# Revitalization in Judea: An Anthropological Study of the Damascus Document

by

## Hanne Irene Kirchheiner

A thesis submitted to the University of Birmingham for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Theology and Religion School of Philosophy, Theology and Religion College of Arts and Law University of Birmingham
31st of March 2018

# Abstract

This thesis seeks to gain a fresh perspective on the movement reflected in the Damascus Document by asking if it could be seen as a Revitalization Movement, a theoretical construct developed by the American anthropologist Anthony Wallace. Signs of a cultural identity crisis and the changes in society causing it are evident throughout the Damascus Document. By comparing the findings to Wallace's model, we understand that the movement could have developed as a reaction to a context of profound cultural changes. This study challenges the prominent view that the major crisis causing the rise of the movement was the Babylonian exile, as another paradigm related to Isa 7.17, featuring Ephraim's departure from Judah, is alluded to in several ways. The princes of Judah are compared to Ephraim and depicted as those who depart, because they have adopted a foreign way of life, the way of the kings of Greece. While both paradigms were seen to represent collective memories used as warnings of judgment, the theme of division of the northern and the southern kingdoms in the past is portrayed as comparable to the current conflict in society.

## Acknowledgements

# Table of Contents

# 1   The need for a New Perspective

This thesis will present an anthropological study of the movement reflected in the Damascus Document. What would we gain by yet another study of the Damascus Document? Why an anthropological study? This thesis is born of the conviction that there is a need for a new perspective on the movement reflected in the Damascus Document. In this chapter I intend to uncover what I see as the old perspective, and why I see the need for a new perspective.

## 1.1   "Sect"

In 1910 Solomon Schecter produced the first publication of some fragments of hitherto unknown texts found in a Genizah in Old Cairo (Hempel, 2000, 15). Schechter termed the publication of the text, now known as the Damascus Document, "Documents of Jewish Sectaries: Fragments of a Zadokite Work" (Schechter, 1910). Major publications shortly thereafter, "The Covenanters of Damascus: A Hitherto Unknown Jewish Sect" (Moore, 1911) and "Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte" in 1922 likewise included the term "sect" (Ginzberg, 1970). Since then the term "sect" has continued to be used to describe the religious movement reflected in the Damascus Document. Later, other fragments of this text were found in some of the caves at Qumran and scholars now recognise the proper context for study of the Damascus Document to be their connection to the Dead Sea Scrolls. However, not only has the terminology "sect" and "sectarian" continued to be used for the Damascus Document, it has likewise been used in relation to other texts among the scrolls that reflect one or more religious movements (Jokiranta, 2013, 17). Why was this term used?

First, we may have to investigate where the term "sect" comes from and what it means. The term is rooted in European history and the early development of the sociology of religion.

Max Weber (1864-1920) could be seen as a founding figure of the term "sect" (Chalcraft, 2007a, 26) in his writings on the sociology of religion, which include his study of Ancient Judaism (Weber, 1952). In the early 20th century he authored several writings in which he theorised about the role of religious groups in society (a comprehensive bibliography of these writings is found in Chalcraft, 2007d). Weber is known to have developed what he called "ideal types". He considered reality too complex to be fully understood and thought it would be helpful to simplify reality in order to comprehend and analyse it. He described "sect" as a religious group with voluntary membership for which the member was qualified, as opposed to the "Churches" of Europe, which Weber understood to be compulsory, as the members entered by birth (Chalcraft 2007a, 33; Weber, 1952). Chalcraft states that Weber left open "the possibility and existence of sects in cultural environments that lack an orthodoxy" (Chalcraft, 2007b, 45). Weber developed the types "sect" and "Church" over time and, as noted by Chalcraft, Weber's original ideas are often equated with the later developments of his ideas by others; in particular Troeltsch (Troeltsch, 1912), who placed a stronger emphasis on the Church/Sect dichotomy (Chalcraft, 2007b, 26).

In the second half of the 20th century sociologists of religion, who were in need of a model to explain religious groups within a broader framework, started to create new sect models. Bryan Wilson (Wilson, 1973 and Wilson, 1990) created a sect model which does not presuppose Church/Sect dichotomy. Wilson states that he uses "sect" as basically synonymous with a minority religious movement and that it can be used for religious groups all over the world outside the Christian context, as the focus is how the "sect" reacts to evil and to the world around them. Wilson fashioned seven ideal types of sect, each representing a particular reaction to evil and the world. Wilson emphasises that different types of sects emerge depending on the external conditions and surrounding culture (Wilson, 1973, 38).

It was also during the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, when the religious scene of Europe was changing that Benton Johnson rewrote the Church/Sect model, as he postulated a continuum representing the degree to which religious groups are in tension with the environment, the ideal church anchored to the social environment in which it exists and the ideal sect on the other pole, despised and persecuted (Johnson, 1957). The idea of the continuum was taken up by Rodney Stark and William Sims Bainbridge, who researched religious movements and their relationship to society at large or the elite, which has the power to enforce its standard on others. They thus defined "sects" and "cults", as religious groups that were existing in tension with society or the ruling elite: "To a great extent, elites represent the society with which sects and cults are in tension" (Stark and Bainbridge, 1985, 50). However, Stark and Bainbridge use the term "cult" to describe an independent religious group, whereas they assert that

> sects have a prior tie with another religious organization. To be a sect, a religious movement must have been founded by persons who left another religious body for the purpose of founding the sect. The term *sect,* therefore, applies only to schismatic movements (Stark and Bainbridge, 1985, 25).

It is important to note that Stark and Bainbridge make this distinction and that their sect model still implies a counterpart in much the same way as the original Church/Sect typology. Another thing worth noting is the fact that they talk about movements. A movement is on the move, it changes over time, it is not static, reacting to changes in the context.

Other sociologists have contributed to the redefinitions of "sect". This section was meant to provide a brief introduction to the main theorists and their definitions of "sect". As seen from this short introduction, the definition of "sect" has changed considerably over time. Indeed, the term can now be used with widely differing meanings, covering different phenomena

(Craffert, 2001, 32) and it has become so flexible that Jokiranta states that "No one definition of 'sect' exists" (Jokiranta, 2010, 201).

## 1.2   "A Story Already in Mind"

As the term "sect" is a sociological term, it could be presumed that the term was adopted because sociological methods were used by the first scholars studying the Damascus Document and other texts found at Qumran. However, this was not the case. Jokiranta notes that, since the first announcement of the discovery of the scrolls in 1948, it was suggested that the 1QS was a manual of discipline of a formerly unknown "sect" and that the term has since been "widely used in a rather loose sense without any explicit sociological pre-understanding" (Jokiranta, 2010, 200). No copies of the Damascus Document were found in the first cave in 1948 but, as we shall see later, the 1QS is somewhat related to the Damascus Document and, whether the texts reflect one or two different movements, the term "sect" is widely used of both. According to Davies the use of social scientific studies was undeveloped during the first decades of Qumran studies (Davies, 2005, 69-70). Martens, who did use sociological methods in his study of the Damascus Document, notes this concerning the Damascus Document explicitly (Martens, 1986). As late as 2002, Charlesworth mourns the lack of sociological influence in Qumran studies (Charlesworth, 2002, 6), but notes that the works of Shemaryahu Talmon were different and he commended him for the use of sociological methods (Charlesworth, 2002, 10). We shall turn our attention to the studies of Talmon later.

We can only speculate as to why the first scholars chose to use this term. We have established that their studies were not sociological, and the term was used in a loose sense. When the first publication of the Damascus Document appeared (Schechter, 1910), the term "sect" was newly coined by Weber, but Weber's essays on "Ancient Judaism" were not published before

1917-1919. By the time of Ginzberg's publication (Ginzberg, 1922), these essays and the work of Troeltsch had been published (Troeltsch, 1912). We can conclude that the first scholars who wrote about the Damascus Document knew the term, "sect", because they used it. However, it seems plausible that they only had a vague understanding of the meaning of the term they used, as their use does not bear the marks of sociological definitions or methods. Before finding the text at Qumran it was not known where or when the Damascus Document was originally composed (Hempel, 2000, 16 and 20); thus, the historical context of the text and the movement reflected in it could not account for the choice either. When the Damascus Document was found among the scrolls at Qumran, scholars realised that they were dealing with a text composed in one of the last two centuries BCE. Details on this will be dealt with later, as we now only want to find answers to the question, why was the term "sect" used for the movement reflected in the Damascus Document and for movement(s) reflected in other texts at Qumran?

I suggest that the usage of the term could have a great deal to do with the reception story of the scrolls. The anthropologist Edward Bruner has stated that ethnographers tend to come to the field with a narrative in their thoughts "which structures their initial observations in the field" or in other words "with a story already in mind" (Bruner, 1986, 146). Bruner warns that the discourse produced in this way shapes our thinking and becomes what he terms "the dominant story". The dominant story will be retold by colleagues and will be very difficult to change (Bruner, 1986, 145-153). I will argue that this principle applies to Qumran studies in which the dominant story has become the story of one or more "sects".

The scrolls were found in a secluded place in the Judean Desert, close to the shores of the Dead Sea and in close vicinity to the ruins of a settlement, Khirbet Qumran. The Catholic

5

archaeologist Roland De Vaux was the first to excavate Khirbet Qumran; and he described the place in terms of a monastery, thus indicating that the group of Jewish believers living there was small and secluded, similar to a group of monks in a medieval monastery (Vaux, 1973). In an article termed "How not to do Archaeology: The Story of Qumran", Davies reiterates Bruner's theory of entering the field with "a story already in mind", as he concludes that the archaeology of Qumran was done with a sense that "you must have a clear idea of what you are discovering before you dig" (Davies, 1988a, 207). Davies' article is not just a critique of the archaeology of Qumran, but also of the way several facts were linked together to create the dominant story. He explains how at an early date the ruins came to be regarded as the place of origin of all the scrolls, thus linking the site to the scrolls and the movement(s) reflected in them. The emphasis in the early studies was an emphasis on tension between a figure mentioned in some of the scrolls, perceived as leader of at least one of the movements, "The Teacher of Righteousness", and another figure, "The Wicked Priest", which was probably a sobriquet for a High Priest (Davies, 1988a, 204).

Davies mentions another "story already in mind": the accounts by Josephus and Pliny the Elder of a Jewish group called the Essenes (Davies, 1988a, 205). Attempts have been made to identify the movement(s) with one of the groups known from the classical sources, Essenes, Sadducees or Pharisees. Thus, features described in the classical sources were projected onto the movement(s). Most scholars in the first decades of Qumran research identified the movement(s) with the Essenes (Newsom, 1990, 167), even though not all thoughts and practices attributed to them fit the picture. One of the features of the Essenes according to the classic sources is that they were predominantly celibate and male, features that fitted the concept of monastery and of being different from other known Jewish religious groups. However, according to a study by Wassen, *Women in the Damascus Document*, this is

contrary to the depiction of the movement in this text (Wassen, 2005, 5). Thus, the ideas from the classical sources represent "a story already in mind", which has attributed strange features to the movement(s) of Qumran that made it seem "sectarian".

Qumran texts were contrasted with what was believed by scholars to be "normative Judaism". Davies states that, at the time of discovery of the first scrolls, the prevalent scholarly position of late Second Temple Judaism was based on a belief that a "normative" Pharisaic Judaism stretched back possibly to the time of Ezra, seen as "a monolithic system based on law, covenant and temple" (Davies, 2005, 69). Additionally, Sanders proposed that Second Temple Judaism was dominated by a nationalistic view of election (Sanders, 1977). His ideas contrasted with the notion of the salvation of a "remnant," expressed in the Damascus Document and other texts found at Qumran. The expectation of salvation of a "remnant" is now thought to have been an important concept, shared by many of the Jewish believers at that time (Elliott, 2000, 50; Blenkinsopp, 2006, 222-250); we shall deal with the notion of a remnant later. The concept of a "normative Judaism" in Second Temple Judaism has gradually been abandoned by scholars in the last few decades. Grabbe comments on it like this, "specialists were realizing the true situation in Second Temple Judaism and starting to reject the "orthodoxy" model" (Grabbe, 2007, 129). It would therefore seem that, because the texts found at Qumran contrasted with the ideas of late Second Temple Judaism assumed by scholars at the time, the movement(s) reflected in the texts were classified as "sectarian" by most scholars.

The last two decades have seen a growing number of conscious studies using sect models in a sociologically informed way (Jokiranta, 2010). These studies will be consulted as part of the discussion of the next question.

## 1.3 "Sect" and Context

In an evaluation of the usefulness of social scientific models in biblical studies, Craffert places an emphasis on the fact that there needs to be "comparability between the model and the data under consideration" (Craffert, 2001, 22). The data in our case is the text of the Damascus Document, but it is also the historical context. Jokiranta explains it this way, "A sect is not a sect as such but in relation to other groups of people and to societal change" (Jokiranta, 2013, 40). Craffert asserts that, as part of evaluating the usefulness of a model, we need to note the origin and features of the model itself (Craffert, 2001, 25), and we need to demonstrate that the model and the evidence address the same phenomena (Craffert, 2001, 23). In other words, we need to evaluate whether the model fits the context. Let us first turn our attention to Weber's model of sects and the church-sect typology in general and start by looking at different scholars' viewpoints on whether this model fits the context and could be seen as a useful model for studying the Damascus Document and other texts found at Qumran.

Chalcraft maintains the usefulness of the ideal types of Weber, and the notion of voluntary movements (Chalcraft, 2007a, 27), as does Jokiranta (Jokiranta, 2010, 202), even though she states that she sees "the traditional categorical church-sect typology" as a "less useful" model for use in Qumran studies (Jokiranta, 2013, 39). I would side with Jokiranta on this statement, as I believe the model makes it impossible not to imply a normative Judaism, as the term is rooted in European history and sociology of religion where the model of Church and Sect predominated. This implication of a normative Judaism also seems to be a major reason for rejecting the use of the term "sect". Even though Albert Baumgarten, who has undertaken a major study of the different religious movements of the Maccabean Era, makes use of Weber's concept of voluntary movements, he sees the need to compose and define his own

use of the word "sect" (Baumgarten, 1997, 6-7). He claims that this is because he wants to distance himself from implying "a primitive orthodoxy from which sectarianism was a deviance" (Baumgarten, 1997, 16). Rather he describes the Maccabean Era as a period with so much fragmentation (Baumgarten, 1997, 16). Müller likewise argues that the term "sect" presupposes a norm, and that it is not possible to talk of such a norm within late second temple Judaism (Müller, 2003, 18 and 22). Blenkinsopp, like many others, implies the need for a better term, and specifies that he uses the term "sect" in a neutral way as he knows "of no entirely acceptable alternative" (Blenkinsopp, 2006, 58), but he is cautious when using the term and underscores that "our understanding of postdestruction Judah has broadened since Weber's time" (Blenkinsopp, 2006, 64). This outlook is in line with Schluchter, who describes Weber's analysis of the time between the destruction of the First and the Second Temple as incoherent (Schluchter, 1981, 8), and criticises Weber for "back-projecting" medieval conditions and post-reformation concepts on to antiquity (Schluchter, 2004, 49). Talmon explains that before the Dead Sea Scrolls were found, no actual knowledge existed of what constituted the perceived "normative Judaism" in the last centuries BCE. The assumptions made were based on deductions from knowledge of later Tannaitic Judaism, from the first centuries CE (Talmon, 1989, 7). Talmon has undertaken a study of Weber, and he states that this study "may be seen as an addendum to Weber's Ancient Judaism" (Talmon, 1991, 16). He is not in favour of the use of Weber's typology for "the Qumran Covenanters". He concludes that their development is

> an incompatible object for inclusion in Weber's clear-cut typology of socioreligious bodies. The dichotomy of Cult versus Word, Law versus Spirit, Church versus Sect simply does not apply to the Qumran community. (Talmon, 1991, 42).

Talmon has, from an early stage of scroll studies, decided not to use the term "sect" for the movement(s) reflected in the scrolls; instead he uses the term "the Qumran Covenanters" in the text seen above. Likewise, Neusner, who has done extensive study into Weber's work on Ancient Judaism (Neusner, 1981), thinks that these "two givens" - the construction of a normative Judaism and the model of Church and Sect - "joined to deprive the Dead Sea Writings of a systematic reading" (Neusner, 2001, 3).

Let us then turn to Wilson's model. Considering the main objection to the church-sect typology to be the lack of evidence of any orthodoxy in the historical context, Wilson's model has an indisputable advantage in that it does not presuppose the Church/Sect dichotomy, a feature commented on by Grabbe, who asserts how truly useful it is to find a model that does not imply an orthodoxy model (Grabbe, 2007, 129). There is a *caveat* though, as Wilson does define "sect" as a minority religious movement (Wilson, 1973); and we have no assurance that the movement reflected in the Damascus Document was a minority movement. Wilson's model does offer a typology that some find helpful, but caution is needed in order to use Wilson correctly as he does point out that not all of his ideal types are found in all types of societies, as the context determines which kind of movements can develop (Wilson, 1985, 38). Among Qumran scholars, Albert Baumgarten has endeavoured to use some of the typology (Baumgarten, 2007), as have Regev (Regev, 2007 a), Piovanelli (Piovanelli, 2007) and Grabbe (Grabbe, 2007). These scholars have generally stated that they consider that the types as such can be helpful tools. However, Craffert has made a striking critique of the use of Wilson's model, particularly the use of it in New Testament studies, which points to matters of concern for the use in Qumran studies, too. He is generally concerned with the shortcomings of Wilson's model. Wilson's model includes so many variables that Craffert claims it ends up as an all-inclusive definition which is so broad that it does not illuminate

much, as it is possible to include every sort of group in the definition (Craffert, 2001, 40). I concede that the model's strength is that it does not imply any orthodoxy, but I agree with Craffert in that the model is too flexible and includes too many variables to accomplish much. Even Jokiranta, who has made a major contribution to assessing the usefulness of Wilson's model in Qumran studies, and generally approves of the model as a useful tool, concludes at the end of her thorough study:

> My conviction is that other typologies as well as completely different theoretical approaches are also needed (Jokiranta, 2009, 206).

This statement seems to imply that Jokiranta is not entirely convinced of the model's usefulness in Qumran studies.

One of the other models that has been used by Jokiranta is the model of Stark and Bainbridge and the notion of tension. Stark and Bainbridge define tension as subcultural deviance towards a more powerful elite and the degree of tension defines the degree of sectarianism (Stark and Bainbridge, 1985, 50). It is particularly interesting that Stark and Bainbridge highlight that, even when the elite may be defined as "deviant", it is often a reality that

> the elite has the power to enforce its standard on others. To a great extent, elites represent the society with which sects and cults are in tension (Stark and Bainbridge, 1985, 50).

In this way they include the aspect of political power in their model. I would consider the notion of tension to be the main strength of this model, as it is something to look for while analysing the text, not something we impose on the text. Wassen and Jokiranta has made an interesting use of this model to analyse the two traditions behind the Community Rule and the

Damascus Document, S and D, in order to estimate in which of the traditions the higher degree of tension with the outside world is found (Wassen, 2007, 205-245). The study of Wassen and Jokiranta shows the usefulness of this model for comparison of texts. Since Wilson has emphasised the notion of tension, some Qumran scholars have mixed these two models. Regev thus uses Wilson's notion of tension towards the world, as well as the studies of Stark and Bainbridge (Regev, 2007a and Regev, 2007b). My main concern with Stark and Bainbridge's model is that the term "sect" according to their definition applies only to "schismatic movements". I am concerned, as this poses a danger of the model inducing the idea of an orthodoxy and a schismatic movement once again.

We have seen how sociologists have tried to change the meaning of the term "sect", so that it does not imply any orthodoxy, but did they succeed in changing such a strong term in the minds of people? Craffert has noted that, even while using Wilson's model, many biblical scholars

> assimilated the model with other sect typologies which use the same term but do not deal with the same categories. On the historical side, the continuous use of any form of normative Judaism remains one of the biggest obstacles (Craffert, 2001, 46).

It seems that that the term "sect" has become associated with the Church/Sect dichotomy and likewise the negative connotations of the word "sect" to an extent that it can no longer be separated from it in most people's minds, which is a fact noted by Wilson himself:

> Although sociologists use the term "sect" in a completely neutral and non-pejorative sense, for the public at large…the word remains…a term of opprobrium (Wilson, 1990, 46).

Wilson's quote warns us that the term has negative connotations which influence the way in which we look at these believers. Newman makes a strong appeal to do away with this term for this particular reason, and use "clean terms", terms that are not "loaded with many meanings", which "are not always relevant to the groups and in some cases can even cause problems" (Newman, 2006,1); while Lim has stated that the term "is badly in need of qualification", because of its assumptions (Lim, 2002, 83).

We must therefore conclude that the term sect is a problematic term to use for the movement reflected in the Damascus Document. Firstly, the term has negative connotations which influence the way in which we look at the movement reflected in the Damascus Document. The second reason is equally pertinent: The term is rooted in European history and sociology of religion where the model of Church and Sect predominated. Although sociologists have made several attempts to redefine sect, the term sect has become associated with the Church/Sect dichotomy and the negative connotations of the word sect to an extent that it can no longer be separated from it in most people's minds. Thus, by using the term sect, the larger context is blurred. This happens because the Church/ Sect paradigm presupposes the existence of a normative Judaism. As scholars no longer assume that a normative Judaism existed within late second temple Judaism, the term sect does not fit the context of the movement it seeks to describe.

## 1.4   Need for a New Perspective

If we use another term, what would happen to our perspective? If we wipe the slate clean and start all over again? We have seen how Qumran studies have been burdened with "stories already in mind" and that the story of a "sect" has followed the Damascus Document from the beginning. Craffert poses a warning that,

models impose an 'Iron Law' of perspective. Once within the framework of

a particular model, it is difficult, if not impossible, to consider viewpoints

which do not belong to that framework (Craffert, 2001, 23).

Would using another model, which is not associated with the term" sect" help us gain a fresh

perspective on the movement reflected in the Damascus Document? If we use another term

we gain an opportunity to rid ourselves of the old assumptions and the negative connotations

the word "sect" carries with it. Using a term other than "sect" might help us gain a fresh

perspective on the movement reflected in the Damascus Document. We would need to search

for a model which could help us gain a fresh perspective on the movement reflected in the

Damascus Document. As noted by Craffert, there needs to be "comparability between the

model and the data under consideration" (Craffert, 2001, 22). The data in our case is the text

of the Damascus Document and its historical context. Craffert maintains that a model's

usefulness needs to be evaluated and this includes "an analysis of the prevailing social and

cultural conditions" in the historical context (Craffert, 2001, 36). Craffert emphasises that the

search for a model that fits the context is imperative and not a luxury (Craffert, 2001, 46). We

should therefore look for a model which meets this requirement. To do this, we need to try to

uncover the context in which the movement thrived. However, the reverse might prove

equally true: If we use a model which as far as we can tell fits the context of the movement

then using this model may help us uncover some perspectives of the relationship between the

movement and the context.

In the next chapter I will unfold the considerations that led me to choose an anthropological

model known as the model of Revitalization or "Revitalization Movements" (Wallace, 1956a)

for this study, in which I will seek to answer the question:

Does the Damascus Document reflect a Revitalization Movement; and would this model help us gain a fresh perspective on the movement reflected in this key document from the corpus of the Scrolls, and the context in which the movement developed?

# 2   The Damascus Document and Methodological Considerations

In the last chapter we concluded that, in order to find a suitable model for our study of the Damascus Document, we need to look for "comparability between the model and the data under consideration" (Craffert, 2001, 22). We have established that the data in our case are the text of the Damascus Document and its historical context. We therefore need to start this chapter by gaining a general understanding of what the Damascus Document is, and to find out what is known about the dating and the possible historical context. After we have done that we should discuss some methodological considerations related to the choice of model and an outline of a suggested model for use for this study. We need to define some key terms as well before we move on to an outline of the chapters to follow.

## 2.1   The Damascus Document

The Damascus Document is part of the corpus of texts that was found between 1947 and 1955 in eleven caves in the Judaean desert, near the shores of the Dead Sea and in close vicinity to the ruins of a settlement, Khirbet Qumran. However, two medieval copies of the Damascus Document had already been found at the end of the nineteenth century in a storeroom of a synagogue, a *genizah,* in Cairo (Hempel, 2000, 15). They were brought to Cambridge (Soskice, 2010, 248) and published in 1910 by Schechter (Schechter, 1910). Schechter referred to his finds as "Documents of Jewish Sectaries: Fragments of a Zadokite Work". This title reflects his thesis concerning the nature of the texts. Based on the interpretation of Ezekiel 44:15 in CD3:20b-4:4a of the role of the sons of Zadok, Schechter called this a Zadokite work and related the document to the Sadducees, as he maintained it contained an attack on the Pharisees (Fitzmyer, 1970, 13-14). This title has since been replaced by the Cairo Damascus Document, henceforth CD. This title refers to witness within the text to

Damascus or the Land of Damascus. CD 7:14-15 is a key passage making it clear that Damascus is an exegetical term derived from Amos 5:26-27.

Scholars now recognise the proper context for study of the Damascus Document to be its connection to the Qumran library. It is not known how the documents came to Cairo, but Taylor states that literary sources indicate at least two occasions when scrolls were found and taken in earlier centuries, but that it is likely that many more scrolls were found and used elsewhere (Taylor, 2012, 300). Reports of a Greek version of Psalms found in jars near Jericho in 217 CE and another ancient letter by the Patriarch Timothy of Seleucia, written around 800 CE, mention a discovery of Hebrew texts in a cave near Jericho, including 200 copies of Psalms used by Origen when compiling his famous Hexapla. Taylor tells of a survey made of more than 30 caves in the area in 1952. She is convinced the description of the cave clearly matches the shape of cave 29 (Taylor, 2012, 277-279). Stegemann on the other hand points out that what is known as cave 3 at Qumran, which was discovered with an open entryway, contained many jars with remarkably few fragments remains. Stegemann thus proposes cave 3 could be where the documents found around 800 CE originated (Stegemann, 1998, 69-71). The Cairo text is shorter than the texts found in the caves, but where they overlap the texts correspond closely to each other (Hempel, 2000, 24).

### 2.1.1 The Manuscripts

The two medieval manuscripts are generally referred to as Manuscript A and Manuscript B. Manuscript A from the 10th century CE is the older and also the longer, containing 16 columns, usually divided into what is referred to as the Admonition (columns 1-8) and the Laws (columns 9-16). Manuscript B dates from the 12th century. It consists of only two columns, partly overlapping with Manuscript A; Schechter numbered the columns of

Manuscript B 19-20 (Schechter, 1910). Column 19 contains a different text from columns 7 and 8 from Manuscript A, but column 20 introduces additional material. Scholars perceive 19-20 to be part of the Admonition (Hempel, 2000, 16). There has been much debate about the relationship between these documents. Kister explains how the manuscripts seem to be transmitted from the same text but constitute two different recensions. He sums up the former arguments for the development of the differences in the text, as either scribal error or differing theology (Kister, 2007, 61-64). However, Kister concludes that the differences seem to indicate "a fluid state of the text of the Damascus Document at an early period" (Kister, 2007, 76). Despite the fact that the fragments preserved at Qumran only seem to represent Manuscript A, Kister suggests that Manuscript B could possibly preserve "even a more original version than the Qumran witnesses" (Kister, 2007, 76). We shall discuss this further when we analyse the parts of Ms A and Ms B that overlap.

The relationship between the different portions of the two manuscripts has likewise been the subject of debate, but according to Wassen the order has now been generally accepted as (Ms A) 1-8, then (Ms B) 19-20, then (Ms A) 15-16 and 9-14 (Wassen, 2005, 20-2). The position of 15-16 before 9-14 was first suggested by Milik (Milik, 1959, 151-152). The manuscripts found at Qumran were found in Caves 4, 5 and 6. The fragments found in Caves 5 and 6 were, however, not well preserved. They were decomposed as they had not been deposited in jars (Stegemann, 1998, 75-76). Cave 5 only contained a small leather fragment, whereas Cave 6 contained five leather fragments (Hempel, 2000, 21-24). A large number of fragments from Cave 4 were assembled by J.T.Milik, who was able to assemble and identify eight MSS of the Damascus Document. Milik assembled and transcribed these fragments and also identified some fragments that were not paralleled in the Cairo Damascus Document. Milik pointed out that two of the 4Q Mss indicated that a change should be made to Schechter's addition in that

columns 15 and 16 should be placed before column 9 (Milik, 1959, 151-152). On the other hand, Schechter's arrangements of the Cairo Damascus Document have been used to place parallel texts of the 4Q manuscripts. The fragments of 4Q266-273, assembled and transcribed by Milik, were subsequently published in DJD XVIII by Joseph Baumgarten (Baumgarten, 1996, 1-2). The Cave 4 manuscripts are written on parchment, except 4Q273, which is written on papyrus (Baumgarten, 1996, 193). 4Q266 is the oldest and longest. The MS is written in a semi-cursive hand with an unusual number of scribal erasures. This has given rise to speculations among scholars that it could be a private draft rather than written by professional scribes at Qumran (Baumgarten, 1996, 2). It consists of eleven numbered identified and 64 unidentified mostly smaller fragments and it contains the beginning and the ending of the document, both of which were lacking in the Cairo Genizah documents (Hempel, 2000, 21-24). Thus, the Cave 4 document comprises a longer version of the documents found in Cairo, including what seems to be the original opening, although this part of the text is very fragmentary. The texts from Qumran agree with the Cairo manuscripts except for minor variants (Stegemann, 2000, 177). Baumgarten notes that nearly half of the 4Q texts parallel those from Cairo and he underscores how this has given confidence to the reliability of the Cairo Document (Baumgarten, 1996, 2). Although the 4Q documents comprise a longer version than the CD, Hempel considers it most plausible that material was lost in the Cairo manuscripts accidentally, rather than by deliberate omission (Hempel, 2000, 21-24).

The following sections are intended to present some contributions of previous studies to the understanding of the nature, development and content of the text.

### 2.1.2  Attempts to Date the Composition

The dating of the fragments has been done partly by means of C 14 dating of 4Q266, which placed the copy either as late as the first century BCE or the first century CE (Hempel, 2000, 21). According to Yardeni, paleographic analysis of the Qumran Damascus texts suggests the earliest copy to be 4Q266, written in semi-cursive Hasmonean script. Six other copies are written in formal Herodian Script (Baumgarten, 1996, 1- 2). Thus, the Damascus Document must have been in existence before its earliest copy 4Q266 was the produced in the first half of the first century BCE (Hempel, 2000, 23).

More than anything the dating of the composition has evolved from a combination of textual analysis and efforts to fit the text into a probable historical context. This was already so when the Cairo manuscripts were studied, before it was known that the texts were written in antiquity. Louis Ginzberg actually managed to come fairly close to a correct estimate of a date. He wrote his work on the Damascus Document shortly after Schechter had published his work. Eli Ginzberg is responsible for a late publication in English of the work of his father, Louis Ginzberg, most of which had been published in German in 1922. He writes that his father estimated a date between 76-67 BCE (Ginzberg, 1970, xxii-xxiii).

The interest in dating the composition rose to new heights after the discoveries of fragments of the Damascus Document at Qumran. Studies of the Damascus Document have played a key role in attempts to reconstruct the history of the movement reflected in the Damascus Document and other texts found at Qumran, as well as attempts to reconstruct the history of the settlement at Qumran and the relationship between the settlement and the scrolls (Hempel, 1998, 3). In many studies it has been assumed that the movement reflected in the Damascus Document was the same movement reflected in other of the documents found in the caves at

Qumran, as similarities in ideology and vocabulary are noticeable (Hempel, 2000, 16). Davies is an advocate of the view that the texts found in the caves at Qumran reflect more than one movement (Davies, 2000, 43). Davies advises caution, particularly when studying the texts using sociological methods. He maintains that it is better to analyse the documents separately than to assume any kind of specific relationship between them beforehand (Davies, 2005, 76).

Many studies have tried to place these texts in relation to what was known from other sources concerning Judaism in the Second Temple Era. Attempts have been made to identify the group of people related to the document with one of the groups known from the classical sources, Essenes, Sadducees or Pharisees, although the group of people reflected in the document shows discrepancies as well as similarities in relation to the known groups (Wassen, 2005, 5-7). Hempel, while explaining how a consensus was reached classifying the movement as Essenes, states that it needs to be underscored that this procedure did not use the primary sources as their starting point; instead a structure for interpretation was built on the basis of the classical sources. She rightly calls this methodology questionable (Hempel, 1998, 6).

Grossman explains how early scholarship tended to either take the historical expressions within the text literally or to dismiss them as literary invention. As the text indicates that this movement originated 390 years after the Babylonian conquest of Judah in the early 6th century BCE (CD 1.1-10) calculations have been made understanding this as a straightforward historical account. Grossman maintains that this generates difficulties, as the method does not take into account the larger ideological framework of the text. However, she comments that many modern readings of the historical claims of the Damascus Document do take the larger framework into account (Grossman, 2002, 6-10).

The Damascus Document, as well as many other texts from Qumran, poses further difficulties when endeavours are made to relate the text to historical events because of extensive use of code names, the so-called sobriquets that are used instead of using the real names or titles of persons (Collins, 2009). Attempts to date the composition have been done using suppositions about one of the sobriquets in the Damascus Document, The Teacher of Righteousness, usually taken to be the founder of the movement. Possible allusions to his death in the Damascus Document have been the basis for calculating the composition to no later than 110 BCE (Wassen, 2005, 23). However, in order to find out who he was and when he lived, speculations concerning his enemy or counterpart, The Wicked Priest, have been made. Proponents of the original Essene consensus have tried to find out which of the Hasmonean High Priests could be behind the sobriquet The Wicked Priest, mentioned in some of the Pesharim, but not in the Damascus Document. The Groningen Hypothesis takes up the idea first voiced by van der Woude (van der Woude, 1987, 375-384) that considers the designation "as a generic one referring to different Hasmonean High Priests in chronological order" (García Martínez, 2007a, 31-52), beginning with Judas Maccabeus (García Martínez, 2007b, 53-66). Another suggestion as to whom this sobriquet could refer to was raised by Pfann, who put forward High Priests in office before the Hasmoneans, Jason or Menelaus, as possible candidates (Pfann, 2004, 171-186). In a recent study Collins discusses the attempts made to date the Teacher of Righteousness. Collins maintains these calculations involve references to him in the Pesharim in which he is mentioned in relation to two other figures, "The Wicked Priest" and "The Liar". Collins notes that scholars have realised that the Pesharim cannot be used to extract historical information, but even so he is convinced that these sobriquets were used for actual historical figures and that it is legitimate to try to figure out who they represent. He offers a lengthy discussion on the issue and concludes that he finds it more

probable that the "Wicked Priest" is one of the later proposed figures, notably either Alexander Janneus or Hyrcanus II or both (Collins, 2010a, 98-121).

All these attempts to calculate when the Teacher of Righteousness lived can thus be seen to be based on some highly speculative hypothesis, which has furthermore been based on integration of the interpretation of the Damascus Document with that of other texts from Qumran. In a recent study of other Qumran texts that have traditionally been linked to the Teacher of Righteousness, Harkins reasons that these texts have been linked to the Teacher of Righteousness due to a common assumption that the scrolls found at Qumran were preserved by a single movement (Harkins, 2012b, 461). This ties in well with Davies' line of argument. As we noted above, he has pointed out that interpreting the Damascus Document as an integrated part of the Qumran scrolls poses methodological problems. He therefore advises that each text should be analysed separately (Davies, 1983, 14-15). This advice will be followed in this thesis; thus, I shall only consider the movement reflected in the Damascus Document.

The aim of this section was to elucidate studies and discussions related to attempts to date the Damascus Documents. Further discussions on the Teacher of Righteousness will be taken up later. What follows is an overview of the progress of previous studies of the language, structure and development of the Damascus Document.

### 2.1.3   Language, Structure and Development

The Damascus Document is written in ancient Hebrew. Schechter described the language of CD as "for the most part pure Biblical Hebrew", but that it also contained "terms and expressions which occur only in the Mishna" (Schechter, 1910, xi). Schechter furthermore noted lengthy passages of Scriptures without introductory formula with deviations from the

Massoretic Text, which he explained away as merely scribal error (Schechter, 1910, xi-xii). Ginzberg devoted a chapter to the language of CD, which was published by his son at a later date (Ginzberg, 1970, 274-303). This publication also includes an early orthographical analysis of the CD (Ginzberg, 1970, 3-4). Qimron, who has also contributed a transcription of the Damascus Document, has written the only published grammar of the language of the scrolls (Fassberg, 2012, 10) in which he states that the language of the scrolls is very similar to the language of the late biblical books, although it also contains influences from Aramaic and at times resembles Mishnaic Hebrew. However, he states that the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls has many features that are not found in other traditions and therefore he concludes that it "draws on a distinct spoken dialect" (Qimron, 1986, 116). Morag likewise notes that, in places, the language resembles Mishnaic Hebrew, but the greater part of the language used he terms "the General Qumran Hebrew" and he argues that, although a number of features of this language undeniably continue Late Biblical Hebrew, it does not do justice to "the General Qumran Hebrew" to classify it as a continuation of Late Biblical Hebrew. Not only does he note that the features that reveal no continuation with Late Biblical Hebrew are too numerous to be seen as secondary, he also claims that several of these features, and notably variations in stress patterns, must have come into being in a spoken language, and he also concludes that these must represent features of a Hebrew dialect of this historical period (Morag, 1988, 161-163). New studies have not come to any differing conclusions. Fassberg has conducted a study of the historical perspectives of the linguistic study of the Damascus Document in which he concludes that the relationship between features of the language of the Damascus Document and Late Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew "has been proven beyond doubt" (Fassberg, 2000, 67). In his most recent review of studies done on the Hebrew of the Dead

Sea Scrolls, he applauds Qimron's conclusion that the Hebrew of the Scrolls reflects an unknown dialect (Fassberg, 2012, 10).

As mentioned earlier the Damascus Document has traditionally been divided into what is referred to as the Admonition (columns 1-8; 19-20) and the Laws (columns 9-16). Baumgarten explains that some scholars have doubted that the laws were an integral part of CD, but he states that the "4Q manuscripts should decisively dispel such a notion" (Baumgarten, 1996, 7). He argues that the Admonition continually calls for obedience to the Torah and its proper interpretation and views the Admonition as a hortatory preface to a corpus of Torah interpretations (Baumgarten, 1992, 55). Wacholder similarly criticises the division between Admonition and Law used ever since Schechter and argues "that the two themes are constantly interwoven" (Wacholder, 2007, 12). He argues that in Judaism this division between admonitory and legal language does not exist and he maintains that the author would never have thought of legal and non-legal Torah (Wacholder, 2007, 12-13). A similar point has recently been made by Hempel, who recommends paying attention to the fluidity between Law and Admonition (Hempel, 2009, 375).

The scholarly interest in studying the Damascus Document has been immense. The Prolegomenon by Fitzmyer to the reprint of Schechter´s volume includes a bibliography of studies before 1970, which takes up ten pages (Fitzmyer, 1970, 25-34). Several scholars have committed their attention to a literary critical study of the Damascus Document. After 1970 some seminal literary critical studies were done by Murphy O´Connor and Davies. Between 1970 and 1972 Murphy O'Connor devoted a series of articles to literary critical analysis of the Admonition (Murphy-O'Connor, 1970; Murphy-O'Connor, 1971a; Murphy-O'Connor, 1971b; Murphy-O'Connor, 1972a; Murphy-O'Connor, 1972b; Murphy-O'Connor, 1974)

followed by another article in 1985 (Murphy-O'Connor, 1985). In 1983 Davies' literary critical study of the document was published (Davies, 1983). Wassen notes that his source critical literary analysis of the Admonition has been very influential in Qumran scholarship ever since (Wassen, 2005, 32). Noting that most previous literary critical studies of the Damascus Document had focused almost exclusively on the Admonition, Hempel offered a comprehensive critical study of the Laws (Hempel, 1998, 8). For earlier attempts see Rubinstein, 1952, and two unpublished works by Tiller, 1987, and R. Davis, 1992. It emerged from Hempel's study that the Laws of the Damascus Document continued to be revised rather than copied (Hempel, 1998, 191). These former studies have noted the composite character and paid attention to apparent seams within the text, which suggests that the text may have developed in a sequence of redactional stages (Grossman, 2002, 16).

### 2.1.4   Purpose and Audience

Wassen notes that parts of the Admonition appear incoherent to a modern reader (Wassen, 2005, 32). However, Grossman in her study, noting the importance of the social setting of the document, brings to attention the importance of the audience and the fact that there exists a literary context, which consists of the textual knowledge and preconceptions that the audience brings to the reading (Grossman, 2002, 21). It is thus important to consider that a text which appears inconsistent to the modern reader may have seemed totally consistent to the original audience. We shall therefore now have a look at what has been suggested as the purpose and audience of the Document.

As already mentioned Grossman has pointed out that some of the historical allusions within the text have been used by scholars in a very straightforward manner and historical reconstruction has been proposed on the basis of this material. Grossman suggests that the

audience is taken into account when such a text is to be interpreted (Grossman, 2002, 19,) and argues that the author/editors of the Damascus Document seem to have seen the narrative of history as complex, and that it contained secrets which could not be uncovered without the right covenantal knowledge (Grossman, 2002, 161). This is in line with a recent study of "Mysteries at Qumran", in which Thomas explains that mysterious knowledge is necessary in order to gain understanding and in order to belong and be saved (Thomas, 2009, 67); and that the Damascus Document is unequivocal about the link between knowledge and "the hidden things" (Thomas, 2009, 67). Grossman maintains that caution is necessary not only in relation to time and the concepts of history, but also in relation to geographical places, as geographic language is part of an imagery that makes metaphorical use of the language of departure and return, presented in a complex relationship to scripture (Grossman, 2002, 180-181). Collins also maintains that the ostensibly historiographical passages in the Damascus Document seem to be concerned with how God works in and through history, rather than chronology and historical records (Collins, 2012, 161). An interesting point is made by Albert Baumgarten, who has argued that ideas only move people when they seem useful, and that the ideas of the past in the Damascus Document played a fundamental role in reinforcing its ideological base (Baumgarten, 2000, 1-9).

The Damascus Document includes several calls to listen. These calls are in the second person plural (e.g., CD 1.1; 2.2 and 2.14). This style gives the impression that the text was intended to be read aloud and heard; and the term "sons" used for the addresses suggests that the speaker takes a parental role (Wassen, 2005, 25). Vermes (Vermes, 1998, 43-45), Knibb (Knibb, 1987, 14) and Falk (Falk, 1998, 234-236) have suggested that the Damascus Document could be related to the annual Festival of the Renewal of the Covenant. The Damascus Document has several allusions to the festival, mentioning the admission of new

members as well as the annual gathering of all members (CD 15.5-16.6 and CD 14.3-6 and CD 20.28b-30), and also in the last part of the document, now attested by 4Q266 11 17-21 and 4Q270 7 1-2 (see Baumgarten, 1996, 76 and 166). As we move on to discuss the concepts of history, time and the use of Scriptures in the Damascus Document, we thus need to bear in mind that the document seems to have been used for the instruction of members.

The complex relationship to scripture is well described by Davies, who notes that not only is the text full of quotations and allusions to the Bible, which the movement uses to express its plea, but "it was in the bible in the first place that the community found its identity" (Davies, 1983, 55). In his study of Scripture in the Admonition of the Damascus Document, Campbell criticises Davies' use of the term Bible in this context. Campbell is careful to make clear that at the time of the writing of the Damascus Document the Bible had not emerged in its final form, but that scriptures of what he terms "a broad and open-ended class of prophets" were circulated and venerated by its users. Thus, he explains that what we now term Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha would have been read and revered along with scriptures belonging to what we now term the Bible (Campbell, 1995, 17-18) a point of view he further emphasises in a later essay (Campbell, 2005). Campbell argues that texts are rooted in the culture of which they are a product and should be read in that light (Campbell, 1995, 44). He concludes that the Admonition belongs to a broader exegetical tradition, which has connected a number of biblical passages in a framework and that this framework is what unites the Admonition (Campbell, 1995, 205- 206). Campbell advices caution when assuming redaction, as he claims that it is a "well-constructed text", although it may not seem so to the modern reader (Campbell, 1995, 183). A table of the scriptural framework is found in his book (Campbell, 1995, 179-182); these Scriptures have as their focal point former rebellions and restorations, as well as the exile, which could be seen as an image of the ultimate rebellion (see also Knibb,

1976 and 1983 and Middlemas, 2007). Campbell comments that it seems that the writer's understanding was that one age was similar to any age and that this state of affairs would prevail till the eschaton (Campbell, 1995, 208)

### 2.1.5   Summary

This part of the chapter was intended to promote a basic understanding of the Damascus Document. A description of the manuscripts was followed by a survey of important advances that previous studies have contributed concerning the date of composition and the language, structure and development of the text.

It was recognised that the texts have a composite character. In my study, which follows, I attempt to take into account the potential for complex textual composition and to be aware that different strata of the work may either go back to different movements or different stages of the life of one movement. Suggestions concerning the possible purpose of the original audience were noted. It was disclosed that the Damascus Document is underpinned by a framework of revered scriptures, and that it is necessary to be cautious in relation to concepts of time and geography as metaphorical use of these concepts is presented in a complex relationship to scripture.

We observed that paleographic analysis of the Qumran Damascus texts suggests the earliest copy to be 4Q266, written in semi-cursive Hasmonean script, while six other copies are written in formal Herodian Script (Baumgarten, 1996, 1- 2). C 14 dating of 4Q266 placed the copy either as late as the first century BCE or the first century CE (Hempel, 2000, 21). The dating of the fragments using these methods provides guidelines as to the latest possible time of composition and clarifies the time of copying, but it does not give any definite answers regarding the actual time of composition. However, the Damascus Document must have been

in existence before its earliest copy 4Q266 was written in the first half of the first century BCE (Hempel, 2000, 23).

We learned that attempts to produce a more specific dating evolved from a combination of textual analysis and efforts to fit the text into a probable historical context. These attempts were seen to be based on a highly speculative hypothesis and were furthermore based on integration of the interpretation of the Damascus Document with that of other texts from Qumran. It is thus not possible to arrive at a more precise dating than that which the paleographic analysis and the C14 texts of the Qumran texts allow for.


## 2.2   Methodological Considerations and Definitions

The survey of previous studies of the Damascus Document and its possible historical context has made it clear that there is no certainty as to which specific historical context we should presume, which is a fact that poses an obstacle to us if we want to look for "comparability between the model and the data under consideration" (Craffert, 2001, 22). The data in our case are the text of the Damascus Document, but it is also the wider historical context. As Craffert has noted, a model's usefulness needs to be evaluated and this includes "an analysis of the prevailing social and cultural conditions" in the historical context (Craffert, 2001, 36). Craffert emphasises that the search for a model that fits the context is imperative and not a luxury (Craffert, 2001, 46). If we were to analyse a modern movement, we would be able to analyse the specific context in detail in order to meet this criterion. In our case we have an ancient Jewish text and the context is not known with certainty, so we will have to modify this methodology. As the Damascus Document reflects glimpses of a historical context I suggest that issues could be drawn from the text and used in order to consider the comparability of a

model to those issues. I will therefore analyse the text looking for aspects of how the text reflects the social world around the movement. It could be argued that these are only reflections of the perspective of the people responsible for the writing of the Damascus Document. However, this perspective is important for our purposes, because it is imperative to understand what aspects of the social context the people in the movement considered to be of such importance that it left a mark on the text. Although it would certainly be useful to know the exact historical context, it does not seem possible at this point and thus my choice of model will be based on impressions in the text of how the perceptions of the historical context were written in this text by the people in the movement. In the next chapter I will therefore analyse passages relating to the perception of the context that the text presents.

I discovered that several passages in the text indicate that the people in the movement perceived themselves to be victims of some sort of cultural displacement; and that some profound changes had taken place in their society. References to exile and cultural displacement displayed in the text are many and profound. As the text also reflects that the Temple, the center of Jewish worship, was envisaged to have been defiled (CD 4.18 and 5.6), the situation could be classified as a religious displacement. However, frequent mention of violence, sword, economic oppression and fornication in society indicates that some very worldly problems were also perceived as part of the historical context presenting the people in the movement with challenges.

It would seem from the above that in our case comparability between the model and the data under consideration means finding a model that relates to displacement and social and religious change. This is a fact noted concerning Qumran studies in general by Albert

Baumgarten, who has expressed concern that many of the sociological theories used in

Qumran studies

> do not specify the kinds of movement which proliferate at times of rapid change,
>
> nor do they elucidate the aspects of rapid change which account for that proliferation.
>
> They do not clarify the mechanisms by which rapid social change affects religious
>
> change (Baumgarten 1997, 30).

Baumgarten considers it important that the methods used for Qumran studies meet these

requirements, because it is important to try to uncover the question of which circumstances

led to the development of such a movement. In his own analysis of the religious movements

of the Maccabean Era he concludes that those movements developed as a direct response to

the dilemmas of the period (Baumgarten, 1997, 200).

Before we move on it is important to define terminology and concepts central to the following

discussion. As "culture" is fundamental to our inquiry we shall start by looking at definitions.

A brief description of culture is offered in the Oxford Dictionary of Sociology:

> In social science, culture is all that in human society which is socially rather than
>
> biologically transmitted...a general term for the symbolic and learned aspects of
>
> human society (Scott, 2005, 132-133)

This definition further links the concept of culture with values and customs that govern

behaviour within a social group, with group identity and with a common language (Scott,

2005, 133). Hastrup states that the British anthropologist Edward Burnett Tylor (1832-1917)

made one of the earliest attempts to define culture. He described it as the complex unit of

skills and habits which man had adopted as a member of society (Hastrup, 2004, 11). Hastrup

contends that many definitions have followed since the early days of Tylor, but recognises

Geertz as someone that, one hundred years later, would renew the concept by focusing on culture as a system of meanings encoded in publicly available symbols and social forms (Hastrup, 20014,12). Clifford Geertz' work has been very influential, causing an interpretive turn in anthropology centred on meaning, perceiving culture as a symbolic system. Geertz' interpretive understanding has been recognised as breaking the ground for postmodern anthropology (Barnard, 2000, 162-164). Geertz has defined culture as a

> historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward life (Geertz, 1973, 89).

This quote shows that Geertz establishes that the meanings embodied in symbols are historically transmitted. In conjunction with this, Geertz speaks of culture as a system of inherited conceptions. As can be seen from the quote, Geertz maintains that culture relates to meaning, to making sense of life itself. In agreement with this existential note, Geertz refers to religious symbols as carrying particular weight, due to the authority such symbols obtain from their relation to a certain metaphysic reality (Geertz, 1973, 90).

In the early attempts to define culture, cultural change was not considered. This former functionalist view of culture has been critiqued, as it only placed an interest in that which sustains order in a society and could not explain the change that constantly takes place in a society (Jensen, 1998, 187-188). Burnett likewise maintains that societal changes constantly take place and explains how these can come in the form of innovation generated from within, or as the process of borrowing from another society, which is called diffusion and is very common (Burnett, 2002,130-131). It is notable that, according to Burnett, diffusion is

a selective process in which some elements are accepted and others are not...in many cases the element is accepted, but it is adapted to the needs of the particular culture and harmonised with the culture as a whole. This is the process of syncretism (Burnett, 2002,128).

This quote indicates that diffusion does not happen automatically but is subject to elements of choice. Burnett asserts that in cultures where a stronger sense of group identity exists, and the members are particularly proud of their culture, diffusion is halted. He also points out that unless the community is "ripe" for a new idea or element to be introduced, no change will occur (Burnett, 2002,128). In other words, cultures are always subject to change, but not all cultures are equally open to change. As we shall see in the following, sudden change can have an almost opposite effect, in which change is resisted and replaced by a quest for roots. Lowenthal, who is well known for his studies of cultural heritage, writes that migration, displacement, and substantial change cut people off from their roots; and he maintains that this evokes a quest for heritage (Lowenthal, 1998, 6-9). He believes that "we value our heritage when it seems most at risk" (Lowenthal, 1998, 24).

The concept of ethnicity is closely related to culture. According to Anthony Smith, a social group may constitute an ethnic community characterised by claiming a homeland and sharing myths of common ancestry (Smith, 1992, 138). The homeland, he claims, could be either in their possession or remembered as a loss. He seeks to analyse which elements help ethnic groups survive and establishes that one powerful element is a myth of election (Smith, 1992, 438-448). The focus of Smith's study is ethnic survival. He maintains that most societies undergo vast changes over time and for that reason he does not expect the retention of any culture intact, but claims that

[e]thnic communities can reasonably be said to have survived in something like their earlier forms, if successive generations continue to identify with some persisting memories, symbols, myths and traditions (Smith, 1992, 139).

We note here that Smith draws on Geertz' studies, as Geertz speaks of culture as a system of historically transmitted conceptions and symbols (Geertz, 1973, 90) in the same way that Smith speaks of successive generations that survive by continuing to identify with some persisting memories, symbols, myths and traditions. In a forthcoming publication Kugler argues that, with a few exceptions, scholars have understood the context of the Dead Sea Scrolls as a religious context and tried to define "the people of the Dead Sea Scrolls" within a religious framework (Kugler, forthcoming). Kugler maintains that this is a modern construct and that people in this ancient movement would not have thought of themselves using this kind of categorization, rather "they were an ethnos" (Kugler, forthcoming). He explains that the religious aspect was a natural dimension of any ethnic group in Greco-Roman antiquity and concludes that the groups of people reflected in the Dead Sea Scrolls "fit the description of ethnic groups in antiquity" (Kugler, forthcoming). This will be the vantage point of this study.

Developing knowledge about, and attitudes toward, life furthermore relates to the concept of social identity. The early anthropologists assumed that social identity was static and primordial in nature (Geertz, 1996, 40-45). However, it is important for us to understand the main thoughts in the current debate on social identity among sociologists, according to which even ethnicity is constructed rather than primordial. The shift has been made from seeing ethnicity as an inherent quality of a community (primordial), to seeing it as a relationship with others. The dynamics of interpersonal relationships shaping and reshaping social identity have come into focus (Coleman, 2004, 2). These ideas are in keeping with Jenkins' observations on

the relationship between change and societal identity crisis. He argues that, although social

identities are constructed, they are no less important or real to the group itself. Time and space

are important entities in the construction of social identity. Jenkins also underlines the

importance of collective memories as a meaningful past which is necessary as a base for

social continuity, as well as a hope for a meaningful future (Jenkins, 1996, 26-28). He

believes that crises of identity might occur in a society due to rapid change because "our

social maps no longer fit our social landscapes" (Jenkins, 1996, 9).

Because a meaningful past is important, a community or an ethnic group will often use

collective memories of the past to get a perspective of the present and the future, in times of

crisis. A number of anthropologists have noted this. Mattingly and Garro maintain that a

'narrative is a fundamental human way of giving meaning to experience' (Mattingly, 2000, 1)

In summary they uphold that traumatic memories must be recalled and retold to others

(Mattingly, 2000, 7) and that narratives are constructs that reflect the way in which people

think in the culture in which the particular narrative is told (Mattingly, 2000, 23-25). Good

explains how people use narratives to make sense of their sufferings, but also to present their

sufferings in a way acceptable to their particular culture (Good, 1994, 135-165). Bruner

furthermore claims that narratives reflect the historical era in which they are written and that

"each telling depends on the context, the audience, and the conventions of the medium"

(Bruner, 1986, 136), and that new stories are told "when there is a new reality to be

explained" (Bruner, 1986, 152). The observations by anthropologists that we have just

considered show that, even if we encounter concepts in the text which either belong to or

seem to belong to the distant past, they should still be considered important (Jenkins, 1996,

26-28; Mattingly, 2000, 1-7; Good, 1994, 135-165; Bruner, 1986, 136). The fact that these

past experiences are selected and have been interwoven with the tale of the present shows that these specific events were imperative in the mind of the author.

We now turn to our quest for a suitable model, a model relating to religious and cultural change. The anthropologist Alan Tippet considers the American anthropologist Anthony Wallace to be "one of the most important theorists in the area of religious change" (Tippet, 1987, 179). Certainly, Wallace has come to be seen as one of the founding figures of anthropology in understanding cultures, not as static and isolated replications of uniformity as the early anthropologists had defined them, but as representing diversity and always subject to change (Grumet, 2003, vii). His study of the effects of disaster on a community in Worcester (USA) in 1956 has been recognised as the first systematic anthropological analysis of such phenomena (Grumet, 2003, xi). This was followed by his study "Human Behavior in Extreme Situations" (Wallace, 1956b). Most of his work has been conducted as ethnographic research of Native American tribes, particularly the Iroquois (Grumet, 2003, vii). However, his most recent books present reprinted essays related to the effects of cultural change and disasters on societies (Wallace, 2003) and essays on the effects of cultural change in modernity (Wallace, 2004). Wallace has been classified as a cognitive anthropologist as he bases his understanding of culture and society on knowledge achieved by behavioral scientists (D'Andrade, 1995, 17). Cognitive anthropology developed in the late 1950s, in relation to studies done concerning the interaction between language and human behavior (Barnard, 2000, 114-117). D'Andrade has explained the approach this way:

> Cognitive anthropology is the study of the relation between human society and human thought...Such a project is closely linked to psychology because the study of how particular social groups categorize and reason inevitably leads to questions about the basic nature of such cognitive processes (D'Andrade, 1995, 1).

Wallace developed an interest in modern psychology and in mental disease and therapy. He wrote about the psychology of culture change in the book *Culture and Personality* (Wallace, 1970, 189), in which he also dealt with the relationship between culture and cognition, and culture and mental illness. The psychological and cultural aspects of religion play a central role in this book as well as in two other books written during the 1960s, *Religion: An Anthropological View* (Wallace, 1966) and *Death and Rebirth of the Seneca* (Wallace, 1969). In *Religion: An Anthropological View* the focus is on the ways in which religion and rituals serve as means through which people achieve a sense of purpose and as means of resolving conflicts that could threaten the existence of their cultures. Thus, Wallace raised crucial questions regarding the role of religion in society and offered explanations of the ways in which individuals and societies react to change.

Wallace is perhaps best known for his article on what he termed "Revitalization Movements" (Wallace, 1956a). Later reprinted in his book on *Revitalizations and Mazeways*: *Essays on Cultural Change* (Wallace, 2003, 9-29) "Revitalization Movements" is a theoretical construct based on observations Wallace drew from documented data about social and religious movements that he had gathered from all over the world.

## 2.3   The Theory of Revitalization

Wallace describes the context in which the need for new religious movements arises as an identity crisis of an entire community, which occurs when the community experiences various changes, such as environmental changes, military defeat or political subordination, resulting in an extreme pressure towards acculturation. By acculturation is meant forced cultural change through dominance. Wallace claims that this identity crisis may produce intolerable stress on the individual level and internal cultural conflict in the community when anxiety

over the loss of a meaningful life becomes evident. He asserts that it is under such circumstances that new religious movements are likely to develop (Wallace, 1956a, 264-281). Wallace has noted that the movements that arise under these circumstances follow a pattern, and he proposes the term "revitalization" for this large class phenomenon. He defines a "Revitalization Movement" as

> a deliberate, organized, conscious effort by members of a society to construct a more
> satisfying culture (Wallace, 1956a, 265).

Wallace suggests that persons perceive their culture as a system, and he compares the mental image a person maintains of society to the mental image a person maintains of self as a person. This mental image is given the appellation "the mazeway" by Wallace (Wallace, 1956a, 266). He argues that a person needs to maintain a mental image of his society and culture, "in order to act in ways which reduce stress" (Wallace, 1956a, 266). Stress of this kind is defined by Wallace as

> a condition in which some part, or the whole, of the social organism is threatened
> with more or less serious damage (Wallace, 1956a, 265).

Wallace believes that members of a society will act "to preserve its own integrity" and "will, under stress take emergency measures to preserve the constancy of its matrix" (Wallace, 1956a, 265). This pressure may result in cultural and societal changes, and an identity crisis of an entire community occurs

> when most, or even many, of a community's members are unable to maintain a
> satisfying image of self because their culture or fellow citizens, or both, are making
> it impossible for them to realize the values they have learned to take as goals and
> models (Wallace, 1966, 157).

In this quote, the learned values refer to the pattern of behavior and conceptions that Geertz defined as culture and, because Geertz maintains that culture relates to meaning - to making sense of life itself (Geertz, 1973, 89) - we may appreciate what Wallace is saying about an identity crisis of an entire community, a cultural identity crisis. Wallace is describing that, due to cultural changes, "their culture" is no longer the same as the culture this community grew up with, "the values they had learned to take as goals and models". Furthermore, we note that it is made impossible for this community to realise these values because of their "fellow citizens". In other words, the "fellow citizens" set the agenda; and the "fellow citizens" have thrown away the old set of values. This, Wallace claims, produces intolerable stress on the individual level and cultural distortion when anxiety over the loss of a meaningful life becomes evident (Wallace, 1966, 157).

Wallace maintains that it has been difficult for him to construct useful sub-classifications of Revitalization Movements, but he does base some typology on cultural areas, notably classifying Jewish/Christian movements as Messianic or Millenarian, as these movements are characterized by an expectation that the messiah needs to supernaturally intervene at a point in history, in order to create an ideal society. This is in contrast to some of the non-religious politically motivated movements, which expect to reach their goal by either gradual societal change or a violent revolution. The term Millenarian Movements has frequently been used in later studies for movements of this sort, often associated with the original studies of Wallace (Y.Talmon, 1962 and 1966 and Wilson 1973, 494-495). Harkin maintains that scholars differ on whether they employ Wallace and revitalization explicitly or not, based largely on whether they are trained in Europe or North America, with North American scholars adopting Wallace's concept of revitalization more readily (Harkin, 2004, xxv).

Studies based on Wallace have investigated the effects of culture changes and Yonina Talmon sums up major research done in the years immediately after Wallace (Talmon, 1962, 125-148), noting that

> quick change and encounter with radically different system of values result in a more or less severe cultural disintegration (Talmon, 1962, 137).

Wallace describes the revitalization process as running in stages but calls attention to the fact that not all movements run the full course. The last paragraph dealt with the context in which the need for revitalization arises; we shall now look at the stages of the revitalization process.

Wallace calls the first stage of revitalization, "the Mazeway Reformulation" (Wallace 1956, 270). This could be described as the formulation of a code, a blueprint of an ideal society or "goal culture". He describes that, within the "existing culture", which refers to the historical context of the movement, a "transfer culture" is established which denotes a system of undertakings that supposedly will lead to the development of the "goal culture" (Wallace, 1966, 160). The "goal culture" refers to a perceived ideal culture, which in Messianic movements will be created by the messiah; whereas the "transfer culture" denotes a purposeful, organized effort by members of a society to construct a more satisfying culture in the present (Wallace, 1956a, 265), which is mostly done by seeking to revive their traditional culture (Wallace, 1956a, 275).

Wallace specifies that a Revitalization Movement is usually conceived and initiated by what he terms a "prophet". The term is used by Wallace to describe an individual who has had visions and encounters with a supernatural being, which Wallace calls "personality transformation dreams" (Wallace, 1956a, 271). He describes certain elements that are typical for these visions: apocalyptic/millennial content, moral content and "the establishment of an

ideal state of stable and satisfying human and supernatural relations" (Wallace, 1956a, 270).

Due to his interest in psychology, Wallace has tried to understand this form of visions using psychoanalytic dream theory, but only found this partially helpful: the meaning of the dream could be illuminated in this way but it did not explain the dynamics of life transformation and change in personality that followed the vision. Wallace contends that in some cases the individual has had no vision but a similarly defining moment of insight and inspiration, which in the same way has led to a changed life. Wallace maintains that "individual ecstatic conversions" could be seen as analogous of "the prophet's personality transformation vision". However, the prophet has a need to communicate his experience to others, a sense of "missionary obligation" (Wallace, 1956a, 270). Wallace attests that, with only a few exceptions, every religious revitalization movement known to him has been conceived in one or more

> visions by a single individual. A supernatural being appears to the prophet-to-be, explains his own and his society's troubles as being entirely or partly a result of the violation of certain rules, and promises individual and social revitalization if the injunctions are followed and the rituals practiced, but personal and social catastrophe if they are not (Wallace, 1956a, 270).

Sanctioned in this way, or at least presented as sanctioned, by the supernatural, the prophet possesses a sort of unquestionable authority. Wallace acknowledges that the concept of a charismatic leader as developed by Weber (Weber, 1952 and 1956) could be used to describe such a person, although Weber is concerned with the quality of the leadership and the relation of the leader to the early followers in other contexts than that of revitalization movements (Wallace, 1956a, 273). Moreover, Wallace considers Weber's use of the charisma concept ambiguous, as Weber leaves it uncertain as to whether it concerns an inherent quality of the

leader or is "ascribed to the leader by followers and hence as being a quality of their relationship to him" (Wallace, 1956a, 274).

The second stage of revitalization concerns "Communication" of the vision to people, as the prophet preaches and teaches about his visions. Wallace maintains that two motifs are usually included in such preaching. The convert is promised protection by a supernatural being; and he is promised that he and his society will benefit from identification with the rules and regulations of the "transfer culture" (Wallace, 1956a, 273). Wallace emphasizes that these rules and regulations depend on elements "which have already attained currency in the society and may even be in use" (Wallace 1956a, 270). Gradually the new disciples become the ones responsible for communication to outsiders as well as to the people in the movement, an activity which continues throughout later phases of organisation (Wallace, 1956a, 273).

The third stage is "organisation" of an authoritarian structure initially under the leadership of the prophet. This includes administering the campaigns as followers start to devote part of their time and money to it. From this time on the program of action is often administered mainly by a political rather than a religious leadership. Some converts have ecstatic visions and many of them "undergo a revitalizing personality transformation" similar to that of the prophet (Wallace, 1956a, 273).

Wallace calls the fourth stage "adaptation". Revitalization Movements could be classified as revolutionary, because such movements threaten the interests of groups obtaining advantage from the status quo. There is a tendency for the code of conduct to harden gradually and the tone to become more militant, as opposition to the movement grows. The original doctrines are thus continuously modified and this reworking "may take account of the changes occurring in the general milieu" (Wallace, 1956a, 275). As the tone becomes more militant,

hostility is often reflected in terminology as nonparticipating members are classified as "traitors" and outsiders and opponents as "enemies" (Wallace, 1966, 162). If coordinated hostility towards the revitalization movement develops, it is common that the emphasis shifts from cultivation of the ideal to combat against the unbeliever (Wallace, 1956a, 275).

If the whole or a dominant part of the population within a culture accepts the doctrines and joins the movement, then the revitalization process is completely successful and the fifth stage of "cultural transformation" will take place. This in turn could be followed by a sixth stage of "routinization", using the concept developed by Weber in relation to charisma (Weber, 1956, 275).

In cases where a sixth stage is reached, the new cultural system might enter a steady state and the organisation will only be responsible for "the preservation of doctrine and the performance of ritual" (Wallace, 1956a, 275).

However, Wallace calls attention to the fact that often movements are unsuccessful; their progress is stalled at some point (Wallace, 1956a, 278). He has therefore considered how many stages he would consider necessary in order to include a movement in the category. He concludes that as long as a movement qualifies as "a doctrine of revitalization by culture change, there should be no requisite number of stages" (Wallace, 1956a, 278). Even so, he explains that for his own research, he chose only to include movements that had passed the first three stages and entered the fourth stage of adaptation (Wallace, 1956a, 278).

Wallace has noted three varieties of movements, classified by their choice of identification. 1) Movements that "profess to revive a traditional culture now fallen into desuetude" (Wallace, 1956a, 275). 2) Movements that profess to import a foreign culture. 3) Movements that could be classified as utopian, as they conceive of a desired culture that has never been realized

before. Wallace admits that the varieties should be seen as ideal types, as many are mixtures. (Wallace, 1956a, 276). According to the studies of Wallace the most common variety is the first, in which the movement seeks to revive their traditional culture (Wallace, 1956a, 275).

Wallace finally emphasizes that for a movement to succeed it is necessary for it to obtain internal social conformity and a successful economic system. If a successful economic system is not established, the movement cannot live according to its idealistic lifestyle, because it would become dependent on the "existing culture", whose lifestyle it has chosen not to follow (Wallace, 1966, 162).

## 2.4   A Revitalization Movement

In what follows I intend to use Wallace´s model to analyse the Damascus Document and evaluate whether it could be seen to reflect a movement that resembles a Revitalization Movement. In order to answer this question, the Damascus Document will be examined according the pattern of the stages of revitalization outlined by Wallace. However, since this is a study of a text and not a current movement, it is not possible to analyse whether the community reflected in the text developed step by step over time in the stages stated by Wallace. My objective is thus only to analyse which stages had developed by the time the texts available today had been written/edited in their current form.

To make this a manageable task I will concentrate on what has been termed the Admonition, which is the narrative setting of the text which outlines the origins and self-portrayal of the movement locating it in a larger framework. I will also use sections from what has been termed the laws of the Damascus Document, but will focus on those rules which reflect expressions of life within the movement or carry information of accounts of inclusion in and exclusion from the movement.

A further methodological consideration concerns the term "author". This term will be used in my analysis heuristically, as I do not take for granted any particular individual behind the document or any particular redactional story.

Before turning to Wallace, I collected data from the text, grouped the data and discovered concepts found in the text. These concepts have then been ordered according to Wallace's model of what causes a Revitalization Movement to develop and how it develops in certain stages. Difficulties were encountered in some cases where concepts overlapped, but I have explained my choices in such cases. The remaining chapters follow Wallace's model.

A cautious methodology was chosen in order not to impose the model on the text. Each chapter therefore starts with textual analysis, the results are then summarized, and finally I compare the findings to Wallace's model. However, I make an exception in the next chapter, chapter three: I start with an introduction to the context in which a Revitalization Movement would arise according to Wallace. I do this as we need to evaluate whether the model fits the context. As stated above (2.1) I will therefore analyse the text looking for aspects of how the text reflects the social world around the movement. This chapter will therefore be slightly different,

The remaining chapters are:

Chapter three, in which I will examine passages relating to the perception of the context that the text presents.

Chapter four, in which I will analyse references to individuals within accounts of the origins of the movement, to gain an understanding of how these individuals could be related to the movement and what their roles were.

Chapter five, in which I will analyse passages related to the message of the movement.

Chapter six, in which I will analyse passages dealing with organisation and economy of the movement.

Chapter seven, in which I will analyse passages that mention that former members have turned back, moved away or become traitors.

Chapter eight, in which I will evaluate whether the Damascus Document reflects a Revitalization Movement; and in which way this model may have helped us gain a fresh perspective on the movement reflected in the Damascus Document?

# 3 Cultural Identity Crisis

In order to evaluate the usefulness of Wallace's model for the study of the Damascus Document, we need to evaluate whether the model fits the context. We shall therefore begin this chapter with a short introduction to the context in which the need for revitalization arises according to Wallace. We have established that, according to Wallace, the context in which the need for revitalization arises can be characterized as an identity crisis of an entire community of people. This identity crisis is caused by stress due to various changes in the historical context such as military defeat, political subordination to foreign powers or even exile, resulting in an extreme pressure toward acculturation, which leads to changes of norms and values in the larger society. The identity crisis of the community of people may develop when changes in their culture or their fellow citizens make it impossible for them to realize the values they have learned to take as goals and models (Wallace, 1956a, 264-281).

In this chapter we shall therefore investigate whether the Damascus Document addresses any of these phenomena. We shall try to establish to what extent the Damascus Document offers evidence for signs of a cultural identity crisis and the pressures that, according to Wallace, lead to this. The passages chosen for this chapter therefore relate to notions of exile or displacement, war, strife and ethnic conflict. A problem encountered in trying to define such sections is that they intertwine with texts that would perhaps better be characterized as relating to faithless members who have left the movement. According to Wallace such members are usually classified as "traitors" by a revitalization movement. This terminology is usually not used until a certain point in the history of such a movement when it encounters opposition and due to this opposition begins to classify such persons as traitors. It is not always possible to be certain of whether a text deals with outside enemies or faithless

members who have left the movement. Some passages use a terminology relating to traitors and faithless people and these will be dealt with in chapter seven.

In order to make this chapter a manageable task it has been divided into two parts. In the first part we will look for allusions to military defeat, mention of foreign powers and exile in the text. In the second part we will investigate whether the community reflected in the document perceived their fellow citizens as obstacles for the realization of the values they cherished as goals and models; in other words, we will look for traces of an ethnic conflict.

## 3.1 Military Defeat, Foreign Powers and Exile

In this section we will look for references to military defeat, foreign powers and exile. In order to know what to look for, apart from straightforward references to these three matters, we need to consider what anthropologists have identified as responses to such experiences. To keep this concise, only a few examples will be mentioned here.

Handler mentions how the necessity to preserve one's cultural heritage grows when one's own culture risks being absorbed into that of a dominating power (Handler, 1985, 213-215) and Ingold reflects on the importance of ancestry, memory and land to minority populations, who need to express their difference as part of strengthening their identity in the presence of imperialistic powers (Ingold, 2000, 151). The Uduk people of the Sudan-Ethiopian border are a small African tribe that has been subjected to forced migrations. The renowned anthropological thesis on the Uduk people written by Wendy James gives us access to their oral traditions, which we would otherwise not have known or been capable of understanding. James' work sparked an interest in the Uduk people, which has led to further writings about them. James has observed that this tribe primarily "know themselves to be something of a remnant" (James, 1979, 18). They described themselves as a remnant because they faced the

possibility of ethnic extinction again and again through history. They expressed thoughts about their past as stories of alternations between civilisation with peace and attacks followed by enslavement and displacement, and they spoke of themselves as a "remnant", those who survived (J. Davis, 1992, 22-23).

As we look for notions of military defeat, foreign powers and possibly exile, we should therefore also look for whether the author might try to connect the present reality to a distant past and a quest for roots, as well as for signs that they had been close to ethnic extinction, as expressed by the concept of a "remnant". As some of the passages related to these matters appear at the beginning of the Damascus Document it is only natural that we look at them first.

### 3.1.1   An Era of Wrath

A Cave 4 manuscript preserves the lost beginning of the Damascus Document known from the Cairo genizah. The fragment has been characterized as a further admonition by Hempel (Hempel, 2000, 27); and Campbell maintains that, although the text is very fragmentary, it contains ample links to the remainder of the Admonition, as the language is similar and certain phrases are used in both texts (Campbell, 1995, 42). It is very rare in the Dead Sea Scrolls to have beginnings and endings preserved. For the Damascus Document we now have both – that is if CD is accidentally shorter (Hempel, 2000, 20). As ancient authors used to place comments to direct the reader at the beginning and the end of works, to point to what sort of work they had created and how they wanted it to be understood (Baumgarten, 2000, 4), it would seem profitable to take note of this beginning and this ending preserved in 4Q266. Wacholder similarly maintains that the beginning of such a document carries great significance and proposes that the author of such a document would usually have placed a title

here; hence his reconstruction and translation of the missing words at the beginning of the fragment, 4Q266 1.1:

| | |
|---|---|
| [הנה מדרש התורה האחרון | [Here is 'The Midrash on the Eschatological Torah'] |

(Wacholder, 2007, 109-110).

This reconstruction was proposed independently by Stegemann, but he translated the title, "The Final Midrash of the Law" (Stegemann, 2000, 193-194). However, as can be seen above, this represents a complete reconstruction, as none of the letters exist in the fragment. Because the text that precedes the text of CD is so fragmentary we shall not spend time on it, except for one phrase which is preserved in its entirety. We shall include this because of its prominent use in the text of CD as well, and because it is central to our discussion of the context. 4Q266 2 i 3. Hebrew text, (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1997):

| | |
|---|---|
| חקוק קץ חרון לעם לא ידעהו | There is a decreed era of wrath for a people that does not know him |

The phrase is possibly resonating with Isa 5:13 in which the prophet laments that the people will go into exile for lack of knowledge. The phrase is also found in CD 1.5, which we shall look at shortly and it closely corresponds to the phrases found in CD 6.10 and 14, CD 12.23, CD 15.7 and 10; and in 4 Q 266 8 i 1, 4 Q 269 8 ii 5, 4 Q 271 2,12:

Hebrew text (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1997):

| | |
|---|---|
| קץ הרשע; קץ הרשיע | the era of evil |

Although the phrase could be translated "a moment of wrath" (García Martínez, 1997, 583), Davies points out that the way these phrases are used in the Damascus Document generally "denotes an extended period of time" (Davies, 1983, 122) and it is therefore better translated

era or epoch. Furthermore, Knibb mentions that the usage of the expression in 1. and 2. Maccabees refers to the period of Antiochus Epiphanes' persecution of Judeans and he maintains that in the Damascus Document it could possibly refer to "the period in which the author was living" (Knibb, 1983, 113). Following Knibb, we could say that this tiny phrase reflects a dissatisfaction with the era in which the author lived.

As we just noted, ancient authors used to place comments to direct the reader at the beginning and the end of works, to point to what sort of work they had created and how they wanted it to be understood (Baumgarten, 2000, 4). Thus, it is interesting that we find that the same expression is also mentioned in plural form at the end of the document, 4Q266 11. 18-19 in relation to the importance of following the right interpretation of the law. Hebrew text (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1997):

| | |
|---|---|
| 18 פרוש המשפטים אשר יעשו בכול קץ | 18 This is the explanation of the commandments, which they shall observe during the entire era of |
| 19 ]הפקודה את אשר יפק[ידו ]בכו[ל קצי החרון | 19 [visitation which they will be visi]ted [during al]l the eras of wrath. |

The fact that this concept is also emphasized at the end underlines its importance. To get a deeper understanding of what is meant by this phrase, we shall have a look at the beginning of CD, in which the phrase is found in CD 1.5. As CD 1.5 also introduces some positive aspects due to God's intervention in the period of wrath, particularly the notion of a remnant, we shall continue under that heading.

### 3.1.2   The Remnant

We are now turning our attention to the first of two passages referring to the remnant. In these two passages of the Damascus Document we encounter the concept of "remnant". This concept was already advanced by the biblical prophets, who developed it into a key motif that

God would not fail his people. In Isaiah it becomes associated with exile from which only a

few will return (Blenkinsopp, 2006, 225-227). The passage in question is attested to in CD

1.1-11a. It corresponds to variants in 4Q266 2 i 6b-15a and 4 Q 268 1 9-18. Hebrew text

(García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1997):

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 *vacat* ועתה שמעו כל יודעי צדק ובינו בשמעי | 1 And now, listen, all you who know righteousness, and understand the actions of |
| 2 אל כי ריב לו עם כל בשר ומשפט יעשה בכל מנאציו | 2 God; for he has a dispute with all flesh and will carry out judgment on all those who spurn him |
| 3כי במועלם אשר עזבוהו הסתיר פניו מישראל וממקדשו | 3 For when they were unfaithful in that they forsook him, he hid his face from Israel and from his sanctuary |
| 4 ויתנם לחרב ובזכרו ברית ראשונים השאיר שארית | 4 and delivered them up to the sword. But when he remembered the covenant with the forefathers, he saved a remnant |
| 5 לישראל ולא נתנם לכלה ובקץ חרון שנים שלוש מאות | 5 for Israel and did not deliver them up to destruction; and in the era of wrath three hundred and |
| 6 ותשעים לתיתו אותם ביד נבוכדנאצר מלך בבל | 6 ninety years after having delivered them up into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, |
| 7 פקדם ויצמח מישראל ומאהרן שורש מטעת לירוש | 7 he visited them and caused a shoot of the planting to sprout from Israel and from Aaron, in order to possess |
| 8 את ארצו ולדשן בטוב אדמתו ויבינו בעונם וידעו כי | 8 his land and to become fat with the good things of his soil. And they considered their iniquity and they knew that |
| 9 אשימים הם ויהיו כעורים וכימגששים דרך | 9 they were guilty; but they were like blind persons and like those who grope for the way |
| 10 שנים עשרים ויבן אל אל מעשיהם כי בלב שלם דרשוהו | 10 over twenty years. And God appraised their deeds because they sought him with an undivided heart, |
| 11 ויקם להם מורה צדק להדריכם לבו *vacat* | 11 and raised up for them a teacher of righteousness, in order to direct them in the way of his heart |

At the beginning of the text there is an appeal to those who understand the actions of God,

that they may listen; and that God judges all who spurn him. Israel is then scolded for having

forsaken God, and this is taken as the explanation of why he hid his face and let them be

delivered up to the sword; in other words, the judgement of God was upon them. This is the first section of the Damascus Document in which a foreign power is mentioned. This narrative introducing the exile and Nebuchadnezzar has received much scholarly attention. This is partly due to the fact that it is woven into the fabric of what has been interpreted as a narrative of the origins of the movement reflected in the text. It has thus been of major importance to scholars who have wanted to understand how, when and where this movement had its origin. For the purpose of this study the actual time and place of origin is only of peripheral interest, but the debates about these issues have generated insights that are valuable to this study. This passage bears the marks of a narrative written by an author within a people that has been close to being exterminated by their enemies. This is borne out by the reference to Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, who conquered Judea, destroyed the temple in Jerusalem, and brought the Judeans captive to Babylon. Before the exile in Babylon in the sixth century BCE, Judea had been a sovereign kingdom. After the exile the Persians allowed the Judeans to return to Judea, but the number was small. The temple in Jerusalem was rebuilt and constituted a central institution in Jewish society, but the actual building never reached the standard it had before the exile. The Jewish people were allowed much freedom under the Persian rule but had no king. (Meyers, 2002,136-138). This narrative offers explanations to the terrible questions that arise from the abandonment that they must have felt when they were taken into exile and afterwards had great difficulty regaining their sovereignty and former grandeur, the questions of how God could abandon his people and his sanctuary.

In Davies' discussion of this passage, he tries to distinguish secondary additions from the original text. He maintains that the "period of wrath" is part of the original text, but that CD 1.5-6 containing the reference to Nebuchadnezzar is a secondary addition by an editor who

understood the divine punishment as referring to the advent of Nebuchadnezzar. However, Davies maintains that no other historical divine punishment is alluded to in the admonition, so although this may be an insertion, the overall message is still the same (Davies, 1983, 63). This is actually not correct: the advent of Nebuchadnezzar is not the only historical divine punishment alluded to in the admonition, as we shall see as we move on to study other passages of the Damascus Document.

The reference to the 390 years and its relationship to the time of the origin of the community have been much discussed. Again, we need to be cautious, as the 390 years are taken by most scholars to originate from Ezekiel 4:5 (Campbell, 2005, 61), and probably are used here in line with a known exegetical tradition "according to which the 390 years of punishment correspond to the 390 years of Israel's iniquity" (Knibb, 1983, 113). It is in this era of wrath that God visited them. Davies notes that a problem arises, as the interpretation of the first verb in CD 1.7 is uncertain:

| פקדם | he punished them<br>he visited them<br>he remembered them favourably<br>he will remember them |
|---|---|

He maintains that most scholars before him have taken it in a benevolent sense, referring to the remnant, but he thinks it is more probable that it refers to Israel and he therefore translates "he punished them" (Davies, 1983, 65 and 233). Later studies tend to translate the verb either in a neutral way, "he visited them" (see for example Knibb, 1987, 17 and García Martínez, 1997, 551,583 and 605) or in a benign way, "he remembered them favourably" (Baumgarten, 1996, 35 and 120) or "he will remember them" (Wacholder, 2007, 27). If the verb is understood in a positive sense, then it is this visitation that causes a sprout, a shoot of a plant to appear, which is said to happen "in order to possess his land and become fat with the good

things of the soil". A parallel is found in 1 Enoch 93:9-10 (Nickelsburg and VanderKam, 2004, 140-143). This kind of plant metaphor is an often used image of a tribe taking root in their land, affirming their relationship to their land (Ingold, 2000, 48-49). The expression could be taken as a reversal of the situation in which God was hiding his face from Israel and thus a reversal of the exilic situation, the pivotal point being that God remembered his covenant with the forefathers and saved a remnant. Blenkinsopp contends that the allusion here is clearly to "the Abrahamic promise of land and progeny" (Blenkinsopp, 2006, 249). Scholars have taken the shoot of the planting to be a description of the emergence of the movement reflected in the document and taken the following text (CD 1:8-11) to describe some of the earliest history of this movement, to an extent that Hempel states this is "universally agreed" (Hempel, 2013, 146 and Hempel, 1999, 321, Tiller, 1997).

The relationship with God is described in covenantal terms. We shall have a closer look at the concept of covenant in chapter five. Here, we note that it is argued that, because of this covenant, God did not let the people be destroyed, but notably saved a "remnant". Many scholars have taken the "remnant" that was saved from destruction at the time of the exile to denote the movement. A minority of scholars have tried to solve this riddle by arguing that the movement originated in Babylon, from where it returned around the time of the Maccabean revolt, as they take the allusions to "exile" in the documents as literal expressions of the Babylonian exile. This argument was first voiced by Murphy-O'Connor (Murphy-O'Connor, 1974, 215-244) and taken up by Davies in his study of the Damascus Document (Davies, 1983, 122-123). However, Davies argues that the "remnant" mentioned in relation to the time of delivering Israel up to the sword is distinct from the "root" coming into existence at a considerably later time (Davies, 1983, 65). This observation was also made by Campbell, who talks of two points of reference, "one exilic and the other considerably later" (Campbell,

1995, 194). The literal interpretation of exile as the exile in Babylon was first challenged by Knibb, who argues that the "exile" in the literature of the period was a theological expression, not to be taken literally, as the "exile" was seen as a period of sin and the wrath of God which had not yet come to an end, but would only come to an end by God's intervention (Knibb, 1983, 253-272). In a general review of the subject in the intertestamental literature, which includes the Damascus Document, Knibb concludes that all the reviewed writings

> seem to share the view that Israel remained in a state of exile long after the
>
> sixth century, and that the exile would only be brought to an end when God
>
> intervened in this world in order to establish his rule. (Knibb, 1976, 271-272)

Although Davies advocates the idea that the movement originated in Babylon, he agrees with Knibb in his understanding that the punishment continues and that the movement was living "during the time in which the devastation and the Exile is prolonged" (Davies, 1983, 74). In a later study of the Damascus Document, Knibb notes that in this passage, CD 1.3-8, the materialization of the community and the exile are linked together and concludes that in the text currently under discussion, "the exile and the emergence of the community are linked immediately together in this passage" (Knibb, 1983, 113). He even thinks they are linked in such a way that the emergence of the community is that which brings the exile to an end (Knibb, 1983, 113). Campbell disagrees with this conclusion, as he states that CD 4.11f. implies that the exile will not be ended before the eschaton (Campbell, 1995, 194). Further discussion will be offered, as we shall look at this passage later, but for now we will focus on the debate of whether this passage links the emergence of the community and the exile.

At the most basic level the reference to a remnant left after the exile only denotes that their ethnic group had not been destroyed at that point in history and this is what I take it to mean. I

therefore do not believe there is any mention here of a relation between the time of Nebuchadnezzar and the beginning of the movement. The mention of the time of wrath or an evil time does, on the other hand, suggest that the time in which they live is perceived as a time in which God's judgment is still at work. Blenkinsopp, who deals with how narratives of exile in the literature of the period relate to biblical prophecy, observes that, although these texts are dealing with current crises, the Babylonian exile looms large in the background (Blenkinsopp, 2006, 231). Collins even uses the expression "an exilic consciousness" to describe the mindset of this passage in the beginning of the CD (Collins, 2010a, 35).

As stated, it is generally agreed that the rest of the passage, CD 8b-11, is a narrative of the beginning of the movement; we now turn to this passage. The first people who joined the movement are said to have considered their own iniquity and identified themselves as guilty and blind. Campbell notes the reference to Deut 28:29, in which blindness is taken to be a curse of the covenant, meaning a judgment subsequent to breaking the covenant. He also notes the relation to Isa 59:10, in which blindness is tantamount to sin and unrighteousness (Campbell, 1995, 57-58). They were groping for the way: an allusion to the Isaian term "way" is noted here, too (Blenkinsopp, 2006, 178-185). This is therefore mainly a self-confession of sin and of having been under the curse of the covenant, but it also reflects a sense of bewilderment and inability to know how to proceed in life because of this bewilderment. These circumstances are described as having changed after twenty years; again, this may not be literal, but possibly an allusion to half of the time Israel spent in the desert before entering the land. A change happened when a teacher appeared who directed them. Our next chapter takes up the discussion of this teacher, so we shall leave this for now.

Apart from CD 1.6 there is only one more passage in the Damascus Document that has a direct reference to a foreign power, referring to the kings of the peoples and the kings of Greece in CD 8. 10f. paralleled CD 19, 22f. At present we will consider that this reference indicates that foreign powers were perceived as a very real threat.

We shall now turn our attention to the second passage in which remnant appears. The text starts in 2.2 with an exhortation to listen, addressed to those who enter the covenant, so it is plausible to see this as a new section. CD 2.3b-12a, corresponding to 4Q266 2 ii 3b-12a. Hebrew text (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1997):

| Hebrew | English |
|---|---|
| 3 אל אהב דעת חכמה ותושייה הציב לפניו | 3b God loves knowledge; wisdom and counsel are before him |
| 4 ערמה ודעת הם ישרתוהו ארך אפים עמו ורוב סליחות | 4 prudence and knowledge are at his service; patience is his and abundance of pardon |
| 5 לכפר בעד שבי פשע וכוח וגבורה וחמה בלהבי אש | 5 to atone for those repenting from sin, but strength and power and hot flames of fire |
| 6 בי)ד( כל מלאכי חבל על סררי דרך ומתעבי חק לאין שאירית | 6 by the hand of the angels of destruction upon those turning away from the way and abhorring the precepts, leaving them without a remnant |
| 7 ופליטה למו כי לא בחר אל בהם מקדם עולם ובטרם נוסדו ידע | 7 or survivor, because God did not choose them at the beginning of the world and before they came into being, he knew |
| 8 את מעשיהם ויתעב את דורות מדם ויסתר את פניו מן הארץ | 8 their deeds and abhorred the generations of blood and hid his face from the land |
| 9 מי)שראל( עד תומם וידע את שני מעמד ומספר ופרוש קציהם לכל | 9 from <Israel> until their annihilation. And he knew the years of their existence and the number and detail of their times for all |
| 10 הוי עולמים ונהיית )ונהיות( עד מה יבוא בקציהם לכל שני עולם | 10 those who exist at all times and <and to those who will exist>, until it occurs in their ages throughout all the ages throughout the everlasting years |
| 11 ובכולם הקים לו קריאי שם למען התיר פליטה לארץ ולמלא | 11 and in all of them he raised men up, renown for himself, to leave a remnant for the land and in order to fill |
| 12 פני תבל מזרעם | 12 the face of the earth with their seed |

In this passage the judgment by sword becomes more pronounced in the context of a warning against judgment. Now, it is stated that those who disobey will not even be left a "remnant" of survivors (CD2.6). It is maintained that, if a person repents of his sin, he will receive pardon, but judgment awaits those who despise the commands of God (Campbell, 1995, 106). The whole passage seems to aim at creating an explanation for the suffering Israel had experienced, and to make sense of it in the light of the scriptures and promises from God. Even the very strong sense of predestination, which shows similarities with 1QS (Davies, 1983, 72), could well have developed as an attempt to offer an explanation as to why so many of the people, who had a covenant with God, perished. Davies considers that CD 1.8 speaks of a specific act, when God hid his face from the land. Yet he argues that, since all the wicked have not been destroyed but their presence remains a contemporary issue, God must likewise still hide his face from the land (Davies 1983, 73-74). Not only do I consider this a plausible argument, it also fits the poetic sense of time displayed in this text, as recurrent events and generations pass by unto eternity. Davies' argument additionally links with Knibb's theory that the "exile" was seen as a period of sin and the wrath of God which had not yet come to an end but would only come to an end through God's intervention (Knibb, 1983, 253-272).

Concerning style, Campbell notes that in this passage the "historical, linear style is much less present, if at all, and there is an absence of personages" (Campbell, 1995, 107). Campbell observes that there is an ambiguity in some of the descriptions and that "the historical portions are interspersed with more ahistorical material", which he claims, "suggests that the writer thought that one age is much the same as any other" an "essentially timeless state of affairs" (Campbell, 1995, 208). Campbell maintains that this provides the logic for the author of the text to connect the recent history to that of the distant past (Campbell, 1995, 208). We note again an underlying framework of biblical allusions informing this text (Campbell, 1995,

110). In particular the prophetic passages include the notion of the "remnant", in Isa 46:3. The prophecy that Israel will take root and fill the world with fruit, Isa 27:6, informs the end of this passage (Campbell, 1995, 112-114). Davies states that

> the 'men of name' raised in every epoch fulfil two goals: they remain to inherit the land, and also to populate the earth (Davies, 1983, 74).

Davies proposes that this may allude to the Noachic covenant, when only a few survived and yet they were able to repopulate the earth (Davies, 1983, 74). This is probable, as Blenkinsopp maintains that in Isaiah "'Noah's floodwater' is one figurative rendering of exilic experience" (Blenkinsopp, 2006, 229). Both allusions have as their focal point a small group of survivors that managed to reproduce and fill the earth or the land.

The text seems to indicate that a "remnant" existed in all the years of history. As mentioned earlier, many scholars have taken the "remnant" to denote the movement reflected in the Damascus Document. If the "remnant" was a self-designation for the movement this passage would not make much sense, unless we choose to translate line 11 differently, taking it to mean "amongst all of them" as Hempel does (Hempel, 2013, 149 and Hempel, 1999, 324). This is a plausible solution. However, although the members of the movement probably saw themselves as the "remnant" of this particular generation, I do not consider the term a self-designation of the movement. We noted that in CD 1.1-8, both Davies (Davies, 1983, 65) and Campbell talk of two points of reference, and therefore the persons referred to must have been from two different generations, "one exilic and the other considerably later" (Campbell, 1995, 194). This would also seem logical as, in order to survive, an ethnic group needs to be represented in each generation. If there is not even a remnant left in a particular generation,

then it means this ethnic group has ceased to exist or has been annihilated. Thus CD 2.11 contrasts with CD 2.9, which speaks of annihilation.

To conclude this part of the study we should list the key concepts. We have dealt with: a time of wrath, judgment by God, the discourse of the sword with the possibility of annihilation of their ethnic group, remnant, exile, covenant with God, land and fruitfulness of their people. Furthermore, we have noted that the concept of time could be said to be that one age is much the same as any other, as the same kind of events reappear. In the preceding discussion we have noted that the author refers to the current time as an evil era in which the audience is admonished to consider justice and the actions of God towards all men and remember that God will carry out judgment on the unfaithful. The author then argues that this is what happened when Israel was taken into exile by the Babylonians and the author explicitly mentions Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon. The author calls those who survived this judgment, a remnant. He believes that God appraised the deeds of the remnant, because they kept the Covenant they had with God. The mention of the time of wrath set the tone that the time in which they live is perceived as a time in which God's judgment is still at work and we could say that "an exilic consciousness" could be perceived as an undercurrent in the passages dealt with in this section. Having an exilic consciousness means having a feeling of still being in exile. We could say that it seems possible from this that the people in the movement were not feeling at home in their own ethnic environment, and we shall therefore now turn to this topic.

## 3.2   Signs of an Ethnic Conflict

In this section we will look for signs of an ethnic conflict. We noted above in CD 1.4 that, due to Israel's unfaithfulness, God delivered them up to the sword but, when he remembered his

covenant with their forefathers, he saved a remnant. In this section, we shall first have a look at a discourse of judgment by the sword; we shall then turn our attention to a passage introducing the idea that the people of Israel have been led astray by Belial; and finally we shall consider a passage in which biblical paradigms and connotations relating to Judah and Damascus have been turned around, so that Judah is seen as a place of judgment and Damascus a place where the Law is kept and the blessings of the Land abound.

### 3.2.1   The Sword

It was evident from CD 1.4 that the sword is related to the punishment from God. In the passage that follows, this concept is elaborated on: CD 1.11-2.1, corresponding to 4Q266 2 i 15a-2 ii 2a. Hebrew text (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1997):

| Hebrew | English |
|---|---|
| 11 ויודע | 11 And he made known |
| 12 לדורות אחרונים את אשר עשה בדור אחרון בעדת בוגדים | 12 to the last generations what he had done to the last generation a congregation of traitors |
| 13 הם סרי דרך היא העת אשר היה כתוב עליה כפרה סוררה | 13 they are those who depart from the way. That was the time of which it was written: "Like a stubborn heifer |
| 14 כן סרר ישראל בעמוד איש הלצון אשר הטיף לישראל | 14 thus Israel is stubborn", when the man of scoffing arose, who preached to Israel |
| 15 מימי כזב ויתעם בתוהו לא דרך להשח גבהות עולם ולסור | 15 waters of lies and led them astray in a wilderness without way, to bring low the everlasting heights, diverging |
| 16 מנתיבות צדק ולסיע גבול אשר גכלו ראשנים בנחלתם למען | 16 from the paths of righteousness and removing the boundary with which the forefathers had marked their inheritance, so that |
| 17 הדבק בהם את אלות בריתו להסגירם לחרב נקמת נקם | 17 the curses of his covenant would adhere to them, to deliver them up to the sword carrying out the vengeance |
| 18 ברית בעבור אשר דרשו בחלקות ויבחרו במהתלות ויצפו | 18 of the covenant. For they sought smooth interpretations, chose illusions, looked out for |
| 19 לפרצות ויבחרו בטוב הצואר ויצדיקו רשע וירשיעו צדיק | 19 loopholes, chose the fair neck and acquitted the guilty and condemned the innocent, |

| | |
|---|---|
| ויעבירו ברית ויפירו חוק ויגודו על נפש צדיק 20<br>ובכל הולכי | 20 violated the covenant, broke the law, banded together against the life of the just man, their soul abominated all those who walk |
| תמיד תעבה נפשם וירדפום לחרב ויסיסו לריב עם 21<br>ויחר אף | 21 in perfection, they hunted them down with the sword and incited public strife. And kindled was the anger of |
| אל בעדתם להשם את כל הצונם ומעשיהם לנדה 1<br>לפניו | 1 God against their nation, laying waste all their great number, for their deeds were unclean before him. |

In contrast to the text in CD 1.1-11, which reveals crisis due to a foreign power, Babylon, this text reveals crisis from within. In CD 1.12 it was stated that God had raised up a Teacher of Righteousness "to direct them in the way of his heart". In CD 1.13 we find another allusion to the Isaian term "way" (Blenkinsopp, 2006, 178-185), as fellow citizens are accused of departing from the way. The theme of departure will be discussed in detail in chapter 7 (7.1 and 7.2), as the discourse of departure recurs in CD 7.9b-8.1 and CD 8.2-19, which is paralleled in CD 19. 15-33a, CD 1.11. The man of scoffing is accused of leading this departure from the way of God, when he preached lies to Israel (CD1.14-15). In CD 1.18 this accusation of lying is underlined by the statement: "they sought smooth interpretations, chose illusions". However, the notion that the guilty were acquitted and the innocent condemned, and the law was broken (CD 1.19-20) indicates injustice and wrong conduct on a practical level. CD 1.20-2.1 even seems to indicate that

> [i]n this text the narrative of "the sword" as punishment is repeated and becomes more
>
> marked (CD 1.16-17).

Campbell identifies a pattern of scriptures informing this narrative and he concludes that there is an underlying framework of biblical allusions informing this text, to the extent that he is reluctant to exclude as secondary any phrases or words, as others have done before him. He

discerns a storyline of rebellion and punishment and the restoration of a righteous remnant in CD 1.1 -2.1 that repeats itself throughout the document (Campbell, 1995, 65). The concept of "the sword" is particularly linked to Lev 26 and Deut 28-32. In Lev 26 various punishments are described which will occur if the covenant with God is broken and, in CD 1.25, the sword is described as carrying out "the vengeance of the covenant", as cited here in CD 1.17-18. Campbell furthermore sees parallels linking the passage under consideration to the story of the golden calf in Ex 32. In Ex 32:26f, the Levites carry out the vengeance by sword after the people had worshipped the golden calf (Campbell, 1995, 57). The notion of the sword is thus related to the punishment of God as seen in CD 1.17 and, in this respect, it could be seen as a way of building a narrative in order to come to terms with the suffering and displacement that the Judean people had suffered.

Although much can be inferred from recognizing the biblical allusions, the text still poses difficulties, especially in relation to discerning whether reference is being made to former problems in society or more recent or current issues. Davies discusses how the complex lines in CD 1. 11-12 have puzzled scholars, for what relationship is there between "the last generations" and "the last generation a nation of traitors"? He considers that, if they were identical, the author would not have posed it this way but used the same phrase or a pronoun. He argues that the discourse of the text from the beginning of the document is a discourse of what God has done in the past, posing a revelation of the meaning of past events and that "the last generations" possibly represent the ones after the exile and that "the last generation a nation of traitors" could represent those who by their sins caused the exile (Davies, 1983, 67-68). However, many of the explanations of this passage have been built on speculations about the sobriquet "the man of scoffing", otherwise only used in CD 20.11 in the plural (Collins, 2009, 67 and Campbell, 1995, 51-67). The sobriquet encapsulates in singular form the

accusations in Isaiah and is mentioned in the Pesharim as contemporary with the Teacher of

Righteousness, mentioned in CD1.11, a figure we shall discuss in chapter four. However,

Davies cautions that the title "the man of scoffing" is derived from these biblical passages: Isa

28:14 (men of scoffing, described as being in positions of authority in Jerusalem); Proverbs

29:8 (in which this figure is contrasted to the wise: Bengtson 2000a, 95-96) and Psalm

107:40; and that he is presented as leading Israel astray. Davies generally believes that the

original part of this text was orientated towards the past, exposing the misconduct of Israel

and the fact that this misconduct led to the punishment of Israel by God. Although Davies is

inclined to follow Stegemann's suggestion that 12b-18 is secondary (Stegemann,

1971,132ff.), Davies does consider it possible that 12b-18 could be part of the original text

and that it refers to pre-exilic generations (Davies, 1983, 67-70). Collins, in his analysis of the

different sobriquets, maintains that the Man of Scoffing appears to have been deliberately

conceived in opposition to the Teacher of Righteousness (Collins, 2009, 69) and Collins is

therefore convinced that, even if the Teacher of Righteousness represents an interpolation, the

Man of Scoffing does likewise; he is part of this interpolation and contemporary with the

Teacher of Righteousness (Collins, 2009, 69-70). Davies also maintains that the reference to

the Teacher of Righteousness is an interpolation. He argues that it is possible that, in a

secondary development of the text, the anger of God has shifted focus from the people prior to

the exile and is now related to the Man of Scoffing, and a more recent group of people

following this man. Davies furthermore emphasizes that this man is not said to lead astray a

group of people within Israel, but the whole of Israel (Davies, 1983, 70-71). Even though

Davies acknowledges that the focus has shifted in what he considers a secondary development

of the text, Davies accepts the view of some previous scholars and maintains that CD 1.12 and

CD 1.21 must refer to the devastations of the Babylonian conquest and the exile, as this is "the only previous reference to an act of divine punishment" (Davies, 1983, 71).

Whether some of the text is secondary or not it seems safe to deduce that, at the stage of the development of the text as we encounter it today, the anger of God has shifted focus from the people prior to the exile and is now related to the Man of Scoffing and a more recent group of people following this man. Furthermore, I would argue that, even if there is no previous reference in the text to punishments other than the Babylonian conquest, there are later references in the Damascus Document to other punishments and devastations that Israel has experienced. Therefore, we cannot conclude that this or other references to swords or devastation always refer to the Babylonian conquest. Rather I maintain that careful analysis of CD 1.11-CD 2.1 in the light of the above considerations discloses that the man of scoffing led Israel astray and that this disobedience caused the curses of the covenant and the sword to come upon the disobedient according to CD 1.17-18. It seems plausible to me that CD 1.18-21 concerns the same people, who had been led astray by that man of scoffing and that these lines are an elaboration of their evil deeds culminating in CD 1.21, in which these people incite public strife and hunt down others with the sword. If that is so, the text seems to be reflecting some sort of a civil war, in which the Israelites, who have been led astray by the man of scoffing, hunted down (with the sword) those among the Israelites who are considered righteous by the author. We shall now turn to some of the subsequent passages containing reference to the sword.

CD 2: 14-3:12a represents an account of some of the early history of the world and Israel with an emphasis on whether or not the listed persons obeyed God's precepts. The patriarchs are said to have been friends of God, but even the sons of Jacob are listed as disobedient. In

Egypt the people of Israel were disobedient and, in the desert at Qadesh, the Israelites did not obey God when he commanded them to go into the land and possess it. Thus, because of this disobedience, a group of people in those days was delivered to the sword, CD 3.10b-11a, Hebrew text (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1997):

| 10b באי הברית הראשנים ויסגרו | 10 b the first ones entering the covenant incurred guilt |
|---|---|
| 11a לחרב בעזבם את ברית אל | 11a and were delivered to the sword as they broke God's covenant |

It is clear that this passage does not refer to the Babylonian conquest but represents one of those passages which recount another time, in this case an earlier time in Israel's history, in which the sword was used as a result of breaking the covenant with God. In this part of the text the time and "the first ones entering the covenant" are defined as those who disobeyed in the desert at Qadesh and the covenant referred to is therefore evidently the covenant of Moses (Numbers 13-14:36).

We may end this section about "the sword" by concluding that a storyline of rebellion and punishment underlies the passage. The text is informed by an underlying framework of biblical allusions and the concept of the sword is particularly linked to Lev 26 and Deut 28-32. In Lev 26 various punishments are described which will occur if the covenant with God is broken and the sword is said to carry out the vengeance of the covenant. Thus, the sword represents God's judgment and the story is a warning not to act in the same way. In contrast to the text in CD 1.1-11, which revealed crisis due to a foreign power, Babylon, this text (CD 2.3b-12a) revealed a crisis from within, as fellow citizens are accused of departing from the way of God, bending justice and even inciting public strife and hunting down others with the sword. The text seems to indicate some sort of a civil war in which the Israelites, who have been led astray by the man of scoffing, have even hunted down those among the Israelites

who are considered righteous by the author. We shall now turn to another passage that indicates the view that Israel has been deceived.

### 3.2.2   The Three Nets of Belial

Dimant has undertaken a study of the theme of exile in the literature of the period in which she concludes that a typical aspect of this time of punishment, the era of wrath, is that the land of Israel was under demonic control and that the people living in sin were ignorant about their condition, an aspect that was likened to blindness (Dimant, 2006, 383-384). In CD 1.9 we noted that blindness was used in this way. In a passage mainly concerned with the wickedness throughout ancient times, we find a notion of opposition to Moses in the desert, describing how Moses and Aaron were opposed when Belial stirred opposition among the Israelites (CD 5.18). Belial is furthermore mentioned in the Admonition: in CD 4.12b-21. In this passage Belial is presented as a deceiver who causes deception in Israel by using his three nets to catch people. Murphy-O'Connor, who proposed that this part of the Admonition was written as what he terms a "Missionary Document", considers this a warning and a demonstration that the people of Israel have been misled. He maintains that this part of the Damascus Document is meant to introduce those who have been led astray to what the author perceives as a true following of the Law. The people have been deceived and this text should help them gain a correct understanding (Murphy O'Connor, 1970, 219-222). This observation is in line with the proposal of a more recent work by Shani Tzoref, who views the passage as a *pesher* composition (see line 14). She maintains that such compositions are meant to transmit divine revelation and reveal how scripture relates to current events (Tzoref, 2011, 144-154). We shall have a look at the text before we move into further discussion. CD 4:12b-21 (attested, but very fragmentary on 4Q266, 4Q267, 6Q15). Hebrew text (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1997):

| | |
|---|---|
| 12 ובכל השנים האלה יהיה | 12 And during all these years |
| 13 בליעל משולח בישראל כאשר דבר אל ביד ישעיה הנביא בן | 13 Belial will be set loose in Israel, as God has said by the prophet Isaiah, son of |
| 14 אמוץ לאמר פחד ופחת ופח עליך יושב הארץ פשרו *vacat* | 14 Amoz, saying *Isa 24:17,* Panic, pit and net against you dwelling on the land *vacat* The interpretation |
| 15 שלושת מצודות בליעל אשר אמר עליהם לוי בן יעקב | 15 Three nets of Belial, about which Levi, son of Jacob spoke |
| 16 אשר הוא תפש בהם בישראל ויתנם פניהם לשלושת מיני | 16 in which he traps Israel and makes them appear before them like three types of |
| 17 הצדק הראשונה היא הזנות השנית החון השלישית | 17 righteousness. The first is fornication, the second wealth and the third |
| 18 טמא המקדש העולה מזה יתפש בזה והניצל מזה יתפש | 18 ritual defilement of the Temple. He who escapes from this is caught by that and he who is saved from that is captured |
| 19 בזה *vacat* בוני החיץ אשר הלכו אחרי צו הצו הוא מטיף | 19 in this *vacat* The builders of the wall who go after Zaw-Zaw is the preacher |
| 20 אשר אמר הטף יטיפון הם ניתפשים בשתים בזנות לקחת | 20 of whom he said *(Micah 2:6)* "Assuredly they will preach" They are caught twice in fornication by taking |
| 21 שתי נשים בחייהם ויסוד הבריאה זכר ונקבה ברא אותם | 21 two wives in their lives, even though the principle of creation is *(Gen 1:21)* "male and female he created them" |

In this text we are presented with an approach that suggests that sins evident in society are the result of Belial's deception (CD 4.13). We need to take a quick look at who Belial is and why this personification of this word? Thomas concurs that, in biblical writings, belial is generally presented with the meaning "worthless"; rarely is it personified (Thomas, 2011, 452). Sperling likewise notes that the use in the biblical books is of a general nature referring to something or someone who is "worthless" or "useless". Sometimes the term is used in this way to describe the false prophets. However, Sperling maintains that the term is well-attested

in the pseudepigraphic literature and in Hebrew texts from Qumran, in which the term is used in a personified sense, representing the forces of evil (Sperling, 1995, 321-326).

In CD 4.12 we note a time frame; "during all those years". Davies explains that the time when Belial is let loose has sometimes been seen as a "pre-eschatological epoch", but he thinks it refers to the whole time in which the movement existed. He bases this on two things. The first is the fact that he considers this passage to be part of a discourse starting in CD 4.9, which concerns the present time. His second argument is that Belial does not figure in the interpretation of Isaiah; rather Belial is at work among the people of Israel at the time in which they live. The people of Israel have been deceived, as can be seen by their deeds and their adherence to a wrong interpretation of the Law (Davies, 1983, 108-109). Davies' supposition that this account of Belial's nets relates to the present is plausible. The problems and sins related to Belial's nets are listed in the continuation of the text, CD 5.6b-15, and these sins seem very mundane and quite specific. This does not seem like some vague list of bad things to be expected for an eschatological era; rather the text seems to present some commonplace problems in society in the present.

Another important question is whether the term Israel refers to the whole nation of Israel. Davies considers this the most plausible explanation for the term. He further concurs that the sins mentioned as the nets of Belial are not peculiar to the Damascus Document or the movement behind it, as close parallels occur in other texts, Psalm of Solomon 8:9ff and Jubilees 7:20; and he considers that the audience was probably familiar with the notion of "the three nets of Belial" (Davies, 1983, 110). Hanan Eshel likewise notes a similar triad of sins mentioned in other texts such as Jubilees, MMT, New Testament texts and the Aramaic Testament of Levi. He is particularly interested in the relation of the text to the Aramaic

Testament of Levi, as Levi is referred to in CD 4.15 (Eshel, 2007, 245). Greenfield considers

several similarities in the Aramaic Testament of Levi to texts from Qumran and compares a

passage in the Aramaic Testament of Levi in which three sins are mentioned to the passage

we are dealing with (Greenfield, 1988, 332). Eshel compares Greenfield's list of sins in the

Aramaic Testament of Levi (first line), with the list of sins in CD (second line), in

| פחז | טומאה | זנותת |
|---|---|---|
| טמא | ההון | הזנותת |

Eshel presents a lengthy argument for how the differences could be explained (Eshel, 2007,

246-251). He does not consider Greenfield's explanation of scribal error plausible for the

differences. Instead Eshel proposes that it is possible that the triad of sins are derived from the

Aramaic Levi, as the author could have made a conceptual link. This link would be via

passages in the prophetic books, as Jeremiah 23:32 and Zephaniah 3:4 both use the same

vocabulary to describe the false prophets as "wanton". These prophets spoke comforting, but

false, prophecies in order to get a better pay. The proposed conceptual link would then be

between false prophets and their greediness, translated by Eshel as "avarice" (Eshel, 2007,

249):

| פחז | Jeremiah 23:32 and Zephaniah 3:4: False prophets, "wanton" |
|---|---|
| ההון | False prophecies to get a better pay "avarice" |

Although it could seem like a vague link, Eshel's proposal could well be correct, as the notion

of builders of the wall (CD 4.19) refers to Ezek 13:10, which speaks of false prophets,

comparing them to builders who built a flimsy wall and covered the cracks with whitewash.

The whole passage is seen to be permeated with the notion of deception, originating from

Belial but presented to the people of Israel by false prophets, and therefore Eshel's proposal sounds plausible.

The link between this part of the text and Ezek 13:10 is not the only connection between this paragraph and Ezekiel. Campbell states that several passages from Ezekiel relate to the passage under consideration. Punishment for defilement of the Temple is reflected in Ezek 5:11 and 44:6-7. In both passages judgment due to defilement of the Temple is foretold. Ezek 44:6-7 is part of the description Ezekiel is given of a new Temple, and Ezek 44:15 is quoted in CD 3:21-4:2 (Campbell, 1995, 127-128). Kampen considers this link to Ezek 44:15 and concludes that the people in the movement have this eschatological Temple in mind as their future hope as the solution for the defiled temple (Kampen, 1999, 193-197). It would seem then that the paragraph presenting Belial's nets is encapsulated in a larger framework of passages from Ezekiel encompassing references to false prophets, as well as eschatological hope regarding the state of the temple.

According to the understanding in the Damascus Document, those associated with Belial are not going to escape judgment (CD 12.2), so it may be appropriate to raise the question: What is required of them for them to escape the coming judgment? How can one escape the nets of Belial? If we recall the three nets of Belial, it becomes clear that it is indeed a problematic task to escape them: "The first is fornication, the second wealth and the third ritual defilement of the Temple". An explanation of what is meant by fornication is given in CD 4.20-21, containing a prohibition against marrying two wives; and in the next part of the text, CD 5.6b-5.15a, which we shall turn to shortly. Although it is possible to understand the prohibition concerning two wives in different ways, Vermes has argued plausibly that the prohibition is followed by three proof-texts in CD 4.21-5.2: Gen 1:27; Gen 7:9 and Deut 17:17, which all

support monogamy as opposed to polygamy. Even though grammar poses some difficulties to this explanation, Vermes argues that, as there is no mention in these proof-texts of divorce and remarriage, the prohibition must refer solely to polygamy (Vermes, 1973, 197-202). While the text at this point is for some reason not explaining the second net, we shall also leave the subject of the second net for now and return to it when we consider wealth and financial matters of the community in chapter six.

The third net must have posed innumerable problems, for how could they live according to the Law of Moses and the requirement according to the Law concerning sacrifices and everything else relating to the Temple if the Temple had become ritually defiled? The fact that the Temple is classified as defiled has been a puzzle to scholars that has led to numerous debates on whether the members of the movement abandoned the Jerusalem Temple or not. This is not something which can be deduced from the study of the Damascus Document; rather this debate has derived from the study of other Qumran texts. Goodman describes the Jerusalem Temple as being at the center of Jewish worship and mentions that the significance of the Jerusalem Temple is also testified to by numerous pagan writers (Goodman, 2010, 86). Goodman does not approve of the theories that the Temple had been abandoned by any movement related to Qumran. Concerning the movement reflected in the Damascus Document, he explicitly states that several laws concerning offerings in CD 6.11-7.4 must have meant that the members of the movement still sacrificed at the Temple, as no hint is given of a rival temple. He likewise opposes the theory of sacrificial practice at Qumran, which has been based on finds of animal remains at the site (Magness, 2002, 118-120). Goodman thinks this is not at all plausible; and he is convinced the members did not abandon the Temple. Most importantly, he is convinced that "such a reading is not required by a simple reading of the texts" (Goodman, 2010, 88). The fact that abandonment of the Temple

cannot be deduced from the reading of the Damascus Document should caution us to leave the matter. We need therefore not enter this debate further. It is moreover not important to our cause whether the members used the temple or abandoned it.

What we do need to note is that defilement of the Temple must have been devastating. This problem seems even more devastating if we consider the implications of a statement by Hempel, who has done extensive studies of the laws in the Damascus Document. She proposes that the background to the movement is

> a multiform heritage…drawing on liturgical, sapiental, and halakhic traditions that were cherished by the learned circles around the temple. A group that turns its back on the temple because the temple is defiled must have a background and heritage that is close to the temple (Hempel, 2005, 251).

Hempel rightly observes that the movement seems to have a heritage that is close to the Temple, as examples of this can be noted several times in the Damascus Document. For our purposes it is first and foremost necessary to establish that the notion of a defiled Temple must have caused the members of the movement immense distress, as the Temple was supposed to be the place at which sacrifices were made, including the sacrifices to obtain atonement. How could one obtain atonement in a Temple that was defiled? The fact that the Temple is considered defiled must therefore be seen as an evident sign of a cultural identity crisis, which has caused disintegration and a sense of displacement within its own people. Elliott discusses the use of displacement theories related to studying movements reflected in the scrolls. He concludes that the displacement of these movements is not so much economic or political but could be classified as a religious displacement (Elliott, 2000, 241). This kind of displacement must be considered the most profound kind of displacement if we recall

Geertz' insistence that culture relates to meaning, to making sense of life itself and that, in agreement with this existential note, Geertz refers to religious symbols as carrying particular weight due to the authority such symbols obtain from their relation to a certain metaphysic reality (Geertz, 1973, 90). Therefore, a sense of religious displacement could well be seen to cause an immense identity crisis of an entire community.

In order to obtain an explanation of what is meant by fornication in CD 4.17, we need to consider the explanation of this, which is given in the next part of the text, CD 5.6b-5.15a, ending attested in 4Q266 3 ii 1-2 and 6Q15 2, Hebrew text (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1997):

| | |
|---|---|
| 6 וגם מטמאים הם את המקדש אשר אין הם | 6 and they also defiled the Temple, for they did not |
| 7 מבדיל כתורה ושוכבים עם הרואה את דם זובה ולוקחים | 7 separate in accordance with the law, but instead lay with her who sees the blood of her flow. And each man takes as his wife |
| 8 איש את בת אחיה{ם}ו ואת בת אחותו *vacat* ומשה אמר אל | 8 the daughter of his brother and the daughter of his sister. *vacat* But Moses said: *Lev 18:13,* |
| 9 אחות אמך לא תקרב שאר אמך היא ומשפט העריות לזכרים | 9 Do not approach your mother's sister, she is a blood relation of your mother. The law of incest |
| 10 הוא כתוב וכהם הנשים ואם תגלה בה האח את ערות אחי | 10 written for males, applies equally to females, and therefore to the daughter of a brother who uncovers the nakedness of the brother of |
| 11 אביה והיא שאר *vacat* וגם את רוח קדשיהם טמאו ובלשון | 11 her father, for he is a blood relation. *Blank* And they also defile their holy spirit, for with |
| 12 גדופים פתחן פה על חוקי ברית אל לאמר לא נכונו ותועבה | 12 blasphemous tongue they have opened their mouth against the ordinances of God's covenant, saying: "they are unfounded". They speak abomination |
| 13 הם מדברית בם כלם קדחי אש ומבערי זיקות קורי | 13 against them. They are igniters of fire, kindlers of blazes, webs |
| 14 עכביש קוריהם וביצי צפעונים ביציהם הקרוב אליהם | 14 of a spider are their webs, and their eggs are vipers' eggs. Whoever comes close to them |
| 15 לא ינקה כהר ביתו | 15 will not be unpunished |

The cause of the defilement of the temple is seemingly linked in this text to sexual impurity. In the text we find prohibitions against marrying two wives, sexual intercourse during the blood flow of the woman, and niece-uncle marriages. The latter is followed by Lev 18:13 as proof text, emphasizing that Moses said this. In her monograph, *Women in the Damascus Document,* Wassen insists that the reference to flow of blood is general and must refer "to men sleeping with women experiencing any kind of vaginal blood" (Wassen, 2005, 119), as this is not the vocabulary usually used for menstruation in the Damascus Document (Wassen, 2005, 119). Wassen asserts that it is rather strange that such a practice even existed, as the prohibition of sexual activity with women passing blood was "ancient and deeply ingrained in Jewish consciousness in the Second Temple Period" (Wassen, 2005, 119). Her remark is rather interesting, as it shows why such a practice could seem so abominable that it would be seen as causing the temple to be defiled. Wassen explains that this defilement could refer to the man becoming impure by the act and then entering the temple, bringing defilement to it (Wassen, 2005, 120).

However, we should consider whether purity is the only concern here. Harrington suggests that, while interpretation of biblical law is crucial to the identity of the movements related to Qumran, some have argued that purity was the central issue (Harrington, 2001, 124). She contends that Second Temple Judaism was characterized by an intensive quest for purity, but she considers the movements related to Qumran the most uncompromising. She defines purity as

> a status, achieved by both moral integrity and ritual purification, which is
> required of Israel in order for God's holiness to reside among and protect
> them (Harrington, 2004, 8).

Since the Temple was the place in which God had promised to speak to his people, purity regulations were stricter the closer one was to the Temple. Purity could be seen as absence of impurity, but purity first and foremost relates to holiness. Harrington notes several passages in the Damascus Document that reflects this, among them the term "congregation of the men of perfect holiness" (CD 20.2-7) and the exhortation to separate from impurities in CD 7.3-4, in which it is stated, "let no man defile his holy spirit" (Harrington, 2001,126-130), which is similar to CD 5.11 in which the concept of defiling one's holy spirit is linked to having a blasphemous tongue and saying that the ordinances of God are unfounded. Werrett considers the biblical rulings behind CD 5.6-7. He contends that it would be necessary to be cleansed from bodily discharges in order not to defile the Temple (Lev 15:31), that women need to stay away from the city of the Temple during their menses so they do not defile the Temple (Num 5:2), and that men are not allowed have sex with a menstruating woman but needs to avoid that in order not to be "cut off" from his people (Lev 18:19 and 20:18). If a man sleeps with a menstruant he is unclean for 7 days (Lev 15:24) and therefore should not enter the temple (Werrett, 2007, 86-87). This last observation links to Wassen's statement that a man who has become impure by sleeping with a menstruant defiles that Temple, if he enters in this state of impurity (Wassen, 2005, 120). These are all possible reasons why the Temple could be considered defiled in CD 5.6-7. However, Himmelfarb adds a very important factor. She asserts that sex with a menstruating woman is the only type of contact with an impure person that is treated as sin in Leviticus (Lev 18:19 and 20:18). Thus, she contends that this is not just a matter of ritual impurity; rather it would have been seen as moral impurity and sin (Himmelfarb, 2001, 21). Himmelfarb's suggestion makes the matter even more serious and adds an explanation to the harsh words in CD 5.12-15.

Concerning niece marriages, Wassen explains that the prohibition of a marriage between a man and his niece in CD 5.7-11 must be seen as exceptional, as marriage between a man and his sister's daughter seems to have been common in Jewish society at that time. She states that other scholars have suggested that the reason for a ban on marrying a niece was that this practice was related to bigamy. She thinks this is possible but points out that biblical exegesis led to the ban. She states that "this gender-inclusive reading of biblical laws appears elsewhere" in the Damascus Document, e.g., CD 16.6-12 (Wassen, 2005, 121).

In sum, we noted that the defilement of the temple is linked in this text to sexual impurity. However, we observed that it was not simply a concern for purity. Sleeping with a menstruant is considered an act of sin in Leviticus (CD 4.7). The prohibition of marrying a niece could well be guided by exegesis (CD 4.8-10). It is therefore hardly surprising that the harsh words condemning the offenders were aimed at their blasphemous acts of speaking against the ordinances of God (CD 4.1-13), as both offenses would have been understood as acting contrary to biblical laws. Since it is clearly the stance of the author that biblical laws should be obeyed, it would seem from the point of view of the author that the values of these offenders are not the same as the values he had learned to take as goals and models. The religious displacement discussed above was thus seen in this passage as relating to sexual impurity, but also to blasphemous speech. We shall leave this passage for now and turn to a passage in CD 6, which in a different manner presents a story of displacement.

### 3.2.3   Judah and Damascus

In the passage we shall consider now, we are presented with a journey to the land of Damascus. This reference of a journey to the land of Damascus within the Damascus Document has given name to the title of the document. We shall turn to CD 6. 2b-10a, also

attested in 4Q266 3 ii 11-13 and 4 Q267 2 11-13. Hebrew text, (García Martínez and

Tigchelaar, 1997):

| | |
|---|---|
| 2 ויקם מאהרן נבונים ומישרל | 2 And he raised from Aaron men of knowledge and from Israel |
| 3 חכמים וישמיעם ויחפורו את הבאר באר חפרוה שרים כרוה | 3 wise men and made them listen. And they dug a well: *Num 21:18,* A well which the princes dug, which |
| 4 נדיבי העם במחוקק הבאר היא התורה והופריה הם *vacat* | 4 the nobles of the people delved with the staff. The well is the law and those who dug it *vacat* they are |
| 5 שבי ישראל היוצאים מארץ יהודה ויגורו בארץ דמשק | 5 the penitents of Israel, who left the land of Judah and lived in the Land of Damascus |
| 6 אשר קרא אל את כולם שרים כי דרשוהו ולא הושבה | 6 all of whom God called princes, for they sought him and their renown has not been |
| 7 פארתם בפי אחד *vacat* והמחוקק הוא דורש התורה אשר | 7 repudiated in anyone's mouth. *vacat* And the staff is the interpreter of the law, of whom |
| 8 אמר ישעיה מוציא כלי למעשיהו *vacat* וניבי העם הם | 8 Israel said Isaiah said: *Isa 54:16* He produces a tool for his labour. *vacat* And the nobles of the people are |
| 9 הבאים לכרות את הבאר במחוקקות אשר חקק המחוקק | 9 those who came to dig the well with the staves that the scepter decreed |
| 10 להתהלך במה בכל קץ הרשיע | 10 to walk in them throughout the whole era of wickedness |

In this text we encounter the expression the whole era of wickedness or the whole of the evil

era, corresponding to the expression the era of wrath discussed at the beginning of this chapter

(3.1.1). The Torah is likened to a well and although the text is slightly complicated it implies

that the Torah needed to be interpreted by men of knowledge and wise men; and that the

interpretation should be acted upon according to CD 6.10, throughout the whole age of

wickedness. With reference to different elements of this passage Knibb states that the various

elements in this expression occur throughout the Damascus Document, and so its meaning is

important to the document as a whole (Knibb, 1983, 105).

Thus, by analyzing this passage, we should be able to expose some key elements of the

Damascus Document as a whole. The first element we shall discuss is "the land of

Damascus". Knibb explains that "Damascus" is used seven times in the Damascus Document,

but not in any other of the Documents found at Qumran (CD 6.5; CD 7.15; CD 7.19; CD 6.19

and 8.21 = 19.34 and 20.12) (Knibb, 1983, 107). It is furthermore attested in 4Q266 3 iii 20.

Wassen classifies "Damascus" as a "key word" as the document recalls a journey to

Damascus. She explains how Damascus has been understood either symbolically as Babylon

or as Qumran or literally as Damascus. As she does not think anything in the text points to a

symbolic meaning, she argues for the literal interpretation (Wassen, 2005, 25). Hempel on the

other hand explains that "Damascus is an exegetical term derived from Amos 5.26-27"

(Hempel, 2000, 60). This is important to note. We have already noted that Grossman

emphasizes that caution is necessary in relation to interpretation of geographical places, as

geographic language is part of an imagery that makes metaphorical use of the language of

departure and return, presented in a complex relationship to scripture (Grossman, 2002, 180-

181). It is not of any importance to this study where Damascus is; however, other aspects of

the discussions of this move to the Land of Damascus are relevant. These relate to the

previously mentioned discussions about the meaning of the Exile and to those who left Judah,

translated above as "the penitents of Israel", CD 6.5:

| | שוב | Dual meaning of verb: Return, repent. |
|---|---|---|
| | שבי ישראל | Captivity of Israel<br>Returnees of Israel<br>Penitents of Israel or converts of Israel |

We should note that we are again dealing with a term that seems to be taken from the book of

Isaiah. Blenkinsopp notes that return and repentance are linked in Isaiah, due to the dual

meaning of the Hebrew verb (Blenkinsopp, 2006, 225-227). However, due to this dual meaning, differing translations of CD 6.5 have been proposed. As a proponent for the idea that the movement originated in Babylon, Davies reads it as the noun "captivity" and renders the phrase "the captivity of Israel" (Davies, 1983, 247). Murphy-O'Connor, likewise a proponent for the idea that the movement originated in Babylon, argued that the phrase should be translated geographically as those who returned to Judah from Babylon, the returnees of Israel (Murphy-O'Connor, 1970 and 1972b). Fabry has written a thesis on the use of the verb in the texts from Qumran. He explains that it has different uses but is frequently used in the sense of a return from sin (Fabry, 1975, 27). In CD 6.5 he maintains that the verb is used in a religious and ethical sense of turning around (Fabry, 1975, 310). Knibb shares this opinion. As part of his argument for a figurative and spiritual understanding of the "Exile", Knibb argues plausibly that the phrase primarily refers to "converts in the religious sense", (Knibb, 1983, 105-109). Brooke contends that this viewpoint has subsequently won general support (Brooke, 2005, 73-74).

Lied has made a convincing study using Soja's "Thirdspace Approach" in order to shed new light on the spaces of Damascus (Lied, 2005, 102). She explains the approach like this: "Firstspace" is the actual physical space and "Secondspace" is imagined space, a notion of space conceived in ideas about the place and "Thirdspace" is an open category that carries the prospect of combining the two, so that space is real and imagined at the same time. She also furthers the notion that Jewish writings in antiquity "are mapping people rather than territory" (Lied, 2005, 108-109). Lied notes that there seems to have been a scholarly consensus that Damascus was a place of exile, and she states that she wants to challenge that notion, particularly the implied negative notion of exile as punishment (Lied, 2005, 105). Lied explains that the onset of the era of evil is marked by several occurrences, "one of them being

the move to Damascus" (Lied, 2005, 113). She examines the passage under consideration and points out that, according to the text, the purpose of departing from Judah and dwelling in Damascus is to give the sojourners the opportunity to live according to the Law and their interpretation of the Law; and it seems an indication that this was not possible in Judah. The timeframe of the sojourn is not defined but seems to her to be a stay of a limited time (Lied, 2005, 111). She maintains that the descriptions of the spaces are highly informed by the Biblical paradigms and connotations relating to Judah and Damascus and she notes that these connotations have been turned around in the Damascus Document. Judah has become a place of punishment, displaying the conventional "exilic conditions" during the time of evil. Damascus on the other hand is a place where the Law is kept and the blessing of the Land is enjoyed during the time of evil. Lied concludes that "time decides space": "The time of evil has its special spaces of punishment and rescue" and "Damascus is space in the time of evil", a space where it is possible to keep the Law (Lied, 2005, 121). Lied's study adds an interesting perspective, which conveys an understanding that the world of those sojourners had been turned upside down. She is correct in noting that the exile in Damascus is described as having a positive nature, and that it can therefore not be compared to the exile in Babylon.

It is also noteworthy that "the converts of Israel" are called "princes", and that it is insisted that their renown has not been repudiated. Whether this means that they had been actual princes in Judah whom others may have repudiated, or whether it means that they thought they had gained the right to the title by seeking God and interpreting the Torah correctly, is ambiguous. Possibly it is their interpretation of Torah which cannot be disputed, as Wacholder suggests (Wacholder, 2007, 216). In this passage this notion of "princes" that had not been repudiated could reflect a sense of cultural displacement in relation to the current

rulers of Judah, particularly if these "converts of Israel" had originally been actual princes of Judah who had been rejected by the current rulers.

We shall leave the notion of the *Interpreter of the Law* to the next chapter in which *the Interpreter of the Law* and *the Teacher of Righteousness* will be studied.

## 3.3   Conclusion

The aim of this chapter was to evaluate whether Wallace's model of Revitalization Movements could be a useful tool to analyse the Damascus Document or not. Revitalization Movements develop because of cultural changes. They emerge when a community experiences various changes such as environmental changes, military defeat or political subordination, resulting in an extreme pressure toward acculturation. By acculturation is meant forced cultural change through dominance. Wallace claims that this could lead to an identity crisis of an entire community. I considered this evaluation necessary, as I do not think this model could be of any use to our purposes if the Damascus Document did not share this common ground with the model. The model seeks to explain in a systematic way what happens to a community or ethnic group because of cultural changes. If this chapter had shown that the text did not reflect any cultural changes and that we could not trace any sort of cultural identity crisis, then it would have been better to look for another model. If on the other hand this chapter reflects signs of perceived cultural change and cultural identity crisis, Wallace's model could be a useful tool that might help us gain a fresh perspective on the movement reflected in the Damascus Document.

Some passages from the Damascus Document text were analyzed for signs of a cultural identity crisis, such as disintegration, displacement and foreign influence, and whether there

are signs that the members of the movement thought it was impossible for them to realize the values they had learned to take as goals and models.

The textual analysis revealed that the text is informed by an underlying framework of biblical allusions. There is a storyline of rebellion and judgement in which a discourse of "the sword" is particularly linked to Lev 26 and Deut 28-32. Various punishments are described, which will occur if the covenant with God is broken, and "the sword" is said to carry out the vengeance of the covenant. Thus "the sword" represents God's judgment with the possibility of annihilation of the people. There is a direct reference to what happened when Israel was taken into exile by the Babylonians, and the author explicitly mentions Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon.

The author calls those who survived this judgment a remnant. This concept was already advanced by the biblical prophets, who developed it into a key motif that God would not fail his people. This concept is furthermore acknowledged in anthropology as a concept used by a people or an ethnic group that has faced annihilation. At the most basic level the reference to a remnant left after the exile only denotes that their ethnic group had not been destroyed at that point in history and this is what I take it to mean. I therefore do not see any relation between the time of Nebuchadnezzar and the beginning of the movement, as has been argued by Murphy-O'Connor (Murphy-O'Connor, 1974, 215-244) and taken up by Davies in his study of the Damascus Document (Davies, 1983, 122-123). Rather the mention of Nebuchadnezzar seems to reflect a distant memory, and as noted in chapter two (2.2) such collective memories function as a base for social continuity.

Even so, the mention of the time of wrath set the tone that the time in which they live is perceived as a time in which God's judgment is still at work and we could say that "an exilic

consciousness" could be perceived as an undercurrent in the passages dealt with, and that the cultural displacement displayed in the text is so profound that it is likened to an ongoing exile. As the Temple, the center of Jewish worship, was perceived as defiled, the situation could be classified as a religious displacement. We noted that the defilement of the temple is linked in this text to sexual impurity. We observed that it was not simply a matter of purity. Sleeping with a menstruant was considered an act of sin in Leviticus. The prohibition of marrying a niece could well be guided by exegesis. It is therefore hardly surprising that the harsh words condemning the offenders was aimed at their blasphemous acts of speaking against the ordinances of God, as both offenses would have been understood as acting contrary to biblical laws. Since it is clearly the stance of the author that biblical laws should be obeyed, it would seem from the point of view of the author that the values of these offenders are not the same as the values he had learned to take as goals and models.

Biblical paradigms and connotations relating to Judah and Damascus have been turned around in the Damascus Document, so Judah is seen as a place of judgment and Damascus a place where the Law is kept, and the blessings of the Land abound. The text reflects a world that has been turned upside down, and it seems as if the members of the movement felt it was impossible for them to realize the values they had learned to take as goals and models, if they stayed in Judah.

On the basis of what we have observed in this chapter, it can be concluded that the texts reflect a context in which the movement originated, and that this context fully meets the conditions described by Wallace of the context in which a Revitalization Movement develops. We have thus demonstrated that the model fits the context and may therefore proceed to use the model for the rest of this study. We shall commence with a chapter in which we shall

study whether the Damascus Document gives any indication of a prophet or "formulator" (Wallace, 1956a, 272), who may have set the movement in motion.

# 4 A "Prophet"

In the last chapter we considered the possibility that the movement reflected in the Damascus Document could have emerged out of a cultural identity crisis. It is recognized that the document contains four possible descriptions of the origins of the movement, CD 1.1-2.1, CD 2.2-13, CD 3.12b-4:12a and CD 5.20-6.11a (Hempel, 2000, 26-31). In two of these four passages we find reference to some individuals who in some way seem to relate to the early beginnings of the movement. In this chapter we shall look at these references in order to gain an understanding of how this or these individuals could be related to the movement and what their role was.

At the beginning of the Damascus Document we are introduced to a figure, *Moreh Sedek,* most often translated *Teacher of Righteousness*, who has been the center of much attention. In this chapter we shall examine the passages in the Damascus Document that contain references to *Moreh Sedek*. We shall also look at another title, *Doresh Hatorah,* often translated the *Interpreter of the Law,* who could refer to the same individual or to another person or office. (The titles for these figures will be highlighted by writing these in cursive script throughout this chapter to make it easier to locate the figures for our discussion). The possible references to these figures in the Damascus Document, with variants, can be seen in this table:

| | |
|---|---|
| מורה צדק | CD 1.11 |
| דורש התורה | CD 6.7 |
| יורה הצדק | CD 6.11 |
| דורש התורה | CD 7.18 |
| מורה היחיד | CD 20.1 |
| יורה היחיד | CD 20.14 |
| מורה | CD 20.28 |

| CD 20.32 | מורה צדק |
|---|---|
| | |

We shall analyse these references in context. Before we do so we will start with a brief look into the general scholarly discussions that have evolved from a broader group of texts from Qumran, as these either contain references to *Moreh Sedek* or have been attributed to *Moreh Sedek* for other reasons. The *Doresh Torah* will be dealt with when we look at the passage in CD 6. The reason for looking at the general discussion concerning the *Moreh Sedek* first should not be understood as indicating that the *Doresh Torah* is considered less important than the *Moreh Sedek*. The reason for choosing to deal with this matter first is that designation *Moreh Sedek* has been the reason for much speculation, which I prefer to deal with before we look at the texts. The designation *Doresh Torah* has not been the basis for speculation to the same extent and the discussions related to the *Doresh Torah* will therefore be taken as part of the study of CD 6.7 and CD 6.11.

## 4.1   Moreh Sedek

As mentioned earlier, when we considered previous literature on the Damascus Document, much thought has been centered on trying to relate the events in the text to historical events known from other sources. The interest in dating the composition rose to new heights after the discovery and publications of fragments of the Damascus Document at Qumran. Studies of the Damascus Document have played a key role in attempts to reconstruct the history of the movement reflected in the Damascus Document and in other texts found at and near Qumran, as well as attempts to reconstruct the history of the settlement at Qumran and the relationship between the settlement and the scrolls (Hempel, 1998, 3). In many studies it has been assumed that the movement reflected in the Damascus Document was the same movement

reflected in other documents found in the caves at and near Qumran, as similarities in ideology and vocabulary are noticeable (Hempel, 2000, 16). The Damascus Document, along with many other texts from Qumran, poses further difficulties in relation to attempts to relate the text to historical events because of its extensive use of code names, the so-called sobriquets that are used instead of using the real names or titles of persons. Attempts to date the Damascus Document have been done using speculations about one of these sobriquets, *Moreh Sedek*, and the account of origins in CD where this figure occurs (Collins, 2009, 23-25). Much research has also been undertaken trying to place *Moreh Sedek* historically, often involving speculations on whether he resided at Qumran. To find out who he was and when he lived other texts from Qumran have been used (VanderKam, 1990, 210). *Moreh Sedek* is only mentioned in a few of the other texts found at Qumran: in four of the pesharim, of which two are very fragmentary, so we are left with references in Pesher Habakuk and a Psalms Pesher (1QpHab, 4QpPs$^a$). The Damascus Document and these four texts of the pesharim thus contain the only references to this figure. It has, however, been assumed by a number of scholars that this teacher either wrote some of the hymns of the Hodayot or that he might be the person referred to as "I" in these compositions (Lim, 2002, 75-77). The authorship of these hymns is very much debated, and the hymns do not mention or supply any information about *Moreh Sedek* (Ulfgård, 1998, 313). The supposition that *Moreh Sedek* was the author of some or all of the hymns in the Hodayot was discarded by Holm-Nielsen as speculative (Holm-Nielsen, 1960, 316-331). Harkins provides a thorough study of the assumptions that have been made linking *Moreh Sedek* to the Hodyaot (Harkins, 2012a, 2-23) in which she calls the Hodayot anonymous and states that they

> have no ancient attributions that associate them in any way with the alleged figure
>
> known as the Teacher of Righteousness (Harkins, 2012a, 21).

Since Holm-Nielsen and Harkins convincingly argue that there is no factual association between the Hodayot and *Moreh Sedek* we may ask how the extensive speculations about an association have come about. In another study of the Hodyaot, Harkins reasons that these texts have been linked to *Moreh Sedek* due to a common assumption that the scrolls found at Qumran were preserved by a single community (Harkins, 2012b, 461). Harkins' study leaves no doubt that facts are obscured, and speculation leads to the risk of becoming fiction, when the scrolls found at Qumran are indiscriminately studied, as if they all belong together. This is in line with Davies, who previously pointed out that interpreting the Damascus Document as an integrated part of the Qumran scrolls poses methodological problems (Davies, 1983, 14-15). As noted earlier, Davies is an advocate of the view that the texts found in the caves at Qumran reflect more than one community (Davies, 2000, 43). Davies thus advises caution when studying the texts, particularly using sociological methods. He maintains that it is better to analyse the documents separately than to assume any kind of specific relationship between them (Davies, 2005, 76). This study takes these methodological considerations into account in that it analyses the Damascus Document separately from other texts.

Although we shall analyse the meaning of the term *Moreh Sedek* in context, as we move on to examine the texts of the Damascus Document, we shall briefly cover a discussion of a more general nature, namely whether this term refers to a particular individual or is rather the title of an office. Weingreen criticises the assumption that the title referred solely to a person mentioned in the texts from Qumran and rightly argues that it is important to discover whether this title was in reality "the normal designation of a man who wielded publicly recognized authority" (Weingreen, 1961, 162). He tries to uncover the meaning on a linguistic basis and based on evidence of the use of this title outside of Qumran circles in biblical Hebrew; and also traces usages in later rabbinic Hebrew (Weingreen, 1961, 163). Weingreen

argues that it is not a unique title coined by the writers of the texts found at Qumran, but a general official title that the writers have used in the same way as it was in use in the surrounding society (Weingreen, 1961, 173-174). Although the noun *Moreh* is generally attributed the meaning "teacher", Weingreen thinks that this translation misses an essential element of the connotation of the word. He goes on to demonstrate that the word is not limited to the academic act of teaching or expounding the *Torah*, but that the word "designates one who has the authority of putting his decisions into effect" (Weingreen, 1961, 164). The term is thus a legal term, and he explains that while the "judicial flavour of this title" is observed more distinctly from rabbinical texts, "the forensic implications are already present in both roots" in a number of passages in the Hebrew Bible (Weingreen, 1961,165). Weingreen goes on to question the rendering of *sedek,* as "righteous". He maintains that its forensic use demands a rendering of being "right" or "the one who is in the right" in a court case (Weingreen, 1961, 166). He maintains that this rendering is in keeping with examples from the Hebrew Bible. As an example, he explains how it is used in Leviticus 19:36 to denote scales and measurements that are accurate or "true" (Weingreen, 1961, 167). Going back to the use in the Hebrew Bible of the hiphil participle, *moreh*, Weingreen argues that the hiphil form of the verb is used distinctly in a forensic sense (Weingreen, 1961, 171-172). Thus, judicial authority is central to the title, as is the authority to make halakhic rulings. Weingreen concludes that it is unlikely that the term *moreh sedek* was minted by writers at Qumran, as the term was an official title in use in society (Weingreen, 1961, 174). Reeves has made a later analysis of the term *moreh sedek.* His concern is particularly that the use of the common translation *Teacher of Righteousness* could lead to misunderstandings in Christian scholarship, as the use of the term "righteousness" may be associated with the use of the term in Pauline teachings, according to which "righteousness" can be imparted as a gift apart from

the law (Romans 3:21 and 28). Reeves asserts that the Torah was central to the ideology presented in the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the *moreh sedek* referred to in the Dead Sea Scrolls would not pronounce a "righteousness apart from the law" (Reeves, 1988, 292). This is an important point to be made. Concerning *moreh* Reeves maintains that in the Hebrew Bible it refers to a teaching function of a priest or prophet, but that the word has undergone a semantic transformation, which is evident in the later parts of the Hebrew Bible and in rabbinic Hebrew, "wherein the word comes increasingly to refer to priestly, halakhic pronouncements" (Reeves, 1988,293). Weingreen and Reeves thus agree on the central issues and particularly on the fact that the title is a title of authority in halakhic pronouncements.

In line with the arguments of Weingreen and Reeves, Stegeman has argued that the title *Moreh Sedek* refers to the authority of pronouncing halakhic announcements and, because of this, he suggests that the title refers to a high priest and he is convinced that *Moreh Sedek* must have held the office of High Priest at some point (Stegemann, 1998, 148). Stuckenbruck explains how this has become a widespread assumption. As the Psalms Pesher, and possibly also the Habakkuk Pesher, identifies this person as a priest, it has been speculated that he was a high priest and attempts have been made to identify him with various high priests known from other sources (Stuckenbruck, 2007, 75-80). Interestingly Ginzberg suggested that *Moreh Sedek* ought to be identified with a high priest long before the *pesharim* texts were found in the caves at Qumran (Ginzberg, 1970, 219). It is important to note that there is no evidence that the *Moreh Sedek* was ever a high priest, as Collins rightly asserts (Collins, 2010b, 123). These discussions of whether he might have been acting High Priest at some point will not be taken up here, as it is not relevant for our purposes.

What is important to note from the discussion above, however, is that *Moreh Sedek* may have been a title in general use. A title of authority to promulgate halakhic pronouncements, possibly even to the degree of possessing the authority to render competing rulings void. As we move on, we shall try to evaluate any indications that the figure referred to in the text as *Moreh Sedek* had such a role.

## 4.2    CD 1.11

We are now going to look at the first passage in the Damascus Document that has mention of the *Moreh Sedek*. The mention of the figure in the first column of the Damascus Document comes at the end of a passage that was analyzed in chapter three (3.1.2). We discovered how the present time was perceived as an evil time. The evil time had followed the time of the Babylonian exile, which somehow loomed large in the consciousness of the writer in such a way that the passage could be said to be pervaded with an exilic consciousness (Collins, 2010a, 35). However, in CD 1.7 there is a shift, as God is said to have caused an emergence of a shoot of a planting to sprout in order to possess his land. Scholars have taken the shoot of the planting to be a description of the emergence of the movement reflected in the document and taken the following text (CD 1:8-11) to describe some of the earliest history of this movement, to an extent that Hempel states is "universally agreed" (Hempel, 2013, 146 and Hempel, 1999, 321, Tiller, 1997). Although we have covered CD 1.7-10 at the beginning of the last chapter (3.1.2), we shall start at CD 1.7 in order to study the *Moreh Sedek* in context.

The passage in question is attested to in CD 1.7-11a, which corresponds to some very fragmentary variants in 4Q266 2 i 11-15 and 4Q268 1 14-16 which do not preserve the reference to *Moreh Sedek,* and we do not know whether they contained it. Hebrew text (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1997):

| | |
|---|---|
| 7 פקדם ויצמח מישראל ומאהרן שורש מטעת לירוש | 7 he (God) visited them and caused a shoot of the planting to sprout from Israel and from Aron, in order to possess |
| 8 את ארצו ולדשן בטוב אדמתו ויבינו בעונם וידעו כי | 8 his land and to become fat with the good things of his soil. And they considered their iniquity and they knew that |
| 9 אשימים הם ויהיו כעורים וכימגששים דרך | 9 they were guilty men and had been like the blind and like those groping for the way |
| 10 שנים עשרים ויבן אל אל מעשיהם כי בלב שלם דרשוהו | 10 twenty years. But God considered their deeds, that they had sought Him with an undivided heart |
| 11 ויקם להם מורה צדק להדריכם לבו | 11 and raised up for them a teacher of righteousness, in order to direct them in the way of his heart. |

These people are said to have considered their own iniquity and identified themselves as guilty and blind. This part of the text has generally been seen as a self-confession of the people in the movement reflected in the Damascus Document. The impression we get from this passage in the text, that they were blind until they were shown a way by the Teacher, is clearly the viewpoint of those who accepted his teachings and only those, as Hempel rightly points out (Hempel, 1999, 321). Campbell mentions the reference to Deut 28:29, in which blindness is taken to be a curse of the covenant, meaning a judgment subsequent to breaking the covenant. He also notes the relation to Isa 59:10, in which blindness is tantamount to sin and unrighteousness (Campbell, 1995, 57-58). In CD 1.9 it is stated that they were "groping for the way": an allusion to the Isaian term "way" is noted here (Blenkinsopp, 2006, 178-185). In CD 1.11 we are told that the *Moreh Sedek* was sent by God "in order to direct them in the way of his heart". Wise maintains that this expression, or sometimes "the Way of your Heart", is a characteristic personal expression related to the Teacher and that "the Teacher several times uses it to describe his legal teaching as a whole" (Wise, 2010, 106). In itself this statement fits well into the assumption above that this person had authority in halakhic rulings. CD 1.8b-9 is mainly a self-confession of sin and of having been under the curse of the

covenant. These circumstances are described as having changed after twenty years; again this may not be literal, but possibly an allusion to half of the time Israel spent in the desert before entering the land.

Davies maintains that the most significant redaction that has taken place in the Admonition is found in CD 1.1-2.1. He believes that an original discourse from an earlier tradition "has been distorted by means of chronological and other insertions" (Davies, 1983, 199), and he suggests that the reference to the Teacher in CD 1.11 has been inserted as part of a revision done at Qumran (Davies, 1983, 200). The argument posed by Davies that the notion of *Moreh Sedek* in this passage is an insertion as part of a revision has been disputed by Boyce, whose thesis concerns poetry in the Damascus Document. Boyce claims that CD 1.9-11, which he terms the second strophe contains no glosses, and he is absolutely convinced that the reference to *Moreh Sedek* is part of the original text (Boyce, 1988, 33-34). Boyce makes a convincing argument, and it seems likely that we may work under the assumption that the notion of *Moreh Sedek* is not an insertion, a point which carries some importance when we move on to study CD 6.

However, as Davies introduces the idea that an earlier discourse "has been distorted by means of chronological and other insertions", we need to consider some core issues about the text and to dig a bit deeper to understand the term *Moreh Sedek* as used in the text of the Damascus Document. Trying to use the Damascus Document as a historic source, even when it is analysed separately from other texts, is problematic. Grossman explains how early scholarship tended to either take the historical expressions within the text literally or to dismiss them as literary invention. Grossman maintains that this generates difficulties, as the method does not take into account the larger ideological framework of the text (Grossman,

2002, 6-10). Concerning attempts to impose a chronological understanding of time on the Damascus Document, we have noted that Campbell attests that there is an ambiguity in some of the descriptions in the texts, "so that it is not always clear who is being talked about nor when", which he considers an indication that "the writer thought that one age is much the same as any other" and that this "timeless state of affairs" provides the logic for the author of the text to connect the recent history to that of the distant past (Campbell, 1995, 208). Grossman and Campbell make some important observations here. We cannot expect the Damascus Document to inform us of a chronological development of the movement reflected in the text and we may even find it difficult at times to distinguish between what could be seen as a reflection of the movement and what relates to a distant past.

In the previous chapter we have already seen examples of how the text in the Damascus Document is saturated with biblical allusions. Campbell speaks of a nexus of biblical texts appearing throughout the document (Campbell, 1995, 41) Similarly, Goldman claims that her analysis of the admonition of the Damascus Document "reveals a string of *pesher* units organised around one leitmotif", which she considers to be closely related to our topic of the Teacher, namely "the controversy over the interpretation of the Torah" (Goldman, 2009, 193). Thus, we might expect the term *Moreh Sedek* to contain an allusion to scripture, too. The title is generally recognised by scholars as alluding to scripture, although scholars "diverge in opinion as to which passage provided the impetus for the coining of this name" (Reeves, 1988, 289). We shall have to look at suggestions of possible allusions to Hos 10:12, Isa 30:20 and Joel 3:23. A striking feature in my opinion is that all three passages are parts of texts dealing with rebellion and God's judgment and all three passages come as a promise of restoration following repentance. We shall look at this pattern in detail as we examine the passages in the Damascus Document. This pattern is the same as the pattern in CD 1.1-11 in

which the wrath of God and former rebellion is now followed by penitent people to whom

God sent the *Moreh Sedeh*. Hosea shares more points of contact with CD 6.12 and will be

dealt with in the next section when we discuss CD 6, but we shall have a look at the other two

passages here.

In Joel the judgment of God had come in the form of a locust plague and possibly a foreign

invasion is also referred to in chapter two, although it could still be the locusts that Joel is

referring to as an army. Joel prophesies that if people call a fast and repent then God will deal

with the enemy and then in 2:23. Hebrew text, (Westminster Leningrad Codex):

| כִּי־נָתַן לָכֶם אֶת־הַ ֹּורֶה לִצְדָקָה וַיּֽוֹרֶד לָכֶם גֶּשֶׁם ֹּורֶה וּמַלְקוֹשׁ בָּרִאשֽׁוֹן | "he has given the early rain for your vindication" (RSV) "For he has given you the teacher for righteousness" (Boyce, 1988, 34) |
|---|---|

Boyce rightly comments that although the first part is usually translated: "he has given the

early rain for your vindication" (RSV), It could also be translated: "For he has given you the

teacher for righteousness" (Boyce, 1988, 34). However, the following clearly indicates that

the verse in Joel concerns the rains: "he has poured down for you abundant rain, the early and

the latter rain, as before" (RSV). Boyce is right in so far as to show the allusion is there: this

play on words could thus be said to shift the focus from "rain" to "teacher" in CD 1:11a. This

is a widely accepted view (Brooke, 2017,14). The allusion does, however, keep its reference

to "rain", as it connects with the text of CD 1.7, which refers to God's intervention as a plant

sprouting and taking possession in the Land. Deuteronomy 11:14 contains a promise that, if

the people listen to the Torah and love the Lord with all their heart, then God will send the

early rain and the latter rain and make the land fruitful. Allen maintains that Deuteronomy

11:13-15 and Leviticus 26:3-4 form the background for Joel 2:23. He contends that covenant

relationship with God, on which the blessings in Deuteronomy and Leviticus depend, had

been broken due to the sin of the people and calamity had resulted. Joel then promises that repentance from sin would result in restoration of the covenant relationship with God, and that this would manifest as the gift of rain (Allen, 1976, 92-93). I consider it likely that Deuteronomy 11:14 and Leviticus 26:3-4 form the background for the prophecy in Joel as well as the text of CD 1.7-11. In Joel and in CD 1 the law has not been kept, but in both cases repentance from sin forms the background for the renewed blessing, as the covenant relationship is restored.

The exegesis of Isa 30:20 on the other hand leaves us with a clear reference to a teacher, not rain (Westminster Leningrad Codex and ESV):

| ונתן לכם אדני להם לחם צר ומים לחץ ולֹא יכנף עוד מוריך והיו עיניך ראות את מוריך | And though the Lord gives you the bread of adversity and the water of affliction, yet your Teacher will not hide himself any more, but your eyes shall see your Teacher. |
| --- | --- |

Isa 30:1-17 concerns the rebellion of Judah against the Assyrians and the fact that the people of Judah put their trust in Egypt instead of trusting the Lord for protection. The rebellion is therefore described just as much as a rebellion against God (Webb, 1996, 126-127). Although the scene is shifted in this passage by the arrival of the Teacher, the following verses in Isaiah, particularly verse 23, concerns the rains that will come and make the land fruitful as a consequence of God's intervention and therefore shares the theme with the passage in Joel 2:23. It should furthermore be noted that verse 20 does not promise that the time of the Teacher will be an easy time, affliction and the time of the Teacher seem to coincide in the verse. This poses a parallel to CD 1. 1-11 in which the time in which the Teacher arrived is described as an evil era.

We have noted in this section that the *Moreh Sedeh* is a title derived from scripture and that the title needs to be understood exegetically. The passage is dealing with rebellion and God's judgment and a promise that repentance would lead to restoration of the covenantal relationship between God and his people. One of the covenantal promises of blessing is the promise of rain and resulting fruitfulness of the land. Since *Moreh* could mean rain as well as Teacher, this play on words places the *Moreh Sedeh* in a position in the text in which he could be seen as God's provision for restoration of the broken covenant. Following his teachings would bring back the blessings and the fruitfulness of the land.

## 4.3  CD 6.7b-11a

The references in CD 6 that we shall look at come as a continuation of the "well midrash" that we dealt with in chapter three. In the well midrash the law is likened to a well that needed to be dug out in order for it to provide water, in the same way the law needs knowledgeable interpretation in order to be understood. We left the passage at CD 6.7 and will continue from there. CD 6.7b- 11a. Hebrew text (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1997):

| | |
|---|---|
| 7 והמחוקק הוא דורש התורה אשר | 7 And the staff is the Interpreter of the Torah, of whom |
| 8 אמר ישעיה מוציא כלי למעשיהו *vacat* ונדיבי העם הם | 8 Isaiah said: *(Isa 54:16)* he who produces a tool for his work *vacat* and the nobles of the people, they are |
| 9 הביא לכרות את הבאר במחוקקות אשר חקק המחוקק | 9 those who came to dig the well with the staves that the staff decreed |
| 10 להתהלך במה בכל קץ הרשיע וזולתם לא ישיגו עד עמד | 10 to walk in them in the whole age of wickedness and without which they will not obtain it, until arises |
| 11 יורה הצדק באחרית הימים | 11 he who shall teach justice at the end of days |

The same biblical references underlying CD. 1:11 form the background to CD 6:11, but particularly the reference to Hos 10:12 (Campbell, 1995, 98). Hos. 10:12c, Westminster Leningrad Codex and ESV:

| עַד־יָבוֹא וְיֹרֶה צֶדֶק לָכֶם | that he may come and rain righteousness upon you |

The notion of a title, *Doresh Torah* in CD 6.7 is also found in CD 7.18-19 and 4Q Florelegium 1.11 and in the S tradition, but Hempel notes that there are "subtle distinctions in the use of the title" between S, D and Florelegium, as well as within D itself. However, Hempel also notes that the title is mentioned in an exegetical context in all the different passages which present the *Doresh Torah,* "as if the title itself was derived from scripture" (Hempel, 2003,66). The passage we are considering at present could be seen as another description of the origins of the movement reflected in the Damascus Document (Hempel, 2000, 30). In this passage the *Doresh Torah* is presented as a legislator who decrees the legislation for the whole age of wickedness. The process of interpretation of the Torah in order to legislate is likened to digging a well to bring forth the water from the ground. When examining CD 1:11, we noted the allusion to Joel 2:23, which could be interpreted as relating to a Teacher figure or to the rains coming from heaven to nourish the land. In both passages the blessings of righteous teaching is likened to water, in CD 1:11 to water being poured down and in CD 6.7-11 to water that needs to be dug up from the ground.

This passage fits well into what we have identified as the domain of the *Moreh Sedek,* namely the domain of Torah interpretation. But do we actually find references to this figure in this passage? In CD 6.7 we read of the *Doresh Torah* and in CD 6.11 we read of *Joreh Sedek*, whom we shall refer to as *he who shall teach justice at the end of days*. Are any of these synonymous to the *Moreh Sedek* of CD1.11? There has been much discussion on this topic. Davies noted that most scholars before him had assumed that the *Doresh Torah* was identical with *Moreh Sedek* of CD 1.11 (Davies, 1983,123). This view was followed by subsequent scholars (e.g., Knibb, 1990, 52; Collins, 1995, 102-102, Maier, 1996, 26). Davies maintains

that the *Doresh Torah* was placed at the origin of the movement according to this passage, whereas his understanding of CD 1.11 is that the *Moreh Sedek* comes to an already existing community, and Davies assumes that the two are therefore distinct; on the other hand Davies consider that *he who shall teach justice at the end of days* is a future figure (Davies, 1983, 124). Davies' interpretation of CD 1.11 relates to his chronological understanding of the events in CD 1 mentioned above. To me it seems reasonable to see CD 1.11 as referring to *Moreh Sedek*, as somebody related to the beginning of the movement reflected in the Damascus Document and likewise to understand the reference in CD 6:11 to the *Doresh Torah* as a reference to the beginning of the same movement, in which case we could be dealing with the same figure in both of these texts. García Martínez, who supports the viewpoint that the *Doresh Torah* in CD 6.7 is identical with *Moreh Sedek* of CD 1.11, maintains that in CD 1.11 he is a figure of the past, whereas *he who shall teach justice at the end of days* in CD 6.11 clearly refers to an eschatological figure (García Martínez, 2010, 234). Although *Doresh Torah* in CD 6.7 is clearly a figure of the past, Fraade refers to 4Q Florilegium (4Q174 1 10-13) and CD 7.18 as references made to the *Doresh Torah* as an eschatological figure (Fraade, 1993, 62). Collins has grappled with the question of how these titles are related and reached a conclusion that exposes how complicated this discussion is:

> This usage suggests that such titles as Interpreter of the Law and Teacher of Righteousness could be variously used to refer to figures past or future, and that they are interchangeable (Collins, 1995,104).

This conclusion seems to infer that we are dealing with titles that do not necessarily refer to only one person, as a name would. This brings us back to Weinberg's suggestion that *Moreh Sedek* could have been an official title, signifying his office (Weingreen, 1961, 173-174), and we may suggest the same could be said about the *Doresh Torah*. However, Fraade is

convinced that the *Doresh Torah* could never refer to the *Moreh Sedek*, as the verb *doresh* is never used in conjunction with the Teacher and in CD 20.31-33 the Teacher is seen to be the "source of the first rules", but according to Fraade "he is never claimed to be the source of the later laws" (Fraade,1993, 62). This view was already promoted by Davies, who furthermore presupposed that the "first rules" were no longer in use but had been superseded; an assumption I can find no support for in the text (Davies, 1983, 197). Fraade furthermore maintains that the interpretive undertakings of the Teacher are only mentioned in respect to the prophetic books in 1QpHab 2.7-10 and 6.15-7.5 (Fraade, 1993, 62). Fraade's viewpoints are too narrow in scope. First of all I am not convinced that CD 20.31-33 express that the Teacher was the source of the "first rules", as it is my impression that the use of "first" in the Damascus Document generally refers to matters or persons long ago, often in what we now term biblical times ("forefathers": CD 1.4 and 16, CD 3.10, CD 4.9, CD 6.2, CD 8.17 and CD 19.29; "first" e.g., visitation: CD 5.19, CD 7.21, CD 19.11). I therefore maintain that the "first laws" must refer to laws from a distant past, including laws we now term biblical laws; in other words, not laws we can attribute to the *Moreh Sedek,* who is described in CD 1 as a more recent person than the forefathers. It is important to notice that Fraade's idea of the antithetical "first laws" as opposed to "later laws", does not originate in the text, as the notion "later laws" is not found in the text. Furthermore, we have no knowledge of whether or not the *Moreh Sedek* could have been the source of what Fraade terms "later laws", which I take to refer to the laws of the Damascus Document and possibly laws in other related texts from Qumran. This point is in agreement with Fraade, who specifies that nowhere do we find an explicit claim that the *Moreh Sedek* composed the laws of the Damascus Document, but that reference is found in the *pesharim* to the specific skill of interpreting prophecy attributed to the *Moreh Sedek.* However, I would say that this specifically stated skill of interpreting

prophecy does not by definition exclude that he was equally skilled in interpreting the Torah. We need to remember that the way in which we classify only some scripture as prophecy today is different to the way it was perceived when the Damascus Document was written. Campbell thus asserts that the Torah "was the foundation of Second Temple Judaism" and that "Moses was viewed as a prophet and the Torah as the prophetic work *par excellence*" (Campbell, 1995,16-17). The distinction between Torah and prophecy is also blurred by the fact that the prophetic books contain ethical pronouncements and that these were read as exhortations to live virtuous lives, and Barton notes that in the second temple period prophetic books might be "cited in support of some particular piece of halakhah" (Barton, 2007, 155). Jassen has shown that the books of the biblical prophets are used as a source of legal interpretation in the Damascus Document as well, as prophetic scriptures are used as proof texts even in the legal part of the document (Jassen, 2014, 216-246). I would therefore argue that it is possible to consider the role of the *Moreh Sedek* to have been the role of an interpreter of prophetic scripture, including the writings of Moses, in which case he could be identical to the *Doresh Torah* in CD 6.7.

What Fraade has to say about the *Doresh Torah* concerns the way in which this figure is displayed in CD 6.7b-11a as God's tool, an instrument

> who has prescribed the rules by which the community members open the 'well' and according to which they conduct themselves through the present age of wickedness (Fraade, 1993, 61).

Fraade thus considers the role of the *Doresh Torah* to be prescribing rules that can sustain the movement and guide them throughout the present evil age, until the future figure, *he who shall teach justice at the end of days,* shall arise (Fraade, 1993, 61). Fraade's convincing

analysis of the role of the *Doresh Torah* in this passage underscores that the rules prescribed by the *Doresh Torah* were intended as a practical guide to right conduct, which needed to be followed in order to get safely through the present evil age and be ready for the time in which *he who shall teach justice at the end of days* shall arise. The notion that the *Doresh Torah* prescribed rules that were intended as a practical guide to right conduct does sound similar to the role of the *Moreh Sedek* in CD 1.11, in which the role of this figure was to lead his followers in the way of God's heart. However, what about Fraade's argument that that the *Doresh Torah* could never refer to the *Moreh Sedek* as he contends that the verb, *doresh,* is never used in conjunction with the Teacher? Fraade's argument is convincing, as long as we have no reason to give in order to explain why different terms are used for the same person.

Boyce has endeavored to explain the matter. He studied the composite nature of the Damascus Document with particular reference to poetry and has divided the Damascus Document according to genres into what he terms poetical section, redactional material and midrashic material. On this basis he concluded that the title *Doresh Torah* refers to the same figure, which is in some parts of the text called *Moreh Sedek.* He contends that the author of the poetical parts of the Admonition used the title *Moreh Sedek,* whereas the preference of the author of the (later) midrashic sections was to use the title *Doresh Torah* (Boyce, 1988, 187-193). I would therefore argue that it seems likely that these titles refer to the same role. We may note, however, that whereas *Moreh Sedek* of CD1.11 was depicted as solely responsible for leading the blind people in the right way, the *Doresh Torah* of CD 6.7, although seemingly the core person in the process of digging, was digging the well together with others. The passage in CD 6.7-11 thus adds a new nuance, as it speaks of somebody who taught others to dig in order to obtain water, not just somebody who had to carry on digging

up water for others, if they were to obtain water to drink. It thus seems possible that this refers to the *Doresh Torah* as making disciples rather than merely teaching a group of people.

We shall now have a closer look at the figure who is listed as *he who shall teach justice at the end of days.* A proposal was made by Schechter (Schechter, 1910) that has had some following, that *he who shall teach justice at the end of days* is the *Moreh Sedek* who has died but will return at the end of days. As there are no other known sources that predict such a thing, Collins duly argues that this suggestion is speculative (Collins, 2009, 44). Davies, drawing on his work on the redaction of the Damascus Document, has suggested that an older text bore reference to *he who shall teach justice at the end of days,* and that the *Moreh Sedeh* was inserted into CD 1.11 after the people in the movement believed the *Moreh Sedeh* to be the expected *"he who shall teach justice at the end of days".* However, as we noted when analysing CD 1.11, Boyce makes a convincing argument, and it seems likely that we may work on the assumption that the notion of *Moreh Sedek* is not a insertion (Boyce, 1988, 33-34). Davies indicates that the *Doresh Torah* "inaugurates the epoch" and *he who shall teach justice at the end of days* "terminates it", which in reality places the latter as a Messianic candidate (Davies, 1988b, 313-317). I do not consider the solution proposed by Davies very likely, as the Damascus Document conveys that the present era is an age of wickedness, not a Messianic era. Steudel has done a thorough examination of the *end of days* concept in the Qumran literature and she affirms that the concept that evolves unambiguously is that the present time was evil. The present time could also be referred to as the *end of days* (Steudel, 1993, 225-246). However, at the end of the *end of days* the final judgment of God "would destroy all evil, whereas the pious would destroy all evil and live in everlasting glory" (Steudel, 2000, 84).

We have discussed the relationship between the title *Doresh Torah* and the title *Moreh Sedek* of CD 1.11 and argued that it seems likely that these titles refer to the same role. It is not important for our purposes whether the *Doresh Torah* of CD 6.7 and the *Moreh Sedek* of CD1.11 were distinct or the same person, as their role as Torah expositors seem similar in nature and they both are figures of the past. It seems clear, however, that *he who shall teach justice at the end of days* is a future figure, possibly messianic in nature.

## 4.4   CD 19.35-20.1 and CD 20.14

The final passages containing reference in some way to the Teacher are all in Ms B appearing in some passages related to traitors and covenant and traitors. The passages in their entirety will therefore be dealt with later, in chapters five and seven respectively, but we shall cover the references to the Teacher here. In CD 19.35-20.1 and CD 20.14 we read references to a time period. Hebrew text (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1997):

| | |
|---|---|
| 19.35-20.1 מיום האסף מורה היחיד  /היחד* | From the day of the gathering in of the Unique Teacher<br>and from the day of the gathering in of the Unique Teacher |
| 20.14 ומיום האסף יורה היחיד   /היחד* | |

A straightforward translation could be: "From the day of the gathering in of the Unique Teacher", but assuming a variant emendation*, which is often favoured, it could equally well be translated "of the Community" (Knibb, 1990, 51). Fitzmyer uses the translation "Teacher of the Community" in an article which takes up the debate of what "gathering in" is supposed to mean. He explains that the general understanding of the meaning has been that the Teacher died or was gathered to his fathers. According to Fitzmyer, this understanding has been gained by parallel use in the Hebrew Bible (Fitzmyer, 1992, 224). This way of understanding the text has been challenged by Wacholder, who maintains that the use of *he'aseph* should be

understood as the *assembling* of the community by the *Moreh* (Wacholder, 1988). Fitzmyer

argues convincingly that this is not possible grammatically, as what we see in CD is a *Nip'al*,

which has a reflexive meaning: "gather oneself". Fitzmyer argues that Wacholder is

translating, "making a *Nip'al* function as a *Qal* and making it implicitly govern an accusative.

That, however, is inadmissible" (Fitzmyer, 1992, 228). Fitzmyer in this way argues

convincingly for the fact that the text of CD in these passages is referring to the death of

*Moreh Sedek.* Fitzmyer's argument has since won general acceptance (Eshel, 1999, 330).

It could possibly be because the *Teacher* had died that the following references only mention

the importance of listening to the Teacher's voice: CD 20.28 and 32. Hebrew text (García

Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1997):

| 28 וישמעו לקול מורה<br>32 והאזינו לכול מורה צדך | and listen to the voice of the Teacher<br>and they lend their ears to the voice of the<br>Teacher of Righteousness. |
|---|---|

Apart from the fact that these expressions seem to underline the importance of the Teacher

and particularly his voice or teachings, it is also possible to understand the reference to his

voice only as reference to a collective memory of the Teacher, who has died. Jokiranta has

raised the subject of collective memory in relation to the Teacher. Her study is based on

theories of social identity. She explains the centrality of a sense of continuity in identity

building of a group and raises the issue of "collective memory", as she argues that the

memory of the Teacher posits a link to the group's past (Jokiranta, 2006, 263), but likewise

that his utterances live on "in the movement that held the divinely trusted vision" (Jokiranta,

2013, 181). García Martinéz takes this further, as he suggests that the notion of the voice of

the Teacher in some texts is related to what he terms "authority-conferring strategies" used to

provide the movements own compositions with an authority similar to the authority of Moses or the prophets (García Martinéz, 2010, 230).

From these passages of the text we realised that the *Moreh Sedek* must have died at some point and that a "collective memory" of him and his teachings posits a link to the movement's past. The exhortation to listen to his voice could furthermore express a strategy to render authoritative status to the text.

## 4.5  Defining a "Prophet"

In this section we shall discuss the question of whether the *Moreh Sedek* could be said to have been a prophet. Jassen has asked the question of what may have constituted prophecy in Qumran literature and who would have been considered a prophet. He rightly argues that in order to ask such a question we first need to define what we mean by prophecy. Jassen centers his definition around the word transmission. He states that a prophet is a person who claims to have received divine revelation, but he also claims that a prophet can be distinguished from other alleged recipients of divine revelation due to "his or her status as spokesperson to a larger body of people" (Jassen, 2008, 300). Jassen notes that, although it has been widely argued that prophecy was active in movements reflected in the Qumran scrolls, other scholars have emphasized the fact that biblical prophetic language is not applied in any of the scrolls to the *Moreh Sedek.* Nonetheless, he is described as "an inspired interpreter of ancient scripture" (Jassen, 2008, 309). Jassen argues that this could be due to a change in terminology, also seen in the writings of Josephus, in which classical prophetic language was reserved for the ancient prophets. Interestingly he notes that such language is avoided in relation to the Qumran movement(s) but used when writings concern its enemies. Jassen considers this to be a deliberate technique related to the question of access to divine revelation. Jassen notes the

prominence of *pesher* exegesis in Qumranic texts and he maintains that new patterns of prophetic ministry had emerged and were seen as a continuation of ancient prophecy. He explains that these patterns can already be traced in the book of Daniel, in which Daniel's interpretation of Jeremiah is described as a revelatory experience. This understanding is likewise found in 1QpHab. in relation to the *Moreh Sedek,* of whom it is stated in 1QpHab. 7.5 that he has obtained revelation, as "God made known all the mysteries of the words of his servants the prophets" to him (Jassen, 2008, 311-325). Jassen's position is therefore that the Teacher of Righteousness must have been "an inspired exegete" and claims that this kind of exegesis "was understood as an application of one of the new rubrics of prophecy" (Jassen, 2008, 325).

Jassen thus considers the Teacher to have been a prophet. This should be understood in the light of his definition of a prophet as a person who claims to have received divine revelation and who also acts as a spokesperson for a larger body of people. This definition of a prophet does indeed fit the little we know about the *Moreh Sedek,* as he is claimed to have received revelation of the meaning of certain prophecies, and he has passed on his knowledge to the members of the movement reflected in the Damascus Document. Jassen's evaluation that forms of revelatory exegesis were seen as a continuation of ancient prophecy, and that the *Moreh Sedek* therefore must have been seen as a prophet, seems plausible in the light of 1QpHab. 7.5, in which he is acclaimed with direct divine revelation of the meaning of the prophecy. Similar viewpoints to Jassen's on revelatory exegesis had been voiced earlier by Barton, who terms the kind of exegesis used in 1QpHab. "charismatic exegesis" (Barton, 2007, 182) and by Fishbane, who in relation to this kind of exegesis in biblical books, e.g., Daniel, terms this kind of exegesis "mantological" (Fishbane, 1988, 444).

## 4.6   Conclusion

We have discussed the role of the *Moreh Sedek* and the *Doresh Torah* and noted that the titles possibly refer to the same person, and that their roles as Torah exegetes seem to be very similar. Some of the difficulties in establishing any certainty about this relates to the fact that the information we have about these figures is quite sparse. We established that the role of both figures related to interpretation of revered scripture. In the 1QpHab. it is explicitly stated that *Moreh Sedek* is a skilled interpreter of prophecy; and we have discussed that these skills probably included interpretation of other revered scripture such as the Torah. We have furthermore noted that, if a prophet is defined as a person who claims to have received divine revelation and who shares or transmits this revelation to a larger group of people, then the *Moreh Sedek* would qualify as a prophet. We do not know whether the *Moreh Sedek* or the *Doresh Torah* had had any dreams or revelations, but the revelatory expositions of Moses and the prophets given by them were understood to be authoritative. It is thus possible to understand the *Moreh Sedek* and the *Doresh Torah* as such a "prophet" of the movement reflected in the Damascus Document.

We shall now return to the writings of Wallace concerning Revitalization Movements and see if this model can help us gain a fresh perspective on the *Moreh Sedek* and the *Doresh Torah.* Wallace specifies that a Revitalization Movement is usually conceived and initiated by what he terms the "formulator". This word is used because the "formulator" is taking the lead in formulating the code, the laws or blueprint for an ideal society. Wallace also refers to this person as a "prophet". That term is used by Wallace to describe an individual who claims he has had visions or encounters with a supernatural being and who goes on to share these with others in his society (Wallace, 1956a, 271). Wallace's definition is similar in nature to Jassen's definition of a prophet above, as Jassen states that a prophet is a person who claims

to have received divine revelation, but that a prophet can be distinguished from other alleged recipients of divine revelation due to "his or her status as spokesperson to a larger body of people" (Jassen, 2008, 300). Wallace contends that in some cases the individual has had no vision but a similarly defining moment of insight and inspiration, which has led to a changed life (Wallace, 1956a, 270). However, he maintains that most often a religious revitalization movement has been conceived in one or more

> visions by a single individual. A supernatural being appears to the prophet-to-be, explains his own and his society's troubles as being entirely or partly a result of the violation of certain rules, and promises individual and social revitalization if the injunctions are followed and the rituals practiced, but personal and social catastrophe if they are not (Wallace, 1956a, 270).

By comparing the *Moreh Sedek* and the *Doresh Torah* to Wallace's account of a prophet, we realise that their radical message could be seen as a reaction to cultural changes in the society in which the movement evolved. This gives us an explanation as to why the *Moreh Sedek* and the *Doresh Torah* emphasised that the laws of God were not being followed and that the way people lived needed to change, or else catastrophe would follow. In other words, we gain an understanding of how social change may have affected religious change. Wallace states that the task of a prophet is "to revive a traditional culture now fallen into desuetude" (Wallace, 1956, 275). Similarly, we noted that desire for societal change reflected in the text was a pursuit of old virtues, not an appeal for change into something new.

The *Moreh Sedek* mentioned in CD 1.11 seems to have died before the Damascus Document reached its current, final form. After his death the memory of his voice and his teachings carried on, but the text tells us very little about him. This has been a puzzle to scholars. If this

teacher had been an important person, why was so little written about him? By comparing the *Moreh Sedek* to Wallace's paradigm, we realise that the reason could have been that his role had only been to instigate a movement. According to Wallace, this kind of person would not lead a movement for long; rather he would fan this spark into a fire and let his disciples carry the work forward (Wallace, 1956a, 273). This could explain why the *Moreh Sedek* had left a vague memory only. As a figure of the (distant) past, he is revered, and his teachings have been remembered. However, it seems that after he died, his work has been carried on by others in the movement that he launched.

In this chapter we also noted aspects relating to genre. We recognized that the use of allusions to scripture and exegetical passages are comprehensive. The title, *Doresh Torah,* is mentioned in an exegetical context in all the passages presenting this figure. Likewise, the term *Moreh Sedek* contains allusions to scripture: Hos 10:12, Joel 2:23 and Isa 30:20. These three passages are parts of texts dealing with rebellion and God's judgment and all three passages come as a promise of restoration following repentance. The allusions in Joel 2:23 and Isa 30:20 furthermore contain a double meaning: "teacher" and "rain". In Isa 30:20 affliction and the time of the Teacher seem to coincide. This poses a parallel to CD 1. 1-11 in which the time in which the Teacher arrived is described as an evil era.

In the next chapter we shall look at parts of the text that concern the message of the movement. What was the message that the prophet had imparted to the movement, the message which was carried forward by his followers?

# 5   The Message

In the last chapter we considered the possibility that the movement reflected in the Damascus Document may have been initiated by a person, who had a personal revelation or conviction. We discovered two possible candidates, the *Moreh Sedek* and the *Doresh Torah.* We discussed the prospect that both titles may refer to the same figure, as it is likely that the author of the poetical parts of the Admonition used the title *Moreh Sedek,* whereas the preference of the author of the midrashic sections was to use the title *Doresh Torah* (Boyce, 1988, 187-193). We discovered that in any case their roles as Torah exegetes seem to be very similar, the correct interpretation of the Torah being the central issue with reference to both individuals. The information we have about these figures is sparse and we considered the possibility that this Torah exegete would have acted mainly as an initiator, who would have taught others the message that he believed God had revealed to him and that these disciples would have been responsible for the further development of the movement. If this proposition is correct we would expect to find reflections of this in the text. However, even if this movement was not initiated by a single visionary person, the growth and maintenance of the movement would still be dependent on its members communicating their convictions to others. In this chapter we shall examine passages in the Damascus Document that concern the message of the movement. Did the movement present a hitherto new message, or was the message that the movement promoted one which had already attained currency in society?

Covenant is a central concept in the Damascus Document. Hempel states that the term covenant "occurs 44 times in the mediaeval and ancient manuscripts not including references that occur in overlapping sections" (Hempel, 2000,79). The concept is so central that Davies for example entitled his monograph about the Damascus Document, *The Damascus Covenant* (Davies, 1983). Some scholars have even suggested that the Damascus Document was written

for use as a liturgical text used at covenant renewal ceremonies (e.g., Knibb, 1987, 14; Vermes, 1998, 127). It would therefore seem useful to investigate, as the concept seems to be fundamental to the message of the movement. In the following we shall analyse a passage central to the issue, CD 3.12b-4.12a. As the passage is very long, we shall divide it into two parts for our analysis. We shall start with CD 3.12b-20a under the heading: "Covenant". In the second section we shall proceed to CD 3.20b-4.12a under the heading: "The Priests and the Levites and the Sons of Zadok", as this text comprises a narrative starting in this way. It could be argued that the latter text fits better the discussion in chapter three, as this passage indeed displays a cultural identity crisis. However, the passage in CD 3.20b-4.12a carries on the message of 3.12b-20a and I therefore decided that it was better dealt with here. It should also be noted that it has not been possible to address all the passages related to cultural identity crisis in the Damascus Document in one chapter, as the subject is pervasive.

The message of the movement included an expectation of the arrival of messiah. We shall turn to this subject towards the end of this chapter.

## 5.1   Covenant

We commence our inquiry into the movement's message on covenant with an analysis of CD 3.12b-20a. The section is preceded by a lengthy passage CD 2.14-3.12a, which begins with an exhortation to listen and walk perfectly in the ways of God and a warning not to go astray as many have in the past. (There are no corresponding remains among the scrolls found at Qumran). CD 3.12b-20, Hebrew text (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1997):

| | |
|---|---|
| 12 ובמחזיקים במצות אל | 12 But with those who adhered to the commandments of God, |
| 13 אשר נותרו מהם הקים אל את בריתו לישראל עד עולם לגלות | 13 those who were left among them, God established his covenant with Israel forever, revealing |
| 14להם נסתרות אשר תעו בם כל ישראל שבתות קדשו ומועדי *vacat* | 14 to them hidden matters in which all Israel had gone astray *vacat* his holy sabbaths, his glorious feasts |
| 15 כבודו עידות צדקו ודרכי אמתו וחפצי רצונו אשר יעשה | 15 his just testimonies and his true ways and the wishes of his will, |
| 16 האדם וחיה בהם פתח לפניהם ויחפרו באר למים רבים *vacat* | 16 which man must do in order to live by them *vacat* he opened before them and they dug a well of plentiful water |
| 17 ומואסיהם לא יחיה והם התגוללו בפשע אנוש ובדרכי נדה | 17 and those who despise them shall not live for they had defiled themselves with human sin and in unclean ways |
| 18 ויאמרו כי לנו היא ואל ברזי פלאו כפר בעד עונם וישא לפשעם | 18 and they had said, for this is ours, but God in his wondrous mysteries atoned for their iniquity and pardoned their sin |
| 19 ויבן להם בית נאמן בישראל אשר לא עמד כמהו למלפנים ועד | 19 and he built for them a sure house in Israel, whose like has not stood since past times until |
| 20 הנה המחזיקים בו לחיי נצח וכל כבוד אדם להם הוא | 20 now. Those who adhere to it will live forever and all the glory of Adam is for them |

In this passage we see that the movement defines itself in covenantal terms. In chapter 3 (3.1.2) we noted the emphasis in the Damascus Document relating to God's faithfulness in keeping the covenant, as God did not deliver the whole people up for destruction but saved a remnant (CD 1.4). On the other hand, God's wrath was incurred when his commandments were not adhered to (e.g., CD 1.17-20). We discussed the latter under the heading "The Sword" (3.2.1) recognising that the concept was particularly linked to Leviticus 26, in which "the sword", is described as "carrying out the vengeance of the covenant" as cited in CD 1.17-18, and to Deuteronomy 28-32.

The concept of covenants was familiar in the cultures surrounding ancient Israel (Taggar-Cohen, 2011, 461-488 and Raitt, 1971, 43). Baltzer has suggested that these Ancient Near

East treaties and particularly those of the Hitittes could well be seen as a model that could be used to analyse the Damascus Document. He identifies a dogmatic or historical section (CD 1.1-6.11), an ethical section (CD 6.11-7.4) and a section of blessings and curses (CD 7.4ff.). The pattern of these treaties thus explains the combination of legal and historical segments of the Damascus Document (Balzer, 1971, 112-122). But which covenant is being referred to in the Damascus Document?

Blanton maintains that the concept of covenant in the Damascus Document relies profoundly on scriptural prototypes from what is now known as the Hebrew Bible (Blanton, 2007, 38). Blanton is right about this, as we shall see as we move on. Blanton describes covenant as a "mutual obligation between the parties", but he cautions that we need sensitivity to the contexts in which we read about covenant in order to grasp its meaning in each of these contexts (Blanton, 2007, 35). Christiansen likewise asserts the dependence of the use of the term in the Damascus Document on the Hebrew Bible. She argues that in the Hebrew Bible, as well as in the Damascus Document, the term is particularly used to describe the relationship that God established in covenantal terms with his people, and she claims that in this way the term defines a community (Christiansen, 1995, 108). In Christiansen's thesis, "The Covenant in Judaism and Paul: A Study of Ritual Boundaries as Identity Markers", she states her supposition

> that the characteristic identity features of a group, the basic forms of socio-religious belonging, are mirrored by the entrance rites…[which]…express a change in social identity. Because they are rites of crossing a boundary and mark becoming part of a community, they serve as means to differentiate one group from another (Christiansen, 1995, 16).

In this way Christiansen is employing analytical tools drawn from sociological studies. Christiansen emphasises that the use of the term covenant in the Damascus Document conveys a perception of continuity, especially with the covenant at Sinai, even when the covenant is sometimes referred to as new (Christiansen, 1995, 109). However, in her survey of the use of the concept in the Book of Jubilees and the Dead Sea Scrolls, she contends that, whereas circumcision is still the most important symbol of belonging to the covenant in the Book of Jubilees, a shift of emphasis has taken place in the Damascus Document, stressing Torah obedience (Christiansen, 1995, 62-144). Thus, she maintains that, although the validity of the covenant depends on God, there is an emphasis on the human response. Christiansen considers that this in effect means that obedience determines whether one belongs to the covenant community. In this way genealogy is no longer the determining factor (Christiansen, 1995, 108). Evans agrees with Christiansen, as he states that in Qumran literature the term new covenant is never used in opposition to the old (Evans, 2003, 80), and Abegg likewise maintains that the new covenant at Qumran refers to a renewal of the old covenant (Abegg, 2003, 88-89). We shall develop our understanding of its use as we move on and analyse individual passages. We shall try to understand what message is being communicated.

The preceding passage, CD 2.14-3.12a, contains an overview of others who had gone astray in the past and were judged by God, with some exceptional individuals included. Thus "those who adhered to the commandments" (CD 3.12.b) are set up as a contrast to those who went astray in the past. The term covenant is used twice in CD 2.14-3.12: In CD 3.4 and CD 3.10. The notion in CD 3.10 clearly refers to those who disobeyed and were delivered up to the sword. Murphy-O'Connor notes an emphasis in CD 3.7-10 on the sin committed at Kadesh, when the Israelites were commanded to go up and possess the land of Canaan and disobeyed; and he rightly comments that the text seems to indicate that this sin is shared by all

subsequent generations (Murphy-O'Connor, 1970, 205-206). This emphasis on the incident at Kadesh could indicate that the only covenant referred to here is the covenant at Sinai. However, the usage of the term in CD 3.2-4 concerns Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, who are said to have been written up as friends of God and members of the covenant for ever, because they kept God's commandments. There is no mention of circumcision, although we are dealing with the Abrahamic covenant. Their friendship with God and the obedience to his commandments are here described as the essential elements of the covenantal relationship of the patriarchs with God. This is interesting given that the commandments were given to Moses, much later. However, this retrojection of knowledge of and obedience to the law to the period of the patriarchs is a familiar theme in Early Jewish Literature including in Jubilees and 11Q Temple (see eg. Najman, 2003, 56-60: Kugel, 2012, 207-220 and Himmelfarb, 2013, 96). Najman explains that the pre-Sinaitic discourse in Jubilees even includes revelations of law and rituals in a way in which "Sinai becomes a reaffirmation of earlier patriarchal revelations" (Najman, 2003, 57). Thus CD 3.2-4 is not unique in retrojecting the commandments to the time of the patriarchs. "Those who adhered to the commandments, those who were left among them" (CD 3.12.b-13a) are regarded as continuing in this relationship with God, described as an eternal covenant. CD 3.13a is very similar in meaning to the notion of remnant in CD 1.4 and 2.11. As the covenant in CD 3.2-4 concerns the patriarchs, this emphasis could make us expect that the determining boundaries of the covenant mentioned in CD 3.14 are genealogical in origin. It is therefore highly interesting that the text of CD 3.12b (and the text in CD 4.3 that we shall look at in the next paragraph) seems to echo Isa 56:2-6, as suggested by Campbell (Campbell, 1995, 81), and the expression in CD 3.12b: "those who adhered" (to the commandments), as well as the expression in CD

4.3 , "those who joined" is found in Isa 56.2b, 3a, 4b and 6. (Westminster Leningrad Codex, translation mine):

| | |
|---|---|
| 2 וּבֶן־אָדָם **יַחֲזִיק** בָּהּ שֹׁמֵר שַׁבָּת | 2 the person who **adheres to** it, who keeps the Sabbath |
| 3 וְאַל־יֹאמַר בֶּן־הַנֵּכָר **הַנִּלְוָה** אֶל־יְהוָה לֵאמֹר הַבְדֵּל יַבְדִּילַנִי יְהוָה מֵעַל עַמּוֹ | 3 Let not the foreigner **who has joined himself** to the LORD say, "The LORD will surely separate me from his people"; |
| 4 וּמַחֲזִיקִים בִּבְרִיתִי | 4 **and those who adhere** to the covenant |
| 6 וּבְנֵי הַנֵּכָר **הַנִּלְוִים** עַל־יְהוָה לְשָׁרְתוֹ וּלְאַהֲבָה אֶת־שֵׁם יְהוָה לִהְיוֹת לוֹ לַעֲבָדִים כָּל־שֹׁמֵר שַׁבָּת מֵחַלְּלוֹ **וּמַחֲזִיקִים** בִּבְרִיתִי: | 6 And the sons of the foreigners **who join themselves to** the LORD, to minister to him, to love the name of the LORD, and to be his servants, everyone who keeps the Sabbath and does not profane it, and **adhere to** my covenant |

The passage depicts those who keep justice and are blessed, and a special emphasis is laid on the observance of the sabbath. In Isa 56:2 it is stated as a general fact that any person who keeps justice will be blessed. However, in Isa 56:3-4 the foreigners and the eunuchs are specifically acknowledged; and Isa 56:6 specifically concerns the foreigners who join themselves to the Lord (Blenkinsopp, 2006, 198). Campbell's suggestion of the dependence of CD 3.12b-14 on Isa 56:2-6 seems plausible, as the passage in Isaiah shares many similarities with CD 3.12b-14, which likewise puts an emphasis on sabbath observance. The connection to Isa 56:2-6 could indicate that obedience to the commandments and observance of the sabbath determines whether one belongs to the covenant community. This is in keeping with Christiansen's suggestion that obedience determines whether one belongs to the covenant community instead of ethnicity being the determining factor (Christiansen, 1995, 108). We shall have to determine if this assumption is correct as we move on in the text. However, already in CD 3.14 we find an indication that this could be the case, as it is stated that "the hidden matters" in which "all Israel had gone astray" concerned "his holy sabbaths,

his glorious feasts". The claim that "those who adhered to the commandments" have had a revelation of the "hidden matters" in which "all Israel had gone astray" seems to indicate that those who belonged to Israel by ethnicity were not guaranteed participation in covenantal identity; rather it was by choice, as foreigners could choose to keep the sabbaths and adhere to the covenant; and vice versa Israel could fail to adhere to the covenant.

The expression "disclosing to them the hidden matters in which all Israel had gone astray" was taken by Murphy-O'Connor to mean that God's desire as expressed in his commandments were "known only to the author's group" (Murphy-O'Connor, 1970, 205). Murphy O'Connor's interpretation would mean that Torah interpretation was at the heart of the dispute between what he termed "the author's group" and "all Israel" that is said to have "gone astray". While I agree that Torah interpretation was at the heart of the dispute, I do not think that "all Israel" refers only to those who did not belong to "the author's group". I am convinced that "all Israel" means "*all* Israel". According to CD 3.13, God established his covenant with "Israel", thus "Israel" is the party with whom God made a covenant. However, "all Israel" went astray which includes "the author's group". CD 3.14a could possibly be an allusion to Isa 53:6a, in which all Israel is likened to sheep, who have gone astray. (Westminster Leningrad Codex, translation mine):

| | |
|---|---|
| כֻּלָּ֙נוּ֙ כַּצֹּ֣אן תָּעִ֔ינוּ | All we like sheep have gone astray |

If we only consider the passage we are currently analysing, this matter is not obvious, as "the author's group" is said to have "adhered to the commandments of God", which sounds as though they never strayed. Nonetheless, if we consider the recurring theme of repentance from sin in the Damascus Document, a theme that was already presented at the beginning of the Damascus Document (CD 1.8b-9), we come to understand that "the author's group" sees

itself as part of "all Israel" that strayed, and that the members of this group pose themselves to be different only in that they repented of sin and returned to the Torah of Moses (CD 15.8-10), while the rest of Israel kept straying from the covenant without repentance.

 In the Damascus Document a variety of verbs of action are used to express the dynamics of straying, returning and departing in relation to the covenant:

| | |
|---|---|
| סור, תעה | Straying |
| שוב | Returning |
| יצא | Departing |

These verbs are used in rather complex ways in relation to scripture and to each other and Grossman suggests that the tendency to complicate their usage constitutes as a discourse in itself, as the ambiguous usage reminds the reader that only with proper knowledge can one avoid "the hazards of mistaking wickedness for righteousness and thereby 'straying' in the wrong path, instead of turning to the right one" (Grossman, 2002, 184), so we shall not go into detail with this here but will take note of these verbs as we come across them in the text. However, one point worth noting here is that Grossman argues that "Israel" is a term that can "take on multiple meanings", sometimes positive sometimes negative. Grossman exemplifies this by referring to the expressions "the penitents of Israel" (CD 4.2) which refers to "the righteous", and "the straying of Israel" (CD 3.14), which refers to "the wicked" (Grossman, 2002, 196). I would contend that the term "Israel" stays neutral in these examples as the party with whom God made a covenant; and that the other terms are the qualifiers, thus "the penitents" are "the righteous" and "the straying" are "the wicked", using Grossman's terms.

Schiffman has argued along the same lines as Murphy O'Connor that the "hidden matters" refer to the movement's halakhah, the correct interpretation of the laws, while the "revealed" refer to the laws revealed to all Israel (Schiffman, 1975, 23). This is a possible interpretation,

which is aligned with our findings in the last chapter concerning *Moreh Sedekh* and *Doresh Torah.* However, it seems to me that the text in CD 3.13-14 speaks of a revelation of matters in which Israel had gone astray, rather than a revelation of how the commandments of God should be interpreted. If my interpretation is correct, the revelation that God has given to the ones "who adhered to the commandments" relates to a quest to understand what had gone wrong in their land, in Israel, similar to the emphasis in CD 1.1-2.11 in which different explanations are suggested as to why God had "hid his face from the land, from Israel". Campbell notes that CD 3:15 quotes the refrain of Ezekiel 20:11,13 and 21, and contends that Ezekiel 20 contains a negative account of the history of Israel similar to the one found in CD 1.1-2.1 (Campbell, 1995, 81). This could indicate that the storyline in CD 3.13-15 is similar to the one found in CD1.1-2.1. Campbell explains that the background for the use of the term "hidden things" and that which God has "disclosed" is found in Deut 29:28, which contains the same vocabulary. Deut 29:28 admittedly speaks of the "hidden things" belonging to God, while the "revealed" matters belong to men, so that they may obey God's commandments. Even so, Campbell maintains that the vocabulary and the storyline in Deut 29-30:7, with Deut 29:28 as its central verse, is similar to that of CD 3.10-21, as Deuteronomy 29 contains a warning from Moses admonishing the people to remain faithful to the covenant and, if they do not remain faithful, the curses of the covenant will come upon them (Campbell, 1995, 77-78). Campbell's proposition seems plausible, and Thomas explains that this juxtaposition of "hidden" and "revealed" is a common trait in Qumran literature and that the book of Daniel similarly contains statements that seem contradictory to Deuteronomy 29:28, eg. Daniel 2:22, claiming that "God reveals deep and hidden things" (Thomas, 2009, 134).

We may recall that the Torah was likened to a well in CD 6.4a, a passage we discussed in chapter three (3.2.3). In CD 3.16-17 we have another case of the testimonies of God being likened to a well. Davies maintains that this means a halakhah was established and that one of the most prominent features must have been issues relating to the calendar such as the sabbaths and the festivals, as these feature in the passage. He suggests that the choice of the verb, "open" indicates that the revelation was given by God, while the expression "they dug" signifies that the halakhah involved human cooperation (Davies, 1983,81-85). Although Davies' interpretation has possibly been influenced by the common scholarly assumptions of the time that calendric issues were central to the beliefs of the movement (Stern, 2011, 39), his interpretation seems convincing, as the text does highlight sabbaths and festivals as an area in which Israel had gone astray (Hempel, 2013, 320). Thomas draws attention to the marked interest in general in Qumran literature to matters related to calendar, festivals and cosmology. He has noted that in several texts the proper observance of festivals and the correct understanding of cosmology and cultic practices related to atonement are associated with the term "mystery" (Thomas, 2009, 235). This term, "mystery", is moreover related to other words like "wondrous and "hidden" (Thomas, 2009, 134-148). As CD 3.12b-20 is one of the passages that includes all of these features, Thomas' observations are clearly important to our study and we shall now turn to CD 3.18b and the notion of "mystery". As we shall analyse its elements in detail, the text is copied below, highlighting "in his wondrous mysteries" in bold:

| | |
|---|---|
| ואל **ברזי פלאו** כפר בעד עונם וישא לפשעם | but God **in his wondrous mysteries** atoned for their iniquity and pardoned their sin |

We shall first examine the meaning of the terms "mystery" and "wondrous", which are used in the construct here. *Raz,* the word used for "mystery" is a Persian loan word that was

incorporated into Aramaic and later into Hebrew. The term is used in Aramaic in the book of Daniel and in Hebrew in several of the texts found at Qumran (Thomas, 2009, 4-5). Thomas is not satisfied with the English translation "mystery", which he therefore uses in quotation marks, as it is loaded with meanings that make it difficult to uncover the original significance. He maintains that "mystery" in the Qumran texts carries a conceptual meaning that

> serves as a shorthand reference to a body of knowledge, to the inner transformative
>
> power of that knowledge, and to the epistemological and social dynamics of access
>
> to and exclusion from matters of "ultimate concern" (Thomas, 2009, 15).

Thomas thus expresses the idea that the way in which the term is used in Qumran texts relates to matters of profound spiritual knowledge, but also to the social dynamics this knowledge creates in the context in which it is used. In this regard Thomas discerns different discourses in which "mystery" is used, which he categorises as "prophetic, sapiential and priestly" (Thomas, 2009, 32). Thomas furthermore asserts that knowledge of the "mystery" is not limited to knowledge of law and interpretation but is associated with historical and cosmological understanding (Thomas, 2009, 135). The word "wondrous", *pele,* is also used in biblical texts and relates to acts of God related to judgment or redemption. The term is for instance used in the Exodus story, when God performed "wonders" and thereafter Pharaoh let the people go (Thomas, 2009, 136-137). According to Thomas the use of the term "mystery" in Qumran literature is associated with creation or redemption of humanity (Thomas, 2009, 144), and the construct "the wondrous mystery" reflects a revelatory context, as in CD 3.13, in which hidden things are being revealed (Thomas, 2009, 145). Thomas maintains that, although the explicit meaning of CD 3.17 is not clear, as it is not specified which sins are referred to, the emphasis is on God, who in his "wondrous mysteries" atoned for whatever sins these were (Thomas, 2009, 236). Thomas characterises this act of God as "salvific",

inasmuch as "it allowed for the continuation of the covenant in the face of ongoing iniquity" (Thomas, 2009,147). The "wondrous mysteries" is thus seen to be a profound expression of God's transformative intervention in human history, that Thomas rightly wants to distinguish from the English word "mystery".

In CD 3.17-18a we read of some who "defiled themselves" and we encounter the phrase, "it is ours". This phrase comes right before the statement that God atoned for them. Davies seeks to uncover whether those who "defiled themselves" and those whose sin was pardoned are the same group; and what the meaning of "it is ours?" could be. Davies clarifies that the phrase "it is ours?" refers to the land, and that the phrase is taken from Ezekiel 11:15. He concurs that most scholars before him maintained that the text referred to two groups, but Davies convincingly argues that "those who defiled themselves" and those whose sin was pardoned are the same group of people. Davies points out that, if we look at other scriptures related to the ideology of the land that we encounter in the Damascus Document, e.g., Leviticus 26:40f., we find a pattern of defilement and confession of sin and forgiveness, resulting in the restoration of the covenant. This illustrates that, although this group of people had "defiled themselves", it is still possible that they were referred to as those who "adhered to the covenant". Davies also maintains that the group is the same group that had earlier been likened to a shoot of a planting, who had likewise acknowledged their sin (CD 1.8). Davies thus argues that the pardoning of sins seems to depend on awareness and confession of sins. Davies substantiates his arguments by drawing attention to the coherence between CD 1.8ff. and the passage under discussion. He maintains that the discourse seems to be written with the purpose of enabling the readers to acknowledge their sin and enter into the covenant (Davies, 1983, 87-89). Davies' argument is in agreement with our previous observation that "all Israel" went astray, but "the penitents of Israel" (CD 4.2), are considered to be righteous.

Following the expression that God in his "wondrous mysteries" atoned for their sins, the text continues, stating that "he built for them a sure house in Israel". Davies explains that this could be seen as a quotation from either 1.Sam 2:35; 25:28 or 1 Kings 11:38. The first quotation relates to a priestly dynasty, the second to the promise to David of a royal dynasty, and the third to a dynasty to Jeroboam. Davies maintains that there is general scholarly agreement that it is most likely the first quotation which is alluded to in CD 3.19, as the sequel in CD 3.21 ff. refers to priests, Levites and the sons of Zadok, but not to any kings (Davies, 1983, 90). We shall look at this text next, so we will deal with that argument shortly. Suffice it to say here that the reference in 1. Sam 2:35 concerns the discontinuation of the house of the priest Eli and the promise that God will establish a trustworthy priesthood, a "sure house" that shall last. CD 3.20 reads, "those who adhere to it will live forever and all the glory of Adam is for them", and Murphy-O'Connor rightly notes that this line contrasts with CD 3.17, which reads "those who despise them shall not live". He explains the phrase in CD 3.20, stating that they "will enjoy the privileges of Adam lost by sin" (Murphy-O'Connor, 1970, 210). Boyce shares this viewpoint,but adds another perspective. He maintains that CD 3.20 concludes a poem that starts in CD 2.14 and that, following an introduction, the poem presents an historical account which takes its beginning with the Watchers in CD 2.18 and finishes with this reference to Adam. Boyce thinks that it is significant that the story does not start with Adam but with the Watchers, and he explains that the Watchers are often held responsible for man's fall in the literature of the late Second Temple period, particularly Jubilees and Enoch (Boyce, 1988, 98). Although the historical account does not begin with Adam, it finishes with Adam, "who is seen as the archetypical man, existing in the world prior to the introduction of sin, thus sinless" (Boyce, 1988, 127).

Before we move to the next section of the text, we should consider what we have found in this section. We have learned that the movement defined itself in covenantal terms. The concept relies on scriptural prototypes from what is now known as the Hebrew Bible with reference to the covenant at Sinai, but particularly with reference to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, who are said to have been friends of God and members of the covenant because they kept God's commandments. Thus, the movement did not present a hitherto new message, but one which had already attained currency in society. We sense a quest for roots, as we recognize reverence for the Patriarchs, and we have established that the movement identifies itself with the covenant of Sinai. The text alludes to Isa 56:2-6, which accentuates the importance of adhering to the commandments in order not to fail the covenantal obligations. The allusion to Isa 56:2-6 also introduces the idea that foreigners and Israelites alike may "adhere to the covenant" (Isa 56:4). We shall return to that matter in chapter six (6.4), when we are going to look at CD 14.4 in which the foreigners are mentioned as proselytes. However, the text seems to indicate that everybody has sinned, even those who are described as "adhering to the commandments" (CD 3.12b). This breach of the covenant had been dealt with by an act of God, who atoned for their sins, allowing for the continuation of the covenant in the face of ongoing iniquity. Following the atoning act of God, God established a "sure house", possibly referring to a new priesthood. Finally, those who adhere to the commandments are promised eternal life, and restoration to the sinless state of man before the fall.

## 5.2   The Priests and the Levites and the Sons of Zadok

We now move on to look at the passage which is the direct continuation of the one studied above. In CD 3.19 we encountered the statement that God "built for them a sure house in Israel" and CD 3.20b-4.12a, gives us further insight into the significance of this expression. Some fragments of the passage are preserved in 4Q266 5 i 9-19 (with reference to the Sons of

Zadok and the Converts of Israel) and in 4Q267 5 ii. For a comparison of the content of these

fragments to CD 3.20b-4.12a, see Hempel, 2013, 217-218. CD 3.20b-4.12a Hebrew text,

(García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1997):

| | |
|---|---|
| 20 כאשר | 20 As |
| 21 הקים אל להם ביד יחזקאל הנביא לאמר הכהנים והלוים ובני | 21 God swore to them by means of Ezekiel, the prophet, who said, *Ez 44:15* the priests and the Levites and the sons of |
| 1 צדוק אשר שמרו את משמרת מקדשי בתעות בני ישראל | 1 Zadok, who kept the charge of my sanctuary, while the sons of Israel strayed |
| 2 מעליהם יגישו לי חלב ודם *vacat* הכהנים הם שבי ישראל | 2 far away from me, they shall offer me fat and blood *vacat* the priests are the converts of Israel |
| 3 היוצאים מארץ יהודה והנלוים ]והלוים הם הנלוים[ עמהם *vacat* ובני צדוק הם בחירי | 3 who left the land of Judah and the Levites are those who joined them *vacat* and the sons of Zadok are the chosen ones of |
| 4 ישראל קריאי השם העמדים באחרית הימים הנה פרוש | 4 Israel the ones called by name, who stand in the last days, here is a list |
| 5 שמותיהם לתולדותם וקץ מעמדם ומספר צרותיהם ושני | 5 of their names, according to their genealogies and the age of their standing and the number of their troubles and the years |
| 6 התגוררם ופירוש מעשיהם *vacat* הקודש שונים אשר כפר | 6 of their residence and a list of their deeds *vacat* holiness, the (forefathers) for whom |
| 7 אל בעדם ויצדיקו צדיק וירשיעו רשע וכל הבאים אחריהם | 7 God atoned and declared the just man just and the evil man evil and all those who entered after them |
| 8 לעשות כפרוש התורה אשר התוסרו בו הראשנים עד שלים | 8 in order to act in accordance with the interpretation of the Torah, in which the forefathers were instructed, until |
| 9 הקץ השנים האלה כברית אשר הקים אל לראשנים לכפר | 9 the end of the period of these years, according to the covenant that God established with the forefathers, in order to atone |
| 10 על עונותיהם כן יכפר אל בעדם ובשלום הקץ למספר השנים | 10 for their iniquities, in this way God will atone for them, but when the era corresponding to all those years is complete |
| 11 האלה אין עוד להשתפח לבית יהודה כי אם לעמוד איש על | 11 there will no longer be any joining with the house of Judah, but rather each one standing up on |
| 12 מצודו נבנתה הגדר רחק החיק | his watchtower. The wall is built, the boundary far away. |

The passage begins with a midrash on Ezekiel 44:15, a verse that records the faithfulness of the Zadokite priesthood and the unfaithfulness of Israel. The text differs notably from the Masoretic text, which speaks of one group: the levitical priests, the sons of Zadok. Although it has been suggested that the differences could be due to an old textual variant (Schwarz, 1965, 98), Campbell considers that the author may have revised the text purposely, as the interpretation is based on the alterations (Campbell, 1995, 83). Grossman has rightly noted that the exegetic style here is similar to that of Qumran pesher (Grossman, 2002, 187), and Boyce has classified it as midrashic (Boyce, 1988, 131).

In the previous section we noted that the reference to a "sure house" was most likely taken from 1 Sam 2:35, which refers to the discontinuation of the priesthood of Eli, due to his sins and the sins of his sons, and the replacement of it by a faithful priesthood. 1 Kings 2:27, 35 depict the fulfilment of this promise, as Solomon excluded Abiathar and replaced him with the priest Zadok. Campbell suggests that this allusion to 1Sam 2:35 fits the pattern from other passages in the Damascus Document, in that it refers to "a major incident of rebellion in the bible" (Campbell, 1995, 83); in other words, Eli and his sons rebelled and were judged accordingly, and their priesthood was replaced. In light of connections to 1Sam 2:35 and 1Kings 2:27, 35, it seems possible that CD 3.20b-4.6 is portraying the beginning of a new priesthood replacing the former. However, the notion of priests, Levites and sons of Zadok signifies the pattern that we have noted, which consists of an emphasis of the importance of returning to old virtues and living according to the Torah and the prophets. Schwartz' analysis supports the understanding that the midrash concerns a replacement of the priesthood. He emphasises that the juxtaposition of 1 Sam 2:35 and Ezekiel 44:15 is unique, as these are the only passages in the Hebrew Bible referring to the decision of God to replace one priesthood with another. Schwartz furthermore draws attention to the fact that the sons of Eli are called

"sons of Belial" in 1 Sam 2:12 (Schwartz, 1981, 439). This is not always noted, as the translations of 1 Sam 2:12 translate "belial": Worthless, e.g., ESV, first line, Schwartz second line:

| וּבְנֵי עֵלִי בְּנֵי בְלִיָּעַל | Now the sons of Eli were *worthless* men Now the sons of Eli were the sons of Belial | ESV Schwartz |
| --- | --- | --- |

As mentioned in chapter three (3.2.3), the biblical use of the term Belial is not yet personified as it is in CD (Thomas, 2011, 452). Therefore, in the Bible the term refers to the noun "worthlessness" and the common translation is entirely appropriate. I would say that in the context of CD 3-4, however, the way that it is read and understood as a proper noun, "Belial", is worth noting, as it is stated in CD 4.13 that Belial will be set loose against Israel, which is followed by a section concerning the "nets of Belial" CD 4:15ff. (attested, but very fragmentarily in 4Q266, 4Q267, 6Q15) which we dealt with earlier (3.2.2). In this way it seems logical that the biblical reference would have been understood and used here as referring to Belial in a personified sense. Our discussion so far has strengthened the argument that the "Sons of Zadok" seem to represent an abrogation of a current "worthless" priesthood. In the Biblical account, the "worthless" priesthood was not abrogated right away, but somewhat later, while the priesthood that God had elected had to wait during that evil time before entering office. This could very well be the underlying narrative of the passage under discussion in the Damascus Document. Schwartz also noted this and suggests that according, to the midrash, "the faithful priests were not in the temple during the time of evil" but were waiting to take their stand at a later time (Schwartz, 1981, 443).

The different elements of the midrash have been interpreted in various ways. Who are the sons of Zadok, and what is their status within the movement? What relationship do they bear to priests in general and to the Levites? Schechter entitled his study *Documents of Jewish Sectaries. Vol.I. Fragments of a Zadokite Work*. (Schechter, 1910). According to Liver, Schechter presumed that the founder of the sect was called Zadok (Liver, 1967, 3). O. Schwarz was the first to suggest that the three terms refer to different stages of the movement: past, present and future (Schwarz, 1965, 155). Her suggestion and the answers posed by Liver have been influential on various later propositions. Liver notes that the title "the sons of Zadok the priests" is not used in the Damascus Document, but is in other texts, such as the Rule of the Community, the Rule of the Congregation and the Rule of Blessings. In these texts the sons of Zadok have a superior status, while other members are referred to as "the members of their Covenant" (Liver, 1967, 4-6). Liver emphasises the important fact that in the Damascus Document the "sons of Zadok" is used in a different way, as part of a midrashic section. Although according to Ezekiel's regulations for the future cult only "the sons of Zadok" may perform priestly service, the Damascus Document attests to priests and Levites as well. Liver poses the suggestion that the Ezekiel midrash could portray the "penitents of Israel" as the elect of Israel at the end of days (Liver, 1967, 9-10). Although Liver maintains that the founders of the movement were priestly descendants of Zadok, who occupied a position of leadership in the movement, Liver's position could be taken to mean that all three terms relate to the same entity, namely the whole movement (Liver, 1967, 29-30). This proposal by Liver was followed by Murphy-O'Connor (Murphy-O'Connor, 1970, 211) and Stegemann (Stegemann, 1971, 121-122). The assumption that the founders of the movement were priestly descendants of Zadok, who occupied a position of leadership, was a common viewpoint in the earlier days of scholarship (see. e.g., Vermes, 1998,49-66). Baumgarten

(Baumgarten, 1992) and Schiffman are among the proponents emphasising the Zadokite nature of the work. Schiffman thus understands the text to have been produced by a Sadducean community (Schiffman, 1994). In a study related to the role of Levites, Kugler explains the meaning of CD 21-4.4 as a description of the identity of the movement as former Temple priests, who are now in exile and identify themselves as Levites but look forward to the time when they shall serve as Zadokite priests at the end of days (Kugler, 1999, 479).

Davies aptly asks the question of whether the account of Zadok offering fat and blood in CD 4.2 could be interpreted as the movement seeing itself as "exercising a quasi-sacrificial function" or "as the True Temple" (Davies, 1983, 91). He answers this question cautiously, noting that the midrash does not ascribe any sacrificial function to any of the three groups and that the approach towards the temple cannot be assessed on the basis of this passage. Davies explains that scholars before him have interpreted the three categories, priest, Levites and Zadokites in various ways. Although it has been suggested that it could signify a hierarchical structure, Davies considers it more plausible that the three categories refer to different stages in the past, as suggested by Schwarz (Schwarz, 1965, 155). He argues that this view is supported by the text and he states that "[t]he activity of the priests is placed definitely in the past, while the sons of Zadok arise 'at the end of days'" (Davies, 1983, 91). Davies rightly emphasises that the Damascus Document does not authorise an exclusive Zadokite priesthood, nor does it place the three categories in a hierarchy or give any basis for believing that the movement was led by Zadokites (Davies, 1987, 54-56). Boyce follows Schwarz' understanding of the three different stages. He thinks that the original members of the movement consisted of Zadokite priests and their supporters, many of whom were Levites. However, he adds a different aspect: He sees this passage as a section of the third poem, and he thinks this whole poem is a warning to the new members of the movement, who are called

"sons". He therefore identifies the "Sons" of Zadok as the new lay members, who are disciples of Zadokite priests. As the Sons of Zadok are supposed to serve at the end of days, he suggests that the movement believed they lived at the end of days (Boyce, 1988, 130-131). Boyce's proposal that the Sons of Zadok are disciples of Zadokite priests and that the whole movement could therefore be seen as "Sons of Zadok", is a plausible suggestion, similar to Hempel's suggestion that in the Admonition of the Damascus Document "the sons of Zadok" appears to refer to the community as a whole, rather than its priestly leadership" (Hempel, 2013, 214). Hempel specifies, however, that in other passages of the Damascus Document the movement is seen to consist of a priestly and a lay component. Furthermore, Hempel notes that the movement is described in "sacerdotal language", which she sees as "indicative of Zadokite sympathies" (Hempel, 2013, 214). In sum, the most important thing to note is Liver's observation that the "sons of Zadok" is used as part of a midrashic section (Liver, 1967, 9-10), and that we have no other indication in the Damascus Document of Zadokite priests performing the duties of an actual priestly office. We therefore need to treat this notion of Zadokites in this passage with caution. In chapter six we shall look into other passages in the Damascus Document that describe priestly tasks as part of an investigation into leadership and organisation of the movement.

The notion in CD 4.2b-3a, that "the priests are the converts of Israel, who left the land of Judah" relates to the discussion in CD 6.2b-10a (4Q266 3 ii 10b-16a and 4Q267 ii 7-15), (see chapter 3.2.3). We shall not enter into this debate here, but only repeat a few points. Rabin (Rabin, 1958, 13) and Campbell (Campbell, 1995, 84) both emphasise a connection to Isa 59:20, which concerns sin and repentance. The present passage could, of course, be interpreted geographically, as the priests are said to have left the land of Judah. Whether or not this is the case we have no way of determining here. However, we may recall that in CD

6.2b-10a we are likewise told of a departure from Judah, and that Lied argued that the purpose of departing from Judah was to give the "converts of Israel" the opportunity to live according to the Torah and their interpretation of the Torah; and it seems an indication that this was not possible in Judah (Lied, 2005, 111). Grossman argues along the same lines as Lied, stating that the text presents "an inversion of images" in that living in Damascus is preferable to living in Judah, as Judah is a defiled land (Grossman, 2002,200).

In CD 4.5-6 a genealogy is mentioned. Strangely the list of names in this genealogy is missing. Grossman poses an interesting suggestion for why it could be missing: the possibility that it was never there, but a blank was left to be used on each occasion, in which either standard genealogical information could be filled in or metaphorical information relating to the new identity of a member as a member of this fellowship (Grossman, 2002, 195). Tromp proposes that it could have been left out by a copyist as it had lost relevance. He adds that it could likewise be missing because of physical damage to the text from which CD was copied, e.g. the loss of a page. He considers this as most likely, as it would explain the way in which CD continues with an incomplete sentence CD 4.6b. He rightly argues that, had the list been intentionally left out, the copyist would not have continued with an incomplete sentence. He maintains that with the generally accepted emendation, "forefather", the line could have read something like this: "This concludes the list of the first holy men for whom God made atonement" (Tromp, 2007, 226). Tromp's argument seems most plausible. Furthermore, it would make little sense that a genealogy would have been left out on purpose, as the Damascus Document generally reflects a quest for roots, which is also demonstrated when CD 4.8-10 emphasises "the interpretation of the Torah in which the forefathers were instructed" and "the covenant that God established with the forefathers". In CD 4.7-10 we

find a reference to God providing atonement, similar to CD 3.18, but this time referring explicitly to atonement for the sins of "the forefathers".

Scholars have been puzzled as to the meaning of CD 4.10b-12a, as well as to whether the lines should be read as a continuation of CD 3.18b-4.10a, as suggested by Schwartz (Schwartz, 1981), or as the opening lines of the section CD 4.12b-21, as suggested by Tromp (Tromp, 2007). It was already noted by Ginzberg that it was difficult to establish the meaning of these lines (Ginzberg, 1970, 20). Schwartz notes allusions to Hab 2:1 and Mic 7:11, but he maintains that these lines are connected to the preceding passage, CD 3.18b-4.10b, and that in order to understand the meaning, the whole passage needs to be taken into consideration (Schwartz, 1981, 437). However, Tromp maintains that most scholars after Schwartz have subsequently regarded the lines 10b-12a as a continuation of CD 3.18b-4.10b, and he contends that this understanding has made it more difficult to settle the meaning of the lines (Tromp, 2007, 225).

First, we shall turn to Schwartz' argument. Schwartz maintains that the concept of joining poses a link between CD 4.10b -12a (no longer joining the House of Judah) and CD 4.3 (Levites joining). He contends that the passage begins with the notion of the "sure house" in CD 3.18b containing an allusion to 1. Sam 2.35, and that this "sure house" is furthermore linked to CD 3.20-21 with reference to Ezek 44.15. As we noted above, Schwartz' analysis supports the understanding that the Ezekiel midrash concerns a replacement of priesthood, but that in the Biblical account the "worthless" priesthood was not abrogated right away, but the faithful priests were waiting to take their stand at a later time. In a similar way, Schwartz maintains that the priests, Levites and sons of Zadok do not constitute a temple; rather they were faithful priests who were waiting to take their stand after the evil era (Schwartz, 1981,

443). This is in agreement with Davies, who likewise dismissed the possibility that the text could be interpreted as the movement seeing itself "as the True Temple" (Davies, 1983, 91). Schwartz then turns his attention to the expression in CD 4.11: "there will no longer be any joining with the house of Judah". He explains that the usual understanding up till then had been that Judah "refers to the sinful majority" (Schwartz, 1981, 440). However, he contends that "'Judah' and 'the house of Judah' are used as codewords for the sect in other scrolls as well" (Schwartz, 1981, 440). He argues that if "Judah" in this passage represents the sinful majority then this line would mean that the members of the movement in the present time "would remain part of the sinful nation and associate with sinners" (Schwartz, 1981, 440). He maintains that this is contradictory to CD 4.3: "left the land of Judah". Even so, he refers to the movement in his conclusion as "a group which does not (yet?) consider itself cut off from the outside world" (Schwartz,1981, 446). I think his conclusion is correct, and I am therefore hesitant to assume that the house of Judah could not refer to "the sinful majority", using his terminology. He then rather abruptly, with no argument to support the claim, states that the wall in CD 4.12 is separating the movement from the rest of mankind. The only validation he provides for this understanding of CD 4.12 is that in some other texts from Qumran we encounter "the image of the sect itself as a firm wall protecting its members from the outside"(Schwartz, 1981, 440). We may recall that Davies gives the advice that it is better to analyse the Qumran texts separately than to assume any kind of specific relationship between them beforehand (Davies, 2005, 76). Had Schwartz not turned to other Qumran texts it is not probable that he would have come to this conclusion, as the text does not imply this. Instead the indication in the text is a link to the "builders of the wall" in CD 4.19, to whom he pays no attention, because he chooses to look for connections in the preceding passage only. We shall return to this shortly. In support of his supposition that the meaning of CD 4.11 is that at that

time no-one can join the movement, he argues that 1. Sam 1.36 refers to evil priests wanting to join the new priesthood. He furthermore concurs that an allusion to Isa 14.1 is evident in CD 4.11 and that Isa 14.1 likewise refers to "the attempt of the evil to join the good, not the reverse" (Schwartz, 1981, 441). Let us therefore turn to Isa 14.1 to see how it may illuminate the passage under consideration. (Westminster Leningrad Codex, translation mine):

| | |
|---|---|
| כִּי֩ יְרַחֵ֨ם יְהוָ֜ה אֶת־יַעֲקֹ֗ב וּבָחַ֥ר עוֹד֙ בְּיִשְׂרָאֵ֔ל וְהִנִּיחָ֖ם עַל־אַדְמָתָ֑ם וְנִלְוָ֤ה הַגֵּר֙ עֲלֵיהֶ֔ם וְנִסְפְּח֖וּ עַל־בֵּ֥ית יַעֲקֹֽב׃ | For the LORD will have compassion on Jacob and will again choose Israel, and will set them in their own land, and strangers will join them and will attach themselves to the house of Jacob. |

I agree with Schwartz that CD 4.11 alludes to Isa 14.1. Actually, the whole passage of CD. 3.18b-4.12b alludes to Isa 14.1. However, Schwartz' proposal that evil attempts to join good in this verse should be modified, as it is more precisely strangers or aliens or sojourners (reflecting different possibilities of translation), who join the house of Jacob, not necessarily "evil" that joins "good". What I do find interesting about the allusion to this passage is that it portrays the opposite pattern of what we find in CD 3.18b-4.12a in which the priests, the Levites and the sons of Zadok left the land of Judah (their own land) and became sojourners. Isaiah foretells the restoration of Jacob, while CD 3.20b-4.12b portrays life in the era of wrath. We shall now turn to Tromp's argument.

Tromp laments that CD 4.10b-12a is most often taken to be a conclusion of the preceding passage, as the concepts in this perceived conclusion fit poorly with the context it supposedly concludes. In CD 4.10b-12a it is stated that "when the era corresponding to all those years is complete there will no longer be any joining with the house of Judah, but rather each one standing up on his watchtower"; this is an allusion to Hab 2:1, while "The wall is built, the boundary far away", is an allusion to Mic 7:11. Tromp contends that the allusion to the

watchtower is the most difficult to understand. He explains that Schechter had not noted the allusion to Hab 2:1, and as he understood the lines as an introduction to the following he translated it as net, corresponding to CD 4.15 referring to the nets of Belial:

| | |
|---|---|
| מצוד | Watchtower in CD 4.12 |
| צוד | Net, root |
| מצודות | Net, feminine plural in CD 4.15 |

Schecter therefore translated it as "every man shall stand up against his net", which he explains as "watch over the net lest he be caught" (Schechter, 2010, 67). Tromp commends Schechter for seeing that the passage connects to the following passage, which concerns the nets of Belial (Tromp, 2007, 230). As the watchtower is definitely an allusion to Hab 2.1, I would take it that Schechter's translation shows that the text has a dual meaning, rather than just referring to nets. The watchtower in Habakuk concerns listening to what the Lord will answer the prophet; it regards being alert. This is in line with Schechter's proposal that one should "watch over the net lest he be caught" (Schechter, 2010, 67). Tromp furthermore comments on a suggestion made by Lohse that the watchtower could refer to the movement in which people could take refuge (Lohse, 1971, 73 and 288). Tromp explains that this would mean that the watchtower is set in contrast to the house of Judah, which would then be valued negatively. He dismisses this idea on the grounds that in his opinion Schwartz has shown that the house of Judah refers to the movement (Tromp, 2007, 229). I am not convinced by Schwartz' argument. Whether Lohse is right or not, it seems to me that the text introduces "standing upon his watchtower" as a contrast to "joining the house of Judah"; in other words, rather than joining the house of Judah one should stand up upon his watchtower and be alert. I therefore take the house of Judah to mean what Schwartz termed "the sinful majority" of Judah. This would mean that a time is expected to come in which it is necessary to separate completely from the house of Judah. As CD 4. 12b-21, which is the passage that immediately

follows, refers to the nets of Belial being set loose against Israel, it is conceivable that a total separation from the house of Judah is what is expected to be necessary at that time. CD 4.10b-12a furthermore shows another connection to the Belial passage, as Tromp notes: The wall in CD 4.12 and the allusion to Mic 7.11 connects to the "builders of the wall" in CD 4.19, which refers to false prophets and carries an allusion to Ezek 13:10. We have discussed this in chapter three (3.2.3). Tromp notes that although the phrase "the boundary far away" in Micah refers to a future extension of the land, the use of the phrase in CD 4.12 is different. He proposes that it refer to the builders of the wall, whose "interpretation of the divine commandments is far beyond reach" (Tromp, 2007, 236). This proposal is plausible as it fits the overall presentation of the builders of the wall in this passage. As CD 4. 10b-12a has shown strong connections to the preceding passage as well as to the following passage, I would suggest that it should be seen as a link between the two, rather than a conclusion to one or an introduction to the other.

In sum, we have observed indications that people in the movement were dissatisfied with the state of affairs in the land of Judah. It is stated that the priests and the Levites and the sons of Zadok left the land of Judah, and the end of the passage possibly speaks of a time when it will no longer be possible to join the house of Judah, as matters are going to get worse, when Belial will be set loose against Israel. An underlying narrative seems to indicate that an abrogation of the priesthood was also needed and was expected to take place in due time, just as it happened to the house of Eli. There are several possible ways the text could be and has been be interpreted, and it is not possible from this text alone to decide whether the movement was started or led by Zadokite priests, or whether the passage should be understood metaphorically so that the movement saw itself as a fulfillment of the prophecy as the sons of Zadok, who arise at the end of days. CD 4.8-9 refers to the need to act in accordance with the

interpretation of the Torah in which "the forefathers" were instructed, and according to the covenant that God established with "the forefathers". Thus, the text displays a quest for roots and an emphasis of the importance of returning to old virtues.

We have noted that the Damascus Document several times introduces the time in which it is written as an era of wrath or an evil era. In this section we discovered an expectation that things were about to get worse, as the last passage poses a link to the passage about Belial's nets. However, in the previous section (CD 3.12b-20) we did encounter a ray of hope, an expectation that at some point things would change. The idea was introduced that God would provide atonement and pardon their sin, build a sure house and revert the human situation so that the glory of Adam would be theirs. We shall now turn to some passages that likewise indicate a hope that evil times will come to an end. We shall look at the passages in which we find specific references to messiah.

## 5.3   Messiah

In this section we shall look at references to messiah. In chapter four we dealt with the debates of whether the notion of a *Teacher* and an *Interpreter of the Law* related to eschatological figures. We are therefore not going to include these discussions here, but instead focus on four places in which the term messiah is used with reference to an eschatological figure. The first one we turn to is found in CD 12.23-13.1a, in a passage that concerns the organisation of the community. We shall investigate this in greater depth in chapter six (6.3). Hebrew text (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1997):

| | |
|---|---|
| 23 המתהלכים באלה  בקץ הרשעה עד עמוד משיח ארון | 23 Those who walk in them in the evil era until the messiah of Aaron |
| 1 וישראל | 1 and Israel arises |

In a sense this reference to the messiah could be said to be in a strange place, as the context concerns organisation of the movement and not eschatology. Hempel maintains that the notion of the evil era also corresponds to the ideology of the Admonition, and she contends that it has been placed here as part of a redaction (Hempel, 1998, 108). However, we are mainly concerned with what the Messianic hopes may be, and from this passage we only get this short glimpse: The word "until" poses hope. There is not much explanation, but the word seems to indicate that the evil era will come to an end. We note again the often-repeated understanding that, as long as the evil time persists, it is important to walk in accordance with the commandments.

The phrase "the messiah of Aaron and of Israel" has given rise to speculations that two messiahs were expected. This suggestion was first posed by Ginzberg, when he studied the copy of the Damascus Document found in Cairo (Ginzberg, 1970, 227-237). Further speculations were added after the find of the first Qumran scrolls, as 1QS 9.9-11 uses the expression "messiahs of Aaron and Israel" (lacking along with a substantial section from 4Q259). However, Collins explains that this is unique, as no other distinctly plural reference is found among the scrolls. Even so, he mentions that a dispute still exists as to whether the references in the Damascus Document concern the expectation of two messiahs (Collins, 2010b, 80). Collins describes that some of the discussion has advanced around the theories of how the movement evolved, as it has been proposed that different Messianic expectations were part of that development (for an overview of these theories, see Hempel, 2000, 44-53). Collins maintains that the notion of Aaron *and* Israel could seem strange, as Aaron would be *from* Israel, but Collins explains that it refers to a priestly and a royal messiah. He considers it probable that an expectation of two messiahs existed, as this assumption could have derived from Zech 4.11-14 in which two anointed figures are referred to, one priestly and one royal.

Collins argues that the movement also had a dual leadership as seen in CD 13 and 14. This leadership consisted of priests and a guardian. He rightly admits that this dual leadership seems to be a priest and lay leadership, and that "it is not clear that the role of the guardian corresponds in any way to that of the royal messiah" (Collins, 2010b, 83). I would say that the guardian (*mebaqqer*) does not in any way correspond to royalty, rather he is a lay leader. We shall look into leadership in chapter six (in which I translate the *mebaqqer* as *overseer*). Abegg contends that the idea of two messiahs is built on very feeble evidence. He maintains that the one and only clear evidence of a plural form is in 1QS 9.9-11, and he insists that had this been found at a later date and Ginzberg not suggested two messiahs, then the lines in 1QS would probably had been emended (Abegg, 1995, 131). We shall turn to the next passage, which is described by Collins as the most compelling argument in favour of the single reference (Collins, 2010b, 86).

CD 14.18-19, corresponding to 4Q266 10 i 12 and 4Q269 11 i 2. Hebrew text (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1997):

| 18 וזה פרוש המשפתים אשר ]ישפטו בהם[ | And this is the interpretation of the judgements by which [they shall be ruled] |
| 19 ]עד מעמוד  משי]ח ארון וישראל ויכפר עונם | 19 [until there arises the messi]ah of Aaron and of Israel and he will atone their sin |

Collins maintains that the singular verb following the messiah "is most naturally translated as an active (piel) 'he will atone'" (Collins, 2010b, 86), although he sustains that it is likewise possible to translate it as a passive (pual) "atonememement will be made" (Collins, 2010b, 86). This reference to the messiah is placed as an introduction to the so-called "penal code" in which certain punishments are described, as relating to certain offences. The penal code will be discussed as part of the next chapter (6.4.1). Although Baumgarten has argued that this line

could indicate that atonement would be accomplished by the messiah, rather than sacrifices (Baumgarten, 1992,268-276), Hempel insists that it is not possible to say anything with certainty concerning sacrifices. This is because the rest of line two is so fragmentary that Hempel dismisses theories derived from this as guesswork (Hempel, 1998, 145). What we are able to see from the text is that messiah in mentioned in a relationship to atonement and that CD 14.19 is probably best translated "he will atone". On the basis of this Collins concludes that

> If CD looks forward to a messiah of Aaron who will atone for iniquity, the implication is that the current Temple cult is ineffective and that a new messianic priest is needed to restore it (Collins, 2010b, 92).

Collins' conclusion is interesting, as we have already noted that CD 3.20b-4.12a, could refer to the need for an abrogation of a current "worthless" priesthood. In CD 3.18, also referring to atonement, the emphasis is on God, who "in his wondrous mysteries, atoned for their iniquity" The "wondrous mysteries" was seen to concern a profound expression of God's transformative intervention in human history. Thus, it does seem possible that the text presents a realisation that ultimately God's intervention was necessary, possibly through the coming of messiah, if atonement was to be obtained. This does leave us with questions as to whether they still performed sacrifices for sin or went to the Temple and had sacrifices made on their behalf. However, as the text does not provide us with answers for this, we would only be entering into speculation if we tried to answer these questions. An interesting point is that this small section about the messiah introduces the so-called penal code, laws regarding penalties for certain offences. Although it is possibly a result of a redaction at some stage, it is still interesting that right before the "penal code" the text provides the information that atonement is possible to obtain, as the messiah will atone.

We shall proceed to the next reference to the messiah, CD 19.10b-11a, no corresponding

fragments from Qumran, Hebrew text (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1997):

| | |
|---|---|
| 10 והנשארים ימסרו לחרב בבוא משיח | 10 but those who remain shall be delivered up to the sword at the coming of the messiah |
| 11 ארון וישראל | Of Aaron and of Israel |

The context of this passage is that of the fate of the righteous versus the fate of apostates. We

shall look at this passage in chapter seven (7.1). The arrival of messiah changes the scene; at

his arrival the apostates will be exterminated by the sword. We should remember that the

discourse of the sword concerns the "vengeance of the covenant" in Lev 26 and Deut 28,

which refers to the expected outcome of breaking the covenant: The sword will come upon

them discussed in chapter three (3.2.1). The passage is very short in nature but does give us

the impression that messiah will put an end to apostates, and possibly to evil persons in

general.

CD 19.33b-20.2, Hebrew text (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1997):

| | |
|---|---|
| 33 כן כל האנשים שאר באו בברית | 33 Thus all the men who entered the new covenant |
| 34 החדשה בארץ דמשק ושבו ובגדו ויסורו מבאר מים החיים: | 34 in the land of Damascus but turned and betrayed and departed from the well of living waters |
| 35 לֹא יחשבו בסוד עם בכתבם לֹא יכתבו מיום האסף {יור מורה} | 35 shall not be counted in the assembly of the people, they shall not be inscribed in their lists. From the day of the gathering in {of the teacher} |
| 1 {...} מורה היחיד עד עמוד משיח מאהרן ומישראל vacat וכן המשפט | 1 {…} the teacher of the community until the arrival of the messiah of Aaron and of Israel vacat and thus is the judgement |
| 2 לכל באי עדת אנשי תמים הקדש ויקוץ מעשות פקודי ישרים | 2 on everyone entering the congregation of the men of perfect holiness and who is slack |

| | to carry out the commandments of the upright |
|---|---|

This text is discussed in context in chapter seven. There has been some debate as to the punctuation in the translation of CD 19.33 (see 7.3 for this discussion, and for my choice of placing a full stop before "From the day…"). The context is the same as in CD 19.10-11, which concerns the fate of the righteous versus the apostates, the men who entered the new covenant, but turned and departed, and those who entered the congregation, but are slack in carrying out the commandments. We note that the only thing we are told about the messiah is the fact that he comes. The key term is "until", which conveys the understanding that a change will take place when he comes, things will be different (as above in CD . In what way things will be different is not stated, although it could relate to the judgment of those who enter but are slack to carry out the commandments.

In sum we could say that CD does not give us a lot of information about the messiah (Hempel, 1998, 110; VanderKam, 1994, 229). However, his role is notably important because his arrival will cause a change. The commandments are going to be kept "until" he comes, and certain judgments are going to carry on "until" he comes. At his arrival apostates will be delivered up to the sword, the "vengeance of the covenant", but his coming will also provide the possibility of atonement. The portrayal as the messiah of Aaron providing atonement could be an indication that he would come as the new messianic high priest, who will restore the polluted Temple.

## 5.4   Conclusion

In this chapter we have learned that the movement defined itself in covenantal terms. We noted that covenant refers to the covenant at Sinai, but that the human covenantal obligation to "adhere to the commandments" is emphasised.

An allusion to Isa 56:2-6 introduces the idea that foreigners and Israelites alike may "adhere to the covenant". The text seems to indicate that everybody, even those who are described as "adhering to the commandments" in CD 3.12b, have sinned. This breach of covenant had been dealt with by an act of God, who atoned for sins, allowing for the continuation of the covenant in the face of ongoing iniquity. Those who "adhere to the commandments" are promised eternal life, and restoration to the sinless state of man before the fall. Following the atoning act of God, God established a "sure house", possibly referring to a new priesthood.

In the beginning of the second passage studied, we are told that the priests, Levites and the sons of Zadok left the land of Judah, and the end of the passage possibly speaks of a time when it will no longer be possible to join the house of Judah, as matters are going to get worse when Belial will be set loose against Israel. We encountered an indication that an abrogation of priesthood was needed and was expected to take place in due time, just as it happened to the house of Eli. There are different ways in which the text could be interpreted but it is possible that the movement saw itself as a fulfillment of the prophecy as the sons of Zadok, who arise at the end of days. It is emphasized that one needs to act in accordance with the interpretation of the Torah, in which the "forefathers" were instructed, and according to the covenant that God established with the "forefathers". Thus, the text displays a dissatisfaction with the current state of affairs in the land of Judah and an emphasis of the importance of returning to former practices.

We studied the four passages in which the term messiah is used. We discovered that CD does not give us much information about the messiah. The commandments are going to be kept "until" he comes, and certain judgments are going to carry on "until" he comes. At his arrival apostates will be delivered up to the sword, the "vengeance of the covenant". The portrayal as the messiah of Aaron providing atonement could be an indication that he would come as the new messianic high priest who will restore the polluted Temple.

We shall return to the writings of Wallace concerning Revitalization Movements to see what fresh perspectives we may gain. Wallace calls the first stage of revitalization "the Mazeway Reformulation" (Wallace 1956, 270). This could be described as the formulation of a code, a blueprint of an ideal society or "goal culture". He describes that, within the "existing culture", which refers to the historical context of the movement, a "transfer culture" is established which denotes a system of undertakings that supposedly will lead to the development of the "goal culture" (Wallace, 1966, 160). The "goal culture" refers to a perceived ideal culture, which in Messianic movements will be created by the messiah; whereas the "transfer culture" denotes a purposeful, organised effort by members of a society to construct a more satisfying culture in the present (Wallace, 1956a, 265), which is mostly done by seeking to revive the traditional culture of the (ethnic) group (Wallace, 1956a, 275). Wallace maintains that it has been difficult for him to construct useful sub-classifications of Revitalization Movements, but he does base some typology on cultural areas, notably classifying Jewish movements as Messianic or Millenarian, as these movements are characterized by an expectation that the messiah needs to supernaturally intervene at a point in history, to create an ideal society.

A comparison with the anthropological research of Wallace allows us to realise that the movement is seeking its roots, because their own society no longer lives according to the

principles that the people in the movement were committed to. The text places an emphasis on the past, on the "forefathers' covenant" and conduct (CD 3,9). This could be seen as an attempt to revive the traditional culture of their ethnic group, which they see as having fallen into desuetude. The alienation from the rest of their own ethnic group has resulted in a perceived need to leave the country. Possibly there will come a time when returning and joining with their own ethnic group, the house of Judah, will not be an option. Although we do not know if the narrative reflects a real move out of Judah, the rhetoric still indicates alienation from their own ethnic group.

By comparing this to Wallace's account we realise that the movement is seeking its roots because of a perception that their own society no longer lives according to the principles that the people in the movement had been brought up with. They see a need to revive their culture and, according to the discourse in the text, they make an effort by leaving the country and by deliberately trying to keep the commandments and staying within the boundaries of the covenant. The movement could be defined as messianic, as we encounter an expectation that the messiah needs to supernaturally intervene at a point in history. We realise that the passages related to the messiah are possibly so short in nature because the members of the movement do not have to make an organised effort to change the world when he comes. He is coming to bring their "ideal culture" back, the glory of Adam will be theirs. They do not need to elaborate on what will happen when messiah comes, because that is his responsibility.

Thus, the people in the movement are responsible for keeping the commandments, reviving the culture and renewing the broken covenant, until messiah comes, and that takes an organised effort. The fact that a "transfer culture" is said to denote a purposeful organised effort, could then give us an explanation why large parts of the Damascus Document concern

laws and regulations in relation to right conduct in the evil era or era of wrath, whether the

laws are explicitly spelt out or just referred to as the covenant and the commandments.

It should be noted that the actual roles of leadership within the movement cannot be

determined from this passage, so we shall look for the roles conferred on priests, Levites and

the sons of Zadok in the Damascus Document in our next chapter.

# 6 Organisation and Communication

We finished the last chapter without being able to discern any actual leadership of the movement from the texts we have studied. In CD 3.21-4.4 we witnessed a reference to Zadok. As we enter this section in a quest for practical leadership roles, we may as well start by noting that the only other place in the Damascus Document in which Zadok is mentioned, is in CD 5.5 in a passage classified as midrashic by Boyce (Boyce, 1988, 131 and 163). The reference concerns the time of King David, and therefore gives us no indication of current leadership. We shall therefore move on to look for what roles the priests and the Levites might have according to the Damascus Document. The reason for looking at priests and Levites first is that we noted in chapter three (3.2.2) that the movement seems to have a heritage that is close to the Temple (Hempel, 2005, 251), and it would therefore seem logical to investigate their roles first. When we have finished the section on priests and Levites, we shall proceed to look at judges, and then the different rules concerning camp and camps, which provides information about the organisation of the movement.

## 6.1 Roles of Priests and Levites

We may note that priests, apart from being called priests, may figure as the sons of Aaron in the Damascus Document. Views differ on the role of priests at Qumran in general, with the most radical approach voiced by Kugler, who has suggested that the priests at Qumran exist only in the literary world, and that there was no correlation to the social world (Kugler, 1999, 93-116). He proposes that Zadokites, Aaronites and Levites only correspond to different priestly traditions in the texts (Kugler, 2000, 688-693). Fabry has refuted this view, arguing that it is most reasonable to assume that the notions of priests in the Qumran literature corresponds to a social reality (Fabry, 2010, 245-246). However, our concern is the Damascus

Document, so we shall leave the general discussions and turn to the role of priests and Levites in the Damascus Document.

In a study devoted to the title the sons of Aaron, Hempel notes that this title is never referred to in the admonition, but it is used six times in the laws of the Damascus Document. Four of the references involve disqualifications of certain priests under special circumstances (4Q266 5ii 5//4Q267 5iii 8; 4Q266 5 ii 8; 4Q266 5 ii 9-10; 4Q 66 5 ii 12); one concerns the sons of Aaron diagnosing skin disease (4Q266 6 i 13) and one deals with priestly dues (4Q270 2 ii 6). On this basis Hempel concludes that these references to the sons of Aaron occur in contexts that are not "community specific" (Hempel, 2013, 198). She explains this point further by stating that these are references to ordinary priestly duties and dues, not to any particular status or authority (Hempel, 2013, 199). Finally, she maintains that the expression the sons of Aaron is never used to refer to the whole movement, in the way that the sons of Zadok could possibly have been used, in the Admonition (see 5.3 for this discussion). Rather the sons of Aaron refer to a priestly component of the movement as opposed to a lay component (Hempel, 2013, 209).

Apart from the references in CD 3.21-4-4 that we have just analysed, the references to priests in CD are primarily found in CD 13, 14 and 16, in passages we shall look at shortly, and then in CD 9.13 and 9.15 which both relate to the category that Hempel calls ordinary priestly duties. In CD 9.13 a debtor is to confess to a priest if there are no creditors and in CD 9.15, lost property will be given to the priest. Besides the possible allusion to Levites in CD 3.21-4-4, we find the references only in CD 10, 13 and 14. We shall therefore turn to these passages to try to establish their roles and the roles of other leadership figures.

## 6.2 The Judges

First, we shall turn to the rule for the judges in CD 10.4-10a, as both Levi and Aaron are mentioned in this passage. The passage is also preserved in 4Q266 8 iii and 4Q270 6 iv.

Hebrew text (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1997):

| | |
|---|---|
| 4 וזה סרך לשפטי העדה עשרה אנשים ברורים | 4 And this is the rule for the judges of the congregation. Ten men shall be chosen |
| 5 מן העדה לפי העת ארבעה למטה לוי ואהרן ומישראל | 5 from men of the congregation for a period: four from the tribe of Levi and Aaron and from Israel |
| 6 ששה מבוננים בספר ההגי וביסודי הברית מבני חמשה | 6 six, learned in the Book of Hagi and the principles of the covenant, between twenty |
| 7 ועשרים שנה עד בני ששים שנה ואל יתיצב עוד מבן | 7 five and sixty years. And no one older than |
| 8 ששים שנה ומעלה לשפוט את העדה כי במעל האדם | 8 sixty years shall judge the congregation; because of the sin of mankind |
| 9 מעטו ימו ובחרון אף אל ביושבי הארץ אמר לסור את | 9 their days were shortened, and God in his anger against those living on the earth commanded to remove |
| 10 דעתם עד לֹא ישלימו את ימיהם | 10 their knowledge before they completed their days |

This short passage referring to judges being among the authority figures of the congregation also helps us gain evidence that both men from the priestly tribes of Levi and Aaron and laity, were acting as judges. This is one of the passages in which individual priests and Levites are seen to have been given a role in the organisational structure of the movement, as four out of ten judges were priests and Levites. The preceding passage, CD 9.10b-10.3, shows that the administration of justice was the responsibility of the judges.

CD 10.6 on the other hand testifies to the need for the judges to be well established in knowledge of the principles of the covenant and the Book of Hagi. This could indicate that they also had a role of instruction, although this knowledge would also help them make judgments in accordance with the teachings of the movement. The Book of Hagi is not known to us and we do not know what it comprises. The Book of Hagi is sometimes called the Book

of Hagu, as the letters *vav* and *yod* are not clearly distinguished by the scribe of CD. Qimron prefers *yod* in his 2010 transcription (Qimron, 2010, 48), and we shall choose to call it the Book of Hagi here, as Baumgarten contends that this reading is favoured by the Qumran manuscripts (Baumgarten, 1996, 67). Reference to the book of Hagi is also found in other sources. However, Hempel explains that the texts referring to the Book of Hagi do not provide us with information concerning the content, but "in 4Q Instruction 2 the vision of Hagi is identified with the Book of Remembrance" (Hempel, 2013, 162). Therefore, Hempel considers it likely that in 4Q Instruction, the Book of Remembrance refers to "a heavenly record of human conduct" (Hempel, 2013, 162). Although these references could refer to the vision of Hagi, Goff contends that the Book of Hagi is described as an actual document (Goff, 2013, 161). Fraade concurs that the phrase the Book of Hagi is also found in CD 13.2 and 14.8, and in 1QSa i 7, and also attested to in 4 Q 266 8 iii 5.5, 4Q267 9 v 12 and 4Q270 6 iv 17. In each instance where the phrase occurs it concerns learning and instruction. While some scholars are convinced that the phrase refers to the Torah of Moses others consider it likely that it refers to another writing, not known to us today (Fraade, 2000, 327). Fraade explains that there is an apparent parallel passage to CD 8.2-3 in 1QS 4.6-8. While the reference in CD discloses that in a place of ten there should be a priest learned in the Book of Hagi, the parallel in 1QS indicates that in a place of ten there should be a man who studies the Torah day and night continually (Fraade, 2000, 327). This alludes to Josh 1:8 and Ps 1:2 in which it is recommended to study the Torah and meditate on it day and night and it has therefore been suggested that *Hagi* could have derived from the term used for meditation, *hgh* (Baumgarten, 1996, 67). The explanation of the connection to Torah meditation is entirely plausible, but so is the other proposal. From the present passage we can see that both priests, Levites and laity

were supposed to know the contents of the Book of Hagi and the principles of the covenant if they were to act as judges.

It is noted that it was deemed best to have an age limit for the judges, so they could not be judges when they were older than sixty years of age. VanderKam maintains that the particular understanding concerning the age limit is based on an allegation in the Book of Jubilees (Jub 23.9-11), in which it is stated that knowledge will leave men as they age, although the reference in Jubilees does not mention sixty years, rather it is just mentioned that men will not reach two Jubilees (VanderKam, 1989, 138-140). However, in a study of Ps 90 as a background to Jub 23 Kugel suggests that CD 10.7-10 could be based solely on Ps 90 (Kugel, 1994, 336).

The essence of the passage is that "four judges must come from the tribe of Levi and Aaron and six from Israel" (CD 10.5-6a). The "tribe of Levi and Aaron" is stated in a way that it seems most reasonable to understand it as referring to one tribe, meaning no distinction between Levi and Aaron here. Israel in CD 10.6a seems to refer to those who are not from Levi and Aaron, but from other tribes of Israel.

## 6.3   The Rule for the Assembly of the Camps

We shall now move on to the next passage in which priests and Levites are mentioned, which is a passage entitled the Rule for the Assembly of the Camps. CD 12.22b-13.7a. The first line of the passage is also preserved in 4Q266 9 ii. Hebrew text (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1997):

| | |
|---|---|
| 22 וזה סרך מושב | 22 And this is the rule for the assembly |

155

| | |
|---|---|
| עמוד עד הרשעה בקץ באלה המתהלכים ת((נוד 23 המח אהרן )) ((משיחמשוח | 23 of the cam[p]s. Those who walk in these in the time of wickedness until there arises the messiah of Aaron |
| 1 וישראל עד עשרה אנשים למועט לאלפים ומיאות וחמשים | 1 and Israel shall be of at least ten men by thousands and hundreds and fifties |
| 2 ועשרות ובמקום עשרה אל ימש איש כהן מבונן בספר ההגי על | 2 and tens. And in a place of ten a priest learned in the Book of Hagi shall not be lacking |
| 3 פיהו ישקו כולם ואם אין הוא בחון בכל אלה ואיש מהלוים בחון *vacat* | 3 By his authority all shall be governed *vacat* but if he is not trained in all of these and one of the Levites is trained |
| 4 באלה ויצא הגורל לצאת לבוא על פיהו כל באי המחנה *vacat* אם | 4 in these, then the lot shall decide that all the members of the camp shall go out and come in at his word *vacat*. But if |
| 5 משפט לתורת נגע יהיה באיש והא הכהן ועמד במחנה והבינו | 5 there is a case concerning the law of leprosy against anyone, then the priest shall enter and stand in the camp, and |
| 6 המבקר בפרוש התורה *vacat* ואם פתי הוא הוא יסגירנו כי להם | 6 the *overseer* shall instruct him in the precise meaning of the law *vacat* And even if he is a simpleton, it is he who shall lock him up, for theirs is |
| 7 המשפט | 7 the judgment |

This passage is the first part of the rule for the assembly of the camps, a passage that carries on until CD 14.2. It gives us additional information about the responsibilities of the priests and the Levites and introduces important information concerning the organisation of the movement. We are also introduced to the concept of the camps. However, we shall elaborate on the concept of the camps in our next section and not discuss it here.

We are told that the rule of the assembly should be adhered to during the whole time of wickedness until the arrival of the messiah of Aaron and of Israel. We have discussed this and the messianic expectations in chapter five (5.3). It is noteworthy that the rule of the assembly is to be used during the time of wickedness, which then becomes a sort of transition period before the messianic times. In this section we shall focus on the roles of the priests and the

Levites and their relationship to another authority figure, the *overseer*. As the whole section starting in CD 13.7b and finishing in CD 14.2 is called "the rule of the *overseer*" and concerns his roles, we shall divide our discussion of the *overseer* into two. In this first section, we shall only take note of his role in relation to the priests and Levites. We shall leave any other discussion of the *overseer* for the next section (6.2).

The passage under consideration displays a complex authority structure, which Hempel considers an indication that it has undergone development over time. She explains that the numbers in CD 13.1-2 refers to the camps in the wilderness in Exodus 18:21 and 25, and that the guidelines for the organisation of the movement alludes to these passages (Hempel, 1998, 108). Again, the Book of Hagi is mentioned. This time a priest is carrying the responsibility for knowing the book and for governing the people in the movement, but only if he is trained; otherwise a Levite who is trained should be in charge. In CD 13.5-7 the priest is seen to have the traditional, biblical role of judgment concerning leprosy and diseases (Leviticus 13:1-46). However, then it becomes complicated. The *overseer* is introduced as the person who guides the priest should this prove necessary. It is not clear from the text whether the *overseer* himself is a priest or not. There have been proponents for both views (that he is a priest, e.g., Vermes, 1998, 36-43; that he is not, e.g., Schiffman, 1983, 215). Fraade maintains that it is not clear from this passage whether the *overseer* played this role in all cases, or only in cases in which the priest lacked knowledge. In any case the priest is now dependent on the *overseer*, and Fraade considers it possible that the *overseer* played this role in all cases, and that "this was an area of priestly law that had devolved to the *overseer*'s purview" (Fraade, 1999, 113). This view is similar to that of Schiffman, who considers the roles of the *overseer* to be part of a democratisation process (Schiffman, 1983, 215).

In conclusion we have realised that the movement consisted of both laity and priesthood. The Zadokites are not mentioned in any roles of actual leadership, whereas priests and sons of Aaron and Levites are. They take part in the organisation as judges together with laity. The priests are also seen to take care of traditional roles concerning knowledge and teaching and concerning judgments of diseases. In the latter case the *overseer* had to be present and it could seem as if he was about to take over the authority in these cases.

We shall now move on to text entitled "the rule of the *overseer*" to gain further understanding of the role of the *overseer*.

### 6.3.1   The Rule of the Overseer

In the Laws of the Damascus Document, in CD 13.7b-14.2, we find this section that is introduced by a *serekh* type heading stating that this is the rule for the *overseer* of the camp. Corresponding passages are preserved in 4Q266 9iii-10ii and 4Q267 9 iv- 9 v, but these do not contain the full passage, and they are very fragmentary. Hebrew text (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1997):

| | |
|---|---|
| 7 וזה סרך המבקר למחנה ישכיל את הרבים במעשי | 7 And this is the rule for *overseer* over the camp. He shall instruct the many in the works of |
| 8 אל ויבינם בגבורות פלאו ויספר לפניהם נהיות עולם בפרתיה )בפתחיהם( | 8 God and he shall make them understand his wonderful mighty deeds and recount before them the events of eternity with their (interpretations) |
| 9 וירחם עליהם כאב לבניו ויש[קור] לכל מדהובם )מרהוב בם( כרועה עדרו | 9 and he shall be kind to them as a father to his children and g[uard] all who have strayed like a shepherd his flock |
| 10 יתר כל חרצובות קשריהם לבלתי היות עשוק ורצוץ בעדתו | 10 and he shall undo all the bonds that tie them so that there shall not be anyone wronged and oppressed in his congregation |
| 11 *vacat* וכל הנוסף לעדתו יפקדהו למעשיו ושוכלו וכוחו וגבורתו והונו | 11 *vacat* and he shall examine everyone who joins his congregation as to their deeds, their insight, their strength, their might, and their property |

| Hebrew | English |
|---|---|
| 12 וכתבוהו במקומו כפי נחלתו בגורל האור *vacat* אל ימשול איש | 12 and they shall inscribe them in their place according to their inheritance in the lot of light *vacat* . No member |
| 13 מבני המחנה להביא איש אל העדה זולת פי המבקר אשר למחנה | 13 of the camp shall have authority to bring anyone into the congregation without the consent of the *overseer* of the camp |
| 14 *vacat* ואיש מכל באי ברית אל אל ישא ואל יתן לבני השחר כי | 14 *Vacat.* And none of those who have entered the covenant of God shall buy or sell anything to the Sons of Dawn except |
| 15 אם כף לכף *vacat* ואל יעש איש דבר למקח ולממכר כי אם הודיע | 15 from hand to hand. *Vacat.* No-one shall perform an act of trade unless he has informed |
| 16 למבקר אשר במחנה ועשה בעצה ולא יש[וגו וכן] ל[כ]ל ל[ו]ק[ח אש]ה | 16 the *overseer* of the camp, and he shall proceed in consultation lest they stu[mble; and likewise] with regard to [any]one who ma[rr]ies a wom[an] |
| 17 וה].]...[...].ב[עצה וכן למגרש והוא ייס]ר את בניהם...] | 17 and […] …[in] consultation. And likewise, with regard to anyone who divorces; he shall ins[truct their children…] |
| 18 [וטפם ברוח [ענוה ובאהבת חסד אל יטור להם[באף] | 18 [and their small children in a spirit of] humility and with kind love. He shall not bear a grudge [in anger] |
| 19 [ועברה על פ]שעיהם ואת אשר איננו נקשר ב.[...] | 19 [and rage because of] their [s]ins, that they are not bound by […] |
| 20 [...] וזה מושב המחנות לכל ז[רע ישראל] *vacat* | 20 […] *vacat.* And that is the meeting of the camps for all the seed of Israel] |
| 21 [ואשר לא מחזיקים בא]לה לא יצליחו לשבת בארץ ב[...] | 21[And those who do not remain steadfast in the]se shall not succeed in dwelling in the land in […] |
| 22 [... ו[אלה המ[שפט]ים למשכיל [להתהלך בם] | 22 […an]d these are the ordi[nan]ces for the *overseer*, [to walk in them] |
| 23 [במועד פקוד אל את הארץ בבוא הדבר אשר דבר יבואו על עמך ימים] | 23 [in the appointed time when God visits the earth, the word was fulfilled which said, there shall come upon your people days] |
| 1 אשר לא באו מיום סור אפרים מעל יהודה וכל המתהלכים באלה | 1 such as have not come since the day that Ephraim departed from Judah. But for all those who walk in these |
| 2 ברית אל נאמנות להם להם להנצילם מכל מוקשי שחת כי פתאום (פתאים עברו) ונענש[ו] | 2 the covenant of God shall be faithful to them to save them from all the nets of the pit for the fools (keep being fools) and are punished |

The text poses some difficulties that can largely be explained by redactional development (Hempel, 1998, 114-130) and a smaller section of the text is so fragmentary that it is not possible to analyse these lines in detail (Hempel, 1998, 126). The section carries on into page

14, which begins with a continuation of a citation from Isa 7:17 that almost certainly started at the end of page 13, although reconstruction is difficult even with the help of the Cave 4 manuscripts, 4Q266 9 iii 17 and 4Q267 9 v 3 (Hempel, 1998, 116 and 127). CD 14.3 forms the beginning of a new section introduced again by a *serekh* type heading stating that this is the rule for the meeting of all the camps, thus a shift from the section in question in that it no longer deals with the individual camps and the running of those, but with all the camps. Hempel maintains that the section in CD 13.7b-14.2 "shows evidence of extensive reworking" (Hempel, 1998, 114). Even so, she does classify this as a unit and maintains that CD 13.23-14.2 "forms a redactional conclusion" to this section and to the whole of the long passage on the meetings of the camps that began in CD 12.22b (Hempel, 1998, 127).

The first question we may ask is what is the role of the *mebeqqer*; who is he? I have chosen to translate this title as *overseer*. Scholars have chosen to translate it in slightly different ways. Schiffman along with many others terms this office *examiner* (Schiffman, 1995, 121), while Collins uses *inspector* (Collins, 2010a, 24), Milik, *superintendent* (Milik, 1959, 100), and Wacholder *supervisor* (Wacholder, 2007, 71). Brooke points out that some scholars who assumed a relationship between the scrolls and early Christian writings, drew a parallel to the role of *episkopos* in the early Christian church and used that term (Brooke, 1999, 66). However, the varied terminology chosen by different scholars does not provide us with any additional understanding of the rule of the *overseer*, so we should turn to the study of the texts related to the *overseer* for that. My own decision to use *overseer* is only based on a desire to use a neutral term.

Hempel distinguishes CD 13,7b,12b-13,15b-16a as the parts constituting the original core of the rule for the *overseer* of the camp, while the rest is classified as additions belonging to

various redactions (Hempel, 1998, 117). What Hempel considers to be the original core can be identified due to terminology. The terms of reference used in this unit "are consistently the *camp* and the *overseer* over the *camp*" (Hempel, 1998, 117). What is the *camp*? The significance of *camp* and *the camps* has been debated since the discovery of copies of the Damascus Document among the Dead Sea Scrolls. Scholars have understood the camps to be members living in various towns and villages across the land as opposed to those who lived at Qumran (Wassen, 2005, 6-7). Although this is an entirely plausible explanation, it does seem that the terminology presents an allusion to the camps in the wilderness and the Exodus story, as Campbell points out in his study of the use of scripture in the Admonition of the Damascus Document (Campbell, 1995, 143). Lied emphasises that the allusions to the Exodus story "brings a powerful set of paradigmatic events into play" as key arguments for the redemption of their own group (Lied, 2005, 118).

As the vocabulary is otherwise very consistent and the *overseer* elsewhere in the Damascus Document is always used with camp or camps (Hempel, 2013, 37), an incongruity is observed as the expression *the many* is used in, CD 13.7c-8. Furthermore, the role of the *overseer* is said to be to instruct *the many* in spiritual matters, whereas his role in the original core "is of a pragmatic orientation" (Hempel, 1998,118). The expression *the many* occurs 34 times in 1QS 6-9 and only four times in the Damascus Document, CD 13.7, CD 14.7 and 12, CD 15.8 (Hempel, 1998, 82); these references to *the many* in the Damascus Document raise questions concerning the complex relationship between the Damascus Document and the Community Rule (Hempel, 1998, 83; Hempel, 2013, 26). Hempel establishes that the role of the *overseer* in this passage is similar to the role of the *wise leader*. She argues convincingly that the duties of the *wise leader* in 1QS 9.18 are analogous to those in the present passage and that it seems probable that the traditions associated with the *wise leader* and the rules for the *overseer* have

merged at some point. This would also explain the otherwise strange statement at the end of the list of what was supposed to be the rule of the *overseer* in CD 13.22, stating that "these are the ordinances for the *wise leader*" (Hempel, 1998, 118-121). Likewise, Metso, dealing with the Community Rule, notes that the *overseer* appears to be head of *the many* in 1QS 6.12 (Metso, 1997,136). Unfortunately, we have no further time for this interesting relationship between 1QS and the Damascus Document in this study.

CD 13.11-12a deals with the responsibility of the *overseer* to examine the persons who join the congregation and to make a written record of the members. The passage shares the subject of admission of new members with the following passage CD 13.12b-13, which Hempel considers part of the original core of the rule on the *overseer* (Hempel, 1998, 122-123). No member is allowed to bring anyone into the congregation without the consent of the *overseer,* and the *overseer* has to conduct a rather detailed examination of all prospective members (Hempel, 1998, 122-123).

CD 13.14-15a concerns trade, a theme that continues in CD 13.15b-16a, but with different terminology possibly indicative of literary development. In CD 13.15b-16a, it is explicitly forbidden to perform an act of trade without the consent of the *overseer* (Hempel, 1998,125). The text of CD 13.14-15a is less clear and poses some difficulties. No member of the covenant of God shall buy or sell anything to a certain group. Who are they not supposed to buy or sell anything to? It depends on the reading. The phrase in CD 13.14b could be read as the *Sons of Dawn,* as Schechter did (Schechter, 1910,13), but it could also be read as the *Sons of the Pit*, which Ginzberg chose to do, as he emended Schechter's reading only a little over a decade after it came out:

| | |
|---|---|
| בני השחר | *Sons of Dawn* |
| בני השחת | *Sons of the Pit* |

Ginzberg maintains that

> "[o]ne shall not buy or sell to the sons of Hell except from hand to hand." The "sons
> of Hell" are, of course, the opponents of the sect, the pagans, and the warning is
> given not to place any trust in them but to deal with them only "from hand to hand."
> (Ginzberg, 1970, 87).

Hempel explains that this reading of the *Sons of the Pit* was the most widely followed until
Baumgarten (Baumgarten, 1983) argued that a meticulous analysis of the photograph of the
original manuscript supports the reading as the *Sons of Dawn* (Hempel, 1998,124).
Baumgarten further argued that, from the opening statement of another closely related text,
4Q298, it appears that the *Sons of Dawn* is a title for members of the movement and, contrary
to Ginzberg, he concludes that this

> concerns not avoidance of contact with outsiders, but the internal economic relations
> among the members of the community. These relations are to be predicated not on
> the commercial basis of buying and selling…, but the fraternal concept of mutual
> help and exchange of services (Baumgarten, 1983, 83).

This reading has since gained general acceptance among scholars and is widely used (eg. for
this study: García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1997, 572; Murphy, 2002; Wassen and Jokiranta,
2007).

CD 13 16b-22 is very fragmentary and it is not possible to analyse this part in detail, but it
seems to regard "the role of the *overseer* in matters of marriage, divorce, and the disciplining
of children" (Hempel, 1998, 126).

Murphy has undertaken a study of wealth in the Damascus Document that we shall now turn to. She has discovered that some of the titles in the Damascus Document are used in documentary texts. The Aramaic verb 'to examine' occurs frequently in records of import and export duties in fifth century BCE Egypt, duty that was "paid in cash directly into the storehouse of the king" (Murphy, 2002, 374). Murphy maintains that the implication of the evidence is that, since one of the officers in the CD is termed *mebbeqer*, he would have acquired that title due to a similar economic role:

| בקר | Aramaic verb, to *examine* |
|---|---|
| מבקר | *overseer* in CD |

Murphy suggests that, since the *overseer*, in CD 13.12-13 has the responsibility of admitting new members, economic concerns were possibly foremost in the decisions over community identity and composition. The passage in CD 13.9-10, relating to the pastoral role of the *overseer*, is translated by Murphy as follows:

> Let him have mercy upon them as a father for his sons and show concern (for them)
> in all their distress like a shepherd for his flock. Let him loose the chains that bind
> them lest there be one oppressed and crushed in their congregation.

Murphy maintains that there are several indicators that "the distress of the flock" as well as "the chains that bind them are economic in nature" (Murphy, 2002,40). The literary context in CD 13 as well as the phrase "show concern for them in all their distress" in another text, 4Q Instruction b,

> implies that the incoming member be freed from service to a master outside the
> community and enter the care of a new master, the Examiner (Murphy, 2002, 44).

Wassen and Jokiranta comment on this statement, concluding that "[t]his freedom would have

concerned a number of matters, including contract labour and slavery" (Wassen and Jokiranta,

2007, 239). In light of the notion in Leviticus 25, 42 and 55 that the Israelites, having been

redeemed by the Lord from slavery in Egypt, belong to the Lord as slaves (Wright, 1990, 181-

182), it would seem that the *overseer* had a sort of guardian role. This admonitory passage is

drawing on Psalm 103:13; Ezekiel 34:12; Isa 58: 6 and Hosea 5:11 (Hempel, 1998, 122).

Three of the terms in this passage also occur in Isa 58:6 (Westminster Leningrad Codex),

which is here shown above the text of CD 13.10. Hebrew text (García Martínez and

Tigchelaar, 1997):

| | |
|---|---|
| הלוא זה צום אבחרהו פתח **הרצבות** רשע **חתר** : אגדות מוטה ושלח **רצוצים** חפשים וכל מוטה תנתקן | Is not this a fast I choose: to loose the **bonds** of injustice**, to undo** the thongs of the yoke, to let **the oppressed** go free and to break every yoke? |
| **יתר** כל **חרצובות** קשריהם לבלתי היות עשוק **ורצוץ** בעדתו | he shall **undo** all the **bonds** that tie them so that there shall not be anyone wronged and **oppressed** in his congregation |

Although the bonds of wickedness and the type of yoke are not described, Murphy concurs

that it could be deduced from the subsequent verse in Isaiah, as Isa 58:7 reads

> Is it not to share your bread with the hungry, and bring the homeless poor into your
>
> house; when you see the naked, to cover them and not to hide yourself from your
>
> own kin?

These all concern economic obligations, but Murphy insists that this allusion to Isa 58:6

"points beyond the practical nature" of the role of the *overseer*, as

> the Damascus covenanters create the community envisioned by third Isaiah when
>
> they relieve their neighbors' economic distress by freeing the oppressed, feeding the

hungry, housing the homeless, and caring for community members (Murphy 2002, 43-44).

In this manner Murphy is convinced that the members of the movement are practising economic liberation, and liberation is at the core. She maintains that "the most predominant explanatory framework" is that the "covenanters are like the post-Exodus wilderness community of Israel" (Murphy, 2002, 93). This view is further supported by the specific terms relating to the wilderness community used in the Damascus Document *camp, congregation*, and *examine* or *muster*. In CD 13.11-12 the *overseer* is supposed to examine a newcomer as to "his deeds, his insight, his might and his wealth", resonating to love God with all "your heart, your soul, your strength" in Deuteronomy 6:5" (Murphy, 2002, 97). CD 13.12-19 attests that the *overseer* has got complete authority to accept new members and in all matters of commerce. Murphy considers that the reason the *overseer* is also to supervise marriage and divorce is because financial arrangements accompany these, and a transfer of property takes place (Murphy, 2002, 59).

We now move on to the discussion of how the redactional conclusion, CD 13.23 and CD 14.1-2, relates to the section it completes. Does the quest for economic liberation taken from the principles in the book of Isaiah resonate here? Let us first recapitulate CD 13. 22b in which the *wise leader* as discussed above is probably synonymous with the *overseer*. The *wise leader/overseer* should follow these ordinances as should the people in his congregation. Wright comments on how the laws concerning judges in the Bible reflect a concern "that the manner in which the law is administered should match up to the standard of the law itself" (Wright, 2004, 304). It seems that this concern is also at the core of the role of the *overseer,* he should be an example and a guardian of the Lord's people, helping the members of the congregation in practical matters to stay within the boundaries of the covenant. What are the

*snares of the pit* from which the covenant can save them? It is possible that Murphy's study might help us gain insight into this, as Murphy explains that references to *men/sons of the pit* and *snares/nets of the pit* are found in the Damascus Document and the Community Rule and "occur in contexts where the economic practices of others are being condemned" (Murphy, 2002, 373). This matches the evidence of external documentary texts, Aramaic ostraca from the fourth century BCE, which indicate that the *pit* was a storage place for commodities and that the owners of the *pit* managed *pits* where taxes, debts or other assessments were paid. Murphy thus proposes that, although the *pit* could serve as a metaphor for evil, "a concrete economic reality lies behind the image" (Murphy, 2002, 373).

Hempel draws attention to the connection between the expression *the snares of the pit* in CD 14.2 and *the three nets of Belial* in CD 4.15, in which Belial is trying to catch Israel:

| | |
|---|---|
| מוקשי שחת | *the **snares** of the pit* |
| שלושת מצודות בליעל | *the three **nets** of Belial* |

Despite different terminology Hempel establishes that it seems that the two are "part of the same complex of traditions" (Hempel, 1998,129). Time does not permit us to review this matter which was discussed in chapter three (3.2.3), but we may note that one of the nets of Belial is wealth.

We still have not considered the citation from Isaiah in CD 13.23-14.1. Does it convey a warning? We need to have a look at the entire context of chapter 7 in Isaiah in order to understand the context. King Ahaz of Judah feared an invasion by Syria and the northern kingdom, Israel, and considered allying with Assyria in about 733BC. The Lord told Isaiah to bring his son and meet Ahaz and tell him to trust in the Lord only, instead of making such an alliance, and that Ahaz need not worry about the enemies he feared, Syria and Israel, as they

were going to be destroyed (Wright, 1983, 85). The significance in bringing his son is in the symbolic name of the son, which translates as *a remnant will return*. Blenkinsopp assumes that it would have made the point that, even if diminished, Judah would survive the threat it was facing (Blenkinsopp, 2006, 226-227). It could on the other hand pose a warning that if the prophet's advice was not taken only a remnant would survive. Ahaz did not intend to follow the advice of the prophet; his mind was already made up to ally himself with the king of Assyria. In Isa 7:17 Isaiah tells Ahaz that, because of that, the Lord intends to bring judgement on Judah and that Assyria will be used as the tool of judgement (Wright, 1983, 85). In the years following the encounter between Ahaz and Isaiah the prophecy unfolded, as the Assyrians first destroyed Syria and the northern kingdom, Israel, and then ravaged Judah and placed Jerusalem under siege. Webb maintains, "Miraculously, Jerusalem survived, but the whole Judean countryside was a smoking ruin" (Webb, 1996, 24). It would seem that the use of the Isaiah citation was meant to pose a stark warning: If the ordinances are not followed, then this kind of disaster will happen again. This is also an admonition to rely on the Lord only and not be dependent on men or be bound by unholy alliances, as Ahaz chose to rely on the Assyrians, instead of relying fully on the Lord. This interpretation seems plausible if we consider Murphy's study, as her study revealed a quest for independence in economic matters in the text. According to her study the economic independence was needed in order for the members of the movement to be able to seek to live out the ideals of Isaiah. I would suggest another probable link between Isaiah and CD, which could substantiate this interpretation. The association concerns terminology as well as content. In chapter three we noted different references to a visitation in the era of wrath, and we discussed possible translations of the term used for visitation and visiting in e.g., CD 1.7 (3.1.1),

| | פקדם | he punished them<br>he visited them<br>he remembered them favourably<br>he will remember them |
|---|---|---|

While the meaning of the verb in CD 1.7 is not certain, we shall look at an example in chapter seven in which the meaning is related to punishment (7.2). In CD 13.7b-14.2 this term is used for the *overseer*. We recall that the *overseer* was to make sure that there shall not be anyone wronged and oppressed in his congregation, and he is supposed to muster or examine (CD 13.11) everyone who enters his congregation. Let us compare this to Isa 10.1-3. (Westminster Leningrad Codex, translation mine):

| הוי החקקים חקקי און ומכתבים עמל כתבו | Woe unto those who make unjust laws, to those who make oppressive decrees |
|---|---|
| להטות מדין דלים ולגזל משפט עניי עמי להיות אלמנות שללם ואת יתומים יבזו | To deprive the needy of their rights and withhold justice from the poor of my people, making widows your prey and robbing the orphans |
| ומה תעשו ליום **פקדה** ולשואה ממרחק תבוא על מי תנוסו לעזרה ואנה תעזבו כבודכם | What will you do on the day of **mustering (examining)**, when disaster comes from afar? To whom will you run for help? Where will you leave your riches? |

This woe unto those who make unjust laws concerns people making laws that lead to deprivation of the poor and the needy and causes oppression and bondage. The role of the *overseer* is to do the opposite, to undo the bonds of injustice and oppression. It would seem probable from this observation that the rule of the *overseer* was established in response to injustice in society similar to what is stated in Isa 10:1-3. The context of Isa 10:1-3 is the same as in Isa 7:17 in which Isaiah tells Ahaz that, because of that, the Lord intends to bring judgement on Judah and that Assyria will be used as the tool of judgement. In Isa 9:7-10:4, Isaiah brings a prophecy of judgement coming as a result of Ahaz' decision to disobey the advice of the prophet Isaiah and to ally himself with the king of Assyria (Wright, 1983, 85-

87). From this it would seem probable that we find in the rule of the *overseer* an allusion to Isa 10.1-3.

In sum, the *overseer* had a role of teaching and instruction, but he was also responsible for taking very practical measures to help the people in the movement live as a redeemed people belonging to the Lord. The terminology used alluded to the wilderness community and to Isaian eschatology. The study has made use of suggestions that have been made that the *overseer* is a financial title and the term *pit* in the Damascus Document is related to the financial realm, where it refers to storage and taxes. This understanding provides a link between the passage and the redactional conclusion. We could say that if the *nets of the pit* were economic in nature the way to stay clear of being caught in them was to establish economic independence, as suggested by Murphy. I considered the Isaiah citation to be a warning not to make unholy alliances and not to become dependent on men, but to rely fully on the Lord. The zeal with which all is tightly regulated, so they do not err, poses another link to the stark warning of judgment in the redactional ending. The role of the *overseer* could then be seen as an obligation to free the members from all economic bondage and to control all matters relating to economy or transfer of property, as in marriage. He should act as a guardian of the Lord's people, helping the members of the congregation in practical manners to stay within the boundaries of the covenant.

The importance of the role of the *overseer* is furthermore evident from the important role he has in relation to the admission procedure to which we shall now turn.

### 6.3.2   The Admission Procedure

The full text of the admission procedure is found in CD 15.5b-16.6a. However, as our inquiry at this point concerns the *overseer*, we need only analyze CD 15.5b-15.15a, the text is also

preserved in 4Q266 8 i and 4Q270 6 ii and 4Q271 4 ii. Hebrew text (García Martínez and

Tigchelaar, 1997):

| | |
|---|---|
| 5 והבא בברית לכל ישראל לחוק עולם את בניהם אשר יגיעו | 5 And those who enter the covenant for all Israel, it shall be an eternal statute, and their children who reach |
| 6 לעבור על הפקודים בשבועת הברית יקימו עליהם וכן *vacat* | 6 the age to be mustered, they shall bind themselves with the oath of the covenant, and thus |
| 7 המשפט בכל קץ הרשע לכל השב מדרכו הנשחתה ביום דברו | 7 is the regulation throughout the age of wickedness, for anyone who turns from his corrupt way. On the day when he speaks |
| 8 עם המבקר אשר לרבים יפקדוהו בשבועת הברית אשר כרת | 8 with the *overseer* of the many, they shall muster him with the oath of the covenant that Moses established |
| ובו[ אל תורת משה 9 משה עם ישראל את הברית לש[ב בכל לב ו{ן}ב{כ}ל{ל} | 9 with Israel, the covenant to re[turn] to the law of Moses with the whole heart and [with] the who[le] |
| 10 נפש אל הנמצא לעשות בכ[ל] קץ ק[ר]בו ואל יודיעהו איש את | 10 soul, to that which is found to do in al[l] the time that he is drawing near. And do not let him know |
| 11 המשפטים עד עמדו לפני המבקר שמה [יתפ]תה בו בדרשה אתו | 11 the ordinances until he stands before the *overseer,* lest he turn out to be a fool, when he examines him, |
| 12 וכאשר יקים אותו עליו לשוב אל תורת משה בכל לב ובכל נפש | 12 but when he has imposed upon himself to return to the law of Moses, with all his heart and all his soul |
| [נק]יאים הם ממנו אם ימעל13 *vacat* וכל אשר נגלה מן התורה לרוב | 13 they will rev[enge] if he sins *vacat* all that has been revealed from the law to the multitude |
| 14 המחנה והוא שגה בו יוד[יעה]ו המבקר אותו וצוה עליו ויל[מד] | 14 of the camp and (if) he errs in it the *overseer* shall teach him and command him to learn |
| 15 עד שנה תמימה ולפי דעתו )יקרב( | 15 for a full year and according to his knowledge (he shall draw near) |

The text poses certain difficulties, some of which are due to damage in the manuscript. In line

10 several readings have been proposed for the damaged part. For a discussion on this see

Hemple, 1998, 75. Qimron has suggested the reading (translation mine):

| | קרבו | He is drawing near |
|---|---|---|

(Qimron, 2010, 37), also used by Schiffman (Sciffman, 1995, 100). I consider this the most plausible due to the use of the word in an Isaian context regarding restoration of the lost relationship between God and man (see e.g., Isa 50:8,51:5, 55:6, and 56:1). Other difficulties could be due to redactional activity.

This passage, which is set in the same covenant and camp discourse as CD 13.7b-14.2, underscores the important role the *overseer* had. The passage features the admission process. Nobody could enter the covenantal fellowship without speaking with the *overseer*. CD 15.9-10 is similar to CD 13.11-12, in which we noted that the *overseer* is supposed to examine a newcomer as to "his deeds, his insight, his might and his wealth", resonating to love God with all "your heart, your soul, your strength" in Deuteronomy 6:5. We note the strong emphasis in the whole passage of the importance of the return to the covenant that Moses established (CD 15.8), and a return to the law of Moses (CD 15.12). This is clearly not a new covenant they invented, but a return to the law of their forefathers. In CD 15.5b-7a it is not entirely clear whether children are entering with their parents, or if the text indicates an admission procedure for the children, who reach the age to be mustered (Hempel, 1998, 77-79). If it is the latter, it could be an allusion to Num 1, which renders the mustering of the tribes in the wilderness and their sons at twenty years of age. Hempel suggests that CD 15.6b-6a could be an insertion and that the reference to the many in CD 15.8 reveals an inconsistency (Hempel, 1998, 89), similar to what we have just discussed concerning CD 13.7c-8 (see 5.4.1). According to CD 15.11 a man is not to know the ordinances before he speaks with the *overseer*. This could relate to the hidden law or mystery that we considered during our discussion of covenant in 5.1. Mystery was related to God's hidden plan of salvation. The

meaning of line 11 could be that the *overseer* was supposed to reveal this hidden plan through instruction in the movement's understanding of the mysteries of God. This would be in line with CD 15.13-14: "all that has been revealed from the law to the multitude of the camp". It is stated as a revelation from the law, so again we see that it is understood to concern the Torah of Moses. Revelation on the other hand is seen to be necessary in order to comprehend the meaning of the Torah. The *overseer* is the person who convey this revelation to any newcomer. Furthermore, if someone errs, he shall correct and teach the person for a full year.

This passage highlights the tight regulations of the movement, which are all realised through one person, the *overseer*. In this passage there is no mention of sons of Zadok , priests, Levites, or judges; the *overseer* is fully in charge. We shall now turn to the rule of the assembly of all the camps in order to understand more about the organisation of the movement at large.

## 6.4   The Rule of the Assembly of all the Camps

We find a passage entitled the rule of the assembly of all the camps in CD 14.3-18a, also preserved in 4Q266 10 I, 4Q267 9 v, and 4Q268 2. Hebrew text (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1997):

| | |
|---|---|
| 3 וסרך מושב כל המחנה יפקדו כלם בשמותיהם הכהנים לראשונה | 3 And the rule for the assembly of all the camps. All of them shall be mustered by their names the priests first, |
| 4 והלוים שנים ובני ישראל שלשתם והגר רביע ויכתבו בשמויהם | 4 the Levites second, and the children of Israel third, and the proselytes fourth; and they shall be inscribed by their names |
| 5 איש אחר אחיהו הכהנים לראשונה והלוים שנים ובני ישראל | 5 each one after his brother; the priests first, the Levites second, the children of Israel |
| 6 שלושתם והגר רביע וכן ישבו וכן ישאלו לכל והכהן אשר יפקד | 6 third, and the proselytes fourth. And thus shall they sit and thus shall they be questioned about everything. And the priest who musters |

173

| Hebrew | English |
|---|---|
| 7 י(א)[ש רבים מבן שלושים שנה ועד ששים מבונן בספר | 7 (at the head) of the many will be between thirty and sixty years old and be learned in the book of |
| 8 ה[ה]גי ובכל משפטי התורה לדברם כמשפטם *vacat* והמבקר אשר | 8 Hagi and in all the ordinances of the Torah to pronounce them according to their rule. *Vacat* and the *overseer* over |
| 9 לכל המחנות מבן שלשים שנה ועד בן חמשים שנב בעול בכל | 9 all the camps shall be aged between thirty and fifty years, master of all |
| 10 סוד אנשים ולכל לשון רמ[ש]פחותם על פיהו יבאו באי העדה | 10 the secrets of mankind and every language according to their fam[i]lies. On his authority the members of the congregation shall enter |
| 11 איש בתרה ולכל דבר אשר יהיה לכל האדם לדבר למבקר ידבר | 11 each in his turn; and everyone who has anything to say to the *overseer* shall speak (to him) about |
| 12 לכל ריב ומשפט *vacat* וזה סרך הרבים להכין כל חפציהם שכר | 12 any dispute or judgement. *Vacat* And this is the rule of the many to provide for all their needs: the salary of |
| 13 שני ימים לכל חדש למעיט ונתנו על יד המבקר והשופטים | 13 two days each month they shall give to the *overseer* and the judges |
| 14 ממנו יתנו בעד [פ]צעם וממנו יחזיקו ביד עני ואביון ולזקן אשר | 14 From it they shall give to their [in]jured and with it they shall support the poor, the needy, and to the old man |
| 15 י[כר]ע ולאיש אשר ינ[ג]ע ולאשר ישבה לגוי נכר ולבתולה אשר | 15 who [is be]nt, and to the in[jur]ed, and to the prisoner of a foreign people, and the virgin who |
| 16 א[י]ן לה נ[וא]ל[ ו]נ[ל]נ[ער א]שר אין לו דורש כל עבודת החבר ולא | 16 has [n]o re[dee]mer and the [youth w]ho has no-one to take care of him. All the work of the association and no |
| 17 י]כרת בית חחבר מיד[ם *vacat* ]וזה פרוש מושב המ[חנות ואלה יסורות] | 17 [the house of the association shall[be cut off from] their [hand] *Vacat* And this is the exact statement on the meeting of the camps and these are the foundations] |
| 18 ]אושי הק]הל | 18a[the men of the ass]embly |

The rule of the assembly of all the camps includes a section on the *overseer* over all the camps. Hempel notes that the design for the meeting of all the camps resembles the passage on the meeting of the individual camps in CD 12.22b-14.2, with the main change being a difference in scale. In the passage on the meeting of the individual camps we find the concept of ten men and a priest, while the present passage conceptualises a large group consisting of a number of priests, Levites, children of Israel, and proselytes, which make up the group. The

members are mustered by their names, according to an orderly hierarchic structure. The text

does not mention this in any detail, but it is conceivable that the members were divided into

groups of thousands, and hundreds, and fifties, and tens in the way described in CD 13.1-2

concerning the individual camps. As this represents an allusion to the wilderness in the

Exodus story (Exod 18:21), an idealised structure, we do not know whether these numbers

reflect reality, or present an ideal (Hempel, 1998, 134-135). In this passage we hear of priests

and Levites again, and in CD 14.7-8 we find another illustration of the need for a priest

learned in the book of Hagi and in all the ordinances of the Torah. However, we still

recognise that the *overseer* has a rather prominent role. Importantly, this involves the

collection and distribution of money, a responsibility he shares with the judges. We also

encounter many entities and principles that we have noted in CD 13.7b-14.3a, with an

undercurrent of wilderness imagery and an idealistic lifestyle taken from passages in the book

of Isaiah, which we shall choose to call an Isaian lifestyle. We cannot know whether this

remained merely as an ideal. However, I consider the rather detailed approach described in

the text both with regard to delegation of responsibilities and with regard to the recipients, an

indication that it was the ambition of this movement to fulfil these duties. It seems plausible

that they intended to live in this way.

CD 14.3-6 introduces a new group of people, which I have chosen to translate as proselytes.

In this section, we will discuss what the identity of this group may be. Scholars have mostly

taken it to mean that this group of people were not Jewish, but associated with Israel (Palmer,

2016, 18-24). Davies, on the other hand, has proposed that the term refers to a group of

people, who are Judeans in the process of becoming members of the movement, but who do

not yet fully belong (Davies, 1994, 75). A recent thesis on the use of the term in the Dead Sea

Scrolls does, however, point in the opposite direction (Palmer, 2016). In this thesis, Palmer

argues that the proselytes, *ger,* are gentiles or non-Jewish, and that they change their ethnic identity when they join the movement. She offers an account of the current debate on ethnic identity, comparable to the one I offered in chapter 2 (2.2). Palmer explains the main thoughts in the current debate on social identity among sociologists, according to which ethnicity is constructed rather than primordial. The shift has been made from seeing ethnicity as an inherent quality of a community (primordial), to seeing it as a relationship with others. As it could be argued that this view of ethnicity is a postmodern construct, Palmer offers some examples of mutable ethnic identity in the ancient Mediterranean world. She notes that the Romans granted Roman citizenship to foreigners, who contributed to Rome; and it was possible to become a Hellene by renouncing one's own indigenous language and taking up Greek. Palmer argues that in a similar way subjecting oneself to Judean Law, or converting to Judaism, could be understood as a change of ethnic identity, as

> [a] "conversion" consists of a change in features that enables a change in membership between ethnic communities (those communities exhibiting features of kinship and culture). In other words, ethnicity comprises mutable features in this Hellenistic and Judean milieu (Palmer, 2016, 4).

Palmer thus shows the complexity of the social dynamics related to conversion in the ancient Mediterranean world. She observes the use of brotherhood language in the Damascus Document and explains that in Greco-Roman cultic associations using the term "brother" was not solely a sentiment of friendship; rather it "signifies newfound notions of kinship" (Palmer, 2016, 226). She notes that in CD 14.3-6 these converts are listed last among their brethren, and she considers this a sign that the use of brotherhood language does not just signify equality (Palmer, 2016, 226).

The rule of the assembly of all the camps was seen to include many of the elements from the rule of the individual camps. The text is ripe with allusions to wilderness imagery and to Isaiah. The text presents a leadership and an orderly hierarchical structure in which the *overseer* and the judges are responsible for collecting and distributing money for charity. An interesting new aspect was noted, as proselytes were seen to take part in the hierarchy of the movement. These proselytes were most likely foreigners who had converted to Judaism. According to Palmer, this conversion to Judaism could be understood as a change of ethnic identity, as she argued that conversion enables a change in membership between ethnic communities (Palmer, 2016, 4).

The section seems to finish here, as CD 14.17b reads, "and this is the exact statement on the meeting of the camps", but the text has a few more lines that we shall consider next.

## 6.4.1    The Penal Code

In the continuation of the text studied in the previous section, we encounter one of the short passages concerning messiah studied in chapter five (5.1.4). This is followed by a very short section representing the end of CD, usually referred to as the penal code (CD 14.18b-22), which exists in a longer form found in the manuscripts from Qumran: 4Q266 10 i-ii, 4Q267 9 vi, 4Q269 11 i-ii, and 4Q270 7 i. (For a composite version of the text see Hempel, 1998, 141-142). Furthermore, a strikingly similar text is found in 1QS6.24-7.25. As in the other sections, we shall study the text in CD, but refer briefly to the extensions found at Qumran. CD 14.18b-22. Hebrew text (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1997):

| 18 And this is the interpretation of the judgements by which [they shall be ruled] | 18 וזה פרוש המשפתים אשר ]ישפטו בהם[ |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| 19 [until there arises the messi]ah of Aaron and of Israel and he will atone their sin, [through meal and sin offerings] | עד מעמוד משי]ח ארון וישראל ויכפר עונם [ממנחה וחטאת] 19 |
| 20 [*vacat* And the ma]n who lies knowingly with regard to money, they shall ex[clude from the pure food] | והאי]ש א[ש]ר ישקר בממון והוא יודע vacat 20 וה[בדילהו מן הטהרה] |
| 21 […and he shall be] punished for six days. And he who spe[aks…] | ...ון] ענש ימים ששה ואשר ידב[ר...] 21 |
| 22 [and he who bears resentment against his fellow] without justification, [shall be puni]shed for […] mo[nths…] | ואשר יטור לרעהו אשר] לא במשפט [ונענ]ש 22 חו]דשים...] |

CD 14.18b-19a has been discussed in chapter five (5.3). The subsequent text lists penal legislation of the movement. The text is unfortunately fragmentary and corrupt, and there are several variants between the text in CD and the text in 1QS. Even so, it is worth noting that the first legislation concerns lying about money or riches in CD 14. 21 as well as in the text of 1QS (1QS 6.24). Murphy considers this an indication of its significance. She argues that this legislation was possibly ranking so high because it signifies "the behavioral fidelity to the community" (Murphy, 2002, 53). Murphy's suggestion sounds plausible, because lying about money could affect the life of the movement in a practical way, and because it would destroy mutual trust. The second legislation in CD 14.22 concerns resentment against another member, which would be an offence that could be very disruptive for the relationships within the movement, and this offence would likewise destroy mutual trust. If we consider Palmer's suggestion that the members considered themselves to be brothers in a way similar to actually being next of kin (Palmer, 2016, 226), we find that these two first laws in the penal code concern issues central to mutual trust and mutual dependence.

The additional material found at Qumran shows penal legislation of a diverse nature. Some of the offences listed are minor offences like falling asleep or leaving during a meeting. The punishments for minor offences consist of minor retributions and exclusions from the fellowship of a short nature, while the major offences cause permanent exclusion. Despising the judgment of the many causes permanent expulsion. The same applies to murmuring against the "fathers". However, the same does not apply to murmuring against the "mothers"; this only causes a punishment consisting of expulsion for ten days. The reason for the lesser treatment is explained by an uncertain term (Hempel, 1998, 141-143). Thus, unfortunately we do not get an explanation for this vast difference in punishment. The offences causing permanent exclusion are seen to concern lack of respect for the leadership of the movement. This kind of offence could of course cause disruption in a movement.

We have now finished our analysis of passages in the Damascus Document that concern organisational issues.

### 6.4.2   Conclusion

In this chapter we have studied passages related to organisation and leadership of the movement. We discovered that the sons of Aaron refer to a priestly component of the movement as opposed to a lay component, and that this term could be used interchangeably with priests. Most references to priests refer to ordinary priestly duties and dues, not to any particular status or authority. However, four out of ten judges had to come from the priestly group. The judges were supposed to be learned in the Book of Hagi and the principles of the covenant. The nature of the Book of Hagi is uncertain. In a group of ten men there should likewise be a priest learned in the Book of Hagi, and by his authority all shall be governed, unless he is not trained in all of these, in which case one of the Levites who is trained can take

over this authority. The organisation of the movement was described in terms alluding to the camps in the wilderness and the Exodus story. A certain authority figure, the *overseer,* was seen to have a very prominent role. In the rule of the individual camps we are told that he should instruct the priest. It is not clear from the text whether the *overseer* himself is a priest or not. In any case the priest is now dependent on the overseer, and the roles of the *overseer* could be seen to be part of a process in which the practical matters of the movement became more and more important. The prominence of the *overseer* is seen in the fact that he is involved in the admissions process, he is responsible for teaching and making judgements, no one may enter the camp without his consent, and he is also to be asked in cases of buying and selling. Issues related to economy were found to be of great importance, and the *overseer* was the person to be consulted in all such matters. His role as a guardian included the responsibility to free the members from bondage, and this was largely seen to relate to matters of economy. He was therefore also responsible for collecting money for charity. An organised effort to support the poor and needy was seen to follow principles from the book of Isaiah. Although it is not known whether all of these ideals were followed in reality, the detailed nature of explanation seems to indicate that they must at least have tried to follow these principles. Finally, we discovered from the penal code that the offences causing permanent exclusion concerned lack of respect for the leadership of the movement. In CD the two offences listed were lying about money and wealth, and resentment against another member. These transgressions could be very disruptive for the relationships within the movement.

We should now compare these findings with Wallace's observations. Wallace describes that, within the "existing culture", which refers to the historical context of the movement, a "transfer culture" is established which denotes a system of undertakings that supposedly will lead to the development of the "goal culture" (Wallace, 1966, 160). The "goal culture" refers

to a perceived ideal culture, which in messianic movements will be created by the messiah; whereas the "transfer culture" denotes a purposeful, organised effort by members of a society to construct a more satisfying culture in the present (Wallace, 1956a, 265), which is mostly done by seeking to revive their traditional culture (Wallace, 1956a, 275). The third stage of a Revitalization Movement is "organisation" of an authoritarian structure. This includes administering the campaigns as followers start to devote part of their time and money to the movement. From this time on the program of action is often administered mainly by a political rather than a religious leadership (Wallace, 1956a, 273). Wallace finally emphasises that for a movement to succeed it is necessary for it to obtain internal social conformity and a successful economic system. Otherwise, the movement cannot live according to its idealistic lifestyle, because it would become dependent on the "existing culture", whose lifestyle it has chosen not to follow (Wallace, 1966, 162).

We may conclude that the movement reflected in the Damascus Document corresponds closely to Wallace's paradigm. The movement was seen to have drawn their ideals for society from Exodus and the book of Isaiah, which to them would denote their traditional culture. In chapter five (5.1) we noted that CD 3.12b-14 shared many similarities with Isa 56:2-6, which introduced the idea that foreigners and Israelites alike may "adhere to the covenant" (Isa 56:4). In this chapter we discussed the recent thesis in which Palmer similarly argues that the proselytes, *ger,* are gentiles or non-Jewish, and that they change their ethnic identity when they join the movement (Palmer, 2016). Overall, Palmer argues convincingly for this degree of inclusion of foreigners into the movement. Her thesis also connects to Kugler's argument that the movement would have seen itself as an ethnic group (Kugler, forthcoming) and to Christiansen's suggestion that obedience governs whether one belongs to the covenant community instead of ethnicity being the determining factor (Christiansen, 1995, 108). For

our purposes it is important to understand that this inclusion of proselytes was promoted because of the movement's dependence on ideals from the book of Isaiah.

The movement had developed an organised authoritarian structure. Money was collected by the *overseer*, in order to establish a system of provision for the needy according to principles from Isaiah. By comparing with Wallace's model, we realise that the organisation of the movement was meant to support the ideal lifestyle, therefore they were forced to create a successful economic system. If they had not achieved economic independence, then they would have been forced to compromise their ideals. We also realise that without an organised structure and social conformity, they would not be able to survive as a counterculture. Therefore, they would need to punish rebellion and resentment between brothers, as well as dishonesty in money matters. The offences causing permanent exclusion are seen to concern lack of respect for the leadership of the movement, as this kind of offence could of course cause disruption. Resentment against another member was punished as this could damage the relationships within the movement.

In our next chapter we shall study a discourse in the Damascus Document of those who depart or turn away from the covenant.

# 7 Those who Depart

In chapter three (3.4.1) we considered several references to "the sword" and noted that the concept of "the sword" is particularly linked to Lev 26 and Deut 28-32. In Lev 26 various punishments are described which will occur if the covenant with God is broken and, in verse 25, the sword is described as carrying out "the vengeance of the covenant". In our study of CD 1.1-2.1 we noted that Campbell has identified a pattern of scriptural passages informing this narrative and an underlying framework of biblical allusions informing the text, which reveals a storyline of rebellion and punishment and the restoration of a righteous remnant in CD 1.1 -2.1. Campbell contends that this pattern repeats itself throughout the document (Campbell, 1995, 59).

In chapter three, we left some of the passages that refer to the sword for later, because these introduce us to judgment on former members of the movement who have departed or turned away, rather than just judgment of sinners in general. Although it is difficult to discern which sections refer to former members rather than sinners in general, the segments we are going to study in this chapter use vocabulary like backsliders, traitors or those who departed or turned away. We shall consider CD 7.9b-8.21, with a parallel in Ms B: CD 19.1-34a, and most of the remaining part of Ms B: CD 19.33b-20.34, focusing on those who departed. Although CD 7.9b-8.3 is paralleled in Ms B: CD 19.5b-15, there are noteworthy discrepancies between the two, which has been a cause of discussions among scholars.

The text in CD B contains the same general theme of backsliding and judgment, but differs particularly in choice of scriptural references, which are used in the texts. CD 7.9b-10a (Ms A) follows CD 19.5b-7a (Ms B), issuing a warning of judgment, but for all those who despise when God visits the earth to repay their wickedness. This is followed in Ms A first by a

reference to Isaiah, CD 7.10b-13b, and then to Amos and Numbers, CD 7.13c-8.1; while in Ms B the warning is followed by a reference to Ezekiel and Zechariah, CD 19.7b-14a. From this point the texts again correspond with one another with some variations. In this way both manuscripts end this passage with a warning of judgment for all those who enter his covenant and who do not remain steadfast in the statutes.

Murphy-O'Connor held that CD A 7.9-13b is original, with CD 7.9-10a paralleled in CD B 19.7-14, and that CD 7.13c-8.1 is secondary (Murphy-O'Connor, 1971a, 223), but later regarded CD 7.13c-8.1 to be original (Murphy-O'Connor, 1985). Davies considers a slightly shorter passage, CD 7.9-10a, to be original and maintains that CD 7.13c-8.1 is secondary (Davies, 1983, 148). He is followed by Knibb who, like Davies, was astounded by Murphy O'Connor's change of view (Knibb, 1991, 245). Hultgren proposes that both manuscripts drew on an older source comprising the reference to Isaiah (CD 7.10b-13b) and to Ezekiel and Zechariah (CD 19.7b-14a) and that a redactor of Ms A added the reference to Amos and Numbers (CD 7.13c-8.1) (Hultgren, 2007, 29-30). The reasons suggested for the discrepancy in textual references have ranged from White's proposition that the difference is caused by scribal error (White, 1987), to more dramatic proposals as e.g., Brooke who envisions development in messianic expectation to be reflected in the differences in the manuscripts related to the debate on whether one or two messiahs were expected (Brooke, 1980). (For a discussion of whether one or two messiahs were expected, see chapter five: 5.3). Brooke's proposal has been refuted by Knibb who argues that, since CD 7.13c-8.1 could be seen to announce two messianic figures - the star, who is the Interpreter of the Law and the sceptre, who is the Prince of the Congregation - this passage could not have been inserted to refute a possible belief in two messiahs (Knibb, 1991, 251). Only seven fragments found at Qumran in cave 4 correspond to the texts in CD 7.9b-8.21, with a parallel passage in CD 19.1-34a. For an

excellent overview of how these fragments correspond to passages in CD, see Hultgren (Hultgren, 2004, 550). It is not necessary to go into further detail with these discussions, as the history of how the manuscripts came to differ is not crucial for our purposes. We shall therefore proceed to examine the passages.

## 7.1   The Sword

The notion of the sword occurs in this section, and the passage has been classified as a warning of future judgment (Murphy-O'Connor, 1971a, 223; Davies, 1983, 148-155 and Knibb, 1991, 243-251). CD 7.11 contains a quotation from Isa 7:17 followed by an interpretation, and then a quotation from Am 5: 26-27 followed by an interpretation.

First, we shall consider Ms A: CD 7.9b-8.1, (CD 7.9b-10a runs parallel to CD 19.5b-7a, and CD 7.16-8.1 is also testified to in 4Q266 3 iii). Hebrew text (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1997):

| | |
|---|---|
| 9 וכל המואסים בפקד אל את הארץ להשיב גמול רשעים | 9 but for all those who despise, when God visits the earth to repay their wickedness |
| 10 עליהם בבוא הדבר אשר כתוב בדברי ישעיה בן אמוץ הנביא | 10 when the word comes which is written in the words of Isaiah, son of Amos, the prophet |
| 11 אשר אמר יבוא עליך ועל עמך ועל בית אביך ימים אשר | 11 who said, *Isa 7:17*"There will come upon you and your people and your father's house days such as |
| 12 (לֹא) באו מיום סור אפרים מעל יהודה בהפרד שני בתי ישראל | 12 have (not) come since the day Ephraim departed from Judah". When the two houses of Israel separated |
| 13 שר אפרים מעל יהודה וכל הנסוגים הוסגרו לחרב והמחזיקים | 13 Ephraim detached himself from Judah, and all the renegades were delivered up to the sword; but those who held fast |
| 14 נמלטו לארץ צפון *vacat* כאשר אמר והגליתי את סכות מלככם | 14 escaped to the land of the north *vacat* as he said *Am 5:26-27* I will deport the *Sikkut* of your king |
| 15 ואת כיון צלמיכם מאהלי דמשק *vacat* ספרי התורה הם סוכת | 15 and the *kiyyun* of your images away from my tent to Damascus *vacat.* The books of the law are the Sukkot |

| | |
|---|---|
| 16 המלך כאשר אמר והקימותי את סוכת דוד הנפלת *vacat* המלך | 16 of the kings, as he said *Am 9:11* I will lift the fallen sukkot of David *vacat* the king |
| 17 הוא הקהל וכיניי הצלמים וכיון הצלמים הם ספרי הנביאים | 17 is the assembly and the *Kiyyun* of the images are the books of the prophets |
| 18 אשר בזה ישראל את דבריהם *vacat* והכוכב הוא דורש התורה | 18 whose words Israel despised *vacat* and the star is the Interpreter of the Law |
| 19 הבא דמאק כאשר כתוב דרך כוכב מיעקב וקם שבט | 19 who will come to Damascus, as is written *Num 24:13* A star moves out of Jacob and a sceptre arises |
| 20 מישראל השבט הוא נשיא כל העדה ובעמדו וקרקר | 20 out of Israel. The sceptre is the prince of the whole congregation and in his position he will destroy |
| 21 את כל בני שת *vacat* אלה מלטו בקץ הפקודה הראשון | 21 all the sons of Seth *vacat* These escaped at the time of the first visitation |
| 8.1 והנסוגים הסגירו לחרב | 8.1 while the renegades were delivered up to the sword |

This complicated text takes its vantage point in the reference to Isa 7.17 (CD 7.11). The same

quotation that we encountered at the end of the rule of the *overseer* (CD 14.1-2) and it follows

the discourse as we discussed in chapter six (6.3.1). Considering the essence CD 7.9b-7.14a,

the obvious meaning refers to the demolition of the Northern Kingdom in 722 BCE and

contains a warning that in the future as well, "the sword" will come upon the backsliders. This

is the same use of this text from Isaiah as we noted in 5.4.3, when we discussed a reference to

Is 7:14 in CD 14.1 (5.4). The fact that we see this passage used more than once in this way in

the Damascus Document shows that this incident in the past loomed large in the mind of the

author. The once unified population of the country of Israel has been divided as "Ephraim",

the northern kingdom, had detached itself from Judah. This is described as a devastating fact,

in which the majority of the nation separated itself from the rest. However, judgment followed

those who detached themselves and the use of the incident in this text is clearly a warning to

backsliders. In Qumran studies there has been much speculation regarding the terms

"Ephraim" and "Judah". Some of these thoughts have even developed out of an attempt to

relate these names to the Sadducees and Pharisees respectively. As these speculations have derived out of studies of the *Pesharim,* we shall not concern ourselves with this. (A review of the origins of this hypothesis can be found in Bengtsson, 2000, 136, 153-155). "Ephraim" is only mentioned explicitly in two passages of the Damascus Document: the passage currently under consideration and CD 14.1, which concerns the same incident in the past, and the same lesson to be taken from it. However, there are implicit references to "Ephraim" in other passages, due to allusions to biblical passages that implicate Ephraim, e.g. in another discourse of the sword: CD 1.19, due to the scriptural allusions to Hos 10.11-12 (Collins, 2017, 223). The discourse of Ephraim's departure from Judah serves as a warning that this could happen again. Another example of this is evident in CD 8 that we shall discuss in the next section (7.2).

We now turn to CD 7.14b-8.1. Davies considers the mention of the flight to the north secondary as it deals with the theme of exile drawn from the Amos text, and not the theme of destruction from Isaiah (Davies, 1983, 151). Hultgren likewise maintains that this reference constitutes the beginning of the interpretation of the reference to Amos and Numbers, which he thinks is secondary as it does not continue the discourse of Lev 26:25 concerning the sword, which carries on in the interpretation of Zechariah and Ezekiel in Ms B (Hultgreen, 2004, 567-571). Kister also is of the opinion that the text in Ms B could be closer to an original version than Ms A, but he argues that the differences attest to "a fluid state of the text of the Damascus Document at an early period" (Kister, 2007, 76). He regrets that the Qumran fragments are so badly damaged that they do not aid in solving the problem (Kister, 2007, 76). Kister thinks the two possible meanings of one verb in CD 7.14 led to replacement of the citations:

| | |
|---|---|
| נמלט | fled or escaped (Ms A) versus: saved (MsB) |

In Ms A the verb in CD 7.14 and 21 is used to describe an historical event, the flight to Damascus; but in Ms B some are saved from destruction at the time of the visitation in the future. Kister understands this as the eschaton (Kister, 2007, 70). Kister further considers the fluid state of the text responsible for the curious interpretation of the proof text Amos 9:11 in CD 7.16. He believes that the passage preserves an original *pesher* of Amos 5:26 that it has been adapted, because of similarities in the text known as Florilegium (4Q174 1 i 10-13), which signifies a royal figure, the Branch of David, alongside an Interpreter of the Torah (Kister, 2007,74). The Interpreter of the Torah has been dealt with in chapter 4.3 and we shall not go further into details here. We shall leave some issues in CD 7.9b-8.1, as these are better discussed in conjunction with our discussion of CD 8.18b in the next section.

Thus, we move on to CD 19.7b-14 to analyse the text in Ms B (CD 19.14 is also found in CD 8.2, from where the texts again correspond to each other with some variations). CD 19.7b-14, Hebrew text, also attested to in 4Q266 3 iii 22-25a (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1997):

| | |
|---|---|
| 7 כתוב ביד זכריה הנביא חרב עורי על | 7 written by the hand of Zechariah the prophet: *Zech 13:7:* Wake up sword against |
| 8 רועי ועל גבר עמיתי נאם אל הך את הרעה ותפוצינו הצאן | 8 my shepherd and against the man who is near to me, says God, smite the shepherd and the sheep will be scattered |
| 9 והשיבותי ידי על הצוערים: והשומרים אותו הם עניי הצאן | 9 and I will turn my hand against the little ones. Those who revere him are *Zech 11:11* the poor ones of the flock |
| 10 אלה ימלטו בקץ הפקדה והנשארים ימסרו לחרב בבוא משיח | 10 these shall escape in the age of the visitation, but those that remain shall be delivered up to the sword, when there comes messiah |
| 11 אהרן וישראל: כאשר היה בקץ פקדת הראשון אשר אמר )יחזקאל( | 11 of Aaron and Israel. As it happened in the age of the first visitation as (Ezekiel) said |

| | |
|---|---|
| 12 ביד יחזקאל<br>vacat (והתוי) להתות התיו על מצחות נאנחים ונאנקים | 12 by the hand of Ezekiel *vacat Ez 9:4* (…) to mark with tau the foreheads of those who sigh and groan, |
| 13 והנשארים הסגרו לחרב נוקמת נקם ברית: וכן משפט לכל באי | 13 but those who remained were delivered up to the sword, which carries out the vengeance of the covenant. Thus, will be the judgment of all those who |
| 14 בריתו אשר לא יחזיקו באלה החקים לפקדם לכלה ביד בליעל | 14 enter his covenant and who do not remain steadfast in these statutes, they shall be visited to extinction by the hand of Belial |

In this passage, the discourse of the sword is spelled out clearly. The sword is mentioned in 19.7, 10 and 13. The first use of it comes in a quotation from Zech 13:7, the second in an eschatological prediction about the coming of the messiah and the third in an explanation of Ezekiel, followed by a warning that thus will likewise be the judgment of those who enter the covenant, but do not remain steadfast. In this way it becomes evident that the warning is primarily aimed at those who have entered the covenant but who have departed or are about to depart. A reminder of Lev 26:25 that the sword is "the vengeance of the covenant" is even spelled out clearly in CD 19.13. Hultgren argues that the link between Ezekiel and Leviticus is probably obtained as an allusion to Ezek 5:1-17, which is very similar in language and imagery to Ezek 13:8-9. The link to Leviticus is then obtained as Ezek 5:17 finishes with a threat that God will bring the sword as judgment. Hultgren also maintains that the end of the interpretation of Ezekiel in CD 19.13 ties up with that of Isaiah by using the same word for being "delivered up" in CD 7:13. By contrast another term is used in CD 19.10:

| | |
|---|---|
| 19.10 uses another term | ימסרו |
| 7.13 Interpretation of Isaiah | הוסגרו |
| 19.13 Interpretation of Ezekiel | הסגרו |

In this way, Hultgren argues plausibly for links between Ms A and Ms B (Hultgren, 2004, 573), and he likewise emphasises that the allusion to Isa 7.17 is important for the connection

between Ms A and MS B (Hultgren, 2007, 29-30). However, he thereby also confirms the underlying discourse of the sword identified by Campbell (Campbell, 1995, 59) that we have been discussing. In fact, Hultgren maintains that CD 7.9-8.18b (with parallel passage in CD 19.5b-32a) must be a literary unit because of the underlying biblical framework, and the first text he draws attention to is Lev 26, which concerns the consequences of either obeying or disobeying the covenant. Lev 26 is the last chapter of the Holiness Code, Lev 17-26, and Hultgren contends that not only do the laws of the Holiness Code feature prominently in the laws of the Damascus Document in general, but they "also underlie the small 'law code' in CD 6.11b-7.4a that summarizes those precepts" (Hultgren, 2004, 553-554). Hultgren therefore maintains that Lev 17-26 informs the structure of all of CD 6.11b-8.18b, arguing that Lev 17-25 informs CD 6.11b-7.9a while Lev 26 informs CD 7.9b-8.18b. Hence, Hultgren confirms Campbell's overall conclusion that the Admonition belongs to a broader exegetical tradition which has connected biblical passages and that this framework is what unites the Admonition (Campbell, 1995, 205- 206).

Knibb observes that the way Zech 13.7 is used in CD 19.7b-10 varies somewhat from what seems to be the original meaning of the passage in Zechariah. The theme of punishment is carried over from Zechariah, in which the whole passage concerns judgment, while in CD 19.9-10 the notion of "the little ones" does not seem to be included in the chastisement; rather it is indicated that God will protect them. Knibb also notes that in the Damascus Document the shepherd is not identified (Knibb, 1987, 59). The problem is enhanced as the citation in CD is taken from Zech 13.7, in which the herdsman is referred to as God's shepherd, while the reference to Zech 11.11 adds a different meaning, because this verse concerns an oppressed flock that has been led by several bad herders and, at the end of the chapter, the flock will be led by one worthless shepherd. This grouping of the two different passages in

Zechariah thus makes it difficult for us to identify the meaning of the shepherd in CD 19.8.

However, we might gain something else from considering the context in Zech 11, as Zech

11:14 adds an intriguing aspect, while speaking of the staffs of the shepherd. (Westminster

Leningrad Codex, translation mine):

| | |
|---|---|
| 14וָאֶגְדַּע֙ אֶת־מַקְלִ֣י הַשֵּׁנִ֔י אֵ֖ת הַחֹֽבְלִ֑ים לְהָפֵר֙ אֶת־הָ֣אַחֲוָ֔ה בֵּ֥ין יְ֖הוּדָ֥ה וּבֵ֥ין יִשְׂרָאֵֽל | 14 Then I broke my second staff called **Union**, breaking the brotherhood between Judah and Israel. |

The meaning of the name used for the second staff is not known, but Boda refers to

propositions that have been made:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | חבל | (1. Sam 10:5 and 10 used for a "band" of prophets, and Joshua 2:15 used for a "cord") suggesting that it could signify a **union** |
| | חבל | (Deut 32:9; Josh 17:5, 14; Josh 19:29; Ps 105:11; 1 Chr 16:18; Ezek 47:13) suggesting an **allotted portion** of a field |

Boda explains that, while Israel and Judah had been separate nations after the death of king

Solomon, the oracles of Zech 9-10 had envisioned a future in which these two nations were

united. However, the breaking of the shepherd's staff in Zech 11:14 signifies that hope for

such a union is now broken. Furthermore, Boda discloses a connection between Zech 11:4-16

and Ezek 37:15-23. In Ezek 37, Ezekiel unites two sticks representing the northern and

southern tribes. Boda argues that the breaking of the staff called Union in Zech 11.14 could be

understood as a reversal of the earlier prophet Ezekiel's prophetic sign-act (Boda, 2016, 503-

508). If we assume that the passage in Zech 11:11-14 is alluded to in CD 19.9-10, then this posits a strong link to Ms A with the reference to Isa 7:17 in CD 7.11-13, and the notion that Ephraim detached himself from Judah.

Davies emphasises that the interpretation of Zechariah establishes an impression that "those who revere him" is a small, struggling group. He maintains that it is the same awareness that the reference to Isaiah imparts: Ephraim was larger than Judah. The text in Zech 13:7f. likewise speaks of two thirds of the country being cut off and perishing. Davies therefore thinks that the main message conveyed in both texts is that, although the group is small and struggling, they will escape the judgment, whereas the larger group will not. The passage is thus posed as a warning not to make the wrong choice (Davies, 1983, 152). I consider this evaluation plausible, as the text certainly spells out an expectation of calamity at a larger scale of national dimension at the same time as it seems to be created as a warning not to commit apostasy.

As we have seen, the central theme remains the same in the CD texts A and B. However, as noticed by Murphy-O'Connor, the main difference is found in the reference from Ezekiel, as this refers to the capture of Jerusalem in 587 BCE in Ezekiel and not - as the text from Isaiah in CD A - to the fall of the Northern Kingdom in BCE 722. Thus, we have allusions to two separate historical events. Nevertheless, Murphy-O'Connor maintains that the events are typologically one, as they both represent exceptional divine judgment (Murphy-O'Connor, 1971a, 225). In other words, he believes that both episodes refer to judgments resulting in a devastating national calamity experienced in the history of the nation. Knibb likewise notes that CD A refers to the fall of the Northern Kingdom in BCE 722, while CD B refers to the capture of Jerusalem in 587 BCE. Similar to Murphy-O'Connor he maintains that "[t]he

implication in any case is clear: as God had punished the apostates in the past, so he would do again" (Knibb, 1987, 59).

In this section, we have noted that an underlying framework of biblical allusions is informing the text, particularly the discourse of the sword from Lev 26. We dealt with other passages related to the concept of the sword in chapter three, but the texts studied in this section primarily pose a warning aimed at those who have entered the covenant but who have departed or are about to depart. Ms A and Ms B share the use of warnings posed as references to historical national disasters. Although the two manuscripts refer to two different historic events, the message was the same: a prediction that this kind of disaster would result if apostasy persisted. Several links were discovered between Ms A and Ms B, and it was established that the allusion to Isa 7.17 is important for the connection between Ms A and Ms B. Isa 7:17 also poses a link to CD 14.1-2 discussed in chapter six (6.3.1). Isa 7:17 concerns the division of the nation when Ephraim departed from Judah. An allusion to Zech 11:11-14 exposes the same theme: The unity of the northern and the southern kingdom will be broken. This allusion has a more sinister note, as the text in Zechariah indicates that even future hopes of restoration of the unity are being crushed.

We shall turn to the subsequent passage, which continues the discourse. I shall therefore include issues from the texts above that we have not discussed yet.

## 7.2 The Princes of Judah

We now turn to CD 8.2c-19. The text is paralleled in CD 19. 15-33a. 4Q266 3 iii 25 corresponds to CD 8.2c-3. Hebrew text (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1997):

| | |
|---|---|
| 2 הוא היום | 2 This is the day |

| | |
|---|---|
| 3 אשר **יפקד** אל היו שרי יהודה אשר תשפוך עליהם העברה | 3 when God will make a **visitation,** the princes of Judah are those upon whom the wrath shall be poured out |
| 4 כי יחלו למרפא וידקמום כל מורדים מאשר לא סרו מדרך | 4 for they hope to be healed, but the defect shall stick. All are rebels for they have not left the way |
| 5 בוגדים ותגוללו בדרכי זונות ובהון רשעה ונקום ונטור | 5 of traitors, and have defiled themselves in the ways of whores and wicked wealth and revenge and bitterness |
| 6 איש לאחיו ושנוא איש את רעהו ויתעלמו איש בשאר בשרו | 6 against his brother, and they hate men. They despised one another |
| 7 ויגשו לזמה ויתגברו להון ולבצע ויעשו איש הישר בעיניו | 7 and indulged in unchastity and bragged about wealth and gain. Everyone, right in his own eyes |
| 8 ויבחרו איש בשרירות לבו ולא נזרו מעם ויפרעו ביד רמה | 8 and chose according to the stubbornness of his heart and did not keep apart from the people and have rebelled with a high hand |
| 9 ללכת בדרך רשעים אשר אמר אל עליהם חמת תנינים | 9 and walking in the way of the wicked, about whom God says *Deut 32:33* Serpents' venom is their wine |
| 10 וראש פתנים אכזר<br>*vacat* התנינים הם מלכי העמים<br>*vacat*ויינם הוא | 10 and cruel poison of asps. *Vacat* The serpents are the kings of the peoples, *vacat* and their wine is |
| 11 דרכיהם וראש הפתנים הוא ראש מלכי יון הבא לעשות | 11 their ways, and the asps' poison is the head of the kings of Greece, who come to carry out |
| 12 בהם נקמה ובכל אלה לא הבינו בוני החוץ וטחי התפל כי | 12 vengeance on them, but all this they did not understand, the 'builders of the wall' and 'daubers of whitewash', because |
| 13 שוקל רוח ומטיף כזב הטיף להם אשר חרה אף רל בכל עדתו | 13 of one who weighs wind and a preacher of a lie preached to them, so God's wrath has been kindled against his entire congregation |
| 14 ואשר אמר משה לא בצדקתך וביושר לבבך אתה בא לרשת | 14 and Moses said *Deut 9:5* Not because of your justice, nor uprightness of your heart are you going to possess |
| 15 את הגוים האלה כי מאהבתו את אבותך ומשמרו את השבועה | 15 these nations, but because he loved your fathers and kept the oath |
| 16 *vacat* וכן המאפט לשבי ישראל סרו מדרך העם באהבת אל את | 16 *vacat* And thus is the judgment of the converts of Israel, who turned away from the way of the people: because of God's love for |
| 17 הראשנים אשר היעירו אחריו אהב את הבאים אחריהם כי להם | 17 the forefathers, who bore witness following him, he loves those who come after them, because to them belongs |

| | |
|---|---|
| 18 ברית האבות<br>*vacat* ובשונאי את בוני החוץ חרה אפו<br>וכמשפט*vacat* | 18 the covenant of the fathers<br>*vacat* and he hates the 'builders of the wall'.<br>His anger is aroused.<br>*vacat* and similar to this judgment |
| 19 הזה לכל המואס במצות אל ויעזבם ויפנו בשרירות<br>לבם | 19 will be that of all who reject God's<br>precepts and forsake them and move aside in<br>the stubbornness of his heart |

This part of the text is saturated with some of the central themes that we have encountered in other parts of the Damascus Document: the visitation and the judgment of God due to sin and rebellion, and the threat of a foreign power who comes to carry out "the vengeance of the covenant" and judgment of the sins committed. In CD 8.3, a specific group, the "Princes of Judah", are being accused of being "rebels" and pointed out as the object of God's wrath. The theme of the princes of Judah is clearly exegetical and taken from Hos 5:10. However, the group's designation as the "Princes of Judah" has raised some discussion concerning the identity of the group. The introduction to the passage has led Murphy-O'Connor to conclude that the movement was at odds with the ruling class of Judah at the time, and he called CD 8.3-19 the "Critique of the Princes of Judah", as "the Princes of Judah" are specifically called "traitors" in the passage (Murphy-O'Connor, 1972a). As mentioned briefly in the beginning, Murphy-O'Connor has concluded that CD 8.3-18 was not well adapted to the rest of the Admonition, and he believes it was a separate text before, and that CD 8.19 had been added to fit it into its context (Murphy-O'Connor, 1972a, 212). Davies similarly believed CD 8.2b-19 to be an autonomous entity, and that CD 8.18b-19 had been added to fit the warnings in CD 7.9 and 8.1b-2 (Davies, 1983, 144). However, Hultgren maintains that all of CD 7.9-8.18b, and the corresponding text in CD19.5b-32a, is a literary unit (Hultgren, 2004, 549). Because of the many and central overlapping themes with other parts of the admonition, I consider it unlikely that CD 8.2c-19 constitutes a separate unit. The themes of judgment and the vengeance of the covenant by the sword carries on, and I will show in more detail below that

there are good reasons to consider CD 8.2c-19 part of a thematic unity with the preceding admonition.

The text under consideration represents one of the places in the Damascus Document in which fear of a foreign power is mentioned: The passage includes an explicit mention of the kings of Greece carrying out the vengeance of the covenant. Knibb notes that the statement concerning the princes of Judah, "walking in the way of the wicked" (CD 8.9) is connected by the citation of Deut 32:33 to the following description of the kings of Greece as poisonous serpents and asps. Knibb therefore argues convincingly that this statement refers more specifically to the princes of Judah, walking in the ways of the kings of Greece. This decision, to walk in the ways of the kings of Greece, backfires on the princes of Judah, as the kings of Greece will then be used to carry out the vengeance of the covenant, God's vengeance. Knibb contends that the text presents this as a future judgment, and the notion of this judgment is therefore best taken as a threat (Knibb, 1987, 68). We encountered the same theme as a warning from the past taken from Isa 7:14 in CD 7.10-14 and CD 13.23-14.1. In that case, the judgment had happened in the past. Isaiah had warned king Ahaz not to rely on the Assyrian king, but the king ignored the advice and the Assyrian king was only a little later used to carry out the vengeance of the covenant. If we turn to Hosea 5 from where the theme of the princes of Judah is taken (Hos 5:10), we note that Ephraim went to Assyria and sent for the great king, hoping to be healed. However, the prophet Hosea warns that Ephraim will not find a cure (Hos 5:13). In the same way the princes of Judah are said to hope for healing, but the defect sticks to them (CD 8.4). The passage in Hosea has been subject to various interpretations regarding which historical facts are hinted at here. One suggestion has been that synonymous parallelism is operating, and thus Judah was responsible for calling the great king, in which case Hosea could refer to the same event as Isa 7.17 (Lim and Castelo, 2015, 106). We need

not be concerned with suggestions of historical interpretations of Hosea, rather we should be concerned with the interpretation of Hosea in CD 8. Hultgren notes that in CD 8.4 Judah is said to be the one hoping for healing, while in Hosea 5:13 it is said about Ephraim. It would seem that the princes of Judah in CD 8.4 are being equated with Ephraim in Hosea 5:13; and Hultgren maintains that "the exegete equated 'the princes of Judah' with 'Ephraim'" (Hultgren, 2004a, 559). Thus, the use of Hosea 5.13 in CD 8 corresponds to the use of Isa 7.17 in CD 7.10-14 and CD 13.23-14.1 and represents effectively the same warning.

Davies has added an important contribution to the study of this passage, as he noted that the behavior of the Princes of Judah is described as contrasting with the laws of the movement listed in CD 4.13-5.12 and CD 6.11b-7.4a. He composed a meticulous list of how the sins of the Princes of Judah in this passage match the laws of the movement listed in CD 4.13-5.12 and CD 6.11b-7.4a. The list of misdeeds cover a fairly broad spectrum, but we readily recognise a range of offences that we have encountered before in our analysis of the Damascus Document: areas that relate to wealth; lust and fornication; defiling the sanctuary; not separating clean from unclean, and not separating from the wicked; not loving one's brother or helping the poor; and not keeping the Sabbath. (For a chart outlining these parallels in detail, see Davies, 1983, 161-163). Following Davies, Hultgren pays special attention to the close connection between the allegations of CD 8.3-9 and the laws of the movement listed in CD 4.13-5.12 and CD 6.11b-7.4a. Because of these associations, he contends that CD 8.3 must concern apostate members of the covenant community, as former members would have been acquainted with the "halakah of the movement" (Hultgren, 2004a, 549). Another reason Hultgren concludes that CD 8.3 concerns apostates and not princes is that he is convinced that the passage CD 8.3b-12 is tied to CD 7.11-13 by the theme of departure. In CD 7.12 Isa 7:17 is quoted, but in CD 7.13 the author is paraphrasing the verb:

| CD 7.12 quotes Isa 7:17 | סור אפרים | CD 7.13 paraphrases Isa 7:17 | שר אפרים | CD 8.3 Departers or princes of Judah | שרי יהודה |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Hultgren argues that, although the verb used in Isa 7:17 and the one used in CD 7.13 have been proven to be interchangeable in biblical and Qumran Hebrew, the author must have deliberately glossed Isaiah in order to connect the theme of Ephraim's departure from Judah with the quotation of Hosea concerning the "princes of Judah" in CD 8.3, (Hultgren, 2004a, 554). Hultgren claims that CD 8.3 should not be translated "princes of Judah", as is usually done, but rather "those who depart from Judah" (Hultgren, 2004a, 555). Prior to Hultgren's analysis, other scholars have acknowledged that CD 8.3 concerns apostates from the covenantal community (see e.g., Davies, 1983, 143 and Knibb, 1987, 66-67). However, Hultgren regrets that previous scholars have focused on the passage as a condemnation of the ruling class of Judah. Even so, he commends Gert Jeremias for suggesting that the "princes of Judah" were former members of the movement, as in other parts of the Damascus Document the members of the movement are referred to as princes (Jeremias, 1963, 111); Hultgren's own conclusion is that CD8.3 does not relate to princes at all, but to "those who depart" from the covenant community (Hultgren, 2004a, 558).

I think it is reasonable to consider that CD 8.3 conveys the meaning "those who depart", and that this links the passage to CD 7.10-13 as argued by Hultgren. However, I maintain that the use of Hosea 5.10 does convey a message of God's wrath directed at the current rulers of Judah. This is substantiated by the fact that the princes of Judah in CD 8.3-13 are said to walk in the ways of the wicked, who are then interpreted as serpents, who are the kings of the peoples. The princes of Judah are thus presented as being at the same level of society as the kings; and their sins are presented as causing judgment and calamity on a national level in CD

8.11-13. Stegemann has likewise argued that the direct reference to the head of the kings of Greece CD 8.11 points to a political interpretation of the princes of Judah (Stegemann, 1971, 168). I am therefore convinced that CD 8.3 represents a word play in which both meanings are represented: those on whom God's wrath shall be poured out are the "princes of Judah" and these persons are at the same time described as "those who depart". In CD 7.12 Isa 7:17 is quoted, and thus this theme of departure is linked to a discourse of national division, the discourse of Ephraim departing from Judah.

We now turn our attention to CD 8.12, the "builders of the wall" and the "daubers of whitewash". This is an allusion to Ezek 13:10 and 22:28 in which false prophets are being addressed for speaking of peace for Jerusalem, when there is no peace. This behaviour is likened to somebody who smears a wall with whitewash, but the wall shall be broken down by the rain, it shall not last. Ezekiel 13 explains that the false prophets have not built a wall which can protect Israel in the day of battle. Instead they have smeared a wall with whitewash, covering up its defects so it does not show. However, when the rainstorms hit the wall it will become apparent that it was not strong. CD 8.2-12 is moreover saturated with similarities to Ezek 22, as are the laws of the movement listed in CD 4.13-5.12 and CD 6.11b-7.4a. In Ezek 22 the leaders and the priests of the people are being accused of bribes and dishonest gain; not helping the sojourner, the widow and the orphan; profaning the Sabbath and not separating clean from unclean; violating women who are unclean in their menstrual impurity and defiling their daughters in law. Hultgren notes that, in another reference to the builders of the wall in CD 4.19, it is said that they go after "zaw", which comes from Hos 5:11 in which Ephraim is determined to go after "zaw". Hultgren considers this significant, because Hos 5:10-13 underlies the structure of CD 7.10-8.12 as a whole (Hultgren, 2004a, 564). The "builders of the wall" are said to lack understanding. This is explained in 8.14 as

the workings of one person, one who weighs wind and preaches or spouts a lie. Collins points out that the definite article is missing and that this sobriquet is therefore best translated "a spouter of a lie" (Collins, 2009, 74). He contends that the notion of "a preacher of a lie" seem to have been inserted into the text, possibly as a late redaction took place. CD 8.12-13 is dependent on Mic 2.11, which presents a man walking in wind and falsehood and preaching about wine. Collins contends that this preacher is presented as a false prophet and an antithesis to the Teacher of Righteousness, though he is cautious not to connect this theory with any historical realities (Collins, 2009, 76). Stegemann (Stegemann, 1971, 152-157), Murphy-O'Connor (Murphy-O'Connor, 1970 220) Davies (Davies, 1983, 113), and Hultgren (Hultgren, 2004a, 564), have argued that the "builders of the wall" represent "the whole of Israel outside the community" (Davies) or "mainstream Jewish society" (Hultgren). This is possible, although the close connection with those who whitewash seems to point in the direction that the "builders of the wall" are false prophets. The strong words in CD 8.18-19 refer to God's hatred of the "builders of the wall" and that his anger is aroused, and judgment will be inflicted on all who move aside, directed at the same persons who were addressed in CD 8.2, the princes of Judah. Even so, the judgment is said to come upon "all who reject God's precepts" (CD 8.19), a statement that conveys an allusion of universality. Therefore, this may be addressed to all, but with a concern for the responsibility of those who mislead. The quotation from Deut 9:5 and the following explanation in CD 8.14-18 seems to be inserted as a note of comfort to those "who turned away from the way of the people" CD 8.16. Norton notes that the citation is actually a composite quotation of Deut 9:5a and 7:8a. In Deut 7.8a it is stated that God kept the oath that he swore to their ancestors and this is partly quoted in CD 8.15 (Norton, 2015, 107-108).

CD 8.3b-12 is tied together with CD 7.11-13 by this theme of departure, and the discourse of Ephraim's departure from Judah taken from Isa 7.17. The princes of Judah are accused of walking in the ways of the kings of Greece, and the indictment is followed by a threat that these kings shall therefore be the vessels of God's chastisement on the princes of Judah, who have not understood that judgment is coming. With allusions to Ezek 13:10 and Ezek 22:38, the reason given for this ignorance is that false prophets have misled the princes of Judah and made them feel secure. The current warning seems to be directed at the leaders of Judah, who are said to have defiled themselves in the ways of whores and wicked wealth and revenge and bitterness against their brothers. However, it seems that CD 8.3 represents a word play in which two meanings are represented: those on whom God's wrath shall be poured out are the "princes of Judah", and they are at the same time described as "those who depart". The phrase "those who depart" conveys the meaning that the "princes of Judah" are accused of apostasy.

We shall proceed to look at the continuation of the text in Ms B, as the same discourse of departure carries on, and some further nuances are added.

## 7.3   The New Covenant in the Land of Damascus

We shall proceed to look at the text in Ms B, as Ms A breaks off after 8.21, which corresponds to Ms B 19.33b-34. The text in CD 19.33b-20.16a is not preserved in texts found in the Judean Desert. Hebrew text (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1997):

{} is used for legible or illegible text erased or corrected by the copyist

| | |
|---|---|
| 33 כן כל האנשים שאר באו בברית | 33 Thus all the men who entered the new covenant |
| 34 החדשה בארץ דמשק ושבו ובגדו ויסורו מבאר מים החיים: | 34 in the land of Damascus and turned and betrayed and departed from the well of living waters |

| | |
|---|---|
| 35 לֹא יחשבו בסוד עם בכתבם לֹא יכתבו מיום האסף {יור מורה} | 35 shall not be counted in the assembly of the people, they shall not be inscribed in their lists. From the day of the gathering in {of the teacher} |
| {1...} מורה היהיד עד עמוד משיח מאהרן ומישראל *vacat* וכן המשפט | 1{...} the teacher of the community* until the arrival of the messiah of Aaron and of Israel *vacat* and thus is the judgment |
| 2 לכל באי עדת אנשי תמים הקדש ויקוץ מעשות פקודי ישרים | 2 on everyone entering the congregation of the men of perfect holiness and who is slack to carry out the commandments of the upright |
| 3 הוא האיש המתך בתוך כור: *vacat* {ה} בהופע מעשיו ישלח מעדה | 3 He is the man who is melted in the furnace: *vacat* when his deeds become evident, he shall be expelled from the congregation |
| 4 כמו שלא נפל גורלו בתוך למודי אל כפי מעלו {יח} יוכיחוהו אנשי | 4 as one whose lot has not fallen among those taught by God. According to his sin, the men of knowledge shall rebuke him |
| 5 דעות עד יום ישוב לעמד במעמד אנשי תמים קדש {אשר אין} | 5 until the day when he returns to stand in his rank among the men of perfect holiness {for} |
| 6 {גורלו בתוך א} ובהופע מעשיו כפי מדרש התורה אשר יתהלכו | 6{his lot is not among m}Once his deeds are evident, according to the interpretation of the Torah in which |
| 7 בו אנשי תמים הקדש אל {ית} יאות איש עמו בהון ובעודה | 7 the men of perfect holiness walk, no man should have any dealings with him in wealth or work |
| 8 כי אררוהו כל קדושי עליון וכמשפט הזה לכל המאס בראשונים | 8 for all the holy ones of the Most high have cursed him and the same judgment applies to everyone who despise among the first ones |
| 9 ובאחרונים אשר שמו גלולים כל לבם {וישימ}וילכו בשרירות | 9 and among the last ones, for they placed idols in their hearts {and serve}and walked in the stubbornness |
| 10 לבם אין להם חלק בבית התורה: *vacat* כמשפט רעיהם אשר שבו | 10 of their hearts. There shall be no place for them in the House of the Torah *vacat* they shall receive the same judgment as their companions who turned around |
| 11 עם אנשי הלצון ישפטו כי דברו תועה על חקי הצדק ומאסו | 11 with scoffers; they will be judged for they spoke error against the just ordinances and despised |
| 12 בברית {.}ואמנה אשר קימו בארץ דמשק והוא ברית החדשה: | 12 the covenant {...}and the pact which they established in the land of Damascus and this is the new covenant: |
| 13 ולֹא יהיה להם {ו} ולמשפחותיהם חלק בבית התורב *vacat* ומים | 13 and neither for them nor for their families shall there be a place in the House of the Law *vacat* and from the day |

| | |
|---|---|
| שבו אשר המלחמה אנשי כל תם עד היהיד יורה האסף 14 | 14 of the gathering in of the teacher of the community*, until the end of all the men of war who turned back |
| ארבעים: כשנים הכזב איש עם 15<br>יחרה ההוא ובקץ *vacat* | 15 with the man of the lie, there shall be about forty years: *vacat* and in this era the anger |
| בישראל אל אף 16 | 16 of God will be kindled against Israel |

*(or the unique teacher, see the chapter on teacher: 4.5).

The text continues the discourse of turning back and departure, and it adds another reference to the man of the lie. The first was in CD 1.15 in chapter three (3.2.1), this time he is presented with the definite article. However, in this text we are also presented with the designation "the new covenant in the land of Damascus" (CD19.33b-34a and CD 20.12) and it is in relation to this covenant that some are said to have turned back, betrayed, and departed. Thus, we need to try to uncover the meaning of this phrase. In CD 20.12 it is stated that the pact was established in the land of Damascus. We have already debated the use of the term Damascus when we looked at CD 6.4b-6 (3.4.4) and when we discussed the departure from the land of Judah in CD 4.2b-3a (5.4). CD 19.34 likewise speaks of a well, the well of living waters, the well of the Torah. We noted that Lied contends that the onset of the era of evil is marked by several occurrences, "one of them being the move to Damascus" (Lied, 2005, 113). She maintains that the descriptions of the spaces are highly informed by the biblical paradigms relating to Judah and Damascus, but that these connotations have been turned around in the Damascus Document. Judah has become a place of punishment. Damascus on the other hand is a place where the Law is kept, and the blessing of the Land is enjoyed during the time of evil (Lied, 2005, 121). In CD19.33b-34a and CD 20.12 we are told that the new covenant was established in the land of Damascus; and that among those who established it, some have turned away or departed. In some ways the passage presents a pattern that is very

similar to what we have seen in other parts of the Damascus Document: The ones who remain in the covenant are commended and the ones who depart are condemned. Campbell notes that CD 19.35 connects to Ez 13.9, which concerns the expulsion of false prophets. In this way this passage relates to the notion of the "builders of the wall" and the "daubers with whitewash" in CD 4.19 and 8.12, taken from Ez 13.10 and 13 (Campbell, 1995, 167). A fresh aspect introduced here is that the covenant is new, and that it was entered into in Damascus, not Sinai.

Due to the references to the "teacher of the community" and "the man of the lie" several theories related to the meaning of "new covenant" have focused on the movement's relationship to these two figures. For example, Stegemann argues that the term "new covenant" relates to a covenant made at an earlier point in history than the arrival of the teacher. He maintains that this group was made up of exiles in Syria, who had fled from Judea. A later dispute regarding the teacher's authority then led to a division between those who followed "the teacher of the community" and those who followed "the man of the lie" (Stegemann, 1971, 239-251 and Stegemann, 1998, 116). Stegemann thus contends that the men who turned back in CD 19.33-20.1 are not the same as the ones who turned back with the "man of the lie" in CD 20.10-13. He also argues that the group in CD 19.33-20.1 was excommunicated from the time of the death of the teacher until the coming of the messiah (Stegemann, 1971, 176-177). Murphy-O'Connor shared Stegemann's interpretations regarding CD 19.33-20.1 but noted that the text seems to indicate that the apostates may get a second chance at the coming of the messiah (Murphy-O'Connor, 1972b, 546). Davies largely agreed with the interpretations stated above, but he argued convincingly that the apostates would not get a second chance at the coming of the messiah, rather they would be judged (Davies, 1983, 180). Hultgren commends Davies for this interpretation and points out that,

according to the preceding text in CD 19.10-13, the apostates are judged when the messiah comes, and not as argued by Murphy-O'Connor given a second chance.

Hultgren furthermore recommends that, although most scholars have taken CD 19.33b-20.1a to be a unit, a full stop should be used between CD 20.35b and c in translations, as he maintains that the notion of the death of the teacher starts a new section. I have chosen to follow Hultgren's punctuation in my translation above, as it seems convincing because he shows how CD 19.32b-20.1and CD 20.8b-15a are composed as parallel units: CD 19.32b-33a, which is also found in CD 8.18c-19 (see above) "And this is the judgment for all who despise" and direct object ... "stubbornness of their heart"; this recurs in CD 20.8b-10. And CD 19.33b-35b, "exclusion from the community for those who betrayed the new covenant" recurs in CD 20.10b-13a. Finally, CD 19.35c-20.1a, "From the day of the gathering in of the unique teacher until…" reoccurs in CD 20.13b-15a. Hultgren emphasises that each of those formulae are followed by reference to exclusion from the community due to betrayal of the new covenant (Hultgren, 2005, 18). I do not see evidence in the text for Stegemann's argument that the men who turned back in CD 19.33-20.1 are not the same as the ones who turned back with the "man of the lie" in CD 20.10-13; and the parallel structure of the two parts of the text in which the two groups are presented encourages me to consider them one and the same group. There is, nevertheless, one marked difference between the first mention of the group and the last: CD 20.5 presents the possibility of return to the movement. Not much explanation is offered, but in line with the rest of the Damascus Document one would expect this follows some sort of personal repentance. In the second reference to the group this possibility for return is not mentioned. Rather in CD 20.13 Murphy-O'Connor suggests that the House of the Torah must refer to the members of the movement, as the apostates are said to be excluded from it (Murphy-O'Connor, 1972b, 550).

We still have not uncovered why the covenant in Damascus is called "new". The term "new covenant" is an allusion to Jer 31:31(Campbell, 1995, 180). We may therefore benefit from looking closer at the biblical allusion to Jer 31:31 and also pay attention to verse 32. (Westminster Leningrad Codex, translation mine):

| | |
|---|---|
| 31 הִנֵּ֛ה יָמִ֥ים בָּאִ֖ים נְאֻם־יְהוָ֑ה וְכָרַתִּ֗י אֶת־בֵּ֧ית יִשְׂרָאֵ֛ל וְאֶת־בֵּ֥ית יְ֖הוּדָ֑ה בְּרִ֥ית חֲדָשָֽׁה | 31 Behold, days are coming, says the LORD, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah, |
| 32 לֹ֣א כַבְּרִ֗ית אֲשֶׁ֤ר כָּרַ֙תִּי֙ אֶת־אֲבוֹתָ֔ם בְּיוֹם֙ הֶחֱזִיקִ֣י בְיָדָ֔ם לְהוֹצִיאָ֖ם מֵאֶ֣רֶץ מִצְרָ֑יִם אֲשֶׁר־הֵ֜מָּה הֵפֵ֣רוּ אֶת־בְּרִיתִ֗י וְאָנֹכִ֛י בָּעַ֥לְתִּי בָ֖ם נְאֻם־יְהוָֽה | 32 not like the covenant that I made with their fathers on the day when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt, my covenant that they broke, though I was their husband, says the LORD |

It should be noted from Jer 31:31that the new covenant is a covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah. This is significant as it relates to discussion of Ephraim departing from Judah. We need to turn to this scripture to understand what is meant by "new" and why the author of this text would even think it necessary to have a new covenant. After all we have seen the following of the covenant at Sinai recommended as a consistent element in the Damascus Document. When we discussed the concept of covenant earlier (5.1), we noted that Christiansen likewise notes continuation with the covenant at Sinai, not abrogation, in the Damascus Document (Christiansen, 1995, 109). However, when we consider Jer 31:32, we note that the only reason stated for the need of a new covenant is that the people of Israel broke the covenant at Sinai. This is something which is referred to repeatedly in the Damascus Document: the people of Israel had broken the covenant. Jeremiah is declaring that days are coming when God will make a new covenant and it will not be like the old covenant in this one respect: the people of Israel will be able to keep it. I suggest therefore that the reason the covenant in the land of Damascus is called "new" is that the covenanters in Damascus believed that the time had come that the prophet had spoken about. They

recommitted themselves to the covenant of Sinai expecting to be able to keep it. Unfortunately, the message in 19.33-35 is that it is from this covenant that some turned and betrayed and departed.

## 7.4   Conclusion

In this chapter we have examined a series of passages from the Damascus Document that place an emphasis on departure from the way of God and from the covenantal fellowship. The notion of the sword that carries out the vengeance of the covenant was a recurring theme. The texts we looked at in this chapter included direct references to people who had joined the covenantal movement but had turned away and departed and are now called traitors. The rulers of Judah are being accused of being "poisoned" by the snake venom of the kings of Greece and warned that the judgment upon them will be carried out by the hand of the head of the kings of Greece.

In CD 7.12 Isa 7:17 is quoted, and thus this theme of departure is linked to a discourse of national division, the discourse of Ephraim departing from Judah. We were presented with a prediction that the terrible thing which happened, when Ephraim departed from Judah, could happen again. If we assume that the passage in Zech 11:11-14 is alluded to in CD 19.9-10, then this posits another link to Ms A with the reference to Isa 7:17 in CD 7.11-13, and the notion that Ephraim detached himself from Judah, as the breaking of the shepherd's staff in Zech 11:14 signifies that hope for a union between Ephraim and Judah is now broken. The princes of Judah are accused of ignorance about this judgment, and the reason given is that false prophets have misled the princes of Judah and made them feel secure. The covenant of Sinai had been broken by the people of Israel, who were therefore seen to be in need of

restoration. A renewal of the covenant is referred to as having taken place in the land of Damascus, but some had turned away again and are said to have betrayed it and departed.

We shall now return to the writings of Wallace concerning Revitalization Movements and see if this model can help us gain a fresh perspective on the above. A Revitalization Movement arises as a reaction against cultural change and the influence of foreign powers (Wallace, 1956a, 264-281). Wallace calls the fourth stage of a Revitalization Movement "adaptation". Wallace states that Revitalization Movements could be classified as revolutionary, because such movements threaten the interests of groups obtaining advantage from the status quo. Therefore, there is a tendency for the code to harden gradually and the tone to become more militant, as opposition to the movement grows (Wallace, 1956a, 275). This hostility is often reflected in terminology as nonparticipating members are classified as "traitors" and outsiders as "enemies" (Wallace, 1966, 162).

In conclusion, we may state that the context reflected in the text is similar to the one we considered in chapter three. The passages analysed in this chapter reflect a cultural crisis so deep that the theme of the division of the northern and the southern kingdoms in the past is continually referred to. We may also conclude that Wallace's account of the fourth stage in a revitalization movement corresponds closely to themes reflected in the sections of the text that we discussed. The tone has hardened and a preoccupation with traitors is evident. We noticed a discontent in the text with former members of the movement. However, this was at the same time a dissatisfaction with the rulers, the princes of Judah, who had allegedly succumbed to the influence of foreign powers and foreign ways of life. A word play indicated that the princes of Judah could have been former members, as they were said to have turned away, as they allegedly were deceived by false prophets.

By comparing the findings to Wallace's account of a Revitalization movement we realise that the movement could have started as a reaction to foreign influence and cultural changes, as these elements are reflected in the text. We gain the perspective that the movement could have challenged the political status quo, because of its opposition towards the leaders of Judah, who according to the text had succumbed to foreign influence. We realise that, as the tension between the movement and the political leaders was growing, the movement reacted with discontent towards the rulers, and towards former covenanters.

# 8 Conclusion

We began this study with a quest for a fresh perspective on the movement reflected in the Damascus Document, asking the question: Does the Damascus Document reflect a Revitalization Movement (Wallace, 1956a) and would using this model help us gain a fresh perspective on the movement reflected in this key document from the corpus of the Scrolls and the context in which the movement developed? We may now conclude that the movement reflected in the Damascus Document could be classified as a Revitalization Movement, and that we have gained fresh perspectives on the movement, which can now be summed up and developed in our concluding chapter.

In the first chapter the term sect was problematized. Sect is a sociological term that was developed in a context in which a normative religious institution was in opposition to one or more sects. As scholars no longer assume that a normative Judaism existed within late second temple Judaism, the term sect does not fit the context of the movement it seeks to describe. For this reason, I decided to attempt to find a model that would fit the context of the Damascus Document and possibly add some insights into which circumstances led to the development of such a movement.

## 8.1 The Separation of Ephraim from Judah

"Revitalization Movements" (Wallace, 1956a) is a theoretical construct based on observations drawn from documented data about social and religious movements. According to Wallace, the context in which the need for revitalization arises can be characterized as a cultural identity crisis of an entire community of people, which develops due to various changes in the historical context, which leads to changes of norms and values in the larger society (Wallace, 1956a, 264-281).

Signs of a cultural identity crisis and the factors causing it are evident throughout the Damascus Document. My study challenges the prominent view that the major crisis causing the rise of the movement was the Babylonian exile, as another paradigm related to Isa 7.17, featuring the separation of Ephraim from Judah, is alluded to in several ways. Twice Isa 7:17 is quoted, "There shall come upon your people days such as have not come since the day that Ephraim departed from Judah". In CD 13.23-14.1 this acts as a warning at the end of the role of the *overseer,* but the quote in CD 7.11 is central to the polemic discourses in CD 7.9b-8.21 (with a parallel passage in Ms B: CD 19.1-34a, and most of the remaining part of Ms B: CD 19.33b-20.34). The context in Isaiah is the Syro-Ephraimite war of 733 BC when the Judean king Ahaz fails to heed Isaiah's warning not to rely on the Assyrian king. In Isa 7:17 Isaiah tells Ahaz that, because of this disobedience, the Lord intends to bring judgement on Judah and that Assyria will be used as the tool of judgement. In the years following the encounter between Ahaz and Isaiah the prophecy unfolded, as the Assyrians first destroyed Syria and the northern kingdom, Israel, and then ravaged Judah and placed Jerusalem under siege. The use of the Isaiah citation was meant to pose a warning and an admonition to rely on the Lord and not be bound by unholy alliances.

Several passages from the Damascus Document place an emphasis on departure from the way of God. CD 8.3b-12 is tied together with CD 7.11-13 by this theme of departure and the discourse of Ephraim's departure from Judah taken from Isa 7.17. The princes of Judah are accused of walking in the ways of the kings of Greece, and this is followed by a warning that these kings shall therefore be the vessels of God's judgment on the princes of Judah in the same way as the Assyrian king in Isa 7:17. The princes of Judah have not understood that judgment is coming as false prophets have misled them and made them feel secure. To

illustrate this, allusions are made to Ezek 13:10 and 22:28 in which false prophets are accused of speaking of peace, when there is no peace. This behaviour is likened to somebody who smears a wall with whitewash, but the wall shall be broken down by the rain, it cannot protect Israel in the day of battle. In Ezek 22 the leaders and the priests of the people are being blamed of bribes and dishonest gain. In CD 8.5 this accusation is directed at the leaders of Judah, who are said to have defiled themselves in the ways of whores and wicked wealth and revenge and bitterness against their brothers. CD 8.3 represents a word play in which two meanings are represented: those on whom God's wrath shall be poured out are the princes of Judah, and they are at the same time described as "those who depart". This analysis indicates that the crisis of the people in the movement was caused because the ruling class in Judah had adopted a foreign way of life, the way of the kings of Greece.

The separation of Ephraim from Judah is referred to in several ways, which underscore this as a major paradigm in the Damascus Document. In CD 19.7b-14 an allusion to Zech 11:11-14 exposes the same theme: The unity of the northern and the southern kingdom will be broken. The text in Zechariah indicates that even future hopes of restoration of the unity are being broken. The allusion to the new covenant in Jeremiah (19.33b-34) also relates to the division versus unity discourse, as it refers to Jer 31:31, "Behold, days are coming, says the LORD, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah".

Deception is also a central theme of CD 4.12b-21 in which the builders of the wall feature in CD 4.19. The passage warns that Belial will be set loose to trap Israel in his three nets (CD 4.17-18): "The first is fornication, the second wealth and the third ritual defilement of the Temple". The paragraph presenting Belial's nets is encapsulated in a larger framework of passages from Ezekiel encompassing references to false prophets, as well as eschatological

hope regarding the state of the temple (3.2.2). The discourse is a continuation of CD 3.20b-4.12a which, considering the connections to 1 Sam 2:35 and 1Kings 2:27, 35, probably portrays the beginning of a new priesthood replacing the current "worthless" priesthood. There are several ways the text could be interpreted, and it is not possible from this text alone to decide whether the movement was started or led by Zadokite priests, or whether the passage should be understood metaphorically so that the movement saw itself as a fulfillment of the prophecy as the sons of Zadok, who arise at the end of days. However, in the Biblical account, the "worthless" priesthood was not abrogated right away, but somewhat later, while the Zadokite priesthood elected by God had to wait during a time of evil to take their stand later (5.2). The solutions to the problems of a defiled Temple and a "worthless" priesthood were thus seen to lie in the future, while a sense of religious displacement characterized the present.

A discourse of "the sword" particularly linked to Lev 26 and Deut 28-32 repeats itself throughout the document (Campbell, 1995, 65). The sword represents God's judgment with the possibility of annihilation of the people of Israel (3.2.1). In CD 1.11 there is a reference to what happened when Israel was taken into exile by the Babylonians, and the author explicitly mentions Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon (CD 1.6). The author calls those who survived this judgment a remnant (CD 1.4). This concept was already advanced by the biblical prophets, who developed it into a key motif that God would not fail his people. Remnant is furthermore acknowledged in anthropology as a concept used by a people or an ethnic group that has faced annihilation. I argued that at the most basic level the reference to a remnant after the exile denotes that their ethnic group had not been destroyed at that point in history and this is what I take it to mean. If remnant is understood in this way, the notion that God will leave a remnant in every generation makes sense (CD 2.11). I therefore understand the

reference to the Babylonian exile expressed in the text as part of the discourse of the sword, presenting a collective memory and a warning of what happens if the covenant is broken.

Finally, we noted that Biblical paradigms and connotations relating to Judah and Damascus have been turned around in the Damascus Document, so Judah is seen as a place of judgment and Damascus a place where the Law is kept, and the blessings of the Land abound. CD 6.2b-10a reflects a world that has been turned upside down, and it seems as if the members of the movement felt it was impossible for them to realize the values they had learned to take as goals and models if they stayed in Judah (3.2.3). In a similar way CD 4.1-3 concerns a discourse of leaving the Land of Judah (5.2), and CD 4.10b -12a seems to imply that as matters get worse a time may come in which it will no longer be possible to join the "House of Judah" (5.2).

## 8.2   Prophet and Message

Wallace maintains that a Revitalization Movement is usually conceived and initiated by a "prophet". The term "prophet" is used by Wallace to describe an individual who claims he has had visions or encounters with a supernatural being and who goes on to share these with others in his society. In some cases, the individual has had no vision but a similarly defining moment of inspiration, which has led to a changed life (Wallace, 1956a, 270-71). Wallace considers the task of such a person to be "to revive a traditional culture now fallen into desuetude" (Wallace, 1956a, 275). According to Wallace, this kind of person would not lead a movement for long, but let his disciples carry his message and the work forward (Wallace, 1956a, 273).

We have discussed the role of two figures mentioned in the Damascus Document, the *Moreh Sedek* and the *Doresh Torah,* and noted that the titles possibly refer to the same person. The text portrays the role of the *Moreh Sedek* and of the *Doresh Torah* as discerning how the traditions and Hebrew scriptures revered by the movement was to be understood and practiced. We do not know whether the *Moreh Sedek* or the *Doresh Torah* had had any dreams or revelations, but the revelatory expositions of Moses and the prophets given by them were understood to be authoritative. It is thus possible to understand the *Moreh Sedek* and the *Doresh Torah* as such a "prophet" of the movement reflected in the Damascus Document.

The reason no dreams or visions feature in the text could be due to the message of the Damascus Document, which is consistently focused on the need to return to "the interpretation of the Torah in which the forefathers were instructed" and "the covenant that God established with the forefathers" (CD 4.8-10). The genre also supports the message as the text is ripe with frequent allusions to scriptures revered by the movement. Even the title *Moreh Sedek* was shown to contain allusions to scripture: Hos 10:12, Joel 2:23 and Isa 30:20. I established that all three passages are taken from texts dealing with rebellion and God's judgment and all three passages come as a promise of restoration following repentance. The allusions in Joel 2:23 and Isa 30:20 contain a double meaning: "teacher" and "rain". Furthermore, we recognized that in Isa 30:20 affliction and the time of the Teacher seem to coincide. This poses a parallel to CD 1.1-11 in which the time in which the Teacher arrived is described as an evil era. Although the play on words could be said to shift the focus from "rain" to "teacher" in CD 1.11a, the reference to "rain" is kept, as CD 1.11a connects with the text of CD 1.7, which refers to God's intervention as a plant sprouting and taking possession in the Land. Deuteronomy 11:13-15 and Leviticus 26:3-4 form the background for Joel 2:23, and Deuteronomy 11:14 contains a promise that, if the people of Israel listen to the Torah and

love the Lord with all their heart, then God will send the early rain and the latter rain and make the land fruitful. Similarly, in CD 6.7-11 the *Doresh Torah* is presented as a legislator who decrees the legislation for the whole age of wickedness. The process of interpretation of the Torah to legislate is likened to digging a well to bring forth the water from the ground. In both passages the blessings of righteous teaching is likened to water, in CD 1:11 to water being poured down and in CD 6.7-11 to water that needs to be dug up from the ground. These blessings of water and fruitfulness that the correct interpretation of the Torah brings are in stark contrast to the discourse of the sword (Lev 26), which refers to the expected outcome of breaking the covenant (3.2.1).

The recurring theme in the Damascus Document is that of sin and repentance from sin, which forms the background for renewed blessing, as the covenant relationship is restored. The designation "Israel" is used for the party with whom God made a covenant. However, according to CD 3.14 "all Israel had gone astray". We realised that the members of the movement see themselves as part of "all Israel" that strayed, and that they pose themselves to be different only in that they repented of sin and returned to the Torah of Moses (CD 15.8-10), while the rest of Israel kept straying from the covenant without repentance. Certain terms are used as qualifiers in this discourse, thus the expression "the penitents of Israel" refers to the members of the movement, while "the straying of Israel" are those who have not repented of their sin (5.1).

Proselytes were seen to take part in the hierarchy of the movement (CD 14.3-18a). These proselytes were most likely foreigners who had converted to Judaism (6.4). The decision to welcome foreigners was seen to be dependent on Isa 56:2-6, which shares many similarities with CD 3.12b-14 and CD 4.3 (Campbell, 1995, 81). The connection to Isa 56.2-6 seems to

indicate that those who belonged to Israel by ethnicity were not guaranteed participation in covenantal identity; rather it was by choice, as foreigners could choose to keep the sabbaths and "adhere to the commandments"; and vice versa Israel could fail to "adhere to the commandments" (Isa 56.6). In a recent thesis, Palmer similarly argues that the proselytes, *ger,* are gentiles, and that they change their ethnic identity when they join the movement (Palmer, 2016). This inclusion of proselytes was promoted because the movement drew their ideals from the Book of Isaiah. Therefore, the choice to include foreigners fits the pattern that we have noted, which consists of an emphasis of returning to old virtues and living according to the Torah and the prophets.

## 8.3   Organisation and Economy

Wallace describes that, within the "existing culture", which refers to the historical context of the movement, a "transfer culture" is established which denotes a system of undertakings that supposedly will lead to the development of the "goal culture" (Wallace, 1966, 160). The "goal culture" refers to a perceived ideal culture, which in messianic movements will be created by the messiah; whereas the "transfer culture" denotes a purposeful, organised effort by members of a society to construct a more satisfying culture in the present (Wallace, 1956a, 265). For a movement to succeed it is necessary for it to obtain a successful economic system (Wallace, 1966, 162).

Our analysis shows that the movement reflected in the Damascus Document corresponds closely to Wallace's paradigm. The rule of the assembly of all the camps (6.4) was seen to include many of the elements from the rule of the individual camps (6.3). These passages present a leadership and an orderly hierarchical structure and confirm the presence of both

priests and laity in the movement (6.1). The text is ripe with allusions to wilderness imagery and to Isaiah.

Remarkably, in the passage concerning the admissions procedure (CD 15.5b-15.15a) there is no mention of sons of Zadok, priests, Levites, or judges: the *overseer* is fully in charge (6.3.2). Nobody could enter the covenantal fellowship without conferring with the *overseer*. He is supposed to teach the members, and we note the strong emphasis of the importance of the return to the covenant that Moses established (CD 15.8), and a return to the law of Moses (CD 15.12). The *overseer* and the judges were seen to be responsible for collecting and distributing money to establish a system of provision for the needy according to principles from Isaiah.

It seems that at the core of the role of the *overseer* is a concern that he should be an example and a guardian of the Lord's people, helping the members of the congregation not to become dependent on the "existing culture" and its lifestyle (6.3.1). This proposal was supported by my finding of an allusion to Isa 10:1-3. It should be noted that one of the Isa 7:17 citations appear at the end of the rule of the *overseer* (CD 13.23-14) and that the context of Isa 10:1-3 is the same as in Isa 7:17. The allusion to Isa 10.1-3 also posits a link to CD 8.3, the visitation of the princes of Judah. The association concerns content as well as terminology. This connection between Isa10:1-3 and the princes of Judah in CD 8.3 reveals what injustices in society might have led to the establishment of the role of the *overseer*. In Isaiah the woe concerns people making laws that lead to deprivation of the poor and the needy and causes oppression and bondage. The role of the *overseer* is to do the opposite, to undo the bonds of injustice and oppression. It would seem probable from this observation that the rule of the

*overseer* was established in response to injustice in society similar to that which is stated in Isa 10:1-3.

The fact that a "transfer culture" is said to denote a purposeful organised effort could give us an explanation as to why large parts of the Damascus Document concern laws and regulations in relation to right conduct in the evil era or era of wrath, whether the laws are explicitly spelt out or just referred to as the covenant and the commandments.

The movement could be defined as a messianic movement. Only a few short sections mention the messiah (5.3). By comparing to Wallace's model, we realise that the passages related to the messiah are possibly short in nature because the members of the movement do not have to make an organised effort to change the world when messiah comes. We concluded that the solutions to the problems of a defiled Temple and a "worthless" priesthood were seen to lie in the future. The portrayal of the messiah of Aaron providing atonement could be an indication that he would come as the new messianic high priest to restore the polluted Temple.

## 8.4   Final Considerations

There is no evidence in the Damascus Document that the movement reached a fifth stage of Revitalization in which the whole or a dominant part of the population within a culture accepts the doctrines and joins the movement. Rather, hostility is reflected in terminology as outsiders are classified as "traitors". The Damascus Document can thus be classified as a Revitalization Movement reaching the fourth stage of revitalization and no further.

In the beginning of this study we noted that the exact context of the Damascus Document is not known, but that the Damascus Document must have been in existence before its earliest copy 4Q266 was the written in the first half of the first century BCE. Evidence in the text was

seen to imply that the ruling class in Judah had adopted a foreign way of life, the way of the kings of Greece. Furthermore, the text has no mention of Romans. Thus, the data in this study suggest a date either early in the first century BCE or in the second century BCE. The dating is also of interest as our study confirmed the inclusion of gentiles as proselyte members in the movement.

As this has proved to be a fruitful study I suggest that the model of revitalization could be used for studies on other texts from Qumran. Furthermore, I have been surprised that after so many years of study of the Damascus Document it is still possible to find more scriptural allusions and to see more connections between the allusions in the text. Therefore, I suggest that we keep digging, as I am convinced that many more gems are to be found.

# Bibliography

Abbreviations used in this thesis follow *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Biblical Studies and Related Disciplines* (2nd ed.) listed below.

Abegg, Martin G. Jr. (1995). The Messiah at Qumran: Are We Still Seeing Double? *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (2), 125-144.

Abegg, Martin G. Jr. (2003). The Covenant of the Qumran Sectarians. In Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C.R. de Roo, *The Concept of Covenant in the Second Temple Period*, 81-97. Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement Series 71. Leiden: Brill.

Allen, Leslie. (1976). *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah. and Micah. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Arnold, Rusell C.D. (2006). *The Social Role of Liturgy in the Religion of the Qumran Community*. Leiden: Brill.

Baltzer, K. (1971). *The Covenant Formulary in Old Testament Jewish and Early Christian Writings.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Barnard, Alan (2000). *History and Theory in Anthropology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barton, John. (2007). *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile.* (New edition, first published in 1986). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baumgarten, Albert I. (1997). *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era*. Leiden: Brill.

Baumgarten, Albert I. (2000). The Perception of the Past in the Damascus Document. In Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon and Avital Pinnick, *The Damascus Document. A Centennial of Discovery. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center,*1-15. STDJ 34. Leiden: Brill.

Baumgarten, Albert I. (2007). Information Processing in Ancient Jewish Groups. In David J. Chalcraft, *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances*, 246-255. London: Equinox.

Baumgarten, Joseph M. (1983). The 'Sons of Dawn' in CDC 13:14-15 and the Ban on Commerce among the Essenes, *IEJ* 33, 81-85.

Baumgarten, Joseph M. (1992). The Laws of the Damascus Document in Current Research. In Magen Broshi, *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*, 51-62. Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society.

Baumgarten, Joseph M. (1996). *Qumran Cave 4. XIII. The Damascus Document (4Q266-273)* (DJD XVIII). Oxford: Clarendon.

Beckwith, R.T. (1982). The Pre-History and Relationships of the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes: A Tentative Reconstruction. *RevQ,* 41, 3-46.

Bengtsson, H. (2000). *What's in a Name? A Study of the Sobriquets in the Pesharim.* Uppsala: Uppsala University.

Blanton, Thomas R. (2007). *Constructing a New Covenant: Discursive Strategies in the Damascus Document and Second Corinthians.* (WUNT 2nd series 233). Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. (2006). *Opening the Sealed Book. Interpretations of the Book of Isaiah in Late Antiquity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Boda, Mark J. (2016). *The Book of Zechariah* (Series: New International Commentary on the Old Testament). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Boyce, M. (1988). *The Poetry of the Damascus Document.* Edinburgh: PhD (unpublished).

Brooke, George, J. (1980). The Amos Numbers Midrash and Messianic Expectation. *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 92, 397-404.

Brooke, George, J. (1989). Psalms 105 and 106 at Qumran. *RevQ*, 14, 267-292.

Brooke, George J. (1999). The Scrolls and the Study of the New Testament. In Robert A. Kugler and Eileen M. Schuller *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings,* 61-76. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature

Brooke, George J. (2005). Justifying Deviance, the Place of Scripture in Converting to a Qumran Self-Understanding. In Kristin de Troyer et al., *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library, the Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations*, 73-87. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Brooke, George, J. (2017). Aspects of Education in the Sectarian Scrolls from the Qumran Caves. In George J. Brooke and Renate Smithuis, *Jewish Education from Antiquity to the Middle Ages: Studies in Honour of Philip S. Alexander*, 11-42. Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 100. Leiden: Brill.

Bruner, Edward M. (1986). Ethnography as Narrative. In Victor W. Turner and Edward M. Bruner, *The Anthropology of Experience,* 139-156. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Burnett, David. (2002). *Clash of Worlds.* London: Monarch Books.

Campbell, Jonathan G. (1995). *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1-8, 19-20.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Chalcraft, David J. (2007). Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances? Some Critical Sociological Reflections. In David J. Chalcraft, *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances*, 2-23. London: Equinox.

Chalcraft, David J. (2007a). The Development of Weber's Sociology of Sects: Encouraging a New Fascination. In David J. Chalcraft, *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances*, 26-51. London: Equinox.

Chalcraft, David J. (2007b). Towards a Weberian Sociology of the Qumran Sects. In David J. Chalcraft, *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances*, 74-105. London: Equinox.

Chalcraft, David J. (2007c). Weber's Treatment of Sects in 'Ancient Judaism': The Pharisees and the Essenes. In David J. Chalcraft, *Sectarianism in Early Judaism Sociological Advances*, 52-73. London: Equinox.

Chalcraft, David J. (2007d). A Weber Bibliography. In David J. Chalcraft, *Sectarianism in Early Judaism Sociological Advances*, 52-73. London: Equinox.

Chalcraft, David J. (2011). Is a Historical Comparative Sociology of (Ancient Jewish) Sects possible? In Sacha Stern, *Sects and Sectarianism in Jewish History*, 235-287. Leiden: Brill.

Charlesworth, James H. (2002). *The Pesharim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus?* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Christiansen, Ellen Juhl. (1995). *The Covenant in Judaism and Paul: A Study of Ritual Boundaries as Identity Markers* (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 27). Leiden: Brill.

Coleman, S. and Collins, P. (2004). *Introduction: Ambiguous Attachments: Religion, Identity and Nation* (S. Coleman and P. Collins). UK: Ashgate.

Collins, Billie Jean (2014). *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Biblical Studies and Related Disciplines* (2nd ed.). Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature

Collins, John J. (2010a). *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Grand Rapids: Eerdman.

Collins, John J. (2010b). *The Scepter and the Star: Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls.* (2nd Edition). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Collins, John J. (2012). Historiography in the Dead Sea Scrolls. *Dead Sea Discoveries* 19 (2), 159-176.

Collins, Matthew A. (2009). *The Use of Sobriquets in the Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls*. London: T&T Clark.

Collins, Matthew A. (2017). Text, Intertext and Conceptual Identity: The Case of Ephraim and the Seekers of Smooth Things. In Ariel Feldman, Maria Cioata and Charlotte Hempel, *Is there a Text in this Cave? Studies in the Textuality of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of George J. Brooke,* 209-225. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 119. Leiden, Brill.

Craffert, Pieter F. (2001). An Exercise in the Critical Use of Models: The 'Goodness of Fit' of Wilson's Sect Model.  In John J. Pilch, *Social Scientific Models for Interpreting the Bible*, 21-46. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

D'Andrade, Roy G. (1995). *The Development of Cognitive Anthropology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Davies, Philip R. (1983). *The Damascus Covenant, An Interpretation of the 'Damascus Document'* (JSOTsup, 25). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Davies, Philip R. (1987). *Behind the Essenes: History and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Davies, Philip R. (1988a). Commentary: How Not to Do Archaeology: The Story of Qumran. *The Biblical Archaeologist* 51, 203-207

Davies, Philip R. (1988b). The Teacher of Righteousness and the 'End of Days', *RevQ* 13, 313-317.

Davies, Philip R. (1994). The 'Damascus Sect' and Judaism. In John C. Reeves and John Kampen, *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, 70-84. JSOTSup 184. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Davies, Philip R. (2000). The Judaism(s) of the Damascus Document. In Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther Chazon and Avital Pinnick, *The Damascus Document. A Centennial Discovery*, 27-43. Leiden: Brill.

Davies, Philip R. (2005). Sects from Texts: On the Problems of Doing a Sociology of the Qumran Literature. In Jonathan G. Campbell, William John Lyons and Lloyd K.

Pietersen, *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 8-10 September 2003*, 69-82. London: T&T Clark International.

Davis, Robert. (1992). *The History and the Composition of the 'Damascus Document'*. PhD Dissertation. Harvard University.

Davis, John. (1992). History and the People without Europe. In Kirsten Hastrup, *Other Histories,* 14-28. London: Routledge.

Dimant, Devorah. (2006). Israel's Subjugation to the Gentiles. *RevQ*, 87, 373-389.

Elliott, Mark A. (2000). *The Survivors of Israel: A Reconsideration of the Theology of Pre-Christian Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Eshel, Hanan. (1999). The Meaning and Significance of CD 20, 13-15. In Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich, *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 330-336. Leiden: Brill.

Eshel, Hanan. (2007). The Damascus Document's 'Three Nets of Belial': A Reference to the Aramaic Levi Documents? In Lynn R. LiDonnici and Andrea Liber, *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism,* 243-255. Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement Series 119. Leiden: Brill.

Evans, Craig A. (2003). Covenant in the Qumran Literature. In Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C.R. de Roo, *The Concept of Covenant in the Second Temple Period*, 55-80. Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement Series 71. Leiden: Brill.

Fabry, Heinz-Joseph. (1975). *Die Wurzel Sub in der Qumran-Literatur.* Bonn: Peter Hastein Verlag.

Fabry, Heinz-Joseph. (2010). Priests at Qumran: A Reassessment. In Charlotte Hempel, *The Dead Seas Scrolls: Texts and Contexts,* 243-262. Leiden: Brill.

Falk, Daniel K. (1998). *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls.* STDJ 27. Leiden: Brill.

Fassberg, Steven E. (2000). The Linguistic Study of the Damascus Document: A Historical Perspective. In Joseph Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon and Avital Pinnick, *The Damascus Document a Centennial of Discovery. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center,* 53-68. STDJ 34. Leiden: Brill.

Fassberg, Steven E. (2012). Dead Sea Scrolls: Linguistic Features. In Khan Geoffrey, *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics*, 9-11. Leiden:Brill.

Fishbane, Michael. (1988). *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fitzmyer, J. A. (1970). Prolegomenon to the reprint of S. Schechter. In *Documents of Jewish Sectaries, vol.I. Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, 9-37. New York: Ktav.

Fitzmyer, Joseph. (1992). The Gathering in of the Community's Teacher, *Maarav* (8), 223-228.

Fraade, Steven D. (1993). Interpretive Authority in the Studying Community at Qumran. *Journal of Jewish Studies,* 44/1, 287-301.

Fraade, Steven D. (1999). Shifting from Priestly to Non-Priestly Legal Authority: A Comparison of the Damascus Document and the Midrash Sifra. *Dead Sea Discoveries* 6 (2), 109-125.

Fraade, Steven D. (2000). Hagu, Book of. In Lawrence H Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (eds.) *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls vol. 1*, 327. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

García Martínez, Florentino and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. (1997). *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition* (I). Leiden: Brill.

García Martínez, Florentino and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. (1997). *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition* (II). Leiden: Brill.

García Martínez, Florentino. (2007a). A Groningen Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History. In García Martínez, Florentino and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *Qumranica Minora I: Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism.* STDJ 63, 31-52. Leiden: Brill.

García Martínez, Florentino. (2007b). Was Judas Maccabaeus a Wicked Priest? Marginal Notes on 1QpHab VIII 8-13. In García Martínez, Florentino and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *Qumranica Minora I: Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism*. STDJ 63, 53-66. Leiden: Brill.

García Martínez, Florentino. (2010). Beyond the Sectarian Divide: The 'Voice of the Teacher' as an Authority-Conferring Strategy in Some Qumran Texts. In S. Metso, H. Najman and E. Schuller (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts*, 227-244. Leiden: Brill.

Garland, David D. (1968). *Bible Study Commentary: Isaiah.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Geertz, Clifford. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books.

Geertz, Clifford. (1996). Primordial Ties. In John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, *Ethnicity,* 40-44. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ginzberg, Louis. (1970). *An Unknown Jewish Sect*. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

Goff, Matthew J. (2013). *4Q Instruction*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Goldman, Liora. (2009). The Exegesis and Structure of Pesharim in the Damascus Document. In Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz, *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 35, 193-202. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Good, Byron. (1994). *Medicine, Rationality and Experience: An Anthropological Perspective.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goodman, Martin. (2010). Constructing Ancient Judaism from the Scrolls. In Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins, *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 81-91. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grabbe, Lester L. (2007). When is a Sect a Sect - or not? Groups and Movements in the Second Temple Period. In David J. Chalcraft, *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances*, 114-132. London: Equinox.

Greenfield, Jonas C. (1988). The Words of Levi Son of Jacob in Damascus Document IV, 15-19. *RevQ 13,* 319-322.

Grossman, Maxine L. (2002). *Reading for History in the Damascus Document: A Methodological Study.* STDJ 45. Leiden: Brill.

Gruber, Mayer I. (2017). *Hosea: A Textual Commentary.* Bloomsbury: T&T Clark.

Grumet, Robert S. (2003) 'Foreword'. In Anthony F. C. Wallace *Revitalizations and Mazeways: Essays on Culture Change, Volume 1*, Robert S. Grumet (ed.), vii-xvi. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Harkin, Michael E. (2004). Introduction: Revitalization as History and Theory. In Michael E. Harkin (ed.) *Reassessing Revitalization Movements: Perspectives from North America and the Pacific Islands.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Handler, Richard. (1985). On Having a Culture. In George W. Stocking, Jr.(ed.) *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture,* 192-217. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.

Harkins, Angela Kim. (2012a). *Reading with an 'I' to the Heavens: Looking at the Qumran Hodayot Through the Lens of Visionary Traditions.* Berlin: Walther de Gruyter.

Harkins, Angela Kim. (2012b). Who is the Teacher of the Teacher-Hymns? Re-Examining the Teacher Hymns Hypothesis Fifty Years Later. In E. F. Mason et al. (eds.), *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam*, 449-467. Leiden: Brill.

Harrington, Hannah. (2001). Holiness and Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls. *DSD* 4/2, 124-135.

Harrington, Hannah. (2004). *The Purity Texts*. London: T&T Clark.

Hastrup, Kirsten. (2005). *Det Fleksible Fællesskab*. Århus: Århus Universitetsforlag.

Hempel, Charlotte. (1998). *The Laws of the Damascus Document, Sources, Tradition and Redaction*. STDJ 29. Leiden: Brill.

Hempel, Charlotte. (1999). Community Origins in the Damascus Document in the Light of Recent Scholarship. In Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich, *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Technological Innovations, New Texts, & Reformulated Issues*, 316-329. Leiden: Brill.

Hempel, Charlotte. (2000). *The Damascus Texts*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press Ltd.

Hempel, Charlotte. (2005). The Groningen Hypothesis: Strengths and Weaknesses. In Gabriele Boccaccini, *Enoch and Qumran Origins*, 249-255. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Hempel, Charlotte. (2009). CD Manuscript B and the Rule of the Community: Reflections of a Literary Relationship. *Dead Sea Discoveries* 16 (3), 370-387.

Hempel, Charlotte. (2013). *The Qumran Rule Texts in Context: Collected Studies* (Texts and Studies on Ancient Judaism, 154). Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Himmelfarb, Martha. (2001). Impurity and Sin in 4QD, 1QS, and 4Q512. *DSD* 8/1, 9-37.

Himmelfarb, Martha. (2013). *Between Temple and Torah: Essays on Priests, Scribes, and Visionaries in the Second Temple Period and Beyond*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Holm-Nielsen, Svend. (1960). *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran*. Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget i Aarhus.

Hultgren, Stephen. (2004). A New Literary Analysis of CD XIX-XX, Part I: CD XIX:1-32a (with CD VII:4b-VIII:18b). The Midrashim and the 'Princes of Judah'. *RevQ* 84, 549-578.

Hultgren, Stephen. (2005). A New Literary Analysis of CD XIX-XX, Part II: CD XIX:32b-XX:1a and the Identity of the New Covenant. *RevQ* 85, 7-32.

Hultgren, Stephen. (2007). *From the Damascus Document to the Covenant of the Community: Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Leiden: Brill.

Ingold, Tim. (2000). *The Perception of the Environment: Essays on Livelihood, Dwelling and Skill*. London: Routledge.

James, Wendy. (1979). *'Kwanim Pa. The Making of the Uduk People: An Ethnographic Study of Survival in the Sudan-Ethiopian Border*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jassen, Alex P. (2008). Prophets and Prophecy in the Qumran Community. *Association for Jewish Studies,* 32/2, 299-334.

Jassen, Alex P. (2014). *Scripture and Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Jenkins, Richard. (1994). Rethinking Ethnicity, Identity, Categorization and Power. *Ethnic and Racial Studies 17*(2), 197-219.

Jenkins, Richard. (1996). *Social Identity*. London: Routledge.

Jensen, Iben. (1998). *Interkulturel Kommunikation i Komplekse Samfund.* Roskilde: Roskilde

Jeremias, Gert. (1963). *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (SUNT, 2). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Jokiranta, Jutta. (2006). Qumran- The Prototypical Teacher in the Qumran Pesharim, A Social-Identity Approach. In Philip F. Esler, *Ancient Israel, The Old Testament in its Social Context* (254-263). Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press.

Jokiranta, Jutta. (2009). Learning from Sectarian Responses: Windows on Qumran Sects and Emerging Christian Sects. In Florentino García Martínez, *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*, 177-209. Leiden: Brill

Jokiranta, Jutta. (2010). Sociological Approaches to Qumran Sectarianism. In Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins, *Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 200-231. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jokiranta, Jutta. (2013). *Social Identity and Sectarianism in the Qumran Movement.* STDJ 105. Leiden: Brill.

Kampen, John. (1999). The Significance of the Temple in the Manuscripts of the Damascus Document. In Robert A. Kugler and Eileen M.Schuller, *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings,* 185-197. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Kister, Menahem. (2007). The Development of the Early Recensions of the Damascus Document. *DSD,* 14, 61-76.

Knibb, Michael A. (1976). The Exile in the Literature of the Intertestamental Period. *Heythrop Journal* 17, 249-272.

Knibb, Michael A. (1983). Exile in the Damascus Document. *JSOT* 25, 99-117.

Knibb, Michael A. (1987). *The Qumran Community*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Knibb, Michael A. (1990). The Teacher of Righteousness – A Messianic Title? In P. R. Davies and R. T. White (eds.), *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History* (51-65). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Knibb, Michael A. (1991). The Interpretation of the Damascus Document VII, 9b-VIII, 2a, *RevQ* 15, 243-251.

Kugel, James L. (1994). The Jubilees Apocalypse. *Dead Sea Discoveries* 1 (3), 322-337.

Kugel, James L. (2012). *A Walk Through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of its Creation.* Leiden: Brill.

Kugler, Robert A. (1999). The Priesthood at Qumran: The Evidence of References to Levi and the Levites. In Donald W. Parry and Eugene C. Ulrich (eds.)*, The Provo*

*International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues.* STDJ 30, 465-479. Leiden: Brill.

Kugler, Robert A. (2000). Priests. In Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (eds.) *Encyclopaedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* vol.2 688-693. Oxford: University Press

Kugler, Robert A. (Forthcoming). Ethnicity: A Fresh Religious Context of the Scrolls. In George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel (eds.) *T & T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Bloomsbury: T & T Clark

Laato, A. (1992). The Chronology in the *Damascus Document* of Qumran. *RevQ* 15, 607-609.

Lied, Liv Ingeborg. (2005). Another Look at the Land of Damascus: The Spaces of the Damascus Document in the Light of Edward W. Soja's Thirdspace Approach. In Jonathan G. Campbell, William John Lyons and Lloyd K. Pietersen (eds.), *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 8-10 September 2003*, 101-125. London: T&T Clark International.

Lim, Bo H. and Daniel Castelo. (2015). *Hosea.* (The Two Horizons Old Testament Commentaries). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Lim, Timothy H. (2002). Pesharim. London: Sheffield Academic Press.

Liver, Jacob. (1967). The Sons of Zadok the Priests in the Dead Sea Sect. *RevQ* 21, 3-30

Lohse, Eduard. (1971). *Die Texte aus Qumran: Hebräisch und Deutsch.* Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft: Darmstadt.

Lowenthal, David. (1998). *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Magness, Jodi. (2002). *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* Grand Rapids: Michigan.

Maier, Johann. (1996). Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit. Franz-Delitzsch-Vorlesung 5: Münster. Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum.

Mattingly, Cheryl and Linda Garro. (2000). Narrative as Construct and Construction. In Cheryl Mattingly and Linda Garro (eds.), *Narrative and the Cultural Construction of Illness and Healing,* 1-49. California: University of California Press.

Metso, Sarianna. (1997). *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule.* Leiden: Brill.

Meyers, Eric. (2002). Jewish Culture in Greco-Roman Palestine. In David Biale*, Culture of the Jews. Volume 1: Mediterranean Origins.* 135-179. New York: Schocken Books.

Middlemas, Jill. (2007). *The Templeless Age*. London: Westminster John Knox Press.

Milik, J. T. (1959). *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*. London: SCM Press Ltd.

Morag, Shelomo. (1988). Qumran Hebrew: Some Typological Observations. *Vetus Testamentum.* 38 (2), 148-164.

Moore, George Foot. (1911). *The Covenanters of Damascus: A Hitherto Unknown Jewish Sect*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Müller, Mogens. (2003). Indledning. In Bodil Ejrnæs, Søren Holst and Mogens Müller, *Dødehavsskrifterne og de Antikke Kilder om Essæerne* (2nd), 17-27. Frederiksberg, Denmark: Anis.

Murphy, Catherine. (2002). *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Qumran Community.* Leiden: Brill.

Murphy-O'Connor, J. (1970). An Essene Missionary Document? CD II, 14-VI, 1. *RB* 77, 201-29.

Murphy-O'Connor, J. (1971a). A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document VI, 2-VIII, 3. *RB* 78, 210-32.

Murphy-O'Connor, J. (1971b). The Original Text of CD 7.9-8.2 = 19.5-14. *HTR* 64, 379-386.

Murphy-O'Connor, J. (1972 a). The Critique of the Princes of Judah (CD VIII, 3-19). *RB* 79, 200-216.

Murphy-O'Connor, J. (1972 b). A Literary Analysis of the Damascus Document XIX, 33-XX, 34. *RB* 79, 544-564.

Murphy-O'Connor, J. (1974). The Essenes and their History. *RB* 81, 215-244.

Murphy-O'Connor, J. (1985). The Damascus Document Revisited. *RB* 92, 223-246.

Najman, Hindy. (2003). *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism.* Leiden: Brill.

Neusner, Jacob (1981). Max Weber Revisited: Religion and Society in Ancient Judaism with Special Reference to the late First and Second Centuries (Oxford: Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies).

Neusner, Jacob. (2001). What is 'a Judaism'? Seeing the Dead Sea Library as the Statement of a Coherent Judaic Religious System. In Alan Avery-Peck, Jacob Neusner and Bruce D. Chilton, *Judaism in Late Antiquity, Part 5: The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls* 1, 3-21. Leiden: Brill.

Newsom, Carol A. (1990). 'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran. In William Propp et al, *The Hebrew Bible and its Interpreters*, 167-187. Brill: Leiden.

Nickelsburg, George W.; VanderKam, James. (2004). 1 Enoch: A New Translation. (Minneapolis: Fortress).

Norton, Jonathan. (2015). Composite Citations in the Damascus Document. In Sean A. Adams and Seth M. Ehorn, *Composite Citations in Antiquity: Jewish, Graeco-Roman, and Early Christian Uses.* Bloomsbury: T&T Clark.

Palmer, Carmen (2016). *Converts at Qumran: The Ger in the Dead Sea Scrolls as an Indicator of Mutable Ethnicity.* University of St. Michael's College. *PhD.*

Pfann, Stephen J. (2004). The Historical Implications of The Early Second Century Dating of the 4Q249-250 Cryptic A Corpus. In Esther G. Chazon et al., *Things Revealed:*

*Studies in Early Jewish and Christian Literature in Honor of Michael Stone,* 171-186. Leiden: Brill.

Piovanelli, Pierluigi. (2007). Was there Sectarian Behaviour before the flourishing of the Jewish Sects? A Long-term Approach to the History and Sociology of Second Temple Judaism. In David J. Chalcraft, *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances*, 156-179. London: Equinox.

Qimron, Elisha. (1986). *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Harvard Semitic Studies 29). Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Qimron, Elisha. (1992). The Text of CD. In Magen Broshi, *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*, 9-49. Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society.

Qimron, Elisha. (2010). *מגילות מדבר יהודה: החיבורים העבריים כרך ראשון* [The Dead Sea Scrolls, The Hebrew Writings, Volume1]. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press.

Rabin, Chaim. (1958). *The Zadokite Documents.* Oxford: Clarendon.

Raitt, Thomas M. (1971). The Prophetic Summons to Repentance. *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft,* 83(1), 30-49.

Reeves, John C. (1988). The meaning of Moreh Sedek in the light of 11QTorah. *RevQ 13,* 287-298.

Regev, Eyal. (2007a). *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Berlin: Walther de Gruyter.

Regev, Eyal. (2007b). Atonement and Sectarianism in Qumran: Defining a Sectarian Worldview in Moral and Halakhic Systems. In David J. Chalcraft, *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances,* 180-204. London: Equinox.

Reymond, Eric D. (2014). *Qumran Hebrew: An Overview of Orthography, Phonology, and Morphology.* Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Sanders, E.P. (1977). *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*. London: SCM Press Ltd.

Schechter, S. (1910). *Documents of Jewish Sectaries. Vol.I. Fragments of a Zadokite Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. (1975). *The Halakha at Qumran*. (SLJA 16). Leiden: Brill.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. (1983). *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony and the Penal Code*. (BJS 33). Chico California: Scholars Press.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. (1994). *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their True Meaning for Judaism and Christianity*. Philadelphia: Yale University Press.

Schluchter, Wolfgang. (1981). *Altisraelische Religiöse Ethik und Okzidentaler Rationalismus*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Schluchter, Wolfgang. (2004). The Approach of Max Weber's Sociology of Religion as Exemplified in his Study of Ancient Judaism. *Archives de Sciences Sociales des Religions* 127, 33-56.

Schwartz, D. (1981). To Join Oneself to the House of Judah: Damascus Document 4.11. *RevQ* 10, 435-446.

Schwarz, O.J.R. (1965). *Der Erste Teil der Damascusschrift und das Alte Testament*. Dienst: Lichtland.

Scott, John and Marshall, Gordon. (2005). *Oxford Dictionary of Sociology* (3rd ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Soskice, Janet. (2010). *Sisters of Sinai: How Two Adventurers Found the Hidden Gospels*. London: Vintage Books.

Sperling, S. D. (1995). Belial. In Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking and Pieter W. van der Horst (eds.) *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (DDD), 322-328. Leiden: Brill.

Stark, R. and W.S. Bainbridge. (1985). *The Future of Religion: Secularization, Revival and Cult Formation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Stegemann, Hartmut. (1971). *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde*. Bonn: Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms Universitat.

Stegemann, Hartmut. (1998). *The Library of Qumran, on the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist and Jesus* (Translated from German). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Stegemann, Hartmut. (2000). Towards Physical Reconstruction of the Qumran Damascus Document Scrolls. In Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther Chazon and Avital Pinnick, *The Damascus Document. A Centennial of Discovery. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center*, 177-200. STDJ, 34. Leiden: Brill.

Stern, Sacha. (2011). The 'Sectarian' Calendar of Qumran. In Sacha Stern (ed.), *Sects and Sectarianism in Jewish History*. IJS Studies in Judaica 12. Leiden: Brill.

Steudel, Annette. (1993). אחרית הימים in the texts from Qumran. *RevQ* 62, 225-246.

Steudel, Annette. (2000). The Development of Essenic Eschatology. In Albert I. Baumgarten (ed.), *Apocalyptic Time,* 70-86. Leiden: Brill.

Steudel, Annette. (2012). The Damascus Document (D) as a Rewriting of the Community Rule (S). *RevQ* 100, 605-620.

Stuckenbruck, Loren T. (2007). The Teacher of Righteousness Remembered: From Fragmentary Sources to Collective Memory in the Dead Sea Scrolls. In S. Barton, L. Stuckenbruck, B. Wold, (eds.), *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity: The Fifth Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium (Durham, September 2004),* 75-94. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Taggar-Cohen, Ada. (2011). Biblical Covenant and Hittite išiul reexamined. Vetus Testamentum 61/3, 461-488.

Talmon, Shemaryahu. (1989). *The World of Qumran from Within*. Jerusalem-Leiden: The Magness Press, Brill.

Talmon, Shemaryahu. (1991). The Internal Diversification of Judaism in the Early Second
Temple Period. In Shemaryahu Talmon, *Jewish Civilization in the Hellenistic-Roman Period*, 16-43. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Talmon, Yonina. (1962). Pursuit of the Millennium: The Relation Between Religious and
Social Change. *European Journal of Sociology*, 3(1), 125-148.

Talmon, Yonina. (1966). Millenarian Movements. *European Journal of Sociology*, 7(2), 159-200.

Taylor, Joan E. (2012). Buried Manuscripts and Empty Tombs: The Qumran Genizah Theory
Revisited. In Maeir, Aren M., Jodi Magness and Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Go Out and Study the Land (Judges 18:2)*, 269-315. Leiden: Brill.

Thomas, Samuel I. (2009). *The 'Mysteries' of Qumran: Mystery, Secrecy and Esotericism in
the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Thomas, Samuel. (2011). בלייעל In Heinz-Josef Fabry and Ulrich Dahmen (eds.) *Theologisches
Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten, Band 1*, 452-458. Germany: Verlag W. Kohlhammer.

Tiller, P. (1987). The Laws of the Damascus Document and Qumran. *HNTSP* (Unpublished).

Tippet, Alan. (2000). *Introduction to Missiology*. Pasadena: William Carey Library.

Tollefson, Kenneth D. and H. G. M. Williamson. (1997). Nehemiah as Cultural
Revitalization: An Anthropological Perspective. In J. Cheryl Exum (ed.) *The Historical Books: A Sheffield Reader*, 322-348. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Tov, Emanuel. (2006). *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library* [CD-ROM] (Revised
Edition). Leiden: Brill.

Tromp, Johannes. (2007). Damascus Document IV 10-12. In Anthony Hilhorst, Emile Peuch
and Eibert Tigchelaar, *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early*

*Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*, 225-237. Leiden: Brill.

VanderKam, James C. (1989). *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text.* Louvain: Peeters.

VanderKam, James C. (1990). People and High Priesthood in Early Maccabean Times. In William Henry Propp et al (eds.), *The Hebrew Bible and its Interpreters*, 205-225. Indiana: Eisenbrauns.

VanderKam, James. C. (1994). Messianism in the Scrolls. In E. Ulrich and J. C. VanderKam, (eds,). *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Notre Dame: Notre Dame University.

Vaux, R. de. (1973). *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vermes, Geza. (1973). *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies.* (Studia Post-Biblica; 4). Leiden: Brill.

Vermes, Geza. (1998). *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. (4th ed.). London: Penguin Books.

Wacholder, ben Zion. (1988). Does Qumran Record the Death of the Moreh? The Meaning of he'aseph in Damascus Document XIX, 35, XX, 14. *RevQ* 13, 323-330.

Wacholder, Ben Zion. (2007). *The New Damascus Document. The Midrash on the Eschatological Torah of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Reconstruction, Translation and Commentary.* STDJ 56. Leiden: Brill.

Wallace, Anthony F. C. (1956a). Revitalization Movements: Some Theoretical Considerations for their Comparative Studies, *American Anthropologist* 58, 264-281.

Wallace, Anthony F. C. (1956b). The Disaster Syndrome. In Anthony F. C. Wallace *Tornado in Worcester: An Explanatory Study of Individual and Community Behavior in*

*an Extreme Situation*, 109-11, 16-18, 23-29, 40-46, 51-59. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council.

Wallace, Anthony F. C. (1966). *Religion: An Anthropological View.* New York: Random House.

Wallace, Anthony F. C. (1969). *The Death and Rebirth of the Seneca.* New York: Random House.

Wallace, Anthony F. C. (1970). *Personality and Culture* (2nd ed.). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Wallace, Anthony F. C. (2003). *Revitalizations and Mazeways*: *Essays on Cultural Change, Volume 1.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Wallace, Anthony F. C. (2004). *Modernity and Mind*: *Essays on Cultural Change, Volume 2.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Wassen, Cecilia. (2005). *Women in the Damascus Document.* Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Wassen, Cecilia and Jutta Jokiranta. (2007). Groups in Tension: Sectarianism in the Damascus Document and the Community Rule. In David J. Chalcraft (ed.), *Sectarianism in Early Judaism*, 205-245. London: Equinox.

Webb, Barry. (1996). *The Message of Isaiah.* Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press.

Weber, Max. (1952). *Ancient Judaism* (Hans H. Gerth and Don Martindale, translators and eds.). Illinois: The Free Press.

Weber, Max. (1956). *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft: Grundriss der Verstehenden Soziologie (Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology).* 2. vols. Johannes Winckelmann (ed.). Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.

Weingreen, J. (1961). The Title Moreh Sedek. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 6, 162-174.

Werrett, Ian C. (2007). *Ritual Purity and the Dead Sea Scrolls.* STDJ 72. Leiden: Brill.

White, Sidnie Ann. (1987). A Comparison of the A and B Manuscripts of the Damascus Document. *RevQ 12,* 537-553.

Wilson, Bryan R. (1973). *Magic and the Millennium*. London: Heinemann.

Wilson, Bryan R. (1990). *The Social Dimensions of Sectarianism*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Wise, Michael. (2010). The Origins and History of the Teacher's Movement. In Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins, (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 92-122. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Woude, Adam S. van der. (1987). Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests? Reflections on the Identification of the Wicked Priest in Habakkuk Pesher from Cave 1 of Qumran. *RevQ 17,* 375-384.

Wright, Christopher J. H. (1983). *Bible Study Commentary. Proverbs-Isaiah 39.* London: Scripture Union

Wright, Christopher J. H. (1990). *God's People in God's Land. Family, Land and Property in the Old Testament.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Wright, Christopher J. H. (2004). *Old Testament Ethics for the People of God*. Nottingham: Inter-Varsity Press.