

Agents of Resurrection in 4Q521, the Sayings Source Q and 4QPseudo-Ezekiel*

Benjamin Wold, Trinity College Dublin

For presentation at Durham University's Seminar for the Study of Judaism in Late Antiquity
(Nov. 11, 2010)

Since its publication in 1992, 4Q521 ("*Messianic Apocalypse*") has become one of the most discussed discoveries from Qumran.¹ The reasons for this are not difficult to understand when fragment 2 column ii is read alongside Matthew 11,1-6 and Luke 7,18-23 (from the sayings source Q). The Hebrew fragment 4Q521 2 ii preserves a reference to a messiah (ln. 1) and shortly thereafter refers to Isaiah 61,1-2 with only one significant addition: the dead are raised (ln. 12). The document 4Q521 is preserved in sixteen fragments and several other references to messiah(s) and resurrection are found among them. The largest fragment is 4Q521 2 ii and reads:

Column ii

- (1) [כי השמים והארץ ישמעו למשיחו]
- (2) [וכל אשר בם הוא יסוג ממצות קדושים]
- (3) [התאמצו מבקשי אדני בעבדתו] *vacat*
- (4) [הלא בואת תמצאו את אדני כל המיחלים בלבם]
- (5) [כי אדני חסידים יבקרו וצדיקים בשם יקרא]
- (6) [ועל ענוים רוחו תרחף ואמונים יחליף בכחו]
- (7) [יכבד את חסידים על כסא מלכות עד]
- (8) [מתיר אסורים פוקח עורים זוקף כ[פופים]]
- (9) [ל[ענ]לם אדבק [במי]חלים ובחסדו]
- (10) [ופר[י] יש לא יתאחר]
- (11) [ונכ>ב דות שלא היו יעשה אדני כאשר ד[בר]]
- (12) [כי] ירפא חללים ומתים יחיה ענוים יבשר
- (13) [ו] [ש]ן קד[ושים] ינהל ירעה [ב]ם יעשה²

* I would like to thank the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung for helping make this research possible.

¹ É. PUECH, Une Apocalypse Messianique (4Q521), RevQ 15 (1992) 475-519. There is no clear reason that 4Q521 should be seen as originating with the Qumran community, but rather stems from a broader Palestinian Jewish tradition. See R. BERGMEIER, Beobachtungen zu 4Q521 f 2, II, 1-13, ZDMG 145 (1995) 44-45. *Pace* PUECH, a late second cent. BCE date of the autograph (4Q521 is likely not the autograph) is possible, but the provenance of the document lacks characteristics that would identify it as Essene; see his, Some Remarks on 4Q246 and 4Q521 and Qumran Messianism, in The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls (STDJ 30), hg. v. D. W. PARRY & E. ULRICH, Leiden 1999, 552. Significantly, M. HENGEL often argued that Christological ideas find parallels in Palestinian Judaism, see for instance his: The Son of God: The Origins of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion, Philadelphia 1976.

² Following J. D. TABOR and M. O. WISE, 4Q521 'On Resurrection' and the Synoptic Gospel Tradition: A Preliminary Study, JSP 10 (1992) 149-62, 158 they justify this reconstruction based on the common language of Isa 49,7-11 and Ez 34,23 where "shepherding" is an activity associated with a messianic figure. A common reconstruction is [יְהוָה וְרָעָה] *beit*, however based upon examination of the photograph, there is too much space between the reconstructed *beit* and final *mem* where the proposed *yod* would have been. Of the letter following "וְרָעָה" only the upper right hand corner remains and the discoloration at the tear does not appear to be ink. וְרָעָה followed by בָּם, for which there is

[וכלו כ] (14)

Column ii

- (1) ... for the heav]ens and the earth will listen to his anointed one(s)
 (2) [and all th]at is in them will not turn away from the precepts of the holy ones.
 (3) Strengthen yourselves, you who seek the Lord in his service. *vacat*
 (4) In this will you not find the Lord,
 all those who hope in their hearts?
 (5) For the Lord will seek out to care for the pious,
 and call the righteous by name,
 (6) and his spirit will hover upon the poor,
 and he will make new the faithful by his might.
 (7) For he will honour the pious upon the throne of an eternal kingdom,
 (8) setting free the prisoners,
 opening *the eyes of* the blind,
 raising up those be[nt down].
 (9) And forever more shall I cling to those who hope,
 and in his mercy...
 (10) and the fru[it of...] ...not be delayed.
 (11) And the Lord will perform marvelous acts that have never been done *before*,
 just as he sa[id],
 (12) [for] he will heal the badly wounded
 and will make the dead live,
 he will proclaim good news to the poor
 (13) he will lead the holy ones,
 he will shep[herd the]m and ma[ke]...³

Gospel scholars are particularly intrigued by this fragment's close parallels with Q; both 4Q521 and Q contain an addition about making the dead to live.⁴ In Mt 11,1-6//Lk 7,18-23 Jesus' answer to the disciples of John the Baptist about his identity is a pastiche drawn from Isaiah 61,1-2; 35,5-6 and 26,19.⁵ In the gospel passages Jesus says, "Go and tell John the things you have seen and heard: the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, and the poor have the gospel preached to them." This amalgam of Isaian passages used by Q is closely paralleled by 4Q521. In fact, no other extant texts reflect this combination of elements from these three sections of Isaiah. 4Q521 and Q clearly reflect (a) common tradition(s). Moreover, 4Q521 is interesting because it mentions an "anointed figure" whom heaven and earth shall obey; however, when the manuscript quotes and uses this Isaian pastiche, it is no longer straightforwardly talking about God's "messiah", but is referring to the activity of God himself, who will resuscitate or raise the dead. In light of this parallel, Jesus' reference to raising the dead as proof of his being God's anointed suggests that in his working of miracles he is aligning himself with the activity of God. Whether in Matthew and Luke's use of Q or in 4Q521, a number of scholars have asked questions about how exactly Jesus, or the messiah, align themselves with God's activity.

One issue that arises when interpreting this column is adjudicating how משיחו ("his anointed" In. 1) is used, especially if it occurs in synonymous parallelism with the

enough space, may be justified by the use of the preposition -כ in Ps 78,71, see ב in line 2. For קד[ושים], see line 2 also.

³ Cf. É. PUECH, *Textes hébreux*, 4Q521-4Q528, 4Q576-4Q579 (DJD XXV), Oxford 1998, 1-38.

⁴ The first to extensively address 4Q521 and similarities with the synoptic traditions and esp. Q were J. D. TABOR and M. O. WISE, 4Q521 'On Resurrection', 149-62.

⁵ This pastiche likely should include Ps 146,5-8 which serves as a link between Is 61,1-2 and Is 35,5-6 (see handout).

“holy ones” (קדושים) in the following line (ln. 2). Orthographically, when the pronominal suffix -ו (i.e. “his”) is added, one may read “messiah” as either singular or plural.⁶ Therefore, if “holy ones” refers back to line one, then there may be multiple anointed ones in the preceding line. Note too that plural “anointed ones” are referred to in a fragmentary context in 4Q521 8 9 (וכל משיחיה).

Another issue relates to agency: who is (or are) the actor(s) in lines 5 and 11? While grammatically the subject is God, there are several persuasive reasons for regarding the actions mentioned in this passage as being carried out not by God, but rather by a prophetic figure.⁷ If this is the case, then in 4Q521 God is portrayed as using a messiah(s) as an agent of resurrection. Reasons for regarding an eschatological prophet as the actor in this use of Isaiah are mainly three-fold: (1) Isaiah 61 itself is concerned with an anointed prophet who does these acts; (2) one of the deeds is to proclaim good news to the poor, which would naturally be done by a mediating figure and not God himself; and (3) the anointed one is described as instrumental elsewhere in the document: 4Q521 9 3 preserves the phrase “you have left, by the [ha]nd of [the anointed one]” (תעזוב ב[י]ד משיחיה), and “by the hand” implies instrumentality.

Deliberating which *eschatological* prophet(s) is/are referred to will occupy most of our attention in the three points to follow below.⁸ With the incorporation of resurrection into this passage, and if God indeed uses a prophetic agent to carry out these tasks, is there a particular figure that is associated with the act of revivification? While several suggestions have been made, the most prevalent is that Elijah or an eschatological Elijah-like figure is in view.⁹ In the following discussion this point of view shall be reviewed before suggesting how *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* materials may offer additional information for considering agency and resurrection in 4Q521. This then will be followed by a discussion of the implications for how Matthew and Luke used Q and how the sayings source and 4Q521, taken together, may inform an understanding of this interpretive tradition of Isaiah 61,1-2 *et al.*

⁶ J. DUHAIME, Le Messie et les saints dans un fragment apocalyptique de Qumrân (4Q521 2), in *Ce Dieu qui vient: Mélanges offerts à B. Renand* (LD 159) hg. v. R. KUNTZMANN, Paris 1995, 264-75.

⁷ See also J. J. COLLINS, *The Works of the Messiah*, DSD 1 (1994) 98-112. The Second Benediction of the *Amidah*, a tradition that may date quite early, also has God raising the dead: “You sustain the living with lovingkindness, revive the dead with great mercy, support the falling, heal the sick, free the bound, and keep Your faith to them that sleep in the dust. Who is like You, Lord of the mighty acts, and who resembles You, O King, who orders death and restores life, and causes salvation to spring forth?”

⁸ In addition to §II below, note that *11QMelchizedek* alludes to Isa 61 in describing an eschatological prophet who will release captives. For prophets as anointed by the Holy Spirit see 4Q377 and *11QMelchizedek* ii 18. H. KVALBEIN, *The Wonders of the End-Time: Metaphoric Language in 4Q521 and the Interpretation of Matthew 11.5 Par.*, JSP 18 (1998) 107 concludes that only God is the agent of salvation and there is no other (see also §II below); his article first appeared in German, *Die Wunder der Endzeit: Beobachtungen zu 4Q521 und Matt 11,5*, ZNW 88 (1997) 111-27.

⁹ L. NOVAKOVIC, *4Q521: The Works of the Messiah or the Signs of the Messianic Time?* in *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions*, hg. v. M. T. DAVIS & B. A. STRAWN, Grand Rapids 2007, 214-16 summarizes three hypotheses about the character of the messiah as either Davidic, prophetic or priestly. See also the summary by A. CHESTER, *Messiah and Exaltation* (WUNT 207) Tübingen 2007, 251-4.

I. Elijah as an Agent of Resurrection

Émile Puech and John Collins have both argued that in 4Q521 2 ii God uses the messiah as an agent in the resurrection and this is unlikely to be the royal messiah or anointed priest and is, therefore, a prophetic figure.¹⁰ They have noted that although the resurrection is associated with the messianic age (see esp. 2Bar 30,2; 4Ez 7; 1Cor 15; Rev 20), one is hard pressed to find a royal messiah as the agent of resurrection.¹¹ With little evidence to suggest a royal messiah, only a few candidates remain. Puech was the first to suggest that the agent of resurrection *par excellence* in the period is Elijah.¹² He finds evidence for this in a reconstruction of the Hebrew of Ben Sira 48,11, which is interpreted as portraying Elijah as aiding in the resurrection, an event that marks the beginning of the eschatological age.¹³ Collins draws attention to other Elijah traditions and, regarding the anointed figure in 4Q521 2 ii, concludes that: “the messiah, whom heaven and earth will obey, is an anointed eschatological prophet, either Elijah or a prophet like Elijah.”¹⁴ This character is a prophetic figure carrying out the will of God by, among other things, resurrecting the dead.

That Elijah is an agent of resurrection is known not only from Hebrew Scriptures (1Kgs 17), but also later Rabbinic literature where we read that the resurrection of the dead comes through Elijah (m. Sot. 9.15; y. Sheq. 3.3; y. Sabb. 1.3; Sanh. 92b). The strongest argument for both Puech and Collins that Elijah or an Elijah-like figure is in view in 4Q521 2 ii is an allusion to Malachi 3,24 (=4,6) in the following fragmentary column 4Q521 2 iii.¹⁵

While a good case may be made that there is a non-explicit use of Malachi 3,24 in 4Q521 2 iii, corroborating evidence that Elijah is the *only* suspect in the reference to resurrection in the preceding column (2 ii) deserves more serious challenge than it has so far received. Reasons that Elijah is the agent in 4Q521 ii may be summarized as

¹⁰ J. J. COLLINS, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*, New York, 1995, 119. That a royal messiah may be found here was based on a mistaken transcription of line 11 by EISENMAN and WISE, in which the grammatical subject of line 12 is the messiah. S. HULTGREN recently raises possibilities about a royal messiah in 4Q521 and Luke’s Magnificat and Benedictus in: *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament* (STDJ 85) hg. v. F. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, Leiden 2009, 119-32. K. -W. NIEBUHR, 4Q521, 2 II – Ein eschatologischer Psalm, in *Mogilany 1995: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of A. Klawek*, hg. v. Z. J. KAPERA, Kraków 1998, 151-68 does not find a messianic reference but rather views an emphasis on the authority of the priesthood; see also M. BECKER, 4Q521 und die Gesalbten, *RevQ* 18 (1997) 73-96.

¹¹ COLLINS, *The Scepter and the Star*, 119.

¹² É. PUECH, Ben Sira 48:11 et la Résurrection, in *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism and Christian Origins*, hg. v. H. ATTRIDGE, J. J. COLLINS, and T. H. TOBIN, Lanham, MD 1990, 86-7 reconstructs: כִּי הָיָה עִיִּים וְיִחִיָּה. Neither the Greek nor Syriac have Elijah raising the dead (though it does appear later). Resurrection does not fit with Ben Sira’s theology.

¹³ Cf. Sir 48,4-5 in the Praise of the Ancestors (cf. 1Kgs 17): “How glorious you were, Elijah, in your wondrous deeds! Whose glory is equal to yours? You raised a corpse from death and from Hades, by the word of the Most High.” Resurrection does not fit within Ben Sira’s theological framework and how such references found their way into that composition has been the attention of many scholars. With regard to Ezekiel, see later in the same section (49,8-10): “It was Ezekiel who saw the vision of glory....May the bones of the Twelve Prophets send forth new life from where they lie, for they comforted the people of Jacob and delivered them with confident hope.”

¹⁴ COLLINS, *The Scepter and the Star*, 120.

¹⁵ Ben Sira 48,10 has been used to explain the allusion in 4Q521 2 iii to Malachi. Where Malachi has “he will turn the hearts of the fathers to the sons, and the hearts of the sons to the fathers” 4Q521 2 iii has “I will free them with [...] it is su[re:] The fathers will return towards the sons” [נִכְוֵן בְּאִים אֲבוֹת עַל בְּנִים]. Ben Sira 48,10 has “at the correct time to return the heart to the sons” [נִכְוֵן לַעַת לְהָשִׁיב לֵב עַל בְּנִים].

follows: Elijah is the one who resuscitates the dead in the end time; in a highly fragmentary context in the middle of the column to follow (2 iii) is an allusion to Malachi 3,24; the combination of these two facts, therefore, mean: that in the reference to resurrection (2 ii), the implied agent is Elijah. It should not be taken as a *fait accompli* that 4Q521, when mentioning resurrection, has only a single referent. That only Elijah or an Elijah-like figure is in view is supported neither by the internal evidence nor broader context. Given that 4Q521 is so poorly preserved, one could imagine that any number of anointed figures could be in mind as intended referents. Such ambiguity or multiple referents are found elsewhere (e.g. *4QTestimonia* and the *Rule of the Community* ix 9-11).

More is at stake in the interpretation of 4Q521 2 ii than understanding interpretations of Elijah in early Jewish literature—serious questions about the history of earliest Christianity are too. Care should be taken not to assume immediately that 4Q521 2 ii is straightforward evidence that the parallel amalgamation of Isaian passages in Q (i.e., the same interpretive tradition), as taken up by both Matthew and Luke, is a straightforward continuation of developments related to Elijah.

Far more has been said about Elijah and messianic expectations in the period than can be addressed or even noted here. However, two preliminary points are worth mentioning. First, while early Christian literature clearly develops Elijah traditions, anachronistic interpretations need to be guarded against. Morris Faierstein, among others, has argued that the idea that Elijah would immediately precede the Messiah, or that the two should be associated, is not to be found in first-century Judaism or earlier but is likely a distinctively Christian interpretation.¹⁶ Second, a lot has been made of references to Elijah in highly fragmentary contexts, one of these is Puech's reconstruction of Ben Sira 48,11. Another example is 4Q558 (*4QVision^b ar*), an Aramaic document that does not preserve a single complete sentence, in which is found the phrase:

לכֹּן אֶשְׁלַח לְאַלְיָה קֶדֶם (“[...]to you I will send Elijah befo[re...]”).

There is good reason to believe that when 4Q521 2 ii conceives of God using an agent for resurrection that the document indicates a multivalent interest in any number of eschatological prophets, not just Elijah.¹⁷ The allusion to Malachi in fragmentary column iii is not enough to suggest that Elijah is the (sole?) mediating figure who will raise the dead in the *eschaton*. Another candidate—and one who has not been given attention in conversations about resurrection in 4Q521 2 ii line 12—is Ezekiel.

Whether in relation to Elijah or Ezekiel, however, a particularly serious question about agency in the *eschaton* has been raised that should not be left unaddressed. Hans Kvalbein argues that, whether in 4Q521 or in the Hebrew Bible, passages concerned with healing wonders are “metaphorical expressions for the restitution of Israel as a whole”.¹⁸ While he allows that there is healing of individuals by great prophets such as Elijah and Elisha, there is no evidence that an anointed individual

¹⁶ M. M. FAIERSTEIN, Why do the Scribes Say that Elijah must Come First, JBL 100/1 (1981) 75-86; see also A. WIENER, The Prophet Elijah in the Development of Judaism, Boston 1978; and J. A. FITZMYER, More about Elijah Coming First, JBL 104/2 (1985) 295-6; B. J. SHAVER, The Prophet Elijah in the Literature of the Second Temple Period: The Growth of Tradition (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 2001).

¹⁷ A. P. JASSEN, Mediating the Divine: Prophecy and Revelation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism (STDJ 68), Leiden 2007, 148.

¹⁸ KVALBEIN, The Wonders, 106.

would act to heal or resuscitate the dead in the end time. Kvalbein maintains that: “*we have no evidence at all for the assumption that the Jews in the Hellenistic and Early Roman period expected healing miracles for individual Israelites in the time of salvation.*”¹⁹ If Kvalbein’s view is correct then Puech and Collins’ interpretation of 4Q521 2 ii as depicting a figure like Elijah who resuscitates the dead in the end-time is faced with a serious challenge, one that to date is defensible only in reference to a reconstruction of the Hebrew of Ben Sira 48,11. Attention to Ezekiel traditions will be seen to be useful for considering Kvalbein’s suggestions about agency.

II. Ezekiel as an Agent of Resurrection

Pesikta de-Rab Kahana 9.4 reads: “All that the Holy One will do in the time-to-come, He has already anticipated and done in part by the hand of the righteous in this world. The Holy One says: I shall quicken the dead. He has already done so by the hand of Elijah, by the hand of Elisha, by the hand of Ezekiel.”²⁰ Perusing the pages of the Hebrew Bible in search of resurrection one cannot help but pause at the Elijah/Elisha narratives, once in Isaiah (26,19), and of course Daniel 12,1-3. Another prominent place that one may turn to is Ezekiel 37,1-14 and the Vision of Dry Bones. However, the vision of Ezekiel 37 is often seen, and for good reason, as concerned with national redemption, in which case it is not nearly as relevant for the present conversation.²¹ If Ezekiel 37 is only about national restoration it really has little to no bearing on agency in 4Q521 2 ii.

Relatively new materials from Qumran, a previously unknown document called *4QPseudo-Ezekiel*, shed fresh light on the interpretation of Ezekiel 37.²² The *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* materials provide the opportunity to explore revivifying agents in the period, and need to be brought into conversation with agency in 4Q521 2 ii. Additionally, once the bearing of *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* upon 4Q521 and the question of agency has been taken into consideration, suggestions may be made about the use of Q in Matthew and Luke.²³

¹⁹ KVALBEIN, *The Wonders*, p. 106 (italics his); 107 “From my interpretation of 4Q521 2.2 and from these observations to related texts it seems quite improbable that the Anointed in l. 1 should have any role as miracle worker or mediator of salvation in the wonders of the end-time mentioned in ll. 5-8 and 11-13....The wonders point to an inner renewal of the chosen people and a radical change of their living conditions....Israel is raised to new life, but no resurrection of the dead is presupposed.”

²⁰ Translation from W. G. BRAUDE and I. J. KAPSTEIN, *Pesikta de-Rab Kahana: R. Kahana’s Compilation of Discourses for Sabbaths and Festal Days*, Philadelphia 1975, 176.

²¹ That Ezekiel’s vision is about national restoration and not personal end time resurrection is clearest in 37,11-12. A. CHESTER, *Resurrection and Transformation*, in: *Auferstehung – Resurrection*, hg. v. H. LICHTENBERGER and F. AVEMARIE, Tübingen 1999, 53 summarizes this view well, that “it can be seen that 37.1-14 is set in a whole context of national ‘restoration’ and the vindication of God’s name and the nation’s fortunes, the ending of disastrous religious and political divisions and developments, and the bringing of the whole people back together in its own land.”

²² *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* has attracted considerable attention and been addressed in several articles about resurrection in the Qumran literature, although agency has not been the focus. For one of the first discussions where 4Q521 and 4Q385 are considered together see H. LICHTENBERGER, *Auferstehung in den Qumranfunden*, in: *Auferstehung – Resurrection*, 79-91, esp. 83-85.

²³ Attention has been given to references to the Vision of Dry Bones in other literature from the Second Temple Period (esp. in 4Macc 18,17, Sir 49,10, 1En 90,4-5), but *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* is unique in making Ezekiel an agent of personal resurrection. For a general introduction to Ezekiel in the Dead Sea Scrolls see: G. J. BROOKE, *Ezekiel in Some Qumran and New Testament Texts*, in: *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, hg. v. J. TREBOLLE BARRERA and L. VEGAS MONTANER, Leiden 1992, vol. 1 317-37; G. T. MANNING, *Echoes of a Prophet: The Use of Ezekiel in the Gospel of John and in Literature of*

4QPseudo-Ezekiel is preserved in six manuscripts (4Q385, 386, 385b, 388, 385c, 391). The oldest copy of the document is 4Q391, which is a different recension, and likely dates to the mid-second century BCE.²⁴ The other manuscripts date to the second half of the first century BCE (50-25). There is no reason to believe that this composition originates from the Qumran community.²⁵ Although portions of this document were published in 1988, the critical edition did not appear in the *Discovery in the Judean Desert* series until 2001.²⁶

The author of *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* writes in the first person, depicts himself as the biblical prophet Ezekiel, and adapts several visions from the book of Ezekiel, notably the Vision of Dry Bones (Ez 37) and the *Merkabah* scene (Ez 1). John Strugnell and Devorah Dimant assess the literary characteristics of *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* and note the combination of characteristics that one would usually only expect in separate compositions.²⁷ *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* is rewritten Bible. It reworks, however, a prophetic rather than narrative text, which is then given an apocalyptic context.²⁸ The new apocalyptic version of rewritten Ezekiel is historicized and related to a contemporary context; this is similar to the *pesharim*, though without the formal literary characteristics of the *pesharim*.

4Q385 fragments 2 and 3 preserve *4QPseudo-Ezekiel*'s adaptation of the Vision of Dry Bones, which transforms the image of national restoration to that of individual redemption. Fragment 2 depicts God directing Ezekiel to prophesy three times over the bones: (1) that the bones be joined together (ln. 5); (2) that they be covered with veins and skin (ln. 6); and (3) that the four winds of heaven blow on them (ln. 7). This retelling of the Vision of Dry Bones, in keeping with other examples of rewritten Bible, simplifies the Ezekiel account by abbreviations and clarifies it with additions. 4Q385 2 (par. 4Q386 1 i 1-10; 4Q388 7 2-7) reads:

- (1) [כי אני יהוה] הגואל עמי לתת להם הברית *vacat*
 (2) [ואמרה יהוה] ראיתי רבים מישראל אשר אהבו את שמך וילכו
 (3) בדרכיך [לבך וא] לה מתי יהיו והיככה ישתלמו חסדם ויאמר יהוה
 (4) אלי אני אראה [את בני ישראל וידעו כי אני יהוה *vacat*
 (5) ויאמר [בן אדם הנבה על העצמות ואמרת ויקיבו עצם אל עצמו ופרק

the Second Temple Period (JSNTS 270) London 2004, 22-77; É. COTHENET, L'influence d' Ézéchiél sur la spiritualité de Qumrân, *RevQ* 13 (1988) 431-39.

²⁴ 4Q391 is a papyrus that survives in seventy-eight fragments and was published several years before the other five manuscripts, M. Smith, 391. *4QpapPseudo-Ezekiel*^c, Qumran Cave 4. XIV; *Parabiblical Texts*, Part 2 (DJD XIX) Oxford 1995, 153-93.

²⁵ D. DIMANT, DJD XXX, 13 writes that while "*Pseudo-Ezekiel* shows no overt connection to the sectarian literature of Qumran, its literary profile displays important links with non-Qumran works. Such links are especially present in relation to three Jewish writings: *Biblical Antiquities*, 4 Ezra and 2 *Baruch*. Significantly, the three are interrelated in various ways, and are considered to have stemmed from a similar milieu." J. J. COLLINS, *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, Minneapolis 1993, 397 on the provenance of *Pseudo-Ezekiel* writes: "It is uncertain whether this document was composed at Qumran...or was merely part of the library, like the book of Daniel itself."

²⁶ J. STRUGNELL and D. DIMANT, 4Q Second Ezekiel, *RevQ* 13 (1988) 45-58; D. DIMANT, *Parabiblical Texts*, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts (DJD XXX) Oxford 2001.

²⁷ STRUGNELL and DIMANT, 4Q Second Ezekiel, 57-8.

²⁸ The term "rewritten" Bible raises a number of issues about boundaries between "biblical" and "parabiblical" texts; indeed, "parabiblical" may be more precise in certain regards. See M. POPAVIĆ, *Prophet, Books and Texts: Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Authoritativeness of Ezekiel Traditions in Early Judaism*, in: *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism* (SJSJ 141), hg. v. M. POPAVIĆ, Leiden 2010, 227-51; on 229-30 argues that "*Pseudo-Ezekiel* was also responsible for, or contributed to, the formation of the final form of biblical Ezekiel in the Masoretic text."

- (6) [אל פרקו ויהי כן ויאמר שנית הנבא ויעלו עליהם גדים ויקרמו עור
 (7) [מלמעלה ויהי כן] ויאמר שוב אנבא על ארבע רוחות השמים ויפחו רוח
 (8) [בהרוגים ויהי כן] וי[ח]יו עם רב אנשים ויברכו את יהוה צבאות אש[ר]
 (9) [חיים vacat] ואמרה יהוה מתי יהיו אלה ויאמר יהוה אל[י עד]
 (10) [אשר ומקץ ימים יכף עץ ויזקף]

(1) [for I am the Lord],
 the one who redeems my people
 to give them the covenant *vacat*
 (2) [I said,
 “LORD], I saw many from Israel who loved your name
 and followed in the (3) ways of [your heart];
 when will [th]ese things happen,
 and how will their righteousness be rewarded?”
 The LORD responded (4) to me,
 “I will show[]the children of Israel,
 and they will know that I am God.” *vacat*
 (5) [He said], “Son of Man, prophesy over these bones,
 say to them:
 ‘let bone be jo[i]ned to bone and joint (6) [to joint!’”
 And it w[as] so.
 Then he said to me,
 “prophesy a second time:
 ‘let arteries come upon them
 and let skin overlay (7) [them from above!’”
 And it was so].
 Then he said,
 “prophesy again upon the four winds of heaven,
 and they will blow a breath (8) [into the dead.”
 And it was so].
 A multitude of people came to life,
 and they blessed the LORD of hosts,
 wh[o (9) [made them live.
vacat
 And I said, “LORD, when will these things happen?”
 And the Lord said to m[e,
 (10) “Until] [after da]ys a tree shall bend and shall stand erect[]²⁹

These lines of *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* have been viewed by Dimant, Puech, Menahem Kister, and Elisha Qimron as depicting personal resurrection.³⁰ Dimant summarizes four modifications to the vision that make it “refer explicitly to an actual resurrection”. These are: (1) the event belongs in the eschatological era; (2) the vision applies only to the righteous of Israel; (3) it is a reward for the righteous; and (4) the benediction given after revival makes the resurrection concrete.³¹ The author produces a type of commentary on the original prophecy and thus decodes it. That this vision is

²⁹ Hebrew reconstruction and translation without full diacritical marks from DIMANT, DJD XXX, 23-4.

³⁰ É. PUECH, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: Immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle?* vol. 2, Paris 1993; M. KISTER and E. QIMRON, *Observations on 4QSecond Ezekiel*, RevQ 15 (1992) 595-602; and DIMANT, DJD XXX. J. TROMP, ‘Can these Bones Live?’ Ezekiel 37:1-14 and Eschatological Resurrection, in: *The Book of Ezekiel and its Influence*, hg. v. H. JAN DE JONGE and J. TROMP, Aldershot/Burlington 2007, 61-78 is alone in suggesting that *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* materials do not refer to an end-time resurrection as reward for individuals.

³¹ DIMANT, DJD XXX, 33. Another eschatological characteristic of *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* is the speeding up of time to hasten the redemption of Israel (4Q385 4).

about personal reward becomes even more apparent when in line 2 the vision is established as a response to the personal righteousness of those who love God.

4QPseudo-Ezekiel's Vision of Dry Bones is now more concretely a resurrection of individuals and recompense for the righteous in the *eschaton*.³² That these fragments are concerned with an eschatological era is found in the twice repeated question: “when will these things happen?” (ll. 3, 9).³³ Dimant draws attention to the (reconstructed) thrice repeated “and it was so” (ll. 6, 7, 8) formula, which is convincingly taken as an allusion to Genesis 1 and the response to each day of creation (וַיְהִי כֵן).³⁴ *4QPseudo-Ezekiel's* association of resurrection with creation is likely the earliest witness to this tradition.

The imagery of bodily resurrection is viewed by Dimant as the central interest of the fragment to follow too. In case there is any doubt as to the transformation of the vision, this fragment likely preserves part of the same column (4Q385 3) and appears to preserve a passage that would follow an account of personal resurrection. These lines read:

(2) [] Lord.
And all the people rose up and st[oo]d on[their feet
to thank] (3) [and to prai]se the Lord Sebaoth,
and I, too, s[po]ke with them[] (4) [va]act
And the Lord said to me:
Son[of Man, Tel]l them[]
(5) [in the place of their bur]ial they will lie until[]
(6) from] your [grav]es and from the earth []
(7) [] which [the yok]e of Eg[ypt]

In both this fragment and the previous one, Ezekiel, the Son of Man, calls to the dead in their graves who subsequently arise and worship God. Not only does this column make clear that the resurrection is of righteous individuals, it also portrays Ezekiel as an end-time figure who is an agent in the resurrection of the righteous. *4QPseudo-Ezekiel's* Vision of Dry Bones is a development, perhaps more widespread than we have evidence for, indicating that at least one character was explicitly associated with resurrection, and was portrayed as an agent of it, in the second century BCE.

Although *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* materials demonstrate that Ezekiel is a clear agent of resurrection in the *eschaton*, connecting this material to 4Q521 requires further attention. Language and imagery that may help to associate resurrection in 4Q521 to resurrection in Ezekiel's Vision of Dry Bones—particularly as told in the *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* materials—may be summarized in the following three points:

³² DIMANT, DJD XXX, 29. KISTER and QIMRON, Observations, comment: “It may therefore be surmised that lines 5-8 represent an implicit answer: the author indicates, in the words that he ascribes to God, that the vision of the Dry Bones (Ez. 37,4-10) was His way of demonstrating to the Children of Israel that the righteous would be rewarded by being resurrected. This interpretation of the vision, which is almost inescapable for a believer in the resurrection, is to be found later both in Rabbinic Judaism and Christianity.”

³³ DIMANT and STRUGNELL first drew attention to the flow of time here and in 4Ezra 4,33; 6,59 and also Mt 24,3; Rev 6,9-11 in: 4Q Second Ezekiel (4Q385), 52-57.

³⁴ That Ezekiel 37 already recalls creation is well recognized, see for example CHESTER, Resurrection, 53 who writes that “‘Resurrection’ here represents a powerful symbolic expression of ‘re-creation’ of the people. This is especially evident in the breathing in of the רִיחַ— the breath, or wind, or Spirit, with its resonance of Gen. 2.7, but also arguably Gen. 1.” Resurrection as a “new creation” resonates within early Christian apocalyptic (cf. Rom 8,18-25; Rev 20).

- (a) **Creation and resurrection.** *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* rewrites the Vision of Dry Bones so that resurrection is explicitly associated with creation. That creation and resurrection are to be associated with one another is reflected in the “and it was so” (וַיְהִי כֵן) formula. One may also speculate that the creation of Adam from the dust of the ground may also be at play in *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* (cf. 4Q385 2 7-8 and the “blowing” רוּחַ וַיִּפְחוּ); ancient interpreters link Ezekiel 37 with Genesis 2,7 where man is fashioned from the dust of the earth and life is then blown into him (e.g. Irenaeus, *Ad. Haer.* v.15.1).³⁵

The linking of imagery relating resurrection and creation may also be found in the *Messianic Apocalypse*. First, in 4Q521 2 ii line 6 the author describes God’s spirit as hovering over the poor (וַעֲלֵ עֲנִיִּים רוּחוֹ תִרְחֹף), and nowhere else in the Hebrew Bible are the words “hovering” (רָחַף) and “spirit” (רוּחַ) found in conjunction with one another except in Genesis 1,2 (וַיִּרְחַף אֱלֹהִים מֵרַחֲפָתָא).

Second, the largest fragment of 4Q521 after 2 ii is 4Q521 7 + 5 ii. This fragment is concerned with creation and resurrection and reads:³⁶

1]they saw [al]l th[at he made...] 2 [Lord, the ea]rth and all that is in it, the waters and[all] 3 [that is in them] and every pool of water and valleys [נַחְלִים] vacat 4 [...all of [you,] those doing good before the Lor[d...] 5 blessing and not as these ones, cursing, and to death they will g[o when he 6 rais]es those brought to life and the dead of his people vacat 7 and we [wi]ll give thanks and proclaim to you the righteousness of the Lord who[...] 8 the sons of death, and opened [the tombs [קְבָרִים]...] 9 and opened [...] 10 and [...] 11 and the valley of death in[...] 12 and the bridge of the de[pths...] 13 and the accurs[ed] have *congealed* (?) [קָפְאוּ] 14 and the heavens have gone before[...] 15 and [all] the angels[...]

It should not go without notice that Psalm 146,6 (“who made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that is in them”) likely lies behind lines 1-2 here. If resurrection is to be found in the expression “raises those bent down” (see (b) directly below), then the linking of creation with resurrection here may be *vis-à-vis* Psalm 146,6-8. The image of resurrection and especially the opening of tombs (ln. 8), assuming the reconstruction of Puech, evokes imagery of resurrection in Ezekiel more than anywhere else in the Hebrew Bible. Resurrection in this fragment appears to be a reward for the righteous, similar to what is found in *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* (e.g. ln. 4 “those doing good works”; ln. 13 “the accursed”).

The association of resurrection with creation in both 4Q521 and in *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* indicate that they conceive of resurrection in similar ways. Imagery of resurrection in 4Q521 7 + 5 ii is a stronger argument for Ezekiel acting as an agent of resurrection in 4Q521 2 ii than the allusion to Malachi in 2 iii is for Elijah as the actor.

- (b) **Raising that which is “bent” and resurrection.** In 4Q521 2 ii line 8 is a modified version of Psalm 146,8 (4Q521 2 ii 8 “raising up those be[nt down]; Ps 146,8 “the LORD raises up those who are bowed down”). The phrase

³⁵ T. HOLSINGER-FRIESEN, Irenaeus and Genesis: A Study of Competition in Early Christian Hermeneutics (JTISup 1) Winona Lake, IN 2009, 193.

³⁶ Translation mine, based on the Hebrew reconstruction of É. Puech, DJD XXV, 23.

זִקְיָה כַּפּוּפִים (“raises those bowed down”) also occurs in *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* (4Q385 2 13) where the image of raising up (וַיִּזְקֶה) a fallen tree appears to be a metaphor for death and resurrection.³⁷ The use of the root זִקְיָה to describe resurrection in *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* is unique except for 4Q521 2 ii line 8 where one should also consider an association with resurrection. Therefore, raising that which is “bent” as a metaphor for resurrection helps link the two scrolls.³⁸

Menahem Kister first suggested that 4Q385 2 10 is known by the the *Epistle of Barnabas* 12,1 who uses it as a proof text for the cross.³⁹ Perhaps the imagery of raising that which is bent over was used to express resurrection more widely than previously understood and to conceive of any direct relationship between *Barnabas* and *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* is unnecessary.⁴⁰

- (c) Resurrection in Isaiah 26,19 and Ezekiel 37. Little has been said in regard to the Isaian pastiche in 4Q521 2 ii, and particularly Isaiah 26,19. While Elijah has been considered as an agent of resurrection in 4Q521 2 ii based upon 1Kings 17,22, the image of resurrection there is not of the righteous (of the) house Israel being raised from the dead. If Isaiah 26,19 is being used in 4Q521 2 ii, then the reference to this passage from Isaiah seems to recall Ezekiel 37 more than 1Kings. There are few passages in the Hebrew Scriptures that refer to resurrection in relation to Israel, punishment, and reward.

These three observations taken together begin to demonstrate that in 4Q521, a work that is only partially preserved, there are arguments that the anointed figure or figures may be Elijah (or an Elijah-like figure) and/or Ezekiel (or a character like Ezekiel). On the one hand, multiple characters may be seen to merge into a single agent; on the other hand, resurrection and agency recall more than one prophetic figure and are described in reference only to a select grouping of biblical passages.

Finally, and before turning to the gospels, Kvalbein’s suggestions, mentioned above, need to be reconsidered. Kvalbein’s argument is a response to Hermann Strack and Paul Billerbeck’s influential claim that the healing of illnesses would herald the messianic end-time.⁴¹ Whether considering Elijah or Ezekiel as agents, if his claim is correct that there is no evidence that Jews in the Hellenistic and early Roman period expected healing miracles for individual Israelites in the time of salvation, then serious interpretive difficulties arise when discussing agency in 4Q521 2 ii. While Lidija Novakovic has already challenged Kvalbein’s conclusion in regard to end time

³⁷ DIMANT, DJD XXX, 29, she also notes that the root זִקְיָה only occurs in late Biblical Hebrew and is common in Mishnaic Hebrew and Aramaic.

³⁸ The root זִקְיָה is only used on one other occasion in the Hebrew Bible (and once in Aramaic in Ezra 6,11) and this is Ps 145,14 where the expression is nearly identical to Ps 146,8. Neither Psalm, to my knowledge, is cited or alluded to in the New Testament.

³⁹ M. KISTER, *Barnabas* 12:1; 4:3 and 4Q Second Ezekiel, RB 97 (1990) 63-67. Bar 12:1 “Likewise, another prophet also describes the cross, who says, ‘When will all these things be done?’ The Lord says, ‘When the tree will fall and rise up, and when blood will flow from the tree.’ Here again you have a reference to the cross, and to the one crucified.”

⁴⁰ Another example of perceiving direct literary dependence is R. BAUCKHAM, A Quotation from 4Q Second Ezekiel in the Apocalypse of Peter, RevQ 15 (1991) 437-46.

⁴¹ H. L. STRACK and P. BILLERBECK, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, 6 vols, München 1924-1956, 1:593.

miracles, she does not address end time resurrection.⁴² Both *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* and the reconstruction of Ben Sira 48,11 are important in this regard. Novakovic, after examining several passages (Jub 23,26-30; 1En 96,3; 4Ez 7,26-29, 7,120-126; 2Bar 29,6-7; 73,1-3, 6-7), convincingly concludes “that the miracles of healing and other marvels play a role in the revelation of the Messiah.”⁴³

Ezekiel’s role as an agent of resurrection in *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* suggests that Kvalbein’s interpretation of resurrection in 4Q521 as a metaphorical expression of national redemption, an argument made based upon an absence of evidence, is not sustainable. Indeed, *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* is the best source available from early Jewish literature that unequivocally depicts a prophetic figure as an agent of resurrection in the *eschaton*.

III. Implications: The Use of Q in Matthew and Luke

If the common source of Matthew 11,1-6 and Luke 7,18-23 (= Q) knows the same interpretive tradition as 4Q521 2 ii, or even 4Q521 itself, how did Matthew and Luke adapt Q to their own narrative frameworks?⁴⁴ Another, and related, question is: do redactional tendencies within Matthew and Luke when portraying Jesus (and John the Baptist) hold any clues or suggestions for how 4Q521 2 ii may be interpreted? If Puech and Collins are correct about the tradition, especially as it occurs within 4Q521 2 ii, being a reference to Elijah, then one may question if the same holds true of Q. When considering how/if Matthew and Luke may have inserted such Elijah material, it will be helpful to adopt José Severino Croatto’s distinction between “Elijah I” (i.e. the Elijah of 1Kgs 17–2Kgs 2) and “Elijah II”, or the returned (“*redivivus*”) Elijah (Mal 3,1; 24).⁴⁵ In the synoptic tradition Jesus imitates Elijah I and John the Baptist is Elijah II.⁴⁶

In the case of Luke 7,18-23 the association of “the dead are raised” (7,22) with Elijah may be more convincing from the context than in Matthew. A number of scholars have argued that Luke imitates Elijah/Elisha narratives (i.e. Elijah I) when portraying Jesus.⁴⁷ If this is the case, one may regard Luke as introducing Jesus’ response to John the Baptist’s disciples with a pericope that clearly intends to associate Jesus with Elijah I: the Raising of the Widow’s Son at Nain (7,11-17; cf. 1Kgs 17,17-24). In this same vein, when Luke discusses John the Baptist in the immediately following passage, a double tradition, he does not describe John the

⁴² L. NOVAKOVIC, *Messiah, Healer of the Sick: A Study of Jesus as the Son of David in the Gospel of Matthew* (WUNT2 170) Tübingen 2003, 163-9.

⁴³ NOVAKOVIC, *Messiah, Healer*, 168.

⁴⁴ TABOR and WISE, 4Q521 ‘On Resurrection’, 161 write: “Although it is unlikely that Luke knew the Qumran text directly, it seems that he shares with its author a common set of messianic expectations. Such interpretive directions evidently influenced Luke.” While Q in Luke is given attention here, it is noteworthy that Q in Matthew is not discussed.

⁴⁵ J. S. CROATTO, *Jesus, Prophet like Elijah, and Prophet-teacher like Moses in Luke-Acts*, JBL 124/3 (2005) 454. The distinction is between Elijah as miracle worker vs. preacher/prophet.

⁴⁶ TABOR and WISE, 4Q521 ‘On Resurrection’, 160 do not make this necessary distinction, writing that “in both instances the Q saying probably reflects an understanding of John and Jesus as fulfilling the mission of eschatological Elijah/Elisha figures.”

⁴⁷ Most recently T. L. BRODIE, *The Birthing of the New Testament: The Intertextual Development of the New Testament Writings*, Sheffield 2004, 284-446. See especially J. D. DUBOIS, *La figure d’Elie dans la perspective lucanienne*, RHPR 53 (1973) 155-76; C. A. EVANS, *Luke’s Use of Elijah/Elisha Narratives and the Ethic of Election*, JBL 106/1 (1987) 75-83; and M. ÖHLER, *Elia im Neuen Testament: Untersuchungen zur Bedeutung des alttestamentlichen Propheten im frühen Christentum*, Berlin/New York 1997, 175-208.

Baptist as Elijah II and forerunner to the Messiah. Because this is already developed in Luke 1-2 it would be unnecessary in chapter 7.⁴⁸ For Luke, one may argue, attention here is given to portray Jesus as similar to Elijah I while avoiding the confusion of John the Baptist as Elijah II (esp. in the immediate context).

The tendency of Luke to portray Jesus as Elijah I is found elsewhere in the gospel. The pericope of the Rejection of Jesus at Nazareth (Lk 4,16-30; par. Mt 13,53-58; Mk 6,1-6) is transformed in Luke by the addition of Jesus reading from Isaiah (without resurrection), which is not found in Mark or Matthew, and is followed by the association of Jesus with Elijah and Elisha (Lk 4,25-27 “But in truth, I tell you, there were many widows in Israel in the days of Elijah...and Elijah was sent to none of them but only to Zeraphath...”). Indeed, in Luke 4 the portion about the “sight to the blind” comes from Isaiah 35 and demonstrates that the same composite Isaian tradition found in Q and 4Q521 2 ii is likely used here by the evangelist. Jesus as Elijah I is likely to be found later in Luke’s gospel, Jesus cleanses the ten lepers (Lk 17,11-19; cf. 2Kgs 5), which is a pericope not found elsewhere in the synoptic tradition.

When 4Q521 2 ii and Q, as used in Luke, are considered together, the two reinforce the view that the presence of resurrection in the Isaiah pastiche recalls Elijah. As suggested, *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* may suggest an alternative or additional view of the agent of resurrection in 4Q521 2 ii. Matthew’s use of Q requires attention because the Elijah typology plays out differently in his gospel, which is then significant for the assessment of agency in both Q and 4Q521 2 ii.

In the case of Matthew, the emphasis is less on Jesus imitating Elijah I, and more on John the Baptist as Elijah II. The implication for reading the reference to “resurrection” in the amalgamated Isaiah tradition in 4Q521 and Q as an unquestioned reference to Elijah is that Matthew would be made to shift from John-as-Elijah II to a confusing portrayal of Jesus-as-Elijah (I-II?) by the insertion of this Q material into his gospel. In this short space, this would be seen to work against his tendency to portray John the Baptist as Elijah II. Matthew’s tendency may be seen directly following 11,1-6 in Jesus’ response to John’s disciples; Matthew has a statement that is not present in Luke’s ordering of material: “For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John; and if you are willing to accept it, he [John] is Elijah who is to come” (11,13-14; cf. Lk 16,16).⁴⁹ And whereas Luke orders his materials so that the Isaiah tradition follows on from the Raising of the Widow’s Son at Nain, Matthew has no such account anywhere in his gospel. The suggestion is that Matthew does not rely on Elijah typologies for his portrayal of Jesus as Luke does.

Nowhere in the New Testament is Ezekiel mentioned by name. The Fourth Gospel, more than any other New Testament composition, has long been recognized for a number of non-explicit uses of Ezekiel.⁵⁰ On one or two occasions John alludes to Ezekiel 37. In John 5,21-29 Jesus as the Son of man is given authority to call forth those in their tombs, the righteous to be resurrected and the wicked to be judged (cf. Jn 20,22). But John is not the only one to make such connections. In Matthew 27,51-

⁴⁸ While Luke may be keen to portray Jesus as Elijah at points (cf. esp. Lk 4,25 where Jesus reads Isa 61 in the synagogue without an addition of “resurrection”). John the Baptist is associated with Elijah II (Mal 3,23 is cited) in the birth narrative (Lk 1,17).

⁴⁹ This is made clear elsewhere in Matthew (17,9-13), after the Transfiguration the disciples ask: “‘Why do the scribes say that first Elijah must come?’ He replied, ‘Elijah does come, and he is to restore all things; but I tell you that Elijah has already come, and they did not know him, but did to him whatever they pleased...’ The disciples understood that he was speaking to them of John the Baptist.”

⁵⁰ MANNING, *Echoes of a Prophet*.

53 an allusion to Ezekiel 37 also occurs; just after Jesus yields his spirit on the cross: “the tombs also were opened, and many bodies of the saints who had fallen asleep were raised, and coming out of the tombs after his resurrection they went into the holy city....” Although this is not overwhelming evidence that an Ezekiel typology undergirds Matthew’s portrayal of Jesus, Matthew nowhere portrays Jesus as Elijah I, and when Matthew refers to resurrection at a later stage in his gospel the Vision of Dry Bones informs the narrative.⁵¹ Moreover, for some time there has been speculation that Matthew’s special material (M) may reflect a Jewish eschatological apocalyptic tradition.

George Brooke, in an article on Ezekiel traditions at Qumran that is concerned with connections to early Christian literature, suggests that “perhaps commentators are correct to see in Matt 27:52 the remains of an early Christian use of Jewish eschatological apocalyptic motifs about the resurrection to interpret the death and resurrection of Jesus.”⁵² Brooke speculates that the occurrence of traditions found in the *Epistle of Barnabas* and the *Apocalypse of Peter* (4,7-8), which appear to allude to the traditions found in *4QPseudo-Ezekiel*, are evidence that special Matthew material may be linked with a particular form of Jewish Christianity. Other studies that Brooke points to begin to support the suggestion made here that Matthew, in his use of the tradition represented in the amalgamated Isaiah passages, may have been influenced by Ezekiel traditions.⁵³

In light of these observations, several questions may be raised about Matthew’s use of Q. Is it that Matthew in his use of the sayings source simply does not understand a specific implied agency? If the agent of resurrection in 4Q521 and Q refers straightforwardly to Elijah or an eschatological Elijah-like figure, then Matthew may be viewed as not being terribly concerned about using Q (=Elijah material) to portray Jesus. If Matthew is familiar with this tradition, then he knowingly used Elijah material in a context that confuses his portrayal of John the Baptist as Elijah II (redactional activity unique to Matthew). Another option, one that arises based upon reflections on 4Q521 in light of *4QPseudo-Ezekiel*, is that Matthew may very well be aware of the interpretive tradition he is using (i.e. 4Q521 or similar) and simply does not associate the act of raising the dead exclusively with Elijah (or an Elijah-like prophet), but rather (or additionally) with Ezekiel.

Materials from *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* suggest that in addition to Elijah, Ezekiel is another important agent of resurrection. Whereas Malachi 3,24 anticipates the return of Elijah in the *eschaton*, among extant literature from early Judaism there is no passage that unquestionably transforms Elijah into an agent of end-time resurrection. When Matthew and Luke independently used this passage from Q, as most assume, they would not necessarily have thought only of Elijah (or Elijah at all). The presence of “resurrection” in the Isaiah tradition in 4Q521 2 ii is part of a complex network of

⁵¹ BROOKE, Ezekiel, 337 comments: “As with the Qumran texts so too in the New Testament, with the obvious exception of Revelation, there is a relative paucity of the use of Ezekiel. The influence of Ezekiel seems strongest in the eschatological apocalyptic material peculiar to Matthew, in the problematic section of 2 Cor 6:14-7:1, and in Revelation itself.”

⁵² BROOKE, Ezekiel, 332; he also ventures that Qumran documents where Ezekiel is more influential, particularly the *Damascus Document*, should be more carefully compared with Matthew to provide insights to the continuity of influence between them.

⁵³ Works cited are É. PUECH, Un Hymne essénien en partie retrouvé et les Béatitudes, RevQ 13 (1998) 85-88 which BROOKE translates and expands in The Wisdom of Matthew’s Beatitudes (4QBeat and Mt. 5:3-12), ScrB (1989) 35-41; G. N. STANTON, The Gospel of Matthew and Judaism, BJRL 66 (1984) 264-84. In regard to commonalities in Mt and CD he notes whitewashed walls in Ez 13,10/CD iv 19, viii 12/Mt 23,27; scattered sheep in Ez 34,12-16/CD xiii 9/Mt 9,36; 18,12.

allusions and references. As scholars continue to consider the extraordinary parallel between 4Q521 and Q and implications for the history of these religions, it would be a mistake only to reflect on imagery of Elijah and consequences that may have for interpreting Q. Indeed, if the identification of a specific agent is not so much at issue then the *eschaton* becomes larger than identity. Classifying 4Q521 among texts that deal with a specific, known figure becomes very difficult.

Conclusions

Issues related to resurrection in 4Q521 have, to date, focused almost exclusively on Elijah as an agent of it. When *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* materials are brought to bear on the topic of agency in 4Q521 as discussed by Puech and Collins, conclusions here may be seen to generally support their views and yet urge less specificity in regard to the prophetic character acting in the end time. If the agent of resurrection in 4Q521 2 ii is understood as Elijah *redivivus*, as they are persuaded, one would be hard pressed to suggest that Matthew understands Q in this way. The proposal here is that the actor who preaches to the poor and raises the dead in both 4Q521 2 ii and Q need not be regarded as Elijah, only Elijah, or an Elijah-like figure. The non-explicit use of Malachi 3,24 in 4Q521 2 iii is evidence, albeit fragmentary, that suggests that Elijah *redivivus* could indeed be in mind. However, the context of this allusion is not extant and one may speculate that this column contained an anthology of biblical traditions. If this is the case, the fragmentary allusion to Malachi does not limit the actors on the stage, but rather begins to clarify who one of them *may* be.⁵⁴

The analysis here considers that the interpretive tradition that uses an amalgamation of Isaiah passages that include “resurrection”, a tradition found nowhere else except Q and 4Q521, may also mean that these two documents conceived of agency in similar ways. It should be acknowledged that this need not be the case and that the preceding discussion simply makes it more probable.⁵⁵ When conclusions about 4Q521 and the agent of resurrection are shifted to Q, interpretive difficulties arise in the context of Matthew. To resolve this issue one of several suggestions was that Matthew was not aware of how Q, at this point, resonated in the new context. Another suggestion about how to deal with this apparent conflict is to conclude that the prophetic figure acting in this tradition is not straightforwardly Elijah. The option also remains to conclude that Q and 4Q521 are not using the amalgamated Isaiah tradition in the same way at all. The claim that Elijah is the agent in 4Q521 2 ii is dependent on a general conclusion about Elijah’s role in the end time during the period as well as the identification of a reference to him in the document. The Ezekiel tradition discussed here is a significant addition to the evidence related to agents of resurrection in the period. There are also good arguments that a resurrection like the one found in *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* may be found in 4Q521 too. I am convinced that the echoes of Ezekiel in 4Q521 resonate more loudly than those of Elijah.

In later Jewish material, *Pesikta de-Rab Kahana* 9.4 for instance, Elijah and Ezekiel are both connected with resurrection. *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* provides valuable insights into how Ezekiel was linked to individual resurrection in the second century

⁵⁴ One might also move in another direction and interpret משיח as plural (“messiahs”) and find in 4Q521 2 ii references to two or more anointed prophetic figures. To do so is not necessary, however, as this discussion relates to the typologies at play and not the number of messiahs acting.

⁵⁵ NOVAKOVIC, 4Q521, 230 “The startling similarity between 4Q521 and the Q passage (Matt. 11:2-6/Luke 7:18-23), which is best attributed to a common tradition, casts additional light on the relationship of end-time marvels and the person of the Messiah.”

BCE. In this document, he is an eschatological agent of resurrection which is a reward for personal righteousness. *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* and 4Q521 taken together may help to demonstrate the antiquity of later Jewish and Christian traditions. The *Epistle of Barnabas*, *Apocalypse of Baruch*, 4Ezra, and Irenaeus (*Ad. Haer.* v.15.1) on Ezekiel 37 would be other examples of this.

Finally, for those who would argue that it is difficult to find evidence for a belief that an eschatological prophet would perform miracles in the end time, *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* suggests otherwise.⁵⁶ Indeed, an understanding of the literary and religious traditions available to Matthew and Luke, and how the evangelists and their sources may have conceived of these traditions, is broadened and enhanced by materials otherwise known only from the Dead Sea Scrolls.

⁵⁶ See for instance P. HOFFMANN, *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle* (NTA 8) Münster 1972, 205-8.