

2008

John and Qumran: Discovery and Interpretation over Sixty Years

Paul N. Anderson

George Fox University, panderso@georgefox.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/ccs>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), [Christianity Commons](#), and the [History of Christianity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Anderson, Paul N., "John and Qumran: Discovery and Interpretation over Sixty Years" (2008). *Faculty Publications - College of Christian Studies*. 77.

<https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/ccs/77>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Christian Studies at Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications - College of Christian Studies by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact arolfe@georgefox.edu.

JOHN AND QUMRAN: DISCOVERY AND INTERPRETATION OVER SIXTY YEARS

Paul N. Anderson

It would be no exaggeration to say that the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls was the most significant archaeological find of the twentieth century. As the Jesus movement must be understood in the light of contemporary Judaism, numerous comparisons and contrasts with the Qumran community and its writings illumine our understandings of early Christianity and its writings. As our knowledge of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls has grown, so have its implications for Second Temple Judaism and early Christianity. Likewise, as understandings of Johannine Christianity and its writings have grown, the Qumran-Johannine analyses have also evolved. The goal of this essay is to survey the scholarly literature featuring comparative investigations of Qumran and the Fourth Gospel, showing developments across six decades and suggesting new venues of inquiry for the future.

At the outset, it must be said that the state of Johannine studies has probably evolved more over the last six decades than that of any other corpus within the New Testament.¹ If Rudolf Bultmann had written his monumental commentary on John a decade or more after 1947, would he have been able to posit his source theories in the same way, inferring stark tensions between Jewish and Hellenistic cosmologies during the first century C.E.?² In the pre-Qumran-discovery bed-

1. For reviews of Johannine secondary literature and its treatment of the Dead Sea Scrolls, see the extensive treatments by Robert Kysar, *The Fourth Evangelist and His Gospel: An Examination of Contemporary Scholarship* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1975), and *Voyages with John: Charting the Fourth Gospel* (Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2006), chs. 5–8. See also the reviews of Johannine research by Stephen S. Smalley, “Keeping Up with Recent Studies; XII. St John’s Gospel,” *ExpTim* 97 (1986): 102–8, and Paul N. Anderson, “Beyond the Shade of the Oak Tree: The Recent Shade of Johannine Studies,” *ExpTim* 119 (2008): 365–73.

2. Indeed, Bultmann’s inference of three non-Johannine sources underlying the Fourth Gospel, edited by an evangelist and reordered (wrongly) by a redactor, was built upon the assumption that the Revelation-Sayings Source reflected a Mandaean and Gnostic ideology and origin, as Judaism was thought to be pervasively monistic in contrast to Johannine dualism.

rock of Johannine scholarship, several foundation stones resisted assault. First, critical scholarship had drawn a sharp distinction between monistic Judaism and dualistic Hellenism. Given John's highly dualistic character, it was therefore assumed that the provenance of the Fourth Gospel was Hellenistic, not Jewish. As a result, the Johannine tradition was truncated from Palestinian Judaism, severed from the ministry of Jesus, and even distanced from Pauline Christianity in Asia Minor in favor of other settings, such as Alexandria. Second, pre-1947 New Testament research characteristically saw the theme of Jesus' "agency" within John's Christology as an element of the Gnostic Revealer-Myth. Bultmann exploited this perception in arguing for the existence of a Revelation-Sayings Source underlying the Johannine "I-Am" sayings, connected inferentially with John the Baptizer and his followers. Third, Johannine religious forms were typically portrayed as primarily non-Jewish, cultic ones rather than as socio-religious features of a Jewish-Christian group. A fourth tendency connected John's Logos Christology with Philo's treatment of the Logos motif, as well as Hellenistic speculation, driving a wedge between John's elevated theology and his mundane presentation of the earthly Jesus. Fifth, messianic Christological constructs tended to be viewed as somewhat monolithic rather than variegated. All these elements of pre-1947 approaches to Johannine studies have largely fallen by the wayside and have been replaced by other perspectives rooted in religious and historical developments largely furthered by the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, and under the influence of scrolls research, several new movements in Johannine studies have developed. First, given the light/darkness dualism of the Community Rule, the War Scroll, and other Qumran writings, Johannine dualism is seen to be perfectly at home within Palestinian Judaism. As a result, the Jewishness of John has been recognized, even to the extent that C. K. Barrett has come to view John as the most Jewish of all the Gospels.³ Second, rather than seeing John's agency schema as

See Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray, R. N. W. Hoare, and J. K. Riches (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971). For an extensive analysis of the evidence for Bultmann's diachronic approach to John's composition, see Paul N. Anderson, *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: Its Unity and Disunity in the Light of John 6* (WUNT 2.78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996). Even C. H. Dodd, who saw the Johannine tradition as having a far greater unity than Bultmann proposed, hardly referred to the Qumran literature at all in sketching the religious background of the Fourth Gospel, even after the initial discoveries had been published. While some awareness of Qumran writings is apparent in *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), only a few references are made, and Dodd believed the scrolls' impact on Johannine studies (and even on the background of John the Baptizer) to be negligible. See also his *Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953).

3. C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel of John and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975); see also his monumental commentary, *The Gospel according to St. John*, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978).

Gnostic, scholars have come to see it as closer to the *shaliach* motif within the Mosaic Prophet agency typology rooted in Deut 18:15–22.⁴ Third, the social function of religious practice and identity has come under new focus, suggesting something of the history of the Johannine dialectical situation. As features of sectarian faith and practice have been illumined by findings at Qumran, greater light has been shed on the emerging Jesus movement, especially in its individuation from Judaism. Fourth, the Jewishness of John's Logos Christology has gained respect over against Hellenistic associations, implying connections with Gen 1 rather than necessitating Gnostic cosmological speculation.⁵ Fifth, a growing awareness of the rich diversity of Jewish and Christian Messianic expectations, as well as unity and diversity within emerging Christologies of the New Testament, has forced scholars to appreciate the dialectical character of early Christological developments rather than pitting one construct against another in needless dichotomies.⁶ While not all of these changes in perspective were affected equally by the Qumran discoveries, it must be said that Qumran has played a significant role in these developments.

These changes can also be seen in the meaningful engagement of the leading Johannine commentaries with the Qumran writings in the several decades after the discovery of the scrolls. While C. K. Barrett argued in the second edition of his commentary (1978) that the original excitement of Qumran had not exactly revolutionized Johannine studies, he did list more than one hundred references

4. Note, for instance, Jan Peter Miranda's *Der Vater, der mich gesandt hat: Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den johanneischen Sendungsformeln Zugleich ein Beitrag zur johanneischen Christologie und Ekklesiologie* (Europäische Hochschulschriften; Frankfurt: Lang, 1972), which connects the Johannine sending motif with Mosaic agency as found in Qumran (353–72); Jan-A. Bühner, *Der Gedante und sein Weg in 4. Evangelium: Die kultur- und religionsgeschichtlichen Grundlagen der johanneischen Sendungschristologie sowie ihre traditionsgeschichtliche Entwicklung* (WUNT 2.2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1977), carries the connection further, especially linking Deut 18:15–22 with John's agency formula. For eight specific links between the lxx rendering of Deut 18:15–22 and John, see Paul N. Anderson, "The Having-Sent-Me Father—Aspects of Agency, Irony, and Encounter in the Johannine Father-Son Relationship," in *God the Father in the Gospel of John*, ed. Adele Reinhartz, *Semeia* 85 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999), 33–57.

5. Especially significant was the second appendix in the first volume of Raymond Brown's Anchor Bible commentary, which argues strongly for the Jewish background of the Fourth Gospel and its Prologue. See Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 2 vols. (AB; New York: Doubleday, 1966–1970), 1.519–24.

6. Building on examples from Qumran, C. K. Barrett shows how the Fourth Evangelist, like other Jewish writers of his day, intentionally placed contravening notions side by side as a means of engaging the reader and drawing audiences into the dialectical thought of the narrator (*Gospel of John and Judaism*, 68–75).

to Qumran writings in his index.⁷ Raymond Brown's commentary connected the Qumran writings to the background of John, although he emphasized that the contacts are not close enough to imply literary dependence.⁸ Likewise, while Rudolf Schnackenburg noted several significant similarities between John and Qumran, he did not think they were close enough to imply any sort of direct dependence. Nonetheless, he did not rule out the possibility that, if John the Baptizer had some contact with Qumran and his disciples became Johannine followers of Jesus, this indirect contact might have explained the connection between the Johannine ethos and that of the Essene community.⁹ While Barnabas Lindars only provided a couple of pages on the contacts between John and Qumran, he did argue that this link in some ways "provides the closest parallel of the thought of Judaism at the time of Jesus." Thus, connections between John and the Manual of Discipline make the likelihood of some sort of Qumranic influence upon John "inescapable," although Lindars does not spell out specific possibilities.¹⁰ These and other examples indicate the growing influence of the scrolls on mainstream Johannine research, even in the face of deeply entrenched assumptions.

Immediately upon their discovery, the new knowledge provided by the Dead Sea Scrolls began to be applied to related subjects. Whereas other archaeological discoveries had involved shopping lists and political correspondence, this set of writings was rich with religious significance and carried obvious implications both for Judaism and Christianity. The discovery of scrolls in a total of eleven caves continued through 1952, although ongoing quests for further archaeological and manuscript evidence will probably never be definitively concluded. While varying interests, levels of information, and aspects of expertise have led to a multiplicity of claims about the manuscripts and their implications for Johannine studies, one way to review the "findings" is to consider the types of claims that are made. Below I supply punctuation marks for claims made in scrolls lit-

7. Barrett, *Gospel according to St. John*, 34. Note the rejoinder, however, in James H. Charlesworth, "Have the Dead Sea Scrolls Revolutionized Our Understanding of the New Testament?" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, 2000), 116–38. Charlesworth answers the question in the title of his essay with a resounding "yes."

8. See Brown, *Gospel according to John*, 1.lxii–lxiv.

9. Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to St. John*, trans. Kevin Smyth, 3 vols. (HTKNT; New York: Seabury and Crossroad, 1980–82), 1:128–35.

10. Barnabas Lindars, *The Gospel of John* (NCBC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972), 36–38. More recently, Craig Keener's commentary, with its extensive engagement with ancient sources, provides one of the most helpful treatments of John's Jewish background, although its focus on the Dead Sea Scrolls is more incidental than pronounced (*The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, 2 vols. [Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2003], 1:171–232).

erature.[NB: Sentence inserted for clarity.] Beginning with the more significant and moving toward the more mundane, I punctuate some of the highlights of discovery and interpretation. It should be stated at the outset that the following lists make no attempt to be exhaustive in their treatment. Indeed, at least twenty thousand essays and books have been written on Qumran and related subjects. Roughly the same number have been written on Johannine studies over the last six decades as well, with hundreds of essays and books touching on the intersections between the two fields. This survey, however, attempts to outline at least a suggestive sample of some of the contributions, concluding with questions for further research. I begin with the exclamation marks!

EXCLAMATION MARKS!—NOTABLE CLAIMS,
BOTH NOTEWORTHY AND NOTORIOUS!

As with any momentous discovery, “exclamations” in research on the scrolls indicate the perceived significance of the event—both realized and anticipated. More-outrageous assertions include the claims that Jesus was “an astonishing reincarnation” of Qumran’s Teacher of Righteousness;¹¹ that the monastery at Qumran was “more the cradle of Christianity than Bethlehem or Nazareth”;¹² and that Jesus did not exist but was instead the hallucinogenic projection of a fertility cult experimenting with mind-expanding mushroom intoxicants.¹³ Perhaps the grandest theory put forward is that of Barbara Thiering, who laid out an extensive hypothesis that the Gospel of John was actually *composed by Jesus himself* in 37

11. See André Dupont-Sommer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey*, trans. E. Margaret Rowley (New York: Macmillan, 1952), 99, who found many parallels between the presentation of Qumran’s Teacher of Righteousness and Jesus: similar teachings; a challenge to the priestly establishment of Jerusalem; an untimely death; and the organization of the movement that emerged in his name.

12. Edmund Wilson, *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1955), 98. Wilson argued that Jesus must have grown up in Qumran, where he returned after his ministry and was eventually buried sometime before 64 C.E. Accusing religious scholars and archaeologists of personal bias, Wilson apparently felt no need to cloak his own antireligious sentiments.

13. John Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Myth*, 2nd ed. (Amherst, N.Y.: Prometheus Books, 1992); see also his more provocative *The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross: A Study of the Nature and Origins of Christianity within the Fertility Cults of the Ancient Near East* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1970). One of the original editors of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Allegro developed an imaginative set of implications for understanding the ministry of Jesus and the character of early Christianity. Following major rebuttals by scholars and former colleagues, however, he resigned from the University of Manchester in 1970 to devote himself to full-time writing.

c.E. while living in Qumran.¹⁴ While media outlets have covered fantastic reports on the Dead Sea Scrolls with astounding popular appeal, striking exclamations from established scholars are still noteworthy.

“MY HEARTIEST CONGRATULATIONS ON THE GREATEST MANUSCRIPT
DISCOVERY OF MODERN TIMES!”

William Foxwell Albright wrote these words in 1948 after receiving correspondence on the scrolls and sample photographs from John Trever.¹⁵ While extraordinary as a claim, it is also true! No set of ancient manuscripts discovered within the last century has had a greater impact on our understanding of ancient Judaism and thus on the origins of Christianity. The way that the scrolls illuminate the ministries of Jesus and John the Baptizer, and also the Fourth Gospel, has been highly significant.

JOHN THE BAPTIZER WAS IMMERSSED IN QUMRAN ESSENISM—A POSSIBLE LINK
BETWEEN THE FOURTH EVANGELIST AND JESUS!

One of the strongest sets of connections between the Qumran writings and early Christianity involves the great number of parallels between the ministry and message of John the Baptizer and Qumran: geographic intersections (John was baptizing across the Jordan, not far from Qumran); priestly lineages (Zadokite or otherwise); teachings regarding holy living and repentance from worldly compromise; prophetic warnings bolstered by threats of the axe “laid at the root of the tree”; emphases upon baptismal cleansings and purification; uses of Isa 40:3 (“the

14. While the media has paid special notice to Thiering’s views, scholars have not. In understated terms, Geza Vermes responded to Thiering’s critique of Vermes’s earlier review of Thiering’s *Jesus the Man* (New York: Doubleday, 1992): “Professor Barbara Thiering’s reinterpretation of the New Testament, in which the married, divorced, and remarried Jesus, father of four, becomes the ‘Wicked Priest’ of the Dead Sea Scrolls, has made no impact on learned opinion. Scrolls scholars and New Testament experts alike have found the basis of the new theory, Thiering’s use of the so-called ‘peshar technique,’ without substance” (*The New York Review of Books* 41, no. 20, December 1, 1994). Of course, as Thiering suggests, Jesus *could have* been raised at Qumran, created a conflict (as the Wicked Priest) with John the Baptizer (the Teacher of Righteousness), married Mary Magdalene (divorcing and remarrying her again), married Lydia, been unsuccessfully crucified outside Qumran (between the bodies of Simon Magus and Judas), been buried and resuscitated in Cave 8, had four children, traveled with Peter and Paul to Rome, and died in Rome (ca. 64 c.E.). But does the textual evidence in the Temple Scroll and the Gospels confirm such, or even suggest it? For a more scholarly analysis of the use of the peshar method of interpretation at Qumran, see James H. Charlesworth, *The Pesharim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).

15. Cited by John C. Trever in *The Untold Story of Qumran* (Westwood, N.J.: Fleming H. Revell, 1965), 94.

voice of one crying in the wilderness: ‘Prepare the way of the Lord’); and challenges issued to religious leaders. Whether or not John was born in Qumran, Otto Betz and others have argued that he was raised there.¹⁶ Plausibly, the Baptizer’s priestly heritage merged with his sense of prophetic and eschatological urgency, as reflected in the ministry of Jesus and eventually in the perspective of the Fourth Evangelist.

THE FOURTH EVANGELIST LIKELY DID SOME ABIDING AT QUMRAN!

As one of the leading British authorities on the Fourth Gospel, John Ashton’s argument that the Fourth Evangelist spent time at Qumran is significant.¹⁷ Attempting to ascertain the character and origin of Johannine dualism, Ashton inferred a direct association with Essene dualism rather than an indirect influence. Against Bultmann’s inference that the Fourth Evangelist was a Gnostic, Ashton wondered if John might have encountered this sort of dualistic thinking within the Qumranic setting “from an early age, maybe from childhood.” Thus, although firsthand contact with Qumran cannot be proven, the Fourth Evangelist “had dualism in his bones.”¹⁸

QUMRAN COMMUNITY MEMBERS INFLUENCED THE PRODUCTION OF THE JOHANNINE GOSPEL!

As one of the leading experts on Qumran, the Fourth Gospel, archaeology, and Jesus, James Charlesworth argued that many residents of Qumran sought refuge in Jerusalem after the destruction of the complex by the Romans in 68 C.E. This influx might have coincided with the production of the first edition of the Gospel of John.¹⁹ Given similarities in the dualistic paradigms of John and

16. Otto Betz, “Was John the Baptist an Essene?” in *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reader from the Biblical Archaeology Review*, ed. Hershel Shanks (New York: Random House, 1992), 205–14.

17. See John Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1991), 205–37. Ashton accused scholars such as Brown and Charlesworth of not going far enough in accounting for the Johannine-Qumranic similarities, although Charlesworth later questioned whether Ashton had fairly considered his analysis; see James H. Charlesworth, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Gospel according to John,” in *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith*, ed. R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 65–97. In Ashton’s view, John’s dualism was rooted not in “his receptiveness to new ideas but . . . his own gut reactions,” which had been formed by his personal history of development (*Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, 237).

18. Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, 236–37.

19. James H. Charlesworth, “The Priority of John? Reflections on the Essenes and the First Edition of John,” in *Für und wider die Priorität des Johannesevangeliums*, ed. Peter L. Hofrichter (TTS 9; Hildesheim, Germany: Georg Olms, 2002), 73–114.

Qumran (especially evident in John 6, 12, 14, which Charlesworth calls *termini technici*) and that the Johannine Gospel possesses a good deal of firsthand archaeological knowledge of Jerusalem, Charlesworth poses that the Fourth Evangelist likely bolstered the story of Jesus by featuring the mission of John the Baptizer in John 1. If the first edition of John was written before 70 c.e., this would explain why many of the Jerusalem topographical features are described as still standing (they had not yet been destroyed by the Romans in June of 70 c.e.). Charlesworth's proposal would also make the first edition of John the *first* Gospel—not only independent of the Synoptic traditions, but preceding them.

THE FOURTH EVANGELIST WAS AN ESSENE!

Did Essenes live *only* in Qumran, or did they live elsewhere in Palestine as well? Brian Capper's analysis of the Essene movement has been one of the most creative and suggestive of recent analyses, and his connection between the Essene ethos and the Johannine approach to community is provocative.²⁰ Based on Josephus's estimate that there were as many as four thousand Essenes in pre-70 Judea, Capper does not view the Essene movement as a reclusive sect but as a virtuoso religious movement of devout celibate males, inhabiting most Palestinian villages and caring for the social needs of local populations. Essenes therefore took in orphans and widows and addressed social concerns in Jewish communities. They cared for the needs of the poor and marginalized in their "houses of the community." If the Fourth Evangelist was a member of this sort of religious movement he may have seen Jesus as endorsing that sort of local social activism; therefore, the Johannine emphasis upon community deserves reconsideration as a movement of radical Jewish community concern.

THE JOHN-QUMRAN MARRIAGE TO BE DISSOLVED DUE TO IRRECONCILABLE DIFFERENCES!

While this exclamation might overstate Richard Bauckham's reluctance to make use of Qumran research for the advancement of Johannine studies, it comes close.²¹ While Bauckham disagreed with Raymond Brown diametrically on a number of Johannine topics (including, notably, whether there *was* a Johannine community), he took Brown's modest assessment of Qumran-Johannine contacts

20. Aside from Capper's contribution to the present volume, see his "With the Oldest Monks . . . : Light from Essene History on the Career of the Beloved Disciple?" *JTS* 49 (1998): 1–55; also "Essene Community Houses and Jesus' Early Community," in *Jesus and Archaeology*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 472–502.

21. Richard Bauckham, "The Qumran Community and the Gospel of John," in Schiffman, Tov, and VanderKam, *Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery*, 105–15.

further.²² Due to the significant number of differences and inexact parallels, even regarding Qumran's modified dualism, Bauckham cautioned against finding the key to the Johannine tradition, and more pointedly the search for a Johannine community, in the literature from Qumran. According to Bauckham, "There is no need to appeal to the Qumran texts in order to demonstrate the Jewishness of the Fourth Gospel's light/darkness imagery. This can be done more convincingly by comparison with other Jewish sources already available long before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls."²³

THE "JOHANNINE COMMUNITY" SECEDES FROM SECTARIANISM AND JOINS A CULT!

Breaking with the Martyn-Brown hypothesis regarding a Johannine "sectarian community" that sought to maintain separateness from the world, Kåre Fuglseth argues for a reappraisal of Johannine Christianity.²⁴ Here the Qumran-Johannine relationship becomes one of contrasts as well as comparisons, as the Qumranic-Johannine-Philonian continuum is revamped, with John closer to Philo than to Qumran. Especially taking issue with Wayne Meeks's sectarian approach to Johannine Christianity, Fuglseth shows some of the inadequacy of sect-like associations with the Johannine situation. If Johannine Christianity was part of a cosmopolitan setting, welcoming outsiders and maintaining contact with other religious institutions (as suggested by references to the temple and other groups), "sectarian" is the wrong designation. In contrast to Qumran's cutting itself off from the rest of the world and highly structured sectarian existence, Johannine Christianity is more permeable and less organized structurally. And, rather than being fixed upon its estranged parental group, Johannine Christianity engaged several fronts—Docetists, Samaritans, alleged Greeks and Romans, and other Christians. In these and other ways, the Qumran-Johannine relationship is as valuable for its contrasts as well as its similarities. According to Fuglseth, Johannine Christianity seems more cultic than sectarian.

Overall, while some "exclamations" about the Qumran writings call for a good deal of skepticism, others merit serious consideration. The above analyses show that biblical studies, and especially Johannine studies, have been influenced in unprecedented ways by the Qumran discoveries. Rather than seeing the Johannine writings against Hellenistic, Gnostic, or Hermetic backgrounds, the solidly

22. See Raymond Brown, "Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles," in his *New Testament Essays* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1968), 102–31.

23. Bauckham, "Qumran Community," 115.

24. Kåre Sigvald Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism in Perspective: A Sociological, Historical, and Comparative Analysis of the Temple and Social Relationships in the Gospel of John, Philo, and Qumran* (NovTSup 119; Leiden: Brill, 2005).

Jewish parentage of the Johannine tradition—despite its later development in a Greco-Roman setting—raises inescapable issues for consideration.

In addition to exclamation marks, however, Johannine-Qumran dialogue also has its *periods*.

PERIODS.—FULL STOPS, AND STARTS, IN THE
NEW TESTAMENT-QUMRAN DIALOGUE

The history of the New Testament-Qumran dialogue is punctuated by several major developments and projects, each of which contributes to ongoing discussions in particular ways. Often these “periods” are determined by actual discoveries (or lack thereof), leading to a periodization of the research. As well as being affected by archaeological discoveries, these periods are also shaped by particular scrolls being published, made available, or commented upon within larger conferences and publications. Whatever the case, these discoveries and their interpretations create the frameworks for chapters of development within the larger history of inquiry. Building upon the periodizations of George Brooke and Jörg Frey, the following outline of four periods of research emerges.²⁵

PERIOD 1: FIRST DISCOVERIES AND PREMATURE ASSUMPTIONS (1947–CA. 1955)

As the first of the Dead Sea documents began to be noticed in 1947, great intrigue surrounded the discoveries, but primarily with regard to their implications for ancient Judaism. The pre-discovery era had already taken note of Ernst Renan’s 1891 dictum that Christianity was an Essenism that had largely succeeded, and the Damascus Document of Cairo had been published in 1910.²⁶ However, with the discovery of the Great Isaiah Scroll A, the Manual of Discipline, the Habakkuk Peshet, the Thanksgiving Hymns, and the War Scroll, interest

25. George J. Brooke, “The Scrolls and the Study of the New Testament,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings*, ed. Robert A. Kugler and Eileen M. Schuller (SBLJL15; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 61–76; repr. in his *Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament: Essays in Mutual Illumination* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 3–18. Brooke’s periods of research, reflecting the archaeological history of Qumran, are described as “Pre-Qumran, Period IA (1948–1952),” “Period IB (1952–1977),” “Abandonment (1977–1991),” and “Periods II–IV (1991–the present).” Jörg Frey, “The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on New Testament Interpretation: Proposals, Problems, and Further Perspectives,” in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 3 vols. (Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2006), 3:407–61. Frey’s periods largely overlap with those of Brooke, but the dates and descriptions are more clearly spelled out.

26. See Brooke’s analysis of the pre-Qumran era, *Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*, 4.

began to take off.²⁷ Karl Georg Kuhn produced several provocative essays analyzing parallels between the Qumran writings and the New Testament.²⁸ Especially significant was Kuhn's observation that the dualism of Qumran was not materialistic, but rather ethical and eschatological. Analyses of Qumran dualism bore special relevance to Johannine dualism, and this was a major factor in the movement away from seeing the Johannine literature as Hellenistic only, contributing to the recovery of an appreciation of its systemic Jewish character. During the early years, the interpretive promise of the scrolls as a resource for understanding the background of the New Testament grew as connections began to emerge between the Qumran writings and early Christianity.

PERIOD 2: THE "QUMRAN FEVER" (CA. 1955–1970)

Jörg Frey describes the next decade and a half as a period of "Qumran Fever." Launched by the discoveries of ten more caves containing thousands of fragments (1952–1956), this new phase saw both the production of solid work on the scrolls, with implications for Christian origins, as well as the expansion of speculation characterized above. The first volume of the Discoveries in the Judean Desert series appeared in 1955.²⁹ In addition to popular speculations on the scrolls and related subjects, an international group of New Testament scholars began to contribute its own analyses. French and German analyses began to make headlines in Europe,³⁰ and British and American advances soon followed. With the publication of the two-volume translation and introduction by Millar Burrows in 1955 and 1958, important New Testament themes were laid out, setting the template for further research to follow.³¹ The translation of the scrolls into English by Geza Vermes and others led to a veritable avalanche of scrolls-related research. Alongside great optimism that the Qumran writings would revolu-

27. Frey, "Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls," 409.

28. See, for instance, Karl G. Kuhn, "Zur Bedeutung der neuen palästinischen Handschriftenfunde für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft," *TLZ* 47 (1950): 81–86, and his more fully developed "Die Sektenschrift und die iranische Religion," *ZTK* 49 (1952): 296–316, where he lays out a plausible view of the Iranian background of Qumran dualism, shedding important light on Johannine dualism.

29. Now numbering forty assigned volumes (some still in production), the DJD series began with *Qumran Cave 1*, ed. D. Bartholémy and J. T. Milik (Oxford: Clarendon, 1955). Volumes 2–5 were also published during this period.

30. See Jean Daniélou, *Les manuscrits des la Mer Mort et les origines du Christianisme* (Paris: Editions de l'Orange, 1957), translated as *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Primitive Christianity*, trans. Salvator Attanasio (Baltimore: Helicon, 1958). Note especially Daniélou's analysis, "St. John and the Theology of Qumran" (103–11).

31. Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1955); idem, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls: New Scrolls and Interpretations with Translations of Important Recent Discoveries* (New York: Viking, 1958).

tionize New Testament studies, however, doubts began to be expressed as to the exactness of the parallels and therefore their implications for the study of early Christianity. Rather than inferring direct connections among Jesus, John the Baptist, Paul, and the Fourth Evangelist, analyses of parallels reflecting lines that never directly cross [QU: The meaning of “parallels reflecting lines that never directly cross” seems a bit cryptic. Can the meaning be stated more directly?] became an important interpretive approach.³²

PERIOD 3: STAGNATION AND ADVANCE (CA. 1970–1991)

While Frey and Brooke refer to this period as a time of stagnation or abandonment in Qumran archaeological research, it is one of the most aggressive periods of advance in Johannine-Qumran analysis. Due to a variety of factors, Qumran research slowed down considerably in the 1970s and the 1980s. The excavation work at Qumran was abandoned, and the dearth of new discoveries, coupled with the lengthy process of getting extant scrolls into print, led the media and the cutting edge of biblical scholarship to look elsewhere for subjects of interest. The publication of the Temple Scroll in Hebrew (1977) created some excitement,³³ but a growing awareness of the differences between Qumran and the New Testament writings had begun to sink in, pouring cold water on the fires of parallelomania.³⁴ Frustration was also growing as years, and even decades, passed without discovered texts becoming available to the broader world of scholarship. It was as though the failure to break new archaeological ground was matched by a failure to break new intellectual ground in interpreting the scrolls as resources for understanding either ancient Judaism or early Christianity. Regarding Qumran-Johannine research, however, some of the most significant advances were made during this period. Most notably, the essay collection *John and Qumran* gathered by James Charlesworth marks boundaries of

32. F. F. Bruce, “Qumran and Early Christianity,” *NTS* 2 (1955–1956): 176–90; Oscar Cullmann, “The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity,” *JBL* 74 (1955): 213–26. Daniel J. Harrington, S.J., also reminds us that, as in Euclidian geometry, parallel lines never do meet (“Response to Joseph Fitzmyer’s ‘Qumran Literature and the Johannine Writings,’” in *Life in Abundance: Studies of John’s Gospel in Tribute to Raymond E. Brown*, S.S., ed. John R. Donahue [Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2005], 134–37).

33. Between 1968 and 1992 only three volumes in the DJD project were published (vols. 6–8). Frey (“Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 416) and Brooke (*Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*, 10) note the importance of Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977–83), [QU: Multiple volumes?] which was the longest scroll to be discovered.

34. The truth of the 1961 SBL presidential address by Samuel Sandmel, “Parallelomania,” *JBL* 81 (1962): 1–13, had begun to sink in for Qumran–Early Christianity studies. The mere determination of a parallel between two ancient texts need not imply derivation or a particular form of contact; caution should be used in determining the particulars of textual relationships.

this period with its first and second printings in 1972 and 1990,³⁵ contributing to further explorations in significant ways. It is also during this period that some of the major commentaries and Johannine works were published, developing the Qumran-Johannine connections further (Brown's second volume, 1970; Barrett's second edition and monograph on John and Judaism, 1978 and 1975 respectively; Lindars's commentary, 1972; the translation of Schnackenburg's commentary into English, 1980–82; and Ashton's major analysis of John's dualism in his *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, 1991). **[QU: It would be preferable – less disruptive to the reader – to place these parenthetical citations in a footnote.]** While archaeological discovery slowed down during this period, Johannine-Qumranic analyses flourished.

PERIOD 4: A NEW “QUMRAN SPRINGTIME” (1991–PRESENT)

Frey called the epoch since 1991 “a new ‘Qumranic springtime,’” and indeed it has been, on several levels.³⁶ Especially significant was the marked increase in access to the Qumran writings. First, the publication of the texts of Cave 4 made accessible the most important of recent discoveries, facilitating the analysis of biblical and apocryphal texts as well as community writings. Second, the increased availability of these texts by microfiche, published photographs, and transcribed writings broke the logjam of limited access to manuscripts that were previously available only to small teams of scholars. Third, the publication of articles and books on particular topics began to take off in unprecedented ways, leading to a consensus opinion about Jesus and Qumran.³⁷ Fourth, symposia, anniversaries, and special collections provided the stimulus for new scholar-

35. James H. Charlesworth, ed., *John and Qumran* (New York: Crossroad, 1972). For the 1990 second edition, the title was changed to *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*.

36. Frey borrowed this term from Martin Hengel, who referred to the new “Qumranfrühling” in “Die Qumranfollen und der Umgang mit der Wahrheit,” *TBei* 23 (1992): 233–37. From 1992–2002 publication of DJD volumes accelerated, with the release of twenty-eight of the forty commissioned volumes (most involving manuscripts from cave 4). In addition, the Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project, founded in 1985 by James Charlesworth, published its first six volumes between 1994 and 2002.

37. In the forward to *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), James H. Charlesworth laid out sixteen elements of what he called a “critical consensus” regarding connections between Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls (xxxi–xxxvii). Essentially, the Qumran community members were a group of male, conservative Jewish religious covenanters, whose writings antedated Jesus and his followers but did not refer to any of them directly; this being the case, parallels are important but incidental. Comparative analysis is thus helpful in that it shows at least twenty-four similarities between Qumran and Jesus' movement and also twenty-seven major differences (see Charlesworth's own essay in the collection, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historical Jesus,” 1–74). For another impressive list of parallels involving similarities and differences, see Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, “Qumran Texts and the Historical Jesus: Parallels in

ship. Fifth, social-science developments within biblical studies produced new approaches to the Essene movement and the Qumran community as social and anthropological phenomena. New approaches to archaeology have also had an impact on Qumran studies. Analyses of skeletal remains, cloth, parchment, ink, fecal remains, pottery, and other materials have lent valuable insights into life in Qumran, illuminating some of the writings.

While this brief overview of the history of Qumran-John studies shows the ebb and flow of discovery and research, the boundaries between the periods are neither hard nor fixed. Sometimes discoveries in one period do not receive widespread notice until a later phase, so some of the chronological differences are simply a matter of timelines and incidental factors in the flow of publications. Overall, history reveals the emergence of more sensational claims, followed by more measured ones, leading finally to a more nuanced set of analyses that considers both similarities and differences between the New Testament and the Qumran writings. Most significant is the overall development of a keener sense of the Jewish background of all of the New Testament writings, including insights into the ministry of Jesus, the epistles of Paul, and the Johannine literature.

COLONS: SIGNIFICANT JOHN-QUMRAN DEVELOPMENTS

Of the many connections that have been drawn between the New Testament and the Dead Sea Scrolls, few have been as significant as the John-Qumran analyses. These studies have ranged in character from positive comparisons between the two sets of writings to observations of significant contrasts, and from assumptions of primary contact between Johannine Christianity and Qumran to assertions that the two communities were distinct. Sometimes a particular study made a significant impact, while at other times a cluster of studies created a wave of interest and furthered inquiry. Following are some of the major contributions to research on John and Qumran—not quite distinctive periods, but notable as colons in the larger flow of research.

EARLY EXPLORATIONS OF POSSIBLE CONNECTIONS

The year 1955 was significant in the blossoming of Qumran studies. It was also significant for the way several important analyses of the Qumran writings illuminated the religious background of the Gospel and Epistles of John.³⁸ At the same time, following the lead of Millar Burrows, scholars were coming to identify

Contrast,” in Schiffman, Tov, and VanderKam, *Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery*, 573–80.

38. In addition to Karl Kuhn’s work on Qumranic dualism and the implications for Johannine interpretation (see n. 28 above), Lucetta Mowrey’s essay “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the

the Johannine literature as those New Testament writings bearing closest affinities with the Qumran writings.³⁹ Of particular importance were the early studies of Raymond Brown and William F. Albright, which identified impressive Johannine-Qumran parallels and argued for a closer connection with contemporary Judaism than with later Mandaean Gnosticism.⁴⁰ In addition to similarities, however, significant differences between John and the scrolls began to emerge. For instance, F. F. Bruce, after initially having noted significant parallels between John and the Qumran writings, soon thereafter expressed second thoughts.⁴¹ Likewise, Howard Teeple, noting the many differences between the Qumran and the Johannine writings, concluded that there are not enough identical parallels to prove an indisputable connection between them, other than what would have been the case with any two sets of writings drawing on a common Jewish background.⁴² Renewed interest in the relationship, however, was to be launched with a full volume dedicated to the subject by leading New Testament scholars.

John and the Dead Sea Scrolls

By far the most significant single volume in the history of John-Qumran analysis is a collection of essays edited by James Charlesworth in 1972 and republished in 1990.⁴³ Leading off with an overall analysis in "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament" (pp. 1-8), Raymond Brown covers nearly a quarter-century

Background for the Gospel of John," *BA* 17 (1954): 78-97, focused early on the John-Qumran relationship.

39. See Burrows, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 338-41; idem, *More Light*, 123-30. See also the early and extensive treatments by Leon Morris, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Gospel of John* (London: Viking, 1960; repr. in his *Studies in the Fourth Gospel* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969], 321-58); F.-M. Braun, "L'arrière-fond judaïque du Quatrième Évangile et la Communauté de l'Alliance," *RB* 62 (1955): 5-44; M.-É. Boismard, "Qumrán y los Escritos de S. Juan," *CB* 12 (1955): 250-64; Gunther Baumach, *Qumran und das Johannes-Evangelium* (AVTRW 6; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1957).

40. Raymond E. Brown, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles," *CBQ* 17 (1955): 403-19, 559-74; repr. in *New Testament Essays*, 102-31. Albright showed how archaeology clearly suggests a Palestinian origin of the Johannine tradition. Later studies have not only confirmed but expanded that judgment (William F. Albright, "Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of St. John," in *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology*, ed. W. D. Davies and David Daube [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956], 153-71). See also Godfrey R. Driver, *The Judean Scrolls: The Problem and a Solution* (New York: Schocken Books, 1965), 544-62.

41. See F. F. Bruce, *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956).

42. Howard M. Teeple, "Qumran and the Origin of the Fourth Gospel," *NovT* 4 (1960): 6-24; repr. in *The Composition of John's Gospel: Selected Studies from "Novum Testamentum,"* ed. David E. Orton (RBS 2; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 1-20.

43. Charlesworth, *John and Qumran*, 1972. See n. 35 above for the full citation.

of research, calling for further investigation. In his more extensive "Light from Qumran upon Some Aspects of Johannine Theology" (pp. 9–37), James L. Price covers such themes as God the Creator, Johannine dualism, and the Teacher/Son as God's representative, revealer, and example. Within "The Johannine Paraclete and the Qumran Scrolls" (pp. 38–61), A. R. C. Leaney analyzes parallels among the Teacher of Righteousness, Jesus, and the Holy Spirit. In "The Calendar of Qumran and the Passion Narrative in John" (pp. 62–75), Annie Jaubert seeks to resolve the differences between the Johannine and Synoptic datings of the Last Supper. Charlesworth himself contributed two essays: the first, "A Critical Comparison of the Dualism of 1 QS 3:13–4:26 and the 'Dualism' Contained in the Gospel of John" (pp. 76–106), outlines eleven significant parallels between the two; the second, "Qumran, John, and Odes of Solomon" (pp. 107–36), shows, on the basis of six parallels between these three bodies of literature, that the Johannine-Odes relationship was not an organic one, but rather that both had been influenced by Qumran. In "Qumran, John, and Jewish Christianity" (pp. 137–55), Giles Quispel shows how Jewish ideas and practices came to be expressed in Hellenistic categories as the Johannine tradition moved from Palestinian traditions toward their expression in an Asia Minor setting. Carrying the association further in "The First Epistle of John and the Writings of Qumran" (pp. 156–65), Marie-Émile Boismard attempts to identify aspects of Qumranic dualism within the Johannine community in Asia Minor. The discussion comes to a head in the essay by William H. Brownlee, "Whence the Gospel according to John?" (pp. 166–94), which connects Palestinian tradition with the work of the Apostle John finalized in a Hellenistic setting such as Alexandria. Noting the continued relevance of these essays for Johannine research in his new foreword to the 1990 reprint, Charlesworth concluded, "In summation, while the Dead Sea Scrolls cannot be used to prove the apostolic connection of the earliest layer of John or demonstrate the early date of the gospel, they do disclose the Palestinian origin and Jewish character of the Johannine tradition. The Gospel of John is perhaps the most Jewish of the canonical gospels."⁴⁴

ANNIVERSARIES, SYMPOSIA, AND SPECIAL COLLECTIONS

After publication of the Charlesworth collection, the primary venues in which Johannine-Qumran studies have been carried out are larger collections, symposia, and special studies. For instance, Charlesworth contributed a significant essay on the subject to a *Festschrift* for Moody Smith in 1996, as did Joseph Fitzmyer and Daniel Harrington within the conference and volume of collected

44. Charlesworth, *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, xv.

essays celebrating the contributions of Raymond Brown.⁴⁵ The fiftieth anniversary of the scrolls' discovery saw many more publications than any previous anniversary. A raft of Johannine-Qumran studies have appeared within the past decade or so.⁴⁶ The most significant collection on this topic appears in the proceedings of the second Princeton Symposium on the Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls, in which significant direct and indirect treatments of John and Qumran abound.⁴⁷ The present book is the most recent example of this phenomenon. It is the only anniversary volume of which I am aware dedicated exclusively to Qumran and the Gospel of John.

What one can see in the first six decades of John and Qumran research is a set of movements toward and away from degrees of specific influence and contact. **[QU: The meaning of previous sentence is unclear. Please revise.]** Whereas the significant number of parallels between the Qumran and Johannine writings has led to inferences of a close relationship,⁴⁸ others have resisted inferring such close proximity. Indeed, influence can happen in a great number of ways, and even differences are suggestive for contrastive analysis. **[QU: The meaning of previous sentence is unclear. Please revise.]** Current studies, beyond noting a similarity of worldview, seek to make use of growing knowledge of Qumran theology, sociology, psychology, and anthropology as a means of better understanding the Johannine writings and their settings. Only recently have the interdisciplinary approaches that have influenced biblical studies so extensively in recent decades

45. Charlesworth, "Dead Sea Scrolls and the Gospel," 65–97; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J., "Qumran Literature and the Johannine Writings," in *Life in Abundance: Studies of John's Gospel in Tribute to Raymond E. Brown*, ed. John R. Donahue (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2003), 117–33; Daniel J. Harrington, S.J., "Response," in Donahue, *Life in Abundance*, 134–37.

46. See, for example, Aage Pilgaard, "The Qumran Scrolls and John's Gospel," in *New Readings in John: Literary and Theological Perspectives: Essays from the Scandinavian Conference on the Fourth Gospel, Århus 1997*, ed. Johannes Nissen and Sigfred Pedersen (JSNTSup 182; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 126–42; Richard Bauckham, "Qumran and the Fourth Gospel: Is There a Connection?" in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans (JSPSup 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 267–79; idem, "Qumran Community," in Nissen and Pedersen, *New Readings in John*, 105–15; Dietmar Neufeld, "And When That One Comes, Aspects of Johannine Messianism," in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Craig A. Evans and Peter W. Flint (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 120–41.

47. Charlesworth, *Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. See here especially Enno E. Popkes, "About the Differing Approach to a Theological Heritage: Comments on the Relationship between the Gospel of John, the *Gospel of Thomas*, and Qumran," 3:218–317; and James H. Charlesworth, "A Study in Shared Symbolism and Language: The Qumran Community and the Johannine Community," 3:97–152.

48. See especially John Ashton, who thinks John's dualism can only be explained on the basis of the Evangelist's direct contacts with the Qumran community (*Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, 205–37).

begun to be applied to the Dead Sea Scrolls and their life settings. As those developments emerge, new venues of research will undoubtedly follow.

SEMI-COLONS DENOTING SIGNIFICANT TOPICS IN QUMRAN-JOHANNINE RESEARCH

Emerging from the above analyses are significant topical developments that punctuate the landscape of the study of John and Qumran. As broad themes, these subjects overlap with each other and with many other topics not covered in this essay. Therefore, this list is suggestive of some of the significant topics in Qumran-Johannine research, although not exhaustive. While the similarities involved are important, so also are the differences when seeking to understand a Johannine emphasis or approach.

CREATION AND THE WORKINGS OF GOD

One of the striking parallels between the Fourth Gospel and the Qumran writings is the featuring of God's work in creation as a singular force in the cosmos.⁴⁹ This is an important feature, because the dualistic pairs of realities have their origins in God's sovereign work; therefore, Qumran dualism is a derived reality rather than an absolute one. Parallel to the creative work of the divine Logos in John 1:1–3, all that exists has come from God's creative power (1QS 3.15; 11.11, 17). Both positive and negative emphases are made in the Qumran writings (although less so in John): all has come into being through God's creative work, and nothing has come into being otherwise. In reflecting a belief in God's primacy in the universe, the Johannine Prologue (John 1:1–18) resonates with the Qumranic worldview, although both have their origin in Gen 1 and related texts. This confirms the Jewishness of the cosmology of the Fourth Gospel, providing an important backdrop for understanding the Johannine perspective and ethos.

DUALISM

Given that God is the source of creation, how could things be so wrong in the world? In Qumranic terms, there are two Spirits, the Spirit of Truth and the Spirit of Deception, that draw humanity into two camps, the Children of Light and the Children of Darkness. This leads to cosmological warfare, wherein God

49. See the treatment of theology in Qumran and the Gospel of John by James L. Price, "Light from *Qumran* upon Some Aspects of Johannine Theology," in *John and Qumran*, ed. James Charlesworth (London: Chapman, 1972), 9–37. Joseph Fitzmyer also begins his treatment of Johannine-Qumranic parallels with a focus on the work of God as Creator ("Qumran Literature and the Johannine Writings," 119–26).

calls the faithful—the Light of the World—to fight for the truth and the way of righteousness embraced by the community, against all opposition. Ironically, those targeted as the adversaries in this duel are largely fellow Jewish leaders in Jerusalem, who are perceived as having compromised the ways of God in their dealings with the world. They will meet their doom at the hand of God's angels in warfare. The Johannine writings employ many of the same dualistic pairs and envision Jesus as the Light of the World, who illumines all (John 1:9). Darkness has not overcome the Light, and as many as receive Jesus as the Light receive the power to become the children of God (1:12). Following the way of Jesus is to be walking in the Light (8:12; 12:45), and the Holy Spirit convicts the world of both sin and of righteousness (16:8).

According to Charlesworth, the following dualistic pairs are found in the Qumran writings and also in John, a fact that had led some scholars to infer at least some sort of contact between those who formed the Johannine tradition and the ethos of the Qumran community.⁵⁰

Fourth Gospel

the Spirit of Truth (14:17; 15:26; 16:13)
 the Holy Spirit (14:26; 20:22)
 sons of light (12:36)
 eternal life (3:15, 16, 36; 5:24, *passim*)
 the light of life (8:12)
 and he who walks in the darkness (12:35)
 he will not walk in the darkness (8:12)
 the wrath of God (3:36)
 the eyes of the blind (9:32; 10:21; 11:37)
 full of grace/fullness of grace (1:14, 16)
 the works of God (6:28; 9:3)
 their works (of men) were evil (3:19)

1QS 3.14–4.26

Spirit of Truth (3.18–19; 4.21, 23)
 the Spirit of Holiness (4.21)
 sons of light (3.13, 24, 25)
 in perpetual life (4.7)
 in the light of life (3.7)
 they . . . walk in the ways of darkness (3.21)
 to walk in all the ways of darkness (4.11)
 the furious wrath of God's vengeance (4.12)
 blindness of eyes (4.11)
 the fullness of grace/his grace (4.4, 5)
 the works of God (4.4)
 works of abomination/of a man (4.10, 20)

While there are significant similarities here, there are also differences. Brown's view that we have at least a common worldview articulated between these two movements within ancient Judaism is the best way forward. But if similarities do not imply direct contact, differences do not imply distance. Even the differences between the scrolls and the Gospel of John are significant for understanding more fully the Johannine ethos.

50. While Charlesworth outlines these technical terms elsewhere, his critical comparison is most fully laid out in his essay "A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in 1QS 3:13–4:26 and the 'Dualism' Contained in the Gospel of John," in Charlesworth, *John and Qumran*, 101–10; repr. from *NTS* 15 (1968–69): 389–418.

MESSIANISM

One of the striking things about perspectives on the Messiah in Qumran is the diversity of models that seem to be in play. The leading interpretation has noted two “Messiahs” in Qumran, that of “Aaron” and that of “Israel” (1QS 9.10–11), although a Prophet-like-Moses typology is also mentioned directly in that same context.⁵¹ Initial discussions identified two messianic typologies in Qumran, one priestly and the other royal, but several objections have been raised. First, the reference to “Israel” is not necessarily a Davidic reference; it could be a reference to corporate Israel. Second, the two typologies could be seen as being fulfilled in the ministry of one person rather than referring to two different people.⁵² Nevertheless, Craig Evans has suggested that the “two sons of oil” in 4Q254 4 2 and other passages argue for a diarchic view of the Messiah in Qumran involving a priestly figure and a royal figure,⁵³ reflecting a Qumranic embrace of two distinctive messianic leaders. Of course, the question is whether *only two* messianic typologies existed in Qumranic interpretation, or whether they accompanied additional associations.⁵⁴ In exploring not only these references, but also many others, Dietmar Neufeld argues for a vast proliferation of messianic typologies at Qumran, the sort of feature that is reflected in the vast number of messianic references in the Gospel of John.⁵⁵

51. On the “two Messiahs,” see Karl G. Kuhn, “The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel,” in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. Krister Stendahl (New York: Harper, 1957), 54–64; Raymond E. Brown, “The Messianism of Qumran,” *CBQ* 19 (1957): 53–82; R. B. Laurin, “The Problem of Two Messiahs in the Qumran Scrolls,” *RevQ* 4 (1963–64): 39–52; Emil A. Wcela, “The Messiah(s) of Qumran,” *CBQ* 26 (1964): 340–49; Andrew Chester, *Messiah and Exaltation: Jewish Messianic and Visionary Traditions and New Testament Christology* (WUNT 207; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 333–40. On Moses typology, see James E. Bowley, “Moses in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Living in the Shadow of God’s Anointed,” in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation*, ed. Peter W. Flint (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 159–81.

52. See George J. Brooke, “The Messiah of Aaron in the Damascus Document,” *RevQ* 15 (1991): 215–30.

53. See Craig A. Evans, “‘The Two Sons of Oil’: Early Evidence of Messianic Expectation of Zechariah 4:14 in 4Q254 4 2,” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*, ed. Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich (STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 566–75; “Diarchic Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Messianism of Jesus of Nazareth,” in Schiffman, Tov, and VanderKam, *Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery*, 558–67.

54. D. L. Hurst sees the notion of “two Messiahs at Qumran” as a creation of modern scholars rather than a deduction from the evidence; see “Did Qumran Expect Two Messiahs?” *BBR* 9 (1999): 157–80.

55. Neufeld, “And When That One Comes,” 120–40. See also Anderson, *Christology of the Fourth Gospel*, 1–15.

With relation to Johannine studies, three connections seem important. First, the great diversity of messianic presentation in the Fourth Gospel is not an anomaly; it is characteristic of messianic hope mingled with speculation as to how God might be working eschatologically in the redeeming of the world. Second, religious debates among characters in the Fourth Gospel as to whether Jesus was indeed the Messiah (needing to have come from David's city, John 7:42; searching the Scriptures but not having noted the one of whom Moses wrote, 1:45; 5:38–47) likely refer to real debates over the character and identity of the Messiah in the ambivalent reception of Jesus and his mission. Third, the significance of prophetic messianic typologies, including the Prophet-like-Moses (whose words must come true; Deut 18:15–22) and the Prophet-like-Elijah (whose signs testify to his authenticity), is pressing in both Qumranic and Johannine messianism. In these ways, parallels between these two sets of messianic views are highly instructive for understanding the Johannine ethos and theology.

THE SPIRIT OF TRUTH

One of the interesting themes that emerges from Qumran-Johannine studies is the role of the Holy Spirit in John as prefigured by various images in the Qumran writings. In the scrolls, the Spirit of Truth is contrasted to the Spirit of Deception. The Holy Spirit, or Spirit of Righteousness, also denotes the means by which God empowers the faithful to adhere to the way of the Torah, maintaining covenant faithfulness as opposed to falling short of full adherence. In addition, the instructions of the Holy Spirit are the basis for community in Israel (1QS 9.3), and God's enlightening work is a foundation for the Teacher of Righteousness and those who follow in his wake. In a creative synthesis of otherwise disparate features, Otto Betz argued that the Qumranic presentation of the archangel Michael, who communicates God's messages to the faithful and strengthens them, serves as the religious backdrop for the Spirit/Paraclete that Jesus promises to send.⁵⁶ From a slightly different angle, A. R. C. Leaney connected the original advocacy and strengthening work of the Paraclete with that of the Father, which the Son and the Holy Spirit carry out in their respective commissions.⁵⁷ Israel Knohl drew particular connections between Menahem the Essene, described by Josephus, and the leadership style of Jesus. Further, Knohl argues that the nouns *Menahem* and *menahemim* mean "comfort/comforters" and implies that John's presentation of Jesus and the ministry of the Holy Spirit, particularly the description of the Holy Spirit as "another" Paraclete (John 14:16), is rooted in stories of

56. Otto Betz, *Der Paraklet: Fürsprecher im häretischen Spätjudentum, im Johannesevangelium und in neu gefundenen gnostischen Schriften* (AGSU 2; Leiden: Brill, 1963).

57. A. R. C. Leaney, "The Johannine Paraclete and the Qumran Scrolls," in Charlesworth, *John and Qumran*, 38–61.

Menahem, expressing “the unique concept of a *chain* of redeemers.” If Jesus was a second Menahem, the Holy Spirit is described in John as a third.⁵⁸ Finally, believers become commissioned as witnesses in the world, extending the agency of the Father by means of their faithfulness. In these and other ways, the Qumranic references to ways the Spirit of God interacts with humanity provide an important backdrop for understanding Johannine pneumatology and its implications for the faithful, as divine guidance is understood to be an important source of direction, effected by the Holy Spirit.

COMMUNITY DYNAMICS

One of the most important sets of insights to come from the Qumran writings is the sense of community life conveyed within this Jewish movement.⁵⁹ While the strict rules of joining and participating in this sectarian society probably did not apply in the same ways to the Johannine community in various phases of its development, some features do help us appreciate features that are distinctively Johannine. For instance, Jesus scholars have long noted the difference in the Synoptic Jesus’ teachings about loving enemies and societal outcasts, whereas the Johannine Jesus commands his followers to “love one another” and to care for their own. This seems like an aberration—an inward-focused deviation from the outward-focused teachings of the Jesus of history. In the Community Rule, however, true followers of God are to “love everything He chose and to hate everything He rejected” (1QS 1.3) and “to love the Children of Light . . . and to hate the Children of Darkness” (1QS 1.9–10). Similarly in the Damascus Document, “Each one must love his brother as himself and support the poor, needy, and alien” (CD 6.20). While neither the Gospel nor the Epistles of John are as vehement in loving insiders and hating outsiders as the author(s) of 1QS, they seem to reflect a conventional set of concerns for members of one’s religious community that was perfectly at home within contemporary Judaism, making the Johannine focus upon loving one another understandable. It is also a fact that the love of one’s own does not preclude love for the outsider and alien (CD 6.20), so the Johannine silence on explicit commands to love one’s enemies and neighbors should not be over-read.

58. Israel Knohl, *The Messiah before Jesus: The Suffering Servant of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2000), 51–71, quote 71. See also A. Shafaat, “Geber of the Qumran Scrolls and the Spirit-Paraclete of the Gospel of John,” *NTS* 27 (1981): 263–69.

59. See Adriana Destro and Mauro Pesce, “The Gospel of John and the Community Rule of Qumran: A Comparison of Systems,” in *Judaism in Late Antiquity, Part Five: The Judaism of Qumran, a Systemic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Alan J. Avery-Peck, Bruce Chilton, and Jacob Neusner, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 2:201–29.

SCRIPTURE AND ITS INTERPRETATION

One of the intriguing features of the Qumran writings is their reverence for Jewish Scripture, reflected in the many approaches to interpretation. While a good number of speculations have arisen which assume that a particular sort of interpretation was characteristically in play, a more measured analysis of interpretive approaches to Scripture shows both the creativity and the real-life application exercised by the Teacher of Righteousness, followed by later generations of eschatological interpretation. Building on earlier analyses of forms of interpretation at Qumran, George Brooke outlined five types of biblical interpretation in the Qumran writings: legal, exhortatory, narrative, poetic, and prophetic.⁶⁰ Implications for Johannine studies are many. The Fourth Evangelist indeed shows a Jesus who challenges legal interpretations of Moses and the Law with his own (John 7:16–24); biblical themes are expounded by Jesus in exhortative ways (John 6:45 // Isa 54:13); narratives and events in Moses' day are appropriated by Jesus with relevance to his own mission (John 3:14 // Num 21:9); works of Moses are interpreted poetically (John 1:16–18); and biblical references are interpreted as prophecy fulfilled (John 19:32–37 // Ps 34:20; Zech 12:10). The relevance of this interpretive analysis of the use of Scripture in both the Qumranic and the Johannine writings is to invite the appreciation of the rich diversity of approach in both cases, helping interpreters avoid tendencies to overly generalize one particular approach or to insist on a singular pattern.

From these thematic parallels it is clear that there are a good number of topical similarities between the Johannine and Qumranic writings, and yet very few of them are exact parallels. They both have a monotheistic understanding of God as the source and destiny of the cosmic order while sketching the plight of humanity in dualistic terms. Challenges for humans are intensified by references to the workings of the two Spirits, leading either to truth or deception. While Qumranic dualism emphasizes divine judgment and violence far more intensely, the Johannine approach presents readers with a dualism of decision—to decide for or against the Revealer. In both sets of writings, a great diversity of approaches to messianic typologies and uses of Scripture can be seen, and this represents the creativity of contemporary Judaism of the day. With regard to community life, the Qumranic sociology has a far more sectarian character in contrast to the more permeable and boundary-bridging ethos of the Johannine situation. While Johannine community members (or even their mentors, if John the Baptizer played a role in forming the Johannine ethos) may have had some firsthand contact with Qumran society, such an inference is not required to account for the large number of parallels between the writings. Even in their differences and con-

60. George J. Brooke, "Biblical Interpretation at Qumran," in Charlesworth, *Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1:287–319.

trasts, however, these analyses are helpful for understanding the Johannine ethos and message.

COMMAS—MUNDANE DETAILS, PHRASES, AND CONCEPTUAL CONSTRUCTS

In addition to topical themes, a variety of mundane details, phrases, and conceptual constructs deserve at least a brief consideration. The sheer number of parallels in particular details between the scrolls and the Johannine writings shows that individual intersections should not be viewed as anomalies. Again, while the relationship between the Qumranic and Johannine communities remains a question, these sets of connections remain suggestive for Johannine research. Whether the parallels are similar or dissimilar, they nonetheless are instructive for getting a better sense of the development of Johannine Christianity in its own trajectory. That being the case, both history and theology in John are affected by these comparisons and contrasts.

The minimal conclusion from the mundane parallels between the Qumranic and Johannine writings is that both operated from a similar perspective and worldview, drawing on Hebrew Scripture typologies and texts in addressing later religious challenges within their communities and beyond. While an exhaustive assessment of the particular relationship between the two compilations is beyond the scope of this essay, it might be helpful to be reminded of a digest of the various approaches to the question before looking briefly at several notable examples. In reviewing the various parallels in shared symbolism and language between the Qumranic and Johannine communities, James Charlesworth offers five “attractive hypotheses” as to how the Qumran Scrolls have influenced the Fourth Gospel.⁶¹

1. John the Baptizer had once been a member of the Qumran Community, Jesus was his disciple, and Jesus passed some of the unique Qumran terms on to his own disciples; or,

2. The Beloved Disciple, Jesus’ intimate follower, had been a disciple of the Baptizer who had been a member of the Qumran Community, and he influenced Jesus and some of his followers; or,

3. Jesus met Essenes on the outskirts of towns and cities in Galilee and Judea; he discussed theology with them and was influenced by some of their ideas and terms; or,

4. Essenes lived in Jerusalem (or Ephesus) near the Johannine community and influenced the development of Johannine theology; or,

5. Essenes became followers of Jesus and lived in the Johannine School, shaping the dualism, pneumatology, and technical terms in the Fourth Gospel. This could have happened in numerous places, including Jerusalem.

61. James H. Charlesworth, “A Study in Shared Symbolism,” 3.97–152.

In reflecting upon Johannine evidence for these approaches, the first two scenarios seem the most likely, accounting for the Qumranic material within the Johannine writings in an efficient and straightforward way. The Beloved Disciple in John 1 may indeed have been one of the earliest disciples to leave their former master, the Baptizer, and follow Jesus. If the Baptizer was steeped in Qumranic ethos, that factor in itself could account for many of the ways the mission of Jesus is presented in cosmological terms—being cast in a struggle between light and darkness. Of course, the other theories of Jesus, the Johannine leadership, or the Johannine community having had contact with Essenes in Palestine and/or Asia Minor are entirely plausible, and there is no reason to discount their likelihood. Even informal contacts with Qumranic cosmology and ethos would have been “in the air” within first-century C.E. Judaism and that would have included Palestine and surrounding regions, as well as Asia Minor, or whatever setting in which the Johannine community may have developed. Therefore, some combination of direct and indirect contacts between the Johannine tradition and Qumranic Judaism is likely, a reality that explains the numerous minor parallels between the Johannine writings and the scrolls.

CLUES TO THE BAPTIZER’S MINISTRY

From the beginning of the discoveries, Qumranic clues to the ministry of John the Baptizer have abounded, casting new light on the Johannine presentation of his ministry and his connection with both Jesus and the Fourth Evangelist. First, if John indeed was baptizing across the Jordan (John 1:28; 10:40) and was associated with Elijah (Matt 11:14; Mark 6:15; 8:28; Luke 1:17; but cf. John 1:21), this could locate his ministry just a few miles from Qumran. If he was or had been a member of the Qumran community, this might also account for his rugged appearance and unconventional diet. Second, the presentation of John’s citing Isa 40:3 as the basis for his mission connects with the Qumranic description of the party of the Yahad (twelve laymen and three priests) who were to consecrate themselves for two years in the wilderness, grounding themselves in the way of truth by abiding in the law of righteousness (1QS 8.14; 9.19–20). This is entirely commensurate with John the Baptizer’s claim to be a voice crying in the wilderness, making straight the way of the Lord (John 1:23). Third, John the Baptizer’s teachings resemble many features of the ethos of Qumran, including his emphasis on righteousness (Matt 21:32) and baptizing as a call to repentance (Mark 1:4).⁶² Fourth, John’s baptism with water carries forth a central Qumranic concern with

62. In particular, his confronting of Herod for taking his brother’s wife (Mark 6:18) reflects ethical concerns echoed in the Damascus Document (CD 4.21–5.1), where taking two wives is forbidden (in keeping with Jewish Scripture). Other aspects of keeping the Law rigorously are implied.

purification and cleansing, although it also is very different from Qumranic bathing. Rather than bathing twice a day, or having a ritualized approach to purification, John's baptism appears to have been a singular and pivotal experience. And, rather than simply continuing a standard process of purification, it appears to have been bestowed upon individuals who had already repented of their sins. These comparative and contrastive details confirm at least some sort of connection between John the Baptizer and the Qumran community, and the inference that he had probably spent some time there is by no means implausible.⁶³ Given this likelihood, the presentation of the Baptizer's followers becoming followers of Jesus in John 1:19–51 provides an important set of plausible contacts between the Johannine presentation of Jesus and the ethos and theology of Qumran.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND TOPOGRAPHICAL DETAILS

In addition to illuminating the ministry of John the Baptizer with implications for understanding better the interests of the Johannine Evangelist and the ministry of Jesus, a variety of other archaeological and topographical discoveries at Qumran are also significant. First, a historic clue to the five porticoes surrounding the Pool of Bethesda (also Beth-zatha) mentioned in John 5:2 is provided by the description of two pools in Jerusalem in the Copper Scroll. If "Beth Esdatayin" can be taken to refer to "the House of the Two Pools," four porticoes surrounded two adjoining pools with one portico separating them.⁶⁴ Confirmed by archaeological discoveries of such a site in Jerusalem, accompanied by Aesclepius images, this Johannine presentation of the Jerusalem healing setting is found to be more historical than it was earlier thought to be. Second, a clue to the six stone jars holding twenty or thirty gallons each in John 2:6 is provided in 11QTemple 50.10–19, where the impurity of clay jars is mentioned, suggesting the purity necessity of alternatives, such as stone vessels. A third archaeological clue to the Johannine presentation of Jesus and the Baptizer relates to the *mikva'ot*, the cleansing pools, found at Qumran. While theories vary as to which deep pools were used for drinking water storage and which ones were used for

63. See, for example, James Charlesworth's explanation that, if John the Baptizer was indeed the son of a Zadokite priest, some sort of contact with this community with clear priestly associations is entirely plausible, although impossible to prove ("John the Baptizer and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Charlesworth, *Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 3:1–35).

64. See Charlesworth, "Dead Sea Scrolls and the Gospel," 65–97; M. Baillet, J. T. Milik, and Roland de Vaux, eds., *Les 'petites grottes' de Qumrân* (DJD III; 2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), 1:214, 271–72; Joachim Jeremias, *The Rediscovery of Bethesda* (Louisville: Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1966), 11–12; John J. Rousseau and Rami Arav, eds., *Jesus and His World: An Archaeological and Cultural Dictionary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 156. See also Urban von Wahlde, "Archaeology and John's Gospel," in *Jesus and Archaeology*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 560–66.

bathing, one pool in particular has three staircases coming up, with one going down, separated by a divider. The reason for this division is that if impurity was transmitted by touch, a bather coming up would not want to be touched by the “unclean” state of ones coming down into the water. Therefore, gradations of removal from impurity are implied. This would have been similar in function to the purification pools one would have used in entering the temple area. That being the case, John the Baptizer’s conjoining of ethical reform and washing in a noncultic setting appears to be a challenge to cultic purity, suggesting an alternative understanding of Jesus’ early challenging of the temple system in the Fourth Gospel. Might Jesus be presented as taking further the Baptizer’s challenge to ritual means of purity in the inaugural temple cleansing in the Fourth Gospel? While such a narrative interest cannot be confirmed or disconfirmed critically, the religious realism now disclosed by Qumran archaeology raises some interesting possibilities for consideration. These details not only have echoes with John’s historicity but also with John’s theology.

METAPHORICAL AND THEMATIC REFERENCES

Several common metaphors and themes between the Qumranic and Johannine writings are also worth noting. First, “living water” is associated in Qumran with spiritual blessing—a clear reflection of the need to have running water in contrast to stagnant pools if water is to be effective for drinking or cleansing. The importance of collecting water running is illustrated by the many cisterns in Qumran and their carefully engineered feeder streams. In 4Q504 4.1–21, the writer laments that people have abandoned “the fount of living water” and “have served a foreign god in their land.” This lament is followed by the grateful prayer, “You have poured out your holy spirit upon us.” The connection of “living water” and pouring out of the Holy Spirit found in John 7:38–39 reflects an intriguing Qumranic parallel. Second, parallel to the Matthean and Johannine references to “the light of the world” (Matt 5:14; John 8:12; 9:5), covenanters are encouraged in 4Q541 9.24 6 that “you will grow and understand and be glad in the light of the world; you will not be a disowned vessel.” Third, references to “eternal life” are made in both sets of writings, and while eternal life is a prevalent theme in the Synoptics, its attainment is a central focus of the Johannine appeal to believe (John 3:15–16, 39; 20:31). Similarly, eternal life is presented in 1QS 4.6–8 as a “gracious visitation” through which “all who walk in this spirit will know healing, bountiful peace, long life, and multiple progeny, followed by eternal blessings, and perpetual joy through life everlasting.” And, CD 3.20 describes eternal life as the result of remaining faithful to the religious (and priestly) house of Israel. Fourth, the “works of God” are described in CD 2.14–15 as what God commands, and this is indeed parallel to the request of the crowd in John 6:28, “What

must we do to perform the works of God?"⁶⁵ Fifth, references to "idols" in 1QS 2.11–12 and 4Q271 2 9 demonstrate interesting parallels with the last verse of the first Johannine Epistle (1 John 5:21): "Little children, keep yourselves from idols." While idolatry in 1 John was probably a direct reference to forbidding participation in cultic festivals in a Greco-Roman context, the reference in 1QS 2.11–12 guards against bringing idolatry into the community, and 4Q271 2 9 simply mentions the materials of which idols were made. In these metaphorical connections between the Qumranic and Johannine writings many parallels exist, both comparative and contrastive.

THE TEACHER OF RIGHTEOUSNESS VERSUS THE WICKED PRIEST AND OTHER VILLAINS

While impressive similarities exist between the Teacher of Righteousness and Jesus, parallels also extend to leaders within the Johannine situation. Likewise, the Johannine adversaries are presented in the Gospel and Epistles in ways parallel to the villainous Wicked Priest in the Qumranic literature. As a radical interpreter of the Law, the Righteous Teacher advocated a vision of following Moses and the Prophets; from a religious and political stance, he and his community must be considered the losers. He met opposition from more powerful priests in Jerusalem, and whoever "the Wicked Priest" might have been, this individual apparently asserted his influence against the Teacher. Likewise, the Johannine Jesus challenged the religious leaders in Jerusalem with a vision of adhering to the heart of the Law. The Fourth Gospel alone shows a sustained history of engagement between Jesus and Jerusalem leaders, involving at least four visits to Jerusalem, resulting in challenges to Jesus' teachings and authority. While particular priests (Caiaphas, Annas) are portrayed with high esteem in John (even making prophecies about Jesus' atoning death, perhaps unwittingly, at John 11:47–53), it is some of the Jewish leaders in Jerusalem (not all of them) that sought to have Jesus put to death. That being the case, the Johannine narrative might actually inform the socio-religious situation in Jerusalem leading to the Qumranic secession.⁶⁶

65. Although one can also render e)rgazw/meqa as "get" ("to receive a miraculous work") rather than "perform," the conventional parallel to Qumran still stands. See Anderson, *Christology of the Fourth Gospel*, 200–202.

66. See Håkan Bengtsson, "Three Sobriquets, Their Meaning and Function: The Wicked Priest, Synagogue of Satan, and the Woman Jezebel," in Charlesworth, *Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1:183–208; David Noel Freedman and Jeffrey C. Geoghegan, "Another Stab at the Wicked Priest," in Charlesworth, *Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2:17–24; Martin G. Abegg Jr., "Who Ascended to Heaven? 4Q491, 4Q427, and the Teacher of Righteousness," in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Craig A. Evans and Peter W. Flint (Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 1997), 61–73.

During the second period of the Johannine movement (70–85 C.E.), the challenges faced by the Beloved Disciple and other Johannine leaders in Asia Minor would have found parallels with the Qumranic leadership, especially as later generations of leaders sought to further the original vision and mission of the Teacher of Righteousness. Interesting parallels between the Johannine Epistles and the Qumranic writings include accusations of lying and deception. In the Johannine situation, such allegations are levied at false teachers who probably encouraged social and religious assimilation within their Greco-Roman civic setting, and yet Diotrephes as a local church leader is also accused of spreading untruths about Johannine believers (3 John 9–10). Parallel to the Qumranic leaders, the Johannine leaders elevate a primary value against a competing, false value, but we see it in two phases—a Palestinian phase and an Asia Minor phase. In Qumran the dichotomy was all Jewish: the Righteous Teacher versus the Wicked Priest. In the Johannine Gospel, Jesus the authentic prophet confronts the leading Judeans; in the Johannine Epistles, authentic Christ-followers confront the Antichrists (1 John 2:18–25; 4:1–3; 2 John 7). In the Qumranic and Johannine writings, community heroes are similarly exalted, while familiar adversaries are countered with parallel pejorative rhetoric.

ASSOCIATIONS WITH JESUS AS THE CHRIST

In addition to the discussion of messianism noted above, some terms that appear in the scrolls are interesting simply because of their similarity to the presentation of Jesus as the Christ in the Gospel of John. First, “Son of God” also appears in the Qumran writings (see esp. 4Q246 2 1, “He will be called the Son of God, they will call him the son of the Most High”), apparently in reference to a false pretender whose reign will fall like a meteor.⁶⁷ Note the requirement of Jesus’ death articulated by the Jerusalem leaders in John 19:7, where they accuse him of a capital offense in claiming to be the “Son of God.” Therefore, “Son of God” can no longer be regarded as a purely Hellenistic messianic construct; it is in play here in sectarian Judaism a full century before Jesus’ ministry. Second, clear criteria are presented for how to distinguish the authentic prophet from the false prophet. A collection of messianic proof texts anticipating the Prophet-like-Moses appears in 4Q175 1.1–4 (Deut 5:28–29) and 1.5–8 (Deut 18:18–19), and the test of a true prophet follows in 4Q375 (fulfilling Deut 18:18–22—the

67. John J. Collins also notes the apocalyptic features of this title, “The Son of God Text from Qumran,” in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge*, ed. Martinus C. de Boer (JSNTSup 8; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 65–82. See also Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J., “The Aramaic ‘Son of God’ Text from Qumran Cave 4,” in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects*, ed. Michael O. Wise et al. (New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 163–78.

words of the authentic prophet must be heeded; the false prophet “must be put to death”) and the Moses Apocryphon in 4Q377. Conversely, traits of false prophets in Israel are outlined in 4Q339. Similarly, debates over Jesus’ authenticity in John 5–10 orbit around whether he is indeed the prophet predicted by Moses in Deut 18. Third, Elijah/Elisha typologies are developed in several passages, notably in the Apocryphon of Elijah (4Q382). As Jesus is portrayed as performing Elijah-type miracles in John (raising Lazarus from the dead, feeding the multitude with barley loaves), the Baptizer’s denial of being either the Prophet or Elijah in John 1:19–27 serves the Evangelist’s presentation of these two typologies being fulfilled in the ministry of Jesus. Fourth, the mention of the “eyes of the blind” (1QS 4.11) and the raising of the dead (4Q521) clearly resonate with Jesus’ ministry in the Gospel of John (see John 9:39–41; 10:21; 11:1–52). Fifth, in a fascinating analysis of connections between the 153 days of Noah’s flood in 4Q252 1.8–10 and the 153 fish mentioned at John 21:11, George Brooke suggests new insights for understanding this detail’s meaning in the light of Jesus’ mission.⁶⁸ Both in their similarity and dissimilarity, echoes with the scrolls abound in the Johannine presentation of Jesus as the Christ.

THE “TWO WAYS” AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS

Parallel to “the two ways” (the way of life and the way of death) in the *Didache*, a clear exposition on the two ways appears in 4Q473 2, inspired by Deut 11:26–28. In addition to parallels with “the narrow gate” and way leading to life versus the road to destruction in Matt 7:13–14, there are significant parallels in John 6:27–71, where Jesus invites his audience to choose the food that leads to life (which he gives) over food that leads to death. While Fragment 2.2–7 promises blessing for following the way of life in contrast to the plight of those who follow the way of evil, John 6 calls for solidarity with Jesus and the way of his community instead of settling for lesser alternatives. In contrast to J. Louis Martyn’s two-level, history-and-theology interpretation of John 9, the four sets of discussants in John 6 (the crowd, the Jews, the disciples, Peter) echo at least four challenges within the history of the Johannine situation during its second and third phases (70–100 C.E.).⁶⁹ Rather than exposing a singular crisis in the Johannine dialectical situation, the “challenge of the two ways” in John 6 addresses four largely sequential-yet-somewhat-overlapping crises in the Johannine situation.⁷⁰

68. George J. Brooke, “4Q252 and the 153 Fish of John 21.11,” in his *Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament: Essays in Mutual Illumination* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 282–97.

69. See J. Louis Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (3d ed.; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003).

70. See Paul N. Anderson, “The *Sitz im Leben* of the Johannine Bread of Life Discourse and its Evolving Context,” in *Critical Readings of John 6*, ed. R. Alan Culpepper (BIS 22; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 1–59, for a description of these four alternative death-pro-

As John 6 was probably added to an earlier edition of the Gospel, the exhortation to chose the way of life—the life-producing food that Jesus offers versus its lesser alternatives—shows signs of being crafted for audience relevance as the Johannine narration developed. On this score, Qumranic and Johannine appeals to the way of life versus the way of death will be mutually informative.

QUESTION MARKS?—SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER INQUIRY

In the light of the above history of research on Qumran and the Fourth Gospel, a number of questions follow. One cannot help but notice how the discussion has moved from discovery and grand hopes of promise, to a disparagement of the relationship, to a set of more nuanced approaches regarding the Johannine-Qumranic relationship. While direct contact need not be inferred to imply influence, and while even differences may provide important insights into Johannine faith and practice, finding the right tools and methods for ascertaining the Johannine ethos will be central to the success of one's investigation. That being the case, the following questions invite consideration, providing suggestions for further inquiry.

First, *What light do John the Baptizer's likely connections with Qumran shed on the Johannine perspective regarding his mission and the ministry of Jesus?* The Johannine presentation of John's baptizing across the Jordan (John 1:28; 3:26; 10:40) bears a good deal of topographical realism. Over the last decade or so, archaeological research in the vicinity of Wadi al-Kharrar has shown itself to be the likely historical site of John's baptismal ministry.⁷¹ This area is also associated with the ministries of Moses and Elijah, so one can understand how John would have been interpreted as following in the trajectories of Moses ("the Prophet") and Elijah (Mark 6:15; 8:28; John 1:21). What is odd, however, is that in the Fourth Gospel John claims that he is neither the Prophet nor Elijah, in con-

ducing "ways"—a materialistic view of Jesus' works versus their signifying power, the "bread" that Moses gave versus that which the Father gives, the bread of the flesh of Jesus given for the life of the world on the cross, and Jesus' possession of the words of life versus emerging structural institutionalism.

71. The archaeological site at Wadi Kharrar is just east of the Jordan River (between Qumran and Jericho), showing a large natural pool in which Christian baptisms have been performed going back at least to the Byzantine area—even referred to by Origen as "Bethabara" after visiting the area on a personal investigation. This may be the site referred to as "Beth-bara" on the Jordan mentioned in Judg 7:25. See also Michele Piccirillo, "The Sanctuaries of the Baptism on the East Bank of the Jordan River," in *Jesus and Archaeology*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 433–43. Against a northern Jordan site, Batanaea, Matthew records the Jordan baptizing work of John as being in Judea—the south (Matt 3:1). Of course, John could have been baptizing in the north, as well; if he also baptized in Aenon near Salim (John 3:23) in Samaria, he could have baptized throughout Palestine, including the northern Jordan, which was near Bethsaida—the home of Philip, Peter, and Andrew (John 1:44).

trast with the presentations of the Baptizer in the Synoptics.⁷² It seems that the Fourth Evangelist seeks to portray Jesus, not John, as fulfilling Moses and Elijah typologies.

Second, *How does the multiplicity of messianic typologies in Qumran affect our understanding of Johannine Christology and its developments?* A striking fact about Qumran expectations of a priestly messiah (Aaron) and a royal messiah (Israel) is that it shows the diversity of messianic expectation in Israel leading up to the ministry of Jesus. While distinct from anticipated messianic typologies, the Teacher of Righteousness assumes a Prophet-like-Moses identity, therefore featuring anticipations of God's anointed agent as the Prophet, Priest, and King.⁷³ This makes it understandable how different messianic typologies are presented among the Gospel traditions; further, it helps to clarify why some of the Judean leaders refused to believe in Jesus. In John 7:42, this diversity of perspective is illustrated by the fact that the Judean religious leaders understand "the Prophet" to come from David's city, leading them to reject Galilean credentials out of hand. Conversely, the Galilean crowd in John 6:14–15 interprets Jesus as a prophet-king like Moses, although he rejects their attempts to rush him off for a hasty coronation.⁷⁴

Third, *How do the distinctive dualisms of Qumran and the Johannine writings illumine experiential and ideological features of these communities' situations and histories?* Discussions regarding Johannine and Qumranic dualism have too often centered around cosmology and theology, when the primary occasion for dualistic thought was experiential disappointment and loss, accompanied by rhetorical and moral interests. The operative question, therefore, is how leaders in both of these Jewish communities interpreted community experiences and hopes in the light of dualistic constructs. The Qumranic sketch of cosmological warfare in the War Scroll, wherein Children of Light are presented as being at war with Children of Darkness, maintains two primary contentions: first, that those who reject the message and stance of the Qumran covenanters are wrong (and thus in the dark rather than in the light); second, that God will be the final judge, bringing the faithful to victory over their adversaries, who appear to have gotten

72. It was from Mount Nebo that Moses glimpsed the Promised Land (Deut 34:1–5), and near this site that Elijah's mantle was transferred to Elisha (2 Kings 2:1–15) by striking the water with it, causing the parting of the Jordan. Another water reference is made to Elisha's legitimation as an authentic prophet, because he is remembered as pouring water over the hands of Elijah (2 Kings 3:11).

73. Richard A. Horsley, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historical Jesus," in Charlesworth, *Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 3:37–60.

74. For an extensive analysis of prophet-king messianic expectations in first-century Palestine, see Wayne Meeks, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (NovTSup 14; Leiden: Brill, 1967). See also the central role of Moses in Jewish messianic ideals, despite competing typologies, in Bowley, "Moses in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 159–81.

the upper hand, at least for now. The Johannine dualism moves out of a similar structure, although the elements are different. In John, it is not the Children of Light who are rejected, but it is *Jesus as the light of the world* who is rejected by religious leaders, whose sin is that they claim to see (9:41). Further, the Evangelist explains this reality more as a reflection of their not having been rooted in God to begin with, or at least loving darkness rather than light (3:17–21). In that sense, both employ dualism as a means of explaining disappointment and the rejection of their communities' convictions. But the Qumranic interpretation sketches the outcome in terms of cosmological warfare, while the Johannine interpretation explains the reception on the basis of a dualism of decision. In presenting the truth-rejecting world as loving darkness rather than light, and the praise of men over the glory of God, the Johannine ethical dualism is structured more closely to Plato's Allegory of the Cave than Qumran's cosmic warfare.

Fourth, *What do the dialogical relationships between Qumran leaders and Jerusalem suggest about the Galilean Jesus and his Judean rejections in John?* Distinctive to the Johannine presentation of Jesus is his adversarial relationship with Jerusalem leaders—the **Ἰουδαῖοι**—especially the priests and defenders of the Law and temple. Territoriality only exists between competing members of like species, and just as the Qumran leadership seems to have been in conflict with the priests of Jerusalem as a priestly tradition, the conflicts reported between the northern prophet and the Jerusalem leaders in the Fourth Gospel suggest some interesting parallels as well. Just as it would be wrong to accuse the Qumran covenanters of being anti-Semitic because they were at odds with Jerusalem priests, so it is wrong to see the Fourth Evangelist as anti-Semitic because the Jerusalem leaders are portrayed as rejecting the prophet from Galilee. If anything, the Johannine Jesus is presented as advocating a radical view of Judaism that fulfills the vision of Moses and the Prophets in a deeply spiritual way. Therefore, while some of the **Ἰουδαῖοι** in John believe, the unbelieving **Ἰουδαῖοι** should be seen as Judean leaders who reject the revealer and his revelation in the name of religious conventions.⁷⁵ Put otherwise, it is unlikely that the Qumran covenanters were the only devout and conservative Jewish group to have been alienated by Jerusalem's priestly establishment; Jesus and his followers likely experienced similar treatment and faced tensions with Jerusalemocentric leaders. Therefore, sociological analyses of the Jerusalem-Qumran tensions and the Jerusalem-Jesus movement tensions would both benefit from comparative analysis. They show similar yet different experiences of Jewish religious movements that came to be at odds with religious leaders in Jerusalem, leading to similar yet different developments, one

75. James Charlesworth puts this point well in "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Gospel according to John," 65–97. The tensions with **οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι** in the Fourth Gospel reflect not anti-Semitism, but rather north-south tensions between the Galilean prophet and Judean religious leaders.

becoming a sectarian community in Qumran, and the other becoming a form of Jewish outreach to the nations in the Pauline and Johannine missions.

Fifth, *Are there parallels between the functions of the Teacher of Righteousness and the Beloved Disciple and what happened with leadership transitions following them?* While parallels between the Teacher of Righteousness and Jesus are telling, the relation between the Teacher of Righteousness and the Beloved Disciple may be even more significant within Johannine studies. Of particular interest is the way these leaders of their respective communities exercised their roles and how they conveyed their understandings of religious truth. Where the Teacher of Righteousness was working with his understanding of Torah and other Scriptures, the Beloved Disciple also sought to develop an understanding of how Jesus' ministry should be remembered, including how it fulfilled Scripture and continued to be relevant for later generations. That being the case, there may be value in analyzing approaches to Scripture in both the Qumran and Johannine writings and in noting how authoritative leadership is transferred from one generation to later ones within a religious community setting.

Sixth, *How do new understandings of the social situations of the Qumran community and Johannine Christianity impact our understandings of the contents of their respective writings?* If Kåre Fuglseth is correct to interpret John's Gospel as more cultic than sectarian, closer to the situation of Philo than Qumran, this could be highly significant. Both in its Palestinian experience (in my view, 30–70 C.E.) and in its Asia Minor settings (in my view, 70–100 C.E.),⁷⁶ a too-narrow view of the Johannine sociological situation as "sectarian" is flawed if conceived as a Qumranic sort of existence. In Palestine, Johannine Christianity would have reflected the north-south dialectic between Galilee and Judea, and it would have faced similar tensions with Jerusalem authorities as did the Qumranic leadership. However, rather than being a conservative appeal for stricter adherence to the Law and its implications, the Johannine appeal would have been more liberal—spiritualizing cultic and religious themes and challenging their literalistic interpretations. Taking the revelatory work of the Holy Spirit beyond the mere illumination of the biblical text, the Johannine identification of Jesus as fulfilling the agency role of the Prophet-like-Moses (Deut 18:15–22) would have challenged alternate approaches to Moses and the Prophets. In continuity with the original challenge posed by Jesus of Nazareth, this appeal to continuing revelation would have met resistance in Judea and beyond. Therefore, when the Johannine leadership translocated to the setting of one of the mission churches, plausibly around 70 C.E. as a result of the Roman destruction of Jerusalem, dialogues with

76. See Paul N. Anderson, *The Fourth Gospel and the Quest for Jesus: Modern Foundations Reconsidered* (LNTS 321; London: T&T Clark, 2006), 193–99, for a two-edition theory of Johannine composition and an outline of the history of the Johannine situation involving seven dialogical engagements over seven decades.

local Jewish communities expanded to engage local Gentile audiences with the news that Jesus was indeed the Messiah/Christ. Rather than fostering a sectarian existence within this Asia Minor setting (no other setting is more plausible than Ephesus and its environs), Johannine believers sought to draw Jewish and Gentile audiences alike into a believing relationship to Jesus as the Messiah/Christ. As the second and third phases of Johannine Christianity (70–85 and 85–100 C.E., respectively) saw the movement from a primary community to a multiplicity of communities as the Jesus movement continued to expand, this would have included more and more Gentile believers within the Johannine movement. Therefore, in their inclusion of Gentile believers into their worship life, it might be argued that, rather than being *between* the social settings of Qumran and Philo (with Fuglseth), the Johannine churches might be placed *on the other side of Philo* with regard to their Gentile outreach. Johannine audiences were exhorted to resist the world (John 17; 1 John 2) precisely because they were living in it.

Seventh, *What are the literary-rhetorical parallels between the Qumranic and Johannine writings?* In addition to sociological interests, a variety of new literary analyses of the Johannine and Qumranic writings are worth considering. Despite considerable differences between these two sets of writings, comparative analyses could still be highly suggestive. For instance, ways that both sets of writings approached Hebrew Scripture articulated and motivated adherence to community values and standards, produced worship material, and recorded their history and aspirations will be relevant to such studies. As new literary approaches are applied to Qumranic writings, this will undoubtedly cast valuable light on the Johannine writings as well. In addition, the workings of the Johannine composition and editing processes will receive assistance from noting how the Qumran authors and editors worked.⁷⁷ At least one example is worth mentioning here. If indeed there appears to have been more than one beginning in the Temple Scroll, it is not unlikely that the Johannine Gospel was also composed with more than one beginning and more than one ending.⁷⁸

These questions regarding future directions of Qumranic-Johannine research concern themselves more with the analysis of sociological parallels and their implications. In contrast to earlier interests seeking to establish direct or indirect influences, more recent studies have approached their analyses by noting the similarities and differences, making good use of contrastive features as well as comparative ones. In addition, as archaeological discoveries continue to be made regarding the living conditions, sociology, economics, and character of the Qum-

77. See Pilgaard, "The Qumran Scrolls," 126–42; Popkes, "About the Differing Approach," 281–317.

78. See George J. Brooke's analysis in "The Temple Scroll in the New Testament," in his *Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament: Essays in Mutual Illumination* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 97–114.

ranic situation, insights continue to emerge regarding what is known about this Jewish movement.⁷⁹ That being the case, any solid knowledge about Qumran will be applicable to biblical studies in general and Johannine studies in particular.

CONCLUSION

As the above survey suggests, similarities between the Qumran and Johannine communities are no longer seen as requiring firsthand contact between these two sectors of ancient Judaism, although some early contact likely existed. Further, as much can be learned from the differences as the similarities, and more nuanced analyses profit from contrasts as well as comparisons. As socio-religious analyses of Qumran and Second Temple Judaism cast valuable light on the situation out of which the Jesus and Johannine movements emerged, the Qumran writings will continue to be a valuable source of information for conducting Johannine studies as well.

As new discoveries lend themselves to additional insights, interpretation will continue to grow in both Qumranic and Johannine fields of investigation. Ironically, one of the unintended consequences of Qumranic-Johannine analyses is that, as a result of learning more about contemporary Judaism, the Johannine writings are liberated from the need to be understood in the light of contemporary Hellenistic literature alone.⁸⁰ They have now come to be interpreted authentically as Jewish writings reflecting a movement in the process of individuating from its parent religious background, within a Hellenistic setting, and thus undergoing the throes of reaching in several directions at once. If indeed the Qumranic Yahad can claim, “When, united by all these precepts, such men as these come to be a community in Israel, they shall establish eternal truth guided by the instruction of His holy spirit” (1QS 9.3–4), the Johannine community was by no means alone in its aspirations and ethos.

79. See especially here the important work of Eileen Schuller, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: What Have We Learned?* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006).

80. While he does not do much with the Qumran writings in this setting, the famous essay by James D. G. Dunn, “Let John Be John: A Gospel for Its Time” (in *The Gospel and the Gospels*, ed. Peter Stuhlmacher [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991], 293–322), argues that John’s autonomy receives a boost from being considered in the light of contemporary Judaism, including the Dead Sea Scrolls.