ANDREW CHESTER

Messiah and Exaltation

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament
207

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament

207

Andrew Chester

Messiah and Exaltation

Jewish Messianic and Visionary Traditions and New Testament Christology

Mohr Siebeck

Andrew Chester, born 1948; studied Semitic Languages at Oxford and Theology at Cambridge; 1981 Ph.D.; University Lecturer in New Testament Studies at the University of Cambridge.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-151496-8
ISBN 978-3-16-149091-0
ISSN 0512-1604 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the Internet at *http://dnb.d-nb.de*.

The book was printed by Gulde-Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

For Susan

Preface

The suggestion and stimulus for this book came originally from Martin Hengel. He encouraged me to bring together my earlier work in this area, and to supplement this with substantial new essays. And he not only provided me with the initial stimulus; he has also given me constant help and encouragement at every stage. This is, indeed, simply the latest of his many kindnesses to me. It seems less than adequate simply to offer him my grateful thanks at this point; but I am deeply grateful, and the very least I can do is to say so. Martin Hengel has done an enormous amount over many years to promote contact between Britain and Germany in the field of New Testament (as well as promote the cause of New Testament study much more widely), and foster fruitful exchange at every level. I very much hope his efforts will be continued and sustained by many of us in both Britain and Germany.

Three of the essays in this volume started life as contributions to the Tübingen-Durham New Testament Research Symposiums that have been held every few years since the inaugural meeting in 1988. These too have benefited enormously from Martin Hengel's initiative and enthusiasm for the whole enterprise, and all those who have been involved have rich memories of them. Another important factor in encouraging this co-operative venture has been the willingness of Mohr Siebeck in Tübingen to publish the proceedings, thanks in no small measure to the warm and fruitful collaboration between Martin Hengel and Georg Siebeck over many years; and through his editorship of WUNT, Martin Hengel has helped promote New Testament scholarship, and Anglo-German links, much more widely as well. Hence it is a particular pleasure for me that the present volume appears in WUNT, even though Martin Hengel has relinquished the editorship. I am deeply grateful to Jörg Frey, the present Editor, for his generous encouragement and helpful advice. The staff at Mohr Siebeck have been helpful throughout: Dr Henning Ziebritzki, the Editorial Director for Theology and Jewish Studies, has facilitated the publication process with great kindness and efficiency, and Jana Trispel, of the Production Department, has been wonderfully patient and enormously and unfailingly helpful. Others at Mohr Siebeck, whose names I do not know, have also helped; my grateful thanks to them all.

A number of people in Britain have also given me much help and support, especially Chris Rowland and Justin Meggitt; and I have had helpful

discussions as well with Rachel Muers and Josette Zammit-Mangion. I am extremely grateful to Graham Stanton and James Carleton Paget for their very kind help and initiative in facilitating funding for the task of indexing, and equally grateful to the Managers of the Hort Memorial Fund for a generous grant towards this. Deep gratitude is due especially to William Horbury, who has provided constant support, encouragement and stimulus; this indeed, despite the fact that I have had to differ from him on specific issues in the course of this book. He is, however, generously tolerant of my ideas, where I diverge from him (as similarly, indeed, is Martin Hengel!), and through the conversations we have had, my respect for his scholarship has been constantly enhanced yet further. Very special thanks go also to David Goode: he has constantly encouraged me to persevere with the process of formatting the text, despite knowing that this would give him more work to cope with, and he has shown extraordinary patience and resourcefulness, and solved innumerable problems, in helping me produce a camera-ready copy of the text. Certainly it could not have reached the present stage without him. I am also very grateful to several of my students at Selwyn College (Sarah Eatherton, Claire Ellis, Emily Shore and Olivia Wilkinson) for very kindly helping me with the tedious business of proofreading. It needs to be said, however (although it should go without saying), that none of those I have named here are in any way to blame for any of the defects in either the form or the content of this book. The responsibility for those is mine alone.

My two sons, David and Stephen, have also given me enormous practical help and support in the formatting process (as well as much pleasure and enjoyment otherwise). They have rescued me from a great many potential disasters that my incompetence with computers had threatened to bring on me. My wife, Susan, has sustained and supported me quite wonderfully all through the writing of this book, despite the rather indifferent health we have both had for much of the time. I dedicate the book to her in gratitude.

Cambridge, November 2006 Andrew Chester

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

Abbreviations used throughout the book for both Ancient Texts and also Periodicals, Reference Works and Serials are almost entirely according to those given in P. H. Alexander *et al* (eds), *The SBL Handbook of Style: for Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies* (Peabody: Hendrikson, 1999). The few exceptions to this will be self-explanatory.

The following additional abbreviations have also been used:

BHM	Bet ha-Midrasch (see under Jellinek in Bibliography)
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testaments
JBTh	Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie
KAV	Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern
SemBibEsp	Semana Biblica Española
WdF	Wege der Forschung

Chapter 1

Introduction

1. Purpose of the Book

This book has eight main chapters. These do not, however, form a single, sustained argument. Each of the eight chapters can stand alone, independently of the others, and several indeed did in their earlier published form. Hence the point of this Introduction is to show why and how they belong together and represent a coherent book overall. It is worth emphasizing here that chapters 2 and 4 (the two longest chapters in the book), along with chapter 9, have been written especially for this collection. In addition, chapter 3 represents a substantially revised and extended version of an essay first published in 2001, while chapter 8 presents a previously published essay in significantly expanded form. Chapters 5, 6 and 7 appear in very much the form in which they were published originally (although I have, for example, omitted the Discussion and Response that were appended to chapter 5 in its originally published form). Thus nearly two-thirds of this book consists of entirely new material. Details of original publication will be found at the end of this Introduction.

The main focus of the book is on central issues within Jewish messianism and traditions of exalted figures, and within early Christology. That is, it is concerned above all with major themes in Jewish messianic hope, intermediary figures, and visionary traditions of human transformation, especially in the Second Temple period; and the significance of all of these for the origin and development of New Testament Christology.

All these main themes, in fact, are central to the earliest of the essays in this collection (that is, chapter 5). Or at least, all of them are central except for the focus on visionary traditions of human transformation; that is present but not central there. This essay began, in a shorter form, as a contribution to the first of the Tübingen-Durham Research Symposiums, held in Tübingen in 1988; it was then published in 1991. In this, I discussed the main evidence for Jewish traditions of both messianic hope and intermediary figures, and developed a distinctive argument in each case. I also considered, briefly, the implications of these for Pauline Christology. The argument here was designed to provoke debate and discussion. Along with that, a number of important issues had to be discussed very briefly (one of those being Pauline

Christology!). And in the fifteen years since that essay appeared there has indeed, for a variety of reasons, been very vigorous and extensive debate in all these areas. Hence, inevitably, in view of all this, there is much from this original essay that I want and need to take up and develop further.

The two main substantial areas of focus in this earlier essay were Jewish traditions, first of messianic hope and secondly of mediatorial figures. These two sets of traditions are potentially interrelated (although that relationship needs to be handled very carefully), and both are also potentially important for New Testament Christology. It is, then, these two main themes that are taken up in this present book, and developed further and in more depth. I have still not, of course, explored them exhaustively, but I hope that I have succeeded in showing something more of their significance in themselves, and their significance also for New Testament Christology.

2. Outline of the Contents

First, then, I take up the whole question of intermediary figures, not least in light of recent debate, and introduce the further important dimension of visionary traditions of transformation, especially human transformation. I assess the significance of these, both in themselves and also for early Christology. This is the focus of chapters 2 and 3. Then, secondly, in the following chapters (4–9), I set the main focus on messianic themes and traditions, explore further dimensions of these, and again to some extent at least assess their significance for New Testament Christology.

It is in chapters 2 and 3 that I focus, in a more extensive way than anywhere else in the book, on very early Christology. This is no coincidence; indeed, one main thrust of my argument here (in chapter 2 particularly) is that it is Jewish mediatorial and visionary traditions that are above all important for helping us understand the origin and development of earliest Christology. Thus indeed my starting-point in chapter 2 is to focus on recent work on the origin and early stages of New Testament Christology, where a considerably different assessment (compared to mine) is given for Jewish mediatorial traditions and their potential significance for New Testament Christology in its formative stages. I enter into constructive as well as critical engagement with this work, as also indeed with recent studies of Jewish intermediary and related traditions in themselves.

This leads me on to examine a substantial number of Jewish texts, the vast majority of which I had not included in my earlier essay (chapter 5). These texts are almost all traditions of visionary experiences concerned with transformation, above all the transformation of human figures such that they take on extraordinarily exalted (angelic or otherwise suprahuman) form in the

heavenly world. These traditions, I argue, help us understand the nature and significance of Paul's visionary experiences of Christ, and similar visionary experiences within the New Testament otherwise. And in helping us understand this, they also, I suggest, provide us with important insight into how and why the Christian movement came, at such an early stage, to perceive Christ as set alongside God in the heavenly world, and belonging very much on the same level with him otherwise.

Following this, in chapter 3, I focus again on the theme of transformation, this time specifically in relation to resurrection. Here I discuss Jewish resurrection traditions from the Hebrew Bible onwards. It is clear that physical, or bodily, resurrection is not unequivocally attested in the Hebrew Bible before Daniel 12 in the second century BCE. Belief in physical resurrection probably *is* attested before the time of Daniel in the Enoch tradition. That would, even so, potentially take this belief back only to the early third century. Nevertheless, I argue that even if bodily resurrection is thus not clearly attested until the third century (or later), the earlier biblical traditions are not therefore simply devoid of significance. On the contrary, metaphorical resurrection traditions, as much as physical, point powerfully to the *transformation* that God is seen as – potentially at least – bringing about. Thus, I argue, the Ezekiel 37 resurrection tradition has a significance even beyond that usually noted, in the way that it shows the creative, transformative mode of divine action that is envisaged here. The Jewish people and their fortunes are not simply restored, as is often claimed; as Ezekiel portrays it, they are utterly transformed, and the effect of this extraordinary passage and emphasis are seen in later traditions as well.

Daniel 12, with its unmistakable portrayal of physical resurrection, in context of dire persecution and martyrdom, introduces a radical and important new dimension into Jewish resurrection tradition, whether or not it is innovatory in itself in depicting bodily resurrection. But what is also important to realize about Daniel 12 is that physical resurrection here is integrally bound up with a powerful tradition of righteous humans being transformed to take on angelic form in the heavenly world. This theme then has a strong influence on subsequent Jewish tradition. Thus in a range of texts, the righteous, set in the heavenly sphere beyond death, are also portrayed as being transformed into angelic mode. From this, I proceed to discuss resurrection traditions in Revelation and Paul. In Revelation 1, 7, 11 and 20, the influence of Ezekiel and Daniel is variously evident, but the theme of transformation takes on remarkable new dimensions, individually, christologically and cosmically. In Paul, I focus on a series of texts where the theme of resurrection is set centrally, but where we also find strong emphasis on the transformation of Christ and of believers. Yet here the tradition of

Daniel 12 (or indeed Ezekiel) plays no obvious role: Paul seems to draw instead on his own visionary experience of Christ transformed.

From Chapter 4 onwards, the focus is on messianism, again with discussion of Christology at a number of points. In my first essay (chapter 5), I drew attention to the need for further discussion of the *definition* of messianism; subsequently I had emphasized repeatedly the importance of this question and of considering the issues tied up in it. Now, in chapter 4, I take up this issue of definition, and argue that in modern scholarship there are effectively four different working definitions. I argue against too restrictive a definition, especially that which insists on a text having the specific term 'messiah'. The position that I argue for is that a messiah should be understood, in the most concise form of the definition, as 'the agent of final divine deliverance'. The eschatological dimension of this definition should, I argue, be seen as an integral aspect of it, over against positions, and definitions, that lack this focus.

In fact, however, the question of definition is only one of the issues that I have needed, and wanted, to take up from the original essay. Thus along with the issue of definition, and bound up with it, there is the question of what evidence counts as relevant, and what is significant about it. This question has to be taken up, both in relation to the substantial amount of (potentially) significant evidence not considered in the original essay, especially that from the Hebrew Bible, and also in relation to newly available evidence. Thus since the first essay was written, a large number of newly published Qumran texts had become available. So, then, the study of messianism in this period had been, potentially, considerably enhanced, and in light of this new evidence and recent discussion of it, a whole set of new questions and issues of importance had been opened up.

The Qumran texts were indeed one main point of focus in the original essay (chapter 5). Since, then, however, the publication in the early 1990s of a substantial number of further Qumran texts (especially Cave 4 Fragments) contained several with apparent messianic reference. Hence in chapter 4, I set out and discuss this evidence, and assess its significance for Qumran and Jewish messianism as a whole. I argue that this new evidence opens up further, and in some cases quite remarkable, dimensions for the role and nature of messianic figures at Qumran. There is now enhanced evidence for a royal messianic tradition at Qumran (though less so for a priestly messiah, or a dual messiah tradition), but from the diversity of portrayals, it is not possible to trace a development of messianic belief, or a specific pattern of messianic identity at Qumran. Nevertheless, taking this new evidence with that considered previously, it is possible to understand all these messianic profiles as, variously, expressions of what I have termed 'agents' of final divine deliverance, and together exhibiting a rich variety of emphasis.

In my first essay (in chapter 5), limits of space and the fact that I was restricting the period to c. 200 BCE – 200 CE meant that I could not include discussion of the Hebrew Bible. It is, however, important to take account of this evidence, both for its own sake and also because of its influence on and importance for subsequent developments in Jewish tradition. But it has become all the more important to do so in view of the prominent place that messianic traditions in the Hebrew Bible have assumed in recent discussion. Hence I give a critical review of recent scholarship, and argue that this reveals quite contrasting positions. These I term 'minimalist' and 'maximalist': the former finds little or nothing of messianic hope in the Hebrew Bible, or indeed before the first century BCE. The latter finds a clear royal messianic tradition running right through from the eight century BCE to the second century CE (and indeed beyond). Both of these, I argue, beg too many questions. The issue here indeed is bound up with that of definition and of what counts as messianic evidence.

Hence I argue that it is necessary to move from considering this evidence to assessing how we can and should understand the nature and scope of messianism in Judaism in this period as a whole. Thus I think an important perspective is to see the messiah as the agent of final divine deliverance; but I argue that it is divine deliverance itself that is the more important and underlying point of focus for Jewish hope. That is, the figure of the messiah is potentially important, but it is not all-important. Hence we need to consider this hope and this phenomenon very much not in isolation or in absolute terms, but in relation to the underlying traditions that inform this hope, and the specific political and national context within which it arises. We need also, then, to consider it especially in relation to popular understanding, as far as that is possible, and raise the question (even if we cannot answer it) of why messianic hope and messianic movements appear at some times and not others. Once we investigate messianism in this way and in real depth, it appears as a richly fascinating and multifaceted phenomenon. It also becomes clear that it is a complex phenomenon, both in the variety of ways it manifests itself and also as we try to gain a clear understanding of it.

The New Testament evidence belongs to the overall phenomenon of Jewish messianism in this period. Hence I move finally in this chapter to consider two main aspects of this. First, I develop further the basic argument that I set out in the original essay (chapter 5) in relation to Paul. Here I take account of recent discussion, and respond to discussion of my original argument. The main focus for my discussion of the New Testament evidence, however, is set in relation to Jesus and the Synoptic Gospels. The question I am primarily concerned with here is whether Jesus would plausibly have been seen as a Jewish messiah within his lifetime, and whether indeed he would have seen himself as such. I did not touch at all on this in my original essay,

but it is an issue that has been brought into prominence in recent discussion, and has in any case intrinsic interest and importance. I argue that a plausible case can indeed be made not only for a messianic identity being attributed to Jesus within his lifetime, but also that Jesus may have implied a messianic identity for himself. If so, however, he does so only indirectly. Equally, he may seem to suggest for himself more of a prophetic than a royal messianic profile, whereas the New Testament and early Christianity generally acclaim him as a Davidic messiah. Hence I argue for ways in which we can address that paradox, and show how it can take us more deeply into an understanding of Jesus' self-claim and of messianism more generally. Thus it can be argued that it is the role of agent of final divine deliverance that the early Christians see Jesus as fulfilling, however little he appears to fit any of the main categories or trajectories of Jewish messianism. Thus the New Testament evidence can help alert us again to the complex nature of messianism, but also to the importance for Jewish hope of the emphasis on divine deliverance.

Chapter 5, as I have said, is the earliest of the essays in this collection and in some ways programmatic for the rest. It will in fact be clear, from chapters 2 and 4 especially, that I have not simply developed themes from this earlier essay; I have also in places revised and changed the views I expressed there. Because of the wide-ranging nature of the title I was given for the paper from which chapter 5 developed, I could not discuss at least some points as fully as I would have wished. Hence, in part, the need and stimulus for the further essays in this book. Nevertheless, I explored Jewish traditions as far as possible within the scope of the essay. Thus I discussed Jewish messianic hope in some detail, and argued a case for recognizing the significance as well as the limits of the evidence, and not least for taking account of popular messianic hope. Along with this, I also discussed relevant evidence for Jewish intermediary figures, and argued for the importance of a number of these, especially for the extraordinarily elevated and exalted status and appearance that some of them take on, and the questions thus raised for Jewish monotheism. I pointed here not only to the genuine difficulties that they pose, but also to the fact that these figures could variously enhance the ways in which God could be conceived and understood. In this essay I could deal with Paul and Pauline Christology only very briefly. What I argued there was that Paul shows deep awareness of the significance of Jewish intermediary figures, and that it is this in part that helps him in attributing a very elevated status to Christ. Paul can also, I argued, potentially be seen to be strongly influenced by Jewish messianic hopes. Yet although he uses the term χριστός very frequently, he in fact moves Jesus and the messianic hopes attaching to him to a different level: removed, that is, from the present situation, and the possibility of the divine kingdom being established as a challenge to earthly

authorities. Hence Paul's Christology can be seen to be 'elevated' in a powerful but ambivalent way.

Inevitably, as I have made clear already, this essay left further issues to be explored, as well as giving rise to some lively discussion. In the subsequent essays, I have taken up these issues, and also brought further relevant themes into consideration. The following chapter, Chapter 6, in fact represents an expanded version of my contribution to the next Tübingen-Durham Symposium (held in 1989, with the essays published in 1992). Here the focus is on eschatology and messianism in early Judaism and Christianity, specifically for the period 70 – 135 CE. Hence I discuss the relevant evidence from Sibylline Oracles 5, 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, along with a number of Prayer Texts and other evidence that relates potentially to messianic hope at a common, popular level. I argue that there is a continuing vibrancy of messianic hope in this period, but that this is also the cause of considerable dispute and conflict within Judaism. For the Christian tradition, I argue for the importance of millenarian and chiliastic hope in this period, and for the significance of the Jewish tradition that it draws on. Here also, however, the emphasis especially on the realization of the kingdom of God on earth in the near future causes conflict and division within early Christianity. What becomes apparent as well is that the early Christian movement here uses Jewish eschatological and messianic traditions to establish its own self-identity. Hence along with the obvious continuity between Judaism and Christianity here, the focus on messianism and eschatological hope also serves to deepen the divisions between them.

Having considered, in chapters 5 and 6, the evidence for messianism in Sibylline Oracles 3 and 5, I focus in Chapter 7 on a more specific topic: that is, the importance of the Temple especially in context of the final age, and the role of the messiah in relation to this. Both Sibylline Oracles 3 and 5 have a very positive attitude to the temple, and specifically look forward to a new and glorious temple in the final age. One main difference between them, I argue, is that in Sibylline Oracles 3 this is, implicitly, the work of God himself. In Sibylline Oracles 5, however, the role of building this new temple is given to the messiah. In defiance of the historical reality of the early second century CE, it portrays this as a glorious temple, built by the messiah and set at the centre of the earth, and symbolizing both the divine glory and also Jewish supremacy over the Romans. The idea of the messiah building the (eschatological) temple is unusual not just in the Sibylline Oracles, but in Judaism more generally. Hence I discuss this briefly in relation to other potentially comparable traditions. I also consider both Sibylline Oracles 3 and 5 in relation to Sibylline Oracles 4, with its (apparently) strikingly negative attitude to the temple, and assess the implications of this for our understanding of early Judaism and Christianity more widely.

In Chapter 8, I consider messianism in relation to what has sometimes been termed, along with the Temple, the other 'pillar' of Judaism in this period: that is, the Torah. In the expanded version of this essay that appears in the present volume (where I have been able to include sections on Paul and the Johannine literature, as well as further material, that had to be omitted from the version as originally published), I discuss the variety of attitudes to Torah in the messianic or final age, as those are manifested in a wide range of early Jewish and Christian sources. I argue that this variety can be seen to have four main strands: first, in at least some Jewish traditions, and in Matthew and James (and Paul and the Didache to an extent), Torah is seen as continuing in force with *intensified* demands. Second, in Paul (on one reading of him at least) and Justin, as well as Hermas, the Kerygma Petrou and Irenaeus (reflecting Jewish tradition), Torah is seen as having its true *fulfilment* in Christ. Third, the understanding that Christ brings a *new law* is evident in Justin, Irenaeus and the Didascalia. It is possible to see Matthew as representing this position, and if it incorporates the idea that Christ brings the true, perfect and final Torah, then the Johannine letters, Fourth Gospel and Paul can all be included as well. Finally, we find the idea that Torah has been *rejected*, or at least superseded, completely. Despite what is sometimes claimed, this has no basis in Jewish tradition. It is, however, starkly portrayed by Barnabas and, almost as strongly, by Hebrews as well. The evidence of Paul, Justin and Irenaeus is more ambiguous on this point. Thus as the early Christians reflected on Torah (and whether or not it had any continuing validity) in light of their belief in Christ as the messiah, very different perceptions of it emerged. Some show genuine continuity with Judaism, but it is abundantly clear that deep tensions and divisions were opened up between Judaism and Christianity on this issue.

In the final chapter, chapter 9, which I have written specifically for this volume, I take this theme further, building on the discussion in chapter 8, but now focusing specifically on Paul's striking phrase 'the law of Christ' in Gal. 6.2, and its implications. First I give an extensive review of discussion of this in modern scholarship, to show that this discussion is more varied and complex than is often perceived. Yet there is also striking overlap and affinity between these different positions, and several themes can be seen to be shared in common by positions that are otherwise diverse. Thus, especially, there is a strong emphasis from a number of vantage points on 'the law of Christ' being one means that Paul uses to depict the new way of life in Christ, enabled by the Spirit and characterized by self-giving love, in Galatians 5–6 as a whole. Yet there remain very real contrasts and irreconcilable differences in the recent interpretation of Gal. 6.2, not least on the issue of whether it can really be understood as 'law' at all. I argue that 'the law of Christ' should indeed be understood as 'law', and in genuine continuity with the Mosaic law. But it

should at the same time be understood as a 'law' transformed, in the messianic age, through the Spirit to take on the character of Christ. It should also, therefore, be set in close conjunction with 'the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus' that Paul speaks of in Rom. 8.2. Thus it is Christ and Spirit who definitively characterize the final, messianic age in Paul's understanding, and the law, now characterized and controlled by them, takes on a transformed mode and dimension in this messianic age.

The nine separate essays contained in this book, then, range widely over Jewish messianic and mediatorial traditions and themes in early Christianity, especially its nascent Christology. What is common to all of these is an emphasis on the importance of understanding all these themes and traditions both in their own right and also in relation to each other. It is fundamentally important here to stress that the various Jewish traditions are not to be seen simply as a backdrop to what can then be observed in early Christianity, or as subservient to and superseded by this. I have emphasized throughout that early Christian traditions, above all Christology, are deeply rooted in Jewish tradition, and cannot be adequately understood apart from this. Indeed, the point I would wish to make is that the more deeply we probe into Jewish traditions, the more potentially we can understand about Christian traditions and their distinctive facets.

Thus, for example, in chapters 2 and 3 the focus is especially on New Testament Christology, in relation to its Jewish context, and the specific theme of transformation. And transformation is indeed a theme that runs through much of the book, and links different chapters and themes together. It is important, however, to note that the argument here throughout is *not* that Christianity represents a transformation of Judaism, taking it to its true mode of understanding, and leaving behind what is inadequate. In fact the theme of transformation as I am concerned with it goes much deeper than this. Indeed, as I have shown in these chapters, my focus is on traditions of transformation in Judaism (and not least visionary texts) as well as in early Christianity. These represent a remarkable phenomenon in themselves, but they are also indispensable for understanding crucial developments within early Christianity.

In the case of Jewish messianism as well, the point that has emerged throughout the book (and which I wish to emphasize especially) is that this is a phenomenon very much worth exploring and understanding in its own right, in all its fascinating variety. At the same time it is self-evident that early Christianity and very early Christology are closely bound up with Jewish messianism; the latter is thus centrally important, indeed indispensable, for a proper understanding of what comes about in the early Christian movement. Thus it is vital for a proper perception of early Christianity and its Christology

to see precisely where it differs from Jewish messianism, as well as where it shares obvious points in common.

It becomes clear throughout the book, therefore, that Jewish traditions of messianism and mediatorial figures are a significant phenomenon in themselves, and have an importance and integrity of their own, as well as for the understanding of early Christianity. It was indeed a point that I made in my earliest essay here (chapter 5), just as I had in my previous work, that Jewish documents and traditions are important in their own right, not significant simply for the light that they can shed on the New Testament and early Christianity. It was indeed precisely because I took seriously in their own right the points of reference in Jewish tradition that I left myself so little space to consider Pauline Christology. That emphasis, and that perspective, have remained central to my subsequent work and to the present book, even though I have now gone further with drawing out the potential significance of Jewish texts and traditions for the New Testament and early Christology. That is, these texts and traditions remain fundamentally important in themselves, as *Jewish* texts and traditions, however much they may also be indispensable for the understanding of early Christianity.

Hence it emerges from this book, and is central to it, that both early Judaism and early Christianity have powerful traditions about future and final hope. They both also, in a number of ways, have powerful visionary traditions about transformation. These traditions, as I have emphasized, can and should be understood in relation to each other. First, however, they must be understood in their own right, and evaluated for the specific and distinctive claims that they make. The purpose of this book is to contribute to that task.

3. Details of First Publication

Some or all of chapters 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8 in the present book have been published previously; details are given below. In each case the bibliography included at the end of the original form of chapters 5, 6 and 8 has been incorporated into the overall Bibliography in the present book.

Chapter 3: 'Resurrection, Transformation and Christology'. A shorter version of this chapter appeared as 'Resurrection and Transformation', in F. Avemarie and H. Lichtenberger (eds), *Auferstehung – Resurrection* / The Fourth Durham–Tübingen Research Symposium. Resurrection, Transfiguration and Exaltation in Old Testament, Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity (Tübingen, September, 1999) (WUNT 135; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), pp. 47–77.

Chapter 5 : 'Messianism, Mediators and Pauline Christology' first appeared as 'Jewish Messianic Expectations, Mediatorial Figures and Pauline Christology' in M. Hengel and U. Heckel (eds), *Paulus und das antike Judentum* / Tübingen–Durham–Symposium im Gedenken an den 50. Todestag Adolf Schlatters († 19 Mai 1938) (WUNT 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991), pp. 17–89. (In its original form, pp. 78–82 of this chapter contained a Discussion and Response, which I have omitted from the version printed here.)

Chapter 6: 'Eschatology and Messianic Hope 70–135 CE' first appeared as 'The Parting of the Ways : Eschatology and Messianic Hope' in J. D. G. Dunn (ed.), *Jews and Christians : The Parting of the Ways A. D. 70 to 135* / The Second Durham–Tübingen Research Symposium (Durham, September, 1989) (WUNT 66; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), pp. 239–313.

Chapter 7: 'Messiah and Temple in the Sibylline Oracles' first appeared as 'The Sibyl and the Temple' in W. Horbury (ed.), *Templum Amicitiae : Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel* (JSNTSup 48; Sheffield : JSOT Press, 1991), pp. 37–69.

Chapter 8: 'Messiah and Torah'. A shorter version of this chapter first appeared as 'Messianism, Torah and Early Christian Tradition' in G. N. Stanton and G. G. Stroumsa (eds), *Tolerance and Intolerance in Early Judaism and Christianity* (Cambridge : CUP, 1998), pp. 318–341.

I wish to express my grateful thanks to the publishers mentioned here for kind permission to reproduce the original form of these essays in whole or in part. In the case of 'The Sibyl and the Temple' (reproduced as chapter 7 in the present book), I am grateful specifically to Continuum Press, who have taken over JSOT Press, the original publishers in this case.