

Jesus and the Gospels in the Light of the Scrolls

F.F. Bruce

[p.70]

In any comparison of the Qumran literature with the Gospels there is an initial difficulty to be taken into account: the historical subject-matter of the Gospels is far more securely established than that of the Qumran literature. For example, whatever doubt may be entertained of other elements in the story of Jesus, the fact that he was crucified by sentence of Pontius Pilate fixes his position in history within narrow limits, for Pilate was prefect of Judaea from A.D. 26 to 36/37. If it were possible to fix the death of the Qumran Teacher of Righteousness within ten or twelve years, we should count ourselves fortunate indeed. As it is, two of the most distinguished British scholars who have dealt with this subject assign to the death of the Teacher dates separated from each other by over 230 years: H. H. Rowley identifies him with the high priest Onias III, who was assassinated in 171 B.C., while G. R. Driver identifies him with the Zealot leader Menahem, who was killed in September, A.D. 66. It must make a difference to a comparative study of Qumran and the Gospels whether we date the Teacher of Righteousness before Christ or after Christ. But even G. R. Driver, while maintaining the post-Christian dating of the Scrolls, insists that "they are documents of prime importance for the understanding of the New Testament and present a challenge which Christian scholars will neglect at their peril" (*The Judaean Scrolls*, 1965, p. 6). His words are still more to be heeded if, as is assumed for purposes of this essay, both the Teacher of Righteousness and the bulk of the Qumran texts thus far published are pre-Christian.

FULFILMENT OF PROPHECY

According to Mark, the burden of Jesus' early Galilean preaching was: "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand;

[p.70]

repent, and believe in the gospel" (Mark 1. 15). According to Luke, he then began to announce the good news which an unnamed speaker in Isa. 61. 1 (probably to be identified with the Servant of Isa. 42-53) is anointed to proclaim. Thus he served notice that the time appointed for the accomplishment of God's promises to Israel had arrived; that the everlasting kingdom of the God of heaven, foreseen in the visions of Daniel, was about to be set up—indeed, that it was in a sense already present in his own words and deeds. This eschatological emphasis is perhaps the most outstanding feature common to the Gospels and the Qumran literature. According to the Zadokite work, the Teacher of Righteousness was raised up by God to "make known to the last generations what he was about to do in the last generation" (CD i. 12). According to the Habakkuk commentary, it was to the Teacher of Righteousness that "God made known all the mysteries of the words of his servants the prophets" (1 QpHab. vii. 4f.). Thanks to the Teacher's insight and instruction, the men of Qumran knew themselves to be living in the last days of the current age, the "epoch of wickedness", and saw it as their duty to prepare the way of the Lord for the new age which was about to dawn.

Let it be said here that the Jesus with whom this essay is concerned is the Jesus of the Gospels. No attempt will be made to draw a distinction between the Jesus of history and the kerygmatic Jesus of post-Easter faith, any more than one will (or could) be made to distinguish the historical Teacher of Righteousness from the Teacher as he appears in the Qumran texts.

In the Qumran texts and in the Gospels the Hebrew prophets are valued and interpreted in their own right; they are not relegated (as so often in rabbinical Judaism) to the role of providing comments or *haphtaroth* to the Torah. In the Qumran literature those covenant-breakers are denounced "who will not believe when they hear all that is coming upon the last generation, from the mouth of the priest [presumably the Teacher of Righteousness] into whose heart God has put wisdom, to interpret all the words of his servants the prophets, through whom God told all that was to come upon his people and upon his land" (1 QpHab. ii. 6-10); similarly Jesus chides his disciples, calling them "foolish men" because they were so "slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken" (Luke 24. 25). The time at which the prophetic oracles would be fulfilled was not made known to the prophets themselves; it was revealed to the Teacher of Righteousness, and communicated by him to his disciples, who thus had reason to thank God for divulging to them his "wonderful mysteries" which were concealed from others. So Jesus thanks God for revealing to babes things

[p.72]

that had been hidden from the wise and understanding (Matt. 11. 25; Luke 10. 21) and congratulates his hearers because they see and hear things that prophets and righteous men longed in vain to see and hear (Matt. 13. 16f.; Luke 10. 23f.). The distinctive theology of each of the two bodies of literature is based in great measure on the interpretation of prophecy characteristic of each.

In the Qumran literature, however, there is a note of hope deferred which is absent from the Gospels. It may be that at one time the winding up of the old age was expected within the lifetime of the Teacher of Righteousness, but its postponement beyond his death called for some reinterpretation of prophecy: "the last time is prolonged, extending beyond all that the prophets have spoken, for the mysteries of God are wonderful" (1 QpHab. vii. 7f.). This reminds us of the New Testament problem of the postponement of the parousia, but while this problem has left its mark here and there in the Gospels (cf. Luke 19. 1; John 21. 22f.) their dominant theme is that the age of fulfilment is here. "Today this scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing", says Jesus in the Nazareth synagogue after reading Isa. 61. If. (Luke 4. 21); his contemporaries should understand that his casting out demons is a sign that the kingdom of God has arrived (Matt. 12. 28; Luke 11. 20), and if it has not yet arrived "with power", it will do so very soon (Mark 9. r); the limitations under which he labours at present will disappear once he has undergone his coming baptism (Luke 12. 50)—a baptism which, in the light of Mark 10. 38f., can readily be identified with his death. There is a difference here which is bound up with the differing roles ascribed to Jesus and the Teacher of Righteousness by their respective disciples.

INTERPRETATION OF LAW

In their understanding and application of the Torah, Jesus and the Qumran community differ from contemporary schools of Jewish thought (including the various Pharisaic schools), but

they diverge radically the one from the other. A superficial resemblance has indeed been recognized in their respective interpretations of the marriage law. The words of Gen. I. 27 are quoted as authoritative by Jesus in the form "from the beginning of creation 'God made them male and female'" (Mark 10. 6) and in the Qumran literature in the form "the foundation of creation is: 'male and female he Created them'" (CD iv. 20—but Jesus combines these words with Gen. 2. 24 to prove that marriage is lifelong and divorce forbidden, whereas the Zadokite work combines them with Gen. 7. 9 to prove that a man should not have two wives simultaneously. Divorce was

[p.73]

not forbidden at Qumran: there is a mutilated passage in the Zadokite laws which seems to provide that a man proposing to divorce his wife must first get the permission of the overseer (*mebaqqer*) of his "camp" (CD xiii. 17), and in any case Jesus' appeal from the divorce law of Deut. 24. 1-4 to the original purpose of the marriage institution would not have accorded with the Qumran outlook.

The divergence is even more marked in the interpretation of the sabbath law, where Jesus again appeals to the original intention of the institution. If Pharisaic interpretations of the law which conflicted with its original intention incurred Jesus' displeasure, we may readily imagine what he would have said of the still stricter interpretations of the Qumran community. Jesus assumes that all shades of Pharisaic opinion will agree with him that a domestic animal which falls into a pit on the sabbath must be rescued, for all the sacredness of the day (Matt. 12. 11; Luke 14. 5), but precisely such a humane action is forbidden in the Zadokite laws: "Let no man assist a beast in birth on the sabbath day; even if she drops [her young] into a cistern or pit, let him not lift it up on the sabbath" (CD xi. 13f.).

Not only in their detailed interpretation of the law, but in their general separatism, the Qumran community showed a strictness exceeding that of the Pharisees. The Pharisees were concerned about holiness and purity, but did not go out to the wilderness to avoid contamination nor did they take nothing to do with the temple services, much as they disapproved of the temple authorities. In the eyes of the men of Qumran, the Pharisees were half-hearted in the zeal for separation, "seekers after smooth things" (or "givers of smooth interpretations"), as they are repeatedly called in the Qumran texts. If Jesus was criticized by the Pharisees for the laxity of his legal observance and social habits, he would have incurred much fiercer criticism from the men of Qumran, who criticized the Pharisees themselves in this respect.

The First Evangelist says that Jesus described the Pharisees as a "plant which my heavenly Father has not planted" (Matt. 15. 13), a form of words reminiscent of the Qumran community's self-description as "a cultivated root which God caused to sprout... to possess his land and grow fat in the goodness of his soil" (CD i. 7f.), a sprout sent out by God "as a flower that will bloom for ever" (1 QH. vi. 15). Other strictures of his upon them are found in all the Gospels. Among his recorded sayings, on the other hand, there is no express reference to the men of Qumran or to the Essenes (the relation between these, if there was any, is not our present concern). There may, however, be implicit references, and critical ones at

[p.74]

that. W. D. Davies has suggested that the Sermon on the Mount "reveals an awareness of the Sect and perhaps a polemic against it" (*The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*, 1964, p. 235)—a polemic which was later edited so as to find a new target in the rabbis of Jamnia.

Jesus' correction of the old-time saying, "You shall love your neighbour and hate your enemy" (Matt. 5. 43), would certainly be applicable to a Qumran attitude, whether Qumran was uppermost in his mind or not. For it is laid down among the duties of the initiate into the covenant-community that "he shall love all the sons of light, each according to his lot, in the council of God and hate all the sons of darkness, each according to his guilt, in the vengeance of God" (1 QS. i. 9-11; cf. Josephus, *B.J.* II. viii. 7). True, there was nothing personal or self-regarding in this holy hatred, but it connotes something more positive than the "lesser love" which the term occasionally connotes on the lips of Jesus (Luke 14. 26). A member of the Qumran community was forbidden to kill a Gentile for such an unworthy motive as material gain (CD xii. 6f.), but he was not commanded to do him good or voluntarily go a second mile to help him.

HEALING AND THE HOLY SPIRIT

As for Jesus' healing ministry, a parallel to the repeated Gospel acts of healing through the laying on of hands has been pointed out by David Flusser (*I.E.J.* 7, 1957, pp. 107f.) in the Genesis Apocryphon, where Abraham relieves Pharaoh of the evil spirit which brought sickness on him by laying his hands on him (1 Q Gen. Apoc. x. 21f., 29). When more material from Cave 4 has been published, further Qumran parallels to the healing narratives in the Gospels will no doubt be recognized. We recall Josephus's testimony to the Essenes' proficiency in the healing art (*B.J.* II. viii. 6) and the opinion of some modern scholars that the word "Essene" is derived from the Aramaic participle 'āsē, 'āsyā, meaning "healer".

There is not in the teaching of Jesus the same predestinated cleavage between the good and the wicked as is stated in the Qumran Rule, where men are divided between the spirits of truth and perversity until the day of divine visitation (1 QS. iii. 18ff.). The closest Gospel affinities with this teaching are found in the Fourth Gospel. But in the Synoptic records Jesus' successful campaign against the demons—emissaries of the realm of darkness—that afflict human beings is carried on by the power of the Spirit of God (Matt. 12. 28), and therefore to attribute his activity to demonic power is to be guilty of blasphemy against the Holy

[p.75]

Spirit (Mark 3. 22-30). John the Baptist's prediction that the Coming One would baptize with the Holy Spirit (Mark 1. 8) thus began to be fulfilled in the ministry of Jesus; in his ministry the age of the Spirit (like the kingdom of God) was being inaugurated. The Qumran community also thought of the age to come as the age of the Spirit; indeed, the establishment of their community and its way of holiness, they believed, provided a foundation for the Holy Spirit (1 QS. ix. 3).

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

If the Teacher of Righteousness was not the absolute founder of the Qumran community, he was its organizer. It was organized as a miniature Israel, for he envisaged it as the righteous remnant of Israel, the true covenant-community; particular care was taken, too, to preserve the

priestly and levitical orders within the wider community. Unnecessary doubt has been cast on Jesus' intention to found a community. That his disciples formed a self-conscious community is clear, and that he himself envisaged them as the true Israel of the end-time is suggested by his selection of twelve of them to play a special role both immediately, as his close companions, and in the new age, when they would "sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Matt. 19. 28; Cf. Luke 22. 30). The general body of his disciples was the "little flock" for which the Father, in his good pleasure, had designed the kingdom (Luke 12. 32).

The twelve selected by Jesus have been compared with the twelve men who, together with (rather than including) three priests, formed a basis for the establishment of the Qumran community (1 QS. viii. 1). These fifteen men at Qumran have commonly been envisaged as an inner council, but perhaps those commentators are right who understand them as the nucleus with which the Teacher of Righteousness began when he set himself to organize the community. The twelve laymen probably represent the twelve lay tribes of Israel (and to this extent are parallel to the twelve apostles of Jesus), while the three priests would represent the three families (Gershon, Kohath, and Merari) of the tribe of Levi. The priestly and levitical elements in the community appear to have received representation beyond their numerical strength; this is bound up with the general priestly emphasis in its organization (each group of ten, for example, into which the community was divided for various purposes, was to include at least one priest). No such priestly or levitical emphasis appears in the Gospels; the principal followers of Jesus were laymen, like Jesus himself. If

[p.76]

in due course an attempt was made to establish a new priesthood in the family of Jesus (James the Just and his relatives), this was a later development and unknown to the Gospels.

The rock on which Jesus proposed to build his Church (Matt. 16. 18) may be compared with the description of the covenant-community as "the tried wall, the precious corner-stone, whose foundations will not tremble nor flee from their place" (1 QS. viii. 7f.), or a plantation whose "roots strike down into the flinty rock, to secure its stock in earth" (1 QH. viii. 23).

The covenant-community built on this sure foundation is a living temple: "a holy place for Israel and the secret council (or foundation) of a holy of holies for Aaron" (1 QS. viii. 5f.)—"Israel" being the laity and "Aaron" being the priesthood. When Jesus was examined before the high priest he was accused of saying, "I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another, not made with hands" (Mark 14. 58); and this theme of a temple not made with hands is embedded in the general New Testament teaching about the new people of God constituted by Jesus through his death and resurrection. But here, unlike the Qumran situation, no distinction is made between the holy place and the holy of holies; the distinction between priesthood and laity is unknown in the earliest Christian community, for the whole community (non-levitical though it is) bears a priestly character.

Some of the followers of Jesus made greater sacrifices than others. Peter speaks of himself and his colleagues as having "left everything" to follow him (Mark 10. 28). True, they did not have to isolate themselves in the wilderness, or subject themselves to such rigid asceticism as marked John the Baptist. If Jesus "came eating and drinking" and was reproached as "a glutton and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and sinners" (Matt. 11. 19; Luke 7. 34), he

presented a contrast not only to John, who came "eating no bread and drinking no wine" (Luke 7. 33), but to the austere men of Qumran. Yet to follow him closely meant leaving house, brothers, sisters, mother, father, children, and lands for his sake and for the gospel (Mark 10. 29). It is debatable how far the men of Qumran had to give up family life, but it is difficult to imagine how it could have been enjoyed in anything like a normal fashion in their wilderness retreat. Some burials of women and children have indeed been identified in the Qumran cemetery, and marriage and family life are contemplated in the Zadokite work and in the Rule of the Congregation (1 QSa). There may have been changes in this regard in the two centuries of the community's life; in any case, we probably have to distinguish between those who embraced the full rigours of coenobitic life in the wilderness

[p.77]

and those who remained at home as well-wishers and possibly "associate members", whose hospitality would always be available to full members if ever they found it necessary to travel abroad. Jesus' reference to some who had "made themselves eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 19. 12) would be applicable to certain members of the Qumran community as well as of his own following. When the twelve, sent out to preach two by two, were told to find out who was "worthy" in any town or village they entered (Matt. 10. 11), the reference is probably to people who, like Joseph of Arimathea, were known to be "looking for the kingdom of God" (Mark 15. 43; Cf. Luke 2. 25, 38) and might be expected to sympathize with the mission of Jesus and the twelve to the point of providing them with free hospitality.

It is plain that during Jesus' ministry he and his disciples were dependent on such private generosity; some well-to-do women who "provided for them out of their means" are mentioned in Luke 8. 2f. They shared a common purse, and Judas Iscariot is named as their treasurer (John 12. 6; 13. 29). But nothing like the carefully regulated administration of the Qumran common fund was required at this stage of the disciples' organization.

The nearest approach in the Gospels to the Community Rule of Qumran appears in the discourses of Jesus in the First Gospel, especially his directions to the disciples in chapters 10 and 18, with the opening paragraph of chapter 23, where a contrast is drawn between them and the Pharisees. It is possible, indeed, with Krister Stendahl to go farther and recognize in the Gospel of Matthew as a whole a counterpart to the Qumran Community Rule, "a manual for teaching and administration within the church" (*The School of St Matthew*, 1954, p. 35), but in this case we have a manual which includes not only the features of a community rule but guiding lines for Old Testament exegesis also (the counterpart of the Qumran commentaries as well as of the Rule), set in a narrative or kerygmatic framework which has no counterpart in the surviving Qumran literature.

FELLOWSHIP MEAL

To what extent a common meal was a regular and significant feature of Jesus' life with his disciples must be a matter of inference from hints here and there in the Gospels, but we should expect *a priori* that it played some part. The sacramental meaning given to the bread and the cup at the Last Supper ("This is my body... this is my covenant blood"), pointing to the death of Jesus as the new passover, is not paralleled at Qumran; but, apart from that,

[p.78]

special occasions for the "breaking of the bread" at which Jesus performed the part of head of his "family" in some distinctive fashion (cf. Luke 24. 30f., 35) were apparently continued in the fellowship of his followers when he was no longer visibly with them. In view of the priestly organization of the Qumran community, its fellowship meals may well have reflected the weekly eating of the shewbread by Aaron and his sons (Lev. 24. 5-9), just as its ceremonial washings, exceeding in frequency and importance those of other Jews (even of the purity-conscious Pharisees), may have perpetuated the special washings prescribed for priests. These are features which we should not expect to be imitated in a lay fellowship like that of the disciples of Jesus, who indeed were more lax than most religious Jews in the matter of ceremonial washing (Mark 7. ff.). But there is the further possibility that the special meals at Qumran were regarded as anticipating the meal in the age to come, described in the Rule of the Congregation, at which the Messiah would be present (1 QSa. ii. 11ff.); in that case we may compare Jesus' statement at the Last Supper that he would not eat the passover again "until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God" (Luke 22. 15f.; Cf. Mark 14. 25; 1 Cor. 11. 26).

The Last Supper, which the Synoptic Evangelists dearly envisage as a passover meal (a view confirmed by the details of the Supper), is equally clearly represented in the Fourth Gospel as being held at least twenty-four hours before the passover meal (a representation supported by some details of the Synoptic narrative). Of all attempts to reconcile the two accounts, the most promising is that of Annie Jaubert in *La date de la Cène* (1957; Eng. tr., 1965); she argues that, while John's record follows the lunisolar calendar which regulated the temple services in Jerusalem, Jesus and his disciples celebrated the passover three days earlier, according to the calendar observed by the Qumran community and some other nonconformist groups among the Jews—the solar calendar previously known to us from the Book of Jubilees. (This book enjoyed high esteem at Qumran, as is plain from CD xvi. 4; Hebrew fragments of it were found in Caves, 1, 2, and 4.)

QUMRAN AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL

Of all the Gospels, it is the Fourth that shows the closest and most numerous affinities with the Qumran literature, to a point where scholars have spoken of a common conceptual reservoir. We shall preserve caution if we recall how practically every fresh discovery in the field of Near Eastern religion from the closing centuries B.C. and the early centuries A.D. has been hailed in its day

[p.79]

as the key to the problem of the Fourth Gospel; nevertheless, such characteristic Johannine expressions as "the sons of light", "the light of life", "walking in darkness", "doing the truth", "the works of God" are characteristic also of the Qumran writings—and not the expressions only, but the thought-world which they reflect. In the Qumran and Johannine writings, however, the dualism of this thought-world is not the absolute dualism of its Iranian home; it is a dualism subordinated to the Hebrew belief in one God who created all things good. "From the God of knowledge is everything that is and that is to be; even before they existed, he established all their design": these words from the Qumran Rule (1 QS. iii. 15) remind us of the Fourth Evangelist's affirmation about the Logos, "all things were made through him, and without him was not anything made that was made" (John 1. 3).

Yet between the Qumran and Johannine use of this terminology there are differences: above all, in the Fourth Gospel "light", "life" and related concepts are embodied in the incarnate Logos, identified with the historical person Jesus of Nazareth, and they find their interpretation in the events of his ministry.

The early chapters of the Gospel of John record a phase of Jesus' ministry in the south and centre of Palestine concurrent with the Closing months of John the Baptist's ministry in those same areas. The dispute about purification mentioned in John 3. 25, which led John's disciples to question Jesus' activity, is the kind of dispute which must have been common when so many competing "baptist" movements were active in those parts. Our reconstruction of the life of the Qumran community provides an illuminating background to these chapters of John. If we try to find a personal link between the community (or the general movement to which it belonged) and the Fourth Gospel, we may (bearing in mind what is said elsewhere in this volume about John the Baptist) reflect on the high probability that the Beloved Disciple, whose testimony underlies this Gospel, was a disciple of John the Baptist before he began to follow Jesus (cf. John 1. 35-40 with 21. 24). Not that the affinities which have been mentioned are to be explained in terms of one individual link; we must think also of "the life of an on-going community" (J. A. T. Robinson, *Twelve New Testament Studies*, 1962, p. 106).

JESUS AND THE TEACHER OF RIGHTEOUSNESS

As the Qumran community owes its character and outlook preeminently to the personality and teaching of the Teacher of Righteousness, so primitive Christianity owes its being to Jesus.

[p.80]

A comparison of Jesus and the Teacher of Righteousness is difficult because of the allusiveness of the Qumran references to the Teacher and the uncertainty of any reconstruction of his career; even the most sceptical assessment of the historical element in the Gospels among contemporary New Testament students leaves us with much more definite information about the historical Jesus than the Qumran documents provide about the Teacher. One thing must be said: in any such comparison apologetic motives have no place. It is foolish to imagine that the significance of Jesus can be enhanced by depreciation of one of the righteous men who went before him. Yet the words "who went before him" are appropriate in more than a chronological sense. The formulation of Jesus' indictment which was fastened to his cross, "The King of the Jews", indicates that he was held to have made some sort of messianic claim for himself, and he was certainly proclaimed by his followers very soon afterwards as the Messiah of Israel. There is no indication that any messianic claim was made for the Teacher of Righteousness either by himself or by his followers: his role was rather that of a forerunner of the messianic age, "to make ready for the Lord a people prepared" (cf. Luke 1. 17). Of the manner of his death we have no information, nor yet about any significance that was attached to it, save that with it a final probationary period of forty years was believed to begin (CD xx. 14 f.; cf. the implied interpretation of the forty years of Ps. 95. 10 in Heb. 3. 7ff.). It is quite uncertain whether his resurrection is implied in the reference to the "standing up of one who will teach righteousness in the end of days" (CD vi. to f.); it is, indeed, quite uncertain whether the Qumran community held the doctrine of resurrection or not. But it is nowhere suggested that, if such an expectation was entertained with regard to the Teacher, he ever did rise again or that anyone thought he did so. Apart from his qualities as an organizer

and leader of men, his main service to his followers appears to have been his creative biblical exegesis. Jesus too taught his followers the principles of a creative biblical exegesis, and while they might not have regarded this as his main service to them, it provided them with the framework for understanding and declaring the meaning of his person and work.

Another essay in this collection deals with the messianic doctrine of the Qumran community. Here it may suffice to say that the messianic doctrine of Qumran, especially as it related to the Messiah of Israel and his career of conquest, was repudiated by Jesus as decisively as other current forms of messianic expectation. If analogies are sought in Old Testament prophecy for Jesus' understanding and fulfilment of his mission, they may be found more readily

[p.81]

in a combination of the Servant of Yahweh of Isa. 42-53 and the "one like a son of man" of Dan. 7. 13 than in the explicit messianic passages.

While the Servant of Yahweh and the Son of Man do not figure expressly in the Qumran literature, the influence of the biblical passages where they are portrayed can be discerned in the thought and language of the community. The speaker in some of the Hymns of Thanksgiving—whether he is the Teacher of Righteousness in person or an anonymous spokesman of the community—describes his experiences in terms of the obedient and suffering Servant. More important still: the community as a whole seems to have regarded itself as called upon corporately to fulfil the Servant's role. As the Teacher and his followers devoted themselves to the study and practice of the law of God, as they endured persecution and privation for righteousness' sake, they believed that they were accumulating a store of merit which would be accepted as an atonement for the polluted land of Israel. But they also believed that, when the "epoch of wickedness" came to an end, it would be their privilege to be God's instruments in the execution of judgement against the ungodly (cf. 1 QpHab. v. 3-6). These two phases of corporate fulfilment of prophecy may be compared with Jesus' words about the Son of Man, on the one hand suffering rejection and giving his life a ransom for many, on the other hand coming in glory to acknowledge faithful confessors and to disown the faithless in the presence of God and the holy angels. The corporate aspect is not absent from the Gospels: Jesus speaks of his followers as both sharing his cup of passion and sharing his throne of glory with him.

COMMON BACKGROUND

Here we have probably the most telling affinities between Qumran and the Gospels. They imply on the one hand the distinctive and divergent emphases of the Teacher of Righteousness and the Prophet of Nazareth; they imply on the other hand a common background more particularly defined than the general background of Hebrew scripture and Israel's history. This more particular common background has been recognized—outstandingly by Matthew Black in *The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (1961)—in a nonconformist tradition going quite a long way back in Israel's story, and one which towards the end of the pre-Christian era gained rather than lost in strength, existing both in a northern and in a southern group. The Psalms of Solomon (mid-first century B.C.) and the first two

[p.82]

F.F. Bruce, "Jesus and the Gospels in the Light of the Scrolls," M. Black, ed., *The Scrolls and Christianity*. SPCK Theological Collections 11. London: SPCK, 1969. Pbk. ISBN: 0281022887. pp.70-82.

chapters of Luke (with their messianic canticles) reflect the piety and hope of the southern group. Further study of this nonconformist tradition, with the wealth of new evidence provided by the Dead Sea Scrolls, is likely to throw additional welcome light on the Qumran community and on its relation to Jesus and the Gospels.

© 1969 *Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge* (<http://www.spck.org.uk/>). Reproduced by permission.

Prepared for the Web in May 2008 by Robert I. Bradshaw.

<http://www.biblicalstudies.org.uk/>
