

SUPPLEMENTS
TO THE
JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY
OF JUDAISM

Editor

JOHN J. COLLINS

The Divinity School, Yale University

Associate Editor

FLORENTINO GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ

Qumran Institute, University of Groningen

Advisory Board

P. ALEXANDER - J. DUHAIME - A. HILHORST - P.W. VAN DER HORST
A. KLOSTERGAARD PETERSEN - M.A. KNIBB - J.T.A.G.M. VAN RUITEN
J. SIEVERS - G. STEMBERGER - J. TROMP

VOLUME 72



RESTORATION

Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives

EDITED BY

JAMES M. SCOTT



BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON · KÖLN
2001

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Scott, James M. :

Restoration : Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives / ed.

by James M. Scott. – Leiden ; Boston ; Köln : Brill, 2001

(Supplements to the journal for the study of judaism ; Vol. 72)

ISBN 90-04-11580-3

Library of Congress Cataloging-in Publication data

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is also available.

ISSN 1384-2161
ISBN 90 04 11580 3

© Copyright 2001 by Koninklijke Brill nv, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

*Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill nv provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910
Danvers MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.*

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Preface	ix
Abbreviations	xi

INTRODUCTION	1
------------------------	---

FORMATIVE PERIOD

Restoration in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic Literature . . .	11
J. G. MCCONVILLE, Cheltenham & Gloucester College of Higher Education	
Restoration Expectations in the Prophetic Tradition of the Old Testament	41
KONRAD SCHMID AND ODIL HANNES STECK, Universities of Heidelberg and Zurich	
"Mind the Gaps": Ezra, Nehemiah and the Judean Restoration . . .	83
LESTER L. GRABBE, University of Hull	

GRECO-ROMAN PERIOD

"Exile" and "Restoration" in the Conceptual World of Ancient Judaism	107
SHEMARYAHU TALMON, Hebrew University	
From the Idealized Past to the Imaginary Future: Eschatological Restoration in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature	147
DAVID E. AUNE WITH ERIC STEWART, University of Notre Dame	
The Davidic Messiah in Jewish Eschatology of the First Century BCE	179
JOHANNES TROMP, Leiden University	
The Concept of Restoration in the Dead Sea Scrolls	203
LAWRENCE H. SCHIFFMAN, New York University	

- Restoration in Josephus 223
 LOUIS H. FELDMAN, Yeshiva University

FORMATIVE JUDAISM

- Trajectories of Return, Restoration and Redemption in Rabbinic
 Judaism 265
 CHAIM MILKOWSKY, Bar-Ilan University

- Some Notions of Restoration in Early Rabbinic Prayer 281
 STEFAN C. REIF, University of Cambridge

- Ezra in Rabbinic Literature 305
 GARY G. PORTON, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

- Temple Restored, Temple in Heaven: Isaiah and the Prophets in the
 Targumim 335
 BRUCE CHILTON, Bard College

EARLY CHRISTIANITY

- Jesus, the Twelve, and the Restoration of Israel 365
 JOHN P. MEIER, University of Notre Dame

- The Geography of Restoration: Galilee-Jerusalem Relations in Early
 Jewish and Christian Experience 405
 SEAN FREYNE, Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland

- The Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts 435
 RICHARD BAUCKHAM, University of St. Andrews

- "And then all Israel will be saved" (Rom 11:26) 489
 JAMES M. SCOTT, Trinity Western University

- Jewish-Christian Chiliastic Restoration in Pseudo-Clementine
Recognitions 1.27-71 529
 F. STANLEY JONES, California State University, Long Beach

- Indices 549

THE DAVIDIC MESSIAH IN JEWISH ESCHATOLOGY OF THE FIRST CENTURY BCE

Johannes Tromp
Leiden University

INTRODUCTION

Since the first century BCE, Palestinian Judaism knew the concept of a descendant of the family of David who would in the future appear on the political stage to assume power and establish a kingdom of righteousness, holiness and peace in Jerusalem.¹

A well-known example of texts expressing this expectation is *Psalm of Solomon* 17, but other texts are witness to its existence, too; 4Q161; 4Q174; 4Q252 and 4Q285 should be mentioned among the older examples. Obviously, the Jewish expectation of a son of David is most of all expressed in Christian texts. However, although early Christian authors were happy to suggest that Jesus was the fulfillment of everything pious Jews had always hoped for, namely the Messiah (e.g., Luke 2:25-26), this suggestion was only partially true at the most.

The expectation of a future son of David, sent by God to rule as king, was not an isolated phenomenon, but part of a complex of ideals about the future of Israel as brought about by God. This complex may be called "Jewish eschatology."² This complex should not be

¹ On the absence of this concept before the first century BCE, cf. J. J. Collins, "Messianism in the Maccabean Period," in J. Neusner, et al. (eds.), *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987) 97-109; K. E. Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism. Its History and Significance for Messianism* (Early Judaism and its Literature 7; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1995). A different view, assuming an unbroken continuity of messianic expectation in the exilic and post-exilic period, is consistently elaborated by A. Laato, *A Star is Rising. The Historical Development of the Old Testament Royal Ideology and the Rise of Jewish Messianic Expectations* (International Studies in Formative Christianity and Judaism 5; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997) 240-42, 285-89.

² From a traditio-historical point of view, concepts about the individual life after death should be clearly distinguished from this political or cosmic

designated as "messianism," as was usual until the inappropriateness of this term was realized.

The term "messianism" suggests that a person called Messiah would in some way have to be part of the eschatological future, a necessary tool in God's hand for the salvation of Israel. However, the study of Jewish literature in the Greco-Roman era has shown beyond doubt that in many eschatological designs God could use other tools to that end, or no tool at all.³ Essential to Jewish eschatology (and distinguishing it from earlier forms of prophecy) is only the exclusively divine nature of the expected salvation: what was needed, the definitive restoration of righteousness, holiness and peace, could not be achieved by, or even with the aid of, any living human being. Humanity was too far gone to be able to produce improvement by itself.

However, it cannot be ignored that the idea that God would bring a son of David to royal power in Jerusalem did in fact exist, at least from the first century BCE. The following pages are devoted to the question of when and how this idea was formed.

Many scholars have traced the origin of the concept back to Babylonian and early Persian periods. The fall of Jerusalem and the Davidic dynasty in 587 BCE would have caused a desire for the restoration of both, but when the hope for the restoration of an idealistically conceived Davidic kingship failed to be fulfilled, it was projected into the future.⁴ The new aeon, a concept thought to have

eschatology; cf. N. Spineto, "L'escatologia nel mondo classico," *Annali di storia dell' esegesi* 16 (1999) 7-20 (esp. 19-20).

³ M. Smith, "What is Implied by the Variety of Messianic Figures?" *JBL* 78 (1959) 66-72; M. de Jonge, "The Use of the Word 'Anointed' in the Time of Jesus," *NovT* 8 (1966) 132-48.

⁴ This brief summary does no justice to the often much subtler arguments of, e.g., R. H. Charles, *A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity, or Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian Eschatology from Pre-Prophetic Times Till the Close of the New Testament Canon* (London: Black, 1899) 106; E. Schürer, *Die Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* (3 vols.; 4th ed.; Leipzig: Hinrich, 1907) 2.583-90; S. Mowinkel, *He That Cometh* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1956) 155-56; D. S. Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic* (London: SCM, 1964) 181-83; A. Laato, *A Star is Rising*, 236-40; S. Talmon, "The Concepts of *Māšīah* and Messianism in Early Judaism," in J. H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992) 79-115.

been perhaps developed under Iranian influence, was welcomed as a time to locate the anticipated fulfillment of the prophecies.⁵

However, the commonly assumed origin of Davidic messianism in the sixth century BCE is inconsistent with the rejection of "messianism" as an adequate term for Jewish eschatological expectation. It suggests that there was an originally intrinsic relationship between the expectation of a future Davidic king and Jewish eschatology, after all. Moreover, in this explanation the family (David), the titles (Messiah, king), and the functions (restore righteousness, holiness and peace) of this particular expectation form an organically coherent concept: the expectation of the Davidic Messiah as the royal saviour in the eschatological future. This organic coherence makes it difficult to explain how in the sixth century such a hope would emerge from the catastrophe, afterwards go underground for several centuries, and then reemerge practically intact in the first century BCE. At the same time, parts of the concept can be observed in the intermediate centuries: in eschatological scenarios kings of unspecified family relations may occur; officers other than kings may fulfill the functions mentioned; also some of the Messiah's tasks may not be the object of future expectations, but may be claimed to actually be exercised in a particular author's own time.⁶

It can be argued that these isolated elements represent alterations and transformations of an original hope for a son of David to return to the throne in Jerusalem.⁷ Furthermore, these variants may well have existed side by side with the original concept itself, even if there are no clear traces of the continuation of the idea after the fall of the Davidic dynasty. Finally, it may be that the silence of our sources about the expected Davidic Messiah is due to coincidence or even the

⁵ E.g., Charles, *A Critical History*, 122-23; 135-36; Schürer, *Geschichte*, 2.587; Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, 271; Russell, *The Method and Message*, 264-71.

⁶ J. J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1995) 20-48, has rightly described these facts as a problem, traditio-historically speaking. I disagree, however, with his claim that first-century-BCE Jewish ideology was "predominantly shaped by scriptural traditions" (p. 41). See further section 1, below.

⁷ P. Sacchi, "Messianismo e apocalittica," *Quaderni di Vita Monastica* 46 (1987) 14-38 = "Messianism and Apocalyptic," in idem, *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990) 150-67.

result of a process of selection by the collectors and editors of the books of the Hebrew Bible. However, these are no less than three hypotheses which have to be set up to make the supposition of a sixth-century origin of the idea possible.

My alternative solution would be that the idea of a son of David expected to be sent by God as king in the eschatological future is the relatively late (second or first century BCE) result of a combination of various, originally unrelated ideas.⁸ The stages of the amalgamation leading to the concept would be: (1) the general phenomenon of eschatological expectation, occurring in the Hellenistic world at large; (2) the expectation of a king as a specification of this eschatology; (3) the adaptation of the expectation of a future king to the local Judean situation, by describing him in the traditional terms used for the ideal ruler; (4) the (possibly) simultaneous association of the future ideal king with the image of David as the ideal king from the past. I shall now discuss these four elements.

ESCHATOLOGY

The first element necessary in reconstructing the origin of the expectation of a Davidic king is the emergence of eschatology in general.⁹ The origins of the eschatological frame of mind are obscure. On the one hand, it has often been traced back to Iranian influence.¹⁰ However, sources bearing witness to Zoroastrian eschatology in this period are virtually absent,¹¹ whereas Jewish eschatological texts begin to emerge only several centuries after Persian political dominance. On the other hand, eschatological concepts were well developed in classical Greece, and from the third century onwards, the Hellenes

⁸ So also Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition*, esp. 169-70.

⁹ With this entire section, compare M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus. Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jh.s v. Chr.* (3rd ed.; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1988) 330-57.

¹⁰ See W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter* (HNT 21; 3rd ed., revised by H. Gressmann; Tübingen: Mohr, 1926) 506-15, and the authors cited in n. 4 above.

¹¹ The few relevant passages, all dating to the Imperial Roman period, which might reflect Zoroastrian eschatology, are discussed in A. F. de Jong, *Traditions of the Magi: Zoroastrianism in Greek and Latin Literature* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 133; Leiden: Brill, 1997) 324-30.

may have done much to further this line of thinking among the cultures in their sphere of influence.¹²

For the present purpose, it has to suffice to say that in many corners of the Hellenistic world, an awareness existed that this world was in a bad state, and quickly deteriorating.¹³ The rulers were unrighteous, warfare was increasing, good and decent people were becoming rare, crops were failing, the weather was becoming unpredictable, in short, everything changed, and changed for the worse. Moreover, it was thought that the bad state of the world was the result of a process over the generations. That is, it was perceived as a development through history, which could not be stopped and which would end in catastrophe. Because the process is thought to stretch over the generations, the situation is beyond human repair. The divinity (or, for instance in early Stoic thought, the same necessity that also causes the world's deterioration) must finally act to restore its creation to its original splendour.

It would seem to me that the strictly heavenly orientation of eschatology, ruling out any human initiative as well as any actually existing person as a restorer, distinguishes it from prophecy, insofar as prophecy is concerned with the divinity's *ad hoc* involvement in everyday politics. The real orientation toward the future distinguishes it from the *vaticinia ex eventu*, from which it is otherwise practically indistinguishable.

A prime example of the phenomenon under discussion is *Jub.* 23:11-31 (early second century BCE). In this passage a rapid decline of humankind since the flood is described. Whereas the ancients still lived for nineteen jubilees (that is, for 950 years), the life expectancy of men has since then decreased because of their wickedness (*Jub.* 23:9). This process of deterioration apparently took on a momentum of its own, for even Abraham, who "was perfect in all his dealings with the Lord," did not live to see four complete jubilees (23:10). Since then, life expectancy has dropped to less than two jubilees, or seventy years, eighty at the most (23:11, 15); moreover, the greater part of human life is filled with misery (23:13). The deterioration of the world, which comes to its all-time low in what is probably the

¹² T. F. Glasson, *Greek Influence in Jewish Eschatology, with Special Reference to the Apocalypses and Pseudepigraphs* (London: SPCK, 1961) 1-7.

¹³ See A. O. Lovejoy and G. Boas, *Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1935) 23-102.

author's own age, is said to have been caused by the people's low morality (23:9, 16-21; it should be noted that the author inconsistently applies a schema which is valid for all humanity to the Jewish people in particular). At the same time, however, the generally prevailing and increasing wickedness is also presented as a symptom of the general decline (23:13-14, 16-21).

The Lord will finally punish the people to a point that there is no more salvation (23:24), while old age is reached after as few as three weeks (23:25). At this point the situation seems beyond repair. However, as often in Jewish eschatological scenarios, there are a few people who find the right path.¹⁴ In *Jub.* 23:26 children are predicted to "begin to study the laws." From that moment on, the situation will improve: people will grow to live for a thousand years again, and there will be no more need for Satan, the accuser in the heavenly courtroom (23:27-28).¹⁵ At that time, "the Lord will heal his servants" (23:30).

The description of the utterly desperate state of the Lord's people can be compared with many similar texts in the OT. Often such descriptions form part of complaints, either by prophets renouncing the king's and the people's wickedness (e.g., Isa 3:5; 24; Jer 9:1-10; Mic 7:2-6; Zech 14:13; cf. Isa 19:1-15), or in prayers addressed to God, in which the despair is vividly depicted to move God to mercy (e.g., Ps 58:2-6; 79:1-4; Lamentations). Also similar are Egyptian texts, in which times of chaos and destitution are depicted.¹⁶

However, none of these outwardly similar texts share the eschatological orientation of *Jubilees* 23, which interprets the misery of human life not as the result, for instance, of mismanagement by a certain bad ruler, but as the result of a deterioration process beginning immediately after the flood, and inexorably moving over the generations toward the absolute low point, when God, in reaction to the

¹⁴ Cf. *Assumption of Moses* 9.

¹⁵ The absence of Satan can be understood as a symbol of the righteousness of humankind, which fits the context of *Jubilees* 23 better than understanding Satan as an evil, contriving adversary of the Lord. In *Jub.* 10:11, Satan is presented as a punisher of mankind, in the Lord's service.

¹⁶ See J. Assmann, "Königsdogma und Heilserwartung. Politische und kultische Chaosbeschreibungen in ägyptischen Texten," in D. Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean world and the Near East. Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1983) 345-77.

faithfulness of a small body of people, will finally restore the situation to as it was before the process of degradation began.

The view on history as a fateful process leading to the total corruption of an originally perfect creation frequently occurs in Jewish literature and lies at the basis of many Jewish texts of eschatological content. In texts such as Dan 2; 7; *1 Enoch* 93:1-10 + 91:11-17; 2 *Baruch* 53-74, history is divided into four or more periods. In common with other texts, such as *1 Enoch* 83-90 and *Assumption of Moses* 2-9, which do not use this clear periodization, they present history with a generally downward tendency. Even if in some of these examples allowance is made for a number of upturns in the downward tendency of history (*Assumption of Moses* 4; in 2 *Baruch* 53-70, history is presented as an alternation of bright and black waters), the end is nonetheless total disruption (*Assumption of Moses* 7-9; 2 *Baruch* 68-70).

The idea that when the downfall of humanity in terms of moral and prosperity is complete, something will happen to restore the world to its original glory, is also known from non-Jewish literature. The idea of the world's deterioration and its restoration by the deity is elaborately discussed in Plato's *Politicus* 268c-274e.¹⁷ The myth is presented as "child's play" (*Politicus* 268c)¹⁸ and likewise, the concept of the return of the golden age may be used half in jest in Virgil's *Eclogue* 4 (referring to "the Cumaean hymn," that is, a Sibylline prophecy). In a fifth-century comedy by Crates, the return of the golden age is parodied.¹⁹ Nonetheless, all three passages are witness to the existence of the idea.

The golden age and the world's deterioration are described in Hesiod, *Works and Days* 107-201. The description resembles that of *Jubilees* 23 to such an extent, that it can be safely assumed that these images were widely known in the Hellenistic world (although it is less likely that the author of *Jubilees* was literarily dependent on

¹⁷ Lovejoy and Boas, *Primitivism*, 156-59.

¹⁸ Cf., however, A. Capelle, *Platos Dialog Politikos* (diss., Hamburg University, 1939) 29-31.

¹⁹ Crates, *Beluae*, preserved in Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 4.267e-268a; cf. Lovejoy and Boas, *Primitivism*, 39-40; H. J. de Jonge, "BOTPYC BOHCEI: The Age of Kronos and the Millennium in Papias of Hierapolis," in M. J. Vermaseren (ed.), *Studies in Hellenistic Religions* (EPRO 78; Leiden: Brill, 1979) 37-49.

Hesiod).²⁰ Hesiod did not say that the golden age would return, but it is obvious that it was understood to come back by many. In this context, the Epicurean and Stoic doctrines of the reconstitution of the cosmos after its decomposition or conflagration have the appearance of reflecting or even rationalizing popular ideas; it may at least be said that the philosophical *topos* on the question of whether the world was eternal or finite, must eventually be rooted in common beliefs.²¹ The notion that degeneration and recomposition formed a cyclical process may be a secondary development, legitimized, if not invented, by the early Stoic philosophers,²² and combining the idea of a new age with astronomical calculations.²³

For the purpose of the present argument, it is important to conclude that Jewish eschatology did not emerge as the result of the disappointment at the Davidic dynasty's failure to return. Jewish eschatology should rather be interpreted as a specific variant of a phenomenon occurring in the Hellenistic Near East in general. The observation that Jewish eschatology was unrelated in origin to the figure of the son of David easily explains why there are so many Jewish eschatological texts in which no king features, and why the son of David emerges only in relatively late eschatological texts. Jewish eschatology is not the eventual outcome of the loss of the Davidic dynasty. Instead, the inclusion of a royal figure into the complex of eschatological expectations is best considered as a secondary specialization of the general concept of future restoration.

²⁰ For the suggestion of literary dependence on Hesiod, see Glasson, *Greek Influence*, 4.

²¹ F. G. Downing, "Cosmic Eschatology in the First Century: 'Pagan,' Jewish and Christian," *L'Antiquité Classique* 64 (1995) 99-109.

²² J. Mansfeld, "Providence and the Destruction of the Universe in Early Stoic Thought," in Vermaseren (ed.), *Studies*, 129-88.

²³ Cf. R. van den Broek, *The Myth of the Phoenix According to Classical and Early Christian Traditions* (EPRO 24; Leiden: Brill, 1972) 67-112. W. Clausen, *A Commentary on Virgil, Eclogues* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994) 131, comments that in the *Fourth Eclogue* Virgil does not imagine the return of the golden age as part of a cyclical process, "but a state of constant felicity, a world endlessly redeemed."

THE KING IN ESCHATOLOGICAL SCENARIOS

The conclusion of the preceding section leads to the question of what induced a number of authors to look forward to a king in the ideal future.

It should be noted, first of all, that a future king features in a non-Jewish eschatological text before such a king is mentioned in Jewish texts, namely the third-century-BCE Demotic Chronicle, in which a native Egyptian king is prophesied to end the foreign rule over Egypt.²⁴ The presence of this figure is not surprising, because kingship and the land were traditionally closely related in Egypt, and the subjection of the land to successive foreign dynasties can plausibly be seen as a reason for expecting a native royal figure. Moreover, there seems to have been a tradition in Egypt of *vaticinia ex eventu*, in which prophets are alleged to have foretold the advent of a king ending a state of utter societal despair.²⁵ These prophecies may have served as a model for composing eschatological scenarios (as in the case of the Demotic Chronicle).

The emergence of a royal figure in Jewish eschatological texts can, to a certain extent, be regarded as an analogous phenomenon. If it is true that Jewish eschatological scenarios which include a royal figure date to the first century BCE at the earliest, it is tempting to assume a connection with the fact that, from ca. 100 BCE onwards, the Hasmonean high priests had themselves called kings. Further substantiation of this assumption might be seen in the observation that in the second century BCE, a number of Jewish eschatological texts include, not a king, but a priest as the ruler of the future ideal situation.²⁶

²⁴ See, e.g., J. G. Griffiths, "Apocalyptic in the Hellenistic Era," in Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism*, 273-93 (esp. 279-83); also Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*, 337-38.

²⁵ J. Assmann, "Königsdogma und Heilserwartung"; see also H. Ringgren, "Akkadian Apocalypses," in Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism*, 379-86.

²⁶ On the early importance of an eschatological priest, see M. de Jonge, "The Role of Intermediaries in God's Final Intervention in the Future according to the Qumran Scrolls," in O. Michel, et al. (eds.), *Studies on the Jewish Background of the New Testament* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1969) 44-63 = *Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Collected Essays of Marinus de Jonge* (NovTSup 63; Leiden: Brill, 1991) 28-47; see also J. C. VanderKam, "Jubilees and the Priestly Messiah of Qumran," *RevQ* 13 (1988) 353-65 = idem, *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature* (JSJSup 62; Leiden: Brill, 2000) 462-75.

The exact nature of the eschatological leader's office would then reflect the actual situation of the period in which a particular concept within the complex of eschatological images arose.²⁷

One consequence of this line of thought should be considered, however, before it can be definitively embraced. It assumes that there is a geometrical congruence between the actual situation and the desired situation, in the sense that the desired situation would be, as it were, the perfectly mirrored situation of the present. This seems to imply that eschatological texts including a political figure must always be assumed to have been written by people who were in political opposition to the people who were concretely in power.

That this is indeed the case, seems obvious, on the one hand, from such texts as *Psalm of Solomon* 17, which is commonly taken to have been written in opposition to the Hasmonean rulers of Judea (cf. *Ps. Sol.* 17:4-6).²⁸ This opposition may well have "led to the emergence of an interpretation of the davidic dynasty tradition in terms of an ideology of renewed davidic kingship."²⁹

On the other hand, there are texts which suggest that matters are more complicated. In *Assumption of Moses* 6, the regime of king Herod and his successors is fiercely rejected. However, the main reason why the author believed that God must finally intervene is the total moral degradation of Judea's leaders in general, as described in *Assumption of Moses* 7. In *Assumption of Moses* 9, it is even clearer that the author regarded his society as a whole to be corrupt to the bone (9:3). In many other texts, eschatological or not, it can be observed that references to bad leaders are made in order to suggest the utterly desperate state of society as a whole (see, e.g., Ezek 22:25-29;

²⁷ This is the argument of, e.g., H. H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic: A Study of Jewish and Christian Apocalypses from Daniel to the Revelation* (2nd ed.; London: Lutterworth, 1947) 25-28.

²⁸ The *Psalm* is usually dated to shortly after Pompey's invasion of 63 BCE. A somewhat later date was proposed by K. Atkinson, "Herod the Great, Sosius, and the Siege of Jerusalem (37 B.C.E.) in *Psalm of Solomon* 17," *NovT* 38 (1996) 313-22. In "The Sinners and the Lawless in *Psalm of Solomon* 17," *NovT* 35 (1993) 344-61, I have argued that here not the Hasmoneans, but the Romans are in view, and have denied the possibility of a more precise dating than that of the Roman era. However, this is less important for the matter presently under discussion.

²⁹ Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition*, 167.

Mic 3:11; Zeph 3:3-4; As. Mos. 5:4-6).³⁰ In the same *Psalm of Solomon* 17 it appears that the deplorable state of Jerusalem politics is not presented as the cause of the problem, but as a part of it (*Ps. Sol.* 17:15, 19-20).³¹

These considerations prevent us, I think, from understanding the ideal future too strictly or concretely as the reversal of the present.³² Whereas it makes perfect sense to say that God must send a king to replace the present one, if one objects to the actually ruling king, it might still make good sense to include such a figure in one's projection of the ideal future, if one is speaking in a more general way of the present as thoroughly immoral.

In that case, the image of the ideal king as it features in a number of eschatological scenarios might simply be part of the traditionally envisaged ideal situation, projected into the future. The presence of a king in such scenarios may have to be explained more on a tradition-historical and literary level, than as the direct consequence of concrete political opposition against particular rulers. This explanation by no means rules out that the actual situation as perceived by an author played a role in the way in which he envisaged the ideal future. However, it is unlikely that eschatological thinking as such was triggered by the rejection of a particular ruler or dynasty. Instead, the rejection of a ruler or ruling class (with or without the expectation of an ideal ruler in the future) should be seen as a feature of an author's negative assessment of society as a whole. In any case, there seems to be no originally intrinsic connection between the expectation of an ideal king in the future, and a native Judean tradition about the return of the Davidic dynasty.

THE IMAGE OF THE IDEAL RULER

If it is true that the concept of an eschatological king, sent by God to end a period of utter misery, was included in certain Jewish circles as a specification of eschatological thinking in general, it should be added that this frame of mind and the concomitant concepts came to

³⁰ J. Tromp, *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary* (SVTP 10; Leiden: Brill, 1993) 186-87.

³¹ J. Tromp, "The Sinners and the Lawless," 352.

³² Cf. E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *Prophets of Old and the Day of the End: Zechariah, the Book of Watchers and Apocalyptic* (OTS 35; Leiden: Brill, 1996) 263-65.

function within an existing culture with its own particularities. That is to say, eschatology and its specific expectations were not imported and simply added to the already available set of traditions and concepts, but integrated into it, and dressed in a distinctively local garb, thereby receiving its particular character of *Jewish* eschatology.

This process of appropriation and internalization resulted in texts that are of a similar nature, and use comparable concepts as their counterparts in other cultures of the Hellenistic world, but which are nonetheless unmistakably Jewish. Obviously, the God who is expected to intervene in history is expected to act on behalf of his own Judean people. This is a truism, but in less obvious ways too, the integration of eschatology in the wider Hellenistic cultures with Jewish tradition, resulting in a genuinely Jewish specimen of this worldview, is observable. Mention can be made of the eschatological interpretation of traditional Israelite themes such as the Day of the Lord, which could now be understood as the day of the final judgement. The portrait of the ideal ruler in the eschatological future can also be observed to have typically Judean traits.

Psalm of Solomon 17 contains the most extensive pre-Christian Jewish description of a son of David expected to assume power in the future.³³ It follows a description of the present situation in Jerusalem, which is characterized by the tyrannical, murderous rule of illegitimate, non-Davidic kings, as well as by the sinfulness and criminal behaviour of the inhabitants of Jerusalem themselves (17:1-20). In the prayer for a son of David to be king in Jerusalem, God is asked to create the king to smash the sinners and their arrogance and free the city from foreigners (17:21-25); next, that he may rule over a righteous people, purified from sin, and holy (17:26-29); that he may subdue the nations and gather the dispersed (17:30-31); and bring about a peaceful and safe existence for the people under his rule, on account of the Messiah's and the people's trust in God (17:32-43).

The future envisaged in this prayer reflects the author's ideas about the perfect society. Peace, righteousness and holiness are the characteristics of the world in which he would like to live. These themes are very much reminiscent of other depictions of the ideal society ruled

³³ For a comparison of *Psalm of Solomon* 17 and other messianic texts with the Qumran fragments mentioned above, see M. A. Knibb, "Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 2 (1995) 165-84; K. Atkinson, "On the Herodian Origin of Militant Davidic Messianism at Qumran: New Light from *Psalm of Solomon* 17," *JBL* 118 (1999) 435-60.

by a good king. The exact wording in which the desired situation is phrased clearly derives to a great extent from ancient royal ideology.³⁴ Several terms and concepts appear to have been taken from OT passages concerning the perfect king, the foremost being Isa 11:1-5.³⁵

It is possible that the author of *Psalms of Solomon* 17 in fact quoted or purposely edited the Isaianic passage; the passage is explicitly quoted and interpreted in the Isaiah peshet (4Q161).³⁶ Alternatively, the terms and concepts of Isa 11:1-5 and other passages may have been part of a living oral tradition, and handed down independently of the book of Isaiah. This possibility, rather than that of literary dependency, more easily explains the variance with Isa 11:1-5 and the concluding lines of that prophecy in vv. 6-9, the omission of certain attractive images occurring in that passage, as well as the presence of certain elements which cannot have been derived from it.

That the tradition of the image of the ideal ruler is not only a matter of creative reading in the psalms and prophets, but of an ongoing, living practice, can be concluded from the following instances, in which particular rulers are praised by prophets or other court officials as the ideal rulers.

Cyrus

In the Deutero-Isaianic *ex eventu* prophecies about Cyrus of Persia, use is made of the image of the ideal ruler formerly applied to the kings of Jerusalem.³⁷ The traditional Judahite image is part of a more

³⁴ Cf., for instance, H. Gressmann, *Der Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie* (FRLANT 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1905) 250-70; Mowinkel, *He That Cometh*, 21-95; A. Laato, *The Servant of YHWH and Cyrus: A Reinterpretation of the Exilic Messianic Programme in Isaiah 40-55* (ConBOT 35; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1992) 47-65.

³⁵ G. L. Davenport, "The 'Anointed of the Lord' in Psalms of Solomon 17," in G. W. E. Nickelsburg and J. J. Collins (eds.), *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism* (SBLSCS 12; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1980) 67-92 (esp. 72, 89-90); cf. L. Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted: The Formation of Some Jewish Apocalyptic Texts and of the Eschatological Discourse Mark 13 par.* (Lund: Gleerup, 1966) 99-101.

³⁶ Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition*, 197-203.

³⁷ On the Jerusalem origin of Deutero-Isaiah, see for instance the concise argument in P. R. Davies, "God of Cyrus, God of Israel: Some Religio-Historical Reflections on Isaiah 40-55," in J. Davies, et al. (eds.), *Words Remembered, Texts Renewed: Essays in Honour of John F. A. Sawyer* (JSOTSup 195; Sheffield: JSOT, 1995) 207-25 (esp. 210-15). However, the dating of Deutero-Isaiah to the second half of the fifth century (K. Baltzer, *Deutero-Jesaja* [KAT 10.2;

general Near Eastern view on ideal kingship, but the authors of the Deutero-Isaianic prophecies had no need to resort to foreign models (as one might be tempted to conclude from the parallels with the so-called Cyrus-cylinder),³⁸ and the properly Judahite character of this image is apparent from the bestowal of the term "Messiah" to Cyrus (Isa 45:1). It is unlikely that Cyrus had ever been anointed as a king, either of Anshan, Babylon or Jerusalem. Therefore, the term, which can be paraphrased as "Yahweh's authorized agent," must be taken figuratively, designating the gift of power along with the assignment of Yahweh.³⁹

In the entire region, "shepherd" (Isa 44:28) is a very usual designation of a king, or more generally, the people's leaders, as in, e.g., Ezekiel 34; cf. 2 Sam 5:2; 7:7.⁴⁰ The image of the shepherd symbolizes the good care which the ideal king takes of his people (his "flock"), especially of the weakest among them (Isa 42:7); for the good care the ideal king takes of his people, see Ps 72:4, 12-14.

God is said to have taken Cyrus by the right hand (Isa 45:1). This is an image of care and protection, as is shown by a Phoenician inscription (mid-eighth century BCE) in which the Danunian vizier Azitiwada boasts: "I grasped the *MSKBM*" by the hand, and they behaved (towards me) like an orphan towards (his) mother" (*KAI* 24:13; cf. Isa. 42:6).

Gütersloh: Mohn, 1999] 57-59; cf. Davies, "God of Cyrus," 216-23) in my opinion fails to explain why someone would want to talk about Cyrus in this magnifying way a century after his appearance.

³⁸ M. Smith, "II Isaiah and the Persians," *JAOS* 83 (1963) 415-21 = S. J. D. Cohen (ed.), *Studies in the Cult of Yahweh*. I. *Studies in Historical Method, Ancient Israel, Ancient Judaism* by Morton Smith (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 130.1; Leiden: Brill, 1996) 73-83.

³⁹ E. Kutsch, *Salbung als Rechtsakt im Alten Testament und im Alten Orient* (BZAW 87; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1963) 61; cf. K. Elliger, *Deuterjesaja*. I. *Teilband. Jesaja 40,1-45,7* (BKAT 11.1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978) 492.

⁴⁰ In the OT, "shepherds" usually refers to the collective ruling class"; see Elliger, *Deuterjesaja*, 476. See further G. Wallis, "הִנֵּנִי," *TWAT*, 7.566-76 (esp. 570-75).

⁴¹ An otherwise unknown group of people in this region; see J. C. L. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions* III. *Phoenician Inscriptions* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982) 35, 37-38.

The Lord has called Cyrus by name (45:3, 4).⁴² In itself, the phrase "to call someone by name" has no royal connotations. When a high-placed person (or god) calls a more lowly placed person by his or her name, the speaker expresses an interest in the exact person of the addressee and his or her specific qualities which the speaker might want to bring into action for his or her intentions (Exod 31:2; 33:12, 17; Esth 2:14). In this instance, the phrase refers to Cyrus as being selected by Yahweh to fulfill specific divine plans, and is equivalent to בחר, "to choose."

For Cyrus, the gates of the cities to be ruined will be no obstacle; God himself will open them (cf. Amos 1:5; Mic 2:13; Hab 1:10). The gods are often depicted as the effective authors of a king's victories. Mesha, king of Moab, ascribed everything he accomplished to Kamosh's command and assistance; it is said, for instance, that he was able to take the town of Yahas from Omri because Kamosh "drove him out before me" (KAI 181:19). Azitiwada continuously mentions that everything he did was on command, and by the grace, of Baal and the gods (KAI 26 *passim*).

Finally, it should be noted that in further oracles that might be dealing with Cyrus, Deutero-Isaiah has also used local traditions other than those connected with the pre-exilic dynasty. The announcements of a king from the East (41:2, 25) are usually found in oracles of doom, but are here transformed into the prediction of the benevolent king Cyrus.⁴³ The comparison of Cyrus with a bird of prey (46:11; cf. Jer 12:9; Ezek 39:4) confirms that the author is recontextualizing traditional announcements, so that the reuse of originally Davidic-royal language for a foreign king can be seen as part of the author's strategy.

Deutero-Isaiah was not written in order to honor Cyrus. It is entirely written in praise of Yahweh, and even allows for being read as a defense of the traditional Jerusalemite deity against reproaches of

⁴² Cf. the Mesopotamian parallels in A. Laato, *A Star is Rising*, 16-18.

⁴³ In Isa 41:25, the author alternates, apparently for variation's sake only, between East and North as the direction from which a conqueror, presumably Cyrus, was expected, making use of quasi-mythological language to refer to actual events; cf. K. Koch, "Die Stellung des Kyros im Geschichtsbild Deuterjesajas und ihre Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Verankerung," *ZAW* 84 (1972) 352-56.

inactivity and inadequacy.⁴⁴ The gods of Babylon have fallen before Cyrus (46:1), but it is Yahweh, and none other (*passim*), who has been using the Persian king as his instrument.⁴⁵

Therefore, the authors have a clear reason for depicting Cyrus in traditional, Judahite terms for kingship, including that of messiah. The foreign king is woven into the local fabric of royal ideology, consciously substituted for the home-bred, Davidic kings, and equipped with honorific predicates stressing Yahweh's sovereignty in choosing and guiding rulers.

This example shows that the ideas and concepts of Judahite royal ideology could be transferred to foreign rulers of Jerusalem, who were not at all of Davidic descent. Cyrus is depicted as God's ideal ruler in the same terms that had been used for the descendants of David. Even the specifically Judahite term "Messiah" was used to designate him, albeit metaphorically. Naturally, no terms or traditions were used that were exclusively characteristic of the Davidides, such as Nathan's prophecy (2 Samuel 7).

The following example confirms that the image of the ideal ruler was not a matter of written texts from the past, but rather a living, meaningfully functioning tradition.

The Levites

In the early-second century BCE, priests effectively, if not nominally, ruled Jerusalem.⁴⁶ In *Jub.* 31:13-17, divine promises are made to Levi

⁴⁴ This understanding of, e.g., Isaiah 45 is suggested by reading v. 15 (contrasted with v. 19) as a reproach on behalf of Judahites: "Nonetheless, you are a hidden god, Saviour God of Israel," which might be paraphrased as follows: "We do not notice much of your salvational activities, Yahweh," that is, as opposed to those of Cyrus and his gods (cf. the equally defensive passages Isa 40:27; 42:14; 43:12). To counter this attack, Yahweh is presented as Cyrus's god, even though Cyrus does not know Yahweh (45:4-5). Compare H. M. Barstad, *A Way in the Wilderness: The "Second Exodus" in the Message of Second Isaiah* (JSSM 12; Manchester: University of Manchester, 1989) 65-66; Laato, *The Servant of YHWH*, 170.

⁴⁵ The concept that the God of Israel uses foreign kings as his instruments is not uncommon (cf., e.g., Jer 43:10 MT; more specifically involving Cyrus: Jeremiah 51 MT).

⁴⁶ Cf. D. Goodblatt, *The Monarchic Principle: Studies in Jewish Self-Government in Antiquity* (TSAJ 38; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1994) 6-28.

and his offspring, which set the Levites apart as the rulers, judges and teachers of Israel.⁴⁷

Several elements in this blessing refer to functions that are naturally priestly. They include teaching the law, acting as judge and blessing the people (*Jub.* 31:15). The administration of justice is a task equally attributed to kings. Moreover, Levi and his descendants are called "rulers" (*Jub.* 31:15).⁴⁸ In a portion of the *Aramaic Levi Document*, preserved in a Greek translation in manuscript *e* of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, and related to the book of *Jubilees*, the priestly rule is explicitly called "kingly rule" (cf. 1Q21 i).⁴⁹

The royal characteristics attributed to the Levites in this passage must be related to the actual position the priests had in early-second century Jerusalem. This impression is confirmed by the immediately following blessing for Judah (*Jub.* 31:18-20). This blessing is not only much briefer than that of Levi, but the concluding words of both blessings are practically identical (compare *Jub.* 31:20 with 31:17). These concluding words are derived from Deut 33:11, Moses' blessing of Levi, so that it appears that terms associated with the tribe of Levi came to be used for the rulers from the tribe of Judah as well. The simplest explanation for this is to assume that for an author who had no memory of other Israelite rulers than priests for centuries, the concept of kingly rule was coloured to an extent by the model of priestly rule.

The blessing of Levi and Judah in *Jubilees* is a *vaticinium ex eventu* of both the royal and the priestly rule of Jerusalem. The "prophecy" concerning Judah has been fulfilled: there have indeed been kings from the tribe of Judah. That there are no more such kings in the time of the author is not made explicit. However, it is not said either that Judah's kingship will last forever. This stands in strong contrast to Levi's priesthood, which is said no less than four times to be eternal. It is clear that the author envisages a continuous priesthood from Levi up to his own time and forever more. In other words, the priesthood

⁴⁷ M. de Jonge and J. Tromp, "Jacob's Son Levi in the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and Related Literature," in M. E. Stone and T. A. Bergren (eds.), *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998) 203-36.

⁴⁸ My comments on VanderKam's rendering *malā'kt* as "leaders," in De Jonge and Tromp, "Jacob's Son Levi," 211-12, were entirely unjustified.

⁴⁹ Cf. Goodblatt, *The Monarchic Principle*, 44-49.

described in Isaac's blessing of Levi is the priesthood which is actually functioning in the author's time.

From *Jubilees* 31 it can be concluded that the traditional language in which kings used to be praised, could be transferred to those actually in power. The priests have in fact adopted many of the duties usually performed by kings, and in the description of the ideal priest several traditionally royal characteristics have been adopted. This passage, therefore, is an instance of the ongoing tradition of the praise of rulers, adapted to the fact that in the time when *Jubilees* was written, priests in effect wielded supreme secular power in Jerusalem.

The Hasmonean Simon

The conclusions reached so far in this section are confirmed by the image of the Hasmonean high priest Simon in 1 Maccabees 14. This writing, composed shortly after 135 BCE, depicts the age of Simon as a time of perfect bliss.

Entirely in line with the praise of Near Eastern despots,⁵⁰ 1 Macc 14:4-15 begins, after briefly mentioning his contribution to the well-being of the people in general (v. 4), with an enumeration of Simon's achievements in the domain of international politics: he is said to have made important territorial conquests and many prisoners of war⁵¹ (vv. 5-7). Next comes a more detailed description of the peace he brought to his country as a result of its enemies' fear of him (vv. 8-13). The phrasing of the nation's welfare is reminiscent of old salvation oracles.⁵² Simon is furthermore said to have supported the poor, to have been faithful to the law, and to have destroyed sinners (v. 14). Almost as an afterthought it is finally mentioned that he added to the temple's splendor and to the number of holy vessels (v. 15).

In sum, Simon is most of all described as a ruler (compare also the "people's decree" in 1 Macc 14:27-47). The author is well aware that he was a priest. In the context of 1 Maccabees, his purification of the land (14:7) and his dedication to the law (14:14) are unmistakable ref-

⁵⁰ Cf. the (self-)praise of petty princes in KAI 24, 26, 214, 215; and the parallels discussed in E. Blumenthal and S. Morenz, "Spuren ägyptischer Königsideologie in einem Hymnus auf den Makkabäerfürsten Simon," *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 93 (1966) 21-29.

⁵¹ Or: "brought many back from captivity"; so F.-M. Abel, *Les Livres des Maccabées* (Paris: Lecoffre, 1949) 251.

⁵² Cf. D. Arenhoevel, *Die Theokratie nach dem 1. und 2. Makkabäerbuch* (Mainz: Matthias Gruenewald, 1967) 62-66.

erences to the temple's centrality for the Jewish society.⁵³ Nonetheless, he has chosen to present Simon's achievements foremost as those of a political and military ruler. According to 1 Maccabees 14, the high priest's attention to the temple was no greater or smaller than that of princes and kings, to whom he is compared in the first place. This reflects the political reality of the Hasmonean period, in which the high priests were the sovereigns of Judea. Consequently, the praise of the ideal ruler, once related to the kings of Israel and Judah, was here transferred to Simon, their effective successor.

This laudatory description of Simon is a perfect example of the casual transfer of royal praise to the one actually in power, even if he happens to be a priest. Simon's priestly duties hardly come into view in this passage, and even the remark about his munificence towards the temple is traditionally more appropriate of a king-benefactor than of the king's cultic employees, which is what priests in the age of the Davidic dynasty used to be.

Zerubbabel

Lack of space prevents inclusion of a thorough discussion of the problematic figure of Zêrubbabel, the governor of Judah on behalf of the Persian king, in this section. Zerubbabel is adduced by many as an example of post-exilic Davidic messianism. However, as has been argued by K. E. Pomykala, Zerubbabel was neither a Davidide,⁵⁴ nor called a Messiah.⁵⁵ Moreover, the passage which is often read as a depiction of an ideal messianic future, Hag 2:20-23, should more likely be read as another example of courtly praise.

The terms in which Haggai phrases the imminent grandeur of the governor of Judah are well-known from the general ancient Near Eastern royal ideology, including that of pre-exilic Judah. God will move heaven and earth (Ps 18:7; Hag 2:6), overthrow the rule of kingdoms (Isa 13:19; cf. Ps 2:8-9; 21:9; 46:9-10; 110:5-6; Jer 51:20), defeat their cavalry (Exod 15:1; Ps 76:6; Isa 31:3; Jer 51:21), and

⁵³ For "zeal for the law" (1 Maccabees 2) as a specifically priestly quality, see Num 25:11-13; Ps 106:30-31; Wisd 18:20-25; Sir 45:23-24; *Jub.* 30:18; Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 1.56-57; cf. Exod 32:27-29; Deut 33:9.

⁵⁴ This is the claim of 1 Chr 3:19 only, and the Chronicler is likely to err in this instance; see J. M. Miller and J. H. Hayes, *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah* (London: SCM, 1986) 456; Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty*, 46-53.

⁵⁵ Cf. Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition*, pp. 53-60.

choose his servant Zerubbabel as his signet-ring, that is, his deputy on earth (Jer 22:24; cf. Ezek 28:12).

All this boils down to a brief, but traditional oracle to a current ruler,⁵⁶ to whom great glory is promised in the (near) future; the promise is conditioned by Zerubbabel's reconstruction of the temple.⁵⁷ This passage does not imply that Zerubbabel was a royal figure, but shows that the courtly rhetoric originally belonging to kings could be transferred to a high-ranking official of the Persian king (so far as the Jerusalemites were concerned, the immediate representative of the king himself), who filled in for the king in one of the latter's most important duties: building and maintaining temples and cults.⁵⁸

In this section, it has been argued that the pre-exilic courtly rhetoric of the king as the ideal ruler was continued in the Persian and Hellenistic period and, with all due modifications depending on circumstances, applied to the actual rulers: the Persian king, or the local high priests. This continuing tradition was unrelated to any expectation of an ideal king in the future, even to kingship at all, not to mention the family of David. Instead, if a Jewish author included a future king in his eschatological scenario, he portrayed him in the image of the ideal ruler as it existed in his own time.

JEWISH ESCHATOLOGY AND A SON OF DAVID

Both in the courtly praise of an actual ruler, and in the description of a ruler to be sent by God in the eschatological future, the portrait which the author draws is that of an ideal ruler. Therefore, both portraits, different from each other as they may be in their authors' intentions, are naturally likely to resemble each other. As the polity of Jerusalem changed through the centuries, and the status of the holders of power changed with it, the courtly praise of the rulers is seen to have been adapted to the demands of the circumstances. Thus, it is easily understood that, for instance in *Jubilees* 31, royal characteristics were

⁵⁶ Ibid., 47-49.

⁵⁷ Cf. R. A. Mason, "The Purpose of the 'Editorial Framework' of the Book of Haggai," *VT* 27 (1977) 413-27. I am less inclined than Mason to sharply distinguish between the oracles of Haggai himself and the editorial framework.

⁵⁸ Cf. Laato, *A Star is Rising*, 196-200.

attributed to the priesthood,⁵⁹ but also that the king in *Psalms of Solomon* 17 indubitably bears priestly traits.⁶⁰

Therefore, it can be said that the image of the ideal ruler in Jewish eschatological scenarios is a reflection of the specifically Jewish idea of what the perfect ruler should look like. Due to the particular history of Judea, the traditional Jewish image of the ideal ruler had developed into a particular form, in which royal and priestly concepts had been combined. As argued above, the memory of, or desire for, a member of the Davidic family to occupy the throne, plays no perceptible role in the development of the image of the ideal ruler from the sixth to the second centuries BCE.

If this argument is accepted, the identification of the eschatological ruler as a son of David, occurring in Jewish texts since the first century BCE, is most easily understood as a further judaization of the more general eschatological concept as it existed throughout the Hellenistic and Roman empires. In the context of the present discussion, however, it is important to stress that the ideal ruler of the future, on the one hand, and the image of David as the ideal king from the past are originally unrelated ideas. This is shown by a survey of the image of David in the post-exilic era.⁶¹

In the books of Chronicles, David is presented most of all as the temple builder and the organizer of the Levitical cult (cf. also the priestly redaction of Nehemiah, Neh 12:45).⁶² Cultic associations also dominate in the priestly redaction of Nehemiah, where David is mentioned as the inventor of temple music and organizer of the Levites

⁵⁹ M. E. Stone, "Ideal Figures and Social Context: Priest and Sage in the Early Second Temple Age", in P. D. Miller, et al. (eds.), *Ancient Israelite Religion. F. M. Cross Festschrift* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988) 575-86 (580) = idem, *Selected Studies in Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha, with Special Reference to the Armenian Tradition* (SVTP 9; Leiden: Brill, 1991) 259-70 (264).

⁶⁰ Davenport, "The 'Anointed of the Lord,'" 75.

⁶¹ On various prophetic passages not discussed here, see J. J. M. Roberts, "The Old Testament's Contribution to Messianic Expectations," in Charlesworth (ed.), *The Messiah*, 39-51.

⁶² P. B. Dirksen, "The Future in the Book of Chronicles," in P. J. Harland and C. T. R. Hayward (eds.), *New Heaven and New Earth: Prophecy and the Millennium. Essays in Honour of Anthony Gelston* (VTSup 77; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 37-51 (esp. 44-50).

(Neh 12:24, 36, 45; cf. Ezra 3:10; Ps. 151; in Tob 1:4 S, "the house of David" even seems to designate the temple).⁶³

In Deutero-Zechariah 12:1-13:1, the house of David is mentioned, but unfortunately this passage is fraught with insurmountable interpretative difficulties.⁶⁴ In this passage the family of David is mentioned in direct connection with the house of Levi (Zech 12:12-13; see also the addition in Jer 33:17-22 MT). The date of these prophecies (and the redactional process leading to their compilation) is a matter of unending debate.

In Isa 55:3-4, David is presented as the king of Judah when it was a major world power. The mercy of David is remembered in 1 Macc 2:57; his heroic deeds are recalled in 1 Macc 4:30 and in the praise of the fathers in Sir 47:1-7. In the latter writing his lasting merits are seen to lie in his cultic achievements: see Sir 47:8-11 and cf. 49:4. Finally, when in Sir 45:25 the "covenant for David" is mentioned, it functions as a model for the idea that only Aaronides can be priests (i.e., in Sirach's view, rulers; cf. Sirach 50).⁶⁵

Obviously, David was seen as a figure from the past,⁶⁶ whose name is used as a warrant of legitimacy. Although the memory of his name was alive, in none of the examples discussed above is there a link to the future, or the slightest trace of hope for a return to the throne by a son of David. This confirms what has been concluded above, that the hope for an eschatological, Davidic Messiah is a secondary development of a more general eschatological worldview. The name of David apparently stood for the king of the Judeans *par excellence*; only

⁶³ The relationship between David and temple music is of course well known from the headings of the Psalms and may already have been familiar to the authors of the legend on David playing the harp for Saul, recorded in 1 Sam 16:14-23. The oldest preserved reference to David as a musician is probably Amos 6:5.

⁶⁴ Cf. M. Sæbø, *Sacharja 9-14. Untersuchungen von Text und Form* (WMANT 34; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969) 260-76; Tigchelaar, *Prophets of Old*, 116-20.

⁶⁵ The promise of eternal kingship to David's offspring, remembered in Sir 47:22, serves to explain why Solomon's sins did not lead to the end of God's providential care for Israel.

⁶⁶ See S. E. Gillingham's comments on the "backward look to David" in the post-exilic collection and editing of the Psalms: "The Messiah in the Psalms: A Question of Reception History and the Psalter," in J. Day (ed.), *King and Messiah in Israel and the ancient Near East* (JSOTSup 270; Sheffield: JSOT, 1998) 209-37 (esp. 226-29).

when in eschatological circles the idea of a future ideal king arose, was this name associated with future expectations.

CONCLUSIONS

In this article the following points have been argued:

(1) The concept of the future advent of a son of David, as a king sent by God to end the present state of corruption, is not a continuation or development of ancient hopes for the return of the Davidic dynasty. Rather, it is a late invention of tradition, to be dated to the first, possibly second, century BCE at the earliest.

(2) Palestinian Jewish eschatology is a local variant of Hellenistic eschatology, that is, the widespread idea that a superhuman intervention is necessary to restore the corrupt state of the present world to its original glory.

(3) The concept that in the restored golden age an ideal king will rule, is not specifically and probably not originally Jewish. It is likely to occur in societies headed by a king, although this is not strictly necessary. In any case, a direct relationship between actually present bad rulership and the expectation of a king should not be assumed: bad rulers are just a very good example of the corruption of the present world as eschatological thinkers perceive it. The image of the ideal ruler in Jewish eschatological scenarios is identical to that which is known from the contemporary Jewish praise of the mighty.

(4) The idea that the ideal king of the eschatological future will be a son of David results from the association of the future king with the image of David as a great king from the past, the founding father of Judea.