Endnotes for Part 4

Chapter 14


2. See 1QM XI .13–xii.18 and XIX .1–5 and cf. Eusebius, E.H. 2.23.13–14, Epiphanius Haeres. 78.14, etc.

3. This episode, as we have seen, is mentioned in Ant. 20.97–9 and occurs right after the long description of Queen Helen’s conversion and her family, most notably that of her and her son Iazes’ ‘famine-relief’ activities; but curiously it is missing from the narrative of The Jewish War written a decade or two earlier, though Josephus obviously knows quite a few details about it. Josephus repeatedly condemns such ‘ impostors and deceivers leading the People out into the desert’ in 20.168–72 and War 2.259–264 (this exactly after he introduces the new group of agitators he calls the ‘ Sicarii’ and, of course, all of the so-called ‘ lestai’ / ‘ brigands’ Felix crucified).

4. See above pp. 114–221. In particular, what he wishes to do is a reverse Joshua or exodus, to lead the people once more out into the wilderness — there, no doubt, to show them ‘the signs of their impending freedom.’

5. One should note that this description of ‘ Theudas’ activities occurs in Ant. 20.97–99 just following the long description of Helen and her sons and just before the one continuing that refers to the ‘ Famine’ and the crucifixion (on the order of Tiberius Alexander, Philo’s nephew) of the two sons of Judas the Galilean, ‘ James and Simon’. Of course, the anachronism in Acts 5:36 regarding ‘ Theudas’ is easily explained on this basis, because in describing these crucifixions, Josephus explains how Judas the Galilean ‘ aroused the People to revolt against the Romans when Quirinius was taking the census in Judea.’ Acts’ author was just reading — and in the process, compressing — his Josephus a little too rapidly. For the reference in Eusebius (who does get his sequence for the most part correct: Philo’s Mission to Gaus, Pilate’s suicide — sic, he doesn’t either acknowledge or consider Judas Iscariot’s suicide worthy of note — the Famine, the beheading of ‘ James the brother of John’ — sic, Agrippa I’s death, Theudas’ beheading, Helen’s famine-relief activities, Simon Magnus, the preaching of Peter in Rome — i.e., obviously based on the Pseudepigrapha, etc., etc.), see E.H. 2.11.1–3.


7. Ant. 18.20. The same number is given by Philo in Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit 7.5.


9. War 1.95.

10. See Ps Rec. 1.71. In 1.72, continuing the parallel, Simon Magus is introduced and described as ‘the Standing One’ (‘that is, the Christ and the Great Power of the High God which is superior to the Creator of the World’), as are his ‘performance’ — ‘ Christ-like’ — of many miracles. The reference to ‘ Simon a Magician’ as being responsible for the riot in which James was injured and thrown down the Temple steps in 1.70 is probably an interpolation on the order of the deletion of this whole first part from the account in the Homilies — and probably as a result of the same embarrassment — since it is clear from the continuing description and from a marginal note on one of the manuscripts that this individual is Paul.

11. 1QS xi.11. N.b., his ‘ coming’ here is grouped together with that of ‘ the Messiah of Aaron and Israel’ (here, we take the ‘ yod’ as an idiosyncratic singular usage as elsewhere in the Scrolls). For the actual appearance of this ‘ True Prophet’ proof-text of Deuteronomy 18:18–19 among the Scrolls, see 4QTesta 5–8. For ‘ works of God’ in the Damascus Document, see CD I.1–2, l.9, v.18, etc. One should note that in the War Scroll, these ‘ works’ are not the miracles, raisings, curings, and the like as in here in the Gospels and in the Pseudepigrapha as descriptive of Simon Magnus’ Messianic claims (i.e., ‘ works of magic’); but rather God’s ‘ mighty works and wonders’ are the battles God wins on behalf of His People (cf. 1QM xi.3–xii.17 (in exposition of the Star.
12. Here, the only difference is that this is not at the 'Last Supper' as later in Matthew 26:26f. and pars. in the Synoptics.

13. For 'the Last Times' / 'Last Day' / 'Day of Judgement' at Qumran, see 1QpHabvii.7, ix.6, xii.14-xiii.4, etc.

14. This 'eating and drinking' the flesh and blood of the living and dying god is the very essence of Greek 'Mystery' Religion; for 'the Mysteries of God' here at Qumran, see 1QpHabvii.12-15 above in exposition of Habakkuk 2:3 leading into the pivotal Habakkuk 2:4: 'the Righteous shall live by his Faith.'

15. See above Ant. 20.168-72 and War 2.259-264. This, of course, is not the entirety of such references. Moreover, it is very interesting and certainly not incongruous that most of these episodes occur on Passover – the National Liberation Festival of the Jews. For Paul on 'freedom' and his sophisticated, Philo-like, yet almost always (as in the Gospels generally) pointedly-antagonistic–to the Jews allegorical method; see Galatians 4:21-5:1, where he even admits his own 'allegorical methodology.'

16. Vita 10 and War 2.119-161. The points of contacts in these two well-known descriptions are in both cases repeated cold-water baths (see War 2.129) and the description of 'banus' clothing as 'growing on trees', i.e., vegetable matter or 'linen' (again see War 2.129, but also see the descriptions of James in Early Church literature as wearing only 'linen'; but perhaps even more germane as 'not anointing themselves with oil'; cf. War 2.123 and Eusebius, E.H. 2.23.5-6 and pars.)

17. E.H. 2.23.8 and pars. In this passage, Eusebius makes it clear that this is a direct quote from Hegesippus' account (c. 165 CE) and the lost Five Books of his Memoirs.

18. 1QMxi.11. This is an incredibly important reference, as we shall see as we proceed further below, because it is delivered not only in the context of the exegesis of 'the Star Prophecy' from Numbers 24:17-9, but also amid reference to how 'the enemies of all the lands will be delivered into the hand of the Poor' and how 'those best in the dust (i.e., the Meek) would pay the Reward on Evil Ones (a term used in both the Community Rule and Habakkuk Pesher further solidifying the common vocabulary and, therefore, the contemporaneity of all these texts) on the Mighty Ones of the Peoples and justify (God's) True Judgment on all mankind.'

19. See 1QNxi.11.1-14 and pars. above.

20. Numbers 24:17–19. As already noted above, one should also connect with this the citation from Isaiah 10:33–4 about 'Lebanon falling by a Mighty One' itself followed up by the 'Shoot from the Stem of Jesse and a Branch growing out of his Roots' material from Isaiah 11:1–5), itself subjected to exegeesis in 4QpPs* as well as in Rabbincic literature where it is definitively connected to the fall of the Temple in 70 CE. Not only is this 'Star' ideology to be found in the Damascus Document below, but it is also at the basis of the 'Star' over Bethlehem material found in Matthew 2:1–10's account of the birth of Jesus. Also see the two pictures of the wall paintings in the catacombs of Rome of Balaam pointing at 'the Star' in BJ, Plates xx and xxix.

21. See below, pp. 617-39, 649-57, 983-4, etc.

22. 1QMxi.7 (the usage here is again idiomtic but probably singular), xii.9-10, and xix.2.


24. E.H. 2.1.2. N.b., this 'crown' imagery too in 1QSVw.7. Eusebius makes this statement in the course of presenting the two 'Jameses', one 'the Lord's brother', 'James the Just', the first 'Bishop of Jerusalem'; and the other 'James' (whom he hardly describes at all and clearly views as secondary); and 'Thomas' (in our view, 'Judas Thomas' who is hardly differentiable from 'Judas of James' in Apostle lists and who is himself indistinguishable from 'Thaddeus' or 'unnamed Lebbaeus' in these same lists) having sent 'Thaddaeus,' 'under a Divine impulse,' 'to the Land of the Edessenes' in Northern Syria and 'the King of the Osrhoeans' there, i.e. 'the Assyrians,' and also, no doubt, Adiabene.

25. War 6.312-315.

26. It should be appreciated that the reference to 'the ships of the Kittim' in Daniel 11:30 is very definitely a reference to the Romans in the Eastern Mediterranean. Where the War Scroll reflecting Roman military usage is concerned, one should have reference to the works of Roth and Driver (also to some extent reflected in those of Yadin); and, once more, we should emphasize that regardless of the 'results' of palaeography and other similarly imprecise forms of measurement, on the basis of internal parameters alone and the use of common vocabulary and replicating dramatis personae, all documents of this kind – generally referred to as 'sectarian' or 'extra-biblical' – should be seen as more or less being written at the same time.

27(26). As we just saw above, this allusion, found in 1QMxi.13–14, is also more or less replicated (in the context of like-minded reference to 'the Poor' / 'the Ebionim') in 1QpHabxii.2–3, 1QsU.6–7, and 4QpPs 37iv.12. It should be appreciated, too, that it also comprises some of the imagery attached to the Isaiah 3:10–11 passage applied to James' death in Early Church literature.

28. 1QMxi.6–14 above. Of course, the 'Justification' imagery is important as is that of the allusion to 'the Meek' and 'the Poor' but so too is that to 'Enemies' / 'Enemies' well known to the Ps. Rev 1.71, the Letter of James 4:4, the Parable of the Tares – Matthew 13:25, and of course Paul in Galatians 4:16 and 1 Thessalonians 2:15.

29. 1QpHabxii.2–4 above. Here, the allusions to judging him to destruction' and 'lehelot' / 'destroy' very definitely refer to the kind of apocalyptic scene of 'the Last
Notes

Judgement' depicted in 1QpHab VII.10-18.3 (in interpretation of Habakkuk 2:3-4), x.3-5, and x.13-5 and alluded to in xiii.14-xiv.4.

30. Ibid.
31. Cf. 4QpX 37II.10, II.19, III.1-2, III.10-11, III.16, IV.9-11 (here, too, the same 'paying him his reward' in the sense of Divine Vengeance), and IV.19-20.
32. 1QM I.3.
33. 1QM I.2.
34. Cf. CD IV.2-3 and V.4-5. For Theudas' reverse exodus, see Ant 20.97 above and for 'Jesus' where he too 'leads' or 'feeds' some 4-5000 people, Matthew 10:1, 14, 13-21 and 15.29-39, and pars. above.
36. See Haeres. 19.1.2-10 and 29.7.7.
37. Ibid., 20.3.2-3, 30.1.7, 53.1.1, etc.
38. 1QM I.2-2, II.10-14, etc. There can be little doubt that what is going on here is the desert between Transjordan and Iraq and all the 'Arab' Nations bordering thereon – i.e., 'the Fertile Crescent'.
39. 1QM I.6-7. N.b., that in the line preceding this (i.5), one actually baldly states that 'this is the time of the 'Jesus for a People of God' – i.e., Yeshua a ke-'Am-El.'
40. We describe the reason for this below, but the point is that the multiple descriptions of the Kittim in 1QpHab. 12-IV.14 and v.16-vi.11, most notably, 'treading the Earth with their horses and pack animals and coming from far off, from the islands of the Sea' (hardly the Seleucids in Syria), 'collecting booty like the fish of the sea', 'sacrificing to their standards and worshipping their weapons of war' (the key allusion as most thinking scholars have recognized and the military practice of Imperial Rome, the Emperor's bust at this time being on the standard and adored after every victory), 'partitioning out their yoke and their taxes (i.e., 'tax-farming' – another definitive allusion), consuming (literally 'eating') all the Peoples' (in the East, 'the Peoples', as we have seen, were called 'Ethni') and their Rulers, 'Kings of the Peoples'), 'and having no pity, even on the fruit of the womb' (n.b., Josephus' description of the butchery carried out by the Romans around the Sea of Galilee where he uses almost the precise language – again, hardly the Seleucids).

But what is definitive here as well is the passage in 4QpNahI.3 which makes it clear that 'the Kittim' come after 'the Greeks' (i.e., 'God did not permit the City – meaning Jerusalem – to fall into the hands of the Greeks from the time of Antochus to the time of the coming of the Kittim'; that is, the coming of Pompey and the Romans and after that the final conquest and destruction by Vespasian and Titus).

41. 1QM I.1. Vernes here gives 'Satan' as he does most frequently in his translations, but the word is 'Belial' – 'the Devil' or 'Diabolos' not 'Satan'. 'Satan' is a different word. This may confuse the unsuspecting reader.

42. 1QM I.3, 8-9, 14-16, VII.1-7, XII.8-9, etc.
43. 1QM I.5 above.
44. 1QM I.2.
45. Both 'Belial' and 'the Sons of Belial', of course, are widespread usages throughout the Qumran corpus. For its part 'Bal'ama' is one of 'the Enemies of God' along with Do'veg, Cain, Korah, and Gehazi delineated in b. San. 105a-109b. Where these 'Sons of Belial' are concerned, in the Bible some of the most vivid usages are to be found in Judges 19:22. 20:13. It should be appreciated that in these passages from Judges 'the Sons of Belial' it is talking about are for the most part Benjaminites. For reference to 'Belial' (corrupted, as we have seen, into 'Beliar') and 'Balaam' in the New Testament, one should see 2 Corinthians 6:15, 2 Peter 2:15 and Revelation 2:14. For 'Balaam' in the Old Testament, see Numbers 22:5 and Deuteronomy 23:4. But perhaps the best discussion of any of these things is to be found in my Appendix to JHP, pp. 87-94: 'The 'Three Nets of Belial' in the Zadokite Document and 'Balla' / "Belâ" in the Temple Scroll. This has been further developed in my article: 'The Final Proof that James and the Righteous Teacher are the Same' in DSSFC, pp. 332-51 (first presented to the Society of Biblical Literature in 1994).
46. For a genealogical chart of the 'Herodians,' see pp. 1010-11 below and Ant. 18.136-7 where Josephus makes it clear that it is this 'Salome' who is married to 'Philip' and not her mother Herodias as in New Testament reformulation – also that she then later marries the son of Herod of Chalcis, Aristobulus (more marriage with nieces and close family cousins so abhorred at Qumran).
47. Since these salutations at the end of Romans do refer to 'the Littlest Herod,' hardly a common name at this juncture of Roman history, it is our view that this individual is the son of said Salome and Aristobulus, making it even more likely that the reference to 'the household of Aristobulus' in 16:10, followed by that to 'Herodion' in 16:11 is none other than the one of these two, 'Aristobulus and Salome' now living in Rome; and making it ever more likely that 'Pual' or 'Saul' is actually the descendant of Herod's sister (the first 'Salome'), a first cousin of both Agrippa I and Herod of Chalcis, and, therefore, the individual who was brought up with 'Herod the Tetrarch' as Acts 13:1 would have it. One should also note that the reference to his 'kinsman Junius' in Romans 16:7 is, in the author's view, none other than the son of 'Salua,' sister Cypros by Helcius/Alexas, the Temple Treasurer, and therefore probably Paul's nephew in Acts 23:16 who has access to and warns the centurions in the Fortress of Antonia of plots against his uncle. In this passage, it should be appreciated, that Paul's 'sister' is specifically listed as residing in Jerusalem. We know too that this 'Julius' was
an avid reader of Josephus' works in Rome and, therefore, specifically retired to Rome (the destination of Paul's letter) because Josephus proudly tells us so in his Vita.

49. Bela' as descendant of Benjamin, see Genesis 46:21 and 1 Chronicles 7:6. This makes the curious reference to barring one 'Bela' from the Temple in 11QTSvl.10-11 all the more riveting.

50. See Koran 2.130-140, 3.65-7, 4.125, etc. and Paul in Romans 4:1-20, 9:8-9, Galatians 3:6-18, 4:22-8, etc.


52. CD IV.2-10 and VI.3-11.

53. 4QpNahit.3-8 and IV.3-7 (in the second instance anyhow, clearly tied to an allusion to 'joinig', i.e., 'ger-nilveh'). It should be appreciated that Ephraim became Samaria when the capital was moved from Shechem to Samaria somewhere in the middle of the Israelite history in 1 Kings 16:24-32 during the reign of Ahab and Jezebel.

54. The usage 'ger-nilvim' is actually used in 4QpNahit.9 introducing these passages in iv.3-7 above but one can also see the outlines of it in the exegesis in CDIV.2-3 above as well. It is not incurious that the further exegesis concerning 'going out from the Land of Judah to dwell in the Land of Damascus' in CDVI.3-10 also relates to 'the Penitents of Israel' ('Priests in the exegesis of CDIV) and 'the Nobles of the People' or 'Peoples' – the 'Ethne' of Paul's 'Mission to the Gentiles.' But see too, my 'Joining/Joiners...' article in DSSFC above.

55. For Monobazus and Kennedaeos, see War 2.520; for 'the Idumaenae,' War 4.228-358; for 'the Peoples' and/or 'the Violent Ones' / 'Violent Ones of the Gentiles' at Qumran, see 1QHab.6, III.5, III.11, IV.14, V.3-4, VI.7, VIII.9-10, and 4QpPs 37.20 and IV.10.

56. For Niger, see War 2.520, 566, and 3.11-28. For his death, see 4.359-63.

57. 4QpPs 37I.20 and IV.10 above.

58. 1QHab.6 above.

59. See Acts 13:21, Romans 11:1, Philippians 3:5 and 1QMI.2 above.

60. See E.H. 1.12.4-13.20 and ANEL: Append in Hippolytus and Codex Barocian 266.

61. Cf. 1QMXXVIII.8 with 4Q252-IV.3

62. 1QMXI.4-11 and XIX.3-4.

63. 1QHabIt.6-11 and XI.7-12.6.

64. 1QMXXIX.11.

65. 1QSV.2 and 9 above.

66. 1QMXXVIII.7. As we have seen, the term 'Yeshu' in Hebrew actually does mean 'Salvation'; cf. the very last line of the substantive portion of the Damascus Document – CDXX.34 above.


68. Aside from the references to the 'delivering up' of Jesus in Matthew 18:34, 27:2,27-26, etc. and pars., see CDI.17 (meaning, 'delivered up to the Avenging Sword of the Covenant'), III.10-11 (likewise), VIII.1, etc.

69. War 2.599, 3.450-531, and Vita 66-7, 134-6, 271-301.

70. War 3.448, 3.463, and Vita 65-67 and 134.

71. War 3.450. This last ('Lestai'), of course, is exactly the vocabulary used in Matthew 27:38 and pars to describe 'the two thieves' (sic), between whom Jesus' crucified – it would, moreover, be more accurate to translate this term as 'bandits' as it usually is in Josephus as these were certainly not two 'pick-pockets' or such like.


73. I have treated this subject extensively in 'The Final Proof that James and the Righteous Teacher are the Same' in DSSFC, pp. 332-51 and the Appendix to JHFP, pp. 87-94: 'The "Three Nets of Belad" in the Zadokite Document and "Ballâ" / "Bela" in the Temple Scroll' mentioned above; but for several interesting examples of this 'casting nets' or even themselves 'into the sea,' see Matthew 4:6 (this 'Jesus' himself), 4:18, 7:22-10:34 ('casting out devils' and 'spirits'), 13:42-50 ('cast into a furnace of fire,' 15:17-30 ('cast down the toilet bowl'), 17:19-23, John 21:6-8 (here Peter puts on his clothes, 'for he was naked' – this probably based on some very good Etruscan or Roman wall paintings – in order 'to cast himself into the sea' with his 'net full of fishes' – that!), etc. and pars.

74. War 3.459-85

75. 77(76). Ibid. 3.522-542.

76. Ibid. 3.532-8. Of course, Josephus is completely either enamored of or obsequious to both Agrippa II, not only in his narration of the Tiberias Palace episode, but also in Vita 364-7, where he admits Agrippa II supplied him with sixty-two letters testifying to the truth of his narrative!

77. War 2.181-3 and Ant. 18.240-55; though in the War, Josephus calls the place of his exile 'Spain,' in the Antiquities he corrects this to 'Lyons a city in Gaul' – perhaps he benefited here from Agrippa II's sixty-two letters.

78. Epistle of Peter to James 4.1-2.

79. 1QSiX.17-18.
82. War 3:522-9 – here, of course, there is real 'blood' being 'poured out.'
83. War 4:478.
84. See Matthew 14:24-35 and par. above.
86. See 4QMMTIii.66-7 above.
87. 1Qm.1-3 above.
88. 1Qmvi.5.
89. See MZCQP, pp. 12-16 and 19-27 and DSSU, pp. 32-43 and 49-80.
90. Cf. my discussion of this in DSSU, pp. 273-80.
91. 4Q448. The scholars who originally found this were A. Yardeni, E. Eshel, and H. Eshel. See their article 'A Qumran Composition Containing Part of Psalm 134 and a Prayer for the Welfare of King Jonathan and his Kingdom,' Tarbiz (60), 1991, pp. 297-300 and in Israel Exploration Journal (42), 1992, pp. 199-229 and the version of this Michael Wise and I published in DSSU, pp. 280-1.
92. 4Q448 (now called by some 'Apocryphal Psalm and Prayer' – we called it 'Psican for King Jonathan') i.6-8.
93. Cf., for example, 1 Maccabees 2:26-7 and 54-8 and 2 Maccabees 4:2 with 1QSII.15, IV.4-18, IX.12, 1QH.6-7, II.31, IX.5, X.15, XII.14, XVII.3, XX.14, etc.
94. War 2.152-3, but also see 'John the Essen' – War 2.567 and 3.11-19 – who participated along with one 'Silas' and 'Niger' in the early battles of the War and died along with his former at Ashkelon.
95. See, for instance, J. T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, London, 1959 whose attitude in pp. 44-98, 142-3, etc. is fairly typical of this way of looking at the documents, that is, dismiss anything that doesn't easily fit into one's preconceptions. Don't worry about what the documents themselves say. These can always be explained away, as, for instance, with the Copper Scroll – to paraphrase, it was dropped by a passer-by or it represented a child's exercise tablet!
96. Aside from the War Scroll, there is the Community Rule itself, in which we have already encountered the expression 'the Day of Vengeance' and which in the Qumran Hymns (vii.20) is called 'the Day of Massacre.' But there is also the finale of the Habakkuk Peshar, XII.12-XIII.4, which twice refers in the manner of Muhammad in the Koran to 'the Day of Judgement' and ends with the pious hope that 'on the Day of Judgement God will destroy all the Servants of Idols and Evil Ones off the Earth.' This is to say nothing of the 'Pecan to King Jonathan,' just elucidated above.
97. 1QXIII.20 above.
98. See our comments on pp. 40-57 above.
100. Cf. CDIV.6-9, VI.17-VII.5, etc., but opposed to this, in addition to Paul's endless remonstrances that 'for me there are no forbidden things,' see Acts 10:14-16, 10:28, and 11:2-10 where, as we have seen, Peter learns from a 'Bat-Kof' not to 'make distinctions between clean and unclean, Holy or profane.'
101(100). 1QSVIII.1-16.
102. 1QSVIII.10-15.
103. Cf. CDIV.8, XX.2, XX.21, IQSI.2, I.7, 1.16-7, V.20 (repeated in VIII.15 in exposition of Isaiah 40:3 as we just saw), IX.20, 1QpHabVII.11 and VIII.1 in exposition of the all-important Habakkuk 2:4, XII.4-5, etc.
104. One can see the 'Piety' part of this dichotomy in CDXX.21, just cited above, but it permeates the whole Qumran corpus as it does the Letter of James (cf. James 2:4 on how 'God chose the Poor...as Heirs to the Kingdom promised to those that love Him,' but in this regard see CDVII.6 in Ms. A, repeated with the term 'love' added in XX.21 of Ms. B, just cited above and cf. 1QVIII.21. For my comments about the 'Righteousness'/Piety' dichotomy generally see JBJ, pp. 62, 109, 235-7, 261-4, 333, and 365 and pp. 109, 253, and 295 above.
105. Epistle of Peter to James 3.1 and 4.4.
106. 1QIX.13-24.
107. For our comments on 'internal data' as opposed to 'external data,' see pp. 45-56 and 424 above.
108. In these documents, there are numerous such references, but in the Habakkuk Peshar, for instance, there are the descriptions of 'the Kittim' as 'sacrificing to their standards and worshipping their weapons of war,' 'tax-farming,' 'having no mercy even on the fruit of the womb,' the exegesis of Habakkuk 2:4: 'the Righteous shall live by his Faith' in terms of 'the Delay of the Parousia' and the 'Last Judgement,' and circumscribed to 'the Doers of the Torah in the House of Judah'; in the Isaiah Peshar, there is of course the exegesis of Messianic Prophecy of Isaiah 10:33-11:5, in Nahum, there is the note about 'the Kittim coming after the Greeks'; in the Florilegium, there are the Messianic promises to David and 'his seed,' including Amos 9:11, evoked in Acts 15:16 in James' speech at the so-called Jerusalem Conference and quoted in conjunction with 'the Star Prophecy' in the all-important Column VII of CD; and in the Testimonia, there are 'the True Prophet' Prophecy of Deuteronomy 18:18-19, so dear to 'Ethiopians' according to the Pseudepigraphi- tines and, of course, following this the full citation of 'the Star Prophecy' itself.
109. 1QHVIII.20 (cf., for instance, 1QM.10 and
For 'standing' at Qumran, see CD iv 4, xii.23, xiv.19, 1QH xv.31, xxi.13-4, xxiii.9-10, etc.

4. For Synoptic parallels to this 'shoe latchet' allusion, see Mark 1:7 and Luke 3:16. At Qumran this 'Shiloah' Prophecy (Genesis 49:10) is actually to be found in the so-called Genesis Pesher (4Q252-4 above), v.1-7, which actually mentions 'the Messiah's 'feet' and probably explains all these 'feet' references we have been variously following above.

5. See 1QH xi.22-5, xx.13-17, and xxi (top), 13-15. It would be well for the reader to trace both this 'Power' and 'Light' language throughout the Scrolls.

6. See 1QH xi.18-22 and 30-33. Also note 1QH xv.31-2 and, whereas before we had 'the Scoffers of Lying' preceding these passages, here there is a reference to 'the Man of Emptiness' (cf. James 2:20 and 1QpHab x.12 on 'the Emptiness' of the Lying Spouter's 'works') that follows this.

7. We have covered this 'swallowing' language at Qumran in many works – particularly 1QpHab v.8-9 ( Habakkuk 1:13), xii.5, and xii.15 – but see JJP, pp.62-4, 87-90, and 96 and DSSFG, pp.182-4, 208-17, 339-51, 425, and 428.

8. 1QpHab xi.2-15 above.

9. 1QSVIII.3-11.

10. 1QSVIII.6-7, but note too 1QM vii.6, xii.13 and 4QPs 37 iv.9, further solidifying the homogeneity of all these documents.

11. CD iv.7.

12. For Paul's 'building' language (to say nothing of 'planting' and 'plantation' imagery), see 1 Corinthians 3:6-14, 2 Corinthians 5:1, and Ephesians 2:19-20 (if authentic).

13. For 'Precious Cornerstone' language as applied to 'Jesus,' see Matthew 21:42 and pars. but also see Acts 4:11, Ephesians 2:20, and 1 Peter 1:20 and 2:6-7.


15. 1QSVIII.3-4 above.

16. 1QSVIII.10.

17. Of course, this links up with 'the Son of Man came eating and drinking' theme in Matthew 11:18-19 and pars. (n.b., here it is specifically remarked that John 'did not come eating and drinking') and is the very opposite of those in Acts 23.12-21 who took an oath (obviously a 'Nazirite' one) 'not to eat or drink until (they) had killed Paul.' In the end, the whole issue revolves around the 'pure foods' debate we have signalled in our discussion of the 'toilet bowl' Parable above. For Qumran, of course, 'Judgement' is a very serious matter and we have also been following it closely in passages (some of which also mention 'Vengeance') like 1QpHab viii.1-2, x.3, xii.14-xiii.3, CD viii.16-25, 1QSVIII.3-9, viii.24, ix.7, and 1QM vi.5, xii.14, xii.10, xv.2-17 (here and in vii.5 'the Day of Vengeance' as in 1QS ix).

18. Cf. 1QM i.2-5, xiv.14-7, xviii.1-3, etc.

19. 1QH xix.10-14.
Notes

20. 1QMMxt.9. For ‘Jinn’ in the Koran, see 6.101-30, 18.51 (together with ‘Ibliis’/‘Belial’), 34.41, 72.1ff. etc.
21. 1QSIII.23-25.
22. Cf. Matthew 22:37-9 and pars., James 1:12-2:8, Justin Martyr in Dial. 23, 47, and 93, etc.
23. Cf. 1QSXX.24-5, VIII.2, CDVII.17-VII.2, XX.18-21, etc.
24. War 2.128, 2.139, Ant. 15.375-9, and 18.117. Josephus also applies these two categories to his description of the first ‘Zaddik;’ Simon the Righteous; in Ant. 12.43.
25. Epistle of Peter to James 4.5.
26. The interpolation, of course, which was first recognized by A. von Harnack in the Nineteenth Century, is the first line ‘Cephas and the Twelve’ (in the Gospel view, there were only ‘Eleven’ at the time and who ‘Cephas’ was is a matter of debate – possibly the ‘Cleopas’ mentioned in Luke 24:18, the first post-resurrection appearance according to that Gospel or, if one prefers ‘Simon bar Cleophas,’ the second successor to James in the history of ‘the Jerusalem Church’). Of course, this depends on whether one acknowledges the ‘suicide’ of ‘Judas Iscariot’ On the other hand, the reference to ‘James, then all the Apostles, and last of all to me’ in 1 Corinthians 15:7 is far less precise and far more sensible.
27. Cf. CDI.4, t.16, III.10, IV.6-8, VII.2, viii.16-7, etc.
28. For Qumran, ‘the First’ are quite literally the ‘First,’ the first of whom in CDIII.3-10 is Abraham himself, in his role as ‘Friend of God.’
29. For ‘Last’ / ‘Last Times,’ see CDI.11-12, IV.4, XX.8-9, 1QSII.1, IV.16-17, 1QPHab.7, II.5-6, VII.2-12, IX.4-6, etc.
30. CDVIII.14-23.
32. 1QSVIII.1-7.
33. Of course, ‘Perfection’ and ‘Perfection of the Way’ are basic Qumran doctrines; cf. 1QSI.8, II.2, III.9, V.24, X.22-5, VIII.6-9, VIII.20, IX.19, XI.2, XI.10-11, CDI.20-21, II.15-6, VII.4-5, VIII.24-30, etc.
34. Cf. 1QPHab.V.5-13 and below, pp. 889-938.
35. 1QSVIII.8, 1QHXXIV.24.27, XVIII.9-9, etc.
38. Cf. 1 Corinthians 8:1 with 1QPHab.VII.14-16.
39. Cf. 1QPHab.V.5-13 above.
40. War 2.128-148 (n.b., the use of ‘casting out’ and ‘separation’ language in 2.143 to describe the treatment meted out to backsliders, the allusion to ‘not spitting in the midst of the Assembly in 2.147 paralleling allusions linking the Community Rule to the Damascus Document, and 2.148 on their ‘toilet’ habits and latrine situation certainly increases these parallels to Qumran documents).
41. Ibid.
42. Ant. 18.117 – ‘Righteousness,’ of course being the basic doctrine at Qumran, which is why I have inter alia continually capitalized it in my work to show its importance.
43. Cf. War 2.123, 129, and 161, Vita 11-12, and pp. 4, 22, 34-6, 71-82, 93, 100, 114-5, 124-5, 210, 259, 264, 392, etc. above.
44. 1QSV.6-8, but see also 1QSV.14-19 and ix.17-22 where ‘Fistitation’ and ‘concealing the Truth of the Marvelous Mysteries’ are concerned.
46. See War 2.155, Hippolytus 9.21, Eusebius, E.H. 3.32.6, and Epiphanius, Haeres. 78.14.5-6
47. Cf. Haeres. 19.4.1, 30.3.1-6, 30.17.5, and Abstract 30.2.
48. 1QSV.19-21.
49. 1QSV.21-23.
50. See CDIV.18-20 (in a passage referring to ‘building a House of Faith,’ standing,’ ‘His marvelous Mysteries,’ and ‘fongwun sin’ ) and 1QMII.20 and xi.11.
51. 1QSI.23-III.4.
52. For a selection of references to ‘the Man of Lying’ / ‘Spouter of Lying,’ see CDIV.14-15, IV.19-20, XX.15, 1QPHab.11, X.9-13, etc., more testimony to the homogeneity and contemporaneity of the documents at Qumran.
53. Aside from all the other parallels, it is Paul, as we shall see, who constantly refers to the fact that he ‘does not lie’ – cf. Galatians 1:20 (in the context of avowing to having met James), 2 Corinthians 11:30 (in the context of escaping from Damascus ‘in a basket’ and ‘knowing a man in Christ who was caught up into the Third Heaven’ – see), Romans 3:7 and 9:1, 1Timothy 2:7, etc.
54. 1QSI.9-12. Note he is ‘the pleasing atonement’ and it is who ‘will be washed by purifying waters and sanctified by cleansing waters.’ Also see 1QSI.15 and III.10 and cf. 4Q266, Lines 17-8 on expelling a person who ‘departs from the right or the left of the Torah.’
55. 1QSVI.7-9.
56. Ant. 18.117 above.
57. For ‘Sons of Zedek;’ see 1QSI.20 and 22; for ‘Sons of the Zadik;’ see IX.14. For ‘the Sons of Zadok’ as ‘the Elect’ or ‘Chosen’ (‘of Israel called by Name who will stand up in the Last Days’), see CD IV.3-4 and cf. 1QSV.2-10 above.
58. 1QSVI.5-9.
60. Haeres. 30.15.3 and 21.1 and Hom. 10.1, 11.1, 11.26-30, 12.6, 13.4-5 (just like ‘Essenes,’ calling these things ‘Piety towards God’), etc.
61. 1QSI.15, IV.7, VIII.10-16, and IX.19-23.
62. 1QMIV.4-5 and cf. VII.5-6.
63. Cf. 1QSI.19-26, X.18, 1QMI.5, IV.13, XI.11-2, XIV.5-8, XVII.7, CDXX.19-34, etc.
64. See Acts 9:31 (this describing all the Churches in Judea), 10:5 (describing
Notes

Cornelius, a Roman Centurion!], 13:16 (here Paul really uses the term to describe Gentiles associated with the Synagogue he is addressing in Antioch at Pisidia), but also Paul’s own use of the formulation – sometimes even sarcastically – in Romans 3:18, 8:15, 13:7. 2 Corinthians 7:1 (perhaps the most ‘Perfect’ formulation of the usage), Ephesians 5:21, etc.


66. Cf. CDVIII.15, viii.1, and viii.8.

67. Cf. 1QSvi.12-20, CDix.18-22, xiii.5-16, xiv.8-12, xv.7-14, 4Q266.16, etc.

68. CDXX.34, basically the last line of the revised historical exhortation in the Damascus Document.

69. Cf. 1QMXI.5-xii.14 and xvii.7-xix.13.

70. Cf. 1QSl.5-6, viii.24, x.19, x.22, xi.10-11, CDxIII.20-21, xi.15-6, xx.2-8, etc., etc.


73. For Paul’s contempt for ‘the Torah as given by the hand of Moses,’ see in particular Galatians 2:16-21, 3:17-4:11, 4:24-4:30, and 2 Corinthians 3:1-18.

74. Of course, for ‘the Way’ at Qumran, see 1QSII.28, iv.22, viii.19-21, ix.5-8, xi.10-11, CDIX.11-16, xii.10-11, etc.

75. The ‘Separation’ ideal is of course the key – see Jeremiah 35:6-18 and above, p. 446.

76. 1QSVIII.13-18.

77. Cf. 1QMVII.5 and 4Q448ii.7.

78. See, for instance, Acts 9:18-41, but in particular Paul’s greetings in Philippians 2:21-2 to ‘the Saints in Caesar’s household’ – clearly meaning, ‘Nero Caesar!’ Such conceptions are obviously a complete turn-around. There are many more such allusions.

79. See 1QMXI.6-xii.10 above.

80. Cf. Matthew 24:30 and 26:64 and pars.

81. 1QMXI.10-15.

82. See A. N. Sherwin-White, The Roman Citizenship, Oxford, 1939, pp. 270-5, the Romans being ‘the Lord of the Peoples’ (‘Princes Gentium’) – in Greek ‘Ethnos,’ Paul not only being ‘the Apostle to the Peoples’ (as Muhammad is), but the Arab King Abgar/Agbar, we have been following throughout this work, being ‘the Great King of the Peoples beyond the Euphrates.’ Also see 1QpHabvii.7, viii.5-x.7, CDVIII.9-11, BJ, pp. 190, 429, 636, etc. and above, pp. 24, 55, 74-5.


84. 1QMXI.13-15.

85. Cf. CDXX.27-34 with 1QpHabvii.1-10 and v.9-12.

86. Note that, as Eusebius sees it in E.H. 2.23.7, one of James’ cognomina besides ‘the Zaddik’/‘the Just,’ is ‘Obias’ – as some would have it ‘Ophel-Am’/‘Fortress’ or ‘Bulwark of the People,’ as others would have it ‘Os -le-’Am’/‘Strength of the People,’ a phrase well known in the Psalms. Elsewhere in E.H. 3.7.9, Eusebius seemingly quoting Hegesippus, alludes to how James’ dwelling in Jerusalem, provided the city, while he was still alive, ‘the surest Bulwark’. Cf. phrases in 1QHxxi.37, xiv.25-7 and xv.8-9 like ‘a Strong Wall,’ ‘a Fortified City,’ ‘a High Wall,’ ‘a Foundation on Rock,’ ‘a Tried Cornerstone,’ ‘a Bulwark that will not shake,’ etc. and my discussions in BJ, pp. 353-67 and above, pp. 5, 60, 123, 137-8, and 155.

87. Cf. n. 65 above and BJ, pp. 226, 270-1, 386, 434, 461-2, 564-76, 728, 741, and 824-5.

88. vide ill. 2.

89. See Zohar on ‘Balak and Balaam’ 193a-97a.

90. 1QpHabviii.2-3.

91. Cf. CDXX.19-34 above.

92. Cf 1QpHabviii.2-3 with x.3-5 and xii.14-xiii.4.

93. 1QpHabviii.14 and xii.3-2 above.


95(208). For the widespread allusions to ‘the Day of Judgement’/‘the Last Day’ in the Koran, see 78.17-8, 81.1-14, 82.12-19, 83.11, 85.2, etc.; for the categories of persons known as ‘idolaters’ and ‘hypocrites,’ see 2.8-20, 105, 113-4, 135, 3, 167, 4.48-89, 136-43, 5.60, 82, 8.49, 9.1-64, etc.

96. 1QpHabviii.3-5.

97. Cf. CDII.19 with iv.7.

98. Cf. 1QpHabviii.3-5 above.


100. Cf. DSSU, pp. 17-23 and 4Q521i.5 (‘the Lord will visit His Pious Ones’) and variously.

101. Cf. CDII.8, cf. CDI.7 and variously throughout that document and elsewhere.

102. v1QMXII.6-xii.10; for ‘the Army of the ‘Gent’ elsewhere in this document, see xix.1.

103. Cf. 4Q521ii.5 above.

104. Cf. CDII.5-9. This allusion occurs in 1QMXII.7.

105. See 1QMXII.9-10 and xix.2-3 above.


107. See, for instance, Psalm 110:2-3: ‘The Lord will send the Rod of Your Strength out of Zion to rule in the midst of Your Enemies...on the Day of Your warfare’ or 110:5-6: ‘The Lord at Your Right Hand dost crush King in the Day of His Wrath. He will judge among the Nations (‘the Last Judgement’ again).

108. Cf. 1QpHabv.16-vii.7 above.

109. 1QMIXIX.3-8, the allusion to ‘eating’ occurring in xix.4.

110. See, for instance, Koran 73.12, 82.15, 92.14, 111.3 or 96.1-5 on ‘The Night of Power’.

111. Cf. 1QMIXII.10 and xix.2 above.

112. Cf. 1QMIXII.10-16 and xix.2-8.
Notes

113. See James 4:4-8 and pp. 132-5 and 153-61 above.

Chapter 16

2. See DSSU, pp. 145-56 and 4QMessianic Apocalypse (521) III.12 and cf. 4Q179 (note here, another allusion to God's 'Visitaton') and 501 (paralleling 4QTestament of Kahat/542 below). Also see, R. Eisenman in BAR (vol. 17 no. 6), Nov/Dec, 1991, 'Long-Secreted Plates from the Unpublished Corpus.'
3. 4QTestament of Kahat (542) IV.4-7.
4. 4QApocryphal Psalm and Prayer (448) II.7.
5. Cf. Vir. ill. 2 under his discussion of James.
6(7). See DSSU, pp. 17-22 and my first publication of this document in BAR (v. 17 no. 6), Nov/Dec, 1991, 'Long-Secreted Plates from the Unpublished Corpus.' Also see the two articles on this document by J. Tabor and M. Wise in BAR (18.6), Nov/Dec, 1992, 'The Messiah at Qumran' and 'The Messiah Text: 4Q521.'

8. Koran 2:30-37. This picture of 'Adam' is, of course, so unique that it can only owe a debt to the previous centuries' thinking about 'the Primal Adam' in Judeo-Christian tradition. For more on 'Adam' and 'Iblis,' see 7:11-18, 17:61-70, and 20:115-24, but in particular, see 3:59, which actually expresses the total 'Essence/'EbiUnite' concept of 'Adam': 'Lo, the likeness of Jesus with Allah is the likeness of Adam. He created him from the dust.' For Paul on the same subject, see 1 Corinthians 15:22 and 45-49, which actually includes the phrase 'made from the dust' three times!

9. Of course, 'Belial' is a widespread usage in the Scrolls (though some like Vermes were originally translating the term 'Satan' – he has corrected this under criticism to 'Belial' or 'the Devil.' 'Satan' in the somewhat clumsy Hebrew usage of the Scrolls is 'the Angel of Mastemah' which includes something of the 'fallen angel' ideology), the most important of which are to be found in CD iv. 15-16.2: 'the Three Nets of Belial' and its exposition, including reference to how 'Belial in his guilefulness raised up Jannes and his brother.' For the corruption, 'Beliar' in Paul, see 2 Corinthians 6:15; for other references to 'Iblis' in the Koran, see 7:11-18, 15:29-37, 17:61-70, 38:72-86, etc.

10. See 4QFlor. 10-14 and below, pp. 602-700 and 4QGen(252)v.1-8 and my discussion in DSSU, pp. 75-86.
11. 4Q521 II.6 and 12 (here 'Ananim,' which as used at Qumran is a synonym for 'EbiUnite' or, for that matter, 'Dallim.' In our translations we have always used the English 'Meek' for the first; 'the Poor' for the second; and 'the Down trodden' for the third while others, not realizing how important these terms really are, have not been as scrupulous or consistent). For the most famous usage of 'the Meek' in the New Testament, see Matthew's 'Sermon on the Mount' 5:5, but also Matthew 11:29 and 21:5 and pars.
12. 4Q521 II.11. The parallel with the definition of the 'Sons of Zadok' in CD ii.12 and iv.3-4 makes it very clear that 'the Sons of Zadok' and 'the Righteous Ones' / 'Zaddikim' are synonyms. In New Testament usage, particularly in Acts, the variation often becomes 'called by this Name' or 'called by his Name.'
13. 4Q521 II.1. For the 'Heaven and Earth' theme in the Gospel of Thomas, see Logion 12; in the New Testament, see Matthew 3:18 and 'the Little Apocalypse' in 24:35 and pars. and above, pp. 135, 255, and 265.
14. The first person that suggested this at the very time the Damascus Document was first discovered and printed, was R. H. Charles. He saw the single nature of the roots, agentials, and verbs associated with this and realized that what we were in fact dealing with here was two Messiahs – always of course a possibility. But more recent texts, such as the Genesis Peshar above, the Messiah of Heaven and Earth, the Florilegium, and all texts incorporating the 'Star Prophecy' distinctly show that the concept of a singular (even 'Davidic') Messiah was alive and well at Qumran.
15. IQM xvii.6-9
16. These kinds of phrases, such as 'Sons of His Truth,' 'Sons of His Covenant,' and even 'Sons of Righteousness' are found generously sprinkled throughout the literature of Qumran; see, in particular, 1QHvi.29, vii.29, ix.35, IQM xviii.8, IQM xiii.20-5, ix.14, etc. 
17. IQM xvi.6
20. See, for instance, Hippolytus 5.2 and 10.5 and cf. 1 Apoc Jas. 40.25 and 2 Apoc Jas. 44.15.
22. IQVIII.3-10. In these columns, it is the 'separation' ideology – 'separation from the Men of Unholiness' or 'the Men of the Pit' – which is pivotal.
23. IQVIII.3-4.
25. 1QS V III .11 and IX .5. This is the same ‘Elec of Israel who will stand in the Last Days’ in CDv.3-4 above – more contemporaneous imagery.
26. 1QpHab x.3.
27. 1QS V VIII .1.
28. 1QS VIII .9.
29. 2 Corinthians 2:16-17.
30. 1QpHab X .5 and cf. CD V VIII .7.
31. Cf. Ps. 11:35 (Peter preaching at Tripoli) and Epistle of Clement to James 20.
32. There can be no doubt what Paul is implying here in his two-fold attack both on the Tables of the Law of Moses and the Certification Letters required by James’ ‘Jerusalem Church’ – for more such attacks by Paul on the Law as bringing ‘death,’ see Romans 5:10-21, 6:13-23 (using the language of ‘Righteousness’ and ‘Unrighteousness’ of 1QS VIII .1-10 and IX .5-8:14 (using the language of ‘Heirs,’ adoptionist sonship,’ and ‘Sons of God’), etc.
33. 1QSIX .2.
34. 1QSIX .3-6.
35. For some of the first examples of this sort of ideology in Judaism, see Tobit 1:7-8, 4:7-12, 12:8-10, etc.
36. Cf. 1QS VIII .4-11 and IX .6 above. Of course, we have already seen that Paul uses the very same ‘offering up a pleasing fragrance’ language in 2 Corinthians 2:14-15 to describe what his newly-minted followers of ‘Jesus’ are to offer up.
37. 1QHxIV .25-7 and xv.8-9.
39. Cf. Eusebius, E.H. 2,23,7,3.7.9, etc. above.
41. See above, pp. 29 and 343-4 and BJ, pp. 502-636, MZCQ, pp. 42, 46-8, 61, 78, etc.
44. The point here is that this ‘Peter’ begins very much to resemble ‘Simion bar Cleophus,’ the second successor to James in the Leadership of the Jerusalem Church and purportedly his ‘cousin,’ but in all probability, most likely his second brother ‘Simon the Zealot’ just mentioned (along with ‘Judas the brother of James’) above – see JBJ, pp. 817-50.
45. See, for instance, the crucial attack on ‘the Righteous One and all the Walkers in Perfection’ in CDv 20 and such ‘soul’ language, not only in Isaiah 3:11 – its probable origin – but also in 1QHxI.9-10, x.32-4 (nephesh-Elion and ‘nephesh-’Ant’), xi.25, xiii.6, XIII.13, etc.
46. See Revelation 2:28, 8:10-11, 9:1, along with the language of ‘the Fountain of Living Waters’ and ‘the Pit’ of the Damascus Document, and 22:6 (defined as ‘the Root and Offspring of David’). Of course, the ‘Star’ imagery is that of Numbers 24:17 and various Quaran documents such as the War Scroll, the Damascus Document, the Testimonia, etc.
47. 4QpHab 11:1-24 interpreted in terms of ‘the Branch of David,’ a term as we shall see found throughout the important documents at Qumran. Also see the newly-published fragment 4Q437 where the term ‘sharp arrow’ is used.
48. For more on the whole complex of these ‘nets,’ see my Appendix to JJHP: ‘The Three Nets of Belial in the Zadokite Document,... etc., pp. 87-94.
49. CDv.16-19.
51. See the Herodian Family Genealogy below, on pp. 1010-11 of this volume. That marrying nieces and close family cousins was the family dynastic policy of the Herodians and not the Maccabees should be obvious.
52. One should note the easy-going relationship between Felix and Drusilla (whom Acts 24:24 dissimilarly calls ‘a Jewess,’ though it knows very well she is an ‘Herodian Princess’ and that even Josephus remarks in Ant. 20.141-4 how she left the Jewish Religion). Nor is this to say anything about that ultimately between Titus and Bernice, her sister; none of whom were likely to observed Jewish scrupulousness about ‘not sleeping with women during their periods.’ This is the key allusion since, whatever the Maccabees were, as Jews and certainly as claiming ‘High Priestly descent’ they most certainly did.
53. CDv.14-15. This significantly follows the material banning on the basis of legal analogy with Leviticus 18:13, marriage with close family cousins (unknown to Jewish Law previously) and the John the Baptist-like imprecations (in Josephus, also based on objections to Herodian marital practices) about ‘kindlers of Fire’ and ‘their offspring being those of vipers’ in v.7-14.
54. For these traditions about Jacob of Khir Sechania, see pp. 162-72 above and b. A.Z. 27b; Tosef. Hal. 2:22-3, and j. Shab. 1:4 and A.Z. 2:2, 40d as well as JBJ, pp. 217-29. One should note that during her purported twenty-one years of three successive seven-year Nazirite-oath periods, Helen, for some reason (unexplained), was considered too impure to be involved in the Temple. As we have seen, Christian tradition also places its ‘Helen’ (Simon Mago’s ‘consort) in the brothels of Tyre.
56. vacat.
57(58). War 2.143 (ekballousai).
58(61). Cf. 11QT xIII.8-18 – this too is pretty specific about ‘defiling the Temple’ – and MMTH III.3-9.
75. See Eusebius, E.H. 2.23.6-17 and pars.

76. 2 Peter 2:6 in the context of allusions to the "Morning Star." Balaam the son of Bosor (sic), and "the dumb beast." See n. 45 above and the crucial attack on "the Righteous One" in CDI.20 and in 1QHix.9-10, x.32-4, xi.25, xiii.6, xiii.13, etc.

77. Vita 11-12. It is interesting that three aspects of "Bamus" behaviour that Josephus lists are daily baths in cold water (he says to quell sexual desire, but there may have been other reasons for such an 'Essene' 'Ebonite'-like practice), consuming 'food growing only of itself' (i.e., like Judas Maccabeus's behaviour here and more or less the behaviour signalled in 'Rechabite' tradition), and finally wearing only clothing that 'grew on trees,' i.e., only vegetable-matter clothing or 'linen,' the clothing of 'the Essenes' and also that of James 'Jewish Church' followers.

78. For 'the Rechabites,' see Jeremiah 35:1-19, which we claim would have been part of the missing introduction of James in the New Testament according to Palestinian tradition (in this context, note the mistaken attribution of the Scriptural passage about the 'thirty pieces of silver' and 'the Temple,' used to characterize 'Judas Iscarioi' in Matthew 27:3-10 as from 'Jeremiah the Prophet' when it is really a loose paraphrase of 'Zechariah') and our discussion of said 'Rechabites' and other such related matters above, pp. 342-7 and in JBJ, pp. 229-47, 456-69, and 728-72.

79. See CDVIII.7-8 above.

80. See my general discussion of this inability to relate to literary metaphor and wordplay in MZCQ, pp. 3-16, 19-27, and 41-46.

81. The reason for this difference is that the Catholic recension, which is based on both the Septuagint and Jerome's Vulgate while the Rabbinic, which seems to have been collected after the 66-73 ce Revolt around 100 ce and therefore incorporated a certain hostility to books that may have inspired this Uprising, contains 1 and 2 Maccabees while the Masoretic does not. This is manifestly very peculiar since Jews in theory (and more and more in latterly following the birth of the State of Israel and their attempts to provide an alternative for their assimilated children to Christmas' powerful hold) celebrate Hanukkah, the reason for which is explained in these books and in Josephus, but not in the Talmud which is for the most part hostile to the Maccabees while Catholics have never been known to celebrate it at all.

82. Cf. 1QSII.20-5 and IX.14 and n. 16 above.

83. Cf. 1QSIII.20-51, signalled by the Hebrew versions of this document found at the Geniza and after that, Masada and Qumran, which applies both 'the Covenant of Phineas' and 'the Sons of Zadok' terminology to Simeon's heirs, thereby linking both the 'Zaddikite' and 'Zadokite Covenant's.

84. See my general discussion of this inability to relate to literary metaphor and wordplay in MZCQ, pp. 3-16, 19-27, and 41-46.


86. See Ant. 12.414 and 419-34, Josephus refers three times here to the 'High Priest-
87. See John 2:13-22 and the Synoptic parallels (though without the cry of ‘zezad’ from the totally ‘Zowit’ Psalm — riled by Gospel artisans — 69-9) in Matthew 21:12-17 and pars.

88. See Sarah 2.43. There is little doubt that the word ‘zakat’ here, which is usually translated in terms of ‘paying the poor-due’ is to be understood (as Muhammad makes clear in subsequent admonitions) as ‘charity’ and is based on the Hebrew root — here condensed — ‘zedakah.’

89. The term ‘Zedakah’ — the closest meaning for which, based on a 4th form causative root, is ‘Justification’ — occurs throughout the Qumran corpus. In CD I 18-21 and iv. 3-9, the verb upon which it is based, ‘lehazdik,’ occurs in two separate instances — each, as I have several times remarked, with mutually-reversed emphases — i.e., ‘they (the Seekers after Smooth Things) and the Man of Living’) justified the Wicked and condemned the Righteous One,’ pursuing the Walkers in Perfection with the sword’ and ‘the Sons of Zadok are the Elect of Israel, called by Name, who will stand up in the Last Days’ and ‘justify the Righteous and condemn the Wicked.’

Another pregnant use of this term ‘Zedakah,’ that we have been calling attention to, occurs in CD X 19-20: ‘and a Book of Remembrance would be written out before Him for God-Fearers and for those considering His Name until God would reveal Salvation (Yeshua) and ‘Justification’ (Zedakah) to those fearing his Name’ — in my view, including Gentile ‘God-Fearers’ just mentioned above.

90. See n. 35 above and Tobit 1:7-8, 4:7-12, 12:8-10, etc. It is interesting that Eusebius too places this ‘Tobit’ or ‘Tobias the son of Tobias’ (his descendant?) in far-off Edessa or, as the case may be, Adiabene, when he describes in E. I. 1.13.10 how, after ‘Jesus’ death, ‘Thomas sends Thaddaeus’ to see the Great King Agbar/Abgar there. For my understanding of these events, see JBJ, pp. 853-82 and below, pp. 941-55.

91. Also see Paul in Acts 26:5, complimented to some extent by Galatians 1:14.

92. Note how Paul puts this in Philippians 4:15-19 in the very terms of the ‘odour of a sweet small, an acceptable sacrifice, well- pleasing to God,’ when referring to the contributions Eaprophidius is bringing from them — exactly the terms of Tobit and, for that matter, those at Qumran and in the Koran we have been discussing — but there can be no doubt he is speaking in terms of monetary contributions, charity or otherwise. He also makes this very clear in Romans 15:25-32 and in 1 Corinthians 16:1-9 and Acts, too, makes it very clear that he does not wish to go up to Jerusalem without the contributions he has raised further delineating what he meant in Galatians 2:10 by describing James as admonishing him ‘not to forget to remember the Poor.’

93. This idea of Jewish ‘backsiders’ is made very clear in the Habakkuk Peshar at the end, when it speaks in xii.2-4 of ‘the Day of Judgment,’ at which time ‘God would destroy all servants of idols and Evil Ones off the Earth.’ The ‘Evil Ones’ recapitulates the usage ‘Wicked Priest’ and previous references to ‘the Evil Ones of His Own People’ in categorizing this genre of wrong-doers.

The Damascus Document, too, throughout refers to such ‘backsiding’ among ‘His Own People,’ but one that particularly stands out occurs in CD VIII. 21-24/xx.33-xx.1 when, in referring to ‘all the men who entered the New Covenant in the Land of Damascus,’ it particularly cites those who ‘turned back and betrayed and turned aside from the Fountain of Living Waters.’ This is to say nothing of the repeated allusions to ‘the Seekers after Smooth things’ in this document and elsewhere in the corpus.

Chapter 17

1. Haeres. 30.16.7-8

2. These debates on the Temple steps are variously pictured in Acts 3:1-4:3 (unlike in the Pseudoclementines only ‘Peter and John,’ James for some reason clearly missing. The reason is not hard to contemplate) and 5:20-33 (including abundant ‘standing’ imagery), in exquisite detail in the Pseudoclementine Recognitions 1.55-71 (not only do we have here, the material concerning the Pharisee Gamaliel paralleled in Acts, but also the number of those listening to Peter, put in Acts 4:4 as ‘some five thousand’ — the exact number the Recognitions says flee with James’ battered body down to Jericho to escape the ‘Enemy’ Paul, and clearly here in Epiphanius’ Anabathmoi (he also mentions ‘The Travels of Peter’) Haeres. 30.15.1-34.6.


4. Here the powerful outside forces, I refer to, are clearly Roman and Herodian, not Maccabean but, of course, the ‘lit-motifs’ are there — in this case, ‘the Teacher of Righteousness,’ ‘the Spouter of Lying,’ ‘the Wicked Priest,’ but what is perhaps the most revealing, ‘the Kings of the Peoples’ in CD VIII. 10, in this instance identified as ‘the viper,’ language we have heard attached to John and clearly identifiable with ‘the Herodians’ since, as I have made clear elsewhere, ‘Kings of the Peoples’ is a definitive Roman juridical term bearing with it the meaning of the Kings in the Eastern part of the Empire where ‘the Peoples’ were considered to be located and full Roman Citizenship did not yet apply. The ‘Herodians’ are clear exemplars of this.

v.4 61.20–25, James is pictured in some manner in the Temple, but in both he is the recipient of a kind of mystic ‘kiss’ of Knowledge (something like the beloved Disciple in the Gospel of John). In the First, v.3 35.5–10 and 36.5–10, ‘the immortal Sophia’/‘Wisdom’ is specifically invoked.

6. Cf. 1QpHabvii.17—viii.3 with James 2:8—11) and Romans 13:7–8 (here using it to defend Roman taxation in Palestine – as I have already pointed out, could anything be more cynical, but where Paul goes, anything goes?) and Galatians 3:5–29 (using this passage as a long polemic to attack ‘the Law’, the very opposite, it would appear, of how it is used in the Letter of James).

7. This is not completely accurate. The ‘kiss’ in both Apocalypses is from ‘Jesus’ (1 Ap Jas. 31.5 and 32.5–10 and 2 Ap Jas. 57.14–20), but only in the Second does it appear to be the mystic ‘kiss’ of Knowledge. In 1 Ap Jas. 40.25–30, this appears simply to be one or the other ‘Mary’s of the Gospels’, though here she is called ‘Mariam’. It is in the Second Apocalypse that ‘Mareim’ is mentioned as ‘one of the Priests’ and the narrator who gave the account to ‘Theudai the brother of the Just One’ (‘Thaddaeus’/‘Addai’/‘Judas Thomas’/‘Judais of James’?). It is in Hippolytus 5.2 above that the group he calls the ‘Naassenes’ receive their knowledge from the numerous discourses which ‘James the brother of the Lord handed down to Marianne’ or ‘Mareim’. This is a subject that has been argued over very extensively in Dead Sea Scrolls studies and the consensus concerning it is clear. See my comments concerning ‘The Wicked Priest’ in MZCQ and JHP.

8. Here the verb ‘hodai’/‘to make known’ based on the usage ‘yodea’/‘to know’ carries with it the same root as a ‘Darat’ – in Hebrew ‘Knowledge’; in Greek, ‘Gnoetis’ – is pivotal and should be catalogued throughout the Qumran corpus. It is particularly strong inter alia, not surprisingly, in the Damascus Document, where it occurs almost from the very first line, addressed to ‘all Knowers of Righteousness’/‘Yod-er-Zedek’ (CDI.1) and, of course in line 11.3, where it is intoned: ‘God loves Darat, Hochuna, and Binah’ (for which ‘Habad’ is the reverse acronym).

11. 1QpHabvii.7–8 – in other words, He informed him about ‘the Delay of the Parousia’.

12. In Judaism of the mystic orientation, this is the companion literature to that ‘the Chariot’ or, what is referred to as ‘Merkahah Mysticism’. The idea of ‘Heavenly Ascents’ is a strong motif, not only in the Koran, but also in Islamic literature and tradition. For Paul, the man he knows in 2 Corinthians 12:2–4 below ‘ascended’ or ‘was caught away – whether in body or out of body, I know not – to the Third Heaven.’ He then adds that he know such a man ‘was caught away into Paradise’ (and in Kabbalistic Hebrew too: ‘Parades’) where he heard unutterable words which it is not permitted a man to speak (sic). He then goes on to allude in 12:7 to ‘the magnificence of (his own) Heavenly Visions’ (Apocalypse). It should be appreciated too, that this is one of the sections in his corpus where he makes in 11:31 his defence against ‘not lying’.

13. Here too, he makes another defence against ‘Lying’, intoning in 1:20: ‘Now the things I write to you, behold, I do not lie.’

14. For the exposition of ‘reading and running’ in Habakkuk 2:2, see 1QpHabvii.3–16 above. Paul also uses this expression ‘running’ in a crucial passage in 1 Corinthians 9:24, following his attack on ‘those who are so weak’ in 8:7–13 as to be unwilling to eat ‘things sacrificed to idols’ and where he outlines his own modus operandi (such as it is) using the imagery of Greco-Roman ‘Stadium’ athletics!

15. This word Apocalypsein ‘Apocalypse’ is crucial in Paul and he uses at key moments in his corpus, for instance in Galatians 1:2, in connection with the words ‘running’ and ‘ran’ and also in connection with the number ‘fourteen years’ again, where he uses it to insist that he was not summoned up to Jerusalem ‘by those reckoned as important’ (i.e., James and the others of the so-called ‘Jerusalem Church’ – whose importance where he was concerned nothing conferred), but rather as a result of a private ‘revelation’ or ‘vision’ (apocalypse) and because of accusations ‘of the false brothers who stole in by stealth to spy on the freedom which we enjoy in Christ Jesus (i.e., ‘the Circumcision Party’ or ‘the circumsiers’), so that they might enslav[e] us’;


17. In Surah 70, we again have reference to ‘the Angels and the Spirit’ who ascend with him (4), ‘the Day of Judgement’ (26), and ‘the Garden of Delight’ (38). The reason we say this is probably James is the peculiar coincidence of the two allusions to ‘fourteen years’ concerning Paul’s references to the Heavenly voyager in 1 Corinthians and his two visits to Jerusalem, both of which times he saw James.

18. Cf. 4QShirShabb (400–407) and 11Q17 and C. Newsom, Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition, Atlanta, 1985. It is not insignificant that fragments of this work were also found at Masada (see Y.Yadin and C. Newsom, ‘The Masada Fragment of the Qumran Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice’, IEJ 34, 1984, pp. 77–88).

19. Koran 22.23. For more on these ‘Gardens,’ see Surahs 19, 37, 38, 43, 55, 56, 76, etc.

20. For additional material on the Mysticism of the Throne in the Koran, see Surahs 7.45 and 85.15, and 53.5 on ‘being taught by One Mighty in Powers.’


22. Cf. for ‘the Sons of Zadok’ as ‘Keepers,’ see 1QSv.2 and 9 above. This directly follows an allusion to ‘the Service of Righteousness’ in1QSv.9. For more of this kind of the language of ‘Servant’ in 1QS,
see 1.13 referring to ‘the Prophets’ ix. 22 below, and xi.15–16 encased in the language of ‘Righteous works’ and following an addition to ‘joining the Community to the Sons of Levi’ as ‘accretion’ to the Damascus Document, see xiv. 8–9.

23. Cf. 1QpHab.i.8–9 and vii.4–10 and for the ‘Mebaker’s mastery of all the secrets of Men and all their respective Tongues’ in the Damascus Document, see xiv. 8–9.

24. For the Habakkuk Pesher, see vii.5, 8, and 14; and for the Community Rule, xi.19 and, inter alia, the document I entitled ‘The Children of Salvation (Yeshua) and the Mystery of Existence’ (4Q413–424), DSSU, pp. 241–54 (entitled by some ‘A Sapiential Work; whatever this means); also, for instance, the mystical 4Q286–7 (Berachot), DSSU, pp. 222–230 and 1QS.6 and the ‘Servant’ language that follows. In addition, the Qumran Hymns are steeped in this sort of language.

25. Koran 2.4, 27, 66, 32.7, 49.19, etc. The Arabic here is ‘gheib’ = ‘absent’/’hidden’/‘unseen’, but it is the equivalent to what would otherwise be called ‘Mystery’.

26. See in the Honities, Epistle of Peter to James 4.1-5.1 and 1QS.x.16–21, not only including reference to the ‘Love’ Commandment, but also the second citation of ‘the Way in the wilderness’.


29. ‘Asia’ is, of course, Paul’s main center of activities and his alleged place of origin. If anyone knew what Paul was doing and saying or preaching in these areas, such Jews would be willing to lend this picture credibility.

30. It is interesting that in the events leading up to this, Acts 20:2–16, in addition to picking up the voice of ‘the We Narrative’ on 20:6, Acts specifically mentions another ‘plot being made against him (Paul) by the Jews (sic)’ and that his intention was ‘to sail to Syria’ (i.e., Palestine and the Lebanon/Phoenician Coast – 20:3). ‘Tophethus’ for the first time in 20:3, his stopping at ‘Miletus’ to deliver a kind of farewell sermon (20:15–21:1 = ‘so that I may finish my course with joy and the Ministry I received from the Lord Jesus’ – he does not say exactly how, but he is using the ‘running’ vocabulary again), and finally his decision ‘to sail past Ephesus so as not to lose time in Asia’, for ‘he was hurrying so as to be in Jerusalem on the Day of Pentecost’ – the time of the annual reunion of ‘all the Sons of Levi and all those dwelling in the camps’ under the Leadership of either ‘The (High) Priest Commanding the Many’ or ‘the Mebakker’ or ‘Bishop’ to ‘curse those departing from the right or the left of the Torah’ according to 4Q266.17–18 above. What could be more explicit or more relevant to these scenes in Acts than this?

31. For more on this, see the teacher Josephus calls ‘Simon,’ who could ‘get together an Assembly’ (Eclesian – in other words, he was the Head of a Church) of his own in Jerusalem in Ant. 19.332–4, who wanted to bar Agrippa I (c. 44 CE) from the Temple, ‘which belonged only to native-born Jews;’ as a ‘foreigner’ or, as some would have it, ‘ritually unclean.’ Not only does this relate to the demand made by the Lower Priesthood and ‘the Innovators’/ ‘Revolutionaries’ in the run-up to the War against rome in 66 CE not to accept gifts from or on behalf of Romans and other foreigners in the Temple, which we have covered above and which Josephus rails against as ‘an innovation which our Ancestors were before unacquainted with,’ but I have made much of this episode as the ‘real Historical Peter’ and the reason for his arrest, c. 44 CE in Acts 12:3–21 – see above pp. 29, 343–4, and 463 and JB, pp. 105–9, 282–9, 534–8, etc. and MZCQ, pp. 42–8.

32. See War 2.402–8.

33. See CDV.3-21, including reference to ‘separating between polluted and pure and distinguishing between Holy and profane’ and ‘each man loving his brother as himself.’

34. See above, Haeres. 30.16.1–8.

35. We have discussed the issue of Qumran chronology, above pp. 40-64 and throughout my work, but it is quite clear that both the group Epiphanius dubs as followers of James (called ‘Ebionites’ – the terminology is extant at Qumran and widespread there) have an ambivalent attitude towards sacrifice and the Temple, depending on the ‘purity’ of those both offering it and the situation surrounding the process, and both are, inter alia, clearly ‘daily bathing’ groups.

36. CDV.14–6 above.

37. Of course, the ‘N-Z-R’ root is found throughout the Damascus Document. It is even found in missing passages leading up to Column i in the new Cave 4 materials in 4Q266–67, the first line of the first fragment. Also see, vii.1 and viii.8. The way we see this is, not only does this usage link up with the expression in Greek ‘keep away from’ of James instructions to Overseas Communities in Acts, but the fact that it is based on an ‘N-Z-R’ root in Hebrew testifies to the life-long ‘Nazirite’ aspect of the Community represented by these documents, not only in terms of its ‘Holiness’ but also its command to ‘separate from all pollution.’ In our view, too, this is something of the confusion that has permeated Greek and other translations ending up in the phraseology ‘Nazarene/ ‘Nazorean’/and ever ‘Nazareth.’

38. See Ant. 20.181 and 206.

39. See 1QpHab.xii.2–10 (‘the Poor’ or ‘Ebionim’ mentioned three times, though the terminology does not appear in the underlying Habakkuk until 3:14 and here it is only ‘Ant’/’the Meek’ – the associated verb being ‘to eat’/’consume’/or ‘destroy’). In the Pesher, the underlying sense is: ‘He (the
Notes

Wicked Priest) would be paid the reward with which he rewarded the Poor,” because he conspired to destroy the Poor; and stole the sustenance (literally ‘Riches’) of the Poor’—in Josephus, this is exactly what Ananus, James’ destroyer, is described as doing.

40. Cf. CDVIII.15 above.

41. CDVIII.5-12. For evocation of the second ‘Love’ Commandment, see CDVIII.20-21 above, but also see XX.17-8, followed by the first ‘Love’ Commandment in XX.21.

42. CDVIII.6 and cf. V.5-1 and VII.1, where the point in both cases is ‘approaching near kin for fornication.’ We have discussed Herodian marital practices above, but see the Genealogical Chart on pp. 1010-11 below and Josephus, Ant. 18.130-42 and 19.354-5.

43. IQSVIII.1.7-25, VII.3-25, etc.

44. This usage ‘People’ / ‘Peoples’ is an important one at Qumran and should be catalogued. Perhaps the most important incidence of it is in the Habakkuk Peshar IX.4-7: ‘Amin’ and ‘Yeter ha ‘Amin’ / ‘the Peoples’ and ‘the Additional ones of the Peoples,’ where the second clearly implies the Army of the Romans who ‘in the Last Days’ clearly do take over ‘the Riches’ of the Temple. But as in CDVIII.10: ‘the Kings of the Peoples,’ the ‘Amin’ here, in our view, manifestly represent Herodians; see JJP, pp. 76-93 and the Glossary on p. 94. The parallel in Paradise parlance is ‘Ethnou’ or ‘Gentium’ and there is, of course, the term ‘Apostle to the Gentiles.’ In Rabbinic literature, there is also the term ‘Am ha-Aretz,’ which has a slightly different, if parallel, connotation.

45. CDVIII.7-8 introducing the material about ‘Kings of the Peoples.’

46. See A. N. Sherwin-White, The Roman Citizenship, Oxford, 1939, pp. 270-75, the Romans being ‘the Lord of the Peoples’ (Princeps Gentium), but also see how eusebius uses the term when he speaks in E.H. 1.13.2 when he speaks of Abgarus, ‘the King of the Peoples beyond the Ephrathas.’

47. CDVIII.10-12. This exegesis will play, as we shall see below, on two parallels or homonyms in Hebrew ‘yayin’ meaning ‘wine’ in Hebrew and ‘Yawan’ / ‘Greece’ and ‘Bish’ meaning ‘Head’ in Hebrew (as ‘Head of the Greek-speaking of the Peoples,’ i.e., the Roman Emperor) and ‘rosh’ meaning ‘poison.’ This double entendre cuts two ways: not only ‘wine’ (a word which might originally have come from Greece) and ‘venom,’ but also ‘yain’ and ‘yavan,’ their ways being ‘Hellenized’ or ‘Greek.’

48. This is the famous ‘Generation of Vipers’ in Matthew 3:7, 12:34, and 23:33 and pars., sometimes attributed to John the Baptist and sometimes attributed to Jesus, the vituperation of which is clear, but see the additional parallel in v.13-15, the sense of which directed against the ruling Establishment in Jerusalem is also clear. There is almost no way one can harmonize these things with Maccabean times except for a superficial reading of the term ‘Grecian Kings,’ which is as I have just shown a play on words and how these ‘Kings of the Peoples’ (all of whom would have been ‘Greek-speaking’) would have appeared to Palestinian eyes from 333 BC onwards.


53. For my critique of carbon dating, see above, pp. 40-51; for palaeography, see MZCQ, pp. 28-31 and 78-91; for archaeology, MZCQ, pp. 32-4 and 91-4, reproduced in DSSU, pp. 80-104.

54. I cannot emphasize this too strongly and, though I have reiterated it several times in this book, these points about ‘the Kings of the Peoples,’ ‘the wine of their ways,’ ‘walking in the spirit,’ and ‘the Lying Spouter’ just add definitively to the weight of the ‘internal evidence’ arguing for a First Century CE date generally for documents of this kind using coming vocabulary and allusions across the board.

55. Cf. James 2:8-10 with CDVIII.20-21 above and note, as we have already done, that whereas the former is preceded by the ‘Piety’ Commandment of ‘loving God’ in 2:5 (itself connected to ‘the Poor’), the latter is followed by it in CDXX.21-2.

56. CDVIII.19-20.


58. See notes 23, 28, and 30, 4Q266.17-18, and CDXIX.8-9 above. It should be appreciated that F.M. Cross in The Ancient Library of Qumran, pp. 232-3, was probably one of the first persons to understand this equivalence.

59. CDVIII.18-19 and XX.8-12 (here in conjunction with ‘the Scoffer,’ which shows the expression is used to characterize his activities as it is ‘the Liar’—and this definitively—who in IQsHabV.11-12 ‘rejected the Torah in the midst of the whole Congregation’ or ‘Church’), but also the more general 1QpHab.10, 1QSII.5F, CDVIII.9, and JJP, pp. 23-32 and 91.

60. CDVIII.21-22.

61. Cf. Plates 6 and 54 both fragments of 4Q266. On the second, the empty space of the right-hand column is clearly visible.


63. See IQSII.15 above.

64. See n. 51 and CDVIII.12-13. above.
65. See n. 58 and CDXIV.8-9 above. What is generally not appreciated by the public at large when presented with these translations is that the expression 'languages' in Hebrew is 'tongues' and, therefore, to 'master all secrets of men and the tongues in their enumeration' as 'the Mehabker' is defined as being able to do is, in effect, 'speaking in tongues.'


67. 1QSix.23and 4QpNaht.3-11 (another 'Lebanon' text, this one being completely anti-‘Kittim’ or anti-Roman, ‘the Kittim’ clearly being the ones who are going to be destroyed via ‘the whirlwind’ of God’s Fury. This also, no doubt, relates to the stormy ‘whirlwind’ of Ezekiel 13:12-14 which God will unleash against ‘the plasterers on the Wall,’ another notation alluded to in the Damascus Document.

68. Cf. DSSU, pp. 180-200 and i.2-24, including in particular the allusion to ‘things sacrificed to idols’ in 8:4 and the rejection of ‘the skins of unclean animals’ in the Temple (i.e., ‘skins sacrificed to an idol’) in 18-24.

69. See Ps. Rev 1.36-7 above.

70. Eusebius, for instance, in E.I. 1.7.11-13 is well aware of Herod’s non-Jewish origins which, therefore included the rest of his family as well and see the incident, noted above, where ‘Simon’ the ‘Head of an Assembly’ of his own in Jerusalem wants to bar even the most observant of the Herodians, Agrippa I, from the Temple as a foreigner; Ant. 19.332-4.

71. M. Sota 8:12; cf. M. Bik. 3.4. This is a mirror reversal of the portrayal of Peter denying the Messiah three times on his death night in the Synoptics or the Heavenly Voice crying out to him in Acts three times on the rooftop in Jaffa ‘not to make distinctions between men’ in the literature so familiar to and beloved by us.

72. To think of any of the troops of the ‘Caesarean Regiment’ (which Josephus describes as the most violent in Palestine and after the War, Titus had banished from the country for such unrestrained violence and obvious disapprobation by the People; Ant. 19.366 – one should also note that before the War, these same troops seem to have been responsible for the manhandling and rape of the young Herodian Princesses Mariamme, Drusilla, and possible even Bernice, later Titus’ mistress; Ant. 19.355-5) being described in this way is beyond the pale and calls the whole account into questions. We have already seen the importance of the terms ‘God-Fearer’ and ‘fearing God’ at the end of CDXX.19-20 and cf. Paul in Romans 3:18; 8:15, 2 Corinthians 7:1, Ephesians 5:21, etc. In fact, the description here seems more like what one would wish to say of James.

73. Ant. 19.332-48. Agrippa dismisses him with a gift as if he is some nobody and so easily bought off, but this ‘Simon’ really would have been arrested in the manner so disingenuously portrayed of ‘Simon Peter’ in Acts 12:3-19 (in the midst of its first real introduction of ‘James’ and the beheading of a ‘brother of someone preceding it in 12:1-3) by the next ‘Herodian,’ his brother ‘Herod of Chalcis’ after Agrippa I’s death under mysterious circumstances; cf. Ant. 19.343-20.16 and War 2.218-22, who had married Agrippa I’s daughter, the notorious Bernice above (another case of ‘niece marriage’ – the preferred ‘Herodian’ family marital policy) did not have the lightness of touch of said Agrippa. Note, for instance, how one ‘Silas,’ Agrippa I’s Commander of the Guard and friend, had been imprisoned by him owing to some personal dispute, but whom the latter declined to have executed. He was then slain under the command of Herod of Chalcis in Ant. 19.335 immediately upon the latter’s assumption of power.

74. See Dio Cassius 68.14.5-33.3 and 67.14.1-18.2. Trajan, of course whose father had participated under Vespasian in the campaigning in Palestine, had virtually decimated the Jewish population of Egypt in the wake of seeming ‘Messianic’ disturbances there around the period 105–115 CE and Hadrian, of course, had done the same in Palestine during the Bar Kochba Revolt from 132–6 CE.

75. See our discussion of this episode above and in BJ, pp. 286-9, 534-7, 623-42, etc.

76. See 11QT XLVI.10-15.

77. 11QT XLVI.15-7.

78. See CDV.17-v.15 and vii.5-8 and 4QMMT1.3-57, but also see 11QT XLVI.12 and XLVII.8-18 above.

79. See War 2.409-26 above.

80. See Ant. 20.189-96. The fact that this episode is, for all intents and purposes, missing from the War is of the utmost importance. Moreover, it precedes the notes about the death of James and the High Priest plundering the ‘Poor’ Priests tithes by means of Herodian ‘bully-boys’ like ‘Saul’ from 20.197-214, also missing from the War. These omissions from the War are quite astonishing and can only be explained by the fact of their importance and that Josephus was unwilling at that point to either communicate them or make such things clear. I have treated this ‘Affair’ and the sequentiality relating to it in some detail in BJ, pp. 487-521 and 778-98.

81. The first person to propose this position was S.G.F. Brandon in his two books, Jesus and the Zealots, New York, 1967, pp. 115-25 and 158-89 and The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church, London, 1951, but he was basing himself for the most part on Robert Eisler, The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist, New York, 1931, pp. 141-52, 221-80, 449-53, 518-27, 540–61, and 593-4, whom he mentions throughout and who really was the first to critically recognize the important of James in this regard and his role as an ‘Opposition High Priest,’ a position which I too have adopted.

82. In Eusebius, E.I. 2.23.18-21, ‘immediately
Vespasian besieged them' (i.e., Jerusalem). Moreover he follows this up with the notice that Josephus testified that 'the siege of Jerusalem' occurred because of 'his martyrdom' — of course, as has been widely noted, totally contradicting Christian theology as we know it and, in particular, the portrait of the Gospels. This position is also supported by and possibly even based on Origen, *Contra Celsum* I.47, from where Eusebius and Jerome, *Vit. ill.* II.2 might have taken it, if not directly from the copy of Josephus they themselves may have seen in the library at Caesarea. For similar accounts, see Clement, Hypotyposes 6.13 and Epiphanius, *Haeres.* 66.20.1 and 78.14. The problem is the whole sequentiality of these matters and the 'fall' James takes, which seems to relate to the attack on him described in the Pseudepigraphic Recognitions, paralleling that on 'Stephen' in Acts around 44 CE. But I have covered these matters in detail in *JBJ* above.

83(82). See War 2.409–26 above.

84. See 1QpHab xi.12–3.

85. This is particularly obvious in CDIII.23–iv9, where Ezekiel 44:15 is quoted and elaborated upon, but also CDVIII.12–4, where Ezekiel 13:10 about 'the builders' and 'the Merchants on the Wall with Plaster' is quoted and related to 'the Sower of Lying' or 'Windsbag' above. Also see XIX.9–13, where Ezekiel 9:4 about 'putting a mark on the foreheads of those who weep and cry' is quoted and related to the 'coming of the Messiah of Aaron and Israel' (singular) nd the 'escape of those who hold fast to the Torah' in the Era of the Visitation'.

86. See 4QMMT 1.3–9 above.

87. For these 'complaints,' see Epiphanius, *Haeres.* 30.16.5–7.

88. Cf. Ant. 20.216 with Eusebius' testimony regarding James in E.I. 2.23.6 and pars. above.

89. Cf. n. 82 above and E.I. 2.23.18–21, Origen, *Contra Celsum* I.47, and Jerome, *Vit. ill.* 2 above.

90. See 1QpHab xi.4–xii.10 and 4QpPs 37II.18–20 and iv.8–10.

91. *Haeres.* 30.16.6–9.

92. See, for instance, E.I. 3.27.1–6 on 'the Heresy of the Ebionites.'

93. Cf. I.QMxI.10–15 in exposition of the Numbers 24:17–19's 'Star Prohecy' and ending in the 'humbling of the Enemies of all the Lands...and the Powerful Ones of the Nations by the hand of the Poor (Ebianim)' and 'the hand of those bent in the dust.'

94. Cf. I.QpHabxi.11–12 above about 'not circumcising the foreskin of his heart' and 4QpPs 37II.18–19 — this about 'the Righteous Teacher' in his role as 'Opposition High Priest.' One can see the same ideology at work in 1QpHabI.7–10 above.

95. See Jerome, *Preface to Book I of Ezekiel,* but also see Letter 84 to Pammachius and Oceanus.

96. *Haeres.* 30.16.8–9 above.

97. See the Genealogy below, pp. 1010–11.

98. See, for instance, the third descendant of this Alexander, who was also called 'Alexander' and was married to Jotape, the daughter of Antiochus, the King of Commagene. Alexander's own wife, as we just saw, was the daughter of the King of Commagene. But then there was also Herod, Agrippa I's brother mentioned above, who was King of Chalcis in Lemanese or Coele Syria, and Drusilla who was originally married to Azizus, King of Emesa (modernaay 'Homs' in Syria) before she ran off with the Roman Governor Felix and left the Jewish Faith altogether; see Josephus, *Ant.* 19.276, 19.355, 20.139–41, War 2.18–22, 7.221–41, etc.

99. See notes 98–9 above and how in *Ant.* 18.139 Agrippa I required Azizus, King of Emesa, to circumcise himself before he would give him his daughter Drusilla to marry (the same 'Drusilla' Acts 24:24 calls 'a Jeuress' but neglects to mention she was an 'Herodian'); but also *Ant.* 19.355, on 'Antiochus,' the son of the King of Commagene, who would not.

100. See the Genealogy on pp. 1010–11 and Josephus, *Ant.* 20.140 and 147, who was like his father before him 'Temple Treasurer' for awhile and originally married to Agrippa I's third daughter Mariamme, before she divorced him in order to marry someone even richer, Philo's nephew, Demetrius, the Alabarcho of Alexandria, the richest man in Alexandria. He like Josephus later enjoyed comfortable retirement in Rome and in *Apion* 1.51, Josephus cites him (along with Agrippa II, Vespasian, and Titus) as willing to vouch for the veracity of his writing. If he was Paul's 'nephew,' then this would make that aunt, also referred to in Acts 23:16, Paul's sister Cypros, a daughter of the Idumaean line of the Herodian Genealogy and the wife of the Temple Treasurer, Helcias, all descendants of Herod's sister Salome.

101. For the two 'Helcias,' see the Herodian genealogy, below pp. 1010–11 and Josephus, *War* 1.566–666 and *Ant.* 17.9–10, 17.175–94, 18.138, 18.273, 19.353–5, 20.140, and 20.194–5. Actually there is some confusion in these genealogies and after Salome died, the first Helcias seems to have married someone else, so it looks as if there were three 'Helcias' though it may be that this was just the first Cypros, the mother of the second Costobarus, Saulos, and the second Cypros, and the person we identify as Paul's 'aunt' who lives in Jerusalem in Acts 23:16 and married to the second (or third) 'Helcias.' Nonetheless, all were Temple
Treasurers (because they were close colleagues of the original Herod and intimately trusted by him) and all descend- 
dants of the third husband of Herod’s sister Salome after both the first, one ‘Joseph,’ and the second, 
*Cotobaros* – the original ‘Idumaean’ in these genealogies – fell afoul of Herod in some way.

102. The point here is that Paul also mentions ‘the household of Aristobulus’ in Romans 16:10, preceding this, who would seem to me no other than the son of Agrippa I’s brother Herod of Chalcis, mentioned above, and the ultimate husband of that Salome supposedly involved in some way in the death of John the Baptist and whom Josephus says was originally married to the notorious ‘Philip the Tetrarch’ and not Herodias her mother as per Synoptic retelling (see Ant. 18.136–37 above and note that she, too, was named after Herod’s sister, the first Salome in these genealogies). But also see Apion 1.51 above on this. ‘*Julius*’ being like Josephus himself in Rome and note that, if our genealogies are correct, this ‘*Julius*’ (‘*Junius*?’) really was ‘a kinsman’ of Paul. Furthermore, if the relationships are as set forth, this would make Julius Archelaus Saulos’ or Paul’s nephew and ‘the Littlest Herod’ or ‘Herodion’ of Romans 16:11. the son of said Aristobulus and Salome (John’s alleged murderer), all by this time living in Rome.


104. For the whole story of this affair, see War 1.441–3, Ant. 15.65–87, and variously.

105. See n. 100 above and Ant. 20.147; for Tiberius Alexander, his presumable uncle or brother, see War 2.220–3 and Ant. 20.100–103; as later Governor of Alexandria and ‘Tina’ military Commander of the Siege of Jerusalem, see War 2.492–7, 4.616–8, 5.45, 205, and 510, and 6.237–42.

106. See Ant. 20.102–103 above. Interesting Josephus mentions this in the same breath as he does Queen Helen’s ‘famine relief’ activity (20.100) and the ‘*The Census taken by Quirinius*,’ the source of the anachronism concerning these same in Acts.


108. See War 2.418, 2.556–9, 4.140–6, and Ant. 20.214.

109. For Niger of Perea, see below pp. 742–7 and JBJ, pp. 537–49 and 885–92; for his execution, see War 4.559–63.

110. This refrain was clearly started by Paul in 1 Thessalonians 2.15 and picked up by Muhammad, though he is hardly a ‘Paulinus’ except in title, in the Koran (e.g., 2.61, 2.91, etc.) as we saw. In both cases, it would be interesting to name one besides Horni (who was stone during civil strife) and Zechariah (the reason behind whose death – if in fact he was killed and this is not just the ‘Zechariah the son of Barzaceus’ we are discussing here – remains murky) before the usual condemnations – almost all of which tendentious – one hears so much about in the First Century CE.

111. See my nn. 100–101 above and the Genealogy on pp. 1010–11 below.

112. For the original ‘*Cotobaros*,’ clearly an ‘Idumaean,’ see Josephus, War 1.486 and Ant. 15.252–266, 16.227, and 18.133. The line descending from Cotobarus was definitely Idumaean.


115. Cf. Ps. Rer. 1.70–71. Here, the use of the word ‘head-long’ is the same word used to describe the ‘*Akeldama*’ and the ‘fall’ he supposedly took into ‘the Field of Blood’ ‘*the Akeldama*’ in Acts 1:18–9 contradicting the account in Matthew 27:3 that ‘he hung himself’ (thus!).

116. Cf. Ant. 20.214 with 1QpHabix.3–7 and xii.2–10 and CDVIII.5–12.

117. Cf. 1QpHabix.5 with CDVIII.7 above. It is here, too, that the ‘*Belai*’ ‘*Bela*’ ‘*Balaam*’ complex of language becomes of interest. We have already seen how the confusions over ‘*Bela*’ being listed in the Hebrew genealogies as both the first King of the Edomites and also as a ‘*Benjaminite*’ and the whole parallel represented by ‘*Balaam*’ both in Rabbinic and Christian literatures contributed to this. But at the same time that said ‘Idumaeans’ were virtually indistinguishable from those that were being called ‘*Arab*’ in those days (as they are today), both deeply imbedded in the ‘*Herodian*’ genealogies, as we have been showing, added to the problem – see my Appendix on ‘The Three Nets of Belial and Balai’ ‘*Bela*’, etc. in *JJP*, pp. 87–94. Both Muhammad and Paul as ‘*Herodians*’ before and with them, no doubt, appreciated and exploited these issues, wisely claiming their mutual descent from Abraham, though not necessary via Jacob or Israel; in Muhammad’s case, via Ishmael though where ‘*Herodians*’, they probably would have been satisfied with Isaac as well.

118. See 1QpHabix.2–12 (the last part of the exposition being missing, but it is based on Habakkuk 2:8–9 ‘*profiteer’s profiting*’). It should be appreciated that throughout this exposition, we are using the expression ‘*Peoples*’ ‘*Amim*’ in particular, ‘the Additional Ones of the Peoples,’ which we claim in this context specifically applies to ‘*Herodians*.’

119. For ‘*Arizei-Go'im*’, one should see 4QPs 37II.20 and IV.10. In our view, these specifically correspond to what Josephus is terming in the final phase of the Revolt as ‘Idumaeans’, who cooperate with those he
has begun calling ‘Zealots’ to take vengeance for the death of James. For the ‘Violent Ones’ in the Assembly of ‘the Priest’/‘Righteous Teacher’ who are privy to his scriptural exegesis sessions, see 1QpHab 6.11.

120. For this kind of ‘persecution,’ see Acts 9:4-5, 22:4-8, 26:11, and Galatians 4:29.

121. See Matthew 10:33, 24:9-27:2, etc., and pars. and note that the Dead Sea Scrolls are full of the use of this verb ‘delivered up’—particularly in the Damascus Document (which we shall cover below), but there it is usually God ‘delivering them up to the sword’.

122. See, for instance, JiJp., pp. 4 and 22 and Josephus, Ant. 1.5-9, Vita 423-30, and Apion, 47-52. As we have been implying above, there are many important characters and episodes for one reason or another left out of the War, including Horn, John the Baptist, Theudas, James, and many others. The why of this is impossible to determine, except Josephus may have felt more comfortable in the 90’s than he did in the 70’s (perhaps falsely so). Still, the ‘Stephen’ in Josephus is only beaten underneath the walls of Jerusalem and not stoned (as he is clearly not Jewish, but rather ‘the Emperor’s Servant’ from Corinth). Clearly, too, the ‘stoning of Stephen’ is taken from the literature surrounding the ‘stoning of James.’ In turn, it replaces the attack on James by ‘the Enemy’ (probably Paul—this manifestly intended to be a mortal attack). All the rest of the mistakes in sequencing both in Acts or in Josephus stem from these original fundamental errors.

123. See Eusebius in E.I. 2.25.5 and 3.1.2, claiming to rely on an earlier tradition from Origen’s Commentary on Genesis (but similar testimony also appears in Clement, Ad. Cor. 5 and Tertullian, Prescript. Haer. 36), claims he was beheaded. Jerome, Vir. ill. 5 gives the date of ‘the Fourteenth Year of Nero’ or 67-68 ce. What is most strange, however and as I have remarked elsewhere, is that Acts which surely knows all these things, chooses to end its account in 62 ce with Paul under light house arrest in Rome while the same year in Jerusalem witnessed the stoning of James, perhaps the most significant fact in the life of the Early Church. Acts ignores this event—why? The answer should be obvious to all but the most close-minded reader.

That someone Paul or even his alter-ego in Josephus, ‘Saulos’ might ultimately have been beheaded in the political turmoil of this time—either before or in the aftermath of Nero’s assassination in 68 ce—would, not be at all surprising, particularly if they were Roman citizens, though what the reason for such a beheading might have been is debatable and must remain an open question. Nor is there any reason to suppose that after Paul’s initial quasi-house arrest in Rome in 62, he might not have gone back to Palestine. In fact, given the nature of his contacts in Palestine, in both Jerusalem and Caesarea, even according to Act’s narrative, he may very well have. Acts’ reticence on these matters and the manner of his death is unsatisfactory and leads one to suspect he did. Luke, the reputed author of Acts, certainly must have known more. In any event, as we are seeing, the narrative in Acts is incomplete, also leaving both James’ and Peter’s deaths in limbo and just trailing off. Again one must ask, why?

124. See the important apocryphal ‘Correspondence between Seneca and Paul,’ alluded to in Jerome, Vir. ill. 12, Hennecke, ii, pp. 133-41 and M. R. James, The Apocryphal New Testament, Oxford, 1924, pp. 480-4. It is also referred to by Augustine, City of God 6.11, and his Epistle 153.14. Also see Tertullian De Anima 20 and 42, who considers Seneca to have been ‘on our side.’ For his part, Gallio may himself have been executed with another brother, Mela, and his son, Lucan, in the aftermath of the Piso Conspiracy in 65 ce; cf. Tacitus, Annals 15.65-16.17.

125. Paul, as we have seen, already knew persons ‘in the household of Caesar’ (cf. Philippians 4:22) and as did his ‘fellow soldier and worker Epaphroditus’ (Philippians 2:23), whom he was actually sending to Rome and to whom, in our view, Josephus was dedicating his Antiquities (cf. Ant. 1.5-9 above). In any event, if he was an ‘Herodian,’ this was certainly the case.

126. See War 2.411-422. As Josephus puts it, this message delivered by ‘Saulos, Antipas (the Temple Treasurier), and Costobarus, all of the King’s kindred,’ made a very deep impression on Florus the Roman Governor, though he claims Agrrippa II tried to calm the situation; but however, these things may be, it is clear that this is the Alliance that invites the Romans into the City.

127. For this ‘mission,’ see War 2.556-8.

128. See Ant. 18.130-42 and 20.138-9, but also see Josephus’ story of the conversion of Queen Helen and her sons, which we have often spoken of above; Ant. 20.38-48. If we take the unnamed companion of the merchant Ananias in this story who did not insist on ‘circumcision’ as a sine qua non for conversation, as Saulos or Paul, then we have an almost perfect convergence of materials. For Paul’s attitude towards ‘circumcision,’ one should have regard for almost the whole Letter to the Galatians, but particularly his remarks in 2:8-12 about ‘those of the circumcision’ and 5:12.
about 'wishing they would themselves cut off,' but also see Romans 2:25-4:12, 1 Corinthians 7:19, and Philippians 3:2 warning against "the Gnosticism."

129. Josephus himself remarks that Agrippa I seemed to have ambitions of founding an Empire of some kind with other petty Kings in the East and Saulos' conduct seems to have fallen under a cloud of some kind, which is why he was urged by Agrippa II to report to Nero in Corinth (the last one hears of him), especially with the butchering of the Roman garrison in Jerusalem and the circumcision of its Commander.

For Paul's attitude towards such a polity of 'Jeus and Greeks,' which his religious efforts seemed aimed at establishing, see Romans 1,16, 2:9-10, 10:12, 1 Corinthians 1:24, Galatians 3,28, and Colossians 3,11.

130. The whole tragic story of this Antiochus, who had been loyal to Rome and whose son had fought in the War as Head of 'the Macedonian Legion,' is told by Josephus in War 7.219-243. At one time he had been friendly with Agrippa I; cf. Ant. 18.140, 19.338 and 355, and 20. 136.

131. Cf. Ant. 20.139-43 above.

132. See Ant. 20.139-40.

133. For Paul's 'cozy' relations with Felix, Claudius' freedman who even Acts opines 'knew a lot about the Way,' and his (Pail's) appeal to Caesar, see Acts 23:24-24:27 (this is in 'the We Document' and includes Drusilla and 25:10-27:1 (this includes Festus, Agrippa II, and Bernice pictured as his consort and Agrippa II making the final decision concerning Paul's 'Appeal to Caesar' just as he seems to have done with 'Saulos' later). Moreover, it should be appreciated that this is the longest continuous narrative episode in the New Testament (almost five chapters).

134. See Ant. 20.142 and cf. Peter's confrontations with 'Simon Magnus' in Acts 8:18-25 for largely unfathomable reasons. The reasons for the confrontations in the Pseudepigraphines are not very much better, but the real reasons have to be seen as those being alluded to here in Josephus, 'Cyprius' as we have suggested elsewhere being a stand-in for 'Samaria,' the connecting pieces being 'Simon's place of origin 'Gatta' (or 'Kitta,' i.e. 'Cretan') and the denotation of 'Samaritans' in classical Hebrew as 'Cuthaeans.' The overlap or confusion in the various manuscripts of Josephus between 'Atmonus' and 'Simon,' of course, reflects nothing more than this 'Simon's basic doctrine, 'the Primal Adam.'

135. See Ant. 15.105, 17.11-80 and 324-38 (on a false 'Alexander'), and 18.139-40 and War 1.552-56. That this is the preferred line, because of the actuality of Maccabean blood is proved by the pre-eminence of both Agrippa I, Agrippa II, and of course all their sisters and made clear by all those who want to become a part of it, as for instance both husbands of Herodias, to say nothing of Salome.

136. Ant. 18.140.

137. See the section of my Chapter 'Jesus' Brothers as Apostles' in JBf: 'Epaphroditus and his Intellectual Circle,' pp. 793-801. This section might just as well be called, 'Who Wrote the Gospels,' and it identifies the outlook of the original traditions behind these documents as stemming from persons such as Epaphroditus, Paul, Josephus, Agrippa II, and a number of other Herodians and the circle surrounding Tiberius Alexander and not a few anti-Semitic Greek Alexandrians, in the Hellenizing and 'Allogorical' Philonic tradition.

138. Ant. 18.141.

139. See 1QpHabxi2.2-10.

140. The portrait in Matthew 14:1-12 and pars. (but see also Mark 12:19-27, a nonsense episode parodying 'the Seven Brothers' in the Maccabee Books, on the level of Gospel understanding of the issue of 'raising up seed unto one's brother' is certainly archaizing, as its Greek-Roman authors knew very little about the true kind of objections that were being raised against the Herodians, such as niece marriage, divorce, polygamy, marriage with close family cousins, and the like as outlined in such Qumran documents as CD, MMT, the Temple Scroll, etc. and were forced (in this case erroneously) to consult their ancient Hebrew texts to come up with some rationale for John's objections to Herodian marital activities.

But, in this case, 'Philip' as Josephus tells us (Ant. 18.136-7), did 'died childless,' so Herod Antipas could have been 'raising up children' unto his half-brother; but he did not since this 'Philip' was not married to Herodias. Rather he was married to her daughter 'Salome' as we have seen, another case of niece marriage. Herodias' first husband was actually called 'Herod' and he was the son of Herod's second wife called 'Mariana,' the daughter of the High Priest Boethus he had im-imported from Egypt in place of the Maccabees (again see our Genealogy on pp. 1010-11 below). Now the issue of their marital state is unclear, but in any event the issue here is 'divorce' and marriage with nieces, this is clearly what John was objecting to. Plus the fact that Antipas divorced his 'Arab' wife in order to marry Herodias, causing a mini-war with her father Aretas which Josephus actually remarks. And what was the moving force behind all these machinations? Herodias' Maccabean blood, to say nothing of her great 'wealth.'

141. (mistakenly numbered 146). See Ant. 18.137 above and 20.13 and 104. It is interesting that these two were ultimately given the Kingdom of Lesser Armenia by Nero (Ant. 20.158), another example of 'Herodian' penetration into these areas of Asia Minor.

142. See Suetonius 6.49.3-4 and 8.14.4 and Dio Cassius 63.28.1-2 and 67.15.1. We have already identified these two in JBf, pp. 791-97 and variously. As we can see here, the 'Epaphroditus' under Nero, to whom
Josephus dedicates all his works, later blamed by Domitian whether justly or unjustly and even though he had also been his Secretary, as Nero's assassin and was executed along with Flavius Clemens, his own cousin (Clement?) in 96 CE. Later another Epaphroditus, perhaps his son or a relative, appears as Trajan's secretary.

143. See, for instance, how Tacitus in *Histories* 5.13 expresses this – an almost perfect copy of Josephus similar statement at the end of the War and an almost precise statement of *‘The World Ruler Prophecy’*. Suetonius among other prolegomenes expresses the same thought in 8.5.6 under ‘Vespasian’ even mentioning Josephus, so the Romans were obviously very much taken by this *‘Prophecy’*. Yet in 7.9.2 under ‘Galba’ (who became Emperor for awhile in 68 CE following Nero’s assassination) he alludes to a similar ideology, but rather adds (in line with the *‘Spanish’* origins of many of these claimants, successful or otherwise – Galba, for instance, had been a Governor there for a long time) *‘would one day arise in Spain’* (thus). Later Emperors like Trajan (98-117) and Hadrian (117-138) also came from Spain. Trajan’s father – also Trajan – was, as we have seen, one of Vespasian’s bravest legion commanders in Palestine, several times mentioned in Josephus.

144. For this crackdown, in particular in regard to Flavius Clemens, Flavia Domitilla, his wife or niece, and others, in regard to which Epaphroditus and Josephus were, in the author’s view, undoubtedly swept up; see Suetonius 8.15.1, 8.17.1-2, Dio Cassius 67.14, and *E. I.* 3.18.3-5.

145. This report to Nero is covered in War 2.556-8 above. If that ‘Sa løs’; Agrippa’s *‘kúsmán’* already alluded to above, did somehow run afoul of Nero’s unpredictable and volatile temperament, it would not have been surprising. Being sent to Nero as we have seen, also in Corinth, Greece where he was supervising the digging of the Canal, to report to him on the turmoil in Palestine, was the last trace of him in Josephus’ work after being the intermediary between *‘the Peace Party’* in Jerusalem (the Pharisees, principal Sadducees, and Herodians) and the Roman Army outside it, was being sent to Nero again in Corinth in Greece. This was right before Vespasian’s appointment as commander in Palestine. It is also around the time most people think Paul was beheaded in Rome in 66 CE, or thereabouts, if he was beheaded.

146. See *Ant.* 19.299-325 (here is another character missing in the War).

147. See *Vita* 407-9 – this in addition to the material in *War* 2.556-8 above. It is clear that Philip goes to Nero on the advice of both Vespasian and Agrippa II. One can make more or less the same conclusion about ‘Sa løs’ (a *‘kúsmán’* of Agrippa) though he is not mentioned in the *Vita*.


151. For our tracing of the identities of these two individuals (Julius Archelaus and his mother, Saulo’s sister, Cypros, the wife of the second Temple Treasurer named *‘Helcias’*), see nm. 100-101 and 145 above and the Genealogy on pp. 1010-11 below. For Antipater’s relations with the Romans and the bestowal upon him and his progeny after him with Roman citizenship in perpetuity, see *War* 1.187-203 and *Ant.* 16.52-4 (also cf. 14.127-49 which gives the whole Senatorial decree, and 14.491 on the ‘meanness’ of Herod’s birth when compared to his own ancestors, the Maccabees!). This would, therefore have encompassed the whole ‘Herodian’ family after him and, in particular, if *‘Sa løs’* = *‘Paul’* and Paul was an Herodian, Paul himself.

152. See how Aretas, the *‘Arab’* King of Petra, took control of Coelesyria and Damascus in the early First Century B.C. in *Ant.* 13.392 and 14.34, 40, and 74. After that, it seemed to have a variety of Roman Governors, but in the mini-war between Herod the Tetrarch and Aretas, his descendant, after the execution of John the Baptist, the *‘Arab’* King Aretas seems to have taken control of it for awhile if Acts 9:22-5 is at all credible; see *Ant.* 18.109-25.


154. See, for instance, *War* 1.401-28, 7.172-77, *Ant.* 15.267-364, 16.136-59, and variously. He even named cities after Julius Caesar, Augustus, Tiberius, Temple guard towers after Anthony (how symbolic) and his own brother. funded Olympic-style games at home and abroad, etc.


156. See his description in *Haeres.* 30.16,8-9 of how Paul was a convert who came up to Jerusalem because *‘he wanted to marry the High Priest’s daughter’* (which I take to be a reflection of Herod and what he actually did. He married two of them!) and cf. his description of Herod’s origins in 20.1.1-6, which shows he has really read his Josephus very carefully too.

157. See Josephus’ description of how Agrippa I treated the *‘Simon’* the Head of an Assembly (*Ecclesia*) of his own in Jerusalem who wanted to have him barred him from the Temple as a foreigner in *Ant.* 19.332-4 above and see *M. Sot.* 7:8, where Agrippa cries when it comes to read the Deuteronomistic King Law in the Temple and the assembled Rabbis cry out *‘You are one of us, you are one of us, you are one of us’* three times on *Sucoat* mentioned above and cf. *M. Bik.* 3-4, *M. Kel.* 1.8, b. *Pes.* 107b, *Keth.* 17a, *Leviticus* R. 3.5, *Ant.* 19.328-34, etc.


159. *Ibid.* 1.7.13. Eusebius claims to be taking this information from Julianus Africanus (170-245 CE), but one need not go here to discover Herod’s base origins. One has only to read Josephus comments noted above in n.
Chapter 18

1. For Eusebius, see E. I. 3.5.3; for Epiphanius, see Haeres, 29.7.7, 30.2.7, and De pond. et mens.; 15; for 1 Apoc Jas., see 5.25.15 and 5.35.15-20.

2. E. I. 3.5.3-4

3. CDIV.2-3 and VI.4.5.

4. 1QpHabxii.5.

5. The Hebrew word here is ‘Ebihonim’ even though the underlying Hebrew, usage, ‘Amer / the Meek,’ doesn’t occur until Habakkuk 3:4. Here we are only at Habakkuk 2:17. This is repeated in 1QpHabxii.10 and xii.15 and in 4QpPs 37 ii.10 and iii.8, as we have seen, is tied to the expression ‘the Church’ or ‘Congregation,’ i. e., ‘the Church of the Poor’ as well.

6. 1QpHabxii.13 and 1QpHabxii.2. This is parallel in Paul’s mocking characterization of the ‘Hebrew’ Super Apostles’ in 2 Corinthians 11:15, who go around presenting themselves as ‘Servants of Righteousness’ as ‘Pseudo-Apostles’ and ‘Servants of Satan.’ Paul is nothing if ever blunt and full of malevolence.

For ‘the Assembly’ / ‘Congregation of His Elect’ see, for instance, in 4QpPs 37ii.5, iv.3, and iii.16; ‘the Assembly’ or ‘Congregation of the Poor’ in ii.10 and iii.8.

7. Cf. ‘the Assembly of the Men of Perfect Holiness’ in CDXX.2-7, ‘a Holy Community’ in 1QS6.ix.2; ‘the House of God’ and ‘the Community of His Truth’ in 1QS9.23-4; the Disciples of God’ in CDXX.4. For John as consecrated ‘from his mother’s womb,’ see Luke 1:15. We know this was how James was described in all Early Church texts. Also see various references to ‘Tammui-Derach’ / ‘Perfect of the Way’ and ‘Tamin-Kadeshi’ / ‘Perfect Holiness’ in 1QS8.i.3, iii.9, viii.8-21, and ix.5-19.

8. See Git 56a, Lam R. 1.15, and ARN 6 (20b-21a). For R. Akiba, see also Ket 62b-63a.

9. See E. I. 3.5.1-6.32.

10. See War 6.312-5.


13. Of course, all this comes from ‘the Star Prophecy’ of Numbers 24:17, since it is clear from numerous sources and now actual letters that Bar Kochba’s original name was Bar Kosiba.


16. E. I. 1.7.14 and cf. Epiphanius in Haeres. 29.7.7 above, who both knows that ‘Cocaba’ is based on ‘Star’ and places it ‘in Bashan’ (see our map on p. 1014) which is on the way to ‘Damascus’ or ‘the Land of Damascus’ not far from ‘the region of Pella’ and ‘the Decapolis’ a little further South. There is a discrepancy here.


18. See our maps on pp. 1013-15. It should be appreciated that ‘Chozeba’ is where the present-day ‘Wadi Kelt’ or ‘Monastery of St. George’ really is. The presence of ‘Kaukaba’ in Southern Lebanon is an extremely interesting location and it is in the middle of what one would term the Shi’ite Area of the Country where most to the ongoing fighting between Hezballah and Israelis takes place.


20. For Paul’s use of the term ‘Apocryphal,’ see Galatians 2:2 where he claims he was not summoned up to Jerusalem to give an account of ‘the Gospel which (he preaches) among the Gentiles,’ but rather as a result of a private Revelation.

21. 1 Apoc Jas. 5.25, 10-20.

22. Cf. Paul in 1 Corinthians 11:25-9 on his presentation of ‘Communion with the body and blood of Christ,’ where he suddenly becomes quite aggressive speaking in 11:27 about ‘drinking the Cup of the Lord in an unworthy way (whatever he might mean by this)’ and, thus, ‘being guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.’ But, of course too, once
one dispenses with the dissimulation of ‘the two sons of Zebedee,’ there is little doubt that what one is really referring to—and this in all sources—is the martyrdom of the two brothers James and Simon’ whether one is talking about ‘the two sons of Judas the Galilean’ by those names or ‘Simon the Zealot’ or, for that matter his double ‘Simeon bar Cleophas’ or James himself? ‘James the son of Alphaeus’ (i.e., ‘Cleophas’).

23. Luke 24:13–35. That this is parallel to Jerome’s Gospel of the Hebrews, where the ‘Cup’ is now given to Jesus’ brother James, should be obvious. So now basically we have two family members, one ‘Cleopas’ (allegedly Jesus’ ‘uncle’) and the unknown other—obviously James.

24. John 21:2. ‘Nathanael of Cana of Galilee’ we have already identified as a parallel in John to James. But here we also have ‘the sons of Zebedee’ again (unnamed) ‘and two other of his Disciples’ again unnamed, but there is no doubt who they are supposed to be—the same ‘two’ that Jesus appeared to ‘on the Emmaus Road’ in Luke. One should also note the ‘standing’ imagery (i.e., ‘the Standing One’ of the Pseudepigrapha) that permeates this episode in John. Moreover, we know from Josephus what really happened in those days by ‘the Sea of of Tiberius’—utter mayhem, devastation, and massacre. This at least is correctly recounted in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

25. Jerome, Vit. ill. 2. As this appears in ‘The Gospel of the Hebrews,’ according to Jerome’s report of Jerome, it reads in full: ‘He took the bread, blessed it, broke it, and gave it to James the Just (there no longer being any doubt as to which individual is missing in Luke’s ‘Emmaus Road account’) and said to him, “My brother, eat your bread, for the Son of Man is risen from amongst those that sleep.”’


27. Vit. ill. 2 above.


29. 1QpHabxii.13-14. This has been misinterpreted by almost all commentators, since it has nothing to do with ‘the Wicked Priest’ alleged ‘drunkenness,’ but rather his ‘drinking his fill’ or ‘drinking to sate of the Cup of the Wrath of God,’ just as here in Revelation.

Inability to relate to literary metaphor has always been a weak point of the ‘run-of-the-mill’ of Qumran commentators. For ‘Cup,’ ‘drunkenness,’ and ‘wine’ imagery as Divine Vengeance, see Jeremiah 13.13, 25:28, 48.26, 49.12, 51.7, Ezekiel 23.32-34, Zechariah 12:2, and Lamentations 4:21. – but, in particular, Psalm 75.8, which seems to be the basis of the imagery here in Revelation. Nor is this to say nothing of Habakkuk 2.15–16, the subject of this exegesis. ‘Poured out,’ of course, is also always important imagery, not only in the various renditions of Last Supper’ pronouncements, but in particular in Isaiah 51.17 on ‘the Cup of the Wrath of God being drunk to the dregs’ as here in the Habakkuk Pesher is actually set forth.

30. See 1QpHabxii.2-5 introducing all this.


33. Cf. Acts 5:36 and 1Apoc.Jas5.25.15-29– the reference to ‘giving the Cup of Bitterness to the Sons of Light.’

34. Ant. 20.97–9.


36. We say ‘grandson,’ because ‘son’ would perhaps be a little precarious given the chronology involved. But Josephus does mention the preventive crucifixion of his ‘two sons, James and Simon’ in Ant. 20.102, which we have mentioned above and which gave rise to the anachronism in Acts 5:36–7 as we have explained elsewhere (the point was that in mentioning these ‘two sons’, Josephus did mention ‘the Judas’ who ‘had roused the people to revolt against the Romans when Cyrenius was taking the Census in Judea.’


38. See War 7.252-406.

Notes

48. See 4Q266 (The Last Column of the Damascus Document) and my discussion in DSSU, pp. 212-19.

49. CDVIII.7-12/xIX.20-5.

50. CD VIII.12-13 and XIX.24-6. Here, we have more inter-textuality, once again, implying a contemporaneous date with other documents mentioning this ‘Lying Spouter.’ That this is the same ‘Spouter of Lying’ one encounters in the Habakkuk Pesher and in the First Column of CD is hardly to be doubted.

51. Cf. CDVIII.7-12/xIX.20-5.

52. Cf. CDXVIII.11-12 and 18-19/xIX.23-24 and 31-32.

53. Ant. 20.22-23 and 34-48. Izares meets the ‘Ananias’ Josephus calls ‘a merchant’ in the town of Charax Spasini at the Head of the Persian Gulf – the city we now call ‘Bastah’ and a hotbed of Shi‘ism. Then it was a hotbed of the ‘Mandaean Elchasaites’ or those Muhammad calls ‘Sabaeans’ after their ‘bathing’ habits – not their supposed place of origin in Southern Arabia (this is a simple confusion of consonants).


55. See our pictures in Plates 53-54. Plate 54 depicts a volcanic hot river that flows past Machaerus and into the Dead Sea more or less opposite the mouth of the Wadi Kedron, depicted in Plates 1-15 and Qumran.

56. War 2.93-5 and Ant. 17.188 and 318-20. This is why the picture in Luke 23:7-15, on the one hand, is a little worrisome (unless ‘Herod’ s opinion is being sought concerning ‘Galilee’ matters; while, on the other, it is fairly accurate in that Antipas is not pictured as having authority in Jerusalem.

57. See n. 40 above and War 2.457-68.

58. Ibid. and Vita 341-2 and 410. This is what makes the picture of ‘Jesus’ in the Gospels visiting and seeming to make headway in ‘the Decapolis’ and ‘beyond Jordan’ in Mark 3:8, 5:20, 7:31, 10:1, Matthew 4:15, John 10:40 and pars. so compelling, because these areas were definitely the scene of much civil strife during the Uprising.

59. This tradition probably began with the work of Aristo of Pella, magnifying the importance of his place of origin, after Hadrian had forbidden Jews ‘from ever going up to the country around Jerusalem’ or ‘even seeing from a distance the Land of their fathers’ – Eusebius, E.I. 3.6.4 above. It is probably in this period to that the Movement, we have stressed, known as ‘the Mourners for Zion,’ which not only gave birth to Karaite Judaism, but several returns to the Land of Zion or Jerusalem at the time of the first discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Eight-Ninth Centuries CE. For ‘the See of St. James’, see E.I. 7.19.

50. For my view of Santiago de Compostella, see [JB], pp. 621-2 and 861-2; for the ‘Myth of Santiago de Compostella,’ see James Bentley, The Way of St. James, London, 1992, pp. 7-15 and J. Marshall-Cornwall, ‘The Myth of Santiago’ in History Today, March, 1981, pp. 46f. This ‘Myth’ is certainly very curious and turns on the story that ‘James the Brother of John’ both had time to accomplish considerable ‘evangelization’ of Spain and yet return to Palestine to be beheaded (thus).

The meaning of the term ‘Compostella’ is debated, some considering related to ‘tomb’; others to ‘Field of Stars.’ The latter rests on a story that a hermit shepherd named Pelayo, ‘guided by a star’ around 810 CE found the corpse of ‘St. James’ buried in a ‘field’ in Northern Spain which became ‘Compostella’ – hence ‘Santiago de Compostella.’ Everyone one knows this mushroomed into a major Christian pilgrimage site, dedicated to ‘the Order of St. James’ and the famous ‘Way of St. James.’ Thus far the ‘myth,’ but what does seem authentic is that there is a ‘star’ and a field ‘(the Akeledama) of the Judas Iscariot bloody fall’ – a story I have already shown related to the picture of James’ fall and death in most Early Church sources and the Pseudoclementines) once more associated with the happenings but, in addition, if one views the gold-plated ossuary, which sits underneath the altar of the Cathedral at Santiago, one cannot escape the feeling that the ‘rosettes’ on it give the impression of something very ‘Palestinian’ from the First Century.

My conclusion: Spanish Pilgrims did probably bring an ossuary back to Northern Spain (one notes there is often a ‘boar’ theme associated with these legends) sometime after the Muslim conquest of the 7th Century, when such ossuaries would have been easily acquired (as they are today).

Since it is questionable if there ever was a ‘James the brother of John’ and not simply a ‘James the brother of Jesus’ (as I have argued and discussed the former as an ‘overwrite’ of the latter throughout JBJ; cf. pp. xviii, xxviii, 51, 95-119, 190-92, and variously) – moreover, the recent controversies over the fraudulent, so-called ‘James Ossuary’ has focussed attention on such ossuaries and since the site of James’ burial was known even in Eusebius and Jerome’s time in the 4th and 5th Centuries, but lost thereafter; I would conclude that if these bones in the ossuary underneath the altar of the Cathedral of Santiago are authentic and belong to any James, they would belong to James the brother of Jesus (not ‘James the brother of John,’ a product of theological transformation), brought to Spain by pious pilgrims sometime after the Muslim conquest of Jerusalem. If this is true, how ironic and yet, how fitting.

60. See pp. 136-41 above and Zohar 59b on Noah and quoting Proverbs 10:25.

61. See Eusebius, E.I. 2.23.18-21, Clement in E. I. 2.5.3, Origen, Contra Celsum 1.47, Jerome, Vir. ill. 2, Epiphanius, Haeres 78.14, etc.

62. Eusebius, E.I. 2.23.20-1, Origen, Contra
63. *Ant.* 20.200-02. I have theorized elsewhere that, since these authors state they saw this testimony in the War, the place it probably occurred was probably in Book Four on the death of James' nemesis the High Priest Ananias or Book Seven on ‘the Signs and portents’ for the fall of Jerusalem.

64. See *War* 7.300-309.

65. In Daniel, the seven and a half-year chronology appears in 7:25 and 8:12-14. The first speaks of ‘three and a half years’ (‘a time two times and a half’), which could certainly have been taken (even if mistakenly) by the Revolutionaries as signifying the time between James’ stoning (Sucrot, 62 CE) and signal for the beginning of the War against Rome. This is to say nothing about the denouement four years later (‘two thousand three hundred evenings and mornings all told’). Here is the ‘seven and a half years’ but one prefers to refrain from comment about this as certainly those following such chronologies would not have known the the War was going to end at its start.


67. Cf. *QpHab* 12-17.8 and CDIV.11-12.

68. See *Ant.* 20.17. That this King also had a large harem – the custom in ‘the Land of the Edessenes’ and beyond in ‘Adiabene’ – is testified to in 20.20.

69. See Moses of Chorene, *History or Armenia* 2.25. In Roman and Latin sources, this King is often called ‘Abanes’ and he is referred to as ‘King of the Arabs’ – see, for instance, Tacitus, *Annals* 12.12 (but also see 6.44, calling these people ‘Arab’). This is what makes Acts 8:25’s allusion to ‘the Ethiopian Queen’ all the more inexcusable. In any event, the name of a ‘prophet called Agabus’ is clearly a nonsense designation.

70. There are so many references to the quintessential ‘coming down to Antioch’ that it would be difficult to catalogue them all, but we have already explained why this ‘Antioch’ is not the one ‘on the Orontes’ in Syria, as it is normally taken to be, but rather ‘Edessan Antioch’ on a tributary of the Euphrates in Northern Syria, see above, pp. 4-21. Strabo, in Books 5-7 of his Geography, identifies five different ‘Antioch’s in the Seleucid Empire at this time – the reason being, as we have pointed out previously, that he honored his father so exceedingly (in 16.1.28 he considers, like Tacitus above, almost all Mesopotamians ‘Arabs’ as did the Romans after him and the inhabitants of Edessa, ‘Oshoans’ or ‘Assyrians’). It is left to Pliny, *H.N.* 5.21 to make the final identification of ‘Antioch-by-Callithoe’ with ‘Edessa’. For additional comments on this situation see J. B. Segal, *Edessa: The Blessed City*, Oxford, 1970, pp. 6 and 46.

Even in the story Eusebius recounts about the conversion of King Abgar or Agbar, echoed thereafter too in Syriac and Armenian sources (see *The Teaching of Addai the Apostle and Moses of Chorene* 2.33-36), ‘Ananias’ plays the key role in the proceedings as he does in Paul’s alleged conversion ‘on a Street called the Straight’ in Acts 9:10-17 and Josephus’ parallel story of the conversion of Izates (one of these *Aghanus’ es* putative sons).

71. On ‘Land of Judah,’ see CDVI.5 and the parallel archaism ‘House of Judah’ in *War* 4.IV.11 above. For this last, also see *QpHab* viii.1, limiting the efficacy of Habakkuk 2:4.

72. Both are ‘beheaded’ contemporaneously in the mid-40’s CE and, in our analysis, both are ‘brothers’ of someone. In the latter case, we identify him with ‘Judas the brother of James’ and his various look-alikes; cf. *JBJ*, pp. 866-958.

73. The key here is Peter’s arrest and subsequent escape from prison; cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 19.277-20.15 and *War* 2.178-2.223

74. Cf. CDXII.22-XIII.1, XIV.19, XX.1, and *QFlor* 11-14. This is also the case in CDII.12-13, the second part of which translators like G. Vermes of Oxford inexplicably omit. See also *QMxi* 11-12 on ‘the sword of No Mere Man’ in exegesis of Numbers 24:16-7.

75. For this kind of ‘laying on of hands,’ see Plate no. 36 in *JBJ*. Also see the Frontispiece in E. S. Drower, *The Mandaeans of Iraq and Iran*, Leiden, 1962.


77. Cf. *QpHab* 1-11, x.1-5, xi.10-xiii.4 and *QPpq* 37i.18-19 and iv.6-11.

78. *Ant.* 20.197-203 above. It is really curious how many things, Josephus packs into this last Book Twenty of the *Antiquities*, including Theudas, James, the whole story of Queen Helen of Adiabene and her sons, ending with the rioting led by Costobarus and Säulus before the enumeration of all the High Priest up to the fall of the ‘Temple, almost all of which missing from the *War*. We say, ‘perhaps unwisely so’, because Josephus seems to have disappeared from sight not long after the publication of these works, along with many other putative ‘Christians’ in Domitian’s court, such as Epaphroditus and that ‘Clement’ (probably *Flavios Clement*), the presumable hero of the *Pseudepigraphines*.


80. For *Banass*, see *Vita* 10-12; for my presentation of *Bannas* as a ‘Rechabite’, see *JBJ*, pp. 319-354.

81. We have touched on the sequentiality of this Book, above n. 78. We shall touch on it further below, pp. 529-48 in discussing the importance of the *Temple Wall* Affair.

82. Cf. *Ant.* 206-58 and his comments about the help Agrippa II and others in Rome provided him in the intervening years in *Vita* 359-67 and *Apion* 1.51. Where ‘goad’ goes, one should note that perhaps Josephus’ last comment about Albinius in *Ant.* 20.215 is that ‘he took
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money’ from many prisoners (those he had not already put to death) and ‘by this means the prisons were consequently emptied and the countryside filled with Robbers’ (often the designation for ‘Revolutionaries’).

83. War 2.254–60. It is with this assassination that Josephus actually first describes exactly who these ‘extreme Zealots’ (or ‘Essenes’ as Hippolytus might prefer to term them) he is calling ‘Sicarii’ are – nor is this definition either comprehensive or adequate. There had to be more than this – for instance, why the Masada suicide?

84. Ant. 20.168 and 188 and cf. War 2.258–9 above, descriptions chronologically preceding that of the death of James. One should note that the word for ‘Deliverance’/’er’ in Greek is ‘Soter’ and should appreciate that there are many references to such ‘signs and wonders’ both at Qumran and in the Gospels though, as we have pointed out, at Qumran ‘the signs and wonders’ are the mighty battles God has won for His People; whereas in the Gospels, in typically Hellenizing style, these same ‘signs and wonders’ are the raisings, curing, healings, exorcisms, loaf multiplications, wine transubstantiations, and the like that ‘Jesus’ and his ‘apostles’ do for the people. It is almost as if we have Asclepius vs. Yahweh.

85. Ant. 20.206–7 and 2.213–14, the second being the riotous plundering led by Saulos and his bully boys, with which the historical part of the Antiquities effectively comes to an end.

86. For Bela as both the first Edomite King and one of the principal sons of Benjamin, see Genesis 14:2–3, 36:32–3, 46:21. Numbers 26:38–40, 1 Chronicles 1:43–4 and 7:6–8:3.

87. See 1QTH xi.v9–12 and my Appendix on same in JHYP, pp. 87–94.

88. For ‘the Temple Wall Affair;’ see Ant. 20.189–196, which just precedes his account of the death of James and probably explains why Josephus himself, like ‘Ismael the High Priest’ and ‘Helcias the Temple Treasure’, who were taken into the actual household of Poppea (before she was kicked to death by Nero), went on an Embassy to Nero and in particular went to see this same Poppea (see Vita 13–16 – he calls the vegetarianism, those on whose behalf he had gone to Rome ‘to secure deliverance for’ displayed by ‘eating nothing but dates and nuts’, an example of their ‘Piety towards God’) and, moreover, why he was not in Jerusalem at the time of the death of James.

89. ‘Blasphemy’; for instance would have included ‘pronouncing the forbidden Name of God’, which James would have done had he gone into the Inner Sanctum of the Temple, as all Early Church sources insist he did (cf. E.1.2.23.11–18 and par. above), ‘pleading on his knees until they became tough as camel’s hide’ (what vivid similes), ‘to ask forgiveness on behalf of the People’. That he and his followers ‘transgressed the Law’ and were, therefore, ‘delivered up to be stoned’ in Ant. 20.200–201, can imply no other charge than ‘blasphemy’. For ‘Jesus’ ‘blasphemy’, see Matthew 26:65 and par. For Talmud Sanhedrin, it should be clear that the punishment for either insurrection or sedition was quite different, including a variety of things like ‘beheading’, but not ‘crucifixion’ which, as the world by now has perhaps come to appreciate (even if movie-makers like Mel Gibson have not), was a Roman exemplary punishment imposed on subject Peoples’ not citizens and absolutely forbidden in all Jewish legal contexts.

90. War 4.288–322 but cf. Vita 193–204 above, where he calls him ‘corrupted by bribes’.

91. Ant. 20.200, also reproduced in Eusebius, E.E. 2.23.23–25. It is doubtful that the term ‘the Christ’ (which is really first encountered in the Letters of Paul) had gained prominence in Palestine or even, perhaps, the circle Josephus. It is impossible to separate out interpolations of this kind from authentic testimony, so the reader will have to judge passages like this for himself or herself. Still, I am not among those who doubt the general authenticity of the timing embodied here, as it certainly makes much too much sense to doubt the reliability of the whole passage.

92. See 1QpHab xi.10–11.6.


94. Cf. the use of the term ‘breaking’ or ‘Breakers’ in CDL.20 (par contra ii.13–14.2), 1QpHab.10, 1QS.24, etc.

95. 1QpHab xi.14–15.10 above.


97. For the illegality of passing the death sentence when the Sanhedrin was ‘exiled’ from the Stone Chamber on the Temple Mount to another place of sitting, which it seems to have been for much of the Period from 30–70 CE, see inter alia Talmudic Tractates R.H. 31a–b, San. 41a, 88b, A.Z 8b, and j. San. 1.1. Also see my article on ‘Interpreting “Abeit-Galitou” in the Habakkuk Pesher’ in DSSFC, pp. 247–71. This paper was first presented to ‘The Groningen Conference’ in Holland in 1989, where the promise was that all papers given there would be published in the Revue de Qumran. It was not, breaking the assurances given at that time. This was not the fault of Florentino Garcia-Martinez, who fought hard to have it included, but of others. Afterwards, it was published by Zdzislaw Kapera as an Addendum to the Proceedings of his Conferences in Poland. Mogilany 1989, vol. II., Crakow: 1991, pp. 177–95.

98. Ant. 20.201–203.

99. It should be appreciated that it is here in Ant. 20.215 that it is Albinus who is portrayed as taking ‘bribes’ and ‘clearing the prisons, so that the country was completely overrun by brigands (lestai as in the Gospels)’.

100. Ant. 20.160–81, for which even Josephus provides his mea culpa in Ant. 20.166: ‘This is the reason why, in my opinion, even God
101. Cf. 1QpHab.5-10 and my comments about this in JIHJ, pp. 17-26, 44-48, and 97-93, etc. These episodes are also reprinted in the Talmud in Pes 57a and Tos. Men. xii. 31: ‘The Zealot Woes.’ It is here to that the Habakkuk Fisher and the Damascus Document actually use the same verb, ‘steal’/‘gazal,’ to describe the activities of the High Priests vis-a-vis ‘the Poor,’ cf. 1QpHab.viii. 11, xii. 10, and CDVI. 16.

102. See Ant. 20.204-15 above.

103. Cf. 1QpHab.xii. 2-10 above.

104. Ananus crystallized his relationship with Agrippa II in Rome in the Early Fifties when Ananus and others had been sent to Rome in bonds and Agrippa intervened on his behalf both with Agrippina and Claudius; cf. War 2.241-6 and Ant. 20.125-34. This was in the wake of the Samaritan-Jewish disturbances when Quadratus ‘crucified’ (at Lydda, as Pontius Pilot had done before him) and ‘beheaded’ a good many individuals whom Cumanus (the previous Governor 48-52 CE) had imprisoned; and on Agrippa’s recommendation Claudius banished Cumanus and sent the Tribune Celer, who had been involved in many of these bloody outrages, back to Jerusalem and ‘delivered him over to the Jews’ to be tortured, paraded around the city, and finally beheaded (sound familiar?). We know the date for this must have been 52 CE, the date of Cumanus’ removal and ten years before James’s death. This was the date too for the beginning of Felix’s governorship.

105. See Ant. 19.332-34 above.


108. See War 2.426.

109. 1QpHab. 5.

110. (14). See War 2.409-13 above. It is here that Josephus starts talking about the charge pre-occupying the Dead Sea Scrolls: ‘pollution of the Temple.’

111. For the best treatment of the Slavonic Josephus, see Robert Eisler, The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist, New York, 1931, pp. 113-82.

112. War 7.312-15. There is very little that could be more self-serving or cynical than Josephus’ interpretation of this Prophecy’ (except perhaps R. Yohanan’s interpretation of it in Rabbinc literature, which is largely parallel).

113. (118). War 7.288-300, displaying both the same cynicism, but also the most humorous credulity.

114. (118), War 7.300-301.

115. Matthew 9:15, 25.1:1-102, John 3:29-30, and pars. Also see Jeremiah 7:34 on ‘bridegrooms’ and ‘brides;’ etc.

116. War 7.302-305.


118. War 7.316. N.b., how he follows this up with the descriptions of the spoils the Roman soldiers took from the Temple and how Titus put ‘the Priests’ to death, who had surrendered amid the carnage, explaining that ‘as the time of pardon had passed,’ it was only fitting that ‘Priests should perish with the House, to which they belonged.’ Little doubt about who destroyed the Temple here. For ‘Yeter ha-Amin,’ see 1QpHab. 4-7, which describes this ‘taking of spoils’ or ‘plundering,’ refers to ‘the Last Priest of Jerusalem,’ and identifies this term with ‘the Army of the Kittim’ or ‘Romans’ — it can be no other. For ‘sacrificing to their standards and worshipping their weapons of war,’ see 1QpHab. 12-vt.11. There can be no other possible interpretation here too.

Josephus also tells the story of a boy who tricked the Romans into giving him some water and then fled. These passages from Josephus (War 7.317-22) are among the most vivid and tragic of any period of history-writing.

119. For the Roman Lex Cornelia de Sicariis et Veneritis, which outlawed such procedures or practices, see IBJ, pp. 183-4, 814-6, and 922 and below, pp. 952-75, and cf. Josephus, Ant. 20.34-48 on how Izates and his brother Monobazus were convinced to adopt the practice regardless of the teachings of Ananias and his companion (Paul?) and their mother’s misgivings. This controversy, as we have seen, is also reported in Gen. R. 46.10 along with the very passage on which it was based and which Izates and his brother seem to have been reading: Genesis 17:11.

120. See Ant. 20.17-20, 51-53, and 101-102.

121. For the Syriac tradition on ‘Judas the Zealot’ who parallels ‘Judas of James’ and, therefore, ‘Thaddaeus’/‘Lebbaeus surnamed Thaddaeus’ in Synoptic Apostle lists, see the two variant notices in Apost. Const. 8.25, which read: ‘Thaddaeus, also called Lebbaeus, who was surnamed Judas the Zealot,’ preached the Truth to the Edessenes and the People of Mesopotamia when Abgarus ruled over Edessa and was buried at Berytus.’ It is also clear that this character parallels the character Josephus is calling ‘Theudas’ — in the Second Apocalypse of James, ‘Theuda the brother of the Just One.’ In the fragment that is attributed to ‘Hippolytus on the Twelve Apostles,’ this is reproduced as ‘Judas who is also called Lebbaeus preached the Truth to the People of Edessa (Aidesinous, i.e., something to do with ‘Addai’/‘Ad’ or ‘Adi’ as ‘Adiabene’ probably does), etc., etc., and in the Latin document known as the Epistula Apostolica num. 2, ‘Judas Zelotes’ is also listed as one of the Eleven Apostles. Some have considered this a mistake for ‘Simon Zelotes,’ but since
Notes

neither ‘Judas of James’ or ‘Thaddaeus’ / ‘Lebbaeus’ is anywhere mentioned while ‘Peter’ and ‘Cephas’ are listed separately (i.e., the second probably meant to be ‘Simon bar Cleophas’ or ‘Simon the Zealot’), this is probably not a mistake. Still, taken as a whole, the variant manuscripts of the Syriac Apostolic Constitutions, backed up to some extent by the fragment attributed to Hippolytus, probably come closer to the truth of the situation than anything else. See my discussion of the whole range of these kinds of complexities in JBF, pp. 807-16, 853-82, and 930-38.

122. Of course, as we have seen, the usage and allusion to ‘Lying’ fairly permeates the Qumran literature. The most important of which occur in CD, 14-15 about how ‘the Man of testing poured out the waters of Lying over Israel’ and viii.13 about how ‘the Windbag’ or ‘Spouter of Lying quoted to them’, 1QSut. 18-iv.11 on ‘the Two Spirits’ – the second being ‘Wickedness and Lying… Deceitfulness and duplicitousness,’ and finally in1QHavb. 11-12 on ‘the Man of Lying who rejected the Law in the midst of their whole Assembly’ or ‘Church’ and x.9-11 on ‘the Spouter of Lying who led Many astray;’ tired out Many with a worthless Service,’ and ‘erected an Assembly’ or ‘Church upon Lying for the sake of his Glory’; and variously.

123. E.g. 3.32-5.8. This testimony, which is attributed to Hegesippus, comes on the heels of the account of the crucifixion of Simeon bar Cleophas ‘at the age of one hundred and twenty’, seemingly during the reign of Trajan during the disturbances in Egypt, but more probably earlier in the persecutions under Domitian, already delineated above.

124. Acts 6:5. Another name parallels ‘the Gate of Nicanor’ in the Temple, named after the gift by an important Rich overseas donor – cf. the various references to it in the Talmud (to say nothing of one of the enemy generals in the Maccabees Books, whose head was hung from the Citadel in 2 Macc 15:35-6 and who even had a Festival named for him – ‘Nicanor’s Day’, the day apparently before Purim).

125. See n. 122 above and War 2.421, 556, 4.81-2, Ant. 17.30-31, and Vita 46-61. With ‘Saulos and Costobarus,’ he is the intermediary between intermediary between ‘the Peace Party’ in Jerusalem and ‘Cestus’ army outside it. He helps convince the Romans to come into the city and try to crush the Rebellion.

126. See War 2.418-9, 556-7, and Ant. 20.214.

127. Otherwise known as ‘Philip the son of Jacinthus’. See War 2.421, 556 Ant. 17.30-31, and Vita 46. With ‘Saulos and Costobarus,’ he is the intermediary between intermediary between ‘the Peace Party’ in Jerusalem and ‘Cestus’ army outside it. He helps convince the Romans to come into the city and try to crush the Rebellion.

In Vita 46-61, Josephus goes into great detail about this ‘Philip’ (probably on the basis of information supplied him by Agrippa II, whose friend he was), and it turns out he also acted as a ‘messenger’ or ‘apostle’ of sorts (in Line 52, Josephus actually uses the term ‘Apostle’). As this is expressed by Josephus, he was one of ‘the Twelve’ who is sent to their Jewish compatriots in Ecbatana (referred to by the adjective ‘Babylonian,’ i.e., Babylon and Persia, Philip’s family having originated there) to dissuade them from revolting against Rome. It even turns out they sent ‘Seventy’ others are required to go with them who are even called by Josephus ‘the Seventy’ – i.e., ‘the Seventy’ and ‘the Twelve Apostles,’ ‘Philip’ is always being confused with in Early Church texts – but these ‘had no intention of seeking Innovations’ (thus!).

Also see Vita 177-84 for more of Philip’s story which very much preoccupies Josephus, probably to exonerate him of certain charges of treason. It also even turns out, as we shall see below, that Philip’s has ‘two daughters’ (cf. Acts 21:8-9’s ‘Philip the Evangelist who had four virgin daughters who were prophetesses’ – sic). These are mentioned as having miraculously escaped Gamala when it was overrun by hiding in a ravine, when ‘other children were spared’ (thus!) – War 4.81-2.

128. Acts 20:15-17. It is here the narrator of the ‘We Document’ explains that Paul ‘was hurrying so as to be in Jerusalem in time for Pentecost,’ which we now know from 4Q266 above was the time of the Reunion of ‘all those in the Desert Camps’ under the command of both ‘the (High) Priest Commanding the Many’ or ‘the Camps’ and/or ‘the Mekhaber’ – ‘the Bishop.’
Antipas was left behind; but the amount of time Josephus spends on Philip, evidently at Agrippa II’s prompting and the ostentatious mention of Vespasian’s intercession on his part, does betoken some concern relating to Philip’s ultimate fate. It is interesting too that, as we saw above, Philip seems to have gone directly from Gamala, after his escape from there, to Ecbatana in Babylonian Persia to his ‘apostolic’ mission to the Jews of the East (along with ‘the Twelve’ and ‘the Seventy’ above) to persuade them not to revolt against Rome and not to join their confederates in Galilee and Judea. At the same time, he seems to have left his ‘daughters’ in Gamala (see our Plates nos. 102-3 below) to fend for themselves – or did he?

134. We have covered this in n. 127 above, but see War 4.54-82, where Josephus recounts some nine thousand perished, four thousand of whom slain outright by the Romans, who ‘did not even spare the children, many of whom were flung down by them from the citadel’; cf. 1QpHabv.10-11 on ‘sacrificing to their standards and worshipping their weapons of war’ and ‘the Kittim,’ who ‘have no pity even on the fruit of the womb.’

135. Loc. cit. As already noted, they seem to have been the only ones to have escaped. Curious. No wonder, Acts refers to the iraltered egos as ‘prophetesses.’


137. Cf. 4Q266.17-18 and DSSU, pp. 212-19 above.

138. Ibid.

139. CDv.12-13 and 19-21.

140. Cf. CDv.14-16 and viii.5-12 above with Ant. 20.206-7 and variously.

141. Ant. 20.206-14.

142. See, for instance, CD.1,4.17,vii.13, and 1QMx.13 (in interpretation of ‘the Star Prophecy’) above and variously.

143. Cf. 1QpHav.9-13 and ix.4-12 (including an allusion to ‘delivered into the hand of’) with Ant. 20.214.

144. 1QpHabv.11-13.

145. Cf. Ps. Rec 7.9-10 and Hom 12.8-17 and 14.6

146. See Eusebius, E.I. 3.39.9-10.n

147. See A.Z. 27b-28a and Eccl. R 1.8.3-4 where Jacob comes to cure a curious individual known as ‘Ben Dama’ (an obvious nom a clef for one or another worrisome individual of some kind; cf. Ber 56b) of snakebite. Also see A.Z. 16b for the main Jacob of Kfar Sechania story.

148. 1QMx.13 above.