THE PRIESTLY PORTRAIT OF JESUS IN THE GOSPEL OF JOHN IN THE LIGHT OF 1QS, 1QSA AND 1QSB *

Wally V. Cirafesi

McMaster Divinity College, Hamilton, ON, Canada

While the priestly aspects of John's messianic portrait of Jesus have been noted by some, they merit further consideration.[1] In this article, I will argue that a comparison of the references to the priesthood in 1QS, 1QSa and 1QSb sheds significant light on the Fourth Gospel's priestly

1. Four studies that have noted the priestly elements of John's presentation of Jesus (to varying degrees) are: (1) J.P. Heil, 'Jesus as the Unique High Priest in the Gospel of John', *CBQ* 57 (1995), pp. 729-45, which uses a narrative-critical methodology to extrapolate the High Priestly theme, but does not locate it in its early Jewish context; (2) Helen K. Bond, 'Discarding the Seamless Robe: The High Priesthood of Jesus in John's Gospel', in David B. Capes *et al.*, *Israel's God and Rebecca's Children: Christology and Community in Early Judaism and Christianity* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007), pp. 183-94, which argues that John does possess a high priestly Christology, but argues this primarily through an analysis of the 'seamless robe' passage in Jn 19.23-24; (3) Richard Bauckham, 'Messianism according to the Gospel of John', in John Lierman (ed.), *Challenging Perspectives on the Gospel of John* (WUNT, 2.219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), pp. 34-69 (36-39), which provides only several notes on the expectation of an eschatological priest in early Judaism. Bauckham's comments are helpful, but they do not develop the priestly functions and actions of John's Jesus to the extent I do in this article; and (4) George Brooke, '4QTestament of Levi[d] (?) and the Messianic Servant High Priest', in Martinus C. De Boer (ed.), *From John to Jesus: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge* (JSNTSup, 84; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), pp. 83-100 (98-99), which, while helpful, only notes John in passing. Alan Kerr comes close to discussing the priestly aspects of the Gospel (see *The Temple of Jesus' Body: The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John* [JSNTSup, 220; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002], pp. 14-19), but does not do so directly. His concern remains on developing a christo-telic temple theology for the Gospel, primarily seeing the temple (and subsequently, Jesus) as God's dwelling place, and not the locus of activity for an expected eschatological priest.

Christology.[2] This will be demonstrated by identifying conceptual parallels that exist between it and the Qumran texts.

It is important to note that identifying 'parallels' between John and Qumran does not necessarily suggest a literary dependency between the two documents.[3] Rather, any conceptual parallels that are identified between the priesthood at Qumran and Jesus in John can only reveal an overlap in theological reflection between the two communities. This *may* be due to the use of a shared tradition, but this is impossible to prove. Therefore, discussing parallels in this manner, that is, in terms of conceptual comparisons without the element of literary dependence, guards this study from the potential fallacy of assuming a two-way interface between the Gospel writer(s) and the writer(s) of 1QS, 1QSa and 1QSb.[4] At the same time, it allows similarities of

2.   I use the terms 'Qumran', 'Qumran community' and 'Qumran literature' broadly to denote the texts 1QS, 1QSa and 1QSb and their communities.

3.   This has been done in previous scholarship. See Raymond Brown's important comments in 'Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *John and Qumran* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1972), pp. 1-8. For a more recent study that, while quite critical, provides helpful precautionary remarks on comparing the Johannine and Qumranic literature, see Richard Bauckham, 'Qumran and the Gospel of John: Is There a Connection?', in Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans (eds.), *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (Roehampton Institute London Papers, 3; JSPSup, 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), pp. 267-79.

4.   In my view, a two-way interface between John and Qumran could be possible if it were demonstrated (1) that the Essenes were responsible for writing 1QSa, (2) that John the Baptist was associated with the sect of the Essenes, and (3) that the John behind the Johannine tradition was well-acquainted with the Baptist and his teaching, perhaps even being one of his disciples (was the Evangelist one of the two disciples mentioned in Jn 1.35-40?). Although some have argued that the Qumran community was an isolated and secluded sect, Josephus seems to indicate that the Essenes were quite populous in Judea, and that their doctrine was in circulation and accessible (e.g. *Ant.* 13.172; 18.18-22; and *Life* 2.10-12, in which Banus seems very close ideologically to John the Baptist). Thus, if the possibility exists that the Johannine tradition evidences Essene influence, whether direct or indirect, then perhaps the Qumran and Johannine communities could have shared similar theological traditions. Further, the notion that the Qumran community was an isolated and secluded sect and the only community to which the Scrolls bear witness has been challenged in the recent work of John Collins. He argues that the sectarian movement evinced by the Dead Sea Scrolls reflects a much larger movement that went well beyond Qumran (*Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010], pp. 52-87, 166-208).

thought to aid construction of a priestly backdrop for John's Gospel as the postdated text.[5] This point will be explored in further detail below.

Methodology

To establish priestly conceptual parallels between John and Qumran,

---

5.   The dating of John's Gospel has gone through various periods. Baur, Bultmann, and the Tübingen school opted for a late date (c. 160 CE). Robinson, on the other hand, dated the Gospel very early, to the sixties CE (John A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* [repr., Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2000), pp. 254-311). In the light of the 1935 discovery of P[52] (dated c. 125 CE) and its linkage to P. Egerton 2 (c. 150 CE), both of which are witnesses to John (see Raymond E. Brown, *An Introduction to the Gospel of John* [ed. Francis J. Moloney; ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 2003], pp. 209-10), dating the Gospel anytime after 100 CE has become more difficult to defend. Late second-century citations of the Apostolic Fathers that reflect an awareness of John's Gospel also put constraints on later dates (e.g. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl*. 6.14). However, Robinson's early, pre-70 position appears not to have taken hold in contemporary scholarship either (for reasons, see Kerr's arguments against Robinson's position in Kerr, *The Temple of Jesus' Body*, pp. 23-25). Thus, the majority of scholars date the Gospel to the latter part of the first century, around 90 CE (e.g. B.F. Westcott, *The Gospel according to St. John: The Authorized Version with Introduction and Notes* [2 vols.; London: J. Murray, 1896], p. xxviii; C.K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text* [Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 2nd edn, 1978], p. 128; D. Moody Smith, *The Theology of the Gospel of John* [NTT; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995], pp. 5-6; Brown, *Introduction*, p. 215; Kerr, *The Temple of Jesus' Body*, pp. 19-25; Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* [2 vols.; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003], I, pp. 140-42; D.A. Carson, *The Gospel according to John* [Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1991], pp. 82-86; Ben Witherington, III, *John's Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995], p. 38; George Beasley-Murray, *John* [WBC, 36; Nashville: Nelson, 2nd edn, 1999], p. lxxviii). However, one should not forget the more complex dating system for John found in Urban von Wahlde, *The Gospel and Letters of John* [Eerdmans Critical Commentary; 3 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010], I, pp. 50-55). He dates the first edition of the Gospel to 55–65 CE, the second edition to 60–65 CE, and the third edition to 90–95 CE. I accept the date of 90 CE, since it fits nicely on three levels. First, it is able to take into account the early papyri documents noted above; secondly, as Keener notes, 90 CE might best reflect the historical situation regarding the division between the Johannine community and the synagogue that is detectable in the Gospel (cf. Jn 9.22; 12.42; 16.2); and thirdly, it allows time for the author(s) of John to become well enough acquainted with the Synoptic material in circulation so as to presuppose its content in the writing of John's Gospel.

three criteria are proposed. The first is the identification of a shared *scenario*, which, as used here, is a technical term that comes from the field of modern linguistics.[6] Cynthia Westfall has applied it to the New Testament in order to construct interpretive domains for the notion of 'messiah' in Hebrews and the General Epistles. She says '"Scenario" is a linguistic term that is used to indicate "an extended domain of reference" or associated bundles of information that lie behind a text. A scenario includes settings, situations, specific items, and "role" slots.'[7] Scenarios imply a certain level of shared information between the author and his or her recipients. Thus, when an author recounts an individual engaging in certain actions that are commonly known of, say, priests (e.g. Torah teaching or the offering of sacrifices), one may rightly label the scenario 'priestly'. If it can be determined that the Qumran texts and John's Gospel contain priestly scenarios that are analogous to one another, then this may be the first indicator of a conceptual parallel between the two.

The second criterion also comes from the field of modern linguistics, and focuses on a language's ability to relate the different 'processes, events, states, actions, ideas, participants, and circumstances of our experience, including both phenomena of the external world and those of one's consciousness'.[8] Michael Halliday calls this the ideational metafunction of language. It is also known as the experiential function, since it refers to the use of language for the purpose of understanding the environment of one's human experience.[9] Closely related to this is the notion of 'field of discourse'. Whereas the ideational features of a text concern the use of language to establish a participant's relationship to his or her environment, the 'field of discourse' refers to how language is used to communicate what is actually happening in a particular situation.

6.   Also known as 'script' or 'scheme'.

7.   Cynthia Westfall, 'Messianic Themes of Temple, Enthronement, and Victory in Hebrews and the General Epistles', in Stanley E. Porter (ed.), *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments* (McMaster New Testament Series; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), pp. 210-29 (212). For a thorough linguistic treatment of this concept and others, see G. Brown and G. Yule, *Discourse Analysis* (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 236-56.

8.   Jeffrey T. Reed, *A Discourse Analysis of Philippians: Method and Rhetoric in the Debate over Literary Integrity* (JSNTSup, 136; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), p. 59.

9.   M.A.K. Halliday, *Introduction to Functional Grammar* (London: Arnold, 1985), p. xiii. See also M.A.K. Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan, *Cohesion in English* (London: Longman, 1976), p. 238.

Consequently, for the present study, the 'field' and the ideational features used to relate priests to their environment in the Qumran texts will be compared with those used to relate Jesus to his environment in John's Gospel. The evaluative question will be, is there any overlap in the ideational features of the texts? If so, then there is a good possibility that a conceptual parallel exists. Yet it is important to note that dissimilarity in ideational components does not necessarily negate the presence of a parallel. For example, in John there may be times when a purposeful dissonance exists between the Gospel's presentation of Jesus and the priestly concepts found in 1QS, 1QSa and 1QSb.

The third criterion that will be used is a modified version of the 'criterion of coherence', and is borrowed from Craig Evans's 1993 monograph *Word and Glory*.[10] The criterion has been used most frequently in historical-Jesus research, stating that 'material that coheres or is consistent with previously established material should also be regarded as authentic'.[11] However, as Porter has noted, the use of 'coherence' in Jesus research is problematic. For example, defining what one actually means by 'coherence' is difficult to do, since it is ultimately a subjective category.[12] Further, 'coherence' can act only as a secondary criterion, not a primary one, because it depends solely on the prior establishment of other authentic material.[13]

Porter's criticisms (rightly) invoke caution in the use of 'coherence' as a criterion for establishing historicity. However, the criterion is used slightly differently in this article, which is less concerned about making claims of historical authenticity. Rather, here, 'coherence' seeks to determine whether a possible parallel is merely formal, or whether it indicates a meaningful relationship of language and concepts between texts. Admittedly, this remains quite subjective, leaving to interpretation what constitutes a 'meaningful relationship'. Yet, however one is to define it, the importance of the criterion lies in the fact that it forces the comparative analysis to go beyond formal similarities (e.g. lexical

---

10. See Craig Evans, *Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John's Prologue* (JSNTSup, 89; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), pp. 18-20.

11. Stanley E. Porter, *The Criteria for Authenticity in Historical-Jesus Research: Previous Discussion and New Proposals* (JSNTSup, 191; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), pp. 79-80.

12. Porter, *Criteria for Authenticity*, p. 81.

13. Porter, *Criteria for Authenticity*, p. 81.

items, literary structures, etc.) to the assessment of shared concepts and themes. Thus, for there to be 'coherence', a concept or theme from Qumran must 'make sense' in the broader context of John's Gospel. The evaluative question is, do the antedated Qumran texts contribute to and shine meaningful light on the texts of the postdated Fourth Gospel?

If none of the above criteria are met, then a parallel is unlikely; if one of the criteria is met, then there may be some sort of conceptual connection between the texts; if all three criteria are met, then a conceptual parallel can be deemed likely. This analysis will begin with brief comment on the interrelationship of the three Qumran texts under consideration. Next, three priestly scenarios will be identified in the texts themselves, which are subcategorized as: (1) priestly legal authority, (2) the communal meal, and (3) the temple. Corresponding analyses of John's Gospel will follow, which will consider the criterion of coherence.

The Relationship of 1QS, 1QSa and 1QSb

There are two pieces of evidence that suggest 1QS, 1QSa and 1QSb should be read in light of one another.[14] First, all three works are found on the same scroll. The scroll from cave 1, which is the most complete, contains the *Rule of the Community* (1QS) first, followed by the *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa) and *Blessings* (1QSb). Fragments of other copies/versions of this arrangement were also found in caves 4 (4QSa-j) and 5 (5Q11, 5Q13). This, coupled with nearly identical paleographic evidence, strongly suggests that the works were produced within the same community. Yet, at the same time, the evidence indicates that each work underwent its own process of development, with its content evolving as the needs of the community evolved along with it.

Secondly, and more important for this study, are the similar themes that bind the works together. One example is from 1QSa 2.11-22—a passage treated in more detail below—which is a mirror representation of 1QS 6.4-9.[15] The scenario of both texts is 'the communal meal', where it is

---

14. Here I depend on E. Qimron and J.H. Charlesworth, 'Introduction to 1QS', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations* (10 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), I, pp. 1-5; and in the same volume, J.H. Charlesworth and L.T. Stuckenbruck, 'Introduction to 1QSa', I, pp. 108-109, and Charlesworth and Stuckenbruck, 'Introduction to 1QSb', I, pp. 119-21.

15. Qimron and Charlesworth agree ('1QS', p. 27 n. 145).

the priest who must first bless the new wine and the bread before any of the congregation is permitted to drink or eat. According to Charlesworth, the only difference between them is that 1QSa 2.11-22 is a messianic text that takes place 'at the final session of the Endtime',[16] while 1QS 6.4-9 takes place 'in the present eschatological, but pre-messianic age'.[17] A second example is found in the use of the phrase בני צדוק in all three texts (e.g. 1QS 5.2; 1QSa 1.24; and 1QSb 3.22). The phrase is almost exclusively used to designate priestly lineage and is often modified by the appositive הכוהנים. It likely reflects a common concern in each of the texts that a number of scholars have identified as a polemical feature directed towards the non-Zadokite lineage of the Jerusalem priesthood during the Hasmonean rule (c. 143–63 BCE).[18] However, whether polemical or not, the use of strong Aaronic and Zadokite language to

16. Qimron and Charlesworth, '1QS', p. 2.

17. Qimron and Charlesworth, '1QS', p. 2. See also Lawrence Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (SBLMS; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), pp. 53-67, where he argues that the communal meal in 1QS 6.4-9 was practiced by the Qumran community in anticipation of and as a reflection of the eschatological meal pictured in 1QSa 2.11-22.

18. See John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2nd edn, 2010), pp. 92-93; Oskar Skarsaune, *In the Shadow of the Temple*: *Jewish Influences on Early Christianity* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2002), pp. 112-15; Noah Hacham, 'Exile and Self-Identity in the Qumran Sect and in Hellenstic Judaism', in Esther G. Chazon and Betsy Halpern-Amaru (eds.), *New Perspectives on Old Texts: Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 9–11 January 2005* (STDJ, 88; Leiden: Brill, 2010), pp. 2-22 (5-10); Eyal Regev, 'Temple and Righteousness in Qumran and Early Christianity: Tracing the Social Difference between Two Movements', in Ruth A. Clements and Daniel R. Schwartz (eds.), *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, Jointly Sponsored by the Hebrew University Center for the Study of Christianity, 11–13 January 2004* (STDJ, 84; Leiden: Brill, 2009), pp. 63-88 (64-65); Nicolas Perrin, *Jesus the Temple* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2010), pp. 29-37; Paul Swarup, *Self-Understanding of the Dead Sea Scrolls Community: An Eternal Planting, A House of Holiness* (Library of Second Temple Studies, 59; London: T. & T. Clark, 2006), pp. 4-5; Jacob Neusner, *Early Rabbinic Judaism: Historical Studies in Religion, Literature and Art* (SJLA, 13; Leiden: Brill, 1975), p. 39. See James VanderKam's notes on Jonathan as an example of the struggle that repeatedly took place over who was to occupy the high priesthood during the Hasmonean era in *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 2004), pp. 251-70.

denote priestly lineage has a noteworthy presence in each of the Qumran texts, which suggests a close thematic relationship among them. In the light of their close association, an analysis that groups them together as reflecting similar priestly concepts seems appropriate.[19] Thus, the priestly scenarios of 1QS, 1QSa and 1QSb can now be considered on the basis of their ideational features.

Priests and Legal Authority: 1QS 5 and 1QSa 1

Priestly legal scenarios are found in both 1QS and 1QSa. Each text expresses the hierarchy of status that acted as a guide for the social structure of the entire community. This hierarchy appears to have revolved around matters such as age and gender (1QSa 1.4-9), ritual purity and physical well-being (1QSa 2.3-9), and one's individual rank within the community itself (1QS 6.4).[20] However, the 'Sons of Zadok, the priests', are at the top of this hierarchy, especially with regard to issues pertaining to Torah. Examples from 1QS 5 and 1QSa 1 provide support for this observation.

At a transitional point in the document, signaled by the phrase 'and this is the rule for the men of the community',[21] 1QS 5 begins a new section that concerns the conduct of the 'men of the community'. These men are those 'who are devoted to turn from all evil and to grasp all that he (God) has commanded in order for his acceptance' (5.1). The priestly legal scenario is identified by two points. First, 'Torah', 'property' and 'judgment' are the main issues at hand (בתורה ובהון in 5.2; לתורה ולהון ולמשפט in 5.3), as the command is given that 'each man is not to walk in the stubbornness of his heart' (5.4).[22] Secondly, the 'Sons of Zadok, the priests' are presented as the authoritative figures in these contexts. The men of the community are described in 5.2 as הכוהנים שומרי הברית ומשובים על פי בני צדוק. The key Hebrew phrase here is על פי, used

19. See Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community*, pp. 8-9; Dominique Barthèlemy and Józef T. Milik, *Qumran Cave I* (DJD, 7; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), pp. 107-30; H.N. Richardson, 'Some Notes on 1QSa', *JBL* 76 (1957), pp. 108-22; M. Martin, *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (2 vols.; Louvain: Institut Orientaliste, 1958), I, pp. 49-56.

20. On the role and significance of age in the Qumran community, see Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community*, pp. 13-26.

21. The phrase resembles other places in the scroll that signal thematic transitions in the material (e.g. 1.1-2 and 9.21).

22. לוא ילכ איש בשרירות לבו

elsewhere in the document to establish priestly authority.[23] This point comes through in Charlesworth's translation as well, in which the men of the community are 'answerable' to the Sons of Zadok.[24] It identifies the priests, specifically the Sons of Zadok, as the authoritative figures among the community in matters of Torah, and sets them forth as examples of daily obedience to it. As the community practices Torah under priestly direction they become 'a foundation of truth for Israel' (5.5), 'a sanctuary in Aaron' and 'a house of truth in Israel' (5.6).

More is said, however, in 1QS 5 about the role of the Sons of Zadok as handlers of Torah. In 5.9, the text says that when the 'council of the community' seeks obedience to the Torah of Moses, they do so 'according to all that has been revealed from it to the sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the covenant and who seek his [God's] will' (5.9). From this line alone two important actions (or experiences) are associated with the Zadokite priests. The first is the experience of divine revelation from Torah ('that which has been revealed from it to the sons of Zadok'); the second is active obedience to the covenant, that is, the seeking after God's will ('those who keep the covenant and who seek his will', cf. 5.1 and 1QSb 3.22-26).[25] The Zadokites held a prominent position as those to whom God had revealed the divine truth of his Torah; because of this, their instruction was endowed with authority and was binding on the rest of the community. Charlesworth describes the Zadokites' covenant-keeping in 1QS in the following way: 'The intended meaning [of the phrase שומרי הברית] is that the Sons of Zadok are the only priests who are faithful to God and his rules'.[26] As such, their legal authority came not only from what had been divinely revealed to them, but also from their own devout obedience to Torah.

Priestly authority in legal scenarios is also quite pronounced in 1QSa, a document that begins with a strong declaration concerning priestly leadership within the community. In 1.1-2, the community lives 'according to the authority of the judgment of [על פי משפט] the sons of Zadok, the priests'.[27] Additionally, in 1.23-25, whenever the community

---

23. See, for example, 1QS 5.21.

24. Qimron and Charlesworth, '1QS', I, p. 19.

25. 1QSb 3.22-26 emphasizes the close connection between the priesthood and the renewal of God's 'eternal covenant'.

26. Qimron and Charlesworth, '1QS', I, p. 19 n. 84.

27. Note what Schiffman says about the term משפט ('judgment'): 'The term...is variously used in legal contexts in the Bible. Our examination of the legal usage of

gathers as an assembly for מִשְׁפָּט, it is under the leadership and authority of 'the sons of Aaron', 'the sons of Levi', and 'the sons of Zadok', all of which are priestly groups.[28] In 1.5, the Sons of Zadok, along with 'the men of their covenant' (1.2), are entrusted with reading 'all the statutes of the covenant' (כול חוקי הברית) to the people and instructing them in its ways. Thus, an important action that this text associates with priests is that that of 'judgment', understood as teaching or instruction.[29] Therefore, when it came to matters of Torah and its application within the community, it was the priests who possessed the authoritative word.[30]

Priests and the Communal Meal: 1QS 6 and 1QSa 2.11-22[31]

The depictions of the community's meal practices (known as the מוֹעֵד, 'appointed time') in 1QS 6 and 1QSa 2.11-22 have received much attention in Qumran scholarship.[32] Both texts illustrate the necessary

this term in the Dead Sea Scrolls shows that in most cases, it refers to the sectarian regulations. These, in turn, are derived by the sect through inspired biblical exegesis' (*The Eschatological Community*, pp. 30-31).

28. 1QSa 1.23-25 reads, 'And the Sons of Levi will take their stand, each man in his position, at the authority of [עַל פִּי] the Sons of Aaron, to bring in and to lead out all the congregation, each man in his rule, at the hand of the heads of the magistrates of the congregation, as rulers and judges and officers in order to number all the hosts at the authority of [עַל פִּי] the Sons of Zadok, the priests' (translation mine).

29. The emphasis at Qumran on the teaching of priests carries over into the community's eschatological expectations as well. Bauckham notes that 'in Qumran texts the eschatological high priest will teach and interpret the law in the messianic age' ('Messianism', pp. 41-42).

30. Schiffman has noticed this heavy emphasis on priestly legal authority in 1QSa, particularly that of the Zadokite priesthood. He says, 'According to numerous sectarian texts they [the Zadokites] are the original leaders who organized the sect and who constituted the main authority figures in the early days of the sect' (Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community*, p. 35; see also Lawrence Schiffman, *Halakah at Qumran* [Leiden: Brill, 1975], pp. 70-75).

31. For references to the banquet in other Jewish literature, see the dated, but still useful, R.H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), II, p. 859. See also G.G. Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet: Positive Eschatological Protagonisits of the Qumran Library* (STDJ, 47; Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 166-67.

32. 1QS 6.4-5 notes that the meal could contain either bread or new wine, whereas in 1QSa 2 both are necessary. See, for example, E.F. Sutcliffe, 'The Rule of the Congregation (1QSa) II, 11-12: Text and Meaning', *RQ* 2 (1959–60), pp. 541-47;

regulations that the community was to follow in order to take part in the meal: (1) ten men were to form each participating group (1QS 6.3-4//1QSa 2.22); (2) priests were to be the central authority figures at the meal (1QS 6.5-6//1QSa 2.12-13); (3) each member of the community was to sit 'according to his rank' (כתכונו) before the priest (1QS 6.4//1QSa 2.15);[33] (4) 'new wine' and 'bread' (הלחם, התירוש) were to be prepared for the community (1QS 6.4-6//1QSa 2.17-21); and (5) only when the priest had pronounced the blessing would the members be able to partake of the food and drink.[34]

Although some have questioned the nature of the texts' relationship, the consensus seems to be that 1QS 6 represents the community's participation in a meal that reflects and anticipates the eschatological banquet that was to take place at the onset of the messianic age.[35] It is 1QSa 2.11-22, however, that represents this eschatological banquet.[36]

In 1QSa 2.12, two key eschatological figures are introduced: 'the

Y. Yadin, 'A Crucial Passage in the Dead Sea Scrolls', *JBL* 78 (1959), pp. 238-41; M. Smith, 'God's Begetting of the Messiah in 1QSa', *NTS* 5 (1958–59), pp. 218-24; J.F. Priest, 'The Messiah and the Meal in 1QSa', *JBL* 82 (1963), pp. 95-100; R. Gordis, 'The "Begotten" Messiah in the Qumran Scrolls', *VT* 7 (1957), pp. 191-94; K.G. Kuhn, 'The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran', in K. Stendahl (ed.), *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1958), pp. 70-72; F.M. Cross, 'Qumran Cave I', *JBL* 75 (1956), pp. 121-25; Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community*, pp. 53-67.

33. In 1QSa 2, however, the notion of sitting before the priest 'according to one's rank' is expressed repeatedly in the phrase לפי כבודו ('according to his glory'; see Charlesworth and Stuckenbruck, '1QSa', p. 117 nn. 70, 72, 73; Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community*, pp. 53-54).

34. Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community*, p. 56.

35. For example, see Priest, 'Messiah and Meal', pp. 96-97; Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community*, pp. 56-58.

36. However, Priest, noting that there is one difficulty with this assertion, says, 'The former conclusion could be accepted without serious question if it were not for the rubric given at the close of the description of the regulations which govern the participants in the meal: "And they shall act according to this decree at every me[al when] at least ten men are gathered" (ii, 21f.)' ('Messiah and Meal', pp. 95-96). In other words, Priest recognizes the tension that exists when one concludes that 1QSa 2.11-22 represents *the* eschatological banquet the Qumranites believed would take place when their Messiah(s) arrived. The reason for this tension is that the end of the passage seems to indicate that this meal was to happen repeatedly and not as a single occurrence, similar to the pre-messianic 1QS 6 text. But Priest goes on to offer a solution to the problem by arguing that 1QSa 2.11-22 is indeed purely eschatological, and represents a communal meal that was understood to occur frequently during the messianic age (see 'Messiah and Meal', pp. 97-100).

Messiah' and 'the Priest'. Cross argues convincingly that 'the Messiah' as an unmodified substantive should be understood as referring to a royal messianic figure, an idea that was prevalent in the overall messianic thought of Second Temple Judaism.[37] On the other hand, 'the Priest' in this text is no less messianic.[38] In 1QSa 2, the Priest is portrayed as the one who leads the congregation of Israel and 'the men of the name who are invited to the feast' (אנשי השם קוראי מועד) into the eschatological banquet (2.12-13);[39] he is the one who stands in authority over both the people *and* 'the Messiah'. This latter point is seen in the restriction that is placed on the entire congregation in 2.18—the Messiah included—that forbids all to eat of the bread or drink of the new wine until the Priest has first stretched out his hand, pronounced the blessing and given permission.[40] Schiffman comments:

> These [two messianic figures] were the priest, under whose administration and direction the cult would be restored in the 'New Jerusalem', and the messiah of Israel who would serve as the temporal and military leader. In keeping with the importance of the priesthood at Qumran and the emphasis placed upon the restoration of the purified cult in the days to come, the priestly 'messiah' is given the higher position.[41]

This ordering of the Priest over the royal figure reflects the biblical data (cf. 1 Kgs 1.34-39) as well as other Second Temple Jewish texts, which at times appear to attribute more authority to the priesthood than to the kingship.[42]

The scenario of the communal meal expresses two overlapping ideational features concerning the role of the eschatological priest, those being, *leadership* and *authority*. The experience of the priest's leadership is encoded through the use of the adjunct phrase 'at the head of all the

---

37. Cross, 'Qumran Cave I', p. 124 n. 9. See also Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, pp. 52-78, 79-83, on the concept of the royal Messiah and Qumran's diarchic messianic expectation.

38. See Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, pp. 92-93, 126-28 on the development of priestly messianism in the DSS.

39. יבוא הכוהן ברואש כול עדת ישראל

40. Both bread and new wine symbolized joy in the messianic kingdom, but wine especially (cf. Joel 3.18).

41. Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community*, pp. 55-56. See also Raymond Brown, 'The Messianism of Qumran', *CBQ* 19 (1957), pp. 53-82; and K.G. Kuhn, 'The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel', in Stendahl (ed.), *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, pp. 54-64.

42. For an example, see *T. Jud.* 21.1-4.

congregation of Israel' (ברואש כול עדת ישראל), which modifies the priest's 'entering'. The Priest's authority is communicated through (1) the primacy of his blessing pronounced over the bread and new wine: 'He shall bless the first parts of the bread and the new wine, and he will stretch out his hand over the bread before [any] of them' (2.19-20),[43] and (2) the fact that each member of the congregation sits before him 'according to his own glory'. The implication here is that the Priest holds the highest rank of all.[44] Thus, leadership and authority in the context of a communal meal characterized both the present and the eschatological role of the priestly office at Qumran.

Priests and the Temple Service: 1QS 8 and 1QSb 3–4

There are strong polemical overtones toward the Jerusalem temple sanctuary and its sacrifices throughout the priestly content of the Qumran literature.[45] This is suggested, for example, by the emphasis on the Zadokite lineage of the priesthood, in 1QSb 3–4. 1QSb 3.22-23, 28 reads: 'Words of blessing for the Master to bless the Sons of Zadok,

---

43. יברך את רשית הלחם והתירוש וישלה ידו בלחם לפנים

44. For a different reading, see Yadin, 'A Crucial Passage', p. 241.

45. Besides the texts considered in this article, note the polemic in 1QpHab 8.8-13 and CD 6.14-17. 1QpHab 8.8-13 reads, 'Its interpretation concerns the Wicked Priest, who is called by the name of loyalty at the start of his office. However, when he ruled over Israel his heart became conceited, he deserted God and betrayed the laws for the sake of riches. And he stole and hoarded wealth from the brutal men who had rebelled against God. And he seized public money, incurring additional serious sin. And he performed repulsive acts of every type of filthy licentiousness' (translation is from Florentino García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English* [Leiden: Brill, 1994], p. 200). CD 6.14-17 reads, 'And all who were brought into the covenant (are) not to enter the sanctuary to light his altar in vain, (but are) to be "closers of the door" of whom God said, "Who of you will close my door and not light my altar in vain?"—unless they take care to perform according to the exact (requirements of) the Torah during the time of evil and to separate (themselves) from the sons of the pit and to refrain from the wicked wealth (which is) impure due to oath(s) and dedication(s) and to (being) the wealth of the sanctuary, (for) they (the sons of the pit) steal from the poor of his people, preying upon wid[ow]s and murdering orphans.' The translation is from J.M. Baumgarten and D.R. Schwartz, 'Damascus Document', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. II. *Damascus Document, War Scroll and Related Documents* [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995], p. 23).

the priests, with whom God chose to establish his covenant... May you dedicate [yourself] for the Holy of Holies.' This text seeks to establish the Zadokites as the only lineage with a legitimate claim to priestly service in the temple (cf. 1QSb 4.25), and offers benedictions with the hope of restoration to that claim in the near future. However, several passages in 1QS express the community's relationship to the temple in quite a different way. These texts reflect the notion that the community itself functions as a spiritual temple in which the priests of the community operate as its most sacred space (i.e. 'the Holy of Holies').

1QS 8 gives the most contoured portrait of the community's experience as a new temple sanctuary. Here, rules are prescribed for the 'council of the community', which was composed of fifteen people—twelve laymen and three priests (8.1). These men were to be 'perfect in everything that has been revealed from the whole Torah' (vv. 1-2), and were entrusted 'to pay for iniquity by works of judgment and suffering affliction' (vv. 3-4). In 8.5-6, this council is called 'an eternal plant, a house of holiness for Israel and an intimate Holy of Holies for Aaron'.[46] The text distinguishes conceptually between the phrases 'a house of holiness for Israel' and 'an intimate Holy of Holies for Aaron'. As seen in other texts (e.g. 1QS 5.6; 9.6), the title 'house of holiness/sanctuary for Aaron' can in fact be used to identify the whole community as God's temple. However, here, there is a distinction between a sacred space for 'Israel' and a (more) sacred space for 'Aaron'. The text links the twelve laymen to the 'house of holiness for Israel' and the three priests to the 'intimate Holy of Holies for Aaron'. That is to say, the laymen represent Israel as the Holy Place within the spiritualized temple, while the inner community of the three priests (i.e. 'Aaron') represents the high priestly service in the Holy of Holies. The text establishes the latter linkage by using the phrase קודש קודשים, a term used in the Hebrew Bible to denote the most holy place of the tabernacle (cf. Exod. 26.33).[47] Consequently, in this inner spiritual Holy of Holies—constructed of priests—atonement is made for the land by means of the 'sacrifice of lips' and 'pure obedience to Torah' (8.2-3, 6).[48]

In view of this attitude toward the temple sanctuary and its sacrifices,[49]

---

46. למפת עולם בית קודש לישראל וסוד קודש קודשים לאהרון

47. Swarup, *Self-Understanding*, pp. 169-70; M.A. Knibb, *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World, 2; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), p. 131.

48. See Swarup, *Self-Understanding*, pp. 168-70.

49. Parallel to this, a movement can be detected in at least some groups of

the two important points to stress concerning the experiences and actions of the Qumran priests are: (1) the text's linkage of the priests to a spiritual Holy of Holies highlights the concept of temple-less worship of YHWH, and (2) the sacrifice of obedience to Torah indicates that the priests could offer spiritual sacrifices rather than animal sacrifices.[50]

Having identified three priestly scenarios in the Qumran texts, we can now consider similar priestly scenarios for John's Gospel. Thus, three texts from the Gospel will be treated below: 8.12-29, 2.1-11 and 2.13-22.

Diaspora Jews toward a decentralization of the Jerusalem temple. Philo, for example, expresses several different ways that Jews could relate to it. First, he says the whole world is God's temple: ἱερὸν θεοῦ νομίζειν τὸ σύμπαντα χρὴ κόσμον εἶναι (*Spec. Leg.* 1.66). Secondly, Philo points to the personal dimension of God's dwelling: σπούδαζε οὖν, ὦ ψυχή, θεοῦ οἶκος γενέσθαι, ἱερὸν ἅγιον (*Somn.* 1.149). Thirdly, he notes that God's dwelling as 'king' is supremely in and among his 'kingdom', that is, his believing people: βασίλειον γὰρ ὁ βασιλέως δήπουθεν οἶκος, ἱερὸς ὄντως καὶ μόνος ἄσυλος. The notions that God did not dwell solely in the confines of the temple, and that Jews could experience the presence of God while not in Jerusalem most likely provided great reinforcement to Jewish identity in the Alexandrian Diaspora (see also 2 Macc. 5.19; *3 Maccabees*; and *Letter of Aristeas*, the last of which seeks to identify the the temple with the Jews of the Egyptian Diaspora rather than Jerusalem Jews [so Hacham, 'Exile and Self-Identity', pp. 6-7]).

50. These observations do not suggest that the Qumranites rejected the temple cult altogether. Indeed, some of the literature suggests that the community expected both worship and sacrifice in the temple building to be re-instituted once the Sons of Zadok reclaimed the Jerusalem priesthood, and once the temple had been purged of its polluted sacrifices (see Swarup, *Self-Understanding*, pp. 168-69). Further, several scholars have suggested that the communal meal practiced at Qumran was sacral in nature and functioned as a substitute for the temple and the offering of sacrifices. For example, Gärtner says, 'The Qumran sacral meal may have been intended to replace the custom of the temple priests eating the flesh of the sacrificial animals: the holy oblation must be eaten by the sanctified in the consecrated room—a situation emphasized by the rites of purification in connection with the meal. The rites may also have included the taking of a ritual bath, a condition likewise imposed on the temple priests' (Bertil Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament: A Comparative Study in the Qumran Texts and the New Testament* [SNTSMS, 1; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965], pp. 10-13). If this is accurate, then it may help conceptually to elucidate the narrative connection that seems to exists between Jn 2.1-11 (the meal scenario) and vv. 13-22 (temple scenario). However, see Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community*, pp. 59-67, where he disagrees strongly with the conclusions of Gärtner.

Jesus and Legal Authority: John 8.12-29

The Mosaic Law figures prominently in John as a whole, and several passages could have been chosen for comparison with the Qumran texts.[51] For example, as early as 1.17, John juxtaposes 'the Law was given through Moses' with 'grace and truth came through Jesus Christ'.[52] In 5.1-45, extended interaction takes place between Jesus and 'the Jews' during which their conflict primarily revolves around a legal matter, that is, the keeping of Sabbath and Jesus' claim of having authority over it. Yet the passage that establishes a priestly legal scenario most similar to Qumran is Jn 8.12-29.

The text's setting is in the temple 'on the last and great day of the feast' (7.37).[53] The last day of the festival featured water-drawing and torch-lighting ceremonies in which the priests played an important role.[54] In 8.20, the author notes specifically what Jesus was doing in the temple: ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα ἐλάλησεν ἐν τῷ γαζοφυλακίῳ διδάσκων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ. Jesus is portrayed as teaching in the temple with, once again, the Law playing a central role in his discussion with the Pharisees (8.17), particularly with regard to what it teaches concerning the validity of one's 'testimony'.[55] However, in contrast to the Qumran priests who possessed uncontested legal authority within their community, which was derived from divine revelation and from their obedience to the covenant (1QS 5.9), the authority of Jesus' teaching is precisely what is under examination in 8.12-29. This point is expressed in the Pharisees' words to Jesus in 8.13: σὺ περὶ σεαυτοῦ μαρτυρεῖς, ἡ μαρτυρία σου οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθής ('You testify about yourself, your testimony is not true'). Interestingly, Jesus defends his teaching with the two ideational features that characterized the legal authority of the Zadokite priests: (1) divine revelation as the

---

51. See, for example, 1.45; 5.45-46; 7.19, 22; 9.28; 10.34; 12.34; 15.25; 19.7.

52. Jn 1.17 should be understood in view of the phrase χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος in 1.16 (see Ruth Edwards, 'ΧΑΡΙΝ ΑΝΤΙ ΧΑΡΙΤΟΣ [John 1.16]: Grace and Law in the Johannine Prologue', *JSNT* 32 [1988], pp. 3-15).

53. ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ μεγάλῃ τῆς ἑορτῆς.

54. I am assuming the inauthenticity of 7.53–8.11. For a helpful survey of the different positions, see Keener, *John*, I, pp. 735-38. Additionally, the concept of 'light', specifically the phrase 'the light of life', finds a close parallel in 1QS 3.6-7: 'By the spirit of the true counsel of God will the ways of a man, all his iniquities, be atoned for, so that he can behold the *light of life* (באור החיים)'.

55. Here, defending the validity of his 'testimony', Jesus says καὶ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ δὲ τῷ ὑμετέρῳ γέγραπται ὅτι δύο ἀνθρώπων ἡ μαρτυρία ἀληθής ἐστιν.

source of the teaching, and (2) his own complete obedience to God.

In 8.16, Jesus says that he is not alone in his judgment but rather it is ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πέμψας με πατήρ ('I and the Father who sent me'). Two verses later in v. 18 Jesus adds that the Father μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ ('testifies about me'). But his statement in 8.28 is even more explicit: καθὼς ἐδίδαξέν με ὁ πατὴρ ταῦτα λαλῶ ('Just as the Father has taught me, these things I speak'). It is evident here that Jesus is claiming a divine origin for his teaching. Further, in 8.29 Jesus gives the reason for his unique relationship with the Father: ὅτι ἐγὼ τὰ ἀρεστὰ αὐτῷ ποιῶ πάντοτε ('For I always do the things that are pleasing to him'). Thus, similar to the Qumran priests, Jesus draws on divine revelation and his own devout obedience to God in order to authenticate his legal authority.[56]

When the text's setting is considered along with the content of Jesus' actions and sayings, the scenario reflected in Jn 8.12-29 indeed possesses conceptual overlap with the priestly legal scenarios of 1QS 5 and 1QSa 1. With reference to the criterion of coherence, the priestly notions of the Qumran texts provide a fresh background for understanding both the role of Jesus' teaching and his obedience to God in John's Gospel: Jesus functions as God's faithful priest, teaching in the temple and living in absolute obedience to his Father. However, this Qumranic background also provides two striking contrasts with John's Jesus as a priestly figure. First, Jesus' authority, although affirmed in the narrative, is rejected by the Jewish leadership. This is probably meant to highlight the disbelief of the Jews, a theme that continues throughout the latter part of ch. 8 (vv. 30-58). Secondly, whereas 1QS 5.9 relates that the Zadokite priests received divine revelation through the medium of Torah, John bypasses this medium and creates a direct line of revelation from the Father to Jesus. In other words, Jesus is not portrayed so much as a teacher of Torah as he is a teacher of the Father himself (cf. Jn 1.18; 14.9). This, of course, includes Jesus being a master of Torah as well, since according to John, if one truly believes in Moses (i.e. the Law), that person will also believe in Jesus (5.46). Yet because of Jesus' privileged access to the Father, being the only one who has ever seen him (1.18; 6.46), the revelation given to Jesus is directly from the Father. Thus, John puts Jesus' legal authority on

---

56. The theme of Jesus' obedience to God arises elsewhere in the Gospel (e.g. 4.34; esp. 8.46), but only in ch. 8 is it used to authenticate his teaching specifically. In any case, particularly interesting are the places where Jesus proclaims that he 'does' or 'seeks the will of God' (Jn 4.34; 5.30; 6.38; cf. 1QS 5.9).

quite a different level than that of the Sons of Zadok.

Jesus and the Communal Meal: John 2.1-11

The Johannine wedding banquet contains several intriguing points of conceptual comparison with the communal meal illustrated in 1QSa 2.11-22. First, in Jn 2.2, Jesus and his disciples are invited (or 'called', ἐκλήθη) to a wedding banquet,[57] while in 1QSa 2.11, 13, 'the men of the name' and 'the priests' are invited (or 'called', קרא) to the eschatological banquet. Secondly, 'new wine' plays a central role in both texts as a symbol of the coming messianic age (Jn 2.3, 9-10; cf. 1QSa 2.17-20).[58] Thirdly, 1QSa 2 says four times that members of the community sit before the Priest 'each one according to his own glory' (איש לפי כבודו) while in Jn 2.11 it is Jesus who reveals his own glory (ἐφανέρωσεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ).[59] Furthermore, Gärtner suggests that the communal meal

---

57. See Keener, *John*, I, pp. 498-99, on the custom of wedding invitations in ancient Judaism.

58. Andreas Köstenberger, 'John', in D.A. Carson and G.K. Beale (eds.), *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), pp. 415-521 (431). At this point there is also some discontinuity between John and the Qumran text. Mention of 'bread' is lacking in John 2, although in 1QSa 2 it is partaken of along with the wine. There are three possible explanations for this. First, 'bread' does play a central role in John 6; therefore, while the key eschatological element of bread is lacking in John 2, the author supplies it for the reader at a later point in the Gospel. Secondly, Jn 2.1-11 is not meant to be read eschatologically. That is, as Schiffman notes concerning 1QS 6.4-9, this communal meal was also practiced in *anticipation* of the messianic kingdom, and so either wine *or* bread was required, not both as in 1QSa 2.11-22. Read this way, the banquet in John 2 represents a pre-messianic banquet that anticipates the coming of the messianic age. Thus, it may add a fuller background to Jesus' statement in 2.4, 'My hour has not yet come'. Or thirdly, Mary's statement in 2.5, likely an allusion to Gen. 41.55, may function to add the concept of 'bread' to the episode (see comments in the main text of the article below).

59. While I do not wish to suggest that δόξα in Jn 2.11 has an underlying Hebrew meaning, the word could carry a similar sense as כבוד in 1QSa 2, that being, 'importance' or 'rank'. The theme of Jesus' 'rank' is present in the Prologue and other parts of John, particularly with reference to Jesus' relationship to John the Baptist. In 1.15, the Baptist declares that the λόγος is of a higher rank than he is because of his preexistence. In 1.27, the Baptist admits that he is not worthy even to untie Jesus' sandals. In 3.30, John acknowledges that it is finally time for Jesus to become the more prominent of the two in God's messianic program. Thus, if there is a conceptual parallel between Jn 1.14 and 1QSa 2.16-17, δόξα in the Prologue could be understood as referring to the preeminent 'rank' or 'importance' of the λόγος

at Qumran included the priests taking a ritual bath for the purpose of purification.[60] This point can likewise be seen in 1QSa 2.11-22, since the section on the messianic meal is immediately preceded by purity regulations that prohibit those who are ritually unclean from entering the banquet (2.1-10). The notion of priestly ritual washing provides a helpful context for John's reference in 2.6 to the 'six stone water jars reserved for the purification of the Jews', which Jesus eventually uses to turn water into wine. The point of contrast between John and Qumran could be that whereas at Qumran ritual purification was required for all members of the community—including priests—in order to partake in the eschatological meal, in John not only does washing appear needless, it may also be portrayed as an unfruitful rite of the Jews that was itself in need of restoration.[61] Jesus uses the very vessels of Jewish ceremonial purification to provide the banquet with the 'new wine' of the messianic kingdom.

The primary ideational feature that was identified for the eschatological priest in 1QSa 2, *authority*, may seem less apparent for Jesus in John 2. However, this is precisely what is established through Mary's words to the servants in 2.5: ὅ τι ἂν λέγη ὑμῖν ποιήσατε. The editors of the NA[27] note that the command somehow alludes to the LXX of Gen. 41.55, in which Pharaoh commands the people of Egypt πορεύεσθε πρὸς Ἰωσηφ, καὶ ὅ ἐὰν εἴπη ὑμῖν, ποιήσατε.[62] Interestingly, Pharaoh's command comes as a response to his people crying out desperately for 'bread' in the light of a famine (ἐκέκραξεν δὲ ὁ λαὸς πρὸς Φαραω περὶ ἄρτων). As a result, Pharaoh puts Joseph in authority over the distribution of bread to the people (Gen. 41.56-57). Whether or not the broader context

---

within John's soteriological framework. Likewise, δόξα in Jn 2.11 may highlight the prominence of Jesus in view of his messianic mission, and perhaps even be meant to draw connections between him and the eschatological priest who ushers Israel into the celebration banquet at the end of days. These are highly tentative suggestions, but are nonetheless plausible.

60. See Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, pp. 10-13.

61. So Köstenberger, 'John', p. 431.

62. Other commentators have identified the allusion as well (e.g. Keener, *John*, I, p. 509; Köstenberger, 'John', p. 431). Keener says, 'This parallel underlining the importance of obeying Jesus might be intentional, since it is from a text—Genesis LXX—frequently read by early Christians. Jesus, like Joseph, will provide abundance in a time of need' (p. 509). See also Josh. 1.16 and 1 Macc. 13.9, where similar phrases are used to endow Joshua and Simon Maccabeus with authority (ὅσα ἂν ἐντείλη ἡμῖν, ποιήσομεν; καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἂν εἴπης ἡμῖν, ποιήσομεν).

of the Genesis text is meant to provide a background for Mary's statement is uncertain. Nevertheless, the statements in both Genesis and John are meant to establish and affirm one's authority in a given situation. In this way, Jesus indeed is to be understood as the authoritative figure at the banquet, similar to the eschatological priest at Qumran, even if his authority is delineated as 'behind the scenes'.

However, do these conceptual parallels satisfy the criterion of coherence? A priestly reading of Jn 2.1-11 fits well within the broader thematic structure of the Gospel, especially if a post-70 CE date is assigned to it. That is, if the Gospel was written to address the needs of a temple-less Judaism, as Kerr and others have suggested,[63] its concern for temple and priestly related issues should be expected (e.g. proper worship [4.19-26] and the practice of Jewish festivals [2.13; 7.2; 19.14]). If John's banquet episode is read through the lens of a Qumran messianic meal, and if the meal is sacral in nature,[64] then Jn 2.1-11 could be seen to reflect a similar concept: the banquet is a spiritual replacement of temple sacrifices, with Jesus presiding over it as the eschatological priest. Textual support for this proposal lies in (1) the immediate transition to the temple cleansing episode in 2.13-22, which is set in the context of 'the Passover of the Jews', and (2) the Gospel's identification of Jesus as a substitute for temple sacrifices (1.29, 36) and for the inner temple sanctuary itself (2.18-22).

Jesus and the Temple Service: John 2.13-22

Texts such as 1QS 8 demonstrate that the Qumran 'council of the community' understood itself as a spiritual temple that offered spiritual sacrifices to God, with priests forming the inner קודש קודשים ('Holy of Holies'). This self-definition arose out the community's dissatisfaction with the Jerusalem priesthood and reflects its anticipation of a restoration and purification of the temple cult by the eschatological priest. Such ideas are likewise reflected in Jn 2.13-22. In 2.14-17, Jesus is portrayed as the refiner of Israel's corrupted temple,[65] which may be meant to evoke

---

63. Kerr, *Jesus' Body*, pp. 19-25; Andreas Köstenberger, 'The Destruction of the Second Temple and the Composition of the Fourth Gospel', in John Lierman (ed.), *Challenging Perspectives on the Gospel of John* (WUNT, 2.219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), pp. 69-108.

64. So Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, 10-13, who argues convincingly.

65. There has been significant debate over what exactly provoked Jesus' actions in

imagery from Mal. 3.1-4.[66] Malachi foretells a day when the Lord
(הָאָדוֹן) will enter the temple and send a priestly figure—'the messenger
of the covenant' (מַלְאַךְ הַבְּרִית)—to turn the way of the people back
to the Lord and to purify the temple cult, so that proper worship might
once again take place in Jerusalem.[67] Jesus' actions in the temple may
be understood against this backdrop of a coming priestly figure, whose
purpose is to restore Israel's cultic communion with her God.[68]

Jesus' response to the Jews' demand for a sign in 2.19—'Destroy this
temple and in three days I will raise it up'—may also qualify as a reference
to his ministry as eschatological Priest. While some scholars wish to

the temple. Sanders suggests that the market place in the temple was necessary if Jews
(particularly ones traveling from abroad to Jerusalem) were to properly participate
in the rites of sacrifice. This leads him to the conclusion that the temple cleansing
episode should be interpreted symbolically: Jesus' act functioned prophetically
concerning the destruction of the temple, the imminence of the eschaton, and his
own expectation of a new temple (E.P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* [Philadelphia:
Fortress Press, 1985], pp. 61-76). However, Schuchard argues convincingly that the
text is clear at 2.16 ('you shall not make my Father's house a house of trade') and
concludes that the traditional view of what provoked Jesus to anger is correct, that is,
the corrupt buying and selling that was taking place within the temple confines (B.G.
Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function
in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John* [Atlanta: Scholars Press,
1991], p. 24).

66. Schuchard draws attention to the possibility that here John is alluding to the
LXX of Mal. 3.3—καὶ χεεῖ αὐτοὺς ὡς τὸ χρυσίον καὶ ὡς τὸ ἀργύριον (which
departs from the MT)—and Jn 2.15—καὶ τῶν κολλυβιστῶν ἐξέχεεν τὸ κέρμα καὶ
τὰς τραπέζας (*Scripture within Scripture*, pp. 24-25, and 25 n. 40). Cf. *Pss. Sol.*
17.30-32, although this figure is primarily portrayed as a royal one.

67. There are three observations that support this assertion: (1) Mal. 2.4-7 likely
represents Malachi's reflection upon God's covenant to Phinehas, Aaron's grandson,
given in Num. 25.11-13. Evidence for this is in the presence of a covenant (בְּרִית)
that brings peace (שָׁלוֹם), and the idea that Levi (i.e. a priest) caused many Israelites
to turn (הֵשִׁיב) from sin, thus making atonement for them; (2) Mal. 2.7 calls the priest
מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה־צְבָאוֹת ('the messenger of the LORD of Hosts'), and so (3) it is likely
that 'the messenger' who appears in Mal. 3.1-4 is also a priestly figure—the one sent
by YHWH to purify the temple cult, and the one to whom the eschatological ministry
of the prophet Elijah is connected in Mal. 4.4-5. This evidence leads Bauckham to
conclude that the eschatological high priest in some circles of early Judaism was
expected to be a 'Phinehas-Elijah' figure, who appears in later Jewish literature
(Bauckham, 'Messianism', pp. 36-37; see also Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*,
p. 25 n. 40).

68. On the eschatological nature of Jn 2.13-22, see Kerr, *Jesus' Body*, pp. 67-101.

link the notion of 'temple (re)building' with a royal figure,[69] Brooke has noted that there are places in early Jewish literature, particularly *Aramaic Levi*, that the expectation of a (re)building and restoration of the temple centers upon the ministry of a coming high priest.[70] Thus, while such a concept is not found in 1QS, 1QSa or 1QSb, this point illustrates the priestly character of Jesus' actions and sayings in Jn 2.13-22. In Jn 2.21, however, John takes Jesus' priesthood to a 'higher' level by presenting him as God's inner sanctuary (τοῦ ναοῦ). Consequently, John's Jesus is not only the coming priest who refines, restores and even 'rebuilds' Israel's temple and cultic relationship with God, but he himself is the spiritualized temple and the locus of God's dwelling, which is distinctly reflective of the priestly formulations at Qumran.

In places both earlier and later in the Gospel, the sacrificial nature of Jesus' priestly ministry is also expressed (cf. 1QS 8.2-3, 6). In Jn 1.29, coming on the lips of John the Baptizer, Jesus is called ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου (cf. 1.36).[71] In 11.50-51, Caiaphas prophesies that Jesus will die 'in behalf of the Jewish nation' (ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους). The aside in 19.14 that immediately precedes Jesus' crucifixion, ἦν δὲ παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα, could be meant to draw a symbolic connection between the slaughtering of the Passover lambs in the temple and Jesus' death.[72] Therefore, 2.13-22 contributes significantly

---

69. For example, N.T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), p. 205.

70. Brooke, '4QTestament of Levi[d] (?)', pp. 85-86, 93, 95, 98, where he lists as examples 4QTLevi[c] frg. 1, 1.5; Greek *T. Levi* 17.8-10; and *Targ. Isa.* 53.5. 4QTLevi[c], while fragmentary in nature, describes the activity of a priestly servant who '[will rebuild, like] a servant of God, [with] his goods, another sanctuary which will be consecrated [*sic*] [...]' (translation is from Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, p. 269). Greek *T. Levi* 17.8-10 says that in the fifth jubilee the priesthood 'will return to the land of their desolation and they will restore the house of the Lord' (translation mine). Brooke also notes that it is possible to understand the term ἐγείρω in Jn 2.19 as 'rebuild' in light of 1 Esd. 5.44: 'Some of the heads of families, when they came to the temple of God that is in Jerusalem, vowed that, to the best of their ability, they would erect (ἐγεῖραι) the house on its site' (p. 98 n. 2).

71. See Brooke, '4QTestament of Levi[d] (?)', p. 98.

72. Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (trans. G.R. Beasley-Murray; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971), pp. 664, 667; Stanley E. Porter, 'Can Traditional Exegesis Enlighten Literary Analysis of the Fourth Gospel? An Examination of the Old Testament Fulfilment Motif and the Passover Theme', in Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner (eds.), *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel* (Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity, 3; JSNTSup, 104; Sheffield:

to a holistic portrayal of Jesus' priesthood in John. In the Gospel, Jesus is not only represented as an ideal priestly figure and the purifier of Israel's temple, but he himself is also the realization of the Holy of Holies in which the priestly service is carried out. But for John, in contrast to the Qumran conceptualization, there is a third component to Jesus' priestly service: he, as the lamb of God, is also the sacrifice of atonement offered in the Holy of Holies by the high priest. Thus, John's priestly portrayal of Jesus, while distinct, overlaps considerably with Qumran's priestly ideas.[73]

Conclusion

This article has attempted to meet the need for further attention to the priestly elements of John's Gospel by identifying conceptual parallels between the Qumran texts (1QS, 1QSa and 1QSb) and John's portrait of Jesus. Priestly scenarios have been identified in which both the Qumran priests and Jesus share similar actions and experiences in their respective texts. Within the priestly legal scenario, divine revelation, obedience and authoritative teaching constitute actions and experiences of both figures. Within the communal meal scenario, the overlapping experience is that of authority, along with the common themes of 'wine', 'invitation' and 'glory'. Within the temple scenario, the experience of existing as a spiritual sanctuary with a spiritual temple service is shared by both figures. Each of these scenarios meets the criterion of coherence, and thus has aided our exegesis of Johannine texts. The result is that the Qumran texts considered here are indeed useful for understanding the presence of a priestly Christology in the Fourth Gospel.

Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), pp. 418-21; Keener, *John*, II, 1129-31. The theme of 'sacrifice', appearing at various points in the Gospel, provides additional evidence for reading the banquet episode in 2.1-11 along the lines of a sacral meal that replaces temple sacrifices. For a discussion on Jesus and the notion of sacrifice in John from a narrative-critical perspective, see Heil, 'Jesus as the Unique High Priest', pp. 735-37.

73. A topic for further study might be how close John's portrait and that of Qumran come to the picture in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where Jesus is likewise presented as high priest (Heb. 3.1; 5.1-10) and the sacrifice of atonement (Heb. 7.27; 10.10).