

# Monotheism, Angelology, and Dualism in Ancient Jewish Apocalyptic Writings

STEFAN BEYERLE

## 1. Ancient Texts and Modern Terminology

In keeping with the title of this essay, I intend to examine religious texts from ancient times by utilizing terminology that stems from the early Modern Age, more precisely the dawn of the Enlightenment: 'monotheism' and 'dualism'. While the former was coined by the Platonist Henry More (1614–1687), an English philosopher of the Cambridge Platonist school, in his essay 'An Explanation of the Grand Mystery of Godliness' from 1660, the latter comes from the book *Historia religionis veterum Persarum* by the English orientalist Thomas Hyde (1636–1703) in 1700.<sup>1</sup> While both scholars certainly examined Jewish and Christian literature of the Bible and beyond, the central aim of their examinations was to describe 'monotheism' and 'dualism' in the light of philosophical or religious-historical hermeneutics.<sup>2</sup> As a consequence, the use of both terms in the context of Jewish and Christian sources from the ancient world requires careful consideration. Furthermore, the usefulness of the modern terminology is limited by its meaningfulness and applicability to the discussion of the ancient sources. For example, it does not matter if 'henotheism' originally stems from the scholar of Sanskrit texts and historian of religions Friedrich Max Müller (1823–1900) or if 'summodeism' was created by the historian and political philosopher Eric Voegelin (1901–1985) so long as the idea in the background of these terms describes phenomena that coincide with constellations from ancient sources.<sup>3</sup>

Recently Ernst Axel Knauf described 'monotheism' from the perspective of the philosophy of religions. He finds in the 'one God' the common

---

<sup>1</sup> See MOBERLY, 'Monotheism', 218–222; BALZER, Dualism, 553.

<sup>2</sup> It is apparent that More used 'monotheism' in a philosophical sense in order to highlight its counterpart 'materialism'. Furthermore, More equated 'materialism' with 'polytheism' and 'atheism'. Cf. on More's intellectual ideas MACDONALD, Deuteronomy, 5–16.

<sup>3</sup> Cf., e.g., the use of 'henotheism' and 'summodeism' within the context of comparable phenomena of the veneration of Marduk and JHWH (SMITH, God, 163–169).

element that unites the diversity of deities into one. In general, Knauf comes close to what Voegelin called 'summodeism'. In Mark S. Smith's words, "'summodeism" may be used to convey the notion of one deity as the sum and summit of the reality of other deities'.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, Knauf distinguishes between 'exclusive' and 'inclusive monotheism', a differentiation that was already foreshadowed in Friedrich Delitzsch's second lecture on 'Babel and Bible' in 1903.<sup>5</sup> 'Inclusive monotheism' emphasizes that all deities or divine beings are part of the one God.<sup>6</sup> In the words of Christoph Levin:

Allerdings setzte die faktische Monolatrie voraus, dass die Rollen anderer Götter wenigstens anteilig auf Jahwe übergangen. Je mehr Jahwe die Verehrung auf sich zog, desto mehr mussten die Funktionen der anderen in das Gottesbild integriert werden. Das Ergebnis ist eine 'Unschärfe des Gotteskonzepts', die für das Alte Testament kennzeichnend geworden ist.<sup>7</sup>

In my view, the Hebrew Bible testifies, on the whole, to an 'inclusive monotheism'. It is still witnessed, with a few exceptions, in later, post-exilic literature like the Deuteronomistic frame of the book of Deuteronomy (cf. Deut 6.4–5) or the late formula in the first commandment of the Decalogue. In the religions of ancient Israel and in Judaism the idea of an 'exclusive monotheism', specified through ignoring and renouncing other gods, is only attested sporadically, as in other religions of the Ancient Near East (cf., e.g., Second Isaiah, the Egyptian era of Akhenaten).<sup>8</sup>

Compared with the theological notion 'monotheism', the idea of 'dualism' is much more ambiguous. Several dualistic concepts are, however, included in the specific apocalyptic worldview, as it is postulated in modern scholarship. Therefore, 'dualism' obviously appears variously shaped in apocalyptic writings and in 'apocalyptic communities' like that from Qumran. With regard to apocalypticism, arguments focus especially on two highly disputed questions concerning 'dualisms': First, how can the several forms of 'dualism' be classified? Second, is there a certain context in the history of religions, in which ancient Jewish and early Christian 'du-

<sup>4</sup> SMITH, *God*, 169.

<sup>5</sup> See DELITZSCH, *Vortrag*, 28–40; cf. also DELITZSCH, *Babel*, 58–60, 70–71 n. 13; SMITH, *God*, 165 and n. 119.

<sup>6</sup> See KNAUF, *Bibel*, 39–40, who states: 'Unter "Monotheismus" verstehe ich die (religions-)philosophische Annahme, dass die Menge aller Götter nur ein einziges Element enthalte' (39). Cf. LORETZ, *Einzigkeit*, 82–83. For the Second Temple period, see HURTADO, *Monotheism*, 961–964.

<sup>7</sup> LEVIN, *Monotheismus*, 157.

<sup>8</sup> See also DIETRICH, *Werden*, 23–24. Within ancient Israelite literature especially the formulas that emphasize the exclusiveness and incomparability of JHWH are of interest when 'exclusive monotheism' is concerned: e.g., Isa 40.18, 25; 43.11; 44.6; 45.5–6, 18, 21; 46.5; Ps 18.32; cf. also Jer 10.6.

alisms' originated? A favorite answer to the second question refers to Persian religion.<sup>9</sup> The primary, mainly later, sources of Zoroastrianism attest a developed 'cosmic-metaphysical dualism' that focuses on the antagonism of Ohrmazd (Avestian Ahura Mazda) and Ahremann (Avestian Angra Mainyu) or the high God of goodness and the Evil Spirit.<sup>10</sup> In his sound taxonomy of different 'dualisms', Jörg Frey rightly pointed to the fact that the Persian idea of a 'cosmic-metaphysical dualism', *signifying opposing powers of equal rank*, found no counterpart in ancient Jewish and early Christian thought.<sup>11</sup> However, taken together with a classification of world history into certain ages and the hope for an imminent end to the world, Persian eschatology could be characterized as 'apocalyptic' and 'dualistic'.<sup>12</sup> And what is more, some scholars characterize the Zoroastrian religion in the Achaemenid Empire, i.e. as early as the fifth and fourth century BCE in terms of an 'inclusive monotheism'. Recently, Thomas C. Römer has discussed phenomena of subliminal dualism in texts of the Hebrew Bible which date from Persian times.<sup>13</sup> He argues for a late-exilic and post-exilic emphasis on monotheism that is separated from dualistic thinking of good and evil in order to avoid the idea of God being responsible for evil deeds. The only exception, which even Römer cannot ignore, comes in Isa 45.5b–7, where one reads:

אֲזוּרְךָ וְלֹא יִדְעֵנִי	5b	I will gird you, though you did not know me,
לְמַעַן יִדְעוּ	6a	in order that they might know
מִמְרוֹחַ שֶׁשֶׁם וּמִמְעֵרָבָה		from the rising of the sun until its setting,
כִּי־אֵפֶס בְּלַעֲדִי		that there is no one else beside me,
אֲנִי יְהוָה וְאֵין עוֹד	6b	I am the Lord, and there is no other:
יִצְרָר אֹר וּבִרְא חֹשֶׁךְ	7a	the one who formed light and created darkness,

<sup>9</sup> See, e.g., PHILONENKO, *Doctrine*, 164–178.

<sup>10</sup> For different structures of dualistic thinking in older and more recent Avestian sources cf. STAUSBERG, *Religion*, 91–95, 129–153; IDEM, *Monotheismus*, 99–100, 102–105. DE JONG, *Connections*, 492–493, pointed to the fact that the dualism of Ahura Mazda and Angra Mainyu in the later sources also included deterministic thinking.

<sup>11</sup> See FREY, *Patterns*, 282–283. Most interpreters refer to BIANCHI, *Category*, 15–17; IDEM, *Dualism*, 506–512. Bianchi describes 'dualism' by referring to the doctrine of two opposed principles. In his typology he sub-divides 'radical' or 'softened', 'dialectical' or 'eschatological' and 'pro-cosmic' or 'anti-cosmic' dualisms. Cf. also FREY, *Patterns*, 280–285; DUHAIME, *Reworking*, 33–35; IDEM, *Dualism*, 215–216. With a view to ancient Jewish sources, most scholars prefer a 'softened', 'eschatological' and 'pro-cosmic' type of 'dualism'. Recently, ALEXANDER, *Dualism*, 170, calls the dualism between heaven and earth a 'mild dualism'.

<sup>12</sup> See HULTGÅRD, *Apocalypticism*, 40–64, 79–81.

<sup>13</sup> See RÖMER, *Tendances*, 45–58.

עשה שלום ובורא רע		the one who made welfare [1QIsa <sup>a</sup> : good] and created evil.
אני יהוה עשה כל־אלה	7b	I am the Lord who made all these things.

God's formation of light and darkness, his creation of welfare and evil, is accompanied by the repeated emphasis on his uniqueness, expressed in sentences of incomparability through the expression *אני יהוה*, a nominal sentence that includes a variety of possible understandings. In short, this text in Deutero-Isaiah<sup>14</sup> presents one of the most specific and developed notions of 'exclusive monotheism'. Seemingly, this passage rejects 'Zoroaster's fundamental dualistic teaching, that the power of God is limited in the present time by that of a mighty and evil Adversary, the source of all the wickedness and suffering in the world',<sup>15</sup> as Mary Boyce put it. Similarly, Thomas C. Römer speaks 'd'une critique du dualisme mazdéen',<sup>16</sup> in Isa 45.7. But, there is only late Persian evidence from the Avesta for the idea of an adversary of divine rank. Furthermore, the prominent 'parallel' in the Avesta (cf. Yasna 44.5; cf. Yasna 43.5)<sup>17</sup> provides no clear evidence for a dualistic understanding of the creation of good and evil.<sup>18</sup> Finally, none of the Achaemenian inscriptions refer to this ideology. And what is more, Isaiah 45 is much more influenced by Marduk veneration of the late Babylonian and early Persian period.<sup>19</sup>

Be that as it may and leaving aside the question of stable continuity from old Avestan towards late Pahlavi traditions, such as the Denkard,<sup>20</sup> every comparison of Persian and ancient Jewish dualisms and apocalyptic motifs lacks clear criteria for the historical background of such a comparison. This is the case because most of the Persian sources stem from the late Sassanian and early Islamic periods (sixth through ninth centuries CE). Consequently, many interpreters of Jewish apocalypticism and the Dead

<sup>14</sup> Isa 45.5b–7 is part of the composition 44.24–45.7. The text is part of a complex literary construct that only partially originates in the times of the anonymous prophet. For the literary history and structure cf. ACHENBACH, *Kyros-Orakel*, 155–167.

<sup>15</sup> BOYCE, *History*, 194.

<sup>16</sup> RÖMER, *Tendances*, 57.

<sup>17</sup> See the discussion in ACHENBACH, *Kyros-Orakel*, 174–183, and the text of Yasna 44.4–5 with German translation in *IBID*, 176.

<sup>18</sup> See ACHENBACH, *Kyros-Orakel*, 179–180, who refers to insights of Carsten Colpe.

<sup>19</sup> See ACHENBACH, *Kyros-Orakel*, 171–173, who opines that Isa 45.1–4 attests motifs that should be compared with the Cyrus Cylinder, while Isa 45.5–7 (with 44.24–27) alludes instead to Persian (Zoroastrian) texts. On the Babylonian background, see also LEUENBERGER, *Jhwh*, esp. 32–46, 74–75.

<sup>20</sup> See HULTGÅRD, *Apocalypticism*, 64–70; WILLIAMS, *Significance*, 53–66.

Sea Scrolls are currently rather skeptical when it comes to comparisons of Persian and Hebrew material.<sup>21</sup>

To go back to Isaiah 45, the wording of v. 7 is to some extent exceptional: first, the combination of *יצר*, *ברא* and *עשה* with God as the only possible subject, alludes to creation and signifies a ‘cosmic-metaphysical’ aspect. Second, this ‘cosmic-metaphysical’ aspect was modified by means of two strategies: in the MT, the making of ‘welfare’ hints to a historical dimension. Consequently, the pairing of ‘light’ and ‘darkness’ has creation in mind, while ‘welfare’ and ‘evil’ reflects upon the divine pact and practice *in time*.<sup>22</sup> On the other hand, the first copy of the book of Isaiah from Qumran reads *טוב* instead of *שלום* (1QIsa<sup>a</sup> XXXVIII.13),<sup>23</sup> so that the dualistic strategy changes from a ‘cosmic-metaphysical’ towards an ‘ethical’ dimension.<sup>24</sup> In conclusion, Isaiah 45 mingles different patterns of dualistic thinking,<sup>25</sup> including the emphasis on an ‘exclusive monotheism’ that is exceptional within the Hebrew Bible.

## 2. Does Angelology and Dualism Presuppose an ‘Exclusive Monotheism’ (Klaus Koch)?

As Klaus Koch rightly states, there is a strong connection between ‘dualism’ and ‘angelology’: for angelological concepts in the Persian and Hellenistic times, one should differentiate between angels of ‘welfare’ and those of ‘harm’. Therefore, angelology and dualistic thinking are closely

<sup>21</sup> See DIMANT, *Dualism*, 55–73, and the list of scholars in DUHAIME, *Dualism*, 219. See also the careful treatment in COLLINS, *Apocalypticism*, 41–51, 99–106.

<sup>22</sup> See ACHENBACH, *Kyros-Orakel*, 193–194.

<sup>23</sup> See ULRICH AND FLINT, *DJD* 32.1, 76–77: pl. 38; and *DJD* 32.2, 166. In the second copy of the book of Isaiah from Qumran, the relevant passage in Isa 45.7 is missing (cf. 1QIsa<sup>b</sup> XIX.19), but a reading of *שלום* is more likely (cf. ULRICH AND FLINT, *DJD* 32.2, 223).

<sup>24</sup> See LEUENBERGER, *Jhwh*, 68 n. 176, who also refers to Lam 3.38; Am 3.6; Job 2.10 and Sir 11.14. The Greek text from Sir 11.14 is short and obviously augmented in the Hebrew version from the Cairo Genizah with the aim to draw out ‘the implications of divine responsibility...in the secondary recensions of Ben Sira’, as COLLINS, *Wisdom*, 84, has emphasized. While the Greek of Sir 11.14 reads: *ἀγαθὰ καὶ κακά ζωῆ καὶ θάνατος πτωχεία καὶ πλοῦτος παρὰ κυρίου ἐστίν* (‘Good and evil, life and death, poverty and riches are from the Lord’), the Hebrew MS A added: *חכמה ושכל והבין דבר מיי הוא: חטא ודרכים ישרים מיי הוא* (‘[W]isdom and prudence and the understanding of a matter, from the Lord are they. Error and the ways that are right, from the Lord are they’); for the Hebrew text, cf. BEENTJES, *Book*, 37. For ‘dualisms’ in Ben Sira, cf. STUCKENBRUCK, *Interiorization*, 148–152.

<sup>25</sup> For further patterns of dualistic thinking, as ‘cosmic’, ‘eschatological’, ‘ethical’, ‘psychological’, ‘spatial’ or ‘theological’, cf. GAMMIE, *Dualism*, 356–359.

related, especially in the apocalyptic writings which Klaus Koch discusses (Daniel; *Astronomical Book* [1 Enoch 72–82]; *Book of Watchers* [1 Enoch 1–36]; *Jubilees*).<sup>26</sup> Furthermore, Koch continues, an elaborated monotheism in Persian and Hellenistic times is a presupposition for an elaborated doctrine of angels and dualistic powers. And, vice versa, within a monotheistic system, a system of agents and mediators is necessary to *establish* the idea of the one and only, transcendent God. As Koch summarizes:

Gerade die Vielfalt der mythologischen Theorien läßt deutlich werden, daß es in einem Zeitalter mit fortschreitendem Monotheismus für fromme Israeliten unausweichlich erschien, bestimmte negative Daseinserfahrung von der Anerkennung des einen Gottes ein Stück weit zu distanzieren. Deshalb werden Aspekte, die Israel früher unbedenklich auf Jahwä selbst zurückführte, jetzt auf ein (oder mehrere) Zwischenwesen zurückgeführt, wobei das Verhältnis zu 'ādonāj in einer gewissen Schwebelage bleibt.<sup>27</sup>

It is obvious that Koch's statement cannot explain a text like Isa 45.7. As already seen, this verse explicitly rules out what Koch calls the 'distancing of evil deeds and negative experiences from the one and only God.' Rather, it emphasizes that the exclusiveness of the one God goes so far as to enable him to 'create darkness and evil' – both acts of creation are covered by the participle of ברא. As Koch's statement has found broad acceptance<sup>28</sup> and is also established by several proof texts, the question arises as to whether a text like Isaiah 45, or better say, the idea of the creation or origin of 'good and evil', 'saints and sinners' by the one God, as is also attested in Deut 30.15, Lam 3.38 or in Sir 11.14, fits with the thesis of a presupposed 'exclusive monotheism'.

At first sight, disqualifying Isaiah 45 and its parallels, as an anomalous tradition without reception, fails with a cursory look at some texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>29</sup> Within the 'Discourse' or 'Treatise on the Two Spirits' (1QS III.13–IV.26) it is clearly God who 'created the spirits of light and of darkness' (III.25: והוא ברא רוחות אור ורושע).<sup>30</sup> Furthermore, the *Hodayot* observe that 'God Most High' created the wicked and the just (1QH XII.38: וכי אתה בראתה צדיק ורשע), or that God 'created the wicked' for the purpose of his 'wrath' (1QH VII.20: ורשעים בראתה ל[י] צר חרוונה).<sup>31</sup> The most striking parallel to Isa 45.7 is, however, 4QWorks of God, a poem of *Hodayot*-like terminology that praises God's greatness in a didactic, wis-

<sup>26</sup> See KOCH, Monotheismus, 219–234.

<sup>27</sup> KOCH, Monotheismus, 232–233 (italics original).

<sup>28</sup> See KNAUF, Bibel, 46; STOLZ, Einführung, 195; KRÜGER, Einheit, 16.

<sup>29</sup> See GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, ברא, 503.

<sup>30</sup> In transcriptions of the Dead Sea scrolls the orthography of the original manuscripts is reflected, e.g. ignoring final letters.

<sup>31</sup> For the reconstruction, text and translation of 1QH VII and XII cf. STEGEMANN, 1QHodayot<sup>a</sup>, 97–107, 157–166 and pl. V, X.

dom-like tone (4Q392 1.4): ‘He [the God in the heavens] is the one who created darkness[ and l]ight for himself.’<sup>32</sup> The preserved text that follows in 4Q392 frag. 1 obviously establishes a sharp contrast between the created world and the heavenly realm: ‘with him [the God in the heavens] is unsearchable light and no one is able to know’ (4Q392 1.7). Giere has recently connected the references to creation in 4Q392 with Isa 45.7.<sup>33</sup> But the question remains whether the merism of ‘light and darkness’ in 4Q392 goes beyond the connotation of a ‘simple’ creation formula. Against this, Isa 45.7 includes historical aspects, e.g., the keyword of the second merism, ‘darkness’, points to the divine speech to Cyrus in v. 3: ‘and I will give you treasures of darkness’ – a metaphor for the divine acts against the Babylonians.<sup>34</sup> Whether the reader of 4Q392 could have found some allusions to historical aspects of divine impact in the Qumran text is nearly impossible to decide due to the fragmentary state of the manuscript. Beyond this, there is the question of how far, at the beginning of the fragment (1.3), the reading ‘their נפש adheres to his covenant’ bespeaks the ‘community of the covenant’ (cf. CD II.2; III.10; IV.9; VI.19; VIII.1; XIII.14; XX.25; 1QS I.16; III.11–12; V.3). And what is also important: while in Isa 45.7 and 4Q392 (1.4) God *creates* darkness and light, traditions like Genesis 1 only state that there *was* darkness which God had separated from light (cf. Gen 1.2–5).<sup>35</sup> In opposition to this, 4Q392 (1.5–6) emphasizes:

ואין עמו להבדיל בין האור	5	for him, <sup>36</sup> there is no need to separate light
לחשך כי לבנין אדם	6	and darkness, because (only) for sons of [me]n
הבדילים לא[ור] יומם ובשמש		he separated them for lig[ht] during daytime and with the sun, <sup>37</sup>

<sup>32</sup> For the text of 4Q392 1.4: הוא ברא חשך [וא]ור לו; and of 4Q392 1.7: ועמו אור לאין חקר; see FALK, *4QWorks of God*, 27–32 and pl. II.

<sup>33</sup> See GIERE, *Glimpse*, 156–160.

<sup>34</sup> See also BAUMGART, JHWH, 222–234, who finds in Isa 45.7 a theological interpretation and augmentation of the historical concept as it is attested in the Oracle of Cyrus with the aim to provide the reader with a rather universalistic outline. For the semantics and meaning of אור and חשך in Isa 45.3 cf. BERGES, *Jesaja* 40–48, 398.

<sup>35</sup> See BERGES, *Jesaja* 40–48, 405–406, who compares Isa 45.7 with Gen 1, but also addresses the differences.

<sup>36</sup> FALK, *4QWorks of God*, 31, assumes the meaning ‘beside, except’ for עם (2 Chron 14.10; 1QH XX.14, 22), but cf. 4QpapJubilees<sup>h</sup> [4Q223–224] 2 I.49; 2 IV.6.

<sup>37</sup> As FALK, *4QWorks of God*, 31, rightly states, the passage is incomprehensible. The translation above cannot be more than a tentative approach. FALK, *4QWorks of God*, 29, 31, discusses a conjecture by John Strugnell who interprets ובשמש as a misreading of שמש and reads לא[ור] as a *Hiph’il* infinitive of אור that lost its ה (on the dropping of ה in texts from the Dead Sea cf. QIMRON, *Hebrew*, 48: §310.145): ‘so that the sun should give [light] by day and by night the moon and the stars’. Nevertheless, Falk suggests a different reading that reconstructs לא[ור] and divides the cola differently: ‘but he

לילה ירח וכוכבים

and (by) night, the moon and the stars.

To sum up, 4Q392 shows affinities with Isa 45.7, but also reveals some differences if compared to creation texts and traditions.<sup>38</sup> Further evidence confirms the combination of dualistic thinking with overtones of an 'exclusive monotheism'. And in ancient Judaism this conjunction must undoubtedly have evoked the question of theodicy. It comes as no surprise that mainly Jewish sources from Hellenistic-Roman times provide helpful data. Most of them stem from a so-called wisdom context.

### 3. Monotheism and Dualism in the 'Treatise on the Two Spirits' and in 1Q/4QInstruction

The most prominent example of dualistic hermeneutics in Qumran texts, besides 1QM, is found in the 'Treatise on the Two Spirits' (1QS III.13–IV.26), a sapiential composition that became part of the 'Rule of the Community'. Matthew Goff recently emphasized that the 'Treatise on the Two Spirits', prominent for its dualistic motifs, includes only meager indications of sapiential influence, while 1Q/4QInstruction, prominent for its sapiential imprinting, reveals only traces of dualistic thinking.<sup>39</sup> On the other hand, both compositions include apocalyptic eschatology. While the 'Rule of the Community' declares that in the two spirits are the natures of all sons of man and that God has set them apart until the end-times (קץ אחרון; cf. 1QS IV.15–17), including a new creation (1QS IV.25: ועשות חדשה),<sup>40</sup> the unresolved riddle of the compositional shape of 1Q/4QInstruction provides the reader first and foremost with apocalyptic motifs like the so-called 'mystery that is to be' and an eschatological visitation.<sup>41</sup> Within recent scholarly discussions, these texts still prove that a one-sided derivation of apocalypticism from prophecy *or* wisdom literature is misleading.

---

separated them for the sons of [ma]n – the sun for li[ght] by day and by night the moon and stars.'

<sup>38</sup> For the aspect of creation in 4Q392, cf. NITZAN, *Idea*, 254–256.

<sup>39</sup> See GOFF, *Dualism*, 33–38.

<sup>40</sup> See COLLINS, *Apocalypticism*, 38–41; METSO, *Rule of the Community* (1QS + fragments), 1170. For an insightful comparison of the 'Treatise on the Two Spirits' with 1Q/4QInstruction cf. HULTGREN, *Covenant*, 341–349.

<sup>41</sup> See COLLINS, *Eschatology*, 50–63.



### 3.1. The 'Treatise on the Two Spirits'

As generally observed, the 'Treatise' constructs its dualism, or better dualisms, on at least two levels.<sup>42</sup> After the creation of the spirits of truth and, at the level of humanity, the creation of the deceit of mankind, the 'Treatise' extends its dualistic construction towards the heavenly world. As the text says (1QS III.17–19):<sup>43</sup>

והוא ברא אנוש לממשלת	17	And it was he who created humanity for the dominion of
תבל וישם לו שתי רוחות	18	earth, and he set within him two spirits
להתהלך בהם עד מועד פקודתו		so that he would walk with them until the appointed time of his visitation.
הנה רוחות		Behold, (these are the) spirits of
האמת והעול	19	truth and of deceit.

In this passage opposed spirits determine the way of life in the immanent, mundane world, as indicated by the *Hitpa'el* of הִלֵךְ (cf. 1QS IV.15, 23–24; V.10–11; IX.12). On the other hand, the following passage in 1QS III.20–21 relates the immanent way of life in its dualistic shape to the heavenly powers.<sup>44</sup>

ביד שר אורים ממשלת כול	20	In the hand of/Under the power of the Prince of Lights is the dominion of all
בני צדק בדרכי אור יתהלכו		the Sons of Righteousness, in the ways of light they walk.
וביד מלאך חושך כול	20/21	In the hand of/Under the power of the Herald of Darkness is all
ממשלת בני עול		dominion of the Sons of Deceit,
ובדרכי חושך יתהלכו		and in the ways of darkness they walk.

Already this short passage, without regard to its context, indicates the differentiation between the 'Prince of Lights' and the 'Herald of Darkness' on the one side, and the 'Sons of Righteousness' and the 'Sons of Deceit' on the other. Thus, the mundane world is populated by the 'Sons of Righteousness' (בני צדק) and the 'Sons of Deceit' (בני עול), both of which appear, as a combination, only in the small fragment of 4Q468b I.5. But the בני צדק are also attested within contexts of a dualistic character (cf. 1QM I.8; cf. also XIII.10), and the בני עול may refer to the בני עולה which are mentioned

<sup>42</sup> If one attends to the history of scholarship on 1QS III.13–IV.26, more than *two* levels or types of dualism can be identified: the two most prominent ones are the 'psychological dualism' of the inner-self and the 'cosmological dualism' that determines the way of the world. Cf. the important article of LEVISON, *Spirits*, 169–194.

<sup>43</sup> For the text, cf. QIMRON AND CHARLESWORTH, *Rule*, 14. On the different levels, see GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, *Influences*, esp. 234–235.

<sup>44</sup> For the text, cf. QIMRON AND CHARLESWORTH, *Rule*, 14. On 'heavenly dualism', cf. COLLINS, *Powers*, esp. 16–17.

in the *Hodayot* (1QH XIII.10) and in 1Q/4QInstruction (4Q418 69 II.8) in order to point to a generation without continuance.<sup>45</sup> It is beyond any doubt that these בניִים refer to humankind.

On the other hand, for both the ‘Sons of Righteousness’ and the ‘Sons of Deceit’, their ‘dominions’ (ממשלה) are under the sway of the ‘Prince of Lights’ and the ‘Herald of Darkness’. The *Cairo Damascus Document*, whose Cave 4 fragments open with an admonition to the ‘Sons of Light’ (4QD<sup>a</sup> [4Q266] 1a–b.1), is the only text from Qumran, besides the ‘Treatise’, which refers to the ‘Prince of Light’.<sup>46</sup> Within the admonitions the שר האורים is the counterpart to ‘Belial’, both of which raised Jannes and his brother with the help of their messengers, Moses and Aaron (CD V.18–19; cf. 4QD<sup>a</sup> [4Q266] 3 II.5; 4QD<sup>b</sup> [4Q267] 2.1; 6QD [6Q15] 3.1). Furthermore, the Hebrew expression מלאך חושך in 1QS III.20–21 is attested in the ‘Treatise’ only. But leaving the proper terminology aside, the metaphor of ‘light’ against ‘darkness’ serves as the most prominent dualism in Qumran (cf. 1QM and wisdom texts from Qumran).<sup>47</sup> In addition, the angel Michael, who is called the ‘great prince’ (Dan 12.1: השר הגדול), achieves authority ‘in everlasting light’ in the War Scroll (cf. 1QM XVII.6). In this regard, the angelic expressions שר אור and חושך מלאך in 1QS III.20–21 are obviously part of a broader tradition that has constructed opposing heavenly figures.<sup>48</sup>

Even though we have already reached the heavenly realm within dualistic thinking, it is not the end – or more precisely: the beginning – of the line. Therefore, after the incipit ‘for the *Maskil* to instruct and teach all the sons of light’ (1QS III.13),<sup>49</sup> the text refers to the ‘God of knowledge’ (1QS III.15–16):<sup>50</sup>

מאל הדעות כול הויה ונהייה 15 From the God of Knowledge [comes] all that is and that (will) happen(s).

<sup>45</sup> See also 4QShir<sup>b</sup> [4Q511] I.8 and JOKIRANTA, Art. בן, 467, who also refers to 2 Sam 7.10: ‘And I will set a place for my people, Israel, and I will plant it [i.e., Israel], and it will dwell in its place, and it will not palpitate anymore, and the evil-doers (בני עולה) will not proceed to afflict it, as formally’.

<sup>46</sup> See also 1QM XIII.10: ושר מאור מאז פקדתה לעזרנו: ‘the prince from light, long ago, you entrusted to our rescue’.

<sup>47</sup> See IBBA, חושך, 925–926, who refers also to the Aramaic מלכי רשע, e.g., in 4QVisions of Amram (4Q544 2.13).

<sup>48</sup> See KOBELSKI, Melchizedek, 75–83.

<sup>49</sup> See also the headings in 1QS IX.12, 21; 4QS<sup>b</sup> [4Q256] IX.1 par 4QS<sup>d</sup> [4Q258] I.1 and HEMPEL, Teaching, 106, 113–114, who rightly emphasizes that the distinctiveness of different headings in the various manuscripts, relating to the ‘Rule of the Community’, make it feasible that these headings signal different sub-compositions within the trajectory of the text.

<sup>50</sup> For the text, cf. QIMRON AND CHARLESWORTH, Rule, 14.

<p>ולפני היותם הכין כול מחשבתם ובהיותם לתעודותם כמחשבת</p>	<p>16</p>	<p>And before they came into being, he ordained all their plans. And when they come into being in their fixed times, according to the plan of his glory, they fulfill their task. And nothing can be changed.</p>
--	-----------	---

This statement sets the tone for the text as a whole: the one God above all. The ‘God of Knowledge’ is a well-known divine designation that is especially attested in 1Q/4QInstruction, in 4QMysteries and in some sectarian texts (cf. 1QH IX.28; XX.13; frag. 4.15; 4QDibHam<sup>a</sup> [4Q504] 4.4; cf. 1 Sam 2.3). Furthermore, the ‘God of Knowledge’ is connected with the ideology of pre-existence and determination.<sup>51</sup> In terms of the textual shape of the ‘Treatise’, we are at the beginning, but in terms of the hierarchy, as conceptualized in the passage, we are at the end or at the top.<sup>52</sup>

With a view to an ‘exclusive monotheism’, the question arises as to how the ‘Treatise’ describes the relationship between God and the angelic messengers. Marco Treves and Paul Heger, both of whom published articles on the topic, the former fifty years ago and the latter quite recently, answered this question rather radically by referring to Isa 45.7.<sup>53</sup> Both deny what they call a ‘cosmological dualism’ in the ‘Treatise’. Since God is characterized as the creator of good *and* evil in Isaiah 45, the Qumran text cannot introduce a self-contained and autonomous class of angels and messengers. Their power is not only dependent on the one God, they simply have no power. Consequently, Treves argues for a dualism in an anthropological manner, as in the Rabbinic יצר הרע and יצר טוב, while Heger denies any dualism at all in the ‘Treatise’. Both authors closely connect the disputed, and recently denied, ‘cosmic dualism’ to ideas that are heavily influenced by Persian dualistic thinking. In the end, especially Heger concludes that as the ‘Treatise’ lacks ‘cosmic dualism’, it also lacks Persian influence.

But neither ‘cosmic’ functions of the angels nor even their functional power necessarily points to Persian influence; nor does a presupposed or even implicit monotheistic model in the ‘Treatise’ rapidly lead to Rabbinic

---

<sup>51</sup> See also the characterization of God as a ‘God of mysteries’ and ‘knowledge’ who determines the end for the existence of injustice in 1QS IV.18: ואל ברזי שכלו ובחכמת כבודו: נתן קצ להיות עולה (‘the God of mysteries of his knowledge and of wisdom of his glory set an end to an existence of injustice’): for the text, see QIMRON AND CHARLESWORTH, *Rule*, 18. Recently, GAGNE, *Visite*, 205–216, discussed the term פקדה (‘visitation’) in the ‘Treatise on the Two Spirits’ and concludes that it stands for the mighty acts of God within both a present and an eschatological or apocalyptic frame.

<sup>52</sup> See also DAVIDSON, *Angels*, 149–150.

<sup>53</sup> See TREVES, *Spirits*, 449–452; HEGER, *Challenges*, 227–310.

anthropology.<sup>54</sup> The 'Treatise on the Two Spirits' is, however, a multi-layered composition that includes different concepts of dualism, including varying notions of monotheism. If one only gets a glimpse of the framework of the composition, the topic of 'creation' alludes to the model of an 'exclusive monotheism'. While God functions as creator, it is no problem to introduce angelic powers, with reference to 'good' and 'evil', by means of a hierarchic scheme: the 'Prince of Lights' and the 'Herald of Darkness'. Here, dualism has a cosmological function. At the end of the totem pole, we find mankind and the struggle of the two spirits which, consequently, evokes an anthropological or psychological type of dualism (cf. 1QS IV.15–16, 23). This type of dualism also refers to the God of creation. In 1QS III.24–25 it is stated:<sup>55</sup>

ואל ישראל ומלאכ אמתו עוזר	24	And the God of Israel and his Herald of Truth help
לכול בני אור והוא ברא	24/25	all Sons of Light. And it was he who created
רוחות אור וחושך	25	Spirits of Light and Darkness.

In what follows, the text refers to the 'works of God' (1QS IV.3–4). Furthermore, God, who brought into existence competing spirits of good and evil, will destroy the 'Spirit of Deceit' (1QS IV.20–21). In conclusion, an anthropological concept of dualism as it is represented in the 'Treatise on the Two Spirits' fits much better with 'exclusive monotheism' as it is represented in Isa 45.7.<sup>56</sup>

Whether these different concepts of dualism and monotheism call for different literary layers within the 'Treatise on the Two Spirits',<sup>57</sup> or, much more likely, whether our struggle with the logic of this text was not the struggle of the ancient writers who simply combined heterogeneous motifs in one and the same work, is hard to decide.<sup>58</sup> Nevertheless, it is apparent that the 'Treatise' reflects both an 'inclusive' and 'exclusive' approach towards the 'one-ness' of God. Furthermore, allusions to both types of

<sup>54</sup> See, e.g., COHEN STUART, *Struggle*, 94, who opines that the 'Treatise' distinguishes within different personalities or sorts of mankind and not, as the Rabbis, between different intentions of the human will (but cf. also 1QS IV.23).

<sup>55</sup> For the text, cf. QIMRON AND CHARLESWORTH, *Rule*, 16.

<sup>56</sup> On the emphasized role of God in the 'Treatise on the Two Spirits' and in the *Hodayot*, cf. FLUSSER, *Dualism*, 283–292.

<sup>57</sup> For an analysis of literary layers, see HEMPEL, *Teaching*, 102–120. For 'dualistic reworking' in the Dead Sea Scrolls, see DUHAIME, *Reworking*, esp. 39–55, and the critical evaluation in FREY, *Patterns*, 286–287.

<sup>58</sup> E.g., POPOVIĆ, *Body*, 181, states, 'The ethical and cosmic dualistic categories are interlocked with each other...', referring to 1QS III.25–IV.1. Cf. also HEMPEL, *Teaching*, 113. See also *Jub* or 2 *Macc* (MACH, *Concepts*, 32–38). Recently, STUCKENBRUCK, *Interiorization*, 162, 166, pointed to the merging of cosmic, psychological and ethical dualities.

'one-ness' suggest they stem from an intrinsic Jewish tradition without necessarily reflecting Persian antitypes.

### 3.2. 1Q/4QInstruction

As widely acknowledged, the 'Treatise on the Two Spirits' and 1Q/4QInstruction share several motifs, ideas and expressions. If Eibert Tigchelaar and Charlotte Hempel are correct, both compositions share the same incipit by introducing the *Maškîl* as a source of the examination that follows (cf. 1QS III.13; 4Q418 238 1; cf. also 4Q417 1 I.25).<sup>59</sup> One may ask whether the addressee is determined by the *Maškîl*. In the case of 1Q/4QInstruction some tension concerning the character of the rest of the composition would arise. Tigchelaar therefore initially opined that 1Q/4QInstruction addresses someone in Jewish society who is not a professional sage and, obviously, who is not a member of one of the sectarian communities— but later Tigchelaar shifted in favor of the *Maškîl*.<sup>60</sup> Furthermore, both texts mention 'truth and iniquity' (cf. 1QS III.18–19; IV.23; 4Q417 1 I.6), the 'ways of truth' (cf. 1QS IV.2, 17; 4Q416 2 III.14 par 4Q418 9.15) and the 'God of Knowledge' (cf. 1QS III.15; 4Q417 1 I.8 par 4Q418 43, 44, 45 I.6 and 4Q418 55.5).<sup>61</sup> More generally, the 'Treatise' and 1Q/4QInstruction especially correspond in their combination of wisdom, apocalyptic eschatology and dualistic material. It is to this combination that we now turn.

1Q/4QInstruction is a composite-work existing in at least eight copies (1Q26, 4Q415–418, 4Q418a, 4Q418c, 4Q423). It comprises pedagogical, tentative philosophical and eschatological passages and can be dated to the late third or early second century BCE.<sup>62</sup> Armin Lange and Eibert Tigchelaar compared 1Q/4QInstruction with the 'Treatise on the Two Spirits'. While Lange's conclusion is rather optimistic, as he found both texts originating in the same circles, Tigchelaar calls for caution. Nevertheless, he listed several correspondences, and both authors agree that 1Q/4QInstruction and the 'Treatise' share dualistic and pre-deterministic ideas.<sup>63</sup> But it is striking that in general '*Instruction* does not know the

<sup>59</sup> See TIGCHELAAR, Learning, 199, 245–246; HEMPEL, Teaching, 116.

<sup>60</sup> For the former identification, see TIGCHELAAR, Addressees, 62–75 (but see for the latter thesis also n. 58, above).

<sup>61</sup> See the overview of terminological parallels in the 'Treatise' and in 1Q/4QInstruction by TIGCHELAAR, Learning, 197–199.

<sup>62</sup> See LANGE, Wisdom Literature, 461–465, who dates 1Q/4QInstruction between Ecclesiastes and the *Hodayot*. On recent statements concerning the historical context of 1Q/4QInstruction cf. KAMPEN, Wisdom Literature, 40–44. For the recent scholarly discussion about 1Q/4QInstruction cf. GOFF, Trends, 367–416.

<sup>63</sup> See LANGE, Weisheit, 127–130; TIGCHELAAR, Learning, 194–203.

distinction between two spirits, and has no apparent interest in the protagonists of truth and deceit.<sup>64</sup> Though one passage, widely suspected of providing the introductory section of the composition,<sup>65</sup> refers to the 'faithful' and the 'wicked' (4Q416 1.10–12).<sup>66</sup>

10 From the heavens he will pronounce judgment (משמים ישפוט) upon the work/service of wickedness. All the sons of his truth will be accepted to[ ] (ויכל בני אמתו ירצו לן) 11 (its) end and they will be terrified. And they shall feel dread, for the heavens shall fear[ ] 12 [s]eas and depths fear. Every spirit of flesh shall be laid utterly bare ( ויתערערו כל רוח ( בשר). And the sons of heave[n]...

The following context commences with the judgment of wickedness and the approbation of the righteous with knowledge of 'good' and 'evil'. Already the perspective of a world in the state of creation, and also several allusions to Genesis 2–3 in 4Q416 1 as a whole, reveal the cosmological and also eschatological dimension of the text.<sup>67</sup> With regard to judgment, God's sovereignty is not challenged at all, and the iniquity of the wicked is greatly elaborated. In line 12 the wicked are identified with the 'Spirit of Flesh' (רוח בשר), while the 'Sons of Heaven' (בני השמים) function as their counterpart. Seemingly, the setting in 1Q/4QInstruction is the same as in the 'Treatise on the Two Spirits': the reader finds God's sovereignty, emphasized within a setting concerned with creation, heavenly beings and, lastly, the dualistic structure of the wicked and the faithful facing the divine judgment. Nevertheless, 1Q/4QInstruction clearly differs from the 'Treatise' in at least two ways: first, God's deterministic role is further elaborated and emphasized. Here, a key-term in 1Q/4QInstruction is of basic interest. The *רז נהיה*, attested more than twenty times in the preserved fragments, points to the deterministic aspect in the text. While *רז* is a Persian-Aramaic loanword, prominent in the book of Daniel, that denotes a divine mystery to be revealed through God or an *angelus interpretis*,<sup>68</sup> the second part of the term represents a *Niph'al* participle from *היה*. Most interpreters translate 'mystery that is to be/come' or 'mystery of existence' and assume the entire range of chronological spheres: past, present and future, with a slight emphasis on the future aspect.<sup>69</sup> Recent philological

<sup>64</sup> TIGCHELAAR, Learning, 201 (italics in the text).

<sup>65</sup> Pace TIGCHELAAR (see above): cf. KAMPEN, Wisdom Literature, 44–45.

<sup>66</sup> For text (and translation), cf. STRUGNELL AND HARRINGTON, 4QInstruction, 81, 83; TIGCHELAAR, Learning, 69, 74–75: for the overlap with 4Q418; KAMPEN, Wisdom Literature, 60–65.

<sup>67</sup> See WOLD, Women, 90–91.

<sup>68</sup> See WILLI-PLEIN, Geheimnis, 162–163.

<sup>69</sup> See HARRINGTON, Wisdom Texts, 48–49; COLLINS, Wisdom, 122; GOFF, Adam, 3; KAMPEN, Wisdom Literature, 46–50; STUCKENBRUCK, Interiorization, 156. For the discussion of *רז נהיה*, cf. GOFF, Wisdom, 30–79.

insights lead to further precision: the morphology clearly hints at a *Niph'al* form, and the *Niph'al* is not simply a passive stem compared to the *Qal*, but reflects on the progress of the described process. It emphasizes the incidence and manifestation of what happens with a view to the subject. This can be seen in those texts which utilize the *Qal* and *Niph'al* of הִיָּה in the same context:

And at that time stands Michael, the great prince, the one who is standing over your people, and there will be a time of distress (וְהִיָּחָה עַת צָרָה) that never happened since there were nations (אֲשֶׁר לֹא נִהְיָתָה מִדְּיוֹת גּוֹי). (Dan 12.1a)

מֵאֵל הַדְּעוּת כּוֹל הוּיָה וְנִהְיָה 15 From the God of Knowledge [comes] all that is and that (will) happen(s). (1QS III.15 (cf. XI.4))

In both cases it is not the temporal aspect, future and past or present and future, but the difference between what generally is and what, on the other hand, specifically happens, happened or will happen, in terms of an incident.<sup>70</sup> 'With reference to situations which are in fact *future*, the participle may denote merely a circumstance accompanying a future event...'.<sup>71</sup> Therefore, the *Niph'al* participle in רָז נִהְיָה denotes a '*futurum instans*' as Rüdiger Bartelmus recently concluded.<sup>72</sup>

Die Fügung kann geradezu als Musterbeispiel für die noetische Struktur des *futurum instans* gesehen werden: In der göttlichen Welt steht bereits fest, was sich (demnächst) ereignen wird; für Menschen ist es aber noch ein Geheimnis, das zu lüften allein dem Apokalyptiker vorbehalten ist.<sup>73</sup>

In conclusion, I would suggest the translation 'mystery that is in the process of taking place' for רָז נִהְיָה. In the context of 1Q/4QInstruction the righteous stay away from the 'Spirit of Flesh' that stands in contrast to the 'Sons of Heaven' (בְּנֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם) or to the 'Sons of his Truth' (בְּנֵי אֱמֻתּוֹ). One of the most interesting passages that brings the 'mystery' and the 'spirit' together is the following (4Q416 2 III.17–18):<sup>74</sup>

17 As he has made them rule over you and formed (you) according to the spirit (הַמְשִׁילֵמָה) (בְּכֹה וַיִּצַּר עַל הָרוּחַ), so serve them! And as 18 he has uncovered your ear with view to<sup>75</sup> the

<sup>70</sup> See JENNI, Funktion, esp. 52–54; BARTELMUS, Art. הִיָּה, 767, 773. Here, I argue against a scholarly tendency to simply identify in the רָז נִהְיָה a marker of apocalyptic future orientation. Cf. the approaches in scholarship discussed in GOFF, Trends, 386–388.

<sup>71</sup> WALTKE AND O'CONNOR, Introduction, 627, § 37.6f (italics in the text).

<sup>72</sup> Cf. BARTELMUS, Art. הִיָּה, 777–778.

<sup>73</sup> BARTELMUS, Art. הִיָּה, 777 (italics in the text).

<sup>74</sup> For text (and translation), cf. STRUGNELL AND HARRINGTON, 4QInstruction, 110, 113; TIGCHELAAR, Learning, 48: for the overlap with 4Q418; KAMPEN, Wisdom Literature, 73.

<sup>75</sup> The preposition should be understood as a *bet comitantiae* that functions as a second accusative object besides אַחֲרָיִם: for the *bet comitantiae* that denotes a 'spiritual

mystery that is in the process of taking place (גלה אונכה ברו נהיה), glorify them for the sake of your own glory.

The context deals with the honoring of parents, i.e. the fifth commandment, and combines sapiential admonitions with participation in the heavenly realm (cf. 4Q416 2 III.10–12)<sup>76</sup> for those who act according to the admonitions.

The latter observation points to the second difference in 1Q/4QInstruction, when compared to the ‘Treatise on the Two Spirits’: the ‘Sons of Heaven’ (בני השמים) are, as already noted, placed in opposition to the wicked, several times referred to in 1Q/4QInstruction as ‘Spirit of Flesh’ (רוח בשר). This dualism equates the ‘Sons of Heaven’ (cf. 4Q418 69 II.12–13) with the ‘Sons of His Truth’ (cf. 4Q416 I.10), the ‘Holy Ones’ (קדושים; cf. 4Q417 1 I.17 par 4Q418 43, 44, 45 I.13; 4Q418 81+81a 11–12) and with the ‘Spiritual People’ (רוח עם; cf. 4Q417 1 I.16 par 4Q418 43, 44, 45 I.13).<sup>77</sup> In the so-called ‘Vision of Hagu’, probably the most famous and also most disputed text in 1Q/4QInstruction, this dualism is further explained (4Q417 frag. 2, 1 I.15–18):<sup>78</sup>

15 A book of remembrance is written before him 16 of/for those who keep his word. And that is the vision of the meditation (and/of/on) a book of remembrance (והוא חזון ההגוי) (לספר זכרון). And he bequeathed it to Enosh/Man/humanity together with a spiritual people (וינחילנו לאנוש עם עם רוח)<sup>79</sup> f[so]r 17 according to the pattern of the holy ones is his fashioning (or: did he fashion him/it: כתבנית קדושים יצרו). And moreover, meditation has not been given (or: not did he give) to a/the fleshly spirit (ויעוד לוא נתן הגוי לרוח בשר), for it does/did not distinguish between 18 [go]od and evil according to the judgment of its [sp]irit.

---

contact’: see JENNI, *Präposition Beth*, 242–47, §262, and on the syntax of this passage cf. BARTELMUS, *Art. הִיָּה*, 778.

<sup>76</sup> The context speaks of those who are ‘seated among the princes/nobles’. They are further appointed to have authority ‘over an inheritance of glory’ (4Q416 2 III.11–12). GOFF, *Wisdom*, 206–214, and KAMPEN, *Wisdom Literature*, 75–76, argue for a metaphorical sense of the ‘princes/nobles’ who are designated to share the lot of the angels.

<sup>77</sup> See STUCKENBRUCK, *Interiorization*, 159–160.

<sup>78</sup> For text (and translation), see STRUGNELL AND HARRINGTON, 4QInstruction, 151, 155; TIGCHELAAR, *Learning*, 52: for the overlap with 4Q418; KAMPEN, *Wisdom Literature*, 95. Recently, TIGCHELAAR, *People*, 103–118, has provided a new reconstruction of the text. The above text and translation follows Tigchelaar, with slight modifications. Tigchelaar also challenged some of the proposed interpretations (105–106).

<sup>79</sup> The second עם is written supralinear in the manuscript of 4Q417 1 I.16 (cf. STRUGNELL AND HARRINGTON, 4QInstruction, 151, 164 and pl. VIII).



A tremendous number of books and articles has been written on this passage.<sup>80</sup> Tigchelaar posed several questions concerning the understanding of the text: The content or reference to the ‘book of meditation’ and its relationship to the ‘book of remembrance’ is not clear. The double reading of  $\text{אש}$  is open to interpretation. The riddle of the meaning of ‘judgment of his or its spirit’ is not resolved. And, finally, the semantic of ‘Spirit of the Flesh’ still awaits further clarification.

What can be said on the basis of this text is that the dualism refers to two different types of humanity. One of them is represented by the ‘Spirit of the Flesh’, the other by the ‘spiritual people’. The latter is fashioned ‘according to the holy ones’. Therefore, the ‘spiritual people’ achieve an angel-like status. In another fragment of 1Q/4QInstruction, for example, they are referred to as being in the lot of the  $\text{אליים}$  (cf. 4Q418 81+81a. 4–5), including a priestly ascent.<sup>81</sup> Consequently, the angel-like status and related terms are organized in a hierarchical manner – here, the ‘Treatise on the Two Spirits’ is in fact comparable. But what differs in 1Q/4QInstruction is that ‘angelic’ terminology refers to the elect and chosen people, obviously addressed in this sapiential work. In other words, the angels in 1Q/4QInstruction lack any intermediary function.

### 3.3. Conclusions

Both texts discussed in this paper represent ancient Jewish sources stemming from early Hellenistic times, the third and second centuries BCE. Furthermore, both texts leave no doubt as to their Jewish provenance and presuppose a divine concept that should be called ‘monotheistic’ – in its widest meaning. Also, both texts are not necessarily of sectarian origin, even if their affinities to ideological aspects known from sectarian evidence cannot be disputed. Both texts combine sapiential and apocalyptic motifs wherein their specific dualisms are conceptualized.<sup>82</sup>

With view to different concepts of ‘monotheism’, from ‘summodeism’ to ‘exclusive monotheism’, the ‘Treatise on the Two Spirits’ and 1Q/4QInstruction have nuanced their ‘monotheisms’ in different ways: while the ‘Treatise’ combines both an ‘inclusive’ and ‘exclusive’ divine

---

<sup>80</sup> See the literature that is listed in TIGCHELAAR, *People*, 103–105 nn. 2 and 3; GOFF, *Adam*, 13–17.

<sup>81</sup> See KAMPEN, *Wisdom Literature*, 134. See also WOLD, *Women*, 161–179; ANGEL, *Priesthood*, 61–77, esp. 77: ‘Whatever the case, this chosen community accessed God’s mysteries and was destined for eternal life by means of participation with the angels.’

<sup>82</sup> After listing the most intriguing parallels between the ‘Treatise on the Two Spirits’ and 1Q/4QInstruction, LANGE, *Weisheit*, 130, concludes: ‘Aus diesen Parallelen darf geschlossen werden, daß die Zwei-Geister-Lehre aus den Kreisen stammt, die auch 4Q Sap [i.e., 1Q/4QInstruction: S. B.] und Myst hervorgebracht haben.’

concept, 1Q/4QInstruction clearly prefers the ‘exclusive’ type. Helpful criteria for this difference are to be found in a more elaborated idea of divine determinism in 1Q/4QInstruction on the one hand and different dualistic concepts in both texts on the other.<sup>83</sup>

#### 4. The ‘Ancient of Days’ and the ‘Son of Man’

When we examine the ‘inclusive’ or ‘integrative’<sup>84</sup> monotheism as attested in Jewish writings of Persian and Hellenistic times, we can detect several categories of terms and figures, whose place and functions are in a divine sphere. John J. Collins, for example, distinguishes under the heading ‘Was Judaism Monotheistic?’, ‘angelic figures’, ‘exalted human beings’ and ‘wisdom and Logos’.<sup>85</sup> Larry W. Hurtado discusses three types: ‘divine attributes and powers’, ‘exalted patriarchs’ and ‘principal angels’.<sup>86</sup> Loren T. Stuckenbruck counts more categories of mediator figures: ‘divine attributes’, ‘patriarchal personages’, ‘priestly and royal figures in the literature’ and ‘eschatological ideal figures’.<sup>87</sup>

Among the latter category Stuckenbruck includes the so-called ‘Son of Man’ in Daniel 7. Nevertheless, the vast majority of scholars preferred – and still favors – a collective understanding that identifies Aramaic כְּבַר אֱנוֹשׁ in Dan 7.13 symbolically with the faithful remnants of ‘Israel’ (cf. v. 27).<sup>88</sup> Here, recent analyses of Otfried Hofius are a good case in point:<sup>89</sup> Hofius not only presupposes a collective reading in the Aramaic text, but, beyond this, also argues for a separation of Greek υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου and παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν in *Pap. 967* and *Codex Chisianus* (Ms. 88). Both Greek witnesses attest the reading ‘one like a Son of Man comes as the Ancient of Days’ instead of the MT’s and *Pseudo-Theodotion*’s ‘one like a Son of Man

---

<sup>83</sup> For the somewhat unresolved riddle of combining determinism and monotheistic thinking on the one hand and dualism on the other hand, especially in the ‘Treatise of the Two Spirits’, cf. PAINTER, *Monotheism*, 235–239.

<sup>84</sup> For the idea of an ‘integrative monotheism’ in Israel and in the ancient Near East, see LEVIN, *Monotheismus*, esp. 153–158, 169–172.

<sup>85</sup> See COLLINS, *Monotheism*, 82–94.

<sup>86</sup> See HURTADO, *One God*, 17–18. DAVILA, *Methodology*, 5–6, adds ‘Charismatic Prophets and Royal Aspirants’ and ‘Ideal Figures’ to the listed triad.

<sup>87</sup> See STUCKENBRUCK, ‘Angels’, 47 and 47–48 n. 7. In general, STUCKENBRUCK discusses the motif of veneration of angels and, consequently, points to another aspect of ‘inclusive monotheism’ (see also HURTADO, *Monotheism*, 550–556).

<sup>88</sup> See, e.g., KEEL, *Geschichte*, 1176.

<sup>89</sup> See HOFIUS, *Septuaginta-Text*, 73–90.

comes to the Ancient of Days'.<sup>90</sup> Whether the Greek text is a scribal error of Greek ἕως and ὥς or whether the writers intentionally changed the meaning of the text, is not Hofius' point.<sup>91</sup> He translated the OG version of Dan 7.13 as follows (*Pap. 967*):<sup>92</sup>

ἐθεώρουν ἐν ὄραματι τῆς νυκτὸς καὶ ἰδοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἦρχετο ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου καὶ ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶ(ν) παρῆν καὶ οἱ παρεστηκότες προσήγαγον αὐτῷ

Ich schaute im Gesicht der Nacht: Und siehe, auf den Wolken des Himmels kam einer, der aussah wie ein Mensch, und der, der aussah wie ein Hochbetagter, war zugegen, und die Umstehenden näherten sich ihm.

But several problems accompany this interpretation of two separated figures, referred to in the parallel *stichos* with ὥς: first, while a translation with 'looks like' or 'in the appearance of' is an interpretation, albeit a possible one, Hofius insinuates that different subjects are meant. Besides the fact that he does not substantiate this understanding, the parallelism speaks against such a reading.<sup>93</sup> Second, a collective understanding of ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου in the Septuagint, same as for Aramaic כּבֵר אֲנִי in MT, is assumed, not discussed, by Hofius. Klaus Koch argued against this assumption:<sup>94</sup> while Koch admits some morphological and semantic problems inherent in כּבֵר אֲנִי and its derivations, he states that language clearly differentiates between the 'simplex' and the 'composite form', pointing to a collective on the one hand and to an individual on the other. Therefore, it is highly improbable that the 'composite form' in Dan 7.13 has a collective

<sup>90</sup> For the Greek readings *Pap. 967* (second or third century CE) and *Codex Chisianus* (Ms. 88: tenth century CE) are relevant. They represent a *pre-Hexaplaric* text that is to be dated to the second or first century BCE. The *Pseudo-Theodotion* Greek text was probably written a little later. It is very close to the content of MT.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. YARBRO COLLINS AND COLLINS, King, 194–198.

<sup>92</sup> For the translation, with slight deviations, see HOFIUS, *Septuaginta-Text*, 87. For the OG text cf. GEISSEN, *Septuaginta-Text*, 108; ZIEGLER AND MUNNICH, *Daniel*, 338: the reading ἕως is also preferred in the Göttingen Septuagint, while ὥς appears only in the apparatus. See also KOCH AND RÖSEL, *Polyglottensynopse*, 202–203. Ms. 88 (and *Syrohexaplar*) reads ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου instead of ἦρχετο ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, and παρῆσαν instead of προσήγαγον.

<sup>93</sup> E.g., in Num 23.24 LXX one reads: ἰδοῦ λαὸς ὡς σκύμνος ἀναστήσεται καὶ ὡς λέων γαυρωθήσεται 'behold the people shall rise up like a cub and shall exalt himself like a lion'. It is obvious that the subjects, marked with ὥς, refer to the same 'people'. Much more comparable to Dan 7.13 is Ezek 1.13 LXX: καὶ ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ζῶων δρασις ὡς ἀνθρώπων πυρὸς καιομένων ὡς ὄψις λαμπάδων συστρεφομένων ἀνά μέσον τῶν ζῶων 'and in the midst of the living beings an appearance as of burning coals of fire, as an appearance of lambs gathered in the midst of the living beings'. Cf. also LXX in 1 Sam 2.2; Pss 34.14; 77.52; 81.7; Ezek 20.32. Furthermore, Dan 7.14 LXX possibly points to a veneration of the υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου as identified with the 'Ancient of Days'; but cf. HURTADO, *Jewish Monotheism*, 19–20.

<sup>94</sup> See KOCH, 'Menschensohn', 369–385.

meaning. Beyond this, Koch favors an individual, angel-like interpretation of כְּבַר אֱנוֹשׁ, as proposed by John J. Collins and followed by a few other scholars.<sup>95</sup>

In short, some arguments for the individual, angelic-like interpretation: It is well known from other apocalypses that angels appear as human figures (cf., e.g., *1 En.* 87.2). Also, the collective interpretation cannot explain, why on the one hand the 'Holy Ones of the Most High will receive the kingdom and will possess the kingdom forever and forever and ever' (Dan 7.18),<sup>96</sup> while on the other the 'Holy Ones took possession of the kingdom' (7.22),<sup>97</sup> and finally, 'kingdom and dominion and the greatness of the kingdoms under all heaven were given to the *people of the Holy Ones of the Most High*' (7.27).<sup>98</sup> If the angelic-like interpretation is preferred, then the 'kingdom' is delivered to the leader of the host, after that to the host and, lately, to the people of the host. Furthermore, angels in the book of Daniel are addressed as appearing 'in the likeness of a man' (Dan 8.15: Gabriel; cf. 9.21; 10.5, 16, 18; 12.5–7). Finally, several texts of comparable provenance and style, such as the so-called 'Son of God'-text (4Q246), speak of individual figures whose functions are comparable with those of the 'one like a human being' in Dan 7.

The most interesting point in the discussion between Hofius and Koch is the theological bias which leads Hofius to his conclusion. Koch speaks of the coercion to 'keep Jesus Christ away from apocalypticism'.<sup>99</sup> And what is more, the theses from Hofius suggest grounds for believing that the 'Son of Man'-texts in the New Testament had a *Christian* origin. A collective understanding of כְּבַר אֱנוֹשׁ could also eliminate the danger of 'two powers in heaven'.

Recently, Daniel Boyarin reconstructed two apocalypses in Daniel 7, one about the four beasts, written in prose (Dan 7.2–8, 11–12), the other about 'one like a human being' and the 'Ancient of Days', written in poetic style (Dan 7.9–10, 13–14).<sup>100</sup> While Larry Hurtado left the riddle unresolved as to whether the human-like figures in Ezekiel (Ezek 1.26; 8.2) and Daniel (Dan 7.13) should be identified with angels or God, Boyarin argues decidedly for a 'second God', because the phrase 'coming with the clouds

<sup>95</sup> See especially COLLINS, Daniel, 304–310, 318–319. See also IDEM, Scepter, 171–214; BEYERLE, Wolken, 1–52; IDEM, Son of Man, 54–58.

<sup>96</sup> Aramaic: מַלְכוּתָא קְדִישִׁי עֲלִיוֹנִין וַיְחַסְנוּן מַלְכוּתָא עַד עֲלֵמָא וְעַד עֲלֵמָא עֲלֵמָא. The translation 'Most High' (Aramaic: עֲלִיוֹנִין) can be disputed since, in terms of morphology, a plural is attested that probably points to the highest rank of angels. Note, however, there are no distinct criteria to distinguish between the 'Holy Ones', the 'Holy Ones of the Highest Angels' and 'the People of Holy Ones of the Highest Angels'.

<sup>97</sup> Aramaic: מַלְכוּתָא חַסְנוּ קְדִישִׁין. The simplex קְדִישִׁין clearly has the heavenly host in view.

<sup>98</sup> Aramaic: וּמַלְכוּתָא וְשִׁלְטָנָא וְרִבּוּתָא דִּי מַלְכוּתָא חַחוּת כֹּל שְׁמֵיָא יְהִיבַת לְעַם קְדִישִׁי עֲלִיוֹנִין (all translations from COLLINS, Daniel, 276).

<sup>99</sup> See KOCH, 'Menschensohn', 369.

<sup>100</sup> See BOYARIN, Daniel 7, 139–162. Cf. also IDEM, Gospels, 31–52.

of heaven' could only denote a divine being.<sup>101</sup> But this 'duothesim' is only valid for the apocalypse of the two thrones (vv. 9–10, 13–14) and was re-interpreted by inserting the apocalypse of the four beasts (vv. 2–8, 11–12) and also the *pesher* of the vision: what followed from this combined reading was that the second God that looked like a human being changed his meaning and function: from a divine figure towards a representative of Israel.<sup>102</sup>

Boyarin's approach is fresh and stimulating and, at the same time, highly hypothetical and, therefore, rather unconvincing. With a view to the motifs in the vision of the thrones, no one can deny that both the 'Ancient of Days' and the 'one like a human being' achieve divine status. The tradition *behind* the text is clearly polytheistic. But, whether the *text* itself, even in an earlier stratum, was polytheistic is a matter of dispute. Nevertheless, tradition *and* text have in common the enhancement of divine subordination, and the tradition, therefore, provided the basis for an angelic understanding of the 'one like a human being'. What remains is that two powers act in the heavenly realm<sup>103</sup> – another clear example for an 'inclusive monotheism'; not least, the reception history of Dan 7 attests to this characterization. For both ancient versions of the text, like the *pre-Hexaplaric* OG, and modern interpreters, like Hofius, try to read the 'one like a human being' in compliance with their own theology and ideology.

## 5. Summary

Generally speaking it is dangerous to use modern terminology for interpretations of texts stemming from the Hellenistic-Roman era. But, sometimes, it helps us in distinguishing different concepts, and especially in the case of 'monotheism', concepts of the divine. The texts from Hellenistic times, discussed above, showed no explicit interests in the 'one-ness' of God, as Deutero-Isaiah and especially the Cyrus oracle. In this connection, other texts from the Dead Sea are more significant, like the 'War Scroll' which states in 1QM X.8–9:<sup>104</sup>

מִיָּא כְּמוֹכָה אֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל	8	Who is like you, God of Israel,
בְּשָׁמַיִם וּבָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר יַעֲשֶׂה		in h[eav]en and on earth, who acts

<sup>101</sup> See HURTADO, *One God*, 75–77; BOYARIN, *Daniel 7*, 149–150, 154–162.

<sup>102</sup> See BOYARIN, *Daniel 7*, 150–154.

<sup>103</sup> See SEGAL, *Powers*; HURTADO, *Jewish Monotheism*, 23–25. See, furthermore, the critical review of Hurtado's approach in RAINBOW, *Jewish Monotheism*, esp. 88–89, and also the critical comments on Segal's theses in MCGRATH AND TRUAX, *Two Powers*, 43–71.

<sup>104</sup> For the text, cf. DUHAIME, *War Scroll*, 116.

כמעשיכה הגדולים		according to your great works
וכגבורתכה החזקה	9	and according to your mighty strength?

The divine incomparability can also be combined with angelic hosts in 1QM XII.1:<sup>105</sup>

כיא רוב קדושים [א]לה	1	Because th[ey] are a multitude of holy ones
בשמים וצבאות מלאכים		in heaven and hosts of heralds
בזבול קודשכה		in your holy habitation
לה[ודות אמת]כה		to pra[ise] your [truth].

And, lastly, evil itself finds its place within this concept of eschatological war (1QM XIII.10–11, 13):<sup>106</sup>

ואתה עשיתה בליעל לשחת	10/11	And you [i.e. God] are the one who has made Belial for perdition,
מלאך משטמה	11	a herald of hatred/Mastema.
מיא כמוכה	13	Who is like you
בכוח אל ישראל		according to strength, God of Israel?

The cited passages praise God's incomparability. They explicitly refer to God as the creator of Belial. The dualism of the 'War Scroll' knows of the angelic host, mentions Belial and Mastema (cf. *Jub*), but, contrary to the 'Treatise on the Two Spirits', God also made Belial. In this concern, the 'War Scroll' comes closer to the 'exclusive monotheism' we find in Isaiah 45.

Apart from an 'exclusive monotheism' or its mixed-up forms in the 'Treatise on the Two Spirits' and 1Q/4QInstruction, the vision in Daniel 7 attests an 'inclusive monotheism'. The angelic, human-like being is enthroned, endowed with glory and royal power and is, consequently, next to God. The divine status of the 'Son of Man' is not explicitly stated, but deduced from a religio-historical typology that reminds us of El and Baal or Zeus and Typhon. Thus, in the final analysis, the Aramaic text of Daniel 7 is 'monotheistic', its background is 'polytheistic'. Not only the Septuagint

<sup>105</sup> For the text, cf. DUHAIME, War Scroll, 120. RAINBOW, Christology, esp. 228–250, has shown, in a detailed list of 'monotheistic' expressions in canonical, as well as non-canonical, ancient Jewish and early Christian writings, that the explicit characterization of God as a superior, sovereign and incomparable divine being in early Jewish apocalyptic texts is rather meagre. Consequently, the War Scroll and the related literature from the Dead Sea represent the exception to the rule. The book of Daniel (MT), e.g., is only listed with reference to Dan 6.27 (cf. also quotations from the additions in OG of the book of Daniel: Dan LXX 3.44–45; Bel 5, 23–25, 41). References from *1 En.* are missing. Furthermore, *Jub* 1.24–25; 10.6; 12.19–20; 15.31–32; 21.3–4; 1QM X.8–9, 11–12 should be taken into account. Most attestations from later apocalyptic writings stem from the *Sib Or.*, *4 Ez.*, *2 En.* or *2 Bar.*

<sup>106</sup> For the text, cf. DUHAIME, War Scroll, 122.

(Ms. 88; *Pap. 967*) but also modern interpreters fought and fight against this understanding, impulsively, but in vain.

## Bibliography

- ACHENBACH, R., Das Kyros-Orakel in Jesaja 44,24–45,7 im Lichte altorientalischer Parallelen, ZAR 11 (2005) 155–194
- ALEXANDER, P. S., The Dualism of Heaven and Earth in Early Jewish Literature and Its Implications, in: *Light against Darkness. Dualism in Ancient Mediterranean Religion and the Contemporary World* (JAJ.S 2), eds. A. Lange et al., Göttingen 2011, 169–185
- ANGEL, J. L., *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (StTDJ 86), Leiden/Boston 2010
- BARTELMUS, R., Art. 717, ThWQ 1 (2011) 762–779
- BAUMGART, N. C., ‘JHWH...erschafft Unheil’. Jes 45,7 in seinem unmittelbaren Kontext, BZ 49 (2005) 202–236
- BEENTJES, P. C., *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts* (VT.S 58), Leiden/New York/Köln 1997
- BERGES, U., *Jesaja 40–48* (HThK), Freiburg/Basel/Wien 2008
- BEYERLE, S., ‘Der mit den Wolken des Himmels kommt’. Untersuchungen zum Traditionsgefüge ‘Menschensohn’ vom Danielbuch ausgehend, in: *Menschensohn und Gottessohn. Exegetische Studien zu zwei Paradigmen biblischer Intertextualität* (BThSt 67), ed. D. Sänger, Neukirchen-Vluyn 2004, 1–52
- ‘One Like a Son of Man’. Innuendoes of a Heavenly Individual, in: *Enoch and Qumran Origins. New Light on a Forgotten Connection*, ed. G. Boccaccini, Grand Rapids/Cambridge 2005, 54–58
- BIANCHI, U., The Category of Dualism in the Historical Phenomenology of Religion, Tem. 16 (1980) 10–25
- Art. Dualism, *EncRel(E)* 4 (1987) 506–512
- BOYARIN, D., Daniel 7, Intertextuality, and the History of Israel’s Cult, HThR 105 (2012) 139–162
- *The Jewish Gospels. The Story of the Jewish Christ*, New York 2012
- BOYCE, M., *A History of Zoroastrianism. Volume Two: Under the Achaemenians* (HO I/8.1, 2A) Leiden/Köln 1982
- COHEN STUART, G. H., *The Struggle in Man between Good and Evil. An Inquiry into the Origin of the Rabbinic Concept of Yeser Hara’ (sic!)*, Kampen 1984
- COLLINS, J. J., *Daniel. A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia), Minneapolis 1993
- *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, London/New York 1997
- Jewish Monotheism and Christian Theology, in: *Aspects of Monotheism. How God Is One: Symposium at the Smithsonian Institution October 19, 1996*, eds. H. Shanks and J. Meinhardt, Washington 1997, 81–105
- *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (OTL), Louisville 1997
- Powers in Heaven. God, Gods, and Angels in the Dead Sea Scrolls, in: *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature), eds. J. J. Collins and R. A. Kugler, Grand Rapids/Cambridge 2000, 9–28

- The Eschatology of Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls, in: *Sapiential Perspectives. Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature*, 20–22 May, 2001 (StTDJ 51), eds. J. J. Collins et al. Leiden/Boston 2004, 49–66
- *The Scepter and the Star. Messianism in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls Grand Rapids/Cambridge 2010*<sup>2</sup>
- DAVIDSON, J. M., *Angels at Qumran. A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1–36, 72–108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran (JSP.S 11)*, Sheffield 1992
- DAVILA, J. R., *Of Methodology, Monotheism and Metatron. Introductory Reflections on Divine Mediators and the Origins of the Worship of Jesus*, in: *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus (JSJ.S 63)*, eds. C. C. Newman et al., Leiden/Boston/Köln 1999, 3–18
- DELITZSCH, F., *Zweiter Vortrag über Babel und Bibel*, Stuttgart 1903
- *Babel und Bibel. Ein Rückblick und Ausblick*, Stuttgart 1904
- DIETRICH, W., *Über Werden und Wesen des biblischen Monotheismus. Religionsgeschichtliche und theologische Perspektiven*, in: *Ein Gott allein? JHWH-Verehrung und biblischer Monotheismus im Kontext der israelitischen und altorientalischen Religionsgeschichte (OBO 139)*, eds. W. Dietrich and. M. A. Klopfenstein, Göttingen/Fribourg 1994, 13–30
- DIMANT, D., *Dualism at Qumran. New Perspectives*, in: *Caves of Enlightenment. Proceedings of the American Schools of Oriental Research Dead Sea Scrolls Jubilee Symposium (1947–1997)*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth, North Richland Hills 1998, 55–73
- DUHAIME, J., *Dualistic Reworking in the Scrolls from Qumran*, CBQ 49 (1987) 32–56
- *War Scroll (1QM; 1Q33; 4Q491–496 = 4QM1–6; 4Q497)*, in: *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Vol. 2: Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents (PTSDSSP 2)*, Tübingen/Louisville 1995, 80–203
- *Art. Dualism, EncDSS 1 (2000) 215–220*
- FALK, D., *4QWorks of God*, in: *Qumran Cave 4. XX. Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2 (DJD 29)*, Oxford 1999, 25–44
- FLUSSER, D., *The ‘Flesh-Spirit’ Dualism in the Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament*, in: D. FLUSSER, *Judaism of the Second Temple Period. Vol. 1: Qumran and Apocalypticism*, Grand Rapids/Jerusalem, 2007, 283–292
- FREY, J., *Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library. Reflections on Their Background and History*, in: *Legal Texts and Legal Issues. Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization of Qumran Studies (FS J. M. Baumgarten [StTDJ 25])*, eds. M. J. Bernstein et al., Cambridge 1995, Leiden/New York/Köln 1997, 275–335
- GAGNE, A., *La visite de dieu dans l’instruction sur les deux Esprits (1QS 3:13–4:26). Caractérisation de la communauté de Qumrân et de ses ennemis*, in: *Defining Identities. We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen (StTDJ 70)*, eds. F. García Martínez and M. Popović, Leiden/Boston 2008, 205–216
- GAMMIE, J. G., *Spatial and Ethical Dualism in Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic Literature*, JBL 93 (1974) 356–385
- GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, F., *Iranian Influences in Qumran?*, in: *IDEM, Qumranica Minora I. Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism (StTDJ 63)*, ed. E. J. C. Tigchelaar, Leiden/Boston 2007, 227–241.



- Art. אָבִי, ThWQ 1 (2011) 502–506
- GEISSEN, A. (ed.), *Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel. Kap. 5–12 mit Susanna, Bel et Draco sowie Esther Kap. 1, 1a–2, 15: Nach dem Kölner Teil des Papyrus 967 (PTA 5)*, Bonn 1968
- GIERE, S. D., *A New Glimpse of Day One. Intertextuality, History of Interpretation, and Genesis 1:1–5 (BZNBW 172)*, Berlin/New York 2009
- GOFF, M., *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction (StTDJ 50)*, Leiden/Boston/Köln 2003
- *Recent Trends in the Study of Early Jewish Wisdom Literature. The Contribution of 4QInstruction and Other Qumran Texts*, CBibR 7 (2009) 376–416
- *Adam, the Angels and Eternal Life. Genesis 1–3 in the Wisdom of Solomon and 4QInstruction*, in: *Studies in the Book of Wisdom (JSJ.S 142)*, eds. G. Xeravits and J. Zsengellér, Leiden/Boston 2010, 1–21
- *Looking for Sapiential Dualism at Qumran*, in: *Dualism in Qumran (LSTS 76)*, ed. G. G. Xeravits, London/New York 2010, 20–38
- HARRINGTON, D. J., *Wisdom Texts from Qumran (The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls)*, London/New York 1996
- HEGER, P., *Challenges to Conventional Opinions on Qumran and Enoch Issues (StTDJ 100)*, Leiden/Boston 2012
- HEMPEL, C., *The Teaching on the Two Spirits and the Literary History of the Rule of the Community (LSTS 76)*, in: *Dualism in Qumran*, ed. G. G. Xeravits, London/New York 2010, 102–120
- HOFIUS, O., *Der Septuaginta-Text von Daniel 7,13–14. Erwägungen zu seiner Gestalt und seiner Aussage*, ZAW 117 (2005) 73–90
- HULTGÅRD, A., *Persian Apocalypticism*, in: *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism. Volume 1: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*, ed. J. J. Collins, New York 1998, 39–83
- HULTGREN, S., *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community. Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls (StTDJ 66)*, Leiden/Boston 2007
- HURTADO, L. W., *One God, One Lord. Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*, London 1988
- *First-Century Jewish Monotheism*, JSNT 71 (1998) 3–26
- *Art. Monotheism*, in: *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, eds. J. J. Collins and D. C. Harlow, Grand Rapids/Cambridge, 2010, 961–964
- *Monotheism, Principal Angels, and the Background of Christology*, in: *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. T. H. Lim and J. J. Collins, Oxford 2010, 546–564
- IBBA, G., *Art. אָבִי, ThWQ 1 (2011) 925–928*
- JENNI, E., *Die hebräischen Präpositionen. Band 1: Die Präposition Beth*, Stuttgart et al. 1992
- *Zur Funktion der reflexiv-passiven Stammformen im Biblisch-Hebräischen*, in: *IDEM, Studien zur Sprachwelt des Alten Testaments*, eds. B. Huwyler and K. Seybold, Stuttgart et al. 1997, 51–60
- JOKIRANTA, J., *Art. אָבִי, ThWQ 1 (2011) 462–473*
- DE JONG, A., *Iranian Connections in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, in: *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. T. H. Lim and J. J. Collins, Oxford 2010, 479–500
- KAMPEN, J., *Wisdom Literature (Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls)*, Grand Rapids/Cambridge 2011

- KEEL, O., *Die Geschichte Jerusalems und die Entstehung des Monotheismus. Teil 2 (Orte und Landschaften der Bibel IV.1)*, Göttingen 2007
- KNAUF, E. A., *Ist die Erste Bibel monotheistisch?*, in: *Der eine Gott und die Götter. Polytheismus and Monotheismus im antiken Israel (ATHANT 82)*, eds. M. Oeming and K. Schmid, Zürich 2003, 39–48
- KOBELSKI, P. J., *Melchizedek and Melchireša' (CBQ.MS 10)*, Washington DC 1981
- KOCH, K., *Monotheismus und Angelologie*, in: *IDEM, Vor der Wende der Zeiten. Beiträge zur apokalyptischen Literatur, Gesammelte Aufsätze 3*, eds. U. Gleßmer and M. Krause, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1996, 219–234
- *Der 'Menschensohn' in Daniel*, ZAW 119 (2007) 369–385
- KOCH, K. AND M. ROSEL (eds.), *Polyglottensynopse zum Buch Daniel*, Neukirchen-Vluyn 2000
- KRÜGER, T., *Einheit und Vielfalt des Göttlichen nach dem Alten Testament*, in: *Marburger Jahrbuch Theologie X: Trinität (MThSt 49)*, eds. W. Härle and R. Preul, Marburg 1998, 15–50
- LANGE, A., *Weisheit und Prädestination. Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran (StTDJ 18)*, Leiden/New York/Köln 1995
- *Wisdom Literature and Thought in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, in: *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. T. H. Lim and J. J. Collins, Oxford 2010, 455–478
- LEUENBERGER, M., *'Ich bin Jhwh und keiner sonst'. Der exklusive Monotheismus des Kyros-Orakels Jes 45,1–7 (SBS 224)*, Stuttgart 2010
- LEVIN, C., *Integrativer Monotheismus im Alten Testament*, ZThK 109 (2012) 153–175
- LEVISON, J. R., *The Two Spirits in Qumran Theology*, in: *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Vol. 2*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth, Waco 2006, 169–194
- LORETZ, O., *Die Einzigkeit eines Gottes im Polytheismus von Ugarit. Zur Levante als Ursprungsort des biblischen Monotheismus*, in: *Polytheismus und Monotheismus in den Religionen des Vorderen Orients (AOAT 298)*, eds. M. Krebernik and J. van Oorschot, Münster 2002, 71–89
- LEONHARDT BALZER, J., *Art. Dualism*, *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, eds. J. J. Collins and D. C. Harlow, Grand Rapids/Cambridge, 2010, 553–556
- MACDONALD, N., *Deuteronomy and the Meaning of 'Monotheism' (FAT II/1)*, Tübingen 2012<sup>2</sup>
- MACH, M., *Concepts of Jewish Monotheism During the Hellenistic Period*, in: *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism. Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus (JSJ.S 63)*, eds. C. C. Newman et al., Leiden/Boston/Köln 1999, 21–42
- MCGRATH, J. AND J. TRUEX, *'Two Powers' and Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*, JBSt 4 (2004) 43–71
- METSO, S., *Art. Rule of the Community (1QS + fragments)*, in: *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, eds. J. J. Collins and D. C. Harlow, Grand Rapids/Cambridge 2010, 1169–1171
- MOBERLY, R. W. L., *How Appropriate is 'Monotheism' as a Category for Biblical Interpretation?*, in: *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism (JSNT.S 263)*, eds. L. T. Stuckenbruck and W. E. S. North, London/New York 2004, 216–234
- NITZAN, B., *The Idea of Creation and Its Implications in Qumran Literature*, in: *Creation in Jewish and Christian Tradition (JSOT.S 319)*, eds. H. Graf Reventlow and Y. Hoffman, Sheffield 2002, 240–264
- PAINTER, J., *Monotheismus und Dualismus*, in: *Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel. Essays by the Members of the SNTS Johannine Writings Seminar (BETHL 184)*, eds. G. Van Belle et al., Leuven 2005, 225–243

- PHILONENKO, M., La doctrine qoumrânienne des deux esprits. Ses origines iraniennes et les prolongements dans le judaïsme essénien et le christianisme antique, in: *Apocalyptique iranienne et dualisme qoumrânien (Recherches Intertestamentaires 2)*, eds. Widengren et al., Paris 1995, 163–211
- POPOVIĆ, M., Reading the Human Body. Physiognomics and Astrology in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Hellenistic-Early Roman Period Judaism (StTDJ 67), Leiden/Boston 2007
- QIMRON, E., The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls (HSS 29), Winona Lake 1986, 2008
- QIMRON, E. AND J. H. CHARLESWORTH, Rule of the Community (1QS; cf. 4QS MSS A–J, 5Q11), in: *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Vol. 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents (PTSDSSP 1)*, Tübingen/Louisville 1994, 1–51
- RAINBOW, P. A., *Monotheism and Christology in I Corinthians 8. 4–6*, D.Phil. Thesis, Oxford 1987
- Jewish Monotheism as the Matrix for New Testament Christology. A Review Article, NT 33 (1991) 78–91
- RÖMER, T. C., Tendances dualistes dans quelques écrits bibliques de l'époque perse, Trans. 23 (2002) 45–58
- SEGAL, A. F., Two Powers in Heaven. Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism (SJLA 25), Leiden 1977
- SMITH, M. S., God in Translation. Deities in Cross-Cultural Discourse in the Biblical World (FAT 57), Tübingen 2008
- STAUSBERG, M., Monotheismus, Polytheismus und Dualismus im Alten Iran, in: *Polytheismus und Monotheismus in den Religionen des Vorderen Orients (AOAT 298)*, eds. M. Krebernik and J. van Oorschot, Münster 2002, 91–111
- Die Religion Zarathustras. Geschichte – Gegenwart – Rituale, Bd. I, Stuttgart/Berlin/Köln 2002
- STEGEMANN, H. et al. (eds.), 1QHodayot<sup>a</sup>. With Incorporation of 1QHodayot<sup>b</sup> and 4QHodayot<sup>a–f</sup> (DJD 40), Oxford 2009
- STOLZ, F., Einführung in den biblischen Monotheismus (Die Theologie), Darmstadt 1996
- STRUGNELL, J. AND D. J. HARRINGTON (eds.), Qumran Cave 4. XXIV. Sapiential Texts, Part 2: 4QInstruction (Mûsâr L<sup>ê</sup> Mëvîn): 4Q415 ff. (DJD 34), Oxford 1999
- STUCKENBRUCK, L. T., 'Angels' and 'God'. Exploring the Limits of Early Jewish Monotheism, in: *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism (JSNT.S 263)*, ed. L. T. Stuckenbruck and W. E. S. North, London/New York 2004, 45–70
- The Interiorization of Dualism within the Human Being in Second Temple Judaism. The Treatise of the Two Spirits (1QS III:13–IV:26) in its Traditio-Historical Context, in: *Light against Darkness. Dualism in Ancient Mediterranean Religion and the Contemporary World (JAJ.S 2)*, eds. A. Lange et al., Göttingen 2011, 145–168
- TIGCHELAAR, E. J. C., The Addressees of 4QInstruction, in: *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran. Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Oslo 1998 (STDJ 35)*, eds. D. K. Falk et al., Leiden/Boston/Köln 2000, 62–75
- To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones. Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction (StTDJ 44), Leiden/Boston/Köln 2001
- 'Spiritual People,' 'Fleshly Spirit,' and 'Vision of Meditation'. Reflections on 4QInstruction and 1 Corinthians, in: *Echoes from the Caves. Qumran and the New Testament (StTDJ 85)*, ed. F. García Martínez, Leiden/Boston 2009, 103–118
- TREVES, M., The Two Spirits of the Rule of the Community, RdQ 11 (1961) 449–452

- ULRICH, E. AND P. W. FLINT (eds.), *Qumran Cave 1. II: The Isaiah Scrolls. Part 1: Plates and Transcriptions* (DJD 32.1), Oxford 2010
- *Qumran Cave 1. II: The Isaiah Scrolls. Part 2: Introductions, Commentary, and Textual Variants* (DJD 32.2), Oxford 2010
- WALTKE, B. K. AND M. O'CONNOR, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, Winona Lake 1990
- WILLI-PLEIN, I., *Das Geheimnis der Apokalyptik*, in: EADEM, *Sprache als Schlüssel. Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Alten Testament*, eds. M. Pietsch and T. Präckel, Neukirchen-Vluyn 2002, 159–176
- WILLIAMS, A., *The Theological Significance of Dualism in the Three Times of Zoroastrian Eschatology*, in: *Zeit und Ewigkeit als Raum göttlichen Handelns. Religionsgeschichtliche, theologische und philosophische Perspektiven* (BZAW 390), eds. R. G. Kratz and H. Spieckermann, Berlin/New York 2009, 53–66
- WOLD, B. G., *Women, Men, and Angels. The Qumran Wisdom Document *Musar Le-Mevin* and its Allusions to Genesis Creation Traditions* (WUNT II.201), Tübingen 2005
- YARBRO COLLINS, A. AND J. J. COLLINS, *King and Messiah as Son of God. Divine, Human, and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature*, Grand Rapids /Cambridge 2008
- ZIEGLER, J. AND O. MUNNICH (eds.), *Susanna–Daniel–Bel et Draco* (Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum XVI.2), Göttingen 1999