

MAKING SENSE OF HEGESIPPUS' TESTIMONY TO JAMES AS HIGH PRIEST

CONTENTS

1. Zaddik, Moreh-Zedek, and Zadokite
2. The "Yazdik Zaddik"-Theology and the Sadducee Problem
3. The "Election" of James as "Bishop" and High Priest
4. James: "the People"'s Priest and "Bulwark"
5. James as "Opposition" High Priest in the Holy of Holies
on Yom Kippur
6. "...the Prophets Declare Concerning Him" and the Qumran
Pesharim

by

ROBERT EISENMAN

Associate Professor of Religious Studies
California State University Long Beach
Long Beach, California 90840, U. S. A.

In order to make sense out of the testimony to James as High Priest by Hegesippus -- possibly also alluded to in some form by Clement--one must pull together various strands of Second Temple history, ideology, and sociology, and this inside Palestine, not outside. In most recent literature one encounters a generally deprecating attitude towards such testimonies, reflecting to a certain extent the depreciation of Jewish Christianity generally in received theology; but as in all such cases of controversial historical materials in the early Church fathers -- I am thinking particularly of various statements in Papias and Justin Martyr -- one would do well to show caution before outright rejection.¹ Particularly, where the materials in question are in such glaring contradiction with orthodox tradition bearing on our subject. If, furthermore, they can actually be made sense of within the historical, ideological, and sociological configuration of the time, one should be extremely chary of dismissal.

The points I am about to raise show the situation in Palestine to have been far more complex than most observers have otherwise imagined, but also, once their basic import has been grasped, far more beautiful. Indeed, as in all such attempts to unify and device a satisfactory overview of seemingly discordant elements, once the substance of certain new definitions has been fully appreciated, a higher simplicity actually seems to emerge. To arrive at it, one must be

willing as far as possible to suspend certain preconceptions and look at the situation in Palestine from a completely fresh perspective bringing to bear in a creative manner the new materials at our disposal. In the case of the testimony of Hegesippus, only with the recent appearance of the materials in the Scrolls do we have the basis to render it sensible, but the new materials themselves have already been much abused and widely misunderstood -- to a certain extent because of the misunderstanding of the old. Actually, with the first startling discovery of the so-called "Zadokite Document" at the beginning of the century, this process seemed to begin, but with the mass of more recent finds and the development of something of a consensus around the work of De Vaux, Cross, Milik, Birnbaum, and others, this has not happened.²

I have previously sought to begin this task in two papers delivered at the 1977 and 1979 SBL national conferences (both still unpublished because of the changes demanded by uncomprehending editors, which I was not prepared to make): "James the Just as Righteous Teacher" and "The Zaddik-idea and the Zadokite Priesthood". Since this time a new book has appeared by B. E. Thiering, Redating the Teacher of Righteousness, the palaeographic and archaeological results of which I am largely in agreement with³, and I myself have completed a very long paper, "Maccabees, Zadokites, and Zealots", attacking both Qumran palaeography and archaeology in great detail, but these matters will have to be considered outside the scope of this paper.

Suffice it to say, that before dismissing the reconstructions we are going to offer in this paper out of hand, one must realize that there are very serious shortcomings that have developed in the consensus around the archaeology, palaeography, dating, and provenance of the Dead Sea Scrolls. I shall, therefore, assume the consensus to be broken and that I am free within reason to use the material in the Scrolls in a manner that will appear relevant.

1. Zaddik, Moreh-Zedek, and Zadokite

In putting together a sensible understanding of the oft-repeated testimony in the literature of the early Church fathers, one must draw on the general notion of the Zadokite priesthood, its relationship to the Zaddik-idea at Qumran, and the whole allusion in the literature at Qumran to the B'nai-Zedek (an allusion interchanged with both the allusions to the "sons of light" and the "sons of Zadok").⁴ One must be aware of the wide-ranging and often even light-hearted resort to wordplay at Qumran, which the Hebrew language particularly lends itself to: in particular where the notion of zedek, righteousness, or z^edakah (which roughly speaking also translates out as righteousness, but probably also should include something of what is meant by "justification") is concerned.⁵ In Christianity, this wordplay also survives, though to a lesser extent, particularly in the Pauline corpus. One notable example from Hebrews is the notion of the "priesthood after the order of Melchizedek", i. e., the order of a "Righteous King" (or priest-king), the

implication of which is that such a priesthood would be completely righteous. In fact, the implications of this usage were probably current as early as Maccabean times, and vestiges of it, however incomplete, can be found at Qumran.⁶ Put in another way, whatever one might wish to make of 11Q Melchizedek, that Melchizedek was an important eschatological figure at Qumran cannot be denied and that the phrase "men of the lot of Melchizedek" is synonymous with other forms of self-referral to be found there like "sons of Zadok", "sons of zedek", sons of light, nimharei-zedek (enthusiasts for righteousness), ebionei-hesed (the poor ones of piety), etc. is also hardly to be denied.⁷

The exegesis of crucial passages from Isaiah (as well as comparable material in Habbakuk, Psalms, etc.) at Qumran is also parallel in scope and kind to the very important exegetical material about James' death conserved in the testimony of Hegesippus. What is being developed in the latter instance is a portion of Isaiah (Is. 3:10), which centers around a reference to the word, "Zaddik".⁸ It is a much misunderstood and on the whole completely overlooked point that at Qumran, wherever an allusion to the Moreh-Zedek is to be found, i. e., the proverbial "Teacher of Righteousness" or "Righteous Teacher", the key word in the Biblical text upon which the exegesis turns is invariably the word, "zaddik".⁹ This linking of the word, zaddik, with the notion of the Moreh-Zedek (and teaching a righteousness of works is by all accounts precisely the role carried out by James in the Jerusalem Community), although obvious once

the connection has been grasped -- a zaddik being the quint-essence of what any moreh-zedek had in fact to be -- is something which to my knowledge no previous commentator has noted, since the general emphasis has been almost exclusively on the substance of the exegesis put forth and not the nature of the actual texts being subjected to such exegesis at Qumran, nor the schema behind their selection. The parallel, therefore, that the Hegesippus passage represents is not only germane to our discussion, but adds weight to the passage's own authenticity and is further reason for taking it seriously.

In order to develop the metaphorical or figurative notion of the Zadokite Priesthood as opposed to (though not necessarily exclusive of) the genealogical one,¹⁰ i. e., the basic identity of the "son of Zadok" with the Zaddik-ideal, and by extension the Melchizedek one, and the necessity of any bona fida "son of Zadok" being one of the Zaddikim (i. e., "the saved" of any generation); one must go back to the original usage of the expression in Ezekiel. Here, it will be found that the allegorical and metaphorical senses perceived to be associated with such a notion at Qumran are by no means unintentional. In Jewish terms, which would include the frame of reference of the so-called "Jerusalem Church" and almost all apocalyptic and pseudepigraphic literature of the period, "the sons of Zadok", as the Zadokite Document puts it, who certainly are synonymous here with the "Zaddikim" or "the Holy Men of Former Times" (as the Zadokite Document again puts it. These in turn are certainly synonymous with the "CAnshei-Hesed", the "Famous Men" or archetypical Hassidim

beginning with a Zaddik, Noah, and ending with a Zaddik, Simeon the Righteous, of the Hebrew version of Ecclesiasticus, itself not insignificantly first found together with the Zadokite Document in the Cairo Geniza), are they who were "to go on functioning" or "stand at the end of days", i. e., who from among the living were to escape the imminent and final catastrophe that was to overwhelm all the evil ones (resha'im) and from among the righteous dead of bygone generations were to enjoy the fruits of resurrection ("to stand at the end of days") in the eternal kingdom.¹¹

As space limitations preclude a thorough analysis of the approximately four incidences of the terminology "sons of Zadok" in Ezekiel, it will be seen that the usage as Ezekiel sets it out is presented over and against a previously functioning priesthood, which presumably in genealogical terms was also "Zadokite", if in fact the term had any real currency prior to Ezekiel's reformulation of it.¹² Among the members of this former and idolatrizing establishment were individuals as prestigious as "the sons of Shaphan", one of the figures involved in the so-called "reform of Josiah" in the previous generation and the fortuitous finding of the scroll (presumably the Deuteronomic one) on the Temple Mount.¹³ As Ezekiel repeatedly insists, the distinguishing characteristic of the "Zadokite" priesthood is "keeping the Covenant", which is in fact a qualitative and not necessarily a genealogical one (though the two are not mutually exclusive). As the term is further developed at Qumran, waw-constructs are purposefully added between the appositives, so that, in a

seeming anticipation of similar liberties Paul takes with Biblical texts in the interests of a certain exegesis, there can be no mistaking the new meaning. What might previously have read in the somewhat ambiguous Ezekiel text, "those priests who are B'nai Zadok levites"(in our reading "righteous" can be substituted for the allegorizing synonym, "B'nai-Zadok") is **definitively separated and the refer-**ence to the "sons of Zadok" now takes on a completely figurative sense, the meaning of which cannot be mistaken. To quote at length: "They that hold fast unto Him are destined for life eternal and theirs is all mortal glory (no mistaking the meaning here), even as God has sworn unto them by the hand of the prophet Ezekiel saying: 'The priests and the levites and the sons of Zadok (n. b. the new constructs; the passage is inexact anyhow as if being quoted from memory) that kept charge of My sanctuary when the children of Israel went astray from Me, these it is that shall offer unto Me the fat and the blood' (Ez. 44.15). By 'priests' is meant those in Israel that repented and departed from the land of Judah (n. b. the allusion to the penitential activities of people like John the Baptist). By 'levites' is meant those that associated themselves with them. By 'sons of Zadok' is meant those elect of Israel that have been designated by name and that shall go on functioning (or "stand") in the last days. (N. b., we do not have here a definition of a priesthood at all, but in this basically historical exegesis, a definition of "the saved" of the end of days -- not to mention the stress on predestination, or what is basically the "pre-

existent Zaddik-idea.) Behold their names have been specified, the families into which they are to be born, the epochs in which they are to function, the full tale of their sufferings, the duration of their sojourn in exile, and the precise nature of their works (italics mine). These were the holy men of former times (i. e., the ^CAnshei-Hesed of Hebrew Ecclesiasticus)-- the men whose sins God pardoned, who justified the righteous (italics mine -- here is the yazdik zaddik- idea of Isaiah 53, which we shall have occasion to discuss below) and condemned the wicked. But all who up to the present time have succeeded them in carrying out explicitly the Law from which those ancients drew their lessons, them too will God forgive, in accordance with the Covenant which He made with those ancients to forgive their iniquities"(here, too, is the attachment to the Law, so characteristic of James' Jerusalem community -- how different is the Pauline formulation of similar ideas!) ¹⁴

The difference between this presentation of the so-called "Zadokite Priesthood" and the all-important "priesthood after the order of Melchizedek" as set forth in Hebrews, when read in this light, is all but inconsequential.

2. The "Yazdik Zaddik"-Theology and the Sadducee Problem

When the Zadokite Document was originally discovered among the finds at the Cairo Genizah, some early commentators, most notably D. S. Margoliouth, identified it as a Jewish-Christian document.¹⁵ Despite some of the wildly speculative conclusions of J. Teicher forty years later in attempting

to pursue this line of thought after the appearance of the Scrolls, I suggest that in the light of B. E. Thiering's results and what I am developing here, we shall have to go back to this original identification -- or as I would term it an anti-Acts (actually in this instance Acts is the opposition document).¹⁶ It was certainly on the basis of this document and the astounding material it contained that Robert Eisler was able to pinpoint the position of James in the configuration of forces of the Jerusalem of his day as "Opposition High Priest".¹⁷ Though containing much of value, Eisler's work was sometimes as damagingly speculative as Teicher's, however with considerably more perspecuity. I claim no particular originality on the individual points I am attempting to make, only in putting them together into a working final synthesis.

To make this final synthesis, one will not only have to draw on the notion of justification as one finds it set forth in the Pauline corpus, but also with even more justice on the passage with which it is so intimately related, Isaiah 53. Though this passage as such has not yet been found subjected to exegesis at Qumran (and there is no reason why it should be), it operates according to the very same schema that we have already called attention to in relation to other passages subjected to similar exegesis at Qumran. In the almost exclusive attention given the "suffering servant"-motif of this key proof text, it is often overlooked that the individual doing the suffering and bearing the stripes is once more

none other than our omnipresent "Zaddik", i. e., the word, "zaddik", is placed in apposition to the suffering servant. The actual reading must run something like this: "...my servant, the righteous one, will justify (or "will bring justification to") many".¹⁸ The actual Hebrew of this exposition of the notion of "justification" is "yazdik", i. e., "will make righteous", a fourth declension "causative", another nuance often lost in the translation into ready English, though not in the Greek. Actual reference to this notion of "justification", or as I prefer to describe it, the "yazdik zaddik"-notion, based on the original notation in Isaiah and conserving the spirit of the original Hebrew, is to be found generously sprinkled throughout the Qumran corpus, particularly and very revealingly in the Book of Hymns, thought by many to be the actual work of the Teacher of Righteousness himself, but also, not insignificantly, in the Zadokite Document as we have already shown.¹⁹ This same ideology can be found to underly many sections of the New Testament, particularly in the Gospel of Matthew, but also in Acts, making up what can therefore perhaps be identified as the earliest strata of theology in the New Testament corpus, i. e., that **Jesus was the Zaddik, or Righteous One par excellence** (for his generation), and that in conjunction with his justifying activity what he demands is absolute righteousness. A perfect example of this approach may be seen in the discussion centering around the material in the Sermon on the Mount, that "unless your righteousness exceed that of the Scribes and the Pharisees (italics mine), you shall in no wise enter the Kingdom of

Heaven."²⁰ One will also find this "righteousness" ideology permeating the work of Justin Martyr, who must be considered with Hegesippus, his probable contemporary, one of our earliest reliable sources on these matters.²¹

In addition, in making this synthesis, one will have to clarify one's perception of the "Sadducee" problem, that is, what should have been clear from the vast corpus represented by Qumran and the obviously major movement associated with it, that whatever else the individuals responsible for it may have been called, whether "Essenes" (the gist of most current theories), "Zealots", "Messianists" (i. e., those people who were called "Christian" for the first time on the witness of Acts at Antioch), or even "Sicarii" -- all points-of-view discernible at Qumran -- they themselves tell us they were Zadokites, i. e., "Sadducees". Since these Sadducees clearly have very little in common with normative or establishment Sadducees portrayed in the Gospels and appearing in the handy delineations in Josephus' works, we must see them as another brand of "Sadducee", who probably should either be called "opposition" or "purist" Sadducees. The answer to this problem is to understand that the Sadducees of the New Testament and Josephus' rather facile descriptions are not at all the Sadducees of 63 B. C. or even Judas Maccabee's time. Indeed, one should realize that a shift occurs with the coming of Herod, who in fact eliminates all the "Sadducee" supporters of his predecessors and introduces a new "Sadducee" line.²² This split is described in both Rabbinic and Karaite literature, where two schools of Sadducee thought are noted, one

following a "Zadok" and the other, one "Boethus", who was the priest whose daughter Herod married after disposing of the last of the Hasmonaeans.²³ Reflections of it can also be found in the Pseudoclementines.²⁴ On this basis, one could refer to the latter either as neo-Sadducees or Boethusians. Whatever one might wish to say about the former, one can be sure that these latter were a far more docile lot and became part of the Phariseeizing elite which had little difficulty putting up with foreign rule either in the person of the Herodians themselves or the Roman Governors.²⁵ Indeed, this is the issue the whole discussion turned upon, and it can be seen very clearly from the slightly varying presentation of the "Hassidaeans" in the two Maccabean books. Here, too, one must probably be talking about two groups of Hassidaeans: one according to the portrait of Maccabees, the followers of Judas Maccabee par excellence, who should probably on this basis be called "Zadokite Hassidaeans", and two, according to the version of 1Maccabees, who "split" with him, and are probably, therefore, more appropriately called "Pharisee Hassidaeans".²⁶ This issue was, whether appointment of the high priest from overseas or by non-Jewish foreigners (which to the purist "the Herodians" most certainly were) would be tolerated or whether some higher determining characteristic, i. e., "zeal for the law" or "absolute righteousness" was in fact to be required. One can confidently say that the whole "opposition" movement in the Herodian period and beyond, consisting of so-called "Zealots", "Essenes", Zadokites at Qumran, "Christians", and others (one must realize that

terms in the Second Temple period tend to slip around a great deal depending on who is doing the observing and from what vantage point, so that a group that might be called one thing by one witness might be called a completely different thing by another), regardless of overlap, clove to the latter.²⁷ We would like to characterize all these groups by the appellation "purist Sadducee"; another, or earlier way of looking at them would be to call them "Zadokite Hassidaean".

In this view, the determining factor for a "Zadokite" High Priest was righteousness, or as the New Testament would have it "perfect righteousness" ("perfection" and "perfection of the way" are also terms familiar to Qumran rhetoric²⁸). It is in this sense the "Zaddik" appellation applied to James is so important. One can see this demand for a high priest of higher righteousness operating throughout the whole period encompassed by the so-called "Zealot" movement (also something of a misnomer foisted on an unsuspecting public both ancient and modern by Josephus) from its supposed inception at the time of the beginning of the "Messianic" disturbances in 4 B. C., and before, to the election of a high priest by lot in the final phase of the uprising against Rome.²⁹ It is also the thread running through much of the literature at Qumran, i. e., the Moreh-Zedek or Teacher of Righteousness is also the quint-essential "son of Zadok" (by virtue of his teaching righteousness and not necessarily his genealogical descent). As such, the Moreh-Zedek (n. b. the parallelism with Melchizedek) is, also, eligible to put forth priestly claims (as for instance the first Zaddik, Noah, certainly exercised priestly

functions, as, for instance, another Zaddik did after him -- Abraham)³⁰ and in particular, as the quintessential "Zadokite", high priestly claims. It is this the pesharim among the Scrolls make very clear in their allusion to the Moreh-Zedek as "the Priest", or the priest par excellence, which most scholarly opinion has taken as a reference to the high priesthood.³¹

The famous Isaiah 53 passage, which we have designated as being at the root of "justification" theorizing, is, also notable for the much overlooked reference to "knowledge". It is not by his "suffering", though this is certainly important, that the "servant/Zaddik" will "justify many"; rather it is by "his knowledge (italics mine -- "beda^Cto") that "my servant, the Righteous One, will justify many" (or "make many righteous"). This notion of a justification process carried out to a certain extent through "knowledge" or "by teaching" has dropped out in the Septuagint translation and is almost altogether lacking in the Pauline reformulation of these notions in conjunction with the "free gift of faith" doctrine. As we shall see, too, the association of the Hebrew word, amal^C or "works", with these expressions in the original allusion will not be without significance.³² Together with the allusion, "by his knowledge", these could not fail to have had important exegetical significance as to the manner in which the "justifying" process was to be carried out for those who saw the Zaddik/servant as a "teacher" -- or in James' case, a "Teacher of Righteousness". One should, also, note that the allusion "many" (rabim) has particular exegetical significance as far as Qumran is concerned, and is probably not unrelated, too, to the numerous allusions in the

Gospels to "the multitudes". Anyone remotely familiar with Qumran terminology will immediately recognize this as the expression used to denote the rank and file of Qumran membership, who in turn presumably made up the sum total of "the saved" of the end of days, "saved" not only by their own righteous works (amal, ma'asei, and ma'lalot are the expression usually used to refer to these at Qumran, the first mentioned actually appearing in the Isaiah text), but also by the justifying righteousness (zedek) and piety (hesed) of the Zaddik/Righteous Teacher/Son of Zadok.³³

In addition to these exegetical notes we can historically-speaking definitively place James in the Jericho area through the express witness of the Pseudoclementines, from where, not insignificantly, he sends out his assistant Peter to Caesarea in what might be considered the first independently documentable missionary journey outside the unreliable and somewhat extravagant claims in Acts.³⁴ This journey has, of course, been completely garbled in Acts into a trip by Peter into Samaria, where he supposedly gets involved with Simon Magus (the actual confrontation took place in Caesarea), and a careful reading of Josephus will provide further verification of a similar visit by another "Simon, the head of a Sanhedrin of his own" (as this "Simon" very much resembles our Simon and should probably be identified with him, this would make him the ab beit-din or nasi of James' Jerusalem Sanhedrin or the proverbial "Jerusalem Council"), to Caesarea where significantly and quite properly he confronts Agrippa I (not the Roman Centurion of Acts' carefully calculated and Paulinizing reconstruction of these materials).³⁵

All these matters are beyond the scope of this paper, but for

the moment suffice it to say that a careful comparison of the relevant portions of the Recognitions and Acts will reveal the deliberate downgrading of the role and importance of James that was being carried out in the early part of the latter work.

One now has coming together around the person of "the Priest" or the Moreh-Zedek, the twin pillars of what should be called "the Zaddikate" (a phrase which would quite properly anticipate the parallel and later institution of "the Imamate" of Shi^cite Islam, with which, not accidentally, it has much in common), priestliness and a justifying attachment to the law, the last being seen -- all questions of Halachah aside-- as "the way of righteousness".³⁶ Against this background one can now read the testimony to James' overriding piety and righteousness, in connection with which he may have been permitted to wear the highpriestly garments and exercise the high-priestly prerogative of entering the Holy of Holies and rendering atonement on behalf of the whole people -- presumably on Yom Kippur -- with more seriousness. His title of "Zaddik", which is attested to by almost all commentators and seems completely integral to his person, would be enough to ensure his identification as a "Righteous Teacher", aside from his leadership and teaching capacity in the early community centered around Jerusalem (I avoid here the translation rooted in Greek tradition of " Church" as misleading). In their anxiety to make quick identifications, early scholars often missed that there was not necessarily one Moreh-Zedek (though in any given generation or age, there would probably have been

one widely recognized one -- just as today there is one widely recognized and pre-eminent "Ayatollah", and again, the comparison is not frivolous, but intrinsic), but a series of them, the expression being more the title of a given function or office than a specific individual. We can identify a series of widely recognized Zaddikim, i. e., our Zaddikate (whose tombs were probably venerated as the New Testament and Pseudoclementines suggest³⁷), going all the way back to Simeon the Righteous, on whom all chains of transmission converge³⁸, his son or grandson, the martyred Onias IV,³⁹ Judas Maccabee (though not his brothers), who is identified as a "Zaddik" in 2Macc and whose mandate is bestowed by Onias also in 2Macc,⁴⁰ and after a break John the Baptist, identified as a "Zaddik" in both Josephus and the New Testament and whose words are reproduced almost verbatim in the Community Rule at Qumran (very likely not completely to be disassociated from the mysterious "Zadduk" Josephus mentions in his Antiquities who came around the time of Archeleus. N. B. the Greek transliteration has as much affinity to the Hebrew, Zaddik, as it does the Hebrew "Zadok", which both Josephus and the Septuagint transliterate differently in the appropriate place)⁴¹, Jesus, James, and the mysterious "Honi the Circle-Drawer", also known as "Onias the Just" and identified as a Zaddik by Josephus, the circumstances of whose death so closely resemble James' and who very probably stood in a genealogical relationship to these other three.⁴²

3. The "Election" of James as "Bishop" and High Priest

The testimony to James as high priest is found principally in three writers of the fourth and fifth centuries, Eusebius, Epiphanius, and Jerome.⁴³ These in turn are mostly based on earlier materials in Hegesippus, Clement, and Josephus, but also each other. Epiphanius, while garbled and sometimes widely off, here and there gives evidence of having even more extensive sources available to him.⁴⁴ Eusebius and Jerome, of course, are by the standards of the day fairly careful scholars. Eusebius' famous testimony is extensive and detailed. The source, Hegesippus, is acknowledged and quoted at length, which brings it down to within a lifetime of the events in question. The Gospels themselves are hardly on much firmer soil, and while the Gospels are on the whole hostile to "Christianity" (if we can call it this) in Palestine and "the Chrstianity of Jesus' family", the tradition conserved in Hegesippus is sympathetic to it. With it, and various other fragments in Josephus, Origen, Jerome, the Pseudoclementines, Thomas, Nag Hammadi, Eusebius himself, and Epiphanius, one finds oneself in the curious, but much underestimated, position of having more independently documentable material on James than any other figure in the early Church, including the putative Messiah himself (excluding Paul's self-documentation, where aside from the ambiguous references to Cephas/Peter, James is the only major figure referred to).

There is a certain justice in this, for I think we can safely say that unlike any of these others, James was a person

of perhaps pre-eminent importance in his own time, occupying a position that perhaps only John the Baptist could approach in an earlier time. Eusebius makes various claims as to the manner in which James succeeded to the leadership of the early Church, but basically these fall into two categories: 1) he was either directly appointed -- as he puts it, he was "the first that received the dignity of the episcopate at Jerusalem from our Saviour himself," or 2) he was "elected" -- as he puts it, "the episcopal seat in Jerusalem was committed (to him) by the apostles".⁴⁵ The first is vividly confirmed by the well-known allusion in the Gospel of Thomas which is at odds with the rather self-serving (self-serving in terms of "Gentile Christianity") portrait in the Book of Acts of an intervening Petrine leadership.⁴⁶ Eusebius, too, elsewhere indirectly confirms the direct accession of James: "This James, therefore, whom the ancients on account of the perfection of his righteousness (n. b. this telltale allusion) surnamed 'the Just', was the first that received the episcopate of the Church at Jerusalem" (italics mine).⁴⁷ This portrait of the direct succession of James without the intervening Petrine leadership is, also, indirectly attested to in the second version of the resurrection appearances in 1Cor 15:6-8, i. e., "first...he appeared to James, and then to all the apostles, and last of all he appeared to me too; it was as though I was born when no one expected it", which scholarship often considers the interpolated tradition, but in fact is probably the authentic one.⁴⁸ Vestiges of it can still be made out in the Emmaus appearance in the Gospel of Luke in

which an unnamed character (who we take to be James), accompanied by another family member, Cleophas, actually sits down and breaks bread with the Messiah (the prototype for the later "Doubting Thomas" story -- also presumably involving a "brother" of Jesus -- in the Gospel of John and an event actually reported of James in the Gospel of the Hebrews⁴⁹).

Showing some confusion, but basically sticking to the same line that the accession of James took place immediately after the ascension of Jesus and not after Peter's arrest and flight (the implication of the information otherwise available in Acts), Eusebius quotes Clement in support of "the election" of James: "Peter, James, and John after the ascension of the Saviour, did not claim pre-eminence, because the Saviour had specially honoured them (here, both Eusebius and Clement show the usual confusion about the "two Jameses" for in the very next excerpt from Clement, Jesus is said to have "entrusted the gift of knowledge" to "James the Just, John, and Peter", who must be equivalent to "James, Cephas, and John, these leaders, these pillars" in Galatians, as well as the triad leadership at Qumran and the general scheme of Sanhedrin leadership of High Priest, Nasi, and Ab-Beit-Din⁵⁰), but chose James the Just as Bishop of Jerusalem."⁵¹ This "election" theme is echoed in the Pseudoclementines, and one can discern the outlines of it in the rather artificial story of "the election" of the twelfth apostle to fill the void supposedly left by Judas' equally dubious suicide coming exactly in the place one should have expected to find material relating to the election of James. Like the Emmaus story, vestiges of it have survived the

redaction process in the highly revealing surname of the curious character named "Joseph Barsabbas" and was never heard of before or since, i. e., "the Just One".⁵²

One should recognize in James' "election" and the graphic vestiges of it in "the casting of lots" in the Acts portrait a typical "Zealot" procedure for choosing high-priestly candidates operative from the time of Judas Maccabee to the demands put forth by the formentors of the disturbances of 4 B. C. to 7 A. D., which Josephus somewhat disingenuously designates as the inception of the movement he characterizes by that name.⁵³ Bearing in mind our caution that terms like Zaddikim, Zaddukim (Sadducees), Kiddushim ("Saints"), Hassidim (the probable root through Aramaic of the allusion, "Essene"), Canan^cim ("Zealots"), Ebionim ("the Poor" or "the Ebionites"), etc. referred to "opposition" groups of one kind or another ("opposed" to the "Herodians" and Romans and the Pharisee/Sadducee establishment they sponsored) and tended to slide around a good deal, being basically synonymous; the reader must try to free himself from the framework of the facile and basically oversimplified descriptions of Josephus. These were purveyed for more or less the same reasons that led him to exonerate the Roman Emperor-to-be, Titus, from having deliberately and as a matter of policy ordered the destruction of the Temple.⁵⁴ A parallel and similar process can be seen in the vilification of the Jews in the Gospels and the Book of Acts and the fictitious portraits of Herod, Pilate, and the Roman Centurian of the Caesarea battalion to be found in them.⁵⁵ As "Zealot" commander or "commissar" in Galilee, Josephus in a more

unguarded moment in the Antiquities clearly shows a certain amount of sympathy for James. He himself studied for three years at the feet of a Qumran-type teacher who he cryptically identifies only as Banus (i. e., "the Bather"), who if not actually identifiable with James, was certainly his contemporary and some one very similar to him.⁵⁶

The priestly "zeal" upon which the so-called "Zealot" movement is based is not a new concept but goes back to the portrait of the Hasmonaeen, Mattathias, in 1Macc, to the praise of Simeon the Zaddik in the Hebrew Ecclesiasticus, and probably even to the portrait of the mysterious "Ezra" in the books bearing his name.⁵⁷ In each case (including the last), what is probably involved is the putting forth of a claim to the high priesthood. On Josephus' own testimony (a testimony conveniently ignored by those conceiving of the "Zadokite" line as genealogical only), Judas Maccabee was twice "elected" to the high priesthood (the circumstances surrounding the demise of the line of Simeon the Zaddik are not unsimilar to the circumstances surrounding the demise of Judas' own family in the disturbances of 4 B. C.- 7 A. D.) presumably on the basis, not only of his self-evident "zeal", but also his John the Baptist-like Zaddik-status described in 2Macc. In fact, Judas is the archetype of all these Nazirite-type priestly Zaddiks, who "to avoid contamination," as 2Macc puts it, retreat into the wilderness.⁵⁸ 1Macc in addition to describing the "zeal" of the family progenitor, Mattathias, also describes in terms bordering on panegyric the "election" of Judas' brother,

Simon, until as both it and Josephus put it "the coming of a Prophet"⁵⁹. The Gospels themselves raise the same claim for "zeal", i. e., "zeal for my father's house consumes me", on behalf of Jesus in the all-important Temple-cleansing episode, which in turn can only be based on Judas' similar activities 200 years before (the basis of the Jewish Hanukkah festivities).

What actually occurs from 4 B. C. to 7 A. D. in conjunction with the key demand that "the people" (i. e., Cam) be allowed "to elect" the high priest on the basis of "higher" righteousness (in contradistinction to the presumably more prosaic "Zadokite" claims and venality of the new Boethusian/Sadducee priesthood introduced by the Herodians in place of the Maccabean) is that the "Zealot" movement now enters its "Messianic" phase, a Messianism vividly reflected at Qumran and by Josephus' single inadvertent disclosure of the "Messianic" underpinning of the uprising against Rome in 66-70 A. D.⁶⁰ This is preached by the mysterious "Zadduk" and Judas the Galilean, the first of a series of messianic "pairs" that continues into the Bar Kochba period.⁶¹ Even in the final "Jacobin" phase of the uprising against Rome, where all vestiges of the hated priesthood owing its appointment to foreign overlords are eliminated, a simple "stone-cutter" (n.b. the ever-present "stone" symbolism), not unsymbolically named Phineas is "elected by lot".⁶² Josephus, feigning indignation, rails against the meanness of this man's origins in much the way the early Church fathers rail against the meanness and poverty-stricken Christology of the so-called "Ebionim". For the purposes of this paper it is even more edifying to quote the latter: "These...cherished low and mean opinions of Christ. For they considered him a plain and common man, and justified (i.e., "made righteous") only by his advances in righteousness... With them the observance of the law was altogether necessary, as if they could not be saved only by faith in Christ and...they

evinced great zeal to observe the ritual service of the law... Whence, in consequence of such a course, they have also received their epithet, the name of Ebionites, exhibiting the poverty of their intellect" (italics mine).⁶³

4. James: "the People"'s Priest and "Bulwark"

Throughout the testimony of Hegesippus conserved by Eusebius James' popularity across the board for all groups outside the Herodian-sponsored Pharisaic/Sadducean establishment is repeatedly averred. This testimony is also seconded by the material in Josephus, both in the form it has come down to us and the no longer extant material attested to by the Church fathers.⁶⁴ As Eusebius himself puts it developing the theme of James' "perfect righteousness": "he was deemed the most just of men (i. e., the quintessential Zaddik or in Qumran terms, the "Zadok" or "son of Zadok" par excellence) by all the people because of his elevated virtue and piety."⁶⁵ There can be little question that one must read as Hebrew equivalents to the two last, zedek and hesed, the two qualities always found linked together at Qumran, based on similar couplings in Isaiah, in relation to the activities of the Teacher of Righteousness and incidentally forming the basis of the more or less interchangeable ascriptions, Zaddikim and Hassidim.⁶⁶ As already noted, the former comprised the sum total of "the saved" or all those eligible to inherit the Kingdom; the latter very probably formed the basis through a transliteration of an Aramaic equivalent of the terminology

"Essene". Hegesippus is quoted by Eusebius as putting the same proposition in the following manner: "But James, the brother of the Lord, who, as there were many of this name, was surnamed the Just by all from the days of our Lord until now" (italics mine).⁶⁷ When James is called upon on Passover, presumably 62 A. D., if Josephus' dating is correct (always a time of agitation and upset for obvious reasons), "to restrain the people" who, as Hegesippus puts it, are being "led astray after Jesus as if he were the Christ", one has vivid testimony that even the establishment parties recognize his hold over "the people". Placing him on a wing of the Temple (it is difficult to imagine the invention of such vivid detail) ostensibly to calm the Passover crowds delirious after the "Messiah" (whose return according to messianic prophecy must have been imminently expected -- though James does nothing of the kind, announcing rather in the celebrated terms of Daniel his imminent coming), they address him in this manner: "O thou just man (i. e., Righteous One or Zaddik par excellence) whom we all ought to believe..." Indeed, throughout this testimony the epithet, "Justus", is applied to him intrinsically as if he were the perfect incarnation of righteousness -- what we have been referring to as the incarnation of righteousness of his generation.

This attestation of the messianic fervor of the mass in approximately the year 62 A. D. finds endorsement in Josephus, who in a moment of evident inattention reveals in the Jewish War that the people's "chief inducement to go to war was an equivocal oracle ("equivocal" because the obsequious Josephus

applies it like Rabbi Johanan Ben Zacchai, like Josephus a Pharisee leader and the putative founder of Rabbinic Judaism, to Vespasian) also found in their sacred writings announcing that at that time a man from their country would become monarch of the whole world."⁶⁸ This prophecy is immediately recognizable as the "Star" prophecy of Numbers 24:17. It is not only at the root of the "star" material in the Gospel of Luke, but the name of the last messianic pretender, Shim^con Bar Kochba, and of all Jewish messianic expectation of the period under consideration.⁶⁹ What it unconditionally asserts is that the uprising of 66-70 A.D., that we know was started when a zealous lower priest class stopped sacrifice in the Temple on behalf of Romans and other foreigners (n. b. the constant repetition of this theme both in the matters we have discussed germane to the situation in Palestine and in matters relative to the controversial "Gentile Mission" outside Palestine) and which represented the popular culmination of the movement inaugurated by "Judas and Zadduk" some 70 years before (also in terms of Danielian and Qumran numerology not an insignificant span of time), was not simply "Zealot", but "Messianic" as well. One should note in this connection, the much underestimated fact that aside from being "Zadokite", Scroll literature is "Messianic", containing at least four allusions to this selfsame "Star" prophecy, two to be found in the Zadokite Document and one in the War Scroll. There are also compendiums of "Messianic" proof texts and much messianic imagery in Hymns and elsewhere.⁷⁰

The coupling of James' name with "the people", one repeatedly encounters in these testimonies, is also part of

another epithet which seems to have been applied to him, "Oblias", the origin of which is still unsure. To quote Hegesippus again via Eusebius: "And indeed, on account of his exceeding great piety (again, hesed, is the patent Hebrew equivalent making James one of the proverbial "Anshei-Hesed"/Zaddikim of Hebrew Ecclesiasticus⁷¹), he was called the Just and Oblias which signify righteousness and protection of the people, as the prophets declare concerning him." From this last, we must assume not only that James himself was an important enough person to be found mentioned in Scripture, but also that these two expressions in particular were to be found there. This is indeed the case with the first. The second, which from the translation provided is usually translated back into C^oz-le-C^am (i. e., "strength of the people", and this word, C^oz, as applied to the Teacher of Righteousness appears amid extremely interesting imagery (at Qumran) is, also, to be found in Psalms amid extremely interesting messianic contexts beyond the scope of this treatment.⁷²

James Breshler has recently suggested "Obdias" as a possible rephrasing of this mysterious sobriquet, but if we are going to get into solutions based on mistaken transliterations, then "Onias" would also do just as well, for as we shall see James operates as a kind of Onias redivivus.⁷³ In the all-important 2Macc, not only is the martyred Onias described as "a zealot for the laws" and serves to introduce the "righteous" priesthood of Judas Maccabee, but he is described in precisely the same manner as this early Church testimony refers to James, i.e., as "a righteous man" and "the protector of his fellow countrymen".⁷⁴ James' death, too, has so many elements in common with the death

of Honi the Circle-Drawer (also known as Onias the Just), who seems to have been another of these incarnated Righteous Ones and most certainly a priestly Zaddik, that one has to wonder if one does not have something like the Shi'ite doctrine of the "Imam" operating here. The Talmud even tells us about a "Rip Van Winkle"-type story, which can be seen as a variation on this "imam" doctrine, associated with one "Abba Hilkiah" a contemporary of James and in many ways very hard to distinguish from him.⁷⁶ Certainly these redivivus-type ideas were operative in this period in relation to two significant and related priestly characters, Phineas and Elijah. Both Abba Hilkiah and another character named "Hanan ha-Nehba" (Hanan the Hidden = John the Baptist?) are identified as descendants of Onias the Just, the former a grandson and the latter, his nephew. But even more significantly rain-making phenomena are associated by tradition with Elijah, Honi, Abba Hilkiah, and James.⁷⁷ Indeed, this notion of rain-making, going all the way back to Elijah and possibly in some way associated with the activities of the archetypical Zaddik, Noah, seems to have been something of the litmus test for the role of Zaddik/High Priest in the period of Abba Hilkiah and James. It is possible even to identify the famine years when such a procedure might have come into play, i. e., around the time of the Queen Helen famine relief effort and the crucifixion of James and Simon, the two sons of Judas the Galilean.⁷⁸

More important, however, than the precise derivation of the "Oblias" epithet is the meaning which the early Church fathers actually tell us was associated with the term, i. e.,

"protection", "strength", or "bulwark of the people".⁷⁹ The expression as a consequence gives us the methodology to understand James' peculiar role for his generation, both as the Zaddik par excellence and acting as the supporting shield of Jerusalem, without whose existence the city could no longer remain in existence. The repeated association of James' activities, we have noted, with "the people", or in Hebrew, "the am", is also not accidental. It is hard to escape the conclusion that the religious and popular role he exercised was among the much execrated, am ha-aretz -- so often and so contemptuously referred to in Mishnaic literature with its roots in Pharisaic tradition.⁸⁰ Hegesippus further alludes to this role James played among those people apparently so loosely lumped together in the Talmud as the am ha-aretz in the same passage that he refers to James' hesed and zedek ("piety" and "virtue"): "Some of the seven sects...of the people (elsewhere Eusebius preserves the reference listing these as aside from Pharisees and Sadducees: "Essenes, Galilaeans, Hemerobaptists, Masbotheans, Samaritans"⁸¹) ...believed that Jesus was the Christ. But...did not believe eiber in a resurrection (meaning, his resurrection) or that he was coming to give every one according to his works (n.b. the typical Jamesian phraseology here, which also permeates documents like the Qumran Hymns -- the Hebrew equivalent being am or maasei); as many, however, as did believe, did so on account of James" (italics mine).

There is no mistaking the import of this testimony, as far as the over-riding role played by James (a role completely indistinguishable from that of the Qumran Teacher of Righteousness for his generation) in the political

and sectarian situation of the time; nor should it be dismissed simply as over-enthusiastic hyperbole.

Furthermore, Eusebius elsewhere reiterates the "bulwark" imagery one finds in Epiphanius giving us further instrumentality (though by this time we are no longer in need of it) for understanding James' role as "protector" or "shield" of "the people". He states: "All that time the most of the apostles and disciples including James himself, the first Bishop of Jerusalem (italics mine -- n. b. his pre-eminent status), known as the Lord's brother, were still alive and by remaining in the city furnished the place with an impregnable bulwark."⁸² The contrary of this statement is the proposition that the removal of his presence is in some way connected with the destruction of the city (a connection which will be drawn in almost all testimonies and which the Gospels assimilate into the way they present Jesus' death -- not surprisingly as both were considered Zaddikim). It is clear, too, from this discussion, just as it is clear from Origen's three references to the same point, that "the people" of Jerusalem did in fact attribute its fall to the killing of James -- and here we are talking about Jews, not Gentiles. As Eusebius presents the proposition, relying it would seem on both Clement and Josephus: "So admirable a man indeed was James, and so celebrated among all for his justice, that even the wiser part of the Jews were of the opinion that this was the cause of the immediate siege of Jerusalem, which happened to them for no other reason than the crimes against him"(n. b. the precise parallel with what the Gospels would rather us believe about Jesus). Eusebius even superadds

the actual testimony of Josephus on this matter, which to all appearances must have been in the Jewish War, since he also appends the still extant testimony about James' death from the Antiquities. "These things", the passage still to be found in his version of Josephus' works states, "happened to the Jews to avenge James the Just, who was the brother of him that is called Christ, and whom the Jews had slain, notwithstanding his pre-eminent justice."⁸³ Origen reproduces similar material at three separate junctures in his work, which he claims was still extant in his version of Josephus, but in the process complains that Josephus should have said, because of Jesus, not James.⁸⁴ As a direct consequence of this last, one must probably conclude, that the passage disappeared from all extant versions of the corpus after 325 A.D. when censorship was imposed.

The explanation of this role of support of the existence of the city or "pillar" of the community is actually quite simple. As a by-product, one also gets a useful explanation of the description of James as "pillar" in Galatians 2:9. It is to be found in the Zaddik-statement about James in the Gospel of Thomas, i. e., "in the place where you are to go (Jerusalem), go to James the Just for whose sake Heaven and Earth came into existence" and in the implication about the saving power of the Zaddik-role to be found in the testimony about Judas Maccabee in 2Macc. In this last Judas with his nine other Zaddikim, i.e. "ten Just Men", flee into the wilderness to avoid contamination, so that the survival of the earth in what must, according to the testimony of Daniel, have been seen as a period of "terrible wrath" was guaranteed.⁸⁵ It is even

not impossible that Qumran, situated as it was in proximity to where these events occurred and the events recorded in the not unrelated Lot story -- including even the continued habitation of caves, was founded in commemoration of them.⁸⁶ In turn, these explanations are integrally **connected** with the several stories about Zaddikim in the early part of the Bible. Not only does the first Zaddik, Noah, who like his descendant, Abraham, also carries out priestly functions, provide salvation for the earth through his seed and through his atoning sacrifice (which not insignificantly opens the way for the consumption of meat on a vast scale -- up to this point, Noah like our other Zaddikim presumably having been a vegetarian); but the second episode involving Zaddikim, that of Lot at Sodom and Gemorrah, provides the literalist with a key definition of the Zaddik's role, i.e., for the sake of "ten just men" God will withhold destruction from the earth.⁸⁷ When combined with the statement in Proverbs about "the Zaddik the foundation of the world", so nicely reflected in the Gospel of Thomas allusion, one is left with the essence of the Zaddik-function and for that matter the essence of how James as the Zaddik of his generation could have been considered to **provide** salvation for the city in which he lived.

The sum total of these allusions is perhaps best summed up in the description of the Zaddik's role one comes upon in the Zohar, not surprisingly, in relation to Noah's biblical designation as a "Righteous One". Through it, one suspects, certain materials found in the Zohar must be a good deal older than is generally recognized: "'Noah was a Righteous Man'. Assuredly so after the supernal pattern (n. b. the outlines of

the pre-existent Zaddik-notion here, which in time metamorphoses into the logos--doctrine of the Gospel of John and the 'Hidden Imam' doctrine of Shi'ism). It is written, 'the Righteous One is the foundation of the world'(Pr. 10:25), and the earth is established thereon (cf. the Gospel of Thomas), for this is the pillar that upholds the world (n. b. the basis of the Galatians' usage). So Noah was called Zaddik (righteous) below. All this is implied in the words 'Noah walked with God', meaning that he never separated himself from him and acted so as to be a true copy of the heavenly ideal, a 'Zaddik the foundation of the world', an embodiment of the world's covenant of peace."⁸⁸ In this light, it is hardly to be wondered at that, as Hegesippus would have it, regardless of a little telescoping in time, "immediately after (James' death) Vespasian invaded and took Judea"(even this last involves the telescoping of some four years), or once the protective shield in the form of the Zaddik was removed, not only was the city condemned, but like Sodom and Gemorrah, it could not longer remain in existence.⁸⁹

5. James as "Opposition" High Priest in the Holy of Holies on Yom Kippur

Part and parcel of this Zaddik soteriological activity would be of course the seeking of atonement on behalf of the whole people for sins of omission and **inadvertent** commission on Yom Kippur -- the Day of Atonement. It is hardly to be imagined that such an atonement carried out by one of the

various priestly families, who bought and sold the priesthood from Herodian family members or Roman governors as so many sacks of grain, could have been considered efficacious by opposition groups cleaving to the Zaddik (in the sense of "purist Zadokite") or even Zealot--ideal -- at this level the two are interchangeable in any event. Even in the Gospels Jesus is presented as purifying the Temple and occupying its precincts for a certain period of time. Whether he actually did this or not must remain an open question, but as Zaddik of his time and "a Zealot" for the Temple (and presumably "the law"), as the episode so surprisingly avers, he would have every right to do so according to this presentation. Nor should one overlook in this connection the thundering against the rich in the letter bearing the attribution to James in the New Testament corpus and how Josephus continually represents how the High Priests, particularly Ananias, enriched themselves (partly at the expense of the lower priesthood).⁹⁰

Here we come to the crux of the matter with regard to James: whether part of his activities involved going into the Inner Sanctum of the Temple on Yom Kippur (a Yom Kippur, which owing to the Jubilees calendar employed by the various opposition groups, might not even have coincided with the normal Pharisaic/Sadducean/and Herodian festivities). Even in the all-important Habbakuk Commentary, which we shall presently invoke to show the uncanny resemblance between the circumstances of the lives of both James and the Teacher of Righteousness, there is a much belabored, but as yet undecipherable, reference to difficulties between the Teacher and his now well-known

antagonist, "the Wicked Priest". These center around events that appear to have transpired on a Yom Kippur, whatever the calendar involved.⁹¹ If this does relate to James' having entered the Holy of Holies on Yom Kippur to make atonement on behalf of the whole people, and if in fact he did actually do this; then, of course, the blasphemy charges upon which he is finally hauled to trial and stoned would make every sense, since the essence of what was meant by "blasphemy" according to Mishnah Sanhedrin was the uttering of, or the encouraging of others to pronounce, the forbidden name of God -- the first mentioned, anyhow, being precisely what the annual atonement by the High Priest in the Holy of Holies consisted of. Such a charge in this context makes sense in a way that similar charges raised against Jesus in the Gospel portrait do not.

To quote Hegesippus' detailed presentation of the relevant materials: "This apostle was consecrated from his mother's womb". Not only is the allusion to James as an "apostle" charged with implications, but the characterization of him as being "consecrated from his mother's womb" is echoed in similar and almost competitive claims made by Paul for himself in his correspondence. There are also exactly analogous allusions put forth presumably on behalf of the Teacher of Righteousness in the Qumran Hymns⁹², the whole bearing on the "life-long nazirite" aspect of James' person developed in the next sentence. "He drank neither wine nor fermented liquors, and abstained from animal food (which tends to link him with John the Baptist and Judas Maccabee earlier, as well for instance as other "Essene"-type priests on whose behalf Josephus initially voyaged to Rome and

whom the latter must have come in contact with in his early years under "Banus" tutelege⁹³). A razor never came upon his head, he never anointed with oil, and never used a bath (meaning presumably, "oil within a bath" or that he never took a bath of the Roman variety, for if James' was allowed entrance into the Temple precincts in a priestly fashion, there can be no doubt he took baths or was involved in lustrations of the normal priestly kind. This is the implication of Jerome's parallel description and such baths were also a conspicuous feature of the Qumran routine -- and not uncoincidentally associated with the mission of John the Baptist. Whatever conclusion one draws, the association of the process of "bathing" with his person, however garbled in transmission, is interesting of itself.) This brings us to the crucial, if controversial, testimony about James on the Temple Mount.

"He alone was allowed to enter the sanctuary." This statement on its own makes no sense, since numerous people entered the "sanctuary" as such on a daily basis. However, it is this which Epiphanius reproduces (with an attribution to both Eusebius and Clement) into the not insignificant description that "he was a priest according to the ancient priesthood (italics mine) and on this account, he was lawfully permitted to enter once a year into the Holy of Holies"(i.e., the "Inner Sanctum" or "sanctuary")⁹³. Elsewhere, he even explains that he was accorded this right by virtue of his being a Nazirite (or Nazarene -- Epiphanius does not really show that he understands there is a difference between the two) and on three different occasions avers he was permitted "to wear the high-priestly diadem".⁹⁴ As Eusebius with the direct attribution to Hegesippus continues: "He never wore woollen, but

linen garments (a right which Josephus himself specifically testifies was accorded in the late fifties or early sixties to the lower priesthood in the protracted struggle with the Temple establishment⁹⁵). He was in the habit of entering the Temple alone, and was often found upon his bended knees (i.e., what one would assume would be the typical posture of the High Priest before the Judgement Seat on Yom Kippur), and interceding for the forgiveness of the people (n. b., here again is the telltale affirmation of James' unique role); so that his knees became as hard as camel's, in consequence of his habitual supplication and kneeling before God." One cannot avoid the implication here of "in the Holy of Holies", for it was here on the Judgement or "Mercy Seat" that the indwelling of God's imminence (i.e., the Shekhinah) was considered to reside. Here, if we substitute the thrust of Epiphanius' testimony, i.e., that it was customary for James to do this once a year, which actually includes a reference to Yom Kippur, we come closer to an actual grasp of the import even of the quotation attributed to Hegesippus. Vivid confirmation of this reconstruction is provided by Jerome, who reproduces what is patently the same material Eusebius is using, including what are more comprehensible references to James being "holy from his mother's womb" and his abstinence from wine, meat, and bathing with oil (italics mine). His version, however, accords almost completely with Epiphanius' and not the somewhat nonsensical transmission of Eusebius including a more matter of fact rendering of James' wearing the linen of priestly vestments: "Many indeed are called James. This one was holy from his mother's womb (cf. the precise parallels in Paul and the Qumran Hymns).. He alone had the privilege of entering the

Holy of Holies, since he did not use woollen vestments, but linen and went alone into the Temple (here again obviously the Inner Sanctum) and prayed on behalf of the people (i.e., the Yom Kippur atonement) so much so that his knees were reputed to have acquired the hardness of camel's knees..."⁹⁶ Such graphic reference to importunate prayer makes absolute sense in the context of the Yom Kippur festivities and is reminiscent of a similar panegyric to Simeon the Zaddik in Ecclesiasticus at an earlier time.

If James was "the Zaddik" with priestly prerogatives (i.e., the archetypical "Zadokite") or "Opposition High Priest" of an alliance of anti-establishment and by this time, subversive, parties loosely called "Essene", "Zealot", "Sicarii", or "Christian", depending on the point-of-view; then this alliance, with its inroads into the "zealous" lower priesthood so vividly attested to in the Pseudoclementines and through a critical reading of the Antiquities⁹⁷, would have been powerful enough to force the establishment to grant the various prerogatives noted above, including effecting his entrance into the Holy of Holies on its Day of Atonement (which not surprisingly was probably different from the Yom Kippur of an establishment compromised by its contacts with Rome); just as it would seem to have been powerful enough from the mid-fifties on to deny Agrippa II entrance into the Temple precincts even though he supposedly appointed the High Priest. The issue was the same for which Paul was mobbed on the Temple Mount on his last visit to Jerusalem, the entrance of foreigners into the Temple precincts, and it is not surprising that Agrippa II should have treated Paul so solicitously. In fact, the affront to Agrippa II implied in all of this is almost certainly the reason for the famous "Temple

wall" incident and Agrippa's later removal of the High Priest, Joseph Kami (= Joseph Cabi?), making way for the appointment of Ananus to effect the judicial murder of James.⁹⁸ The struggle between a zealous lower priesthood, probably known for figurative, exegetical, and even actual reasons as "the Poor", and the high priestly establishment in this period is graphically documented by Josephus (who had it seems connections with both) and has been neatly delineated, including an unavoidable analysis of James' role in it, by S.G.F. Brandon.⁹⁹

Even if James only carried out this "people's atonement" just once, i.e., on the Yom Kippur of 61 A.D., the establishment parties would have had the pretext they needed to trump up the blasphemy trial that was to follow in between the death of Festus and the arrival of Albinus as governor in 62 and effect the stoning (really the only one on record for this period other than its rather fanciful reflection in the "Stephen" episode in Acts) and removal of James.¹⁰⁰ The chosen instrument of this policy, Ananus, the younger scion of the same family that put Jesus to death thirty years before, whose brother Jonathan had recently been slain by Sicarii and who was himself to meet a similar fate in the final "Zealot" phase of the "Messianic" uprising beginning 3½-4 years later (n.b., the further interesting reflection of Danielian chronology), ruled the city almost as an independent fiefdom, which he was later to do once again in the years 66-68 A.D. These, and other characteristics of his person and life can to a certain extent be linked to the description of the "Wicked Priest" in the pivotal Habbakuk Commentary at Qumran with more precision than perhaps for any other candidate so far suggested.¹⁰¹

6. "...the Prophets Declare Concerning Him" and the Qumran Pesharim

As Eusebius has noted, the events in James' life were considered of such importance that they were to be found through

an exegetical interpretation of **scripture**, as were the various epithets applied directly to his person. The Isaiah 3:10 quotation in the Qumran manner is specifically applied to the events surrounding his death, and like so many similar passages at Qumran (many of which also from Isaiah) reflecting the life, teachings, and death of the Teacher of Righteousness, turns on the contrast between zaddik and rasha^c, which are invariably interpreted in the peshar as the Teacher of Righteousness and the Wicked Priest.¹⁰² Even the phraseology of this particular citation is so reminiscent of similar passages in the Qumran corpus as to be repetitive. However, one can make even a firmer case. If one examines the atmosphere surrounding the Isaiah 3:10 passage, the build-up in Chapters 1-2 to the imminent fall of Jerusalem, including the allusions to Sodom and Gemorrah, the princely accomplices of thieves all greedy for profit, the taking away¹⁰³ from Jerusalem and Judah support of every kind, "Jerusalem is falling into ruins and Judah is in collapse", the approach of conquering armies, the reference to "the poor" one finds in most such passages being subjected to exegesis, and the allusion to Zion being redeemed by righteousness and her penitents by integrity, it is not surprising that exegetes with an apocalyptic bent should have found this material applicable to James, nor does it take much imagination to grasp what the general peshar (of which the Isaiah 3:10 passage must be seen as only an excerpt) must have looked like. In these chapters one finds oneself in almost precisely

the same kind of atmosphere that was so extensively and revealingly commented upon in the Habbakuk peshar at Qumran, found as if by a miracle almost completely intact among what must be considered some of the last materials in use at Qumran in Cave 1.¹⁰³

I will not dignify with a response the various concerted attempts that have been made to date this commentary at a prior period to that building up to the fall of the Temple in 70 A. D. -- the commentary itself may have been written before the events of the fall itself, though the fall was certain and inevitable at the time of its composition.¹⁰⁴ Everything in the commentary speaks of our period from the forties to the sixties A. D., including the reference "to the final priests of Jerusalem who will amass for themselves wealth and gain by plundering the people (italics mine), but whose wealth and plunder will ultimately be delivered into the hands of the army of the Kittaeans" and the "Wicked Priest"'s plundering "the property of 'the Poor'". In it one has the usual contrasting of zaddik with rasha^c, so eagerly seized upon in Qumran exegesis, and as we can now see from Hegesippus, also in early Christianity. In it, too, are ideas not unfamiliar to early Christianity, most notably, that now that the inevitable tragedy was clearly at hand, "the last days would be drawn out beyond anything the Prophets had foretold."¹⁰⁵ Even more important is the subjecting of the Habbakuk 2:4 passage to exegesis, the passage which together with Isaiah 53 and Genesis 15:6 forms the basis of the Pauline position on "justification" in Galatians and Romans, and in the derivative Hebrews.¹⁰⁶ The exegesis

is almost precisely the same at Qumran as in these works (a similarity which almost of itself puts to rest the question of the chronological provenance of the former), with one important exception, which itself is demonstrative of the Jamesian position (and by consequence that of the Jerusalem community) on this issue in the dispute with Pauline Christianity.

The word, "zaddik", in the text is in the usual manner identified with the Righteous Teacher in the commentary. This produces the rather unusual effect, that the phrase "the righteous shall live by faith" in the original text, now is interpreted to mean "faith in the Righteous Teacher", a nuance which is precisely preserved in the Pauline exegesis; only here the exegesis is deliberately confined only to those "in the House of Judah", i. e., all Jews, in contradistinction to Paul's extension of his rather innovative exegesis of the same passage to include Gentiles (and this more in a primary than a secondary role).¹⁰⁷ But the Qumran exegesis, as if to stress the point, goes even further along the Jamesian path by confining its effect only to those who "observe the law". Lest there be any mistaking the meaning, it specifically mentions the word which we have already noted formed part of the sense of the original Isaiah 53 "justification" allusion, "amal" or "works", i. e., "works of the law". Here, it is impossible to miss the parallel with the discussion of Paul's faith doctrine in the Letter of James, and the latter's insistence that "faith without works is dead" (meaning of course "works" or "acts of the law".)

When one actually analyses the text of the Habbakuk Commentary and materials germane to our analysis in the Psalm 37 Pesher, also relating to and centering around materials about "the Zaddik", one can make almost a point for point link-up with the events of James' life.¹⁰⁸ "The Wicked Priest" in the exegesis, who was "formerly known" or "called by the name of truth" (Josephus says as much of Ananus¹⁰⁹) and who ruled Israel, which we have already noted Ananus did on at least two occasions, in 62 and from 66-68 A. D., is, of course, our Ananus ben Ananus, whose body is in fact reviled and mutilated by Gentiles, i. e., the Idumaeans, who afterwards fling it outside the Temple without burial as carrion for dogs.¹¹⁰ Regardless of any other findings at Qumran that have been developed on the basis of some extremely biased and self-serving **use of palaeographical** and archaeological data, the fact that we can make such good sense out of the Qumran material and make such extraordinary link-ups, more perhaps than for any other individuals so far suggested (and it is inconceivable that the persons referred to at Qumran should simply be anonymous nonentities -- the totality of the settlement is too important and our information about the period is much too comprehensive for that), begins to become extremely persuasive evidence. What lends even more weight to it in a textual sense is that we can show that the exegesis in vogue at Qumran was actually in vogue in a parallel fashion in the 50's and 60's of the Common Era in other documents like the Abbot de Rabbi Nathan and the Pauline corpus -- and it is impossible to show that similar exegeses were in vogue a hundred or even

two hundred years earlier; in fact, it is impossible to show that such a style of exegesis was even employed before the period of the events we have been examining, i.e., the first two-thirds of the first century of the Common Era. Aside from the allusion to the key "Star" prophecy scattered through Qumran texts from the Zadokite Document to the War Scroll, which we know from both Josephus and the Abbot de Rabbi Nathan was applied to the Messiah in this period and the actual quoting in precisely the same manner twice in the Community Rule the words used in the New Testament to describe the mission of John the Baptist¹¹¹; we can show by using evidence completely independent of Qumran that a scriptural passage expounded at Qumran and related there to the fall of the Temple was actually applied to the fall of the Temple so important to us of 70 A.D. The passage in question, Isaiah 10:34: "Lebanon shall fall by a mighty one" (cf. the parallel material on "Lebanon" subjected to exegesis again with the characteristic use of word-play in, not insignificantly, the crucial Habbakuk peshar, as well as in other Isaiah passages and Nahum at Qumran), is one of a series of Isaiah texts expounded at Qumran. It was subject to almost exactly the same exegesis in the Abbot de R. Nathan as one of several texts definitively connected with the fall of the Temple in 70 A.D.¹¹² This raises an extremely heavy presumption for the chronological provenance of much exegetical material at Qumran, which unless controverted by equally convincing independent material (which it cannot be) cannot simply be dismissed on the basis of questionable archaeological and palaeographic reconstructions.

*

*

*

To sum up: we have already noted the similarity of James to two earlier priestly Onias', both designated as Zaddiks in the literature, the first martyred in connection with the events leading to the appearance of the kind of Zaddik/Battle Priest described in the War Scroll, Judas Maccabee, and the second martyred in the events leading up to the Roman desecration of the Temple in 63 B. C. The rain-making capacities associated with James (and actually alluded to in the Letter bearing his name) and the second of these Onias', i. e., Honi the Circle-Drawer, so-called for the circles he used to draw and within whose circumferences he used to confine himself until the desired rain appeared,¹¹³ seems to have been the crucial fitness test in the Noahic/Elijah redivivus priestly Zaddik tradition. We have advanced concerning this last the designation "purist" Zadokite or "Zadokite" Hassidaean as opposed to the "Pharisaic" Hassidaeans, who "split" with Judas and his holy warrior "saints" over the issue of foreign appointment of High Priests (obviously untenable on the basis of "the Deuteronomic King law" as well as on the basis of strict "Zaddik"ite ideology¹¹⁴) and as a consequence the esoteric interpretation of the term "Zadok" associated with this tradition and reflected in the Zadokite Document at Qumran.

According to this ideology it was only atonement on the part of a completely righteous priestly Zaddik (whether genealogically pure or not -- the basis of the esoterism) on Yom Kippur which could be considered efficacious in the tradition

of the first Zaddik (Noah, i. e., "the Zaddik the pillar of the world" of Proverbs and the Zohar)'s similar atonement ensuring salvation for the earth and forgiveness for communal sin, i. e., both sins of omission and sins of inadvertent commission, and which itself in turn was a sine qua non (as was John's important immersion ritual, the actual point of which is described quite clearly by Josephus in the Antiquities¹¹⁵) for the entrance of the living (the Righteous Dead by contrast enjoying the promise of resurrection) into the imminent Kingdom. Certainly no one contaminated by or even remotely connected with that arch prostitute (i. e., "the whore of Babylon"), Rome, could hold out any hope of such a promise. It is this "Righteous Priesthood" which is at issue in the esoteric discussion of "the priesthood after the order of Melchizedek"(i. e., "a Righteous King") in Hebrews, a usage which was probably current as early as Maccabean times. It is also set forth very clearly and called by name in the Apocalypse of Peter.¹¹⁶ The larger-than-life antecedents of this priesthood, i. e., the Anshei-Hesed (or Hassidim/Zaddikim) of Hebrew Ecclesiasticus, found not unremarkably at Qumran, Masada, and in the Genizah conserving some Karaite materials in Cairo, are also enumerated in similar presentations in Enoch, Wisdom, and the Zadokite Document. In Enoch, in particular, which is in accord with Daniel and 2Macc on this issue, it should be noted that the white lambs include both the martyred Onias and Judas Maccabee, i. e., both were part and parcel of the same tradition and this in a fragment attested to at Qumran.¹¹⁷

It is in this light that the claims for James making such an atonement, wearing the high-priestly vestments presumably on Yom Kippur, never wearing woollen, but always linen, garments, and actually entering the Holy of Holies according to two out of our three accounts, should be understood. The Yom Kippur in question probably was according to the sectarian Jubilees calendar and involved a confrontation between the Moreh-Zedek/Zadok/Zaddik and the Wicked Priest which is signalled in extant exegetical literature at Qumran. On Josephus' testimony the privilege to wear the priestly linen was extended to "the lower priesthood", whose spiritual leader James presumably was, as it grew more and more uncontrollable throughout the fifties and sixties (i.e., more and more "Zealot") until the final cessation of sacrifice in the Temple on behalf of foreigners (a Pharisaic innovation) in 66 A.D. led to the beginning of the final war.

As "pillar", "support", "migdal" (fortress), "oz" (strength), and "even" (stone --- all terms mostly applied to the Teacher of Righteousness at one point or another in the Qumran Hymns), this priestly Zaddik exercised a soteriological office that through the "Yazdik Zaddik"-ideology (undoubtedly specifically applied to the situation of the suffering Zaddik and putative messianic contender Jesus) was extended to all the members of the community, according to Qumran, "from the House of Judah", i.e., only Jews and not including the Pauline "Gentile Mission". It should be perceived that what we have operating here is something of "a People's Priesthood", which accounts for all the claims of popularity

in Josephus, the New Testament, and early Church literature for John, Jesus, and James. This priesthood was somewhat subversive, certainly anti-establishment, zealous, and nationalistic (i. e., what Josephus and others pejoratively refer to as "Zealot" -- a priesthood probably of "the ^cAm ha-Aretz"). Insofar as "the Zadok" at Qumran can be considered an "Opposition High Priest", regardless of whether in John the Baptist's time or James'; then if in fact these are not one and the same persons, i. e., John the Baptist/James and the Moreh-Zedek/Zadok (and in my view they clearly are), then James the head of "the Jerusalem Community" (whatever might be implied by such a circumlocution) and presumably "a High Priest after the order of Melchizedek", delineated in the letter so suggestively directed to "Hebrews", must certainly be considered to have exercised a similar capacity in the Jerusalem of his time and we are talking here for Jews, not Gentiles.

In conclusion: I, therefore, consider the Hegesippus testimony about James to be authentic in almost every detail, more authentic than similar testimonies about Jesus in the Gospels which can even be said to have assimilated materials more properly appertaining to his fraternal heir and successor, James.