

of an exhortation to obedience (Phil. 2.12) with fear and trembling (cf. Exod. 15.15-16) endorsed by his own self-sacrifice (Phil. 2.17). As mentioned earlier, there are few allusions, if any, to the Psalms in these new early Christian hymns.⁵⁴ Nevertheless, here once again are Genesis, Isaiah and Deuteronomy combined through an obvious christological purpose with universalist implications.

4. Conclusion

Four scriptural books and their extras were particularly popular amongst those connected with the Scrolls and the various New Testament authors: Genesis, Deuteronomy, Isaiah and the Psalms. To both groups these books in various ways guaranteed the antiquity of their claims, allowed them to justify their positions as the true representatives of Israel, strongly suggested they were living at the time of the fulfilment of God's promises, that his blessings were theirs despite persecutions and misunderstandings.

The covenanters of the Scrolls thought of how in them humanity was restored, that through God's mercy correct obedience was possible, and that in purity they could join the worship of the angels; God was about to complete his consolation of them. For many of the early Christians too, humanity seemed restored; God's mercy enabled correct response and thanksgiving became a community characteristic. For the covenanters the interpretative myths associated with these four authoritative books were shattered when the land was irretrievably occupied and the locus of worship destroyed; for the Christians the interpretative myth, somewhat similarly based, came to reflect a continuing reality because it was made of universal significance through the recollection of the death of one man.

54. There is a possibility that Phil. 2.10 contains an allusion to Ps. 67.15 (LXX) in which Shaddai is rendered by the very distinctive 'heavenly one'. The context in the Psalm describes God as at Sinai.

QUMRAN AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL: IS THERE A CONNECTION?

Richard Bauckham

It seems to have become quite widely accepted that the parallels between the Johannine literature of the New Testament (the Gospel and Epistles of John) and those texts from Qumran which most likely express the community's own theology are probably the most impressive parallels between the New Testament and Qumran, and are so impressive as to require an historical connection closer than could be provided merely by the common Jewish milieu of late Second Temple Judaism. The hypothesis of some kind of influence from Qumran on John is widely accepted, whether this is regarded as indirect (for example, R.E. Brown¹) or direct (for example, K.G. Kuhn,² J.H. Charlesworth,³ J. Ashton⁴). In my view this hypothesis is mistaken. It arose from a natural enthusiasm about parallels between the Scrolls and the New Testament when the Scrolls were first published,⁵ but the parallels in this case have not been assessed with sufficient

1. R.E. Brown, 'The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles', in *idem*, *New Testament Essays* (New York: Paulist Press, 1965), pp. 102-31; *idem*, 'The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Crossroad, 1990), pp. 7-8; *idem*, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple* (New York: Paulist Press, 1979), pp. 30-31.

2. K.G. Kuhn, 'Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das neue Testament', *ZTK* 47 (1950), pp. 192-211.

3. J.H. Charlesworth, 'A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in IQS 3.13-4.26 and the "Dualism" Contained in the Gospel of John', in Charlesworth (ed.), *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 76-106.

4. J. Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), pp. 232-37.

5. Cf. B. Lindars, *John* (NT Guides; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), p. 49: 'Initial enthusiasm overstressed the importance of these similarities'. For a minimalist view of the significance of the Scrolls for understanding John, see C.K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St John* (London: SPCK, 2nd edn, 1978), p. 34.

methodological rigour.⁶ I do not think they amount to a case for influence or for any particular historical connection between John and Qumran. Given the limitations of space, I shall focus here on the evidence for a connection to which most weight is usually given: the expression of dualistic thinking in *light and darkness imagery* in both the Qumran texts and the Fourth Gospel.⁷

The extent of the similarity between the dualism of the Qumran texts and the dualism of the Fourth Gospel has been debated, but even those who emphasize dissimilarities more than others seem to agree that the extensive use of light/darkness imagery to express a dualistic worldview in both cases represents a very striking similarity.⁸ In assessing the hypothesis of a Qumran origin for Johannine dualism, it is therefore very useful to focus on precisely how this imagery of light and darkness is used in each case. This will enable us to avoid conducting a comparison at too high a level of abstraction from the way the theology of the texts is actually expressed in them.

The dualism of the Fourth Gospel is expressed in two sets of images. One is the imagery of light and darkness (1.4-9; 3.19-21; 8.12; 9.4-5; 11.9-10; 12.35-36, 46; cf. 1 Jn 1.5-7; 2.8-11). The other is the spatial imagery which appears in the terms 'from above' and 'from below' (8.23), 'not from this world' and 'from this world' (8.23; 18.36), 'not from the world' and 'from the world' (15.19; 17.14, 16). The further

6. This is also true of those scholars who conclude that these same parallels show John's dependence on first-century Jewish forms of thought which Qumran exemplifies but which had wider currency (for example, J. Painter, *The Quest for the Messiah* [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2nd edn, 1993], pp. 50-52). Here too there is no sufficiently careful assessment of the alleged parallels themselves, as well as of the relationship of the Qumran texts, on the one hand, and of John, on the other, to comparable material in other Jewish literature.

7. For a survey of other similarities, see Brown, 'The Qumran Scrolls'. In what follows, material in 1 John will be noticed only in passing; limitations of space preclude adequate discussion of the use of light/darkness imagery in 1 John here.

8. Charlesworth, 'A Critical Comparison', pp. 100-101, after stressing the differences in the dualistic theologies of 1QS 3.13-4.26 and John, writes: 'After full account is taken of all the dissimilarities in the theological perspective, we must ask whether in the realm of symbolism and mythology there exists between John and the Rule an underlying interrelationship of conceptual framework and literary expression. We may reasonably hold that the dualistic opposition between light and darkness is not something each developed independently, but rather something that betokens John's dependence on the Rule.'

contrasting phrases 'from God' and 'from the devil' (8.42-44, 47) and 'from God' and 'from humans' (12.43) are easily associated with the spatial imagery, since God is above and the devil and humans are below. The two sets of images therefore are the light/darkness opposition and the above/below and God/world opposition. It is very important to notice that these two sets of images never combine or overlap in the Fourth Gospel. Each is kept distinct from the other. (When 'the world' appears in connection with the image of light [1.9; 3.19; 8.12; 12.46], it has the neutral sense of the created world, never the pejorative sense of the world opposed to God which it has in the God/world dualistic passages.)

Of these two sets of images, the Qumran texts provide parallels only to the light/darkness opposition, which, of course, is found also in other Jewish texts. For the distinctively Johannine use of 'the world' and 'this world' in a pejorative sense, and the distinctively Johannine contrast of 'from above' and 'from below' the Qumran texts provide no parallel at all.⁹ This in itself makes implausible the view that Johannine dualism as such derives from Qumran dualism. It would surely be hard to argue that the light/darkness imagery is the primary expression of Johannine dualism and the above/below and God/world opposition a secondary development. The latter plays just as important a role in the Gospel as the former. Consequently, even if the Johannine use of light/darkness imagery derives from Qumran, this could not easily be understood to mean that Johannine dualism as such derives from Qumran.

But can the Johannine use of light/darkness imagery plausibly be held to derive from the Qumran texts? We should first recall two evident facts. First, the contrast of light and darkness is the most obvious of dualisms observable in the natural world, and has therefore acquired the metaphorical meanings of knowledge and ignorance, truth and error, good and evil, life and death, in most (perhaps all) cultural traditions. Secondly, these metaphorical uses of the light/darkness imagery occur relatively often in the Hebrew Bible and in Second Temple Jewish literature, and so were readily available in the Jewish

9. It has rarely been noticed that the best parallels to these Johannine usages are in James (1.17, 27; 3.15, 17). Since there are no other resemblances between James and the Johannine literature, these parallels are best explained by common dependence on a Jewish terminology which does not seem to have been preserved in extant Jewish texts.

tradition to the authors of both the Qumran texts and Johannine literature. To establish a special connection between these it is not sufficient to point out that none of the other Jewish texts emphasize the light/darkness imagery to the extent that 1QS and the Fourth Gospel do.¹⁰ In fact, this is not strictly true, since the sustained use of the metaphor of light and darkness for good and evil, truth and error through some 132 verses of the apocalypse of the clouds in 2 *Baruch* (chs. 53, 56–72) represents a more extensive use of the imagery than do the sixteen verses of the Fourth Gospel which use the imagery. But in any case, the mere fact that both 1QS and the Fourth Gospel make more prominent use of this imagery than most Jewish texts proves very little. If the imagery was available in the Jewish tradition, it would not be especially surprising to find two authors independently developing it more extensively than most other Jewish texts do. Only if the development in the two cases exhibited extensive similarities not attributable to common roots in the common Jewish tradition would there be any reason to postulate a connexion. If, on the other hand, there were extensive dissimilarities in the two developments, and if the distinctive development in each case could be plausibly explained as a development of elements in the common Jewish tradition, then to postulate a connection between the two developments would be unnecessary and implausible.

In the rest of this paper, I shall argue, first, that the use of the light/darkness imagery in the Fourth Gospel, on the one hand, and in the Qumran texts, on the other, exhibits far more impressive dissimilarities than have been noticed in the scholarly enthusiasm for drawing conclusions from the comparatively unimpressive similarities. While this considerably weakens the case for influence from Qumran on John, it does not necessarily disprove it. The dissimilarities might result from John's creative adaptation of the basic motif he borrowed from the Qumran texts. In order to disprove this possibility, I shall show that the distinctively Johannine uses of the light/darkness imagery, which cannot be paralleled in the Qumran texts, can be paralleled to a significant extent in other Second Temple Jewish literature, and can very plausibly be understood as rooted in biblical texts predominantly different from the biblical texts which influenced the uses of the light/darkness imagery in the Qumran texts. Since what is distinctive in the

10. Cf. Charlesworth, 'A Critical Comparison', p. 100.

Johannine use of the light/darkness imagery finds parallels in other Second Temple Jewish literature and sources in the Hebrew Bible, what the Johannine use has in common with the Qumran use is much more plausibly attributed to common dependence on the Hebrew Bible and general Jewish tradition than to any closer relationship between John and Qumran.

Among the Qumran texts, the light/darkness dualism occurs predominantly in the Rule of the Community (1QS), the War Rule (1QM, (4Q543–548).¹¹ Since the most impressive parallels with John have been seen in the passage about the two spirits in 1QS 3.13–4.26, I shall focus on this passage, but add references to relevant material in the War Rule. The passage in the Rule of the Community uses synonymously the three pairs of opposites: light and darkness, truth and deceit, justice and injustice. It depicts two angelic beings, the Prince of Lights who are the sources of good and evil in the world. Both were created by God, though God loves one and hates the other, and has destined by one for triumph and the other for destruction. Meantime, they contend with each other in human hearts. Depending on the dominance of either, human beings are divided into the sons of light, truth or justice and the sons of deceit. The influence of the two spirits in human life is correlated with the image of the two ways drawn from the wisdom tradition: people walk either in the paths of light or in the paths of darkness. These two ways lead to different destinies at the eschatological judgment, again described partly in the imagery of light and darkness: the light of glory in eternal life, and the darkness of the nether regions in which the wicked are punished and destroyed. The War Rule uses the light/darkness dualism not in this psychological and individual way, but to depict the eschatological war in which Michael, his angels and the sons of light will defeat Belial, his angels and the sons of

11. Cf. also 4QSongs of the Sage^b (4Q511); 11QApocryphal Psalms^a (11Q11). The light/darkness dualism does not appear in the *Hodayot*, or in the Damascus Rule (though the title 'the Prince of Lights' is used for Michael in CD 5.18, as in 1QS 3.20). For other significant occurrences of light/darkness imagery in the Scrolls which seem more distant from the way this imagery is used in 1QS and 1QM, see 4Q462 9–10; 1QMysteries (1Q27) 1.5–6; 4QMysteries^a (4Q299) 5.1–3; 4QCryptic A (4Q298) 1.1; 4Q471 4.5.

darkness. The same cosmic dualism appears in different aspects in the two works.

I will now outline some noteworthy differences in the use of the light/darkness imagery in the Fourth Gospel and the above mentioned Qumran texts.

(1) These Qumran texts exhibit a stereotyped and elaborate dualistic terminology, in which each term has its corresponding opposite: the spirit of truth and the spirit of deceit, the sons of light and the sons of darkness, the paths of light and the paths of darkness, and so on (see the Appendix for a table of terminology). Apart from the terms light and darkness themselves, only one of these terms—'the sons of light'—appears in those passages of the Fourth Gospel which use the light/darkness imagery (12.36). This single coincidence of terminology between John and Qumran is misrepresented by Charlesworth when he claims that 'the expression "sons of light" is characteristic only of Qumran and John'.¹² It is no more characteristic of John than of Luke, Paul and the author of Ephesians, each of whom, like John, uses the expression just once (Lk. 16.8; 1 Thess. 5.5; Eph. 5.8). The list of terminological parallels should not be expanded to include phrases which occur in John outside the passages which use the light/darkness imagery, especially not when these are such commonplace expressions as 'the holy Spirit', 'eternal life' and 'the wrath of God',¹³ but not even in the case of the distinctively Johannine term 'the Spirit of Truth', which in John has no relationship to the light/darkness imagery.¹⁴ It is hardly credible that, if the Qumran use

of the light/darkness imagery influenced John, the highly distinctive terminology which virtually constitutes the Qumran use of the light/darkness imagery should have left such minimal traces in John.¹⁵

(2) Conversely, expressions which characterize the Johannine use of the light/darkness imagery have no parallel in the Qumran texts: 'the true light' (1.9; cf. 1 Jn 2.8), 'the light of the world' (8.12; 9.5), 'to have the light' (8.12; 12.35-36), 'to come to the light' (3.20-21), 'to remain in the darkness' (12.46; cf. 1 Jn 2.9), and the contrast of 'day' and 'night' (9.4; 11.9-10).

(3) Several important features of the way the light/darkness imagery functions in the Qumran texts are entirely absent from John. For example, essential to the Qumran usage are the two spirits of light and darkness, the Prince of Lights and the Angel of Darkness, Michael and Belial in the War Rule. They do not appear in John's use of the

Spirit, as is the case in John, such expressions specify one particular effect of the divine Spirit (for example Exod. 28.3; Deut. 34.9; Isa. 11.1; 1 En. 49.3; 62.2; Rom. 1.4; 8.2; 15.2 Cor. 4.13; Eph. 1.17; 2 Tim. 1.7; Heb. 10.29; 1 Pet. 4.14). The term 'spirit of truth' is just one such natural formation, not confined to 1QS and John (cf. *Jub.* 25.14; *Jos. Asen.* 19.11). Its occurrence in both these texts is an aspect of the prominence of the term 'truth' in both.

15. Of the other 'shared literary expressions' listed by Charlesworth, 'A Critical Comparison', p. 102, only three deserve mention: (1) 'to walk in the paths of darkness' (1QS 3.21; 4.11) and 'to walk in darkness' (Jn 8.12; 12.35; cf. 1 Jn 1.6; 2.11); (2) 'the light of life' (1QS 3.7; Jn 8.12); (3) 'blindness of eyes' (1QS 4.11) and 'the eyes of the blind' (Jn 10.21; cf. John 9).

On these the following comments should be made: (1) Both expressions are biblical: 'to walk in the paths of darkness' (Prov. 2.13), 'to walk in darkness' (Ps. 82.5; Eccl. 2.14; Isa. 9.2[1]). 1QS uses the former twice (1QS 3.21; 4.11) and the latter once (1QS 11.10), whereas John uses only the latter (Jn 8.12; 12.35; cf. 1 Jn 1.6; 2.11). The difference is significant. The usage in 1QS derives from the wisdom tradition (in 1QS 3.21; 4.11 the phrase corresponds verbatim to Prov. 2.13) and is part of the picture of the two ways. By contrast the two ways terminology makes no appearance in the Fourth Gospel, whose use of light/darkness imagery seems uninfluenced by the wisdom tradition. Its use of the expression 'to walk in darkness' probably derives from Isa 9.2[1] (see below). (2) The phrase 'the light of life' is a biblical expression (Job 33.30; Ps. 56.13[14]), which also occurs in later Jewish literature (1 En. 58.3). In 1QS 3.7 it derives from Job 33.30, in Jn 8.12 probably from Ps. 56.13[14]. (3) The phrase 'blindness of eyes' (1QS 4.11) occurs in the following list: 'blasphemous tongue, blindness of eyes, hardness of hearing, stiffness of neck, hardness of heart'. Clearly blindness here has no particular connexion with light and darkness, as it does in John 9.

12. Charlesworth, 'A Critical Comparison', p. 101.

13. The first two of these three phrases are included by Charlesworth, 'A Critical Comparison', pp. 101-102, in his 'four shared linguistic formulae which suggest a strong correlation between John and 1QS 3.13-4.26', while the third occurs in his 'seven additional shared literary expressions'. For a few additional parallels, see C.A. Evans, *Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John's Prologue* (SNTSup. 89, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), p. 147.

14. The coincidence in the use of this term 'the Spirit of Truth' in both 1QS (3.18-19; 4.21, 23; cf. 'all the spirits of truth' in 1QM 13.10) and John (14.17; 15.26; 16.13; cf. 1 Jn 4.6) has attracted much attention and deserves a full discussion, which should not, however, be confused by conflating John's use of this term with his use of light/darkness imagery, with which it has no textual connexion. The coincidence is far less remarkable than often thought, since genitival phrases combining 'spirit' and an abstract noun are a standard way, in Jewish literature and in the New Testament, of specifying the effect of the 'spirit'. When the 'spirit' is the divine

light/darkness imagery, where Christ himself is the light, but the devil, who in other parts of the Gospel is 'the ruler of this world' (12.31; 14.30; 16.11) and 'the father of lies' (8.44), is never related to darkness.¹⁶ Secondly, neither the conflict of light and darkness within the heart of the individual nor the conflict between the two categories of humanity, the sons of light and the sons of darkness, appears in John, where 1.5 is the only verse to make any use at all of the image of conflict between light and darkness. Thirdly, the use of light and darkness to characterize the alternative eschatological destinies of the two classes of humanity is absent from John,¹⁷ even though this was common in Jewish eschatological imagery (for example *I En.* 92.3-5; 108.11-15).

(4) Although John's use of the light/darkness imagery is flexible and not wholly consistent, the central image is that of a great light coming into the world, shining in the darkness of the world, giving light to all people, so that they may come out of the darkness into the light, and be able to walk in this light instead of stumbling in the darkness (see 1.5, 9; 3.19; 8.12; 11.9-10; 12.35, 46). This dominant image of a great light shining in the darkness is not at all the dominant image in the Qumran texts' use of light/darkness imagery. Once the spirit of truth is said to enlighten the heart of the individual (1QS 4.2), while the War Rule envisages the time when, following their defeat of the Kittim, the sons of light will shine in all the edges of the earth, giving light until the end of all the periods of darkness, when God's own glory will shine for eternity (1QM 1.8). These seem to be the only instances of the image of light shining in and dispelling darkness. They are subsidiary to the dominant image of conflict between light and darkness, where very often the metaphorical force of the words light and darkness seems to have been largely lost and they function simply as names for opposing cosmic principles, interchangeable with truth and deceit, justice and injustice. In the Fourth Gospel the light/darkness imagery is always used to convey specific visual images of light and darkness, of which the central and dominant one, the great

light shining in the darkness of the world, finds a parallel at Qumran only in one line of the War Rule.¹⁸

(5) Finally, the difference in the imagery corresponds to a difference in the meaning conveyed by the imagery. In the Fourth Gospel the central image of the light shining in the darkness has christological and soteriological significance. Christ is the light of the world, come into the world so that people may come out of the darkness into the light. At Qumran, on the other hand, the imagery of light and darkness is used to portray a conflict between cosmic hierarchies of good and evil, which contend in the heart of the individual and on the heavenly and earthly battlefield of the eschatological war. There is no thought of people moving from 'the lot of darkness' into light.

In summary, then, the similarity between the use of light/darkness imagery in the two cases is almost entirely limited to the basic symbolism: light and darkness symbolize truth and error operating on a cosmic scale. The particular development of this symbolism in each case diverges widely. Characteristic terminology, dominant imagery and theological significance all differ to such an extent as to make the influence of Qumran on the Fourth Gospel unlikely.

I shall now show how the use of light/darkness imagery in the Fourth Gospel has its own sources in the Hebrew Bible and parallels in Second Temple Jewish literature which explain precisely the ways in which it diverges from the Qumran texts' use of such imagery and make the hypothesis of influence from Qumran on John entirely redundant.

(1) The opening verses of the prologue to the Gospel are an exegesis of the opening verses of Genesis, and the first appearance of the light/darkness imagery in the Gospel (1.4-5) constitutes an interpretation of the light and darkness of the first day of the Genesis creation narrative

16. Contrast 1 Cor. 6.14-15 and Acts 26.18, both of which are closer than John to Qumran usage.

17. In Jn 8.12 (cf. 12.35) 'walk in darkness' refers to living in ignorance and error, not to eschatological destiny.

18. Cf. also 1QMysteries (1Q27) 1.5-6: 'When those begotten of iniquity are delivered up, and wickedness is removed from before righteousness, as darkness is removed from before light, and just as smoke ceases and is no more, so wickedness will cease forever; and righteousness will be revealed as the sun throughout the measure of the world' (trans. D.J. Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran* [London: Routledge, 1996], p. 70). But here light and darkness appear as a *simile*, alongside the alternative simile of smoke, not in the way they appear in the dualistic light/darkness language of 1QS and 1QM. This text shows no other trace of (and cf. 4Q541 frag. 9, col. i, ll. 3-5; *T. Levit* 18.2-4), and so provides general Jewish, not specifically Qumran, background to 1 Jn 2.8.

(Gen. 1.3-5). It is possible that when the Qumran Rule of the Community says that God 'created the spirits of light and of darkness' (1QS 3.25) it also reflects the Genesis creation account (though allusion to Isa. 45.7 is also possible),¹⁹ but, even if this is the case, there are much better parallels in other Jewish literature. The Johannean prologue belongs to a Jewish tradition of theological exegesis of the Genesis creation narrative, which often devoted particular interest and speculation to the work of the first day and to the primordial light which appeared on that day (for example, 4 *Ezra* 6.40; *LAB* 28.8-9; 60.2; 4Q392 1.4-7; 2 *En.* 24.41; 25; Aristobolus, *ap.* Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.* 13.12.9-11; Philo, *Op. Mund.* 29-35). Most instructive for our purposes is *Jos. Asen.* 8.9, which addresses God

who gave life to all (things)
and called (them) from the darkness to the light,
and from the error to the truth,
and from the death to the life.

This shows that to associate the contrast of light and darkness in the Genesis creation narrative with the contrasts of truth and error, life and death, as the Johannean prologue implicitly does, one did not need to be influenced by Qumran (since influence from Qumran in *Joseph and Aseneth* is unlikely²⁰),²¹

(2) The image of a great light shining in the darkness of the world in order to give light to people, which as we have seen is marginal in the Qumran texts but central and dominant in the Fourth Gospel's use of the light/darkness imagery, has several kinds of sources in the Hebrew Bible and parallels in Second Temple Jewish literature. I note first the image of a prophet or teacher as a light who by his teaching of truth gives light. For example, Samuel is described as a light (*LAB* 51.4), not only 'for this nation', but even 'to the peoples' (51.6,

19. See 11QApocryphal Psalms^a (11Q11) 1.12-13, for an explicit allusion to Gen. 1.4 in connexion with the light/darkness dualism.

20. Against alleged affinities between *Joseph and Aseneth* and the Essenes, see R.D. Chesnut, *From Death to Life: Conversion in Joseph and Aseneth* (SPS Sup. 16; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995), pp. 186-95.

21. *Gen.* R. 3.8 interprets the light and darkness of Gen. 1.3 as the deeds of the righteous and the deeds of the wicked. This latter passage again shows how a Jewish exegete did not need to be influenced by Qumran in order to find good and evil symbolized by the light and darkness of the creation narrative.

echoing Isa. 51.4).²² The Aramaic *Levi* text from Qumran (a pre-Qumran work²³) depicts the teaching of the ideal priest of the future as an eternal sun which will shine to the ends of the earth, such that darkness will vanish from the earth (4Q541 frag. 9, col. 1, ll. 3-5; cf. *T. Levi* 18.2-4). That John was aware of such usage is proved by his depiction of John the Baptist as 'a burning and shining lamp' (5.35).²⁴

(3) Familiar in Jewish literature is the image of the law as a light which shines to give light in which people may walk. This has biblical sources (Ps. 119.105; Prov. 6.23; cf. Isa. 2.3, 5; 51.4). Two points are worth noticing about this image. First, it seems particularly prominent in Jewish literature contemporary with the Fourth Gospel (*LAB* 11.1; 19.4; 33.3; 4 *Ezra* 14.20-21; 2 *Bar.* 17.4; 18.2; 59.2). 2 *Baruch*, in the context of extensive use of light and darkness as symbols of good and evil, truth and error (53, 56-72), says that 'the lamp of the eternal law which exists for ever and ever illuminated those who sat in darkness' (59.2), while 4 *Ezra* says that without the law 'the world lies in darkness, and its inhabitants are without light' (14.20). Secondly, when this image is used, the law is sometimes said to be a light for the world (Wis. 18.4; *LAB* 11.1; cf. Isa. 2.3, 5; 51.4). This language about the law is remarkably close to what the Fourth Gospel says about Jesus Christ as the light of the world, paralleling the central image in the Gospel's use of light/darkness imagery in a way that the Qumran texts so notably fail to do. It therefore seems likely that the Fourth Gospel deliberately claims for Jesus what the Jewish literature of its time claimed for the law. Just as Jesus is the true bread from heaven, by comparison with the bread Moses gave (6.32), and just as Jesus is the true vine, by comparison with Israel as the vine (15.1), so he is the true light (1.9), by comparison with the law given by Moses.

(4) If John's image of Christ as the light of the world parallels the Jewish image of the law as the light of the world, it is more directly the form of messianic exegesis of passages in Isaiah, whose prophecies have influenced this Gospel in many ways. John's image reflects Isaiah

22. Cf. also Sir. 24.32; 2 *Bar.* 18.2.

23. Cf. now R.A. Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi* (SBLJL, 9; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).

24. The second half of this verse is strikingly similar to 2 *Bar.* 18.2: 'did not rejoice in the light of the lamp' (that is, the lamp of the law which Moses lighted).

9.112] ('The people who walked in darkness have seen a great light; those who lived in a land of deep darkness—on them light has shined'; cf. Jn 1.5; 8.12; 12.35), the references to the Servant of the Lord as 'a light to the nations' (Isa. 42.6-7: 'a light to the nations, to open the eyes that are blind, to bring out the prisoners from the dungeon, from the prison those who sit in darkness'; Isa. 49.6; cf. John 9), and the picture of the light which will rise over Zion, in the midst of the darkness that covers the earth, and attract the nations to its brightness (Isa. 60.1-3; Tob. 13.11).²⁵ These passages, which play no part in the light/darkness dualism of the Qumran texts, readily supply the central Johannine image of the great light shining in the darkness of the world to give light to people, as well as the christological-soteriological significance which this image bears in the Fourth Gospel.

(5) In setting Jesus' declaration 'I am the light of the world' (8.12) at the Feast of Tabernacles (7.2), John associates it with the light symbolism of the festival, just as Jesus' invitation to drink (7.37-39) relates to the water symbolism of the festival. The great lamps which blazed all through the night in the temple at Tabernacles (*m. Sukk.* 5.2-4) symbolized the perpetual light which God himself would be for his people in the eschatological age (Isa. 60.19-20; Zech. 14.7; cf. *1 En.* 58.6; Rev. 21.23-24).

In summary, the dominant picture of light and darkness in the Fourth Gospel results from a creative exegetical fusion of Jewish speculation about the primordial light of the first day of creation and messianic interpretation of the prophecies of eschatological light.²⁶ This understanding of the sources of the light/darkness imagery in John accounts for its actual character and significance in a way that the hypothesis of influence from Qumran cannot do. It proves to be a development of Jewish light/darkness imagery quite different from that which is distinctive to Qumran.

It was the publication of Qumran texts which effected a shift in Johannine scholarship towards recognizing the thoroughly Jewish

25. These passages are interpreted messianically and applied to Jesus in Lk. 1.79; 2.32; Acts 26.23; Rev. 22.16; *Barn.* 14.6-8.

26. According to one rabbinic interpretation of Gen. 1.3, recorded in *Gen. R.* 3.6, the light created on the first day is not the ordinary light of day but 'has been stored away for the righteous in the age to come' (with reference to Isa. 30.26). This shows another Jewish exegete connecting the primordial and eschatological light as John did.

character of Johannine theology. In retrospect this appears to have been a case of drawing the correct conclusion from the wrong evidence. There is no need to appeal to the Qumran texts in order to demonstrate the Jewishness of the Fourth Gospel's light/darkness imagery. This can be done more convincingly by comparison with other Jewish sources, which were already available long before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

APPENDIX

The Terminology of Light/Darkness Dualism at Qumran

(Terms and references in 1QS are in Roman type; terms only in 1QM are in italics)

<i>Michael</i> (1QM 17.6)	Belial (1QS 1.18 etc; 1QM)
Prince of Lights (3.20; CD 5.18)	Angel of Darkness (3.20-21)
<i>Prince of Light</i> (1QM 13.10)	
the spirit of truth (3.19; 4.21, 23)	the spirit of deceit (3.19; 4.9, 20, 23)
<i>all the spirits of truth</i> (1QM 13.10)	all the spirits of his lot (3.24)
	<i>the spirits of his lot</i> (1QM 13.4, 12)
the men of God's lot (1QS 2.2; 1QM 1.5)	the men of Belial's lot (1QS 2.4-5; 1QM 1.15)
<i>the lot of your truth</i> (1QM 13.12)	<i>the lot of darkness</i> (1QM 1.11; 13.5)
<i>the sons of light</i> (2.16; 3.24, 25; 1QM)*	the sons of darkness (1.10; 1QM)
the sons of truth (4.6)	the sons of deceit (3.21)
<i>the sons of your truth</i> (1QM 17.8)	
the sons of justice (3.20, 22; 1QM 1.8)	
the paths of light (3.20)	the paths of darkness (3.21)
the paths of truth (4.17)	the paths of darkness and evil cunning (4.11)
the paths of justice and truth (4.2)	the paths of wickedness (4.19)
wisdom (4.24)	folly (4.24)

(*New Testament occurrences: Lk. 16.8; Jn 12.36; 1 Thess. 5.5; Eph. 5.8.)