article this is, dismisses recent speculation that 4Q285 refers to a Messiah who is killed. He puts forward cogent arguments (contra Eisenman and Wise) that the correct interpretation of the words in question is that it is the Messiah who does the killing.

Section three investigates links between the Qumran texts and the NT, especially ideas and teaching. These come in three essays, the main ones being: "The Dead Sea Scrolls, Jesus Christ and the Origins of Christianity" (which betrays its origin as a lecture) and "The Qumran Texts and the New Testament." It is no surprise to read that the main contribution of the Qumran documents to the study of Christian origins is that they reveal the rich and different Jewish background "against which to draw, into which to insert and from which were developed the figure of Jesus Christ and of (sic) his message as well as early Christianity" (p. 198). This may not be a ground-breaking set of essays in the section, but nonetheless is a sober assessment of current research.

The theories of the authors' compatriot José (Josep) O'Callaghan, that some fragments from cave 7 are from the NT, especially his identification of 7Q5 with a couple of verses in Mark, are examined by García on pp. 14ff. He does not agree with them. García tells us that, among several flaws, one snag with O'Callaghan's identification of 7Q5 is the fact that his fragment bears witness to a variant in Mark unknown elsewhere. García says that that variant involves three letters. The case against O'Callaghan is stronger than that. The variant is even more striking—it involves three WORDS!

It should be noted that O'Callaghan's theory has had a new lease of life since our authors published their Spanish edition in 1993. O'Callaghan has just published his Los primeros testimonios del Nuevo Testamento (Cordoba; Editiones el Almendro, 1995), in which he devotes a great deal of space to defending his theory of over 20 years ago, and adds some new statistical support. We should also note M.-E. Boismard's article "A propos de 7Q5 et Mc. 6,32-53" in ReB 102 (1995) pp. 385-88.

The book under review is beautifully printed. A few slips need correction: the Epistle of Jude appears as Judah and Judas within a couple of lines of each other on p. 118. Trocmé (p. 207) is É. On p. 211 subsection a should be c).

There is no index, and that is to be regretted.

J.K. ELLIOTT


This book traces the history of ideas surrounding the monarchy of Israel, from before the Exile up to the first century C.E. Two main traditions emerge, one centred on David and his descendants—a "davidic tradition"—and the other on an "Israelite" king, called here a "non-davidic tradition." As might be expected, at first these relate to conventional kings. Many centuries later, in Hellenistic times, they refer to a "messiah," an anointed leader or king, not necessarily yet living, who was frequently linked with future, often eschatological hopes and events. This conclusion emerges from a systematic, chronological analysis of the relevant biblical and post-biblical sources in their time. The author thus isolates the two main traditions, and other beliefs that evolved. He also describes, as far as is possible, the characteristic features of the leader or king—davidic or otherwise—who is featured in the text.
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Novum Testamentum XXXVIII, 4
The evidence shows a persistent continuum for different forms of both the daudic and the non-davidic traditions, although their separation is not always easy to confirm—indeed, the story of the discovery of Deuteronomy and its public reading before the king may even suggest that the earliest (probably) of the non-davidic traditions (Deut. 17:14-20) was openly venerated by the davidic kings themselves. What also emerges is a continuous debate on different, often contradictory aspects of the monarchy, even from its earliest times. For example, in relation to the davidic tradition, pre-exilic texts composed while a descendant of David still occupied the throne suggest that there was a running discussion between those who considered that David’s possession of throne was unconditionally given by God, as a simple reading of God’s original promise to David at 2 Sam 7:11b-16 seems to suggest (see for example 1 Kgs. 11:34-36). On the other hand, others considered that possession of the throne was conditional on David’s compliance (or that of his descendants) with Jewish law (see for example, 1 Kgs. 8:25). Or again, after the end of the davidic dynasty, Ezekiel in Babylon seems to expect both a return of a davidic-style monarch, possibly from the family of David, although he may be called a “prince” (מֶלֶךְ) rather than a “king” (מלך). Similarly, although the closing verses of 2 Kings seem to deny a literal survival of the davidic dynasty, a post-exilic text from Jeremiah insists that the monarchy of David would continue as surely as day follows night (Jer. 33:14-26). The vehemence of this claim hints at the existence of an opposing view, which may be revealed in the work of Haggai and Zechariah 1-8, who anticipate a return of the monarchy, but significantly (according to the author) fail to link this event explicitly with David. This can be deduced particularly from the fact that Zerubbabel is never given davidic status in texts which were composed closest to his time—he is named nine times in the Hebrew Bible (by Haggai, Ezra and Nehemiah) as “the son of Shalihiel,” but only once in a later text (1 Chron. 3:19), is he connected with the family of David (see p. 46). Subsequently, after at least one century and a half after the destruction of the davidic monarchy by Nebuchadnezzar, when it was reasonable to assume it would never return, the Chronicler attempted to explain how the everlasting dynastic promise made to David by God was compatible with the stark and unarguable reality of its demise. According to this study, the paradox was resolved by assuming that God’s original promise to David presaged the establishment of an everlasting, cultic community (rather than an eternal dynasty of kings), in the Temple built by Solomon, the dynastic successor to David’s throne.

The principle of the Chronicler’s theory was affirmed in Hellenistic times by Ben Sirach, although a later interpolation (Ben Sirach 51, between vv. 12 and 13 in the LXX, and present also in the Hebrew text) seems to show a persistence of belief that the davidic monarchy would one day return. But both these opinions were shaken to their core when the Hasmonaean’s seized the controlling symbol of each. First the pre-eminent symbol of the cultic community—the office of High Priest—was taken over by Simon Maccabees (probably in 142 B.C.E.), although he was not eligible for the position because he was not a member of one of the families of the High Priests (Schürer 1, p. 193; 2, p. 234). Subsequently the office of the monarchy itself was appropriated by Aristobulus I in 104/3 B.C.E. (or by his successor Alexander Janneus, who succeeded in 103 B.C.E.). The actions of the Hasmonaean thus shattered the beliefs of both those who accepted that God’s eternal promise to David was manifest in the continuous descent of the cultic community and those who believed in the continuation of the monarchy exclusively in relation to the family of David. Thereafter we find literature with messianic themes.

The earliest of such sources can be seen in the Psalms of Solomon 17, which was written (according to the author of this book) between 61 and 57 B.C.E. As scholars have noted (and as this author confirms), this is the earliest text in which belief in the reality of a messiah emerges. Significantly, he is from the family of David.