



Faculty Publications

---

2011

## 4Q521 and What It Might Mean for Q 3–7

Gaye Strathearn

Brigham Young University - Provo, [gaye\\_strathearn@byu.edu](mailto:gaye_strathearn@byu.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/facpub>



Part of the [Christianity Commons](#)

---

### BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Strathearn, Gaye, "4Q521 and What It Might Mean for Q 3–7" (2011). *Faculty Publications*. 3514.  
<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/facpub/3514>

This Peer-Reviewed Article is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact [scholarsarchive@byu.edu](mailto:scholarsarchive@byu.edu), [ellen\\_amatangelo@byu.edu](mailto:ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu).



## 4Q521 AND WHAT IT MIGHT MEAN FOR Q 3-7

*Gaye Strathearn*

I am personally grateful for S. Kent Brown. He was a committee member for my master's thesis, in which I examined 4Q521. Since that time he has been a wonderful colleague who has always encouraged me in my academic pursuits.

The relationship between the Dead Sea Scrolls and Christianity has fueled the imagination of both scholar and layperson since their discovery in 1947. Were the early Christians aware of the community at Qumran and their texts? Did these groups interact in any way? Was the Qumran community the source for nascent Christianity, as some popular and scholarly sources have intimated,<sup>1</sup> or was it simply a parallel community? One Qumran fragment that

---

1. For an example from the popular press, see Richard N. Ostling, "Is Jesus in the Dead Sea Scrolls?" *Time Magazine*, 21 September 1992, 56-57. See also the claim that the scrolls are "the earliest Christian records" in the popular novel by Dan Brown, *The Da Vinci Code* (New York: Doubleday, 2003), 245. For examples from the academic arena, see André Dupont-Sommer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey* (New York: Macmillan, 1952), 98-100; Robert Eisenman, *James the Just in the Habakkuk Peshet* (Leiden: Brill, 1986), 1-20; Barbara E. Thiering, *The Gospels and Qumran: A New Hypothesis* (Sydney: Theological Explorations, 1981), 3-11; Carsten P. Thiede, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Jewish Origins of Christianity* (New York: Palgrave, 2001), 152-81; José O'Callaghan, "Papiros neotestamentarios en la cueva 7 de Qumrán?," *Biblica* 53/1 (1972): 91-100. None of these arguments has been embraced by the majority of scholars.

may provide an important window into this discussion is 4Q521.<sup>2</sup> Although a fragmentary text, it clearly describes the eschatological expectation of activities that are remarkably close to activities found in a hypothetical document known as Q, which scholars have (re)created from the gospels of Matthew and Luke. It identifies Jesus as the Coming One (*ho erchomenos*), the figure anticipated by John the Baptist who would “baptize . . . in [holy] spirit and fire” (Q 3:16).<sup>3</sup> In addition, the Coming One gives sight to the blind, makes the lame to walk, cleanses the lepers, heals the deaf, raises the dead, and preaches to the poor (Q 7:22). In 4Q521 we read of eschatological events that will take place at the coming of the messiah: the release of captives, opening the eyes of the blind, straightening out the twisted, healing the badly wounded, raising the dead, and proclaiming good news to the poor (4Q521 2 II, 8 and 12). Both Q 7:22 and 4Q521 are based on a particular messianic interpretation of Isaiah 61—a healing and preaching messiah—that was not a common Jewish expectation in the first century AD.<sup>4</sup> Prior to the discovery and publication of 4Q521, however, this interpretation seemed to be peculiar to the Christian tradition. 4Q521 challenges that assumption.

The similarities between the two texts have divided scholars over the importance of 4Q521 for the study of early Christianity. Thomas Hieke notes that “the role of the messianic figure in 4Q521 is doubtful and the relationship of Qumran texts to Q completely unclear.” For him, the value of 4Q521 is that it is “an important witness to the fact that certain texts and motifs from the Book of Isaiah are prolific and well-known in the discourse of Early Judaism.”<sup>5</sup>

2. Émile Puech, *Qumrân grotte 4, XVIII: Textes Hébreux (4Q521-4Q528, 4Q576-4Q579)*, DJD XXV (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 1-38.

3. All quotations from Q are taken from James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffmann, and John S. Kloppenborg, eds., *The Critical Edition of Q* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000).

4. The Masoretic Text (MT) of Isaiah 61:1 does not include “giving sight to the blind,” but the phrase is found in the Septuagint (LXX). In the MT “giving sight to the blind” is found in Isaiah 35:5 and Psalm 146:8.

5. Thomas Hieke, “Q 7,22—A Compendium of Isaian Eschatology,” *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 82/1 (2006): 179.

Frans Neirynck concludes that “it would be too rash a conclusion . . . to suggest that ‘New Testament writers’ may have known 4Q521.”<sup>6</sup> In contrast, however, James M. Robinson has mused that “the list of healings from Isaiah may not be original to Q for it is remarkably similar to the Qumran fragment 4Q521.”<sup>7</sup> John J. Collins has gone even further. He claims that the author of Q either knew of 4Q521 or “at the least . . . drew on a common tradition.”<sup>8</sup> Thus George J. Brooke correctly summarizes, “Whether we conclude that Jesus must have known of this tradition directly from a Qumran source or that it was mediated to him some other how, the details of the similarities are too great to be brushed aside.”<sup>9</sup>

In drawing these conclusions about 4Q521 and Q, however, none of these scholars seems to have appreciated the significance of the material in column III of 4Q521’s second fragment where, as Émile Puech has noted, there is fragmentary evidence for an expectation of the coming of an eschatological Elijah.<sup>10</sup> Therefore, 4Q521 and Q 3-7 share not only the expectation of a healing and preaching messiah, but also an interpretation of Malachi 4:5-6 (Heb. 3:23-24) that an Elijah figure would be associated with the coming of this messiah. In this paper I will suggest that this additional factor strengthens Collins’s conclusion that the author of Q either knew of 4Q521 or drew from common material. If it is the latter, however, we have no evidence for the common material. Therefore, I will argue that the Q community knew of 4Q521 and that therefore we

---

6. Frans Neirynck, “Q 6,20b-21; 7,22 and Isaiah 61,” in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*, ed. Christopher M. Tuckett (Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1997), 58.

7. James M. Robinson, “The Matthean Trajectory from Q to Mark,” in *Ancient and Modern Perspectives on the Bible and Culture: Essays in Honor of Hans Dieter Betz*, ed. Adela Yarbro Collins (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 131 n. 12.

8. John J. Collins, “The Works of the Messiah,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 1/1 (1994): 107.

9. George J. Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 262.

10. Émile Puech, “Some Remarks on 4Q246 and 4Q521 and Qumran Messianism,” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*, ed. Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 559-61.

are in a position to address the question of why John the Baptist plays such a prominent role in the first third of Q, a document primarily concerned with Jesus's sayings.

### The Prophet and the Messiahs in Qumran and 4Q521

Florentino García Martínez writes, “the large number of [messianic] references inserted in every kind of literary context, including legal contexts, testifies to its importance for the Qumran community.”<sup>11</sup> Although there is no monolithic messianic expectation, there was an expectation of more than one messianic figure. These figures are variously described performing both political and religious functions, liberating the community from the physical and spiritual oppression of its enemies, interpreting the law, acting as an eschatological judge, and providing an atonement.<sup>12</sup> In addition, one passage indicates that the community rules would be in force “until the coming of the prophet, and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel” (1QS IX, 11: *‘d bw’ nby’ wmsykyh yhrwn wysr’l*).<sup>13</sup> Thus, in conjunction with the messianic figures, we note the expectation of a prophet. Lawrence H. Schiffman interprets this phrase to mean that the two messiahs will be “announced by an eschatological prophet.”<sup>14</sup> This interpretation is in keeping with the position of *nby’*, which precedes the messianic construct in the sentence.<sup>15</sup>

11. Florentino García Martínez, “Messianic Hopes in the Qumran Writings,” in *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Florentino García Martínez and Julio Trebolle Barrera; trans. Wilfred G. E. Watson (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 189.

12. For a discussion, see García Martínez, “Messianic Hopes,” 161-89.

13. The original scribe apparently misspelled the word for prophet as *ny’*. The **נ** has been added above the line of the text. See James H. Charlesworth et al., eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1994), 1:40. The anticipation of the coming of a future prophet is also found in 1 Maccabees 4:46; 14:41.

14. Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their True Meaning for Judaism and Christianity* (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 324.

15. In this passage *mshykh* only has reference to Aaron and Israel and not to the prophet, although García Martínez believes that he was still a messianic figure (“Messianic Hopes,” 186-88).

Unfortunately, the text does not delineate more fully for us the functions of this prophet. There are, however, references in other Qumran materials that enhance our understanding of this figure. 11Q13 seems to describe an eschatological prophet who is identified as “the messenger” who is “anointed of the spirit” (11Q13 II, 15-19).<sup>16</sup> Although the text at this point is fragmentary, it is clear that the prophet’s role is to announce salvation, and the context implies that he will introduce the judicial action of the messianic figure, Melchizedek. Similarly, 4Q175 contains a pastiche of texts that the community interprets messianically, including Deuteronomy 18:18-19: “I would raise up for them a prophet from among their brothers, like you [i.e., Moses], and place my words in his mouth, and he would tell them all that I command them. And it will happen that the man who does not listen to my words, that the prophet will speak in my name, I shall require a reckoning from him” (4Q175 5-8).<sup>17</sup> Thus the prophet, who is associated in some way with Moses, acts as a mouthpiece for Yahweh on earth. In addition, this prophet in 4Q175 is specifically identified with a messianic figure who will destroy the enemies of the covenant people (4Q175 12-13, drawing on Numbers 24:17).

Although 4Q175 makes the association of the eschatological prophet with Moses, at least fragmentary evidence reveals that the Qumran community also looked for a prophetic Elijah figure. 4Q558 reads, “therefore I will send Elijah before . . . .”<sup>18</sup> which phrase clearly presupposes Malachi 4:5 (Heb. 3:23). The Masoretic text of Malachi reads, “Behold I will send the prophet Elijah to you before

16. The word *prophet* is not used in the extant text, but it has generally been accepted that the messenger refers to a prophet. See Marius de Jonge and A. S. van der Woude, “11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament,” *New Testament Studies* 12 (1966): 306-7; and García Martínez, “Messianic Hopes,” 186.

17. Unless noted otherwise noted, I have taken all scrolls translations from Florentino García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English*, trans. Wilfred G. E. Watson, 2nd ed. (Leiden: Brill, 1996).

18. Collins, “Works of the Messiah,” 106. See J. Starcky, “Les quatre étapes du messianisme à Qumran,” *Revue biblique* 70 (1963): 498.

the great and terrible day of the Lord comes” (cf. Sirach 48:10). The context for this verse is established by Malachi 3:1, “Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me [i.e., Yahweh].” Beth Glazier-McDonald has convincingly argued that the messengers in Malachi 3:1 and Elijah in Malachi 4:5 (Heb. 3:23) “are one and the same.”<sup>19</sup> She notes that Yahweh sent both individuals (*shlkh*), their arrival is near (*hnh*), and both of their missions are to prepare the people for the coming of Yahweh. We have already outlined the Qumran community’s expectation of an eschatological prophet in association with the messianic age. The relationship, if any, between the “prophet like Moses” and Elijah in the minds of the Qumran community is impossible to establish given the fragmentary nature of texts from Qumran, but what is important here is that they did anticipate a prophetic figure and that Malachi’s prophecy was known to them.<sup>20</sup> This concept from Qumran is important because Malachi’s prophecy is not commonly found in Second Temple literature, although the messenger becomes important for the Q community (Q 7:27).

We place 4Q521 within this messianic spectrum. The editor of this text, Émile Puech, paleographically dates it to the first quarter of the first century BC, although he notes that our present text is probably a copy of an earlier document.<sup>21</sup> He argues that its author was an Essene. Not all scholars agree with the attribution of the text to the Essenes, but Puech notes some thematic and verbal parallels with other Qumran material.<sup>22</sup> He gives two main reasons why these connections are not more numerous: (1) the fragmentary

19. Beth Glazier-McDonald, *Malachi: The Divine Messenger* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 263.

20. 4Q253a 1 I, 1-4 also includes a quotation from Malachi. Once again we are dealing with a fragment, but the quotation that precedes the promise of Elijah’s return is from Malachi 3:16-18.

21. Puech, *Qumrân grotte 4*, 36.

22. For an example of a scholar who does not believe that 4Q521 was an Essene document, see Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (New York: Penguin, 1997), 391.

nature of the text and (2) its origins within the first generation of the Qumran community before much of the characteristic theology had developed. Most important, for Puech, “the dual messianism attested in this scroll appears to recommend the allocation of the composition of this work to the Essene movement.”<sup>23</sup> The purpose of the text seems to be to encourage the pious to persevere because the messianic era and time of judgment were imminent.<sup>24</sup>

The largest fragment (fragment 2) contains three columns. The text of column II reads as follows:

- 1 [for the heav]ens and the earth will obey his Messiah,<sup>25</sup>
- 2 [and all] that is in them will not turn away from the  
commandments of the holy ones.<sup>26</sup>
- 3 Be encouraged, you who are seeking the Lord in his service!
- 4 Will you not, perhaps, encounter the Lord in it, all those  
who hope in their heart?
- 5 For the Lord will observe the devout, and call the just by  
name,
- 6 and upon the poor he will place his spirit, and the faithful he  
will renew with his strength.
- 7 For he will honor the devout upon the throne of an eternal  
royalty,
- 8 freeing prisoners, giving sight to the blind, straightening out  
the twisted.
- 9 Ever shall I cling to those who hope. In his mercy he will  
jud[ge,]

23. Puech, *Qumrân grotte 4*, 38.

24. Puech, *Qumrân grotte 4*, 38.

25. Puech suggests that the *mshykhw* could be read as a defective form of the plural (“Some Remarks on 4Q246 and 4Q521,” 554-55). I, however, have opted for the singular reading for two reasons: (1) because of the parallel with “his spirit” in line 6 and (2) because the standard plural form *mshykhyh* is found in one of the fragments, 4Q521 8 9. Florentino García Martínez, “Messianische Erwartungen in den Qumranschriften,” *Jahrbuch für biblische Theologie* 8 (1993): 182-83.

26. Although García Martínez has translated *qdwshym* as “holy precepts,” I have followed Puech in translating it as “holy ones” or saints (*Qumrân grotte 4*, 11).

10 and from no one shall the fruit [of] good [deeds] be delayed,  
 11 and the Lord will perform marvelous acts such as have not  
 existed, just as he sa[id]  
 12 for he will heal the badly wounded and he will make the  
 dead live, he will proclaim good news to the poor<sup>27</sup>  
 13 give lavishly [to the need]y, lead the exiled and enrich the  
 hungry.  
 14 [. . .] and all [. . .] (4Q521 2 II, 1-14)

The text then breaks off. Column III of fragment 2 continues as follows:

1 and the law of your favor. And I will free them with [. . .]<sup>28</sup>  
 2 . . .the fathers towards the sons [. . .]  
 3 who blesses the Lord in his approval [. . .]  
 4 May the earth rejoice in all the places [. . .]  
 5 for all Israel in the rejoicing of [. . .]  
 6 and his scepter. . .[. . .]  
 7 . . .[. . .]

Seven items should be noted with this text as we investigate its significance for Q. First, its messianic nature is established in the very first line of column II with the word *mshykhw*. My reading of the text is in contrast to that of Jean Durhaime, who believes that the first two lines represent the end of a passage on the messiah and the saints and thus infers that these lines are thematically distinct from what follows.<sup>29</sup> The paragraph break in the text may support

27. Although García Martínez has translated *‘nwym* as “meek” I have translated it as “poor,” which is the more common meaning.

28. Émile Puech originally restored the lacuna in context as follows: “And I will liberate them by [the word of your mouth (?) for] it is sure: “The fathers are going/ returning to the sons.” “Une apocalypse messianique (4Q521),” *Revue de Qumran* 60/15 (1992): 495; see Puech, “Some Remarks on 4Q246 and 4Q521,” 554. However, in his critical edition he leaves the lacuna blank but discusses the possibility of this restoration (*Qumrân grotte 4*, 19).

29. Jean Durhaime, “Le messie et les saints dans un fragment apocalyptique de Qumrân (4Q521 2),” in *Ce Dieu qui vient: Etudes sur l’Ancien et le Nouveau Testament*

this reading. However, there are more compelling reasons to see a coherency between the first two lines and the rest of the text. As Collins points out, any attempt to dissociate them “ignores the string of allusions to Psalm 146 in lines 1-9.”<sup>30</sup> Additionally, the suffix in *mshykhw* serves to link the first line to those that follow. Although we are limited by not having the text that preceded line 1, there is good reason to understand the suffix in reference to the *adonai* of lines 3, 4, and 11. In every instance where *mshykhw* is attested in the Hebrew Bible, the suffix refers to Yahweh.<sup>31</sup> Likewise, the only other definite example of *mshykhw* in the nonbiblical Qumran texts, 4Q377 2 II, 5, refers to Moses as the anointed of the Lord God of Abraham. In 4Q521 the author seems to have made a conscious effort to use *adonai* instead of the tetragrammaton because his sources in Psalm 147 and Isaiah 61 use the latter.<sup>32</sup> Puech suggests that this shift may reflect the author’s desire to avoid any misuse of the divine name.<sup>33</sup>

Second, the phrase *heaven and earth* in line 1 is probably a “figure of speech (merism) for the expression of ‘totality,’” as we find in the Hebrew creation story.<sup>34</sup> Although Puech and García Martínez translate the construct *shm<sup>c</sup> l* as “listen to,” it can also mean “obey” (Genesis 3:17; Judges 2:20; Exodus 15:26) and, given the parallelism with line 2, that seems to make better sense here.<sup>35</sup> Thus line 1, in

---

*offertes au Professeur Bernard Renaud*, ed. Raymond Kuntzmann (Paris: Cerf, 1995), 267.

30. John J. Collins, “A Herald of Good Tidings: Isaiah 61:1-3 and Its Actualization in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders*, ed. Craig A. Evans and Shemaryahu Talmon (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 235 n. 38.

31. See 1 Samuel 2:10; 12:3, 5; 16:6; 2 Samuel 22:51; Psalms 2:2; 18:50 (Heb. 18:51); and 20:6 (Heb. 20:7); 28:8; and Isaiah 45:1.

32. This is not a surprising development since the Hebrew Bible often links the two titles (e.g., Genesis 15:2; Deuteronomy 3:24; 9:26; Joshua 7:7).

33. Puech, *Qumrân grotte 4*, 36.

34. John Sailhamer, “Genesis,” in *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary with the New International Version of the Holy Bible*, ed. F. E. Gaebelin, 12 vols. (London: Pickering and Inglis, 1979-92), 2:23. See Puech, “Some Remarks on 4Q246 and 4Q521,” 555.

35. In French Puech uses *écouteront*, which can mean “listen to” or “hearken to” (*Qumrân grotte 4*, 11; “Une apocalypse messianique,” 486). In his English publication he used the phrase *listen to* (“Some Remarks on 4Q246 and 4Q521,” 553). See García Martínez, *Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, 394. Others who translate it as “obey” are James D.

essence, means that all things in heaven and earth (cf. Deuteronomy 10:14) will obey God's messiah. While "all things" certainly includes the notion of all people, it may also have broader connotations. Joel 3:15-16 indicates that this totality of "the heavens and the earth" also includes creations such as the sun, moon, and stars. We certainly have examples where the elements obey human directives (see Joshua 10:12-13; 1 Kings 17).

The third point concerns the debate over who performs the eschatological deeds in lines 7-13. Grammatically the subject is clearly *adonai*.<sup>36</sup> The question may be asked *how* God will accomplish these acts. Would he use a human agent?<sup>37</sup> Clear instances in the Hebrew tradition show where God's agents assume responsibilities normally associated with God.<sup>38</sup> Although Psalm 146:5-8, one of the biblical texts that stands behind 4Q521, does not mention any human agent, in the Septuagint of Isaiah 61:1 God specifically anoints his agent to proclaim good news (*bšr*) to the poor, bind up the brokenhearted, proclaim liberty to the captives, open the prison to those who are captive, and open the eyes of the blind.<sup>39</sup> In fact, in none of the attested uses of the verb *bšr* in the Hebrew Bible is God the subject.<sup>40</sup> Likewise, while it is clear that the power

---

Tabor and Michael O. Wise, "4Q521 'On Resurrection' and the Synoptic Gospel Tradition: A Preliminary Study," *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 10 (1992): 151; and Collins, "Works of the Messiah," 99.

36. Pace Tabor and Wise, "4Q521 'On Resurrection,'" 149-55. For a critique of their reconstruction, see García Martínez, "Messianic Hopes," 170.

37. Hans Kvalbein, "The Wonders of the End-Time: Metaphoric Language in 4Q521 and the Interpretation of Matthew 11.5 par.," *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 18 (1998): 87-88; and Collins, "Herald of Good Tidings," 234-35.

38. Cf. *Psalms of Solomon* 17:26; Isaiah 60. See also Edward P. Meadors, "The 'Messianic' Implications of the Q Material," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 118 (1994): 260.

39. Cf. also Isaiah 42:1-9, where God acts through an agent to give sight to the blind. Thus Hieke observes, "it is noteworthy that both Isaian texts [Isaiah 42:1-9 and 61:1] deal with an eschatological figure different from God who will bring the final redemption and salvation in the name of the Lord." Hieke, "Q 7,22," 180.

40. Tabor and Wise, "4Q521 'On Resurrection,'" 157-58. See also Collins's assessments: "It is surprising [in 4Q521] . . . to find God as the subject of preaching good news. This is the work of a herald or messenger" ("Works of the Messiah," 100), and "the suspicion arises that God is supposed to work through an agent here. Works

to heal the sick and raise the dead originates with God in Hebrew literature (cf. Psalm 103:2-3), he invariably uses a human agent to accomplish the task (see 1QapGen<sup>ar</sup> XX, 22-29; 1 Kings 17:17-23; Sirach 48:5; 2 Kings 5:1-15).

We must seriously consider the implication of this fact for our understanding of 4Q521. If it is acknowledged that God is often, or even usually, represented as performing his mighty deeds through a human agent, who is there in 4Q521 who could be that agent? Although it is possible that it may be the holy ones (*qdwshym*) in line 2, as we have already noted, the suffix attached to *mshykh* in line 1 already ties the messiah to *adonai* in the lines that follow. Therefore, I would argue, although the ultimate source of these eschatological deeds is clearly God, it is well within the realm of Hebrew religious tradition to see him acting through an agent, and the only agent mentioned in this text that makes sense is the messiah. The totality of the “heaven and earth” that obey the messiah would then include not just humans but also other natural elements. In this context it would also refer to humans along with their burdens, diseases, and afflictions.

Fourth, God, through his messiah, is the giver of life in 4Q521: “he will make the dead to live” or, as Puech translates it, “he will raise the dead.”<sup>41</sup> This attribution seems to be loosely based on Isaiah 26:19. Robert Eisenman translates the verb *khwh* as “resurrect.”<sup>42</sup> It must be noted, however, that the Hebrew gives no indication of whether the messiah would revive the dead to a state of mortality or immortality,<sup>43</sup> although fragment 5 of 4Q521 may support his

---

performed through an agent would, of course, be nonetheless the works of God” (“Herald of Good Tidings,” 234-35).

41. Puech, *Qumrân grotte 4*, 11.

42. Robert H. Eisenman, “A Messianic Vision,” *Biblical Archaeology Review* 17/6 (1991): 65.

43. The verb has the sense of “live,” “sustain life,” to be “revived,” or to “give life.” Ludwig Koehler, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann J. Stamm, eds., *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, trans. M. E. J. Richardson et al., 5 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1994-2000), s.v. חָיָה, 1:309-10.

translation. The text is fragmentary, but reads, “He [i.e., the Lord] shall open [graves ] and he shall o[pen (?) ] and [ ] and the Valley of Death in [ ] and the Bridge of the De[ep]” (5 II, 8-12).<sup>44</sup> It seems clear that the raising of the dead in this instance is associated with the judgment in Sheol and therefore with the resurrection.

That the messiah is associated with the resurrection is also not surprising. Other Hebrew texts, such as 2 *Baruch* 30 and 4 *Ezra* 7, indicate that the resurrection takes place during the time of the messiah, but in neither of these texts is there any indication that the messiah brings about the resurrection. In this aspect 4Q521 is unique. Some may argue that it is precisely this point that proves that 4Q521 describes the eschatological deeds of God rather than of the messiah. But the subject of healing the mortally wounded and causing the dead to live must be the same as the person who will bear good tidings to the poor, and these are the works of an agent. Also, as we noted above, God is never the subject of *bśr* in the Hebrew Bible. Therefore it is not only possible, but entirely likely that the immediate subject for the rest of the deeds in this line is also God’s agent. Again, we must acknowledge that the best candidate for that agent in this fragment is the messiah mentioned in 4Q521 2 II, 1.

Fifth, what does it mean that the messiah will “proclaim good news to the poor”? A similar phrase is found in the Hodayoth (i.e., the Thanksgiving Scroll found among the Dead Sea Scrolls), “herald of your goodness, to proclaim to the poor the abundance of your mercies” (1QH<sup>a</sup> XXIII, 14). But in 4Q521 the author is clearly indebted to Isaiah 61:1. Both the terms *proclaim good news* and *poor* are important for our investigation. *Bśr* means “to bring news.”<sup>45</sup> With the exception of 1 Samuel 4:17, in the Hebrew Bible, it denotes

44. English translation from *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader: Additional Genres and Unclassified Texts*, ed. Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 160–61.

45. Koehler, Baumgartner, and Stamm, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, s.v. בשר, 1:163–64.

good news.<sup>46</sup> In Isaiah 61 the good news is that Yahweh's anointed agent will "bind up the broken hearted, proclaim liberty to the captives and free those who are bound." In 4Q521 the good news is similar but is extended to include all the wonders that the Lord will perform through his messiah. Of course, the importance of Isaiah 61 to the messianic understanding at Qumran is not isolated to 4Q521.<sup>47</sup> We have already noted above the eschatological prophet mentioned in 11Q13. In this text, the prophet is described as a "messenger" (the nominalized form of *bšr*). His role, which is to "comfort the afflicted" and "watch over the afflicted ones of Zion," is substantively the same as the messianic activities described in 4Q521.<sup>48</sup>

Sixth, it is also significant that 4Q521, following Isaiah 61, designates the recipients of the message as *the poor*, a term that has already been used in 4Q521 2 II, 6 to describe the faithful.<sup>49</sup> In commenting on Isaiah 61:1, John L. McKenzie delineates the poor even further as "the devout core of the faithful."<sup>50</sup> Given the context of 4Q521, his description seems appropriate. The communal lifestyle of the Qumran community is well known, and the term *poor* seems to be a self-designation for the community (see 1QM XI, 7-9; XIV, 7-8; 1QH VI, 3).<sup>51</sup> Of course, the Qumran community was not the only group concerned with the poor. We have already noted that the poor are the recipients of the good tidings of Isaiah 61:1, but

---

46. For example, see Jeremiah 20:15, where it is used in parallel with *smkh* "to rejoice," and 2 Samuel 1:20, where it is used in parallel with both *smkh* and *'lz* "to exult."

47. Collins, "Herald of Good Tidings," 225-40.

48. See also *Psalms of Solomon* 11:1, where the "good news" is that "God has been merciful to Israel in watching over them," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Garden City: Doubleday, 1985), 2:661.

49. *'nwym* is in parallel with *'mwym*. The scrolls use two words to designate the poor: *'nwym* and *'bywn*. E. Bammel argues that in the Qumran texts "there is no clear distinction between the terms." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Friedrich (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968), 6:896-98.

50. John L. McKenzie, *Second Isaiah* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1968), 181.

51. Poor is also frequently used in the Hodayoth to describe the righteous (1QH<sup>a</sup> VI, 3; IX, 36; X, 32, 34; XI, 25; XIII, 13, 16, 18, 22).

they are also important in numerous other passages.<sup>52</sup> These passages specifically deal with Yahweh's concern for the poor, but they do not, as we have noted with the scrolls, use the term as a divine self-designation. In this respect the Qumran community seems to have the earliest attested use of *poor* in this way.

The dominating picture portrayed in fragment 2 column II is that God, through his messiah, will not only vindicate the righteous (lines 5-6), but he will also heal those who would have otherwise been denied access to any office in the community because of their physical deformities (1Q28a II, 3-9).<sup>53</sup> The difficulty with this reading in 4Q521 is that it is perhaps the earliest document we have that associates teaching and healing with the messiah. This position is in stark contrast to the messianic activities of battle and judgment found in other sources such as the *War Scroll* (1QM), 11Q13, Psalms of Solomon 17, 1 *Enoch* 37-71, 2 *Baruch* 39-40, and 4 *Ezra* 12-13. Yet it is precisely the combination of teaching and healing that give evidence in Q that Jesus was the Coming One (Q 7:22).

The final point of importance for our discussion moves away from the eschatological activities of God, through his messiah, in column II and focuses on the fragmentary text in column III. Here we have a clear reference to Malachi's prophecy that before the day of the Lord, Elijah will turn the hearts of the "fathers towards the sons [ . . . ]." While scholars generally recognize the importance of this line for understanding the messianic interpretation of the fragment, they disagree on the way that it should be interpreted. For example, Brooks argues that the anointed in column II "should be understood as *Elijah redivivus* and the text understood to be describing

52. For example, Psalms 40:17; 70:5; 86:1; 109:22; 112:9; Proverbs 13:7; 14:31; 17:5; 28:6; Isaiah 3:15; 14:32; 29:19; *Psalms of Solomon* 5:11; 15:1.

53. García Martínez, "Messianic Hopes," 169. Kvalbein has argued that the healings in line 8 were spiritual rather than physical ("The Wonders of the End-Time," 87-110). I agree, however, with Hieke's corrective: "It is doubtful whether the Isaian texts (as well as 4Q521) were always read only metaphorically: How is an eschatological renewal worthwhile, if there are still sick people, blind, deaf, lame? To read the eschatological promises 'only' as metaphors lets these powerful texts faint and sound rather cynical" ("Q 7:22," 178 n. 17).

how God will act through him, as he has done through Elijah in the past, including raising the dead.”<sup>54</sup> Collins also argues that the two columns refer to a single individual, but he indicates that there is no distinction between the prophet and the royal messiah. He claims that 4Q521 describes a single prophetic messiah possessing the combined traits.<sup>55</sup> Puech, however, argues that it refers to two distinct people, a new Elijah who announces the royal messiah.<sup>56</sup> Two points seem to favor Puech’s reading of two individuals. First, 1QS IX, 11 identifies a prophetic figure in distinction to other messianic figures. Second, 4Q521 8 9 contains a plural form of *mshykh* (*mshykyh*) and would seem to indicate two different figures. If this interpretation is correct, then 4Q521 may be our earliest evidence for positing a relationship between the messenger/Elijah mentioned in Malachi and the coming of the messiah.

### Editorial Activity in the Early Q Sections

We now turn to Q, which is a hypothetical document that scholars have (re)constructed. They have noted numerous verbal similarities between many of Jesus’s sayings in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke and suggest that these similarities can be explained if both gospels used a source that concentrated on the sayings of Jesus. The discovery of the *Gospel of Thomas* in the Nag Hammadi Library, which contains 114 sayings of Jesus with only limited narrative context, proves that some early Christians did indeed collect Jesus’s sayings.<sup>57</sup>

54. George J. Brooke, “Parabiblical Prophetic Narratives,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, 2 vols., ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam (Leiden: Brill, 1998–99), 1:277.

55. Collins, “Works of the Messiah,” 103–6. John S. Kloppenborg Verbin follows Collins and assumes that the messiah in 4Q521 is an Elijah figure. *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000), 123.

56. Puech, “Some Remarks on 4Q246 and 4Q521,” 559–60. See García Martínez, who argues that it refers to a royal or Davidic messiah (“Messianische Erwartungen,” 182–85).

57. For a detailed discussion on Q, see John S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987). While I have no problem accepting that a document such as Q existed and that it represents early

Even though Q consists primarily of a collection of sayings, numerous scholars have noted evidence of editorial activity.<sup>58</sup> Here we are interested specifically in the editorial activity evidenced in the reconstruction of the respective missions of John the Baptist and Jesus and their subsequent relationship to each other. In this editing we see the christianization of the title “the Coming One” in an effort to acknowledge the primacy of Jesus and thus attract John’s followers into the Q community.<sup>59</sup> In doing so it appears that the editor has drawn upon traditions that were already developed to some extent in 4Q521.

Q opens, after a possible unrecoverable incipit, with John the Baptist crying repentance in the wilderness (Q 3:7-9). He preaches repentance and predicts destruction for those who fail to return to their covenantal obligations—in this case, the terms of God’s covenant with Abraham. Receipt of the associated covenant blessing requires, for John, much more than familial bloodline. Rather it is one’s actions that qualify a person for either the covenant

---

attempts of Christians to record Jesus’s sayings, I do not accept many of the assumptions that scholars have developed from Q. For a perspective that cautions against some of these assumptions, particularly for a Latter-day Saint audience, see Thomas A. Wayment, “A Viewpoint on the Supposedly Lost Gospel Q,” *Religious Educator: Perspectives on the Restored Gospel* 5/3 (2004): 105-15.

58. Dieter Zeller, “Redactional Processes and Changing Settings in the Q-Material,” in *The Shape of Q: Signal Essays on the Sayings Gospel*, ed. John S. Kloppenborg (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), 116-30; Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*; Migato Sato, “The Shape of the Q-Source,” in *Shape of Q*, 156-79; Arland D. Jacobson, *The First Gospel: An Introduction to Q* (Sonoma: Polebridge, 1992); James M. Robinson, “The Sayings Gospel Q,” in *The Four Gospels, Festschrift for Frans Neirynck*, ed. F. van Segbroeck et al. (Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1992), 361-88. Latter-day Saints recognize that the Book of Mormon was created through the editing process of both Mormon and Moroni. Mormon tells us on a number of occasions that “a hundredth part of the proceedings of this people . . . cannot be contained in this work” (Helaman 3:14; see Words of Mormon 1:5; 3 Nephi 5:8; 26:6; and Moroni in Ether 15:33). In other words, they had to choose what to include and what to exclude. In addition, their direct editorial voice is seen in the Words of Mormon and 3 Nephi 5:12-13, and indirectly through statements such as “and thus we see” (e.g., Alma 12:21-22; 24:19; 28:14; 30:60; Helaman 3:28; 6:34; Ether 14:25).

59. Robinson, “Matthean Trajectory,” 149-54.

blessings or the corresponding curses for disobedience (Deuteronomy 27:14-28:6).

Yet it is clear in this Q pericope that John's mission does not include the carrying out of any punishments. Instead, the role of spiritual axeman belongs to another. Thus he declares: "I baptize you in water, but the Coming One (*ho erchomenos*) after me is more powerful than I, whose sandals I am not fit to take off. He will baptize you in [holy] spirit and fire. His pitch fork is in his hand, and he will clear his threshing floor and gather the wheat into the granary, but the chaff he will burn on a fire that can never be put out" (Q 3:16b-17). John's ministry is thus subordinated to that of the Coming One. The title is an interesting one because in the first century AD the Coming One was not normally a messianic title. Its only use in the Hebrew Bible is in Psalm 118:26a, where the immediate context shows that it refers to pilgrims to Jerusalem. However, Christians later reinterpreted Q in terms of an eschatological figure (Q 13:34-35), and Mark and John in terms of Jesus (Mark 11:9; John 12:13),<sup>60</sup> even though nothing in this Q text specifically identifies the Coming One with Jesus. David R. Catchpole argues that for the historical John the title referred to God who brings judgment upon the people,<sup>61</sup> but, as in 11Q13, in Q it may also have referred to the Son of Man, a supernatural agent of God's judgment.<sup>62</sup> In any case it is clear from this pericope that John's role is a subordinate

60. Robinson, "Sayings Gospel Q," 363.

61. David R. Catchpole, *The Quest for Q* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1993), 68, 239.

62. Catchpole, *Quest for Q*, 239. John's expectation of the Coming One as an agent of divine judgment may have been influenced by the Qumran community. See 4Q252 5 1-7, where the messiah is described as the messiah of righteousness and the expression that "[the thousands of Israel are 'the feet'" highlights the military context of the promised royalty (García Martínez, "Messianic Hopes," 162). See also 4Q161 3 18-22, where the "shoot of David . . . will rule over all the peoples and Magog [ . . . ] his sword will judge all the peoples." Perhaps the most compelling point from a conceptual, if not a linguistic, perspective is 1Q28b V, 20-29. In this text the "prince of the congregation" renews the covenant of the community (cf. John's role in Q 3:8) and strikes the people with the power of his mouth. "With your sceptre may you lay waste the earth. With the breath of your lips may you kill the wicked."

one, whether the Coming One referred specifically to God or to his agent. This passage, however, is the springboard for Q's later discussion on the significance of Jesus's ministry, which in Matthew is introduced by John's delegation asking Jesus, "Are you the Coming One (*ho erchomenos*)" mentioned in Q 3:16b, or should we look for another (Matthew 11:3)? Jesus's response recorded in Q not only defines his own mission, but also its relationship to John's.

First let us look at Q's description of Jesus's mission. "And in reply [i.e., Jesus] said to them: 'Go report to John what you hear and see: the blind regain their sight and the lame walk around, the skin-diseased are cleansed and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised and the poor are evangelized'" (Q 7:22). Rudolf Bultmann believed that this passage was "originally independent, and used by the community in the composition of an apophthegm."<sup>63</sup> But finding this passage in Q is somewhat surprising for a number of reasons. First, although not explicitly stated, our passage infers that Jesus is indeed the Coming One of Q 3, but not in the sense that John may have anticipated. Instead of an agent of judgment we find a miracle worker, and John S. Kloppenborg is correct to point out that "there is no indication that John expected a miracle-worker"<sup>64</sup>—hence Q 7:23, "And blessed is whoever is not offended by me." Second, related to the first, is the fact that we have listed here a number of miracles when Q is generally uninterested in miracles. This fact causes Robinson to muse that the passage "would have been more at home in the Σημεῖα [Semeia] Source used in the Gospel of John!"<sup>65</sup> Likewise Arland Jacobson frets over the fact that the "one type of miracle in Q linked to the manifestation of the kingdom is exorcism (Q 11:20)," and yet exorcism is not even mentioned in Q 7:22.<sup>66</sup> Third, this passage is a pastiche of Isaianic references associated with Isaiah's de-

---

63. Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, trans. John Marsh (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), 23.

64. Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 107.

65. Robinson, "Sayings Gospel Q," 364.

66. Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 112.

scription of the coming time of peace (Isaiah 61:1-2 LXX; 29:18-19; 35:5; 42:6-7), but which have been edited “with Jesus’ miracles in view.”<sup>67</sup> Therefore one is left to ponder why, in a document with so little interest in miracles per se, 7:22 is the defining passage in Q of Jesus as the Coming One.

Points such as these have led scholars to question the assumption that Q 7:22 represents a dominical saying of Jesus while little unanimity yet exists regarding its editorial history. Kloppenborg, who believes that Q 7:22 is a post-Easter editorial composition,<sup>68</sup> represents one end of the continuum, while at the other end Catchpole believes that “everything in this tradition [i.e., the Jesus/John pericope] *apart from* the six-fold list in Q 7:22 is Q editorial.”<sup>69</sup> However Catchpole’s position is not as definite as one might think from reading this statement. In a footnote, he does allow for some editorial work in Q 7:22 by admitting that “we cannot rule out the further possibility, even probability, that some of the actions listed are additions to the original list.” In particular, he identifies the phrases *lepers are cleansed* and *the dead are raised up*.<sup>70</sup> Jacobson agrees and argues that the raising of the dead “derives from the Jesus tradition rather than from Isa. 26:19.”<sup>71</sup> Kloppenborg cites the phrase *lepers are cleansed* as the primary reason for his post-Easter dating.<sup>72</sup>

In drawing these conclusions, however, none of these authors seems to be aware of 4Q521 (although in a later monograph Kloppenborg does refer to it).<sup>73</sup> Yet this fragment from Qumran provides some important insights into the issue at hand. Healing of the lepers is not part of the wonders expected during the Jewish eschaton, nor is it mentioned in Isaiah 61; its absence in 4Q521 may strengthen

67. Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 108; Robinson, “Sayings Gospel Q,” 363-65.

68. Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 107.

69. Catchpole, *Quest for Q*, 239, emphasis added.

70. Catchpole, *Quest for Q*, 239 n. 30.

71. Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 113.

72. Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 108.

73. His discussion here, however, does not address the impact of 4Q521 for his assessment of Q 7:22 as a postresurrection saying (Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 123).

both Cathchpole's and Kloppenborg's arguments that it represents an editorial element. On the other hand, 4Q521 forces us to reassess the editorial nature of raising the dead in this list of miracles.<sup>74</sup> I have argued here that 4Q521 had a tradition of a messiah raising the dead. The difference between Qumran and Q, however, is that while the Qumran community interpreted the phrase in terms of the eschatological resurrection, the Q and later Matthean communities interpreted it simply in terms of a revivification to mortality. This difference may indicate either of two positions: (1) the Q and Qumran communities were working from a common text that they interpreted independently, or (2) the Q community knew of 4Q521 and massaged it to fit their own circumstances since the resurrection does not appear to be theologically important for Q.

A case can be made for the latter of the two positions. In every other instance where Q quotes scripture it references a single passage.<sup>75</sup> In Q we find no other example of creating a scripture from a number of different passages,<sup>76</sup> a fact that makes Q 7:22 unique. Yet we find the creation of such a scriptural pastiche similar to that found in 4Q521. Given that the original of 4Q521 predates the first century BC, the direction of influence can only go one way. In addition, no other extant text that I am aware of combines the three characteristics of giving sight to the blind, raising the dead, and evangelizing the poor as a sign of the messianic kingdom. Giving sight to the blind and evangelizing the poor are based on either Isaiah 61:1 LXX or, possibly, a combination of Isaiah 61:1 and Psalm

74. So also Neiryneck, "Q 6,20b-21; 7,22 and Isaiah 61," 59.

75. Hieke notes, "obviously the Q community is deeply rooted in the knowledge and appreciation of Jewish Scripture. This becomes clear in detail in the temptation narrative (Q 4), where Jesus only quotes core sentences of Scripture, especially from the most important texts of the Torah, and does not say a single word of his own. There seems to be a great interest in the community responsible for the Q text to relate Jesus closely to well known parts of Scripture" ("Q 7,22," 177).

76. Q 4:4 = Deuteronomy 8:3 LXX; Q 4:8 = Deuteronomy 6:13a; Deuteronomy 10:20a LXX; Q 4:10-11 = Psalm 91:11-12 LXX; Q 4:12 = Deuteronomy 6:16 LXX; Q 7:27 = Exodus 23:20a-b or Malachi 3:1a LXX; Q 13:35 = Psalm 117:26 LXX.

146:8; but raising the dead is loosely based on Isaiah 26:19. Again, no other Hebrew text creates this particular pastiche of Isaianic, plus or minus Psalmic, passages, with the exception of 4Q521. This point cannot be overemphasized. Moreover, it seems clear that the message of Q is that when John identified the Coming One in Q 3, he was referring to a known prophetic figure.<sup>77</sup> The problem, however, is that no single place in the Masoretic Text anticipates someone with all the qualifications listed in Q 7:22. Although Isaiah 61:1 LXX is an important pretext, the closest text is 4Q521.

A close parallel text, however, does not necessarily prove dependence.<sup>78</sup> After all, the list of end-time wonders is not identical in both texts. Kloppenborg Verbin notes that “most of the items listed in Q 7:22 (except deafness and leprosy) [occur] in 4Q521.”<sup>79</sup> We have already noted above that the healing of the lepers is probably a later addition to Jesus’s list; but what of the other differences? It is strange that Kloppenborg Verbin does not also include lameness in the items not mentioned in 4Q521, and he does not include any explanation. The question is whether we can also understand the additions of deafness (*kōphos*) and lameness in terms of Q editing. In addition to the combined acts of giving sight to the blind, raising the dead, and evangelizing the poor, 4Q521 also includes acts of liberating the prisoners and straightening out the twisted. The concept of liberating the prisoners in 4Q521 2 II, 8 (*mtyr ʿswrym*) may come from Isaiah 61:1 (*lʿswrym pqh-qvḥ*), but the Hebrew is the same as that in Psalm 146:7 (*mtyr ʿswrym*), and raising up those who are bowed down clearly comes from Psalm 146:8. No immediate direct connection appears between these last two activities and the list in Q 7:22, but suggesting dependence requires an explanation of these apparent absences.

77. Robinson, “Matthean Trajectory,” 131. 4Q521, however, may suggest that the prophecy was extracanonical.

78. Neiryneck, “Q 6,20b-21; 7,22 and Isaiah 61,” 58.

79. Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 405 n. 72.

Let us examine the miracle of healing the *kōphos*. The Greek word *kōphos* can refer to someone who is deaf (Mark 7:37), mute (Matthew 15:31), or both.<sup>80</sup> In Q 7:22 the verb clearly indicates that the affliction is deafness rather than muteness. In addition, the stigma of being *kōphos* was sometimes associated with being possessed of a devil (Luke 11:14; Mark 9:25). This latter association is certainly how Matthew interpreted Q 7:22's phrase *the deaf hear*. In chapters 8 and 9 Matthew has brought together a number of miracles that serve as examples of each of the miraculous actions of the Coming One mentioned in Q 7:22. His example for "the deaf hear" is the miracle in Matthew 9:32-33. This interpretation does not work well in English, but in Greek both passages describe the man being *kōphos*. In this case the *kōphos* is specifically described as being "possessed of a devil" (*daimonizomenos*).<sup>81</sup> But how does this relate to 4Q521? 4Q521 does not have a corresponding passage about healing the deaf or casting out demons. Instead it has the phrase *liberate the prisoners*. Hieke speculates "whether Q might have contained such a sentence, since both, Matthew and Luke, had strong reasons to omit this aspect: According to both gospels, John the Baptist is imprisoned, and Jesus did not manage or even attempt to set him free."<sup>82</sup> If he is correct, then Q would have a very good reason to reinterpret this phrase in 4Q521. In addition, Edward P. Meadors has convincingly demonstrated that Q has reinterpreted liberating the prisoners as the casting out of devils. He points out a precedent for such an interpretation already in 11Q13 II, 1-13.<sup>83</sup> Is it just coincidence that Q is independently interpreting the liberating of captives as healing the *kōphoi*, or was the editor aware of 11Q13's interpretation and then applied the same interpretive framework to

---

80. Herodotus, *Histories* 1.34.

81. Here Matthew has incorporated healings from Mark's gospel to illustrate the healing capacities enumerated in Q 7:22. Linden E. Youngquist, "Matthew and Q" (PhD diss., Claremont Graduate University, 2003), 107-15.

82. Hieke, "Q 7,22," 181.

83. Meadors, "'Messianic' Implications," 262-63.

4Q521? It seems a logical step since in Q the casting out of devils is one of only two miracles mentioned (11:20). If so, then we can easily account for this discrepancy between 4Q521 and Q 7:22.

The phrase *straightening out the twisted* in 4Q521 is more problematic. Q may simply have taken the miracle of healing a lame man from Isaiah 35:6, but then we would again have to explain the pastiche approach to scripture that is otherwise not found in Q. If, on the other hand, Q 7:22 is dependent on 4Q521, then it must have reinterpreted the phrase about those who are twisted as the lame who are healed. I recognize that this interpretation is a tough sell linguistically because no specific connection exists between being lame (Heb. *pskh*, Gk. *chōlos*) and twisted (Heb. *kpp*). So why would Q reinterpret being twisted as being lame? Unfortunately, *kpp* does not have many attestations. In the Qumran texts, 4Q385 2 10 is the only other certain attestation where *kpwpyym* (straightening out) and *zwqp* (raising up) are found together, although it has been reconstructed in 4Q501 1 4. The context in 4Q385 is the restoration of Israel through the covenant, using the physical symbols of sight, connecting of bones and sinews, and covering with skin as metaphors for Yahweh's bestowal of life. The author then asks, "when will these things happen?" Unfortunately the text containing Yahweh's reply is fragmentary. All we can read for certain is the phrase *a tree will bend over and straighten up* (*ykp 'ts wyzqp*). The lacuna makes it difficult to determine how the author understood this phrase in the context of what preceded it. Five attestations of *kpp* occur in the Hebrew Bible (Psalms 57:6 [Heb. Psalms 57:7]; 145:14; 146:8; Isaiah 58:5; Micah 6:6). Some of these texts describe a state of sacral humility (Isaiah 58:5; Micah 6:6; Psalm 57:6) or distress/humiliation (Psalms 145:14; 146:8), but none of these uses is particularly helpful for understanding how Q could have interpreted it as the healing of the lame. But the Akkadian cognate *kapāpu* and the use of *kpp* in the Talmud suggests a broader semantic range that includes a physical, and not just an

emotional or spiritual, component.<sup>84</sup> Thus, although being used in a very figurative sense, Hebrews 12:12-13 associated the straightening of paralyzed knees (*paralelumena gonata anorthōsate*; the same Greek word used in Psalms 145:14; 146:8 LXX for *kpp*) with the healing of the lame. It is conceivable, therefore, that Q has reinterpreted the Hebrew *kpp* with the Greek *chōlos*.

But what would be Q's motivations for this interpretation? The simple answer is that it was not uncommon to combine the attributes of lameness (*chōlos*) with blindness (*tuphlos*).<sup>85</sup> If Q were to reinterpret any of the activities of 4Q521 as being lame, it would be "straightening out the twisted" (*zwqp kpwpyw*) because it immediately follows "giving sight to the blind" (*pwqkh 'wryw*) in line 8. The implication for my argument here is that the Q editor reinterpreted *kpp* as *chōlos* because he wanted to include Q's other miracle, the healing of the centurion's son, within the pastiche of Jesus's healing miracles. While not explicit in Q, this would assume that the Q editor understood the son's malady as associated with being *chōlos*. Matthew, "standing as he did in the Q heritage,"<sup>86</sup> seems to have shared this assumption in his editing of the Q miracle since his description of the son being a paralytic has a semantic range that includes being lame.<sup>87</sup>

In summary then, Q 7:22 is a pastiche of activities that the Q editor has used to interpret John's figure, the Coming One. Rather

---

84. *Kapāpu* can refer to a woman's bent nose; "*kapāpu*," in *Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, ed. A. Leo Oppenheim (Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1971), 8:175.

85. In LXX see Leviticus 21:18; Deuteronomy 15:21; 2 Samuel 5:6, 8; Job 29:15; Malachi 1:8. See also Matthew 15:30, 31; 21:14; Luke 14:13; 1QM VII, 4; 11Q19 LII, 10; Philo, *Questions and Answers on Genesis* 3:28.

86. Robinson, "Matthean Trajectory," 132.

87. Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, eds., *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*, 2 vols., 2nd ed. (New York: United Bible Societies, 1989), 1:273. Catchpole argues that "there is an underlying tradition historical relationship between the two stories [the healing of the Centurion's son in Matthew and the healing of the paralytic in Mark], even if not one of direct literary dependence." David R. Catchpole, "The Centurion's Faith and Its Function in Q," in *Four Gospels*, 520-21.

than being an agent of divine judgment, the Coming One is described in terms of his healing and preaching activities. As Kloppenborg notes, the title has clearly been infused “with specifically Christian content.”<sup>88</sup> Yet the editor’s reinterpretation of what it meant to be the Coming One is based primarily on an interpretation of Isaiah 61 that was unknown prior to the publication of 4Q521. In other words, our Q editor did not just fabricate the list in order to prove that Jesus was indeed the Coming One but seemed to be working from a tradition of messianic expectation that was already in place. The editor used that tradition, based on 4Q521’s interpretation of Isaiah and Psalms, to describe Jesus’s mission. We can understand both major Q editings of 4Q521, therefore, as a desire to incorporate both of the Q miracles within the pastiche of messianic activities that proved to the Baptist loyalists that Jesus was indeed the Coming One.

#### **4Q521 and the Mission of John the Baptist in Q 3**

But what of John’s mission? We have already noted that his mission of repentance was distinct from the mission of the Coming One. Yet the Q editor is very careful not to discard either the prophet or his mission. Rather, his place in the Q community is central to the first third of the document. Not only is John a prophet, but he is “more than a prophet” (Q 7:26) and one of the children of Wisdom (Q 7:35); “among those born of women there is none greater” (with the exception of Jesus, Q 7:28). He is also specifically identified as the messenger referred to in Malachi 3:1 (Q 7:27). These points have led Christopher M. Tuckett to conclude, “Much of this material probably had a complex pre-history behind it before it ever reached Q.”<sup>89</sup>

In recent years scholars have debated the Christian assertion here in Q and other synoptic passages that John the Baptist

88. Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 107.

89. Christopher M. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1996), 109.

is linked with Elijah. Morris M. Faierstein argued that there is no pre-Christian evidence that Elijah was considered to be a messianic forerunner. Rather, he notes, scholars relied upon later Rabbinic and Christian tradition and retrojected them into Second Temple Judaism.<sup>90</sup> Dale C. Allison, however, argues that Faierstein has gone too far. While the idea of Elijah as forerunner might not have been widespread, it was at least known in some quarters.<sup>91</sup> 4Q521 would seem to support Allison's position that, although not widespread, the idea was not original with the New Testament.

Why then was Q so interested in John as the Elijah forerunner? Kloppenborg and others have suggested that the editing of the first Q segment arose in an effort to "attract Baptist disciples into the Christian fold."<sup>92</sup> Rather than simply acknowledging John as the leader of his own religious group, Q 3-7 cleverly maintains his importance while at the same time subordinating him to Jesus; the Q community thereby allowed the Baptist disciples to join the Q community without losing face. In addition to this scenario, I would suggest that Q is also aware of a tradition from the Qumran community of a prophet associated with the messiah and used it to justify incorporating passages about John to fulfill that aspect of their messianic collage. The important parallels that we have noted between Qumran and Q suggest such a conclusion. If this is the case, then one further detail must also be explored. Qumran knew of more than one prophetic figure in association with the messiah. The more common is a "prophet like Moses" and then briefly a prophet in the mold of Elijah. If Q knew of the materials from the Dead Sea, then why did the editor prefer Elijah to Moses?

---

90. Morris M. Faierstein, "Why Do the Scribes Say That Elijah Must Come First?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100 (1981): 75-86.

91. Dale C. Allison, "Elijah Must Come First," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 103 (1984): 256-58.

92. Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 107; Robinson, "Sayings Gospel Q," 361-62; and Catchpole, *Quest for Q*, 61-62.

The key seems to lie in Malachi's description of Elijah's role and the substance of John the Baptist's message of repentance. Some scholars have understood Malachi 4:5-6 (Heb. 3:23-24) to be a later addition to the text,<sup>93</sup> perhaps referring to a dissolution of family life during the Hellenistic period.<sup>94</sup> Even if this is the case, another level of interpretation other than reconciliation within the nuclear family is possible. The term *fathers* can also be interpreted in relation to the covenant.<sup>95</sup> Throughout the Hebrew Bible the plural term *fathers* usually refers to ancestors—and the quintessential positive ancestors are Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who represent the covenant.<sup>96</sup> A return to these fathers represents a return to covenantal status.

This understanding of Elijah in Malachi is particularly appropriate given Elijah's confrontation with the priests of Baal on Mt. Carmel. As Elijah confronted the priests he turned to the people and challenged them: "How long halt ye between two opinions? if the LORD be God, follow him: but if Baal, then follow him" (1 Kings 18:21). Elijah's subsequent dialogue with the Lord shows that he understood his actions with the priests to be a matter of covenantal fidelity (see 1 Kings 19:10, 14). What is interesting is Elijah's prayer after his miraculous quashing of the priests of Baal, "O Yahweh, God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, let it be known this day that you are God in Israel, and that I am your servant, and that I have done all these things at your word. Answer me, Yahweh, answer me, that this people may know that you, Yahweh, are God, and that you have *turned their hearts back*" (1 Kings 18:36-37, emphasis added). Although acknowledging Yahweh's power, Elijah's actions that day sought to return the people to the covenant and thus they "turned

93. C. C. Torrey, "The Prophecy of 'Malachi,'" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 17 (1898): 7.

94. Glazier-McDonald, *Malachi: The Divine Messenger*, 254.

95. Andrew E. Hill, *Malachi: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 388.

96. See, for example, Genesis 48:15-16; Exodus 3:15-16; 4:5; Deuteronomy 1:8; 6:10; 9:5; 29:13; and 30:20.

their hearts back.” Although the word *turned* (*hsbt*) is different from that of Malachi (*hshyb*), the substance of the message is the same. Elijah was therefore the perfect choice for Malachi’s prophecy because he was already associated with the turning of hearts.

As we then move to consider why Q preferred the Elijah model over that of Moses, we are reminded of the substance of John the Baptist’s imploring with the multitude that they “bear fruit worthy of repentance and do not presume to say to yourselves, ‘We have as forefather Abraham!’” (Q 3:8). Jacobson argues that this passage is “probably a redactional addition, integrated into its context by picking up the theme of bearing fruit from Q 3:9.”<sup>97</sup> If he is correct, then Q’s editor is making a specific statement about John’s audience—that they refuse the call to repentance by “invoking national privilege,”<sup>98</sup> as epitomized in their appeal to their father Abraham. John’s original designation of his audience as a “generation of vipers” counteracts their claims to Abraham. They may well have been lineal descendants of Abraham, but spiritually they were not because their actions did not reflect such. John’s cry for repentance could therefore be understood as a cry for a spiritual turning back to Abraham.<sup>99</sup>

One wonders whether the Israelites in 1 Kings 18 reacted similarly to Elijah’s condemnation! The fact that Elijah specifically invoked “Yahweh, God of Abraham, Isaac, and all Israel” implies as much; otherwise the invocation would have been meaningless. Thus both Elijah’s and John’s audiences would have understood the importance of the figure of Abraham in their blood lineage, but neither group was acting as if the covenant of Abraham was the center of their lifestyle. Yahweh through Elijah turned the hearts of the Israelites back, and John the Baptist would do likewise through his

97. Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 82.

98. John S. Kloppenborg, “The Formation of Q and Antique Instruction Genres,” in *Shape of Q*, 145.

99. The Hebrew behind the Greek *metanoia* is *shuv*, the same word used for “turning” in Malachi 4:6 (Heb. 3:24).

cry of repentance. The Q editor could therefore play on this scenario by portraying John as a prophet like Elijah.

### Conclusion

It is not, I think, happenstance that in the editorial process the Q editor has incorporated themes that we have noted in relationship to Qumran and specifically 4Q521—that is, the portrayal of a healing and preaching messiah who is associated with a prophetic Elijah figure. Dieter Zeller reminds us that “no OT quotations refer to a wonder-working and preaching messiah,” and yet we find here two communities drawing on such a tradition.<sup>100</sup> Similarly, Faierstein and Allison remind us that no widespread pre-Christian tradition associated Elijah with the messiah, and yet we here find these same two communities drawing on such a tradition.<sup>101</sup> Two possibilities for these occurrences avail themselves. Either both communities were dependent on an otherwise unknown common tradition, or the Q community knew of the Qumran tradition found in 4Q521. If the former, then it seems that these two communities preserve the only attestation to such a tradition. In this paper, I have argued for the latter. Thus Q 7:22 does not represent a direct interpretation of Isaiah, specifically Isaiah 61:1, but an editing of 4Q521’s reinterpretation of Isaiah and Psalms.

Josephus informs us that the Essenes were not exclusive to Qumran but dwelled in every city.<sup>102</sup> Presumably that included Galilee, where it would have been possible for them to come into some kind of contact with the Q community.<sup>103</sup> Both the Essenes and the Q community had an understanding of a healing and preaching

100. Zeller, “Redactional Processes,” 123 n. 32.

101. Faierstein, “Why Do the Scribes?” 75-86, and Allison, “Elijah Must Come First,” 256-58.

102. Josephus, *War* 2.8.4.

103. It seems clear that other New Testament authors were familiar with teachings from the Qumran community. James H. Charlesworth, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historical Jesus,” in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 1-74.

messiah. Although we have noted the similarities of healing the blind and especially raising the dead and evangelizing the poor, I have argued that we can understand some of the other differences as a Q editing of 4Q521. In addition to the parallels mentioned, the relationship of the form of Q 7:22 to the scrolls is also significant. The Q editor has clearly gathered together a collection of miracles and activities from a number of Isaianic passages and brought them together as a peshet to show their fulfillment in Jesus. This is an unusual editorial activity for Q but one that is common in the scrolls. Finally, we also see both texts associating an Elijah-type prophetic figure with the messiah—something that is difficult to support from other contemporary Jewish texts. 4Q521, therefore, should be viewed as another source on the trajectory from nascent Jewish messianism to the Christian development of Jesus as the Messiah.

*Gaye Strathearn is associate professor of ancient scripture at Brigham Young University.*