will and bad temper (itself playing on the 'Essene' practice of 'casting out' backsliders as reported in Josephus): 'Therefore cast out the slave woman' – this in place of what might have been considered real 'freedom' and 'slavery' by his opponents, i. e., those fighting against Rome or in the so-called 'Zealot,' 'Messianic,' or 'Sicarii' Movement – a point actually even expressed on their coinage from 66-69 CE: and even later in the Bar Kochba (another of these 'Star's') Uprising: 'the Freedom of Israel.' But where Paul is concerned, as he puts this, following the precedent of Philo (whom, if he was an 'Herodian,' as we shall argue presently in this book and have done previously elsewhere – 'Herodians' having married into Philo's family): 'Such things are allegory.'
30. See n. 27 above.
31. Lam R. 1.5.31 and 2.2.4 and ARN 4.5 (20a) above, but also see Eccles. R. 7.12.1 and Git 56b above as well.
32. See, for instance, 4Q163 (Isaiah Peshet), Fragment 21.7-9, where the passage being cited is Zechariah 11:11, just after these quotes from Talmudic literature above, and Fragments 8-10.7-10, where the passage being quoted is Zechariah 3:9.
33. See, for instance, 1QpHabv.12-vi.11, where the passage being expounded is Habakkuk 1:14-16 and the exposition has to do with 'the Kittim' (in our view, the Romans), who 'eat' or 'consume all the Peoples year by year giving many countries over to the sword' (hardly the Seleucids!). 'They destroy many by the sword...and have no pity even on the fruit of the womb.' This pericope is very compelling, particularly for dating purposes. For this kind of 'destruction' applied to 'the Righteous Teacher,' 'the Poor,' and, in turn, via 'God's Judgement,' 'the Wicked Priest' and 'all the Servants of Idols' as a whole, see 1QpHabxi.4-xiii.4 below.
34. 1QpHabxi.16-xii.5. Note here that this reference to 'Lebanon' as 'the Council of the Community' comes amid evocation of 'the dumb beasts' as 'the Simple Ones of Judah doing Torah' and 'the Ebionim' – and presumably their 'Blood' ('the Blood of Man' / 'Adam' in Habakkuk 2:17) – as consisting of these and 'the Council of the Community.' For 'the Essenes' wearing only 'white linen' (like 'Priests' in the Temple), see Josephus, War 2.122. It should be noted too that in the interpretation of Zechariah 11:1 in ARN 4.5 (20a): 'Open your doors, O Lebanon, that fire may devour your cedars,' 'Lebanon' would appear to stand for 'the High Priests'; and here the exposition involves hurling the keys to the Temple up to Heaven.
35. For this list of the virtues and characteristics of 'the Community Council,' see 1QSviii.1-12 (immediately preceded by a rehearsal of 'Essene' expulsion practices and directly followed by evocation of Isaiah 40:3's 'Prepare in the wilderness the Way of the Lord' as descriptive of the Community's own 'separation from the midst of the Habitation of the Men of Unrighteousness to go into the wilderness'). Note, too, that in this perhaps fundamental description, these also include 'paying the Wicked their Reward' of 1QpHabxii.2-3 above and 'those bent in the dust' in the War Scroll, the 'steadfastness' of Columns VII-VIII and XIX-XX of the Damascus Document, the 'Precious Cornerstone' imagery of 'Jesus' in the New Testament, and the 'spiritualized' Community as Temple imagery of Paul in 1 Corinthians.
36. ARN 4.5 (20a). For being 'made white,' see Yoma 39a and 39b below.
37. Yoma 39b. note that in 39a, preceding this, there is even an allusion (as in Isaiah 1:18) to 'whitening' of the scarlet strap that was tied between the horns of a bullock in the Temple for sacrifice. For the exposition of this passage in Nahum at Qumran, see 4QpNahi.4-9 which, once again, though fragmentary, clearly centers on what 'the Kittim' are doing to the Land including the Temple.
38. Lam R. 1.5.31. In this narrative, which rather takes place in the presence of his nephew 'Ben Battiah' (in Gittin, 'the Head of the Biryonim in Jerusalem'), it is the difference between a 'woe' and a 'wah' that make all the difference.
39. Ibid.
40. Cf. Lam R. 1.5.31 with ARN 4.5 (20a) and Git 56b above.
41. War 6.312-3. In another curious parallel, it is interesting to note that, even in the story of 'Jesus ben Ananias' that precedes this in War 6.300-9, 'Jesus' cry of 'Woe, woe to Jerusalem,' repeated some four times, is also anticipating the fall of Jerusalem and the

- destruction of the Temple.
42. Cf. *War* 2.151-3 with *Ant.* 18.23 and note that, while Josephus is calling the latter 'the Fourth Philosophy' followers of 'Judas the Galilean' without specifically naming it either 'Zealot' or 'Sicarii' but obviously rather 'Galileans'; the description of the courage they show under torture and the threat of imminent death is the same. In fact, it is this indifference to torture and death that Hippolytus is rather ascribing as characteristic of those he is calling either 'Zealot' or 'Sicarii Essenes' (9.21).
 43. See Josephus, *War* 4.585-663 and cf. Tacitus, *Hist.* 2.78-5.13, Suetonius 8.5.1-8.85, etc.
 44. See Josephus, *War* 3.399-405 above.
 45. We first began to call these 'Movements' 'Messianic' and insist on a singular Davidic Messiah at Qumran in *MZCQ*, Leiden, 1983, pp. 20-27, 36-38, and 96-7. The finding, of course, of 'The Messiah of Heaven and Earth' text (4Q521) in *DSSU*, 1991, pp. 19-21 did not hurt this hypothesis at all. See also my comments introducing this section, pp. 17-19 but, also, my more general ones in pp. 10-12.
 46. See 4QFlor.7-11 on 2 Samuel 7:11-14 and Amos 9:11 and pp. 633-86 and variously below. One should note that in all such contexts 4Q285, *The Messianic Florilegium* on the Promises to David, Columns vii and xix of the Damascus Document, and in the Genesis *Peshet*, the adjectival, verbal, and pronominal usages surrounding all these allusions are invariably singular.
 47. 4Q285 above, *DSSU*, pp. 24-30.
 48. See my comments in n. 25 above. Though this was widely trumpeted as a text which I found; it was not I who either found this text or translated it. As already stated, my purpose in releasing it in 1990 was to show how significant some of the materials in the unpublished corpus actually were as opposed to what some members of the Qumran Editorial Team were publically insisting.
 48. See my comments in *DSSU*, pp. 24-27 in 1990-91. This introduction, written solely by myself, was also my sole contribution to the decipherment of this text. The idea of a 'Suffering Messiah' at Qumran always seemed to me to run counter to the militancy and apocalyptic aggressiveness of the general thrust of the texts there. Though possible, it was – to say the least *Lam R.* 1.16.48 highly improbable despite the equivocal and ambiguous nature of the allusion in question.
 49. CDVII.18-21, XII.23, XIV.20, and XIX.10-11 and see my comments in *DSSU*, pp. 10-12 and 17-19 above.
 50. See 4Q252v.1-6, *DSSU*, p. 89 and my comments there on pp. 83-5. Of course, the allusion here to the Messianic 'feet' are all-important to the numerous accounts in the Gospels – which we have covered *ad nauseum* above – of anointing Jesus' feet with expensive 'spikenard ointment' or 'wiping' them with one's hair or 'bathing' them with one's tears. But also one should see the numerous allusions to 'making Your enemies Your footstool' of Psalm 110:1 (another aggressively 'Messianic' Psalm which also speaks of 'sitting on the Right Hand' of God, the 'Sceptre in Zion,' a Priest after the Order of Melchizedek forever,' 'shattering kings,' 'smashing skulls,' and 'holding His Head high in Victory') in Matthew 22:44, Mark 12:36, Luke 20:43, Acts 2:35, and Hebrews 1:13 and 10:13 and cf. 1QM XII.11-12 and XIX.3-4.
 51. See *Lam R.* 1.16.51, which has many of the quotations found here at Qumran not to mention in Paul – cf. 'the Comforter' or 'Deliverer' of Isaiah 27:9 in Romans 11:26 as well as in John 15:26 and 16:7.
 52. See CDVII.18-21 where 'the Sceptre arising out of Israel' is said to be 'the Nasi chol ha-'Edah' who, at whose 'rising' or 'standing up' (resurrection?), 'shall utterly destroy all the Sons of Seth' – this again in line with the aggressive quality of Psalm 110:5-7, despite later 'Christian' attempts to transmute it.
 53. See *ARN* 4.5 (20a) above.
 54. *Git.* 56b above.
 55. See our comments about 'the Mourners for Zion' in *James*, pp. 309, 709, 764, and 898.
 56. CDVII.18-20, 1QM XI.5-9, and 4QTest.9-13.
 57. *Loc. cit.*, *War* 3.399-405.
 58. *Lam R.* 1.13.41 and Song of Songs *R.* 8.9.3. It should be noted that Numbers 24:17 is also quoted in the latter 2.3.5.
 59. 1QP Hab. 6-7 (note that the context here is the fall of Jerusalem and, in particular, the destruction of 'the Last Priests of Jerusalem'). The 'Oracle to leave Jerusalem' is known as 'the Pella Flight Oracle' and for a description of it, see *E.H.* 3.5.3 and Epiphanius, *De pond. et mens.* 15. For our treatment of it, see below, pp. 510-48. It is interesting that directly following this reference in *E.H.* 3.8.1-11, Eusebius gives all of Josephus' 'signs' from the *War* for the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple, including the whole story of 'Jesus ben Ananias' oracle which we discuss below and compare both to 'the Pella Flight Oracle' and 'Agabus' reverse oracle in Acts 21:10-14 'not to go up to Jerusalem'; One should also note that it is in this same section, *E.H.* 3.8.10-11, that Eusebius remarks Josephus' application of 'the World Ruler Prophecy' to Vespasian (and here, quite clearly, he is using the language of Numbers 24:17 not Isaiah 10:34), arguing that this was incorrect and should rather have been applied to 'Jesus,' 'since Vespasian did not rule the whole world, but only that part of it which was subject to the Romans' (*sic*). For Paul's receipt of another reverse revelation, this time, to 'go up to Jerusalem,' see Galatians 2:1-2.
 60. *Ket.* 66b.
 61. Cf. *Ket.* 66b-67a with *Lam R.* 1.16.48 and n. 15 above.
 62. Cf. *Ket.* 66b and 67a with *Git* 56a and *Lam R.* 1.16.47 and, again, see above n. 15. We

- have already paid sufficient attention to all these 'hair' motif allusions, but for the various ministrations of women 'anointing' Jesus' feet' with their 'tears' or 'wiping' them with their 'hair' in the New Testament, see Matthew 26:7-12, Mark 14:3-4, Luke 7:38-44, John 11:2, and 12:3 (in the latter two cases, as we have seen, it is again another 'Mary,' this time identified as 'Martha's sister' – *sic*), etc.
63. ARN 6.3 (20b)
64. For the 'sweet fragrance' of the 'Righteousness, et. al.' of Community Council at Qumran, see 1QS VIII.9-10. It should be noted, as we shall again below, that this is the same Epaphroditus that Paul addresses earlier in Philippians 2:25 as his 'brother,' 'fellow-worker and fellow-soldier,' 'minister' and 'apostle' seemingly to those he later calls 'the Saints' in 'the Household of Caesar' in Philippians 4:22 (speak about Rabbinic hyperbole!). It is hardly to be doubted that this is the same 'Epaphroditus' (also 'in the Household of Caesar' – in this case, both 'Nero Caesar,' whom he seems to have helped commit suicide, and after that, the Flavians), to whom Josephus dedicated most of his works. In 2 Corinthians 2:14-17, Paul really surpasses himself with this 'sweet fragrance' imagery, using it in every way imaginable.
65. For 'the Sons of the Pit' in the Scrolls, see 1QSix.15 in exposition of 'the Way in the Wilderness' citation, CDvi.14-16 with the same sense of 'separation' from them and in the context of allusion to the 'Nazirite' language of 'keep away from' (Hebrew: *lehinnazer* – the same sense of Matthew 15:14's 'leave them alone,' i. e., 'the Pharisees' / a euphemism and their 'Blind Guides'), etc.
- 66(23). 4QMMT II.56-66 (4Q396-7). It is interesting that these passages on 'pure' and 'impure liquids' and 'the vessels' that hold them are sandwiched in between references to 'the blind who cannot see' (so as to keep apart from uncleanness and impurity) and 'the deaf who cannot hear the Law and the Ordinance and the Precepts of Israel on cleanliness and purity,' followed by allusion to 'barring the dogs from the wilderness camps.'
67. ARN 25.3 (27a), somewhat palely reflected in *San.* 68a. It is interesting that in this discussion R. Eliezer not only seems to cantankerously reverse many of the purity regulations his Disciples had previously recognized and, dying with the words 'clean' on his lips, thereby prompting either R. Eleazar b. Azariah or R. Joshua to cry out, 'the ban is annulled' (meaning 'the ban of excommunication' Rabban Gamaliel had placed upon him – see below *B.M.* 59b), 'because his soul departed with the word "clean" upon his lips, he is clean for the world to come' (thus); but also in discussing the miracles attributed to R. Eliezer, one uses the very language of 'planting' and 'uprooting,' we have just described, and attributed in Matthew 15:13 to Jesus' teaching on the subject of 'the Blind Guides' and 'the Pharisees,' that 'every Plant which My Heavenly Father has not planted shall be uprooted' – as this is put in typical Rabbinic prosaicism, 'an entire field of cucumbers' which 'with a word' he both 'planted and uprooted' and 'taught' others how to do so).
- 67(29). *Lam R.* 2.2.4 and *j. Tān* an 68d.
68. ARN 25.3 (27a) and *San.* 68a above. It is here he is said to prophesy the manner and harshness of R. Akiba's death and others of his generation, 'because they did not come to study under (him)' 'taking no more than the paint brush takes from the palette.'
69. See *A.Z.* 16b-17a, *j. Shab.* 14d, *Eccles. R.* 1.8.3, and *Tos. Hul.* 2.24 above. In this encounter, the *sitz im leben* would appear to have been the charges of 'heresy' levelled in some quarters against R. Eliezer. To explore these, the traditions have R. Akiba – clearly R. Eliezer's favorite student – ask him sympathetically, 'Perhaps you heard an heretical opinion and it appealed to you?' It is in response to this query by an adoring Disciple that R. Eliezer tells the story of his encounter with Jacob of Kfar Sechania who told him the story in the name of 'Jesus the Nazorean' or 'Jesus ben Pandira.' Whatever one's view of the authenticity of this story (the writer considers it perhaps the only really authentic tradition regarding this mysterious teacher we have), it is clear that R. Eliezer sympathizes with this story and the position it represents and considers it quite funny which, of course, would be even more the case of 'Jacob of Kfar Sechania' ('James'?) were more hard-line and the opposite of what received Scripture has attempted to transform him and his colleagues into, i. e., at the very least, more sympathetic to Rome in the manner of R. Yohanan, R. Joshua, and Gamaliel II below rather than more extreme approach represented by the Dead Sea Scrolls (clearly documents of 'the Minim' or 'Sectarians,' the very thing R. Eliezer is being accused of here).
70. See, in particular, their dispute over the 'cleanness' or 'uncleanness of the oven of Akhnai' in *B.M.* 59b above, which led to R. Eliezer's excommunication. here, for a change, R. Eliezer. In this dispute, after first causing a 'carob tree to be uprooted a hundred cubits out of its place' (Cf. 'Jesus' 'miracle' on 'coming back into Jerusalem' in Matthew 21:19-22 of 'making' 'the fig tree' wither and even the possibility of 'moving a mountain into the sea' by 'Faith,' a matter also referred to in ARN above in relation to R. Eliezer!), R. Eliezer appeals to 'a Bat Kol' which promptly cried out from Heaven in favor of his opinion (cf. Peter and his vision of the Heavenly Tablecloth in Acts 10:11-20, when a Heavenly 'Voice' accompanies it instructing him three times 'to kill and eat'). It is at this point that R. Joshua quotes Deuteronomy 30:12: 'It is not in Heaven,' insisting one should, 'pay no attention to a Bat Kol,' but rather quoting Exodus 23:2, 'follow the majority' – then proceeding to cast the deciding vote vis-a-vis R. Eliezer's

excommunication.

Other notable disputes between them occur when a woman who had committed incest in Eccles R. 1.8.4 and *Tos. San* 13.2 came to both and R. Eliezer in the manner of the more hard-line School of Shammai drove her away but R. Joshua accepted her (cf. Gospel portraits of 'Jesus' keeping 'table fellowship' – and I use the term 'portrait' advisedly – with 'prostitutes' and 'sinners'); or *Ned* 74a on widow's waiting periods important for the situation of Jesus b. Gamala above. In general portrayed as sympathetic to 'Gentiles,' he is quoted in *Tos. San*. 13.2 as saying; '*Pious Gentiles have a share in the world to come*' and lamented in *Tos. Sot.* 15.3 with the words: '*Since R. Joshua dies, good counsel has departed from Israel.*'

Not only was R. Joshua with Rabban Gamaliel and others a prominent member of the 'Peace Party' and participated in several voyages to Rome in this regard (cf. *Bek.* 8b, *Hul* 59b–60a, *Nid.* 69b–70a, and *Gen R.* 64.10), his approach contrasted markedly with that of R. Eliezer who, for instance, in *M. Shab.* 6.4 supported the wearing of weapons on the Sabbath and in *A.Z.* 23a supported 'banning sacrifices from Gentiles in the Temple' – one of the issues that began the First War against Rome (R. Joshua almost always being the most lenient and R. Eliezer in the spirit of the more rigorous School of Shammai – cf. *Nid.* 7b and *Shab.* 130b – being the more stringent as opposed to that of Hillel). He was even reputed in *Bek.* 8b above to have conversed with the Emperor Hadrian in Athens!

But besides these various resemblances to the picture of 'Jesus' in Scripture, perhaps the most interesting episode concerning R. Joshua is his argument with '*the Mourners for Zion*' in *B.B.* 60b who, because of the destruction of the Temple, refuse any longer '*to eat meat or drink wine.*' Here, he is pictured as quoting Malachi 3:9: '*You are cursed with a curse, yet you rob me – nay, even the whole Nation.*' To be sure, anyone familiar with the New Testament Book of Acts will immediately recognize the resemblance of this to Acts 23:14: '*with a curse we have cursed ourselves not to eat or drink until we have killed Paul*' (which is to say nothing of the Synoptics' various insistences that '*the Son of Man came eating and drinking!*').

Nonetheless, in the end, R. Joshua is pictured as being among the first to proclaim the abolition of the ban against R. Eliezer and his Halachot (legal rulings – '*the ban is annulled, the ban is annulled*') in the account of *San.* 68a above and, in arguments concerning widowhood and intervening marriage (in this case, we have a subject being treated by Muhammad in the *Koran* 2.230 taking basically the same position and a 'divorce' law in Islam to the present day) in *Git* 83a–b, he was forced to admit, basically restoring all of R. Eliezer's opinions, '*You should not refute the Lion after*

he is dead.'

71. For more arguments with R. Yohanan and his 'school' (including R. Joshua and Gamaliel II), which basically continue those between Hillel and Shammai as just noted, see *Ned* 19a on 'unclean fluids' again, *M. Neg.* 9.3 on the proper application of *Halachic* Tradition, *T'ran* 25b in another episode regarding a '*Bat Kol*' which supposedly criticized R. Eliezer's lack of '*forbearance*' in the matters of the stopping or making of rain again, and *B.B.* 10b, *M. Shab.* 6.4, *Nid.* 7b, *A.Z.* 23a, and *Git.* 83a–b above. By the same token and as opposed to many of these examples, *Pirkeh Abbot* 2.8 reports that R. Yohanan '*used to say: "If all this sage of Israel were on one scale and Eliezer b. Hyrcanus on the other, he would outweigh them all!"*'
72. See *B.M.* 59b above. Because of this excommunication, Rabban Gamaliel was said to have been swept over by a great wave at sea. For his sister, '*Imma Shalom*,' see *Shab.* 116a–b, '*Er* 63a, and *Ned.* 20a–b.
73. *ARN* 6.3 (20b) above and *Gen R.* 42.1; cf. too *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* 7 and *Ps Philo* 12.1.
74. For the *Zohar* 1.31b–32a too, the actual explanation of this mystical designation has to do with '*the light on Moses' face*' and see *James*, pp. 133–4. In Islamic Sufi tradition, a similar tradition holds sway.
75. For the use of this allusion, '*House of Judah*,' at Qumran, see CDIV.11, 1QpHabviii.1, 4QPp 37n14, etc.
76. *ARN* 25.3 (27a).
77. *ARN* 25.1 (27a).
78. *ARN* 6.3 (20b) and *Gen R.* 42.1.
79. *Ibid.* Actually in this account the allusion to '*a silver silver couch*' makes some commentators feel this name should actually be '*Ben Sisi*' or '*Ben Zizzit Hakkef*' ('*Silver*'), that is not either '*Keset*' or '*Keseth*' / '*Couch*' or '*Cushions*'
80. *Eccles R.* 7.12.1. Actually here there are again only three '*Councillors*,' '*Ben Gurion*' and '*Ben Nakdimon*,' probably correctly, being combined into one. It is in *Lam R.* 1.5.31 that the four '*Councillors*' are named. Still, in both accounts, it is '*Ben Battiah*,' Yohanan b. Zacchai's nephew (not Abba Sikkra – if there is any difference between the two terminologies), who is '*Head of the Zealots in Jerusalem*' and who '*burned the storehouses*.' It is at this point, too, that R. Yohanan rather applies the Prophecy '*Lebanon shall fall by the hand of a Mighty One*' from Isaiah 10:34 above to his 'prophecy' about Vespasian, not '*the Star Prophecy*' – in any event, as we have seen, both are extant at Qumran.
81. *Git.* 56a but also, one should note, here two derivations of his name are given: 1) '*because his seat (kise) was among the Great Ones of Rome*' above and 2) '*because his fringes (zizzit) used to trail on cushions (keseth)*.' However, as we have already suggested, whoever he was he was clearly an Establishment person and I would imagine a member of the Herodian or that of the

- Alabarch of Alexandria – see p. 215, n. 69, Chapter Eight above and p. 315, n. 46, Chapter 11 above.
82. For the story of this woman – supposedly named ‘*Rufina*’ (also rumoured as being responsible for his death) and supposed to be the wife of the Roman Prefect Tinius Rufus – and this marriage, see *Ned.* 50b, *A.Z.* 20a and n. 70, Chapter Eight above. It should be noted that this same ‘Sainly’ R. Akiba did make some peculiar rulings – for instance, in *Git.* 90a that it was permissible to divorce one’s wife if one wished to marry a more beautiful woman and in *Shab.* 64b allowing women to use beauty aids during menstruation. For ‘*Tinius Rufus*,’ one should also see *Git.* 90a.
83. 1QpHabxi.8. This allusion, which is normally translated ‘*cause to stumble*’ and describes what the Wicked Priest did to the Righteous Teacher and his followers (‘*the Poor*’/‘*the Ebionim*’) actually translates out as ‘*cast them down*’ – a usage pregnant with meaning for this Period.
84. 4QpPs 37ii.13–20.
85. Cf. 4QpPs 37ii with Gen R. 42.1.
86. See 4QpPs 37ii.14–16, iii.1, iii.5–7, and iii.11, and below, pp.715–32 and 895–903. It should be noted that this term, ‘*Doers of the Torah*’ which circumscribes the application of Habakkuk 2:3–4 on ‘*the Delay of the Parousia*’ and ‘*the Righteous shall live by his Faith*’ in the Habakkuk *Peshet*, where it is a fundamental usage, is also fundamental to the Letter of James 1:22–2:26, thereby thereby focussing them via internal parameters into the same Era.
- 87(89). 4QpPs 37ii.18–20.
88. See *MZCQ*, pp. 29, 32–33, and 92–6. The use of the term ‘*Nasi*’/‘*Nasi Chol ha-Edah*’ (a term also found in the exegesis of Numbers 24:17 in the Damascus Document as we have seen) in iii.14 and v.1 in the War Scroll from Qumran, a term we know was in use on Bar Kochba coinage, further solidifies this possibility.
89. Cf. 4QpNahiii.8 and iv.4–5 and also the use of the term ‘*Nilvim*’ in CDiv.2–3 and 4Q448(‘*Paean for King Jonathan*’).ii.4 (*DSSU*, pp. 273–80), which is based on the word ‘*joining*’/‘*Joiners*’ and which I have identified as ‘*Gentiles attaching themselves to the Community*’ as in Esther and Isaiah below.
90. CDiv.3 in exposition of the term ‘*halleviyim*,’ and below, pp. 413–5, 423–7, 511, 557, 620–23, 655–75, 714–23, 893–4, 915–26, and 974–88.
91. See Luke 10:33, 17:16, John 4:39–40, 8:48, and Acts 8:25, but *par contra*, see Matthew 10:5. Nor is this to take into account the point that I have paralleled the portrait of the fate of the Samaritan *Tahab* in Josephus (another ‘*Joshua ben Joseph*’) with that of ‘*Jesus*’ in the Gospels and, furthermore one should note that in the Pseudoclementines some of the followers of John the Baptist, such as ‘*Dositheus*,’ were very definitely considered to be ‘*Samaritan*.’
92. See pp. 163–9 and 343–57 above. Note that this concept of ‘*Salvation*’ is very important. The Gospels themselves are aware that ‘*Jesus*’ name actual means or alludes to ‘*Saviour*’: ‘*Salvation*.’ This concept, expressed as ‘*yeshu*’/‘*yeshu*’ is fundamental to documents like the Damascus Document (especially in the final promises in xix–xx). As I have expressed this – particularly in my *Preface* but also in the piece I have referred to in *The Huffington Post*, ‘*Gospel Fiction and the Redemionization of Judas*’ (12/19/07) – this is a new concept for the Hellenistic Greco-Roman World which had personified with ‘*gods*’ or ‘*man-gods*’ almost every kind of abstract intellectual Power/Force/or Concept, but never the relatively new ‘*Hebrew*’ concept of ‘*Salvation*.’
93. 4QpPs 37ii.9–10 and iii.10 and cf. 1QpHabii.6–11, v.5–12, and vii.4–16, ix.9–10, and xi.2–10 and Paul in Galatians 2:10 and James in James 2:5.
94. 4QpPs 37ii.18–209. For Josephus vivid picture of this alliance and these events, see *War* 4.300–25 and the picture of the havoc wrought by ‘*the Zealots*’ or ‘*Sicarii*’ in Jerusalem continues into 5.26.
95. 1QpHabxi.10–xii.3. This language of ‘*being paid the reward of*’ or ‘*paying the reward*’ is crucial and is, not only to be found in 1QSviii.6–7 referring to the Community Council, but also in the Isaiah 3:10–11 proof-text applied to the circumstances of James’ death at the hands of ‘*the Wicked Priest*’ of his generation; *E.H.* 2.23.15–16. It is this which is being reflected in the language of the Habakkuk *Peshet* above.
96. CDiv.2–3, but cf. too CDvi.3–5 about ‘*the Diggers*’ from Numbers 21:18 which parallels this, in xix.17 also called ‘*the Penitents from Sin in Jacob*’ who ‘*keep the Covenant of God*,’ i. e. they were ‘*Keepers*,’ that is, they were ‘*Sons of Zadok*’ according to the definition in the Community Rule v.2 and 9.
97. 4QpPs 37ii.9–10 and iii.10 above and note that this is really the same as James 2:5 above on ‘*the Kingdom reserved for those who love Him*’ – ‘*loving God*’ being the definition of the first part of the ‘*All Righteousness*’ dichotomy of ‘*loving God*’ or ‘*Piety*’ and ‘*loving your fellow man*’ – the ‘*Righteousness Commandment*’ also found in at least two places in the Damascus Document and, to some extent, here in the Habakkuk *Peshet*.
98. CDvii.5–9 following the ‘*Nazirite*’ language of ‘*keeping away from*’ (*lehazzir/lehinnazer*, familiar in Acts 15 and 21’s picture of the outcome of ‘*the Jerusalem Council*’), ‘*fornication*,’ ‘*separation*,’ and, of course, the ‘*Righteousness*’ Commandment: ‘*loving each man his brother as himself*’ from CDvi.17 to CDviii.3, we have been following throughout.
99. CDiii.19–20: ‘*And He built for them a House of Faith a House of Faith in Israel, the likes of which has never stood from ancient times until now and for them that hold fast to it, there will be Victorious Life and all the Glory of Adam*

- will be theirs.’
100. Cf 4QpPs 37iii.1-2 with CDi.7-8. The allusion in the latter to ‘inherit His Land and prosper on the good things of the Earth’ is exactly parallel, once again bearing out my contention that most of these so-called ‘sectarian’ documents at Qumran were written at more-or-less the same time, regardless of relying on the tendentious results of palaeographic reasoning or carbon test dating. Note here, too, the allusion to ‘knowing they were Sinners’ one finds there corresponds to the allusions ‘the Penitents from Sin in Jacob’ one finds later in the Document as we have seen and the whole idea of allusions like ‘John taught Repentance from Sin’ in the wilderness’ one finds peppered throughout the New Testament.
- For this ‘Covenant and the Compact which they raised in the Land of Damascus – and this is the New Covenant’ and the fact that God ‘does mercy to (the thousands) of them that love Him and to His Keepers for a thousand generations’ (Exodus 20:6), see CDXX.11-23 which also includes reference to ‘the Penitents from Sin in Jacob’ just mentioned above; ‘Yeshu’ / ‘Salvation, and ‘God-Fearers’ or ‘fearing God’s Name,’ a fairly common way of alluding to right-guided ‘Gentiles’ in this Period.
101. Gen R. 42.1.
102. See pp. 377-8, 623-37, 671-9, and 949-53 below.
103. Cf. CDi.7-8 above and in the Community Rule, 1Qxi.7-9 on ‘the Building of the Holy Ones’ and ‘joining one’s Assembly to that of the Sons of Heaven.’
104. See CDXX.21 above, but also in relation to ‘the Penitents of Israel’ in CDviii.16-18 again, a kind of ‘Grace,’ in that God ‘so loved the First who testified on His behalf, that He loved those coming after them.’
105. 4QpPs 37iii.4-6.
106. CDvi.3-11. One should also note the allusion preceding this in iii.16 and following those to ‘the Testimonies of His Righteousness and the Ways of His Truth which a man must do in order to live through them’ (note the Jamesian emphasis on ‘doing’ here), to ‘digging a well rich in waters’ and the material following this up about ‘the New Covenant in the Land of Damascus,’ also alluded to as ‘the Well of Living Waters’ in viii.21-3. In vii.18-19, Numbers 24:17’s ‘Star,’ of course, is identified with ‘the Interpreter of the Torah’ just as ‘the Staff’ of Numbers 21:18 and Isaiah 54:16 here in Column vi.
- Chapter 13
1. DSSU, pp. 182-200. In fact, if one will note the way I arranged these texts, the introductions and commentaries to which I wrote, I divided this reconstructed document – which was made up of some seven plates, 4Q393-99 – into two documents, because of an allusion in ii.29-32 about writing its respondent(s) earlier ‘some works of the Torah which we reckoned for your own Good and for that of your People (implying, as I have argued elsewhere and will proceed to argue here, that this is the King of a foreign ‘People’ of converts to Judaism who require such tuition and because, introducing this in ii.28-29 with the example of David, a former ‘King’), for we see that you possess discernment and knowledge of the Torah.’
2. This passage is to be found, as we have previously noted, in MMTi.62-70, which is preceded by allusion to the Blind and the Dear ‘trespassing on the Purity of the Temple’ and the whole issue of the cleanness of ‘poured liquids’ and the effect of this on the ‘purity’ of their containers – which was something of the issue, it will be recalled, between R. Eliezer and Rabban Gamaliel and his supporters among the rest of the School of R. Yohanan in B.M. 59b above.
3. For the ‘Official’ publication of this document, which came out about a two years after that of Prof. Wise and myself, see E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *DJD x: Qumran Cave 4 - v*, Oxford, 1994 (though I don’t recall ever having received a footnote from these two authors). Again, the present writer was the first to point out that this term implied the charged expression ‘works’ and not either ‘words’ or ‘acts’ which has since – backed up by Prof. F. Garcia Martinez in his translation of *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, Leiden, 1998, ii. pp. 790-804, who was the first to realize that I was right in this insight, followed up by M. Abegg, ‘4QMMT, Paul, and “Works of the Law,”’ in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation*, Grand Rapids, 2001, pp. 203-14, who picked up the idea of the whole relationship with the Letter of James, first enunciated by myself in Poland in the Summer of 1990 (one might add, first one has to know what is in the Letter of James – something not too widespread in Dead Sea Scrolls Studies – then one might be able to see some relationship).
- For my original presentation of these ideas, which was written even before the entire ‘Composite Document’ became widely available in *samizdat* copy, see my ‘A Response to Schiffman on MMT’ in Z. J. Kapera’s publication, *The Qumran Chronicle: ‘Qumran Cave IV and MMT Special Report*, Krakow, 1990/91, nos 2/3, pp. 95-104, which still reads as fresh today as the day it was given. I also presented a more developed version of these ideas to the Society of Biblical Literature in 1994: ‘MMT as a Jamesian Letter to “the Great King of the Peoples beyond the Euphrates” or Izates,’ *The Journal of Higher Criticism*, vol. 11, no. 1, Spring, 2005, pp. 55-68, which was later published in *The Journal of Higher Criticism*, vol. 11, no. 1 in Spring, 2005, pp. 55-68.
- For the actual references to this usage, see MMTii.26-33, which actually ends in

- an allusion to ‘*doing them*’, meaning of course these ‘*Works of the Torah*.’ Of course, too, important portions of 1QpHabvii.11–viii.3 and xii.2–6 actually invoke this usage ‘*Oseh ha-Torah*’ as a qualifier, as we have seen. For Paul’s famous allusions to Genesis 15:6 – together with Habakkuk 2:4, one of the basic building blocks of ‘Gentile Christianity’ – see Romans 2:13 (which also even includes a reference to ‘*Doers of the Law*’), 4:2–5:9, and Galatians 2:16–7, 3:11–24, and 5:4; for James’, see 2:21–25. Moreover, once again, we are encountering verification that all of these documents were written at more or less the same time, despite the widely disparate parameters that are applied to them. It is worth remarking that some have even thought the term ‘*Essene*’ in Greek, the derivation of which is unsure, actually comes from the term ‘*Oseh ha-Torah*’ and not the Aramaic for ‘*Piety*’, that is, ‘*Osim*’/‘*Essenes*’/‘*Doers*.’ I would not be opposed to this derivation.
- 4(2). See my several analyses in ‘A Response to Schiffman on MMT’ in *The Qumran Chronicle: Qumran Cave IV and MMT Special Report*, Krakow, 1990/91, nos 2/3, pp. 95–104. In my view, the addressee of this ‘*Letter*’ – the only ‘*Letter*’ in the Qumran corpus – and found in multiple copies, showing just how important it was, was either ‘*Agbanus*’, ‘*Agabus*’, ‘*Agbarus*’, or ‘*Izates*’, the favorite son of Queen Helen of Adiabene, as we shall see below, if in fact they can be differentiated at all; see James, pp. xxxiii, 194, 296, 484, 881, and 991 and ‘*MMT*’ as a Jamesian Letter to “the Great King of the Peoples beyond the Euphrates” or Izates, *The Journal of Higher Criticism*, vol. 11, no. 1, Spring, 2005, pp. 55–68, etc.
- 5(3). The expression I am referring to occurs in MMTii.29–30 above and begins the portion I will now proceed to translate; but it also harks back to the somewhat reconstructed phrase in MMTi.1–2 where the word ‘*māsim*’ definitely occurs though the sense is somewhat obscure because of the poor state of the redaction at this point. Nevertheless it is clear that this term ‘*works*’ (plural) is being used to describe what the ‘*some of (these) words*’ referred to. The reconstructed phrase ‘*miksat-divareinu*’ does appear in i.1, but if this were what the abbreviation ‘*MMT*’ stood for, then it should have read the reconstruction ‘*MDTE*’ (‘*Miksat Divareinu ha-Torah-ET*’), not ‘*Miksat Māsei*’ (based on the root ‘*to do*’/‘*doing*’ and, therefore very definitely meaning ‘*works*’ and not some other formulation such as that employed by G. Vermes in his translations, ‘*Observances*’ – more often he uses the word ‘*Acts*’ or ‘*Deeds*’, to translate such the Hebraicism, which of course misses the point entirely and the charged usage involved; anything to avoid the formulation ‘*works*’).
- By the same token, it is true that the allusion to ‘*words*’ reappears at the end of the Second Letter, together with allusion to ‘*the Last Times*’ and ‘*it will be reckoned to you as Righteousness*’ (presumably meaning, ‘*your having done what was Upright and Good before Him*’ obviously implying these same ‘*works of the Torah*’ just spoken of), i.e., ‘*you will rejoice at the End of Time when you find some of our words to be True*.’ Once again, were anyone doubting it, verifying the contemporaneity of it and documents like 1QpHab and CD above, regardless of imprecise and tendentious palaeographic arguments or carbon test analysis. This is an issue, as I said in my original Preface, the public will have to decide for itself as both judge and jury. It is the crucial one. Without agreement on it, there is no proceeding forward – that is, will internal data take precedence over tendentious external date, or *vice versa*?
6. See the key exegesis of ‘*the Last Age*’ or ‘*Final Era*’ in 1QpHabvii.2–14, based on Habakkuk 2:3 (preceding Habakkuk 2:4): ‘*For there shall yet be a vision of the Appointed Time and it will speak of the End and will not Lie*’, which includes allusions to ‘*the Doers of Torah*’ and ‘*the Men of Truth*’ and leads into allusion to the Last ‘*Judgement*’; and ix.3–7, which pictures the fall of the Herodian High Priestly clans (plural) and more of course, on ‘*the Last Judgement*’ in x.3 and xii.14–xiii.4. *Inter alia*, in CDiii.21–iv.12, see the key exegesis of ‘*the Sons of Zadok as the Elect of Israel who will stand up at the End of Days*’ (also an allusion to ‘*the Resurrection of the Righteous*’) who would ‘*justify the Righteous and condemn the Wicked*’ – again, obviously eschatological.
7. MMTii.29–32.
8. The key phraseology, of course, is ‘*reckoned to you as Righteousness*’ (*nachshveha lecha le-Zedakah*), which actually echoes the language of Genesis 15:6 and not that found elsewhere in the Scrolls, such as in the definition of ‘*the Sons of Zadok*’ in CDiv.7 above: ‘*yazdiku Zaddik*’ – the Scrolls, it would seem, can use a plural verb when they mean a plural verb; but for a parallel usage in 4Q266 (the Last Column of the Damascus Document), see DSSU, pp. 218–9, Lines 6–7: ‘*yachshevah*’ – ‘*he will not be reckoned among all the Sons of His Truth, for his soul has rejected the Foundations of Righteousness*’ (i. e., Mosaic Law, which Paul refers to as ‘*Agar*’ which ‘*is Mount Sinai in Arabia*’ and ‘*brings forth Slavery*’ in Galatians 4:24–5). One should also see the reference in 4QMMTi.29–30 about ‘*some works of the Torah which we reckoned for own Good and for that of your People*’, though here the verb here is simply the active ‘*hahsavnu*’. To some extent the same can be said for Psalm 106:31 related, interesting enough, to Phineas, the patronymic father of the so-called ‘*Zealot Movement*’: ‘*and it was reckoned to him as Righteousness until all generations forever*.’ The importance of this allusion in this context in terms of all the positions we have been evaluating cannot be

- underestimated.
9. CDvi.19-21 – the actual definition of ‘*the New Covenant in the Land of Damascus*.’ The second citation is from vi.18-19 introducing this, but also see v.7 on ‘*pollution of the Temple*’ and ‘*not separating (clean from unclean as) per Torah*’ in the matter of ‘*fornication*’, i. e., ‘*lying with a woman during the blood of her period*’ (as, for instance, someone like Drusilla – ‘*a Jewess*’ according to Acts – marrying Felix) and ‘*each man taking the daughter of his brother and the daughter of his sister (to wife)*’.
 - 9a. The reference is to be found in 4QMMTi.29-30 above: ‘*And finally, we (earlier) wrote you concerning some of the works of the Torah which would be reckoned for your own Good and that of your People.*’ As just indicated, this very definitely harks back to 4QMMTi.1-2, implying there certainly was an earlier ‘*letter*’ or ‘*letters*’ much like in the New Testament 1 and 2 Corinthians or 1 and 2 Thessalonians.
 10. For ‘*King Ezad*’, see James, pp. 906-10 and J. B. Segal, *Edessa, the Beloved City*, p. 15 above. Also see pp. 953-4 below. Where the identification with ‘*Izates*’ is concerned, it is not without relevance that at one time Josephus in *War* 4.567 also denotes Queen Helen’s son as ‘*Izas*’. This person would also seem to be known as ‘*Abgar vii*.’
 11. See Hippolytus 9.21 which also includes, surprisingly enough, references to ‘*good conscience*’ in the sense of ‘*despising death*’ and going the final mile, in particular in the matter of not ‘*blaspheming the Law or eating things sacrificed to idols*’. But see, in particular, ‘*for (one of these Sicarii or Zealot Essenes) submits to death and endures any torture rather than violate his ‘conscience*.’
- For Paul’s use of the word ‘*conscience*’, see Romans 2:11-17 (including reference to ‘*the Doers of the Law being reckoned as Righteous*’, ‘*work of the Law*’, and ‘*not being a respecter of persons*’ – an allusion known from Early Church descriptions of James), 1 Corinthians 8:7-12 specifically relating to ‘*eating things sacrificed to idols*’, and 10:15-25 including reference to ‘*all things being for me lawful*’ and ‘*communion with the blood of Christ*’. For Josephus’ ‘*Essenes*’, the allusion is the less specific ‘*nor blaspheme their Law-Giver or eat forbidden things*’, see *War* 2.152-3 above.
12. See above CDvi.19-vii.4 and xx.17-20 (here again including reference to the term ‘*reckoning*’, ‘*revealing Salvation*’ / ‘*Yeshā*’, and ‘*Justification to those fearing His Name*’ / ‘*God-Fearers*’ – often an allusion to ‘*Gentiles*’).
 - 13(12). Cf. James, pp.661-4 and 832-5 and Romans 2:11-17, 1 Corinthians 8:7-12 specifically relating to ‘*eating things sacrificed to idols*’, and 10:15-25 including reference to ‘*communion with the blood of Christ*’ above.
 14. For the antagonism to ‘*blood*’ in CD, see ii.8, iii.6-8, v.7, etc.
 15. See, for instance, the use of this verb in exactly this sense in CDvi.14-15 about ‘*keeping away*’ from ‘*the Sons of the Pit*’ and ‘*the polluted Evil Riches of the Temple*’, vii.1-2 on ‘*keeping away from fornication*’ and sexual relations with ‘*near kin*’ including nieces and close cousins, and viii.8 on ‘*keeping away*’ from the Traitorous Establishment ‘*wallowing in the ways of fornication*’, ‘*approaching near relatives for fornication*’, ‘*Evil Riches*’, and ‘*profiteering*’.
 16. This linkage is specifically to be found in CDv.6-11, where the ‘*pollution of the Temple*’, the Third Net of Belial, is specifically tied to the ‘*fornication*’ one, i. e., ‘*marrying nieces*’ and ‘*sleeping with women during their periods*’. See in particular my Appendix in JJHP, pp. 87-94: ‘*The “Three Nets of Belial” in the Damascus Document and “Ballā” / “Belā” in the Temple Scroll.*’
 17. These definitions are to be found, as we have seen, in CDiv.20-v.11, but they are also found reflected in 11QTlvii.15-21 and lxvi.12-17 and 4QMMTi.47-57 and 83-9.
 18. Josephus speaks of just this kind of rejection of, for instance, Gentile sacrifice in the Temple, the stopping of which on behalf of whom he designates as immediate cause of the War against Rome in *War* 2.408-420.
 19. See n. 17 above, but also all the additional references to ‘*fornication*’ in CDii.16, viii.5-7 and documents like 1QSI.6-7, iv.10, 1QpHabv.7, viii.7, and 1QHxiv.7.
 20. 4QMMTi.84. In this sense, it is perhaps helpful to look upon Qumran and ‘*Essenes*’ generally as a Community of ‘*Holy Ones*’ / ‘*Kedoshim*’ or, as we are presently attempting to call attention to, ‘*Nazirites*’ (probably life-long ‘*Nazirites*’), ‘*dedicated to*’ or ‘*Holy to God*’. For the kind of allusions expressing the ‘*Holiness*’ of Israel, see, for instance, Leviticus 19:2-21:22 and Deuteronomy 7:6, 14:2-21, 23:14, 26:19, 28:9, etc.
 21. 4QMMTi.84-8.
 22. Cf. for instance Exodus 28:36 and 39:30
 23. 1QSViii.1 and 5-6.
 24. 4QMMTi.88-9
 25. See pp. 97-9, 137-8, and 189 above and Ps. *Hom* 7.8, Koran 2.173, 5.3, 6.146, 16.115, etc.
 26. This counter-indication is expressed in the Gospels in several ways: since ‘*Jesus*’ is the Temple, the various scenes of ‘*Jesus*’ keeping table-fellowship with and approving of various classes of persons, such as ‘*prostitutes*’, ‘*tax-collectors*’, ‘*Sinners*’, ‘*gluttons*’ (i.e., persons not keeping Mosaic dietary regulations), and the like in Matthew 9:10, 11:19, 21:31 and *pars.* and miraculously curing ‘*the deaf*’, ‘*the dumb*’, and ‘*the blind*’ (Matthew 9:32, 10:51, 11:5, 12:22, 15:30 and *pars.*) provide vivid examples of this sort of reversal.
 27. 4QMMTi.68-70.
 28. 1QMt.2-3.
 29. Cf. CDvii.13-21 with 1QMt.2-3. and 4QMMTi.68-70 above and see below, pp. 413-29.
 30. We have discussed the situation in Northern Syria variously, including pp. 82-89 above and 939-956 below, but see our

- map on pp. 1012-13.
31. See n. 25 above, but for our original discussion of 'strangled things' in James' rulings as 'carrion'; see *James*, pp. 294-6. For this ban on 'carrion' as applicable specifically to 'Priests' or 'Sons of Zadok' in the Temple, see Ezekiel 44:31.
 32. See, for instance the bans on such persons in 'the Camps of Holiness' in 1QM^{vii}.3-7 and in the Temple in 11QT^{xvii}-xvii and cf. no. 20 above and for 'touching'; see Matthew 8:2 (a leper)-15, 9:20-34 (a woman with a flow of blood, a blind person, and a dumb one), 14:36, Mark 3:10, 5:25-34, 7:32-5 (a deaf and dumb man and including 'spitting on his tongue!'), 8:22-5 (again a blind person), 10:13 ('litle children' which even 'the Disciples' get angry about), Luke 7:14-6 (the bier of the dead, accompanied by the cry 'God has visited His People' – thus; cf. CD^{iv}.7-8 above about 'God visiting them' and 'causing a Root of Planting to grow'), 7:37-40 ('a woman in the city...a Sinner'), 8:43-7, 22:51 (here 'Jesus' heals the High Priest's servant's ear!); but *par contra*, see John 20:17 forbidding Mary Magdalene to 'touch' him in his post-Resurrection state, for he had 'not yet risen' (thus!) implying that 'touching' in this way (in the Jewish manner, this would particularly apply to women) was somehow 'polluting'.
 33. See above n. 18 and variously, and *War* 2.408-420.
 34. See 11QT^{xlvi}.10 and the general allusions, in the same context, to 'skins sacrificed to idols' in XLVII.13ff. – a variation of James', MMT's, and Hippolytus' 'Essenes' 'things sacrificed to idols' – and my full Appendix on this subject in *JJHP*, pp. 87-94 above.
 35. Cf. 4Q^{MMT}ii.66-70 above.
 36. The point is that 'the Temple' is directly mentioned in 4Q^{MMT}ii.67, which then leads into ii.68-70 about 'Jerusalem being the Holy Camp' and 'the foremost of the Camps of Israel' (this being clearly not a Samaritan document but very obviously a nationalist 'Judean' one). But see too the ban relative to 'Priests' in the Temple in Ezekiel 44:31's 'Zadokite Statement' above.
 37. The first such allusion would appear to be Irenaeus in *Ad. Haer.* 1.23.2, but also see Justin Martyr, *First Apology* 1.26, Hippolytus 6.15, Eusebius, *E.H.* 2.13.4, Epiphanius, *Haeres.* 21.2.1-3.6, and *Ps. Rec.* 2.8-12, where she is called 'Luna'; and see p. 202 above.
 38. See specifically Josephus, *War* 2.409-10.
 39. See in particular Ezekiel 44:6-13, disqualifying 'the Levites' in favor of 'the Sons of Zadok' on this basis and note that when the Habakkuk *Peshet* describes 'the Wicked Priest' as 'not circumcising the foreskin of his heart' in xi.13 below, it is disqualifying him too from Temple service on this basis.
 40. See Hippolytus 9.21 above.
 41. *War* 2.152-3.
 42. See *E.H.* 3.33.1-4 which recapitulates the substance of Pliny's Letter 96 and Trajan's reply, no. 97. For Simeon's purported death, by crucifixion, which also seems to have occurred during the reign of Trajan, see *E.H.* 3.32.3-7; for the examination of Judas' two sons, which seems to have occurred under Domitian (d. 96 CE), see 3.20.1-10.
 43. See my remarks on this subject, pp. 11-15, 108, and 199 above and *James*, pp. 808-50.
 44. See p. 280 and n. 57 above.
 45. Of course, 'Meroe' could not be mistaken for 'Ethiopia' even in Roman times, but 'Ethiopia' as a pejorative form someone 'dark' is something else. See the reference to the last-documented 'Candakes' in Strabo's *Geography* 17.1.54 and Pliny, *H.N.* 6.35, but this 'Candakes,' who was killed in approximately 22 BC, certainly was not 'Rich' enough to send any 'treasury agents' up to Jerusalem at this time as Queen Helen had done. Nor is there any evidence that 'Christianity' had yet penetrated either into Egypt or further South into Nubia or Ethiopia, while the opposite is true of Northern Syria/Iraq.
 46. These 'Arizei-Go'im' are obviously pro-Revolutionary foreign fighters, either 'Herodians' like 'Niger of Perea' and his 'Idumaeans' or descendants and servitors of Queen Helen and her two sons, Izates and Monobazus; but for 1QpHabⁱⁱ.1-10, where they are simply called 'Arizim,' they participate in the scriptural exegesis sessions of the Righteous Teacher – 'the Priest in whose heart God put (the discernment) to interpret all the words of His Servants the Prophets (through whom) God foretold all that was going to happen to His People.' 4QpPs 37ⁱⁱ.19-21 and iv.8-12 goes further. There, using the language of 1QpHab^{xii}.2-3 and Isaiah 3:10 of 'paying him his reward,' they are the ones who are specifically specifically denoted as 'taking vengeance upon' the Wicked Priest for what he seems to have done to the Righteous Teacher and 'the Congregation'/'Assembly'/'or 'Church of the Poor'; see *James*, pp. 179-84 and below, pp. 731-56 and 846-7.
 47. *War* 2.520.
 48. See, for instance, our nn, 125 and 70 on pp. 169 and 252 above and Dio Cassius 68.3-4 and Origen's comment in *Contra Celsus* 2.13 that the judges even in his time were particularly zealous in applying this law and few escaped death who had run afoul of it.
 49. Dio Cassius 68.3-4.
 50. See *Git.* 44a, 55b, 58a, and B.B. 47b, etc.
 51. For this 'remembering before God' language, one should see *Ps. Rec.* 1.70 about how, after the riot led by 'the Enemy' on the Temple Mount in which James broke either one or both his legs, the Community fled to Jericho but escaped the 'Enemy's' pursuit because they went outside the city to visit the tombs of two of the brothers which, because they 'were remembered before God,' 'miraculously whitened of themselves every year'; and the crucial Column xx.18-20 of Manuscript B of the Damascus Document, referring to 'the God-Fearers' and/or 'those

- who feared God, for whom 'a Book of Remembrance would be written out before Him' because 'they reckoned His Name' (the 'reckoning' vocabulary again), and for whom 'God would reveal Salvation (*Yeshā*) and Justification.'
52. *Contra Celsus* 2.13 and see Jerome, Letter 84 to Pammachius and Oceanus..
 53. For fornication, marriage, monogamy, divorce, and adultery, see CDIV.17-v.11, vii.1-3, viii.3-15, 11QTLvi.11-lviii.19, LXvi.12-17, etc. But one should also note 1QpHabxii.4 – 'the Simple Ones of Judah' and 4QpNahii.9 and iii.5-6 – 'the Simple Ones of Ephraim' basically paralleling in signification these expressions in the Gospels such as 'these Little Ones' or 'the Little Children.'
 54. In Hippolytus' testimony in 9.21 above, it is because these 'Sicarii' or 'Zealot Essenes', when meeting such an uncircumcised person discussing the Laws of God, 'threaten to slay such a person if he refuses to undergo the ritual of circumcision' that they are called by these names – in other words, this is the reason for these appellations. For Josephus' derivation, in which he only emphasizes the 'terrorist' aspect of the appellation, see *War* 2.254-7 and *Ant.* 20.186-7.
 55. CDi.14-18 and cf. viii.12-xx.16.
 56. See *Ant.* 20.38-48, which tells the whole story, including the controversy between Helen's teachers 'Ananias' and his unnamed companion (Paul?) and the countermanning of their position by one 'Eleazar of Galilee,' who sees circumcision as the *sine qua non* for conversion. One should also compare this picture with *Gen R.* 46.10, we have already pointed out above and elsewhere, which actually knows the passage Izates and his brother Monobazus were reading when they understood 'Eleazar' had the correct approach – *Genesis* 17:11-27 on Abraham circumcising his whole household and all those traveling with him. It has correctly been pointed out by scholars that this argument very much resembles the one between R. Yohanan's two students on the same subject, R. Joshua and R. Eliezer (b. Hircanus), who typically holds the more severe position (just as 'Eleazar of Galilee' here – is there some mix-up?); while R. Joshua (like 'Jesus') the more lenient or accommodating, in *j. Kid.* 3:14.
 57. CDXVI.4-7. The passage in question actually refers to 'the Angel Mastemah' / 'Satan' and the oath that had been taken 'to circumcise,' the 'keeping' of which turned aside the pursuit by this 'Angel. CDXii.11 also alludes inadvertently and in passing to such entry into 'the Covenant of Abraham.'
 58. For this 'Land' and its association with 'Abraham' – to say nothing of 'Noah,' 'Ad and Thamud' – see *Koran* 11:25-49, 26.105-49, 29.14-35, etc.
 59. The 'going' or 'leading astray' vocabulary is so widespread in the Scrolls that it is difficult to list all the occurrences, but some important ones come in CDi.13-16 above in the description of 'the waters of Lying which the Man of Scoffing pours over Israel,' ii.13-17 in the primordial history of Israel, vii.22 on 'betraying and turning aside from the Fountain of Living Waters,' and xx.10-12 on 'turning aside' from 'the House of the Torah' and 'rejecting the New Covenant in the Land of Damascus'; but also in 1QSIII.21-2 on how 'the Sons of Righteousness (*sic*) are led astray' by 'the Angel of Darkness' ('Mastemah' again?), 1QpHabx.9-10 about 'the Spouter of Lying who leads Many astray to build a Worthless City upon Blood and erect an Assembly ('Church?') upon Lying,' etc.
 60. See the Preamble of the Gospel of Thomas and *E.H.* 1.13.10 and the account Eusebius translates from the Syriac about 'Judas Thomas' sending 'Thaddaeus' to Agbarus/Abgarus in Northern Syria; and also see the *The Acts of Thomas* and the Syriac *Doctrine of the Apostles*.
 61. See above, pp. 108-22 and *James*, pp. 844-870.
 62. Cf. Matthew 26:6-13/Mark 14:3-9, having all the elements of John 12, including the 'precious alabaster flask/jar of pure spikenard oil' and 'Jesus' self-centered utterance 'the Poor you have with you always, but you don't always have me,' but which is used to introduce the betrayal of by 'Judas Iscariot'; and Luke 7:39-50, including more 'anointing' of his 'feet' and more Dionysus-like rebukes. We have already expressed the opinion that cognomens like 'the leper' or 'the Pharisee' are more of this 'Code,' the former in some warped manner perhaps standing 'the Iscariot' / 'Sicarios' and, for that matter, partisans of James.
 - 62a. The Adiabene family are proverbial for their 'wealth' and largesse in Josephus and Talmudic tradition; see, for instance, the palace Helen and her sons built in Jerusalem in *War* 5.252 and 6.355. their tomb, 5.55, 5.119, 5.147, and *Ant.* 20.94-5, the Golden Candelabra, depicted on the Arch of Titus, that was ultimately taken to Rome and probably melted down to help pay for the Colosseum (see Plates 85-88), and the golden handles for vessels used in Temple services on *Yom Kippur* – *Yoma* 3:10 (37a), and her famine relief in *B.B.* 11a, *j. Pe'ah* 1:1, 15b/Tōs. *Pe'ah* 4:18, and *Ant.* 20.49-51, in which Josephus actually remarks the 'great amounts of money (Izates) sent to the Leaders in Jerusalem' (*B.B.* 11a even records how his brother Monobazus – the members of whose family are even described in *Men.* 32b as being so 'Pious' that they carried *mezuzoth* with them when they traveled and set them up in inns where they stayed, even though temporary dwellings of this nature did not require them – just about beggared the Kingdom with so much charity); so if she was a supporter of the kind of 'Nazirite Judaism' exemplified at Qumran, there is no reason to suppose that she or her sons could not have supported that installation as well.

63. This is the implication of 'the suspected adulteress' plaque containing the passage from Numbers 5:12-31 she had erected on the wall of the Temple and the three successive seven-year Nazirite oath penances she observed according to Rabbinic tradition in *Naz.* 3:10 (19b-20a) above and in *Git.* 60a.
64. *Ibid.*
65. We have already compared Helen to Simon *Magus'* consort of the same name (See, for instance, Ps. *Hom.* 2.23-4). It is curious that the inscription found in 'The Tomb of the Kings,' mentioned above, bears the formulaic '*Malchat-Zedan*' ('The Queen of *Zedan*') repeated twice both in Hebrew and Palmyrene Syriac, which can imply '*Sidon*' in Phoenician '*Tyre*,' this being the very place Simon was legended to have picked his consort/mistress – early Church hyperbole aside – out of a brothel there, to say nothing of 'Jesus' various excursions and the women he meets there we have covered sufficiently above. But equally curious is another obscure passage in *Ket.* 7a about a decision R. Yohanan was supposed to have given 'at *Zedan*' relative to Queen Helen, the why and wherefore of is unclear, but recalling the imposition by the Rabbis *Beit-Hillel* on here of an 'additional seven-year' Nazirite oath penance period as illustrative of or a precedent for forbidding the performance of 'the first intercourse on the Sabbath.' This certainly is a peculiar notice and certainly more lurks beneath its surface than is immediately apparent, but it does go a certain way perhaps towards helping elucidate these strange '*Zedan*' evocations.
66. See *Ant.* 20.51-53 and, for instance, *E.H.* 2.12.1-3 above (*n.b.*, that Eusebius directly follows this up in *E.H.* 2.13:1-7 with the notice about Simon *Magus'* consort '*Helena*, who had formerly been a prostitute in *Tyre* of *Phoenicia*,' saying more about her than the '*Helen*' who preceded her which, all things being equal, is certainly very peculiar placement indeed. The author has no explanation for it other than to remark it).
That the New Testament is not totally unaware of this '*Queen*,' as I have already argued in connecting her with 'the *Ethiopian Queen*' who sent her '*Treasury Agent*' (who was a '*emuch*') up to Jerusalem in Acts 8:27-39, but her plight is also to be found reflected in the story in Luke 7:11-17 of '*the Widow of Nain*' (an otherwise unidentifiable Palestinian locale, i. e., '*Adiabene*'), who has lost her '*only-begotten son*' – a title we shall see below which Josephus applies to Helen's son '*Izates*' and which, of course, the Synoptics apply to 'Jesus'! – and Jesus raises him, at which point all the People there cry out, '*A Great Prophet has appeared among us*' ('the *True Prophet*' ideology) and *God has visited His People*' (cf. the like-minded usages we have already pointed out in the Damascus Document and will point out further below).
67. Though the '*King*,' her husband (whom some sources also call her '*brother*') had children by numerous wives, Izates and Monobazus stand out as favorites; and it was Monobazus who stood in for his brother in difficult times and had the Pyramid monuments, known as 'The Tomb of the Kings,' built for both Helen and Izates in Jerusalem – see Josephus, *Ant.* 20.92-96 above. One should note that Josephus promised at the end of this passage to '*narrate*' the rest of '*the acts of King Monobazus during his lifetime later*,' though for some reason he never performed on this promise (possibly because he made it in *The Antiquities*, after the publication of which in 93 CE he himself soon disappeared from the scene. That this tomb was also connected in Jewish tradition with what was known as '*the Cave of Kalba Saur'a*' (i. e., '*Ben Kalba Sabu'a*') above, whose daughter Rachel seems to have married the famous Rabbi, known for his Revolutionary and Messianic sentiments, Akiba) should not be underestimated – see the article '*Izates*' in *The Encyclopaedia Judaica*, vol. 9, p. 1158.
We have already commented upon Monobazus' extreme '*Piety*' above in *Men.* 32b and *B.B.* 11a in n. 62 above. Monobazus seems to have been the Persian designation for principal members of this family and it is possible to point to at least four by that name in the small amount of information we have: Helen's husband '*Bazeus*' (evidently a corruption of '*Monobazus*'), Monobazus, the Monobazus who gave his life at the Pass at Beit Horon at the start of the 66 CE Uprising, and in the final generation of this family, as we shall argue below, R. Akiba's important associate by this name: '*Monobaz*.' It is interesting that, according to Tacitus, *Annal.* 15.1 and 15.4, the Herodian '*Tigranes*' was ravaging his Kingdom from neighboring Armenia in 62 CE and, in any event, under Trajan (98-116) the area was conquered and absorbed into the Roman Province of Assyria., but the date of Monobazus' passing remains a mystery. Was it one of his sons or of Izates that was the '*Monobazus*' who martyred himself at the beginning of the War against Rome – or could it have been '*Monobazus*' himself?
68. See *Naz.* 3:10 (19b-20a) above and in *Git.* 60a above, but also see Josephus in *Ant.* 20.95 who also comments on her great sorrow which seems to have been a contributing factor to her death almost directly thereafter – she died of a 'broken heart.' But also see the story of '*the Widow of Nain*,' we have called attention to in Luke 7:11-17 above, and how 'Jesus' as a favor to this grieving '*Widow*' resurrects her son (thus!).
69. The relation between all these '*Abgarus*' and '*Monobazus*,' as far as I am aware, has never been completely investigated, but we first called attention to the matter in *James*, pp. 887-92, 906-14, and variously.

70. Josephus, *loc. cit.* above, but also see Pausanius, *In Arcadicis* 8.16.5 and Eusebius *E.H.* 2.12.3. Moses of Chorene, *History of Armenia*, 2.35 in the 6th Century comments on her 'remarkable' tomb 'before the gates of Jerusalem' and he is sure she is 'the principal of Abgar's wives' (thus).
71. We have covered this 'Primal Adam' ideology in *James*, pp. 423–34 and 585–88 and below, pp. 183–88 and variously.
72. See the allusions to James 'being a Nazirite from his mother's womb' in *E.H.* 2.23.4 Epiphanius, *Haeres.* 78.7.7; but also see n. 74 below. It should be appreciated that relative to John 3:10–13's contention that 'the Son of Man' know 'Heavenly things'; in 1QpHab. 8–10 and VII.4–10 not unusual things are said about 'the Priest' / 'Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God made known all the Mysteries of His Servants the Prophets' and 'in whose heat God put the Knowledge to interpret all the words of His Servants the Prophets and through whom God foretold all that was going to happen to His People.'
73. For this expression 'only-begotten' as applied to Helen's favorite son Izates, see Josephus, *Ant.* 20.20, whom Josephus seems to designate as younger than Monobazus, who nevertheless supported him. For 'the Subba' of the Marshes', see pp. 81–98 above and *James*, pp. 324–332 and 836–9.
74. The point that we have emphasized is the 'fourteen years' in both Paul's references to going up to see James in Galatians Galatians 2:1 and this notice in 2 Corinthians 12:1–5. It is hard to imagine that Paul had anyone else in mind than James. This would be particularly true if James were 'the Righteous Teacher' from Qumran in view of documents there like 'Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice' describing just such Heavenly Wisdom, not to mention the lost work Epiphanius and others describe known as 'The Ascents of James' (*The Anabathmoi Jacobou*) which by its very nature – aside from discussing James' discourses on the Temple steps as reflected in Book One of the Pseudoclementine *Recognitions* – would seem to be implying something of what Jewish Mysticism (*Kabbalah*) would imply as 'the Literature of Heavenly Ascents,' i. e. *Hechalot Mysticism*.'
75. For these accounts, see *Ket.* 62a–63b, where R. Akiba is called 'Ben Kalba Sabur'a's shepherd' and *Ned.* 50a, both of which tell the story of R. Akiba's two 12-year periods of study and his 24,000 'Disciples' (i. e., an army!) including an allusion to a vow and its annulment (this time *Ben Kalba Sabur'a's* vow to disinherit his daughter – thus!). For the matter of grain storage, one should see *Git.* 56a, which mentions the four 'Councillors of great wealth,' all of whom 'could keep the city in provisions for twenty-one years'; for *Lam R.* 1.5.31, this is reduced to 'ten years.' For *ARN* 6.3 (21a), as we have seen, this is 'twenty-two years' and what 'Kalba Sabur'a' does alone, but which 'the Zealots' wish to burn (see *War* 5.24–6 and Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.12 above). However, he objects (*n.b.*, *Ben Kalba Sabur'a* – unlike the other Councillors – is both endlessly generous and a patriot!) and rather has baked into 'loaves of bread' ('Jesus' miracle of the loaves again?), they rather 'bricked into the walls and had them plastered over with clay' (an alternate translation is: 'cut with saws and soiled with mud').
76. *Ps. Rec.* 1.72, 2.7–8, and *Ps. Hom.* 2.22–4 and above pp. 12, 25, 81, 115–29, etc.
77. See *Ket.* 62a–63b, *Ned.* 50, and *ARN* 6.1 (20a) above. For *Kethuboth*, Rachel's father kisses R. Akiba's feet (thus!) and gives him all his wealth, when he hears he is 'a great man'; for *Nedarim*, which contains the 'straw' episode, *Kalba Sabur'a* comes before R. Akiba and asks him to remit his vow, presumably because he is so great.
78. *Shab.* 68b. In our view, this notice clinches the relationship of R. Akiba to the family of the Royal House of Adiabene and its constant sponsorship of revolutionary activity against both Herodians and Romans. If one takes the death of the first Monobazus at around 68 CE and the second at about the same time, then this third 'Monobazus' can either be the son or grandson of the first or the son of the second, or he may have been a descendant of Izates. In any event, in our view, this would either make him Rachel's brother or close cousin.
- It is interesting that the context of the discussion recorded here is that of 'a child taken captive among the Gentiles' or 'a convert among the Gentiles,' including reference to both the consumption of 'blood' and 'idolatry' (the 'food sacrificed to idols' of James' ruling as and Hippolytus' 'Sicarii Essenes' above?) with 'Monobaz' adopting the more lenient position regarding the necessity of one 'sin offering for breaking the Sabbath' only and R. Akiba ultimately deferring to him.
79. See *ARN* 6.3 (21a) and *Ta'an* 19b–20a.
80. See pp. 12, 25, 115–6, etc. and *Ps. Rec.* 1.72, 2.7–8, *Ps. Hom.* 2.22–4, and Epiphanius, *Haeres.* 21.2.3–5.1 above.
- 81(82). In Psalm 69:9, of course, it is only 'zeal for Your House consumes me' not as John 2:16 applies it to 'You have made My Father's House a house of commerce.' We have already commented upon this previously, but elsewhere in this Psalm, in 2:8 we have the theme of 'being a stranger to my brothers and an alien to my mother's other sons.' In 69:15, there is the language of 'the Pit' and in 69:21 'being given vinegar to drink.' Then, of course, there is: 'Let their encampment be desolate and let none dwell in their tents' (69:26, preceded by allusion in 29:25 to God's vengeance and the 'fierceness of His Anger' – hardly very 'Christian' sentiments), quoted so tendentiously Acts 1:20's discussion of the election to succeed Judas Iscariot and 'occupy his Office' (*Episkopon*).
- Of course the Psalm ends in 69:36–7 with the statement that 'God will save Zion and rebuild the cities of Judah. The seed of His

- Servants shall inherit it and they that love His Name shall dwell therein* – the very language, as we have pointed out, of CDxx.19-20 regarding ‘*the Book of Remembrance that would be written out for those fearing God*’ and ‘*God-Fearers*’ above. It is hard to imagine anything more Zionist than this. Such are the pitfalls of taking scriptural passages out of context.
82. M. *Ta’an* 3:8, *Ta’an* 23a/j. *Ta’an* 66b, and *Ber* 19a.
83. For ‘*Honi*’, who is called – prefiguring James – ‘*Onias the Righteous*’ in Josephus (missing from the account in the *War*), see *Ant.* 14.22-28; for the account of how Aristobulus, whose part ‘*Honi*’ appears to have taken with his rain-making before he was stoned, refused to humble himself before Pompey (which differs from the account in the *Antiquities*), see *War* 2.128-141.
84. See *Ant.* 2.24-8 above in the aftermath of *Honi*’s (Onias the Righteous’) stoning and cf. 1 Kings 17:1 and 19:9-14 where Elijah, as we have seen, as the prototypical ‘*Zealot*’, is ‘*filled with a burning zeal for the Lord*’; and note too in 1 Kings 21:19, following the murder of Naboth of Jezreel, how Elijah prophesies to Ahab that ‘*the dogs will lick your blood too*’ (thus) – meaning, that all male members and descendants of his family will ‘*be swept away*’.
85. *Ta’an*. 20a. That the *Talmud* knows five ‘*Disciples*’ of ‘*Jesus the Nazorean*’ known as ‘*Matthai, Nakai, Nezer, Boni, and Thodah*’, all of whom were supposedly put to death for various bizarre reasons, is to be found in *San.* 43a. It is clear, as we shall discuss, that these names are euphemisms, but the passage itself – which has been questioned – except for the names, would appear to be mostly dimly-remembered, obscure nonsense.
86. See M. *Ta’an* 3:8-9, *Ta’an* 19a, 23a-b, and j. *Ta’an* 66b. In this story, as told in a kind of ‘*Rip Van Winkle*’ manner in the Babylonian *Talmud*, *Honi the Circle-Drawer* goes into a mountain cave and sleeps for seventy years. When he awakes and asks for his son, he is told about his grandson, either another such *Honi the Circle-Drawer*, whom we identify with ‘*Hanan the Hidden*’ or ‘*John*’, or ‘*Abba Hilleliah*’ who like his grandfather also made rain (see *James*, pp. 366-85, 419, 474-5 and 820 and above. pp. 151 and 206).
- For the Jerusalem *Talmud*, this all occurred ‘*near the time of destroying the Temple*’, it ‘*destruction*’, and ‘*its being rebuilt after seventy years a second time*’, though what this might mean is impossible to say. Of course, the ‘*seventy years of Wrath*’ are important chronological pegs for Jeremiah 25:11 and 29:10, Daniel 9:2-27, and the *War Scroll* from Qumran. In these passages in the two *Talmuds*, the ‘*seventy years*’ of *Honi*’s ‘*sleep*’ are equated in the former with the time between the planting and germination of ‘*the carob tree*’; in the latter, with a ‘*world changed utterly*’ where ‘*vineyards produce olive orchards*’ and ‘*olive fields produce grain*’ (thus).
87. ‘*The Branch*’/‘*Netzer*’ is important vocabulary in the Scrolls. It is to be found in 4Q285, as we have seen, as ‘*the Branch of David*’ and identified with ‘*the Nasi ha-Edah*’ and in 4QpIs* on Isaiah 11:1-4, where it is again identified with ‘*the Branch of David*’. This is also the case for 4QpGenV.5 on Genesis 49:10, which introduces a new identity ‘*the Messiah of Righteousness*’ and 4QFlor1.11-12 which we shall analyse further below. Of course, the terminology is based on Jeremiah 23:5 and 33:15, as well as Zechariah 3:8 and 6:12. Still at Qumran and in early Christianity one cannot ignore the ‘*Nazirite*’ component to the vocabulary even though it is based on a lightly different root.
88. *San.* 43a. The choice of Scriptural passages given here as reasons for the death of these five would seem to be totally tendentious. Still the reversal involved are quite typical.
89. See Psalm 10:9, 12, 17, etc.
90. *War* 2.451 and 628 and *Vita* 197ff., 290, 316, and 322. It would be interesting to know just who this ‘*Ananias*’ was. At this point in the narrative, he is certainly part of ‘*the Peace Party*’ and allied with the High Priest responsible for James’ death Ananus ben Ananus. On the attribution of the tomb, otherwise known as ‘*The Tomb of the Kings*’ and now known to be dedicated to Queen Helen of Adiabene and her sons, to ‘*Ben Kalba Sabwa*’, see n. 67 above and the article on ‘*Izates*’ in *The Encyclopaedia Judaica*, vol. 9, p. 1158. As already remarked that this tomb, known significantly to Jewish tradition as ‘*the Cave of Kalba Sabwa*’, i. e., the individual whose daughter Rachel married the famous ‘*Zealot*’ Rabbi we have been describing above and supporter of the Bar Kochba Revolt, for which he seems to have been executed in the most excruciating manner conceivable, cannot be underestimated.
91. See Koran 7:59-79, 9:70, 11:25-68, 14:9, 22:42, 26:106-59, 27:20-53, 29:14-40, 51:41-6, 69:5-8, etc. For our discussion of these matters, see pp. 82-87 above and 939-55 below.
92. The comparison to Abraham’s ‘*salvatory*’ state in Genesis 15:6 and the references to it in such contexts as Paul’s Letter to the Romans, Galatians, and James is crucial. We have covered the importance of Northern Syria and Edessa (‘*Antioch-by-Callirhoe*’) in pp. 82-102 and 107-22 above.
- 93(94). *War* 2.451-56. Here Mitelius saves himself by agreeing to convert and be (forcibly – i. e., our ‘*Zealot*’/‘*Sicarii Essenes*’ again) circumcised. Here, too, Josephus shows his fawning obsequiousness by stating that not only was ‘*the city polluted by such a stain of guilt*’, it would not be able to avoid ‘*some Visitation from Heaven*’ (the ‘*Visitation*’ language again which we shall discuss below), if not ‘*the vengeance of Rome*’, but he even adds to this the fact of the

- massacre of the garrison having occurred on the Sabbath, 'a day on which Jews with religious scruples (meaning 'caring about Mosaic Law', paralleling Paul's 'weak conscience' language in 1 Corinthians 8:10-12) abstain even from the most innocent acts.' War 2.451-56. This would appear to be the same 'Eleazar son of the High Priest Ananias', 'the Captain of the Temple', who argued for 'the stopping of gifts or sacrifices on behalf of foreigners' in War 2.409 and the 'Party' of whom in 2.440-44 was responsible for the death of Menachem, the descendant of Judas the Galilean and the Head of the Sicarii Party at Masada, whom he blamed for the death of his father and who had just put on the Royal purple in the Temple. It certainly was not 'Eleazar ben Jair' who in War 2.447 is described as fleeing back to Masada, leaving his kinsman Menachem to be 'tortured with all sorts of torments and slain.' Nor does it seem to be the 'Eleazar' of Galilee who taught the necessity of circumcision to Helen's two sons some two decades earlier.
94. War 2.418, 556-8, and Ant. 20.214, where the two are called 'brothers'. These people are clearly, like Paul, of the generation of Agrippa I. We give their probable genealogy in the Chart on pp. 1010-11. Costobarus along with Saulos is probably a descendant through Herod's sister Salome of her Idumaeon husband by that name, also seemingly executed by Herod in a fit of jealousy - Ant. 15.252-66. We treat 'Saulos' relation to 'Paul' and the whole 'Costobanus' line in pp. 492-509 below.
95. War 2.556-8. Afterwards, the two along with Philip the son of Jacimus ('Philip the father of four virgin daughters who were prophetesses' in Acts 21:6-9?) seem to have gone to Corinth to report to Nero who was then building the Corinth Canal (a favorite venue, as we can see from Paul's Letters to the same, of Paul's activities).
96. War 2.557 and 4.140-6. It is at the point of executing this man 'of Royal lineage and most powerful in the whole city' in prison by cutting his throat (here he mentions one 'John the son of Dorcas' as instigating the deed; cf. Acts 9:36), that those Josephus has up to now been calling 'Lestai'/'Brigands' (the Gospels' 'Thieves') and abrogating the previous High Priest Lines (War 4.147-8) by 'electing by lot' an ignoble and unknown commoner named 'Phannius' (i.e., 'Phineas' - 4.155-56, also known as 'the Stone-Cutter') start to be called 'Zealots' (4.160-365). It is here that Josephus, not only introduces his friend 'Jesus ben Gamala' as (along with Ananus ben Ananus) an 'anti-Zealot'; but, like Paul in Galatians 4:17-18, who calls his 'Zealot' opponents 'zealous to exclude' and not 'zealous in the right way', challenges such person as not 'zealous in the cause of virtue,' but rather 'in the cause of evil works in their lowest and basest sense.'
97. War 2.557 and 4.140-6. It is at the point of executing this man 'of Royal lineage and most powerful in the whole city' in prison by cutting his throat (here he mentions one 'John the son of Dorcas' as instigating the deed; cf. Acts 9:36), that those Josephus has up to now been calling 'Lestai'/'Brigands' (the Gospels' 'Thieves') and abrogating the previous High Priest Lines (War 4.147-8) by 'electing by lot' an ignoble and unknown commoner named 'Phannius' (i.e., 'Phineas' - 4.155-56, also known as 'the Stone-Cutter') start to be called 'Zealots' (4.160-365). It is here that Josephus, not only introduces his friend 'Jesus ben Gamala' as (along with Ananus ben Ananus) an 'anti-Zealot'; but, like Paul in Galatians 4:17-18, who calls his 'Zealot' opponents 'zealous to exclude' and not 'zealous in the right way', challenges such person as not 'zealous in the cause of virtue,' but rather 'in the cause of evil works in their lowest and basest sense.'
98. War 2.254-57, but in Ant. 20.162-68 he only uses the term 'Brigands' again and blames Felix for 'bribing' them to do accomplish this assassination. In War 4.400-409 he starts to describe the Sicarii took and how they took over Masada and overran the surrounding countryside.
99. Loc. cit. and see 1QpHabVIII.12-4 and XII.8 where it is used, harking back to the 'pollution of the Temple'/'breaking the Covenant' parameters, to disqualify 'the Wicked Priest' from service in the Temple for things like his violent tax-collecting and 'robbing the Poor.' Also see 11QTXLVIII.6, LXVI.11ff., LX.17ff., and LXII.16 where it is used to related to forbidden foods and 'things sacrificed to idols,' niece marriage and relations with Gentiles generally.
100. See n. 93 above and War 2.451-56.
101. See CDi.7, vii.9, xix.6, etc. and above, pp. 28, 174, 267, 322-9, 354, 374 and below, 608-707.
102. See n. 99 above and 1QpHabXII.8 and 11QTXLVIII.6.
103. See n. 96 above and, in particular War 2.558, Ant. 17.30-1, and Vita 46-61, 177-84, and 407-9. For Josephus' references to Philip's 'daughters', relating to 'Philip the father of four virgin daughters who were prophetesses' with whom Paul stayed in Acts 21:9-9, who escaped from the Roman massacre at Gamala (see Plates 102-103) by hiding in a ditch, see War 4.80-3.
104. See n. 95 above and War 2.418. For his further activities as a leader of a gang of thugs and final going over to Roman forces whose agent he seems to have been all along, see War 2.556-8 and Ant. 20.214.
105. see War 2.556-8 above. For Vespasian's dispatch by Nero in Corinth from Britain to Judea, see War 3.1-8.
106. See War 2.648-53, 4.162-238, and 4.314-18 where he praises him in the most extravagant terms and calls his murder by 'Zealots' and 'Idumaeans' was 'the beginning of the destruction of the city' and 'the ruin of her affairs' (meaning Jerusalem), a speech which seems rather to embody much phraseology applied in early Church literature to James whose death he engineered. But also see Vita 193-216 and 309, where his attitude towards Ananus, with whom he seems to have been closely involved, is almost exactly the reverse.
107. See n. 90 and War 626-31 and Vita 197ff., 290, 316, and 322 above, the last illustrating Josephus' leniency towards this man. For his involvement with 'Gurion the son of Nicodemus' (i.e., 'Nakdimon') and their mutual attempt to have the Roman garrison of Jerusalem released, see War 2.451 above as well.
108. See Ant. 18.1-25 and note that in this description of the so-called 'Fourth Philosophy' (which we prefer to call 'the Messianic Movement'), he admits that 'our young men were zealous for it' and, seemingly borrowing a piece from his description of 'the Essenes' in the War, they did not hesitate to die a death of any kind, nor the deaths of their relations and friends, nor could

Notes

- any such fear induce them to call any man Lord.
This is the 'Movement' which he ascribes to 'Judas the Galilean and Sadduk' and later from the 50's to the mass suicide at Masada, he starts rather to designate as 'Sicarii.'
109. See *ARN* 4.5 (20a), *Git.* 56a, and *Lam R.* 1.5.31 above.
110. Cf. *Ps. Rec.* 1.65-8 (who is described as 'secretly our brother') and 71 with Acts 5.34-40, which includes the anachronism about 'Theudas' and 'Judas the Galilean' and where Gamaliel is pictured as persuading the Sanhedrin to be lenient with 'Peter and the Apostles' (James missing). Also see Acts 22:3 for Paul's alleged claim to have 'been brought up at the feet of Gamaliel,' whatever this might have meant, in the same breath as 'zealous for God, even as all of you today' (*sic*).
112. See Josephus' *Vita* 1-8 where he identifies both his father and his brother as named 'Matthias' and claims to be a direct descendant of the first Maccabean High Priest Jonathan – obviously the brother of Judas and Simon Maccabee.
113. *Ps. Rec.* 1.72, 2.7-8, and *Ps. Hom.* 2.22-4 and nn. 71 and 76 above.
114. It should be appreciated that everywhere the term 'Righteous Teacher' is mentioned at Qumran in the pesharim, the underlying Biblical text being subjected to exegesis is a 'Zaddik' text – see, for example, 4QpHabi.10-11, v.8-12, vii.17-viii.3 (on Habakkuk 2:4), 4QpPs 37ii.22, and iii.9-16, etc.
115. See *Ant.* 20.20 and cf. John 1:14, 3:15, 3:19 (the last two lecturing 'Nicodemus'), etc.

Notes

Notes