6-1-1957

The Teacher of the Righteousness and his Relationship to Jesus Christ

Norman Habel
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_habeln@csl.edu

Short Title

THE TEACHER OF RIGHTEOUSNESS

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Exegetical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Sacred Theology

by

Norman Charles Habel

June 1957

Approved by: Arand V. R. Hamann
Advisor

Arand V. Hamann
Reader

THE TEACHER OF RIGHTEOUSNESS AND HIS RELATIONSHIP TO JESUS CHRIST

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Exegetical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Sacred Theology

---

by

Norman Charles Habel

June 1957

Approved by: Alfred V. R. Bauer
Advisor

Horace D. Hummel
Reader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

1Q	Qumran Cave One
4Q	Qumran Cave Four
fr.	Fragment
p	Pesher or commentary
1QH	Thanksgiving Hymns, or Hodayoth
1QM	War of the Sons of Light with the Sons of Darkness, or Milhamah
1QpHab.	Commentary on Habakkuk chapters one and two
1QpMic.	Commentary on Micah (fragments on chapter one)
1QS	Manual of Discipline or Serek Hayyahad
1QSa	Manual or Serek for the Future Congregation of Israel
1QSb	Collection of Benedictions
4QpGen.	Commentary on Genesis (fragments on chapter forty-nine)
4QpHos.	Commentary on Hosea (fragmentary)
4QpIs.	Commentary on Isaiah (fragments on chapters ten and eleven)
4QpNah.	Commentary on Nahum (fragments on chapter two)
4QpPs37	Commentary on Psalm thirty-seven (fragmentary)
4QTestimonia	A Manuscript containing several Biblical quotations.
CDC	Cairo Genizah Document of the Damascus Covenanters
CDCb	Manuscript b of CDC

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

It is now ten years since the first scrolls were discovered at Qumran in the vicinity of the Dead Sea. This discovery was remarkable in more ways than one. It has affected the areas of textual criticism and theology, of history and Christian origins. It is in connection with the last of these areas that we intend to direct our major research in this present study.

More specifically we wish to examine and delineate a certain name which figures prominently in the Qumran literature. That name is "Teacher of Righteousness." Accordingly, we wish to uncover what kind of person (or persons) it is who bears this mask "Teacher of Righteousness," and to discover how he (or they) and the rest of the movement think. What are the basic beliefs and controlling concepts championed by these Qumran students? This is the leading question! This question, however, can never be divorced from the question to which it leads, viz., how does the thought world of Qumran, and more closely that of the "Teacher of Righteousness" compare with the ideals and activities of Jesus of Nazareth? And again, is there any indication of a direct connection between the principal ideology of Qumran leaders and Jesus Christ? These two questions must stand in juxtaposition in our mind throughout our research.

In order to achieve the proposed goal, we will present

certain preliminary chapters. These are groundwork for later comparisons. The first chapter will present the reader with a translation of the pertinent passages, so that, from the outset, the reader has a unified overview of the basic material, material which at this early stage is still scattered throughout various books and periodicals. Included in these necessary prolegomena are two other chapters, the former attempting to establish a relative chronology of composition for the major literary works from Qumran and thereupon crystallizing the biography of the "Teacher of Righteousness"; the latter discussing the various historical personalities which vie for the title "Teacher of Righteousness." We then attack the heart of the problem, avoiding as far as possible trivialities of terminology and driving on to the key motifs that would either establish a close relationship or a clear distinction.

The impetus for this research has been provided, to some extent, by a number of recent works which have posited the thesis that Jesus of Nazareth may have been no more than an imitator of a great Qumran personality. The authors of these works will be mentioned in the course of the paper. Accordingly we wish to put their hypotheses to the test.

The source of material for this paper is, first of all, the Holy Bible in the original languages, and then the works of Qumran published to this date. Where the original Hebrew facsimiles are not available, a Hebrew transcript or translation is used with an explanatory footnote. Due to the length of the paper, and in order not to burden the reader on

a certain point, very few extensive quotations of other writers are given. Ample footnotes, however, will acquaint the reader with their locale.

Such a study should prove timely and stimulating for our understanding of Jesus Christ against the historical and theological environment of his day.

CHAPTER II

THE TESTIMONY OF QUMRAN TO THE TEACHER OF RIGHTEOUSNESS

The Teacher of Righteousness is a controversial figure. Any student involved in controversy must take cognizance of all the textual data available. Alas, even the relative importance of the textual data is questioned by the scholars in this debate. At the outset, then, we will present the reader with a connected outline of this data, arranged in logical sequence, as a background and springboard for all future discussions. For the sake of clarity, the evidence will be given under three heads, viz. specific, probable and alleged references to the Teacher of Righteousness. Ample footnotes will acquaint the reader with the numerous issues involved.

Specific References

This Teacher of Righteousness practiced what he preached. He was both a teacher and righteous man. This is probably intimated in the comment on the צדק of Hab. 1:4 in 1QpHab. 1:13,[1] which reads, "he is the Teacher of Righteousness."[2]

---

[1]All translations from 1QpHab. are taken from the first volume of photographs edited by Millar Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls of the St. Mark's Monastery (New Haven: The American School of Oriental Research, 1950). These translations are those of the author, except where otherwise indicated.

[2]Since the צדקה of Hab. 1:4 is a generic term, it calls into question the actual existence of the Teacher of Righteousness. Gaster, for example, would translate "he who

As well as that, he was a priest. The fragmentary pesher on Ps. 37:23,24 reads, "This refers to the priest, the Teacher of Righteousness (. . .) they built a congregation for him . . . ."[3]

The historical perspective for this righteous priest is given in two passages from the Cairo Genizah Document of the Damascus Covenanters.[4] These two passages follow now.

> Even in the era of wrath, that is, in the 390 year period when He delivered them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon,[5] He cared for them and effected the growth of a planted root from Israel and Aaron, so that it might repossess its land and become fruitful in the richness of its soil. Eventually they realized their iniquity and acknowledged that they were guilty people. Nevertheless, for 20 years[6] they were like blind men who

---

expounds the law aright," referring the words to any such person who interprets the law in accordance with the Qumran viewpoint. Cf. Theodor H. Gaster, The Dead Sea Scriptures (New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1956), p. 5.

[3]The translation of this brief passage is taken from Gaster, op. cit., p. 261. The final word, "him," may refer to God or to the Teacher of Righteousness.

[4]The text of CDC used here is that of Leonhard Rost, Die Damascusschrift (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter & Co., 1933). This document belongs to the Qumran circle. The figures involved, the use of scripture and finally the discovery of fragments of this document in some of the Qumran caves, verify this assumption.

[5]The figure 390 mentioned here is probably from Ezekiel 4:5. What is the terminus a quo for this figure? Rabinowitz calculates from the reign of Rehoboam until the time of Nebuchadnezzar; Isaac Rabinowitz, "A Reconsideration of 'Damascus' and '390 Years' in the 'Damascus' ('Zadokite') Fragments," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIII (1954), 11-35. Gaster also favors this approach, op. cit., p. 99f. Others reckon from 586 B.C., when Nebuchadnezzar took Judah captive. H. H. Rowley, The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1952), p. 62.

[6]Rabinowitz finds Neh. 1:1ff. to be the source for this figure. Op. cit., pp. 11-35. This has led Gaster to equate the first Teacher of Righteousness with Ezra. Op. cit., p. 100.

grope for their way. Then God took note of their deeds that they began to seek him with sincerity, and He raised up for them the Teacher of Righteousness to direct them in the way of His heart. And He[7] made known to future generations what He does to any future generation that belongs to the congregation of traitors, that is, those who turn from His way. CDC 1:5-8.

During the period of the destruction of the land, there arose certain men who removed the landmarks, and led Israel astray. Then the land became desolate[8] because they uttered sedition against the commandments which God gave through Moses[9] and also through His Holy Anointed One,[10] and because they prophesied falsely in order to turn Israel from God. But God remembered the covenant[11] of the forefathers and raised up discerning men from Aaron and wise men from Israel, and He made them listen. Thus they dug the well as it is written , "The princes dug a well, and the nobles of the people dug by order of the lawgiver.[12] The well is the law.[13] They who dug are the captivity[14] of Israel who departed from Judah and

---

[7]God is the subject of this sentence, although the Teacher of Righteousness is probably the agent of the revelation.

[8]The reference is probably to the destruction of Jerusalem and the consequent desolation of Israel.

[9]Moses is the first great lawgiver, prophet, and teacher in the eyes of the sect, cf. CDC 19:2,11, 20:2, 1QS 5:8, 8:22.

[10]The משיח הקודש may be Aaron or his descendents who held office as high priest. Cf. CDC 7:19. Note Gaster op. cit., p. 67.

[11]The covenant of the law is meant. For ברית see CDC 1:12, 2:1, 5:2, 7:13, 1QS 4:22, 5:5, 1QH 1:2, 2:22,28, 4:24 et alii.

[12]The passage is taken from Num. 21:18. However, the term בנשיא בארה is omitted, for this term, being plural, would spoil the allegory which refers the parallel word מחוקק to one specific individual. The Qumran community sees in this word from Moses, the first lawgiver, a prophecy for their own time.

[13]The הבאר is the living water of the sect. Primarily it is the law of Moses, cf. note 9 supra.

[14]בשבי could be rendered "the penitent ones," but since the picture of "departure" and "sojourning" is in the close context, we favor the rendering "captivity."

sojourned in the land of Damascus.[15] All of these God termed princes because they sought him, and their glorious word[16] was never refuted by the mouth of another. The Lawgiver[17] is the Student of the Law[18] as Isaiah said, "One who produces an implement for his work." The nobles of the people are those who come to dig the well with the precepts which the Lawgiver[19] prescribed for them to walk by during all the period of wickedness. Without these, they would never have attained their goal prior to the rise of the Teacher of Righteousness at the end of days.[20] CDC 8:1:10.

These CDC passages reveal that both the Teacher of Righteousness, and the Lawgiver appeared at a vital period in the history of the sect, and of the whole world for that matter. These two figures may be identical. The former is to appear again at the very end of time. He was the guide for the last times, the counterpart to Moses, the guide of the first times. Each spake the words of God, each was involved in a vital legal covenant, and each was expected as a prophet <u>redivivus</u>. The somewhat incomplete comment on Hab. 1:5 is instructive here.

---

[15] Whether or not Damascus be taken as figurative for exile, the withdrawal of the community under the Lawgiver was a radical manoeuvre. Cf. Amos 5:26, CDC 8:15, 9:5,28.

[16] The translation of this word is somewhat free, but conveys the probable meaning. The Hebrew reads פי ארתם.

[17] The term המחוקק can mean "the staff" or "the lawgiver." This is the evident meaning in Num. 21:18.

[18] The term דורש התורה is a general term in 1QS 6:6, 8:15. Here, as in CDC 9:8, it refers to the specific leader of the community's withdrawal. In 4Qp 2 Sam. fr. on 7:11 the future arrival of this figure is expected.

[19] Moses is the lawgiver κατ' εξοχην for this community, but the Teacher of Righteousness, the enlightened exponent of the law is the lawgiver normative for the final period of wickedness. The identification of the Teacher of Righteousness with the Lawgiver, is therefore feasible. Cf. chapter three infra. Cf. S. Mowinckel, <u>He That Cometh</u> (New York: Abingdon Press, 1954), p. 301.

[20] This may reflect the idea of a Teacher <u>Redivivus</u>.

(This refers to)[21] the traitors with the man of the lie, for they did not (heed the words of) the Teacher of Righteousness from the mouth of God,[22] and to the trait(ors against) the new (covenant)[23] for they did not believe the covenant of God, (but profaned) His holy na(me). Thus it[24] also refers (to the t)raitors at the end of days. These are ruth(less against the covenan)t, who do not believe when they hear all the things that are c(oming upon) the last generation from the mouth of the priest,[25] in whose (mouth) God placed (wisdom) to interpret all the words of His servants the prophets (through) whom God related all the things that are coming upon His people. . . . 1QpHab. 2:1-10.

---

[21]The reconstruction of the missing portions is often merely a matter of personal opinion. That which is given here is based on a study of words and phrases used elsewhere in this text. In each case, the proposals of Millar Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls (New York: The Viking Press, c.1955), W. H. Brownlee, "The Jerusalem Habakkuk Scrolls," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, CXII (December, 1948), 8ff. (hereafter, this periodical will be referred to as BASOR), "Further Light on Habakkuk," BASOR, CXIV (April, 1949), 9f; "Further Corrections of the Translation of the Habakkuk Commentary," BASOR, CXVI (December, 1949), 14ff., and S. Talmon, "Notes on the Habakkuk Scroll," Vetus Testamentum, I (January, 1951), 33-8, have been taken into consideration.

[22]The Teacher of Righteousness is regarded as the prophetic mouthpiece of God, but is never entitled prophet specifically. Cf. Jer. 1:9.

[23]For details of the New Covenant, See Jeremiah 31:31, CDC 19:1ff., CDCb 9:28,37. Who founded this new Covenant? Possibly the Teacher of Righteousness, although many favor the Student of the Law in CDC 9:8. For example M. H. Segal, "The Habakkuk 'Commentary' and the Damascus Fragments," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXX (1951), 141.

[24]The וכן may introduce a new scene, with the expositor considering the present situation. He adds the phrase אחרית הימים and changed the perfect of אמר to imperfect. Otherwise the thought in the two sections is almost parallel. It seems, then, that the Qumran sect believed that they were actually living in the last days, with the expositor depicting both past and present opposition to the community.

[25]The Teacher of Righteousness was indeed a priest (this is explicit in 4QpPs. 37, fr. on vv. 23, 24) like the three leaders of the assembly (1QS 8:1), although the change in tense may indicate that a successor is meant. This avoids the apparent repetition of thought. Cf. 1QSa where the priestly Messiah is called priest.

Thus, the Teacher of Righteousness had a definitive word for his sect, he was not merely another student of the law; he spoke, and his word about the law was itself law. This is the note upon which manuscript B of CDC closes.

> Now all who hold fast to these rules, namely, obedience to the law at all times, obedience to the voice of the Teacher,[26] and confession to God in these words: We have sinned, both we and our fathers have walked contrary to the statutes of the Covenant, but thy verdicts against us are correct; all who refrain from raising their hand against His holy statutes, His righteous judgement, and His true testimonies; all who take to heart the lessons of the former judgements upon the men of the community, and finally all who give ear to the voice of the Teacher of Righteousness and do not reject the statutes of righteousness when they hear them[27]--all these shall rejoice and be glad, their hearts shall be strong and they shall prevail over all the sons of the world,[28] God will forgive[29] them and they shall see His salvation, because they took refuge in His holy name. CDCb 9:50-54.

Moses, the lawgiver of old, had also been a prophet. The Teacher of Righteousness, the lawgiver of the last times, was likewise a prophet. In fact, he was greater than Habakkuk, having an intimate knowledge of all past prophets and all future prophecies. This is outlined in the exposition of Hab. 2:2.

---

[26]This Teacher may not be the Teacher of Righteousness, for obedience to the word of the Teacher of Righteousness brings this list of qualifications to its climax in line 53. Repetition such as this is unlikely. And since the list begins with the law, Moses the first Lawgiver is the logical choice. CDC 4:7 seems to depict Moses as the first great Teacher also. The Teacher of Righteousness is then the last great Teacher.

[27]The statutes of righteousness, it seems are the laws laid down by the Teacher of Righteousness. These correspond to the Law laid down by Moses, the Teacher, in line 51 <u>supra</u>.

[28]Those who follow these rules will be the victorious Sons of Light in the final conflict against the Sons of Darkness (sons of the world). Cf. 1QM.

[29]For the usage of כפר cf. 1QM 2:5, CDC 5:5, 1QS 5:6, 8:6, 9:4.

> . . . God told Habakkuk to commit to writing all the events about to befall the last generation, but He did not reveal to him the actual consummation of the age.[30] And when it says, "so that the person on the run can read it," it refers to the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God revealed all the mysteries[31] contained in the words of His servants, the prophets. 1QpHab. 7:4,5.

All was not plain sailing for this prophet, however, for his exclusive claims and striking message met with deliberate opposition from without. This element of opposition is somewhat foreign to the traditional portrait of the Essene movement.[32] The following pesher bears out this observation.

> This refers to the house of Absalom[33] and the men of their party who remained silent when the Teacher of Righteousness was rebuked,[34] and who did not help him against the man of the lie who rejected the law in the midst of all the p(eop)le! 1QpHab. 5:9-12.

---

[30]"Consummation of the age" renders the Hebrew expression קצ ה ר ה ק צ. Brownlee favors the translation "end-time," or "goal-time" for קצ ק. W. H. Brownlee, "Further Corrections of the Translation of the Habakkuk Commentary," BASOR, CXVI (December, 1949), p. 15. Cf. 1QpHab. 5:7,12, 15:17, 1QM 1:5,8, CDC 6:7, 20:1, CDCb 9:40.

[31]This term ר ז is found in Daniel 2:18,19ff. The prophetic interpretations of the Habakkuk Commentary do have some kinship with that of Daniel. "Deeper Implications" is a suitable translation. For the usage of this term in QL, see 1QH 1:11,13, 2:13, 7:26f., CDC 5:5, 1QS 3:23, 11:5, 1QM 3:9, 14:9.

[32]Christian D. Ginsburg, The Essenes. The Kabbalah. (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1956), p. 20.

[33]This term, "the House of Absalom," is a riddle to most scholars. For example, Dupont-Sommer thinks of the followers of the uncle of Aristobolus II who bore the name Absalom. A. Dupont-Sommer, The Dead Sea Scrolls (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, c.1952), p. 36. H. H. Rowley, on the other hand, looks to the Tobiads for a clue, op. cit., p. 69.

[34]The context favors the translation which posits the Teacher of Righteousness as the object, rather than the subject of the rebuke. The rebuke was apparently at some public gathering.

Likewise, the encounter of the Teacher of Righteousness with the Wicked Priest[35] was no mere tiff. It was a life and death struggle. Whether or not the Teacher of Righteousness actually suffered a violent end, is nowhere stated explicitly.[36] However, the controversial pesher which follows, depicts a rather bitter encounter.

> This refers to the wicked priest who pursued after the Teacher of Righteousness[37] to devour him in his raging fury, desiring to disrobe him[38] and at the time of the festival, that is, the rest-day of atonement,[39] he actually did appear to them,[40] in order to devour them, and to effect their downfall on the fast day, the Sabbath of their rest. 1QpHab. 11:4-8.

Thus the Teacher of Righteousness brings his sect into

---

[35]The relationship between this Wicked Priest and the Man of the Lie in 1QpHab. 5:9-12, is still a debatable issue.

[36]Cf. 4QpPs. 37 fr. on vv. 32, 33.

[37]In view of the immediate context, the דרשי אמרו can well mean persecution. Cf. Ps. 7:2, 1 Sam. 23:25.

[38]The form לגלות can be either Kal or Piel infinitive construct. The former would permit the translation "to banish him" Millar Burrows, op. cit., p. 370, or "to exile him," the latter "to uncover him." In view of the conflict concerning the legitimate high-priesthood, it would be quite normal if the wicked priest should want to disgrace his opponent by removing his official robes in public. If the following נראה denotes the appearance of the wicked priest in his resplendent attire, the contrast would be complete.

[39]The specific day of atonement mentioned here is regarded by Dupont-Sommer as the day on which Pompey captured Jerusalem. A. Dupont-Sommer, The Jewish Sect of Qumran and The Essenes (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956), p. 33. The evidence for this association, however, is not conclusive for the majority of scholars.

[40]At this juncture the reader is referred to the following passages for the study of the term נגלה. Deut. 33:2, Ps. 50:2, 80:2, 94:1, Job 3:4, 10:22, 37:15, 1QM 1:15, 12:13, 18:11, 1QH 4:6,23, 5:32, 7:24, CDCb 9:31,33,49.

direct contact with the outside world. His word is decisive and his presence divisive. God will, therefore, punish the Wicked Priest with affliction and reward the faithful adherents with deliverance. This is the gist of the two passages which follow; the first being a pesher on Hab. 2:8b, the second a pesher on Hab. 2:4b.

> This refers to the (w)icked priest, whom, because of an of(fen)se[41] against the Teacher of Righteousness and his party, God delivered into the hand(s) of his enemies, to afflict him with scourging for destruction, in bitterness of soul, because he acted in a sinful way against His elect,[42] 1QpHab. 9:9-12.

> This refers to all the doers of law[43] in the house of Judah[44] whom God will rescue from the house of judgement[45] because of their labor[46] and faith[47] in the Teacher of

---

[41]The restoration of this text is almost certainly כ[ע]ון. The nature of this offense is uncertain. Nor can we identify with certainty, the rebuke, or the rejection of the law, by the Man of the Lie, (1QpHab. 5:9-12) with this offense by the Wicked Priest.

[42]To whom does the term "his elect" refer, to the Teacher of Righteousness, or to the chosen members of the sect? Or is there a third possibility, the rightful priestly or Davidic ruler? For the use of בחיר in the Qumran Literature, see 1QM 2:7, 10:9, 1QH 2:13, 14:15, CDC 2:7, 4:2, 1QS 4:22, 1QSb 1:2, 3:23,25.

[43]"Doers of the Law" is a significant title for the members of the community. Note the stress on the law in 1QS 8:1ff., CDC 6:4ff., cf. also footnotes 9 and 11 <u>supra</u>.

[44]The house of Judah may merely stand for Jewry in general. Gaster, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 253. Cf. CDC 6:7.

[45]"The house of judgement" has eschatological import.

[46]The word "labor" translates the Hebrew עמל. Note the vicarious labor and anguish (עמל) of the suffering servant, Is. 53:11. The Qumran sect as a whole seemed to regard its absolute integrity as vicarious, at least to some degree, cf. 1QS 8:5ff. They are God's eternal planting. Cf. 1QS 11:8, 4QSb 3:28, 4:1ff., CDCb 9:53f. Hence the idea of affliction is probably involved. Note that in Hab. 1:13, עמל is parallel to יגע.

[47]A complete study of this vital term will follow later. Suffice it to say here that faith in the Pauline sense is not meant.

Righteousness. 1QpHab. 8:1-3.

These references portray a character whose activity and person are vital for the life of the sect. They can be supplemented, however, by a number of passages where the Teacher of Righteousness is alluded to, or referred to by another name.

Probable References

Most of the translations quoted under this head refer to the conflict between the Teacher of Righteousness and his violent foes. For the foe there was always condemnation, but for the faithful, commendation. The pattern is quite similar in both fragments of the pesher on Ps. 37, which follow now.[48]

> The wicked have unsheathed their sword and bent their bow, to cast down the poor and needy and to slay those who walk the straight way. Their sword shall enter their own heart and their bows shall be smashed. This refers to the wicked men of Ephraim and Manasseh who will seek to assail[49] the Priest[50] and the men of his counsel in the time of trial[51] that is to come upon them. But God will re(dee)m the latter out of their hand. And afterwards, they will be delivered into the hands of violent men of the Gentiles for judgement.[52] 4QpPs. 37 fr. on vv. 14,15.

---

[48]The fragments on Ps. 37:14,15 and 37:32,33 were studied from the publication of photographs edited by J. M. Allegro, "Further Light on the History of the Qumran Sect." Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXV (June, 1956), 90f.

[49]Literally, "to put forth the hand against."

[50]This priest is called the Teacher of Righteousness in the pesher on verses 23 and 24.

[51]This time of trial is eschatological for the sect. For the similarity between this passage and the opposition to the Teacher of Righteousness in 1QpHab., see 1QpHab. 11:4ff., 9:9ff.

[52]The judgement of the wicked party of Israel at the hand of the Gentiles must be distinguished from the final judgement in which the elect of Qumran will judge the Gentiles. 1QpHab. 5:3ff.

The wicked watches for the righteous and seeks (to slay him. The Lord will not leave him in his hand, nor) condemn him when he is judged. This refers to the wicked (pries)t[53] who (assailed[54] the Teacher of Righteousness)[55] to put him to death[56] (and to destroy the covenant) and the law, which he sent to him. God will not le(ave him in his hand nor condemn him when) he is judged[57] (but God will) exec(ute) retribution upon (him) by giving him into the hand of violent men of the Gentiles to do to him. . . . 1QpPs. 37 fr. on vv. 32,33.

Likewise, in the fragmentary pesher on Micah, the keynote is deliverance for the faithful. Because the text is poorly preserved, however, we can only offer a tentative translation here.[58] The comment on Micah 1:5,6 is the most pertinent passage.

---

[53]The final "ל" which is visible and the activity of the Wicked Priest elsewhere, favors this restoration. Cf. 1QpHab. 8:8ff., 8:16 etc.

[54]The initial letter in this gap is probably "ש". The same situation in the pesher on vv. 14 and 15 is expressed by ל/ר ר׳ משש . Hence we restore in this way!

[55]The restoration of "Teacher of Righteousness" or "Priest" is very probable. The priest, who is designated as Teacher of Righteousness in the pesher on vv. 23 and 24, is treated in precisely the same way in the pesher on vv. 14 and 15, and in 1QpHab. 9:9ff., 11:4ff., etc. Note especially 1QpHab. 1:12,13 where the פ׳ר׳ץ of Hab. 1:4 is interpreted as referring to the Teacher of Righteousness.

[56]The situation is parallel to 1QpHab 9:5, which reads, "He persecuted the Teacher of Righteousness to swallow him up."

[57]The judgement seems to include the Teacher of Righteousness. The wide use of משפט, however, does not necessitate a final judgement of God in which all risen men will appear before God, the Teacher of Righteousness and party being saved, the Wicked Priest and party being condemned, as Allegro thinks, <u>ibid</u>., p. 95.

[58]In the restoration of this text, we follow the publication of D. Barthelemy, and J. T. Milik, <u>Discoveries in the Judaean Desert I</u> (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), p. 78, and plate 15.

> This refers to the dri(v)eler of lies[59] (who leads astray) (the si)mple ones. "And what are the high places of Judah? (Are they not Jerusalem?)" (This refers to) the Te(ach)er of Righteousness,[60] who is the one who (teaches the law to) his (council) and to all those who are willing to join the ele(ct)[61] (of God, that is, the doers of the law) in the council of (the) community, who will be del(iv)ered on the day of (judgement). 1QpMic. fr. on 1:5,6.

Although there is no direct reference to the Teacher of Righteousness in either 1QS or 1QH, the portrait of a certain man, a "gibhor" of the future, destined to be purified as a special channel for divine truth and revelation, seems to fit the Teacher of Righteousness. Brownlee translates the text from 1QS 4:20-23 as follows[62]

> And at that time, God will purify by His truth all the deeds of a man; and he will refine him more than the sons of men, in order to consume every evil spirit from the midst of his flesh, and to cleanse him through the Holy Spirit from all wicked practices; and He will sprinkle upon him the Spirit of Truth as purifying water so as to cleanse him from all untrue abominations and from being contaminated with the Spirit of impurity, so that he may give the upright insight into the knowledge of the Most High and into the wisdom of the sons of Heaven, in order to make wise the perfect of way.

---

[59] Cf. Mic. 2:6,11. CDC 9:22.

[60] Barthelemy and Milik, loc. cit. reads מורי הצדק here. Hence we could translate, "Teachers of Righteousness," cf. Gaster, op. cit., p. 239. But the singular ה הוא which follows, argues for a singular reading מורה הצדק. The photograph of this fragment would allow either. Nor can we argue from the following parallel word, which could be read בחירו or בחירי.

[61] The term "elect" may be rendered singular (בחירו, His elect) or plural (בחירי, the elect ones of). Cf., however, 1QpHab. 9:9-12 where "the Teacher of Righteousness" seems to be parallel to "His elect" in the singular form בחירו.

[62] Cf. 1QH 5:15f., 1QpPs. 37 fr. on vv. 23f. William H. Brownlee, "Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament," New Testament Studies, III (November, 1956), 25.

To conclude this section, we introduce two texts from Manuscript b. of CDC. Both refer to the Teacher of the Community, an alternate name for the Teacher of Righteousness. The new element involved is the expected death of this Teacher. It is no ordinary death, however, for it heralds the final conflict. The following translations make this contribution quite clear.

> All those men who entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus, but turned, became traitors and left the well of living water,[63] shall not be reckoned in the communion of the people, nor their names inscribed in its book, from the time that the Teacher of the Community is gathered in,[64] until the rise of the Messiah from Aaron and Israel.[65] CDCb 9:28-29.

> From the time that the Teacher of the Community is gathered in until all the men of war[66] who joined the company of the man of the lie,[67] are annihilated, will be about 40 years[68] and during that period the wrath of God will be kindled against Israel and the result will be as

---

[63]The Well is the law of Moses as seen by the sect. Cf. CDC 8:1-10.

[64]Teacher of the Community renders the Hebrew מורה היחיד . The fact that his death (מות) is referred to, does not mean that it has taken place, as Rost maintains. L. Rost, "Der Lehrer der Einung und der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit," Theologishe Literaturzeitung, Jahrgang 78, No. 3 (Marz, 1953), 143-48.

[65]The problem of the two Messiahs cannot be discussed here. Suffice it to say that the present text makes a distinction between Teacher and Messiah. For the Biblical background, note Zech. 4:14.

[66]Obviously a reference to the sinful people in Israel. They are regularly denoted as the Sons of Darkness in The War Scroll. Cf. 1QM 1:1,10 etc.

[67]For this figure, see 1QpHab. 5:11, 10:9.

[68]Cf. 1QM 2:6. Rabbinic tradition assigns 40 years for the ministry of the Messiah. Theodor H. Gaster, op. cit., p. 103. Cf. 4QpPs. 37 v. 10.

it says, "there is no king, no prince, no judge and none who rebukes with righteousness."[69]

Since the publication of fragments and consequent research therein is far from complete, the evidence compiled here may also be incomplete in the near future. Further light may be shed on these probable references too, and thus enable us to pin point them more precisely.

The data given thus far is basic. To grasp the full scope of the problem, however, and to follow both sides of the debate, the reader must be acquainted with the wealth of alleged references to the Teacher of Righteousness. The ensuing data should be adequate for this purpose.

Alleged References

From the mass of material that could be ranged under this head, we will cull out representative passages. The approach of Dupont-Sommer is typical. He writes, "Here and there, for instance, this Master is called 'Unique,' 'Unique Master,' 'Unique Founder,' 'Founder of Justice,' 'Lawgiver,' especially 'Annointed One,' 'the' Annointed One who has descended from Aaron and Israel."[70] This avenue of approach fixes on specific names and equates them with that of the

---

[69]The quote includes part of Hos. 3:4, but with the significant addition of תורה בצדק . This may be an indirect reference to the Teacher of Righteousness. When he has passed away there will be none to rebuke with righteousness as he had done. This would add proof for the identification of the Teacher of the Community with the Teacher of Righteousness.

[70]Dupont-Sommer, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 63.

Teacher of Righteousness without a detailed analysis of their usage. A second approach is to insert the title, Teacher of Righteousness, within extensive lacunae of the text. An example of the latter is given now.[71]

> (The explanation of these words refers) to the Priest who has rebelled (space of two lines; towards the end of the space supply something like: . . . and he persecuted the Master of Justice,[72] who was) struck by him in the execution of iniquitous judgements; and odious profaners committed horrors on him and vengeance on his body of flesh.[73] 1QpHab. 8:16-9:2.

Textual "doctoring" of this nature has led to some rather startling conclusions.[74] Even the former method of identification is not above reproach in certain cases. It is to this plurality of titles which we now turn. One of the first of these is that of "His Elect One." For example, the pesher on Hab. 1:12,13 reads;

> This oracle refers to the fact that God will not destroy His people by the hand of the nations; rather God will hand over the judging[75] of all the nations to His

---

[71] Ibid., p. 34.

[72] An alternate translation of מורה הצדק .

[73] The diseases etc. must be inflicted by God. That God would directly punish the sect, or its leader is contrary to the Qumran thought pattern. The term בגויות בשרו merely denotes the material part of man's nature, Col. 2:11. Cf. F. M. Cross, "The Essenes and Their Master," Christian Century, LXXII (August 17, 1955), 945.

[74] Cf. for example, J. M. Allegro's restoration of the 4QpNah. text. Allegro, op. cit., p. 89ff.

[75] This is an eschatological judgement (משפט). It is universal and final. The judgement begun by the nations will be completed by the sect. Cf. 1QM 1:1ff., where the armies of Light execute the justice of God.

elect,[76] and by their chastisement[77] even all the wicked of His people will suffer the consequence of their guilt, because they kept his commands only in time of adversity. 1QpHab. 5:2-5.

According to Dupont-Sommer, the Teacher of Righteousness is here depicted as the judge of the world.[78] By further equating the Teacher of Righteousness with the Interpreter (or Student) of the Law, some maintain that even his imminent resurrection was expected by the sect. The small fragment on 2 Sam. 7:11f. is instructive here.[79]

> The Lord (has told) you that he will build a house for you, and I will set up your seed after you, and I will establish his royal throne (for ever). I (will be) a father to him, and he will be a son to me. This one is the Shoot[80] of David who arises with the Student of the Law[81] who (. . .) in Zi(on) in the l(ast days), as it is

---

[76]The problem here is to decide whether the בחדיך is singular or collective. In the original text of Hab. 1:12, the singular suffix "ו" stands for the Chaldaean nation as a unit. The בחדיך which is the interpretation of that suffix could then be the Qumran sect as a unit. The plural suffix in the following ואוכחדיהם, which is apparently the activity of the same sect, lends support to this view.

[77]The chastisement need not be salutary as it is in Hab. 1:12; cf. 1QpHab. 5:10 where the Teacher of Righteousness is chastised by the man of the lie.

[78]Dupont-Sommer, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 43.

[79]J. M. Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXV (September, 1956), 176. Allegro used the title 4Q Florilegium. Dupont-Sommer, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 44, maintains that the verb והופיע of 1QpHab. 11:4-8 contains a reference to the supernatural reappearance of the Teacher of Righteousness. See footnote 40 supra.

[80] צמח, cf. Jer. 23:5, 33:15, Zech. 3:8, 6:12.

[81]The connection with צמח and the overall picture confirms the view that the דורש התורה is an eschatological figure here. Is it but another descriptive title for one of the Messiahs?

written, and I will establish the tabernacle[82] of David that has fallen. That is the tabernacle of David which has fall(en and after)wards will arise to save Israel. 4QpII Sam. fr. on 7:11f.[83]

Despite the possible link between the Teacher of Righteousness and the Student of the Law who will arise in the future, there is no conclusive evidence that the Teacher of Righteousness is to be regarded as the Messiah. The title Messiah of Righteousness, however, would be the next link in this chain reaction. This title occurs in 4QpGen. fr. on 49:10.[84] The passage reads;

A ruler[85] (shall not) cease from the tribe of Judah. When Israel is once again a dominion, (there will always be a) Davidic ruler[86] in it. For the staff[87] is the covenant of the Kingdom[88] and the feet are the (peop)les

---

[82]Cf. Amos 9:11, in CDC 9:6.

[83]Other references to the Student of the Law may be found in 1QS 6:6, 8:15, CDC 8:8, 9:8, and the reconstruction of 4QpGen. fr. on 49:10 by Allegro, op. cit., p. 174ff.

[84]Ibid.

[85]Note that the word יגוז is added to the Massoretic Text, while the term שבט is taken in the sense of tribe rather than staff. This is probably not meant to be a verbatim quotation.

[86]The participle יושב is used here, no doubt, in the technical term of a "throne-sitter," that is, a king or ruler. Cf. 1 Kings 8:25, Jer. 17:25, 33:17.

[87]The term מחוקק is here directed to the Covenant of the Kingdom which may be a wider term including both Davidic and Levitical restoration to power in accordance with Jer. 33:17. In CDC 6:7, this term refers to the דורשי התורה. Cf. footnote 89 infra.

[88]Allegro translates "Royal mandate," ibid., p. 174. The covenant of the Davidic Kingdom is no doubt the promise of God according to 2 Sam. 7:12-16, which is recalled by David in 2 Sam. 23:5, and by Solomon in 1 Kings 8:25f.

> of Israel, until the Messiah of Righteousness has come, that is the shoot of David, for to him and to his seed has been given the covenant of the Kingdom over his people for all generations, which have awaited (?) (him and also the Student of the) Law (?)[89] with the men of the community, for (. . .) it is assembly of the men of. . . .

The Messiah of Righteousness is, no doubt, a synonym for one of the other two Messiahs, namely, the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel.

The reader will recall that these titles occurred in the translation of CDCb 9:28,29, quoted above.[90] A rather pertinent passage concerning the Messiahs of Qumran is found in the Manual of Discipline, which is comparatively free from historical allusions and eschatological figures. Three such figures are mentioned in this text, however.[91] It reads,

> Until the Prophet[92] and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel actually come, they should not depart from the counsel of the law by walking according to their own stubbornness of heart, but rather the original judgement in which the members of the community have been instructed, should be their norm. 1QS 9:11.

Elsewhere, it seems, the Davidic Messiah, or Branch, is depicted as the Prince of the entire congregation. As such, he comes to Damascus, or perhaps Qumran, is active in the eschatological conflict against evil, and thereupon makes his

---

[89] In the light of CDC 6:7 and 4Qp II Sam. fr. on 7:13,14, we reconstruct here דרש התורה.

[90] Cf. also CDC 15:4, 18:8.

[91] The text of 1QS used is that of Millar Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls of the St. Mark's Monastery (New Haven: The American School of Oriental Research, 1951), II.

[92] Cf. Deut. 18:15-22, Zech. 13:3-6, 1 Macc. 4:44-46.

triumphal journey to Jerusalem.[93] In all this, however, he is subordinate to the Aaronic Messiah whose titles may include Student of the Law, High Priest, or simply the Priest.[94]

It is in connection with the title Priest that Dupont-Sommer has advocated the equation, Teacher of Righteousness equals Messiah.[95] The occurrence of the term New Priest in chapter eighteen of the Testament of Levi has influenced Dupont-Sommer in this judgement. It would be profitable to reproduce the first few lines of that chapter here.

> Then shall the Lord raise up a new priest. And to him all the words of the Lord will be revealed. And he shall execute a righteous judgement upon the earth during a multitude of days. And his star shall arise in Heaven as a King, lighting up the light of knowledge as the sun the day.[96]

Similarly, the titles, "Savior of the world," and "He who renews the law," found in the Testament of Levi, chapters fourteen and sixteen respectively, are also used to support this theory.[97]

Thus far in our presentation of the pertinent data little has been said about the Qumran Psalms, for these are a class apart. They constitute a problem in themselves. It ought to

---

[93]Cf. 4QpGen. fr. on 49:10, CDC 9:8-10, 1QSb 5:20, 1QM 5:1, 4QpIs. fr. on chs. 10, 11.

[94]Cf. 4Qp II Sam. fr. on 7:11f., 1QM 15:3, 1QSa 2:11-22, 1QpHab. 2:8, CDC 2:11f., 1QSb 2:1-3:21.

[95]Dupont-Sommer, The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes, chapter three.

[96]Ibid., p. 41. We have used Dupont-Sommer's own translation.

[97]Ibid., p. 49.

be noted, however, that the subject of many of these Psalms is in the first person singular. Is this then the Teacher of Righteousness speaking? Many hold this view.[98] Hence we will present a few snatches from the first Psalms, which are the basis for this assumption.

> Thou hast made me a banner for the chosen of righteousness, an interpreter of knowledge through marvellous secrets,[99] and an assayer of (those who seek) the truth,[100] to test those who love correction. (Cf. Prov. 5:12) 1QH 2:13f.

> Thou hast sheltered me from the face of mankind and hidden thy law (within me) until the time when thy salvation was revealed to me. 1QH 5:11f.

Here we see a man who claims special knowledge of God's mysteries and the hidden law. In fact he further adds that God has "firmly entrenched the foundation of the truth" in his heart (1QH 5:9). He is furthermore at loggerheads with the world, burdened by discord within his party (1QH 5:22). He is a "sojourner" in a foreign land, (1QH 5:5), like a sparrow thrown from its nest (1QH 4:9), and yet one who can speak of "My Covenant" (1QH 5:23).

The similarity between this sequence and the passages from the Habakkuk commentary and the Damascus Document is quite obvious. Nevertheless the problem still remains as to how much historical detail we can glean with any degree of certainty

---

[98] See E. L. Sukenik, The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1955), p. 39; and S. Mowinckel, "Some Remarks on Hodayoth 39:5-20," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXV (December, 1956), 265ff.

[99] Cf. 1QpHab. 7:4-8.

[100] Cf. Jer. 6:27. Here בחן is used, but note the numerous passages where the idea of צרף is present. Cf. also 1QH 5:15f.

from such poetical and devotional texts.

It can be readily seen that when all these alleged references are applied to the Teacher of Righteousness directly, this personality assumes a position of the utmost importance in the documents of the sect. And in the eyes of many, this position is a challenge to the originality of Jesus, as Messiah κατ' ἐξοχήν. The next step, then, is to supplement this systematic survey of the material with a systematic study and thereby to meet this challenge.

It is first necessary, however, to adjust our focus so that, to some degree at least, we have a true historical perspective of the evidence. This can be best done from two vantage points, namely that of the Qumran historians, and that of contemporary historians. It is to this aspect of our study to which we now turn.

CHAPTER III

THE SCROLLS, TITLES AND HISTORY INVOLVING THE TEACHER OF RIGHTEOUSNESS

A cursory glance at the evidence presented in the preceding chapter will reveal the wide range of texts from which this evidence has been gleaned. The range of the evidence is *per se* no serious drawback. Gleanings such as these have enabled reconstruction of history in numerous other eras. Nevertheless, historical scholarship demands that the student pay full attention to the relative chronology of his texts. The same principle must apply here. The issue, however, is complicated by the very nature and *milieu* of the scrolls themselves. The men of Qumran with their life of rigor and the cliques within the movement as well as their clashes with the outside world present a complicated fabric of history in which the normal warp and woof of events are disguised and distorted by the overall pattern of allegory. To expose the basic outline of this internal history is our present task. We call upon the testimony of archeology and paleography first of all.[1]

The Evidence of Archeology and Paleography

The ruins of Qumran were the original home of most of these scrolls. The nearby caves proved useful for their immediate

---

[1]For a complete discussion of this question refer to Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: The Viking Press, c.1955), pp. 73ff.

preservation. At Qumran itself there were two major periods of occupation extending from the time of John Hyrcanus (135-104), until the end of the Hasmonaean era (39 B.C.) and from the reign of Archelaus 4 B.C.-6 A.D.) until the first Jewish Revolt (68-70 A.D.). A third period of occupation prior to the second Jewish Revolt was quite independent of the Qumran covenantors. Some time before 70 A.D. the scrolls were deposited in the caves. This date is the terminus ante quem for all transcription and composition; the earlier dates give probable periods of activity. This briefly is the evidence of archeology.[2]

Paleography, on the other hand, can assign possible dates for the transcription of the scrolls as we have them now. Apart from the Manual of Discipline and a number of fragments, the significant texts were copied some time during the first century after the birth of Christ.[3] But what of the date of composition?

Literary affinities with the book of Enoch, the book of Jubilees, Assumption of Moses,[4] the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs[5] and similar pseudepigraphical writings[6] have been

---

[2]Ibid., pp. 65-67.

[3]Ibid., pp. 118f.

[4]Cf. Hugh Schonfield, Secrets of the Dead Sea Scrolls (London: Vallentine, Mitchel & Co. Ltd., 1956), pp. 11,83ff; S. Mowinckel, "The Hebrew Equivalent of Taxo in the Ass. Mos. IX," Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, I (1953), 90ff; Burrows op. cit., p. 221.

[5]Cf. A. Dupont-Sommer, The Jewish Sect of Qumran and The Essenes (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956), pp. 38ff.

[6]Refer also to the interesting study of Ascensio Isaiae

suggested. Research in this field is just beginning, however, and can afford no final criterion.

A more precise terminus a quo is suggested by the reference to a certain Demetrius in the Nahum Commentary.[7] Hence we must place the composition of this work and similar peshers some time after the reign of Demetrius the First (162-150) at least and perhaps after the victory of Demetrius the Third (circa 88 B.C.).[8] The Manual of Discipline may have been written earlier. Accordingly, we agree with La Sor in allowing from circa 175 B.C. to 68 A.D. for the limits of composition.[9]

The chronological series according to Paleography is given as Manual of Discipline, Habakkuk Commentary, Qumran Hymns, War Scroll and Damascus Document.

This cursory survey of Archeology and Paleography is a necessary background to the whole debate. It orientates us in the chronology of those scrolls to which we must refer repeatedly.

The Question of Internal History.

Having disposed of these chronological preliminaries, we

---

by D. Flusser, "The Apocryphal Book of Ascensio Isaiae and the Dead Sea Sect," Israel Exploration Journal, (1953), pp. 30ff.

[7]This is found in the fragmentary pesher on Nahum 2:11. It begins "(This refers to De)metrius, the King of Greece, who at the instigation of 'them that seek smooth things,' sought to enter Jerusalem . . . ."

[8]Theodor H. Gaster, The Dead Sea Scriptures (New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, Doubleday & Co. Inc., 1956), p. 263.

[9]W. S. La Sor, Amazing Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Faith (Chicago: Moody Press, 1956), p. 64.

move on to the internal history of the community itself. But what approach should be adopted? The particular bias of a writer invariably influences his approach. Some have unearthed minute literary affinities with dated literature, others have sought to pin point one or two historical allusios and build a structure of history around them, still others have regarded one scroll as the vital link to connect up the chain of events. Each approach has its drawbacks, yet each must be taken into consideration.

The approach suggested here is quite simple. Since the Teacher of Righteousness is the principal character in the Qumran literature, let him be the touchstone. Needless to say, he is not to be isolated from his congregation, nor from the full range of Qumran works. In support of this approach we should add that it does throw into bold relief the central figure of Qumran. His history is ultimately that of Qumran itself; the Sons of Righteousness take their stand beside the Teacher of Righteousness, their hopes are his, their life is his, and their history is his. No effort will be made here to offer precise dates for events or composition of texts. This is peripheral to the main theme. The problem is to find the relationship of the Teacher of Righteousness to the history of the men of Qumran.

It is evident, however, that once we bring one personality into the limelight, we must needs clarify his position. What of his titles and identity? What is his relation to the texts of Qumran? What is his part in the drama of Qumran? Such leading questions must be answered. To this task we now turn.

The Teacher of Righteousness--a Significant Title and an Actual Person

The title, Teacher of Righteousness, is Biblical. At least the students of Qumran found reference to their master in the Scriptures. We can conjecture that they found one such reference in Joel. The Vulgate has "qui dedit vobis doctorem justitiae" for Joel 2:23; Luther translates "der euch Lehrer zur Gerechtigkeit gibt"; while the Hebrew reads כי נתן לכם את המורה לצדקה. Metrical considerations have induced certain critics to delete המורה לצדקה. If this be correct whence the המורה לצדקה? Sellers conjectures that some pious student of Qumran was induced to make this significant addition in the interest of his own beliefs.[10]

When the Damascus Document first introduces the Teacher of Righteousness, it appears to be alluding to Hosea chapter ten. The verse in question reads, "For it is time to seek the Lord, that he may come and shower righteousness upon you." (Hos. 10:12)

The passage from the Damascus Document could be translated "and the time came when God took note of their deeds, that they actually sought him with sincerity, and he established for them a shower (teacher) of righteousness" (CDC 1:7). The similarity is obvious. Certain people seek (דרש) God at a specific time,

---

[10] O. R. Sellers, "A Possible Old Testament Reference to the Teacher of Righteousness," Israel Exploration Journal, V (1953), pp. 93ff.

and God rewards them with a shower or teacher (a qal participle of יורה)[11] of righteousness (צדק). As the one who showers righteous truths this figure stands in antithesis to the dripper of lies.[12]

This usage, however, is only secondary. The terms יורה and מורה (both are used) stem from the root ירה and can mean "guide" or "teacher." This can be illustrated from Scripture. The poetic parallelism of Proverbs 4:11 makes the former meaning quite explicit.[13] Here the hiphil of ירה is parallel with the hiphil of דרך. The same pattern is found in Qumran literature. The Guide (or Teacher) of Righteousness is to guide (הדריך) the blind seekers, in the way (דרך) of God's heart (CDC 1:6f.). Likewise, the Lawgiver (probably the Teacher of Righteousness) provides precepts or guide lines by which the faithful are to walk (והתהלך בם) unswerving (CDC 8:9). The very purpose of the community is to prepare a way (פנו דרך) in the wilderness (1QS 8:14). In fact, the spirit of light dwells in each of them to reveal the ways of righteousness and truth (1QS 4:2).

The initial function of this figure, then, was to guide the blind. After twenty years of groping he brought them to

---

[11]For the concept of יורה and מורה as "shower," see Deut. 11:13f., Ps. 8:7, Jer. 5:24, Hos. 6:3. In each case the shower comes as a result of obedience, trust or searching.

[12]Cf. 1QpHab. 9:9 מטיף הכזב.

[13]For the concept of "guidance" with ירה see also Job 36:22, Ps. 25:8, Is. 30:20f.

the spirit of light (CDC 1:6f.). He was their first real leader.

Be that as it may, the translation "guide" does not do full justice to the usage of this word nor the portrait of the man who bears this title. This man was more than a mere guide for the journey of life; he was to provide the impulse and instructions for its completion. Indeed, he was to be a faithful teacher. Every priest of Israel was supposed to be such a teacher (כוהן תורה 2 Chron. 15:3f.).[14] Aaron was commissioned to teach the statutes of Moses (Lev. 10:11). His word had to be obeyed. So, too, the word of the Teacher of Qumran was final; he taught the truth (CDCb 9:53f). He was the mouthpiece of that same God who had taught Moses (Ex. 4:12, 1QpHab. 2:1-4).

For the bearer of this title we can observe a dual function. As the leader of the community he is both the compass and corrective for his followers. He is a guide, a leader, a student, a teacher, a master for men of God.

The second member of this title defines the chief object of concern for the bearer of the title. We say "object" for צדק is an objective genitive.[15] The Teacher of Righteousness is a man who teaches the mysteries of God (1QpHab. 7:4f.) and utters the statutes of righteousness (CDCb 9:53). This title is similar to "Seeker of the Law," "Dripper of Lies" and "Teacher of the Community," all of which exhibit the use

---

[14]For the concept of teaching with the hiphil of נבא see 2 Kings 17:28, Prov. 5:13, Is. 9:14, Job 27:11.

[15]La Sor, op. cit., p. 165.

of this objective genitive. The righteousness which he preaches is the righteousness of the law of Moses as revealed to the sons of Zadok (1QS 5:8f.). That he too shared in this righteousness and was classified as righteous need not be denied.

The members of the community have been entitled Sons of Zadok. This title may not be correct. Sons of Righteousness may be nearer the truth.[16] At least, it would be very appropriate. The similarity between waw and yodh in these texts makes this error quite understandable. The members of the community (either בני צדק or בני צדוק) could be either בני צדק (1QS 3:20,22) or בני צדוק.[17] Even if the transliteration צדוק were retained, it is a name meaning "the righteous One" and need not refer to the originator of the Zadokite priesthood (1 Kings 2:35), but to a righteous leader in the community, perhaps the Teacher of Righteousness.

The discussion up to this point has spoken of a leader, a teacher within the community. But are we necessarily justified in speaking of but one leader of teacher? Could a number of men have borne this title? Theodor Gaster is of this opinion and favors the translation "he who expounds the law aright."[18] This title he applies to any spiritual leader of the community.

A silentio we might argue that the term מורה צדק never

---

[16]For the term צדוק (or צדוקי) see 1QS 9:14, 5:2,9, CDC 6:2, 7:7.

[17]For a complete analysis of this problem, see P. Wernberg-Moller, "צדק, צדוקי and צדוק in CDC, DSD, and DSH," Vetus Testamentum, III (1953), 310ff.

[18]Gaster, op. cit., p. 5.

occurs in the plural in Qumran Literature, although this has little force. More positive are the distinctive features of this personality in the Habakkuk Commentary (1QpHab. 7:4f., 8:2f. et alii). Were there more than one who could receive such profound insights into God's mysteries? Does the deliverance of Qumran depend on faith in a succession of leaders?[19] Could this Teacher of Righteousness, whom God sent at a crucial point in the history of Israel, have been just one of a series (CDC 1:5-8)? It seems rather unlikely! (This, of course, does not exclude a later appearance as a prophet redivivus.) Accordingly, we will treat this personality as one individual.[20] The subsequent discussions will show how all references to the Teacher of Righteousness can be fitted into one historical pattern.

The Teacher of Righteousness and The Lawgiver

The foregoing has enabled us to appreciate the full import of the principal title borne by the foremost personality within the community and the corresponding appellative for the community itself. A man of such a calibre, one so esteemed by his fellows, may well have borne other titles, especially

---

[19] J. C. G. Grieg, "The Teacher of Righteousness and the Qumran Community," New Testament Studies, II, No. 2 (November, 1955), 123.

[20] Toombs has discovered a division with 1QpHab. which argues for two Teachers of Righteousness, the one having died, the other being contemporaneous with the author of 1QpHab. L. E. Toombs, "The Early History of the Qumran Sect," Journal of Semitic Studies, I (October, 1956), 367ff.

at a later date when both his memory and his word were so highly revered. It is necessary to locate these titles, for in so doing we gain new vantage points from which to calculate the historical course of this group. It is this calculation which is the ultimate purpose of this chapter.

Many have equated the Teacher of Righteousness with numerous other men of prominence active within the community itself,[21] and in rather an arbitrary fashion at that, yet few have given clear literary or historical reasons for doing so. In many cases the evidence is too slender to make such an equation. There is one case, however, where the arguments are quite cogent and the identification quite probable. This case will be studied in some detail.

The leader in question is entitled the "Lawgiver." This title in itself is not new. Isaiah speaks of God as the Lawgiver (Is. 33:22) yet he is the only Old Testament writer to do so.[22] Usually the term means no more than staff or sceptre. And strange to say, this title (מחוקק) is never assigned to Moses in the Old Testament, although it was he who had executed this unique function as the mediator of Israel. A priori then, it is unlikely that the Sons of Righteousness were speaking either of God or Moses, and the context in the Damascus

---

[21]Cf. A. Dupont-Sommer, The Dead Sea Scrolls (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, c.1952), p. 63. A recent advocate of the theory that the Teacher of Righteousness equals the Lawgiver is L. E. Toombs, op. cit., pp. 370f.

[22]The Hebrew original is מחוקק. Cf. James 4:12.

Document bears out this assumption.[23] It is interesting to note, however, that Josephus uses the name Lawgiver or Legislator when comparing Moses with the great Greek legislators.[24] More pertinent is the statement of Josephus that amongst the Essenes "the name of the Lawgiver was, after God, an object of great veneration" and that "He who blasphemed it was punished by death."[25] Contrary to the view of Dupont-Sommer, this reference applies to Moses.[26] Moreover the Community itself, although similar in practice and belief to the Essenes, did not execute capital punishment.[27]

A possible veiled reference to the Lawgiver of the covenantors occurs in the Assumption of Moses, chapter nine. Here the name given is Taxo (ταξωυ). Mowinckel has shown that the Hebrew equivalent of this word may well be מתן.[28] More striking is the content of the prophecy, supposedly given by Moses. A portion of the speech of Taxo, who is also a Levite, reads, "Observe, my sons, behold a second ruthless and unclean visitation has come upon the people. . . . Let us fast for the

---

[23]CDC 8:1-10. Here Moses is mentioned in the first lines as a forefather; the Lawgiver is depicted as a member of the community. Cf. CDC 9:8.

[24]Josephus, Contra Apion, 2:16ff.

[25]Josephus, Bella Judaica II, 8:9.

[26]Dupont-Sommer, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 91.

[27]CDC 10:1. Excommunication was the most severe punishment admistered by the community, 1QS 7:18-25.

[28]S. Mowinckel, loc. cit. By the Hebrew process of Atbash Schonfield finds a reference to Asaph (אסף = תזחר) op. cit., pp. 83ff.

space of three days and on the fourth let us go into a cave which is in the field, and let us die rather than transgress the commands of the Lord of Lords. . . ." The points of contact are obvious, yet the etymology of the leader's name is uncertain.

All in all, then, there is nothing in the external use of this title which would compel us to refer the title Lawgiver to any Biblical name. The legend of Taxo may reflect the hope of a second Lawgiver like Moses. It may even be a prophecy ex eventu by one of the cave dwellers from Qumran.

This Tendenz becomes a cogent probability when the internal data is rehearsed. First of all, what aspects of the life of this Lawgiver or Student of the Law must be underscored? He was the leader of the group who went to "Damascus" during a turbulent era. There, it seems, he was instrumental in establishing a new covenant. This covenant made provision for certain statutes which were to be normative until the last days.[29] In the eschatological future he was to return as the supreme Student of the Law.[30] This man is a student, an interpreter whose interpretation is normative, whose followers are bound by a pact to adhere to his exposition of the law. He taught the law and his teaching was itself law!

---

[29] CDC 8:1-10, 9:8, b 9:37.

[30] 4Qp2 Sam. fr. on 7:11. The term Students of the Law is also applied to the group leaders within the community. 1QS 6:6, 8:15. This is a general term and in no way conflicts with the idea of the leader of the sect as the supreme student of the law.

Point for point of this survey can be matched in the life and ideals of the Teacher of Righteousness. That the Teacher of Righteousness was the leader of his community is axiomatic. He was the "moreh," the guide, the teacher, the leader. In the case of each the advent was timely and opportune, the times dire and abnormal.[31] Although the metaphor is changed, the idea of guidance is essentially the same. The Teacher of Righteousness is seen leading blind groping men to the light of truth, while the lawgiver leads thirsty wanderers to a refreshing well of truth.[32] The addition of the term "Damascus" in no way burdens the metaphor. This is but the place of retirement for the wandering exiles. And even if some historical trip is meant, this does not invalidate the parallelism of the accounts.[33]

In neither case does it say <u>expressis verbis</u> that the leader was the originator of a new covenant, but in each case it is implied. The issue is quite apparent in the Damascus Document.[34] Here the members of the new covenant constitute the household of the law. All members of this household must keep the statutes of the New Covenant. Likewise they must keep the statutes given by the Lawgiver. And since both sets of statutes were laid down in "Damascus," they would appear to be

---

[31]CDC 1:5-8, 8:1-10, Hab. 2:1-4, 4QpPs. 37 fr. on vv. 14,15.

[32]CDC 1:7,8, 8:3-6.

[33]Cf. Gaster, <u>op. cit.</u>, pp. 4,24.

[34]Cf. CDC 8:4-9, <u>b</u> 9:37.

identical.

The Teacher of Righteousness was also a lawgiver in a sense. He was the mouthpiece of God; his word was equivalent to a divine promise, a divine covenant, presumably the new covenant (cf. 1QpHab. 2:1-4). Consider the connection! The Lawgiver lays down the precepts of the covenant. Yet to enter the covenant of the community one must acknowledge the teachings of the Teacher of Righteousness, and any who oppose him are considered traitors to the covenant.[35]

In the Hymns of Qumran a similar echo is heard. The banner of Righteousness can speak of "my covenant." His word is the touchstone for those who seek the truth. His interpretation of Scripture is a perfect directive for life.[36]

One thing is clear, the word of both the Lawgiver and the Teacher of Righteousness was a curb, a rule, and a norm for the adherents of each. The voice of each was authoritative and final; that is, until the ultimate era of glorious conflict and peace.

Is it likely that two men in one community could have spoken with such finality? Moreover the obligatory statutes of righteousness linked with the Teacher of Righteousness in the B manuscript of the Damascus Document can hardly be different from the necessary statutes of the law imposed by the lawgiver

---

[35]For an overall picture of this question compare 1QpHab. 2:1-4, 5:9-12, 7:4f., 1QS 5:7-9, CDC 8:4-10, b 9:41f., 9:53. Cf. also 1QSa 1:2,7, 1QSb 3:26.

[36]1QH 2:13f., 5:11f., cf. 4:26f.

as outlined in manuscript A.[37] Another major tie-up between these two figures becomes apparent when we realize that each is expected to return in the glorious era of the end.[38] The proximity of these two titles in the Damascus Document (CDC 8:9f.) does not demand that we have two separate persons. It can be the same figure who is called the lawgiver (according to Numbers 21:18) while he is still alive but specifically the Teacher of Righteousness when he returns to be active in the eschatological era of righteousness.

It seems then that these two figures are identical and this becomes even more probable after a survey of the concept of righteousness and truth in the Qumran literature. The statutes of Righteousness are parallel to the New Covenant law. They are truth. The Teacher of Righteousness is therefore an imparter of statutes, a lawgiver.[39] Thus his followers are both Sons of Righteousness and doers of the law, and his function is that of a student and interpreter as well as that of an imparter or lawgiver! He is the one great leader of the sect. He is a second Moses, a guide, a prophet, an interpreter of laws, and an imposer of statutes. He is the Teacher <u>par excellence</u>. Much of this may well represent a later exaggeration on the part of pious descendants; nevertheless, we must give credence

---

[37] CDCb 9:50-54, <u>a</u> 8:5-10.

[38] CDC 8:9f., 4Qp2 Sam. fr. on 7:11f.

[39] For some passages on מורה צדק see CDC 1:8-17, <u>b</u> 9:37,50,54, 1QS 3:20, 4:2,24, 9:17, 1QH 4:37, 9:9, 4:31, 2:13f.

to the Qumran texts unless we are compelled in some way to do otherwise. A pointed footnote to this whole discussion is the fact that the Greek Manuscript of Sirach 10:5 translates the ר ס פ ר of the Hebrew manuscript by γραμματεύς (scribe or teacher)!

Basic Historical Sequence of Texts Concerning the Teacher of Righteousness

Having identified and localized the central figure in this debate, we are in a better position to consider his relationship to those texts which have a bearing on his life history. More precisely, what is the order of composition of those scrolls which are pertinent in his biography?

The chronology of archeology and paleography given above leaves much latitude and can never hope to determine the exact sequence of composition. Needless to say, some semblance of order must be found so that the progression of historical events remains consistent. A full treatment of the literary affinities of each scroll to the other is beyond the scope of this thesis. However, certain leading thoughts and over-all impressions may help to get across the historical development as certain scholars view it.

Following the lead given by paleography, we begin with the Manual of Discipline. The communal group was, no doubt, well established by the time this text reached its final draft. Yet the restricted circle of activity, the narrow range of legal codes, and the clearly defined strata of theology indicate

a period earlier than that reflected in the Damascus Document.[40] It smacks of unity and originality.

Here, there is a community, self-contained, secluded and studious, a יחד of priests, minding their own business, searching the Scriptures, and "preparing a way of the Lord in the wilderness."[41] The preparation of this way is their ultimate goal, a goal attained by strict allegiance to that Mosaic legislation as it is revealed to the Sons of Zadok (or Sons of Righteousness).[42]

There is little indication of severe internal discord or violent intervention from without as depicted in the numerous peshers and the Damascus Document. No mention is made of those infamous persons who brought sedition and sorrow into the ranks of the members. There are but few examples of that typical Qumran interpretation which calls upon Scripture for a record of all historical events, past, present or future.[43] Theirs was still a life of peace, preparation and research.

Nevertheless for a core of students so Scripture conscious, for a school of perfectionists so law conscious, and for a group of historians so conscious of eschatology, it is indeed

---

[40]Cf. CDC columns 1-9 which are a conglomeration of historical, didactical and allegorical interpretation of Scripture and the life of the community. Later columns mention urban as well as camp communities.

[41]1QS 9:21f., 5:1-7, 8:1, 8:13f.

[42]1QS 8:14f., 5:8f.

[43]See all the peshers involved, also CDC 6:1ff., 8:1ff., 9:5ff., et alii.

strange that this systematic work contains no reference to their great interpreter of mysteries, their Lawgiver, or their Teacher of Righteousness. What explanation can we offer? It is hardly likely that the Teacher of Righteousness was still unknown, for if the word of the Damascus Document has any force, it was this great man who first brought the covenanters to the light (CDC 1:8)! It is more probable tht the Teacher of Righteousness himself composed the work and felt no inclination to include his own name expressis verbis, or, that the work reflects a very early period before the Teacher concerned had split with the Man of the Lie and became acknowledged as the one true leader of the group. In any case this text has the approval of the early leaders, and we can safely assume that the Teacher of Righteousness espoused the cause propounded here.

But is there no reference to the Teacher of Righteousness? A close study of the "gibhor" (or geber) and the future prophet of the Manual reveals certain points of similarity with that Teacher. Brownlee, for one, is persuaded that the "gibhor" reference is a direct allusion to the Teacher of Righteousness.[44] Suffice it to say that this man is to stand out among his fellowmen and to be sprinkled with the spirit of truth in order to accomplish his task of granting wisdom and special insights

---

[44] 1QS 4:20-23. The striking similarities are the reason for the selection of this passage among the "probable references" in Chapter Two. Cf. William H. Brownlee, "Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament," New Testament Studies, III (November, 1956), 25.

to the Sons of Heaven.[45] Is this the Teacher of Righteousness making a veiled allusion to himself? Or was this pious expectation of the sect later seen fulfilled in their teacher? We must leave the question unanswered.

The question of the future prophet is perhaps a little more simple (1QS 9:10f.). His coming will mark a significant milestone in the future. Up until that time obedience to the original laws is a vital requirement. A similar passage in the Damascus Document urges that the basic laws of the group must be followed carefully until the great day when the Teacher of Righteousness arrives (CDC 8:10). Are these two accounts parallel in the strict sense of the term?

If so, the two figures are identical. In any case it is possible that, at a later date, the expected prophet was equated with the expected Teacher of Righteousness. This suggestion has much to commend it, especially when we consider that elsewhere in the Damascus Document the Teacher of Righteousness is portrayed as the predecessor of the Messiahs (CDCb 9:29,39). Precisely the same office is filled by the prophet in the passage under discussion. Pertinent also is the reference in the Habakkuk commentary which exalts the Teacher of Righteousness above the prophetic standing of Habakkuk himself (1QpHab. 7:1ff.).

All these factors argue in favor of an early dating for the Manual. This is prior to the time when such descriptive

---

[45] The comparison of one "man" over against the sons of men (בני אדם), who is to guide men who are already upright and perfect (ישרי דרך and תמימי-דרך) specifies this as an individual.

"nicknames" came into vogue. During this stage the names "gibhor" and prophet are quite fitting for the leader of the Community. The introduction of "nicknames" may have come later when the current persecution of the sect forced them to be guarded and secretive. Be that as it may, the priority of this work seems very probable.

Rather enigmatic is the reference to the so-called Book of Hagu.[46] All members were obliged to subscribe to its tenets, just as they were to subscribe to the tenets of the law as revealed to the Sons of Zadok (or Righteousness) and the tenets of the Lawgiver.[47] Do we have three separate codes of legislation? It is unlikely! And yet the references to the Book of Hagu are not explicit enough to draw any definite conclusions. The fact that the columns of 1QSa which belong to the Manual of Discipline mention this Book of Hagu indicates that it was known quite early and that it may have been the work of the Teacher of Righteousness. Accordingly, we group it with the Manual of Discipline, allowing for the possibility of their being identical.

The next scroll is the Habakkuk Commentary. Much of the discussion in this text centres around the tense of the verbs used throughout. Certain verb changes are evident and certain

---

[46]Cf. CDC 11:2, 15:5, 1QSa 1:7. Schonfield thinks that the Book of Hagu (הגו) is a hidden title for Book of Testing (בחן) which well expresses the content of the Manual of Discipline. This identification is arrived at by the process of Atbash. Op. cit., pp. 2ff.

[47]1QS 5:9, CDC 8:9, b 9:53.

scholars had made much of these. Brownlee,[48] for example, finds the crucial division in column nine (9:9-12), while Toombs[49] regards column seven (7:5-8:3) as the decisive transitional section.

It seems, however, that there is some distinction between past and present personalities. This dual outlook is evident already in column two. Here the author of the commentary views the work of God "in your days" (Hab. 1:5 - בימיכם) as an ongoing process from the former antagonism against the Teacher of Righteousness, until the current opposition to the words of this priest in his own days, the end of days (1QpHab. 2:1-10). We say "this priest" in order to identify this figure with the Teacher of Righteousness.[50] Here the priest is an interpreter of prophecies relating to the future. Elsewhere this office is ascribed to the Teacher of Righteousness (CDC 1:7f., 1QpHab. 7:1-5). The context does not demand that this priest is still normative at the end of days. In fact this is the main burden of the pesher on Habakkuk chapter two.

The pesher on the first chapter, from column three onward was designed to incite courage and faithfulness in the face of the oncoming Kittim (3:1-6:12), for it is they, the perfect

---

[48] W. H. Brownlee, "The Historical Allusions of the Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, CXXVI (April, 1952), 16.

[49] Toombs, op. cit., pp. 367-370.

[50] This question was left open in chapter two. Cf. footnotes 24 and 25 to the translation of this passage in chapter two.

ones, and not the Kittim who will execute God's judgement (5:2-6); they who had been purified by the removal of the Man of the Lie and his ilk. The burden of the pesher on the second chapter resumes the central theme of perseverance till the day of judgement. The words of the Teacher of Righteousness are definite on the subject even though the fulfilment of these words has been delayed (7:1-8:3). If they remain faithful to him, they would see the great day when the Teacher's foes would all be annihilated (9:12-13:4). In fact a foretaste of this judgement had already been experienced by certain of his enemies (8:3-9:12).

The verbal tenses draw out this contrast between those antagonists of the past who had already suffered judgement and those who would yet do so! The latter are contemporaneous with the author of the Commentary. But is the Teacher of Righteousness also contemporaneous? Was he still alive at that time? Probably not! There is no instance in the Habakkuk Commentary where the actions of the Teacher of Righteousness are present or future! Quite some time had passed since he uttered his prophecies concerning the future (7:7-14). Moreover the second column indicates a lapse of time between the days of the Teacher of Righteousness and the current disturbances. The same overview of deceased and living antagonists in later columns reflects a considerable number of years.[51]

---

[51] It is unnecessary to regard the Teacher of Righteousness referred to in 1QpHab. 9:9f. and 11:5 as a second leader of the sect as Toombs has done. Op. cit., p. 370f. This is but two phases of the work of one man.

The cogency of these arguments is quite apparent. On the other hand, certain factors compel us to place this work close to the lifetime of the Teacher of Righteousness himself. For one thing, certain of the personal foes of the Teacher were still alive when the author wrote; their judgement, too, had been delayed. For another, the vivid description of the struggles of the Teacher of Righteousness seem to be "on the spot converages," as it were. The time lag between the passing of the Teacher of Righteousness and the writing of this work cannot have been too great.

One feature of this work calls for special attention. It concerns the twofold nature of the conflict within the community. In the one case the enemies are public figures; in the other, they are renegade members of the community itself (cf. 5:9-13, 12:7-10). This feature provides a major connection with Qumran Hymns or Psalms. Admittedly it is a debatable question whether or not one can infer a precise historical situation from a devotional work such as the Qumran Hymns. Nevertheless certain allusions are so striking that the student must grapple with them. For example, the writer of the first few hymns (assuming they have a common author) complains of being forsaken by many who entered his covenant (5:22f.), mocked by the world (2:11f., 31f.), and ejected from his homeland (4:8f., 5:5). Those who treated him thus will experience divine judgement (6:28f.).

Here we have the same lifelike torment of one in trouble, the same vivid portrait of distress and deliverance, the same

twofold class of traitors and intruders, and the same antithesis between the present encounter and the future judgement. Perhaps certain of the features seem coincidental, yet if the author is regarded as the Teacher of Righteousness they become pointed and pertinent. Accordingly, certain of the Qumran Hymns must take their place with the events reflected in the Habakkuk Commentary. Similar events are apparent in many other peshers. Alas, the fragmentary nature of these works makes any historical connections difficult to uphold. Likewise a critical treatment of the later Qumran Psalms has not as yet appeared.[52]

The correlation of the preceding texts with the Damascus Document is likewise frought with many difficulties, encrusted, as it were, in a film of allegorical and midrashic vagaries. However, such vagaries need not hide the leading aims of the writer. Here the author (or authors)[53] is viewing the past from a distance, but reviewing it differently than his predecessors. He has an axe to grind, an axe that had become blunt in the memory of the community. Thus it is that a mosaic of biblical allusions and peshers are called upon to revive interest in the community's glorious past. Each event of their history is seen mirrored in Scriptural prophecies. All this is to arouse hope in a glorious future. This general tendency to

---

[52]For a recent treatment of the earlier Psalms see Joseph Baumgarten and Menahem Mansoor, "Studies in the New Hodayoth," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIV (1955), 115ff., 188ff., and LXXV (June, 1956), 107ff.

[53]The question of multiple authorship involved in the Damascus Document is quite complicated. At this point there is little agreement among scholars on this question. Let it be said, however, that, in general, the language and content throughout reflects the atmosphere of a similar period and environment.

to look back on history, presupposes a considerable lapse of time since the occurence of the major events involved. Thus it is that the community can look upon its retirement to "Damascus" (whether or not this term refers to the actual Damascus in Syria) as the great and decisive event of the past, the time when the well of the law was first delved, and its legal covenant sealed.[54] This was their grand "exodus" under the leadership of the "Star" or "Student of the Law" (CDC 9:8). It was this Student who guided them in their construction of the law and the Covenant. He was their original teacher (CDC 8:8), and as the previous discussion has shown, this man has all the "earmarks" of being the Teacher of Righteousness himself.

The dissension of the Man of the Lie and his adherents still remains a touchy point with the author of this work, and he singles them out for special censure.[55] Yet the specific historical incidents of the past are not described in detail; it is their past significance which counts. The Teacher's personality conflict is forgotten (1QpHab.); it is his abiding interpretation which must be upheld (CDCb 9:53f.). In fact, things had come to such a pass that the people began to expect their Teacher to return (CDC 8:10).

---

[54]CDC 8:6,15, 9:6,8, b 28:37. Segal believes that this work bears the indubitable mark of Syrian origin. M. H. Segal, "The Habakkuk 'Commentary' and the Damascus Fragments," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXX (1951), 141.

[55]Rost distinguishes four groups of traitors in Manuscript B 9:28-37. L. Rost, "Der Lehrer der Einung und der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit," Theologishe Literaturzeitung, Jahrgang 78, No. 3 (Marz, 1953), 143-48.

This train of thought argues for a late date of composition. Additional proof is afforded by the apparent expansion of the community itself. The legislative portions are designed to meet the requirements of both urban and camp communities. Those who had families, property, or slaves, were in no way obliged to relinquish their ties with the movement.[56] Quite a difference from the quasi-monastic life seen in the Manual of Discipline!

One thing at least is clear. The foremost documents of Qumran vary in topic and tempo. Throughout this group of documents, however, there is a certain thread of development, a unified progression amid the diversity of circumstances and motives. In nuce this progression is seen in the sequence Manual of Discipline, Qumran Hymns (in part), Habakkuk Commentary (and similar peshers), and the Damascus Document (both manuscripts).

A Survey of the Life of the Teacher of Righteousness

Having established a relative chronology of the texts involved, and having defined more clearly the title and identity of the Teacher of Righteousness, we are at liberty to present a skeleton outline of his life. A concise, but pertinent biography will provide a synthesized overview of the figure in question. A glance at this biography will, at the outset, point up certain differences between the life of this figure and that of Jesus Christ. In brief the salient points are these.

---

[56] CDC 10:1ff., 13:20f., 15:1-4, 14:11.

At a critical stage in the history of the world a few lonely men abandon the world of darkness and search for the light, a rather scarce commodity in their day. Under the leadership of their revered Teacher they succeed. At first, perhaps, the group does not acknowledge the divine mission of this man, yet it is through his industry and that of his colleagues, that a practical code of communal life is developed, and this handful of men become dedicated to their cause of purification and preparation for the day of the Lord! In due time the Teacher of Righteousness feels compelled to speak with divine authority. Many recognize that his word is truth and that his prophecies are sure. His word becomes law and his interpretation final. He becomes their Teacher and their Lawgiver.

As might be expected, his leadership does not go unchallenged. One faction dubbed the House of Absalom it seems, becomes traitors to the cause. Their leader, well known to all as the Man of the Lie, rebukes the acknowledged Teacher and finds himself cast from the ranks of the faithful. The memory of this great rift is seen even in the latest works of Qumran, and the part of the victorious Teacher becomes glorified.

Soon the isolation policy of the group has to be revised. The precise motive for this revision is unknown. Whether the public Jewish priesthood intrudes upon the privacy of Qumran, or whether the Teacher of Righteousness begins to make bold incursions into the outside world, is not clear. The outcome is evident, however. The Teacher of Righteousness meets with

severe opposition from without. And his bewildered followers inherit a long string of enemies. They hope for an immediate fulfilment of their Teacher's predictions, but alas, this is not forthcoming. These days of trial and rebuff, both at home and at large, were productive of many vivid hymns and peshers. The thoughts of the Teacher and the trials of his congregation are soon put to paper. From this record we can see that the conflict was not over in a matter of days. The community is often severely hampered; nevertheless, the fame of its great leader and the sincerity of his adherents, induce whole families, from both town and country, to join forces with the movement while still remaining in their own homes.

In due course this Teacher dies, but his work, his teaching, his hermeneutics and his memory live on in his faithful congregation. With him dies the details of his personal frays, but after him is erected the momument of his law. He is revered as a Lawgiver, second only to Moses.

The group longs for the fulfilment of their Teacher's prophecies. In this dreary period of waiting, the fires of eschatological hope are fanned repeatedly. The past, present and future of the group is seen reflected in Scripture. Soon the future is not complete until their glorious Teacher returns to hail the final days of turbulence and triumph. He who prophesied the coming of this day must come again to herald its arrival. In this the historian of the Damascus Document expresses the feeling of his times. With these hopes we must break off the story. Anything beyond this would be conjecture.

This briefly is the reconstruction of the history of the Teacher of Righteousness. We realize that research in this field and textual evidence itself, is far from complete. Accordingly, many features of this outline must be stamped as tentative. But it is axiomatic that the apologist should not underestimate the opposite position. Here, too, the evidence concerning the Teacher of Righteousness must be given its full emphasis. If then we still find no crucial point of contact with Jesus Christ, our hypothesis has stood the test.

In this chapter, then, we have categorized the pertinent texts and events, titles and personalities, yet without being categorical. This spadework has thrown into bold relief the greatest figure of Qumran.

CHAPTER IV

WHO WAS THE TEACHER OF RIGHTEOUSNESS?

The quest for the historical Teacher of Righteousness is far from complete. A thousand and one theories have been proposed, and each theory must take into account not only the preceding testimony to the Teacher of Righteousness himself, but the numerous veiled or actual references to historical figures mentioned in the literature of Qumran or the wealth of kindred literature from the intertestamental and early Christian eras. To discuss this question at length goes far beyond the scope of this study. Nevertheless, it is necessary for the reader to retain a skeleton image of the historical period portrayed in the scrolls and to be acquainted with the various outside figures who vie for the title of Teacher of Righteousness.

If such an historical identification could be made, we would have a more solid basis for comparing the Teacher of Righteousness with Jesus Christ, or any other historical figure for that matter. As indicated in the previous chapter, the over-all period within which we might search for a specific personage whose life might be comparable to that of the Teacher of Righteousness, extends over several centuries, (from about 200 B.C. to 50 A.D.). The question of the relative chronology of the scrolls must always take pride of place in such a search. The issue is further involved by the wide range of titles which must be fitted into the "jigsaw puzzle" of history. For example,

who were the Man of the Lie, the Wicked Priest, the Last Priests of Jerusalem and the Young Lion? What were the House of Absalom, the House of Judgement and the Kittim? Or where was "Damascus"?

The answers to this puzzle must be left to historians. Their various answers, however, are pertinent at this point. To review them will reveal not only their inadequacy, but their significance for comparing the Teacher of Righteousness with Jesus Christ.

The Origin of the Community

The historian always likes to uncover the origin of the movement he is interpreting. This is a basic prerequisite. Alas, the discovery of origins is often veiled by tradition or lost in the mists of time. The same is true of origin of the Qumran Community. Even the various hints thrown out by Qumran literature have been variously interpreted. For example, the usual interpretation that the community claimed direct descent from the Zadokite priesthood of David,[1] may now go by the board.[2] That many of the group were priests is obvious and that they remained faithful to the covenant is unchallenged,[3] but the question of a legitimate priesthood is nowhere given an explicit treatment. It was Moses and Aaron who stood out

---

[1] 2 Sam. 8:17, 1 Kings 1:39, CDC 6:1f., 2 Kings 22:8ff., CDC 7:5-7, 1QS 5:2,9.

[2] P. Wernberg-Moller, "פרץ, פרצים and פרוץ in CDC, DSD, and DSH," Vetus Testamentum, III (1953), 310ff.

[3] Jer. 31:31f., Neh. 9:38, 10:28ff., Mal. 2:4f., CDC 5:1ff., 19:2, CDCb 9:29.

as the great predecessors of these "doers of the law," these Levites.

The so called Damascus Document does give something of an historical background to the community. In fact, one chief purpose of that book is to glorify the previous history of the group. The work begins with a statement that the period of God's wrath was some three hundred and ninety years (Cf. Ezek. 4:5). After this period the covenantors began their return to the law.

One terminus for this age of three hundred and ninety years is the date of the Babylonian exile (586 B.C.). But which terminus is meant? The disputed passage reads, "When he delivered them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar. . . ." (CDC 1:5) The initial words render the Hebrew בהתם . Does this infinitive denote a date before or after the exile by Nebuchadnezzar? Rabinowitz favors the former view and regards the evil reign of Rehoboam as the terminus a quo.[4] Schonfield, on the other hand, inclines to the latter. For him the captivity of Jerusalem (586 B.C.) is the precise terminus a quo.[5] Three hundred

---

[4]Isaac Rabinowitz, "A Reconsideration of 'Damascus' and '390 Years' in the 'Damascus' ('Zadokite') Fragments," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIII (1954), 11-15. Note the objections of H. Wiesenberg, "Chronological Data in the Zadokite Fragments," Vetus Testamentum, V (1955), 293ff.

[5]Hugh J. Schonfield, Secrets of the Dead Sea Scrolls (London: Vallentine, Mitchel & Co. Ltd., 1956), p. 9. For the use of Lamedh with the infinitive in dating, cf. 1 Kings 6:1 which reads, "480 years after the going forth. . . ." Consider also the weighty objections to this usage, Wiesenberg, op. cit., p. 286.

and ninety years after the fall of Jerusalem brings us to the reign of Antiochus the Great (223-187 B.C.). A further twenty years of groping (CDC 1:6) extends to the eve of the reign of the notorious Antiochus Epiphanes (175-165 B.C.). Do either of these dates prove helpful?

It seems that the first Jewish Senate, a zealous core of Mosaic legislators, is first mentioned during the reign of Antiochus the Great.[6] There is no apparent connection here, however. The same cannot be said for the rule of Antiochus Epiphanes. Hellenistic fashions came into vogue and heathenish manners became popular.[7] A new spirit of revolt was born during his regime. This latent spirit became evident in numerous movements of later decades. One such movement was that of the Chasidim. These "pious" adherents of the Mosaic law later became fanatical associates of Judas Maccabaeus.[8] It is to this colorful group that many would trace the origin of the Essenes, a group closely akin to the community of Qumran, if indeed, not identical with it. The Essenes themselves are first mentioned as a separate group in the days of Jonathan the Maccabaean (circa 160 B.C.).[9] The roots of Pharisaism and Sadducaism probably reach back into this period also.

---

[6]Josephus Antiquities XII, 3:3. Cf. Schonfield op. cit., p. 14.

[7]II Macc. 4:12ff., 1 Macc. 1:11f., 1:63f.

[8]I Macc. 2:42-44, 2 Macc. 14:3,6, 7:12-17, cf. Enoch 90:6.

[9]Josephus Antiquities XIII, 5:9.

Although the origins of the Qumran Community, the Essenes and the Chasidim are shrouded in mystery, the era of reaction against Antiochus Epiphanes seems a probable point of departure for this "Back to the Law of Moses" sect from Qumran. It is noteworthy that within forty years of this time, the monastery of Qumran itself was occupied.

An interesting synthesis of these two theories is proposed by Wiesenberg. The author of the Damascus Document, he feels, claimed that the origin of the sect stems back to the Fall of Samaria (722), whereas, in reality, it must be placed somewhere in the Early Greek period. In this connection he writes, "Their pretentious claim of the hoary antiquity of their sect, whether or not they presented it with a bone fide belief in its veracity, thus had a fair chance of being accepted by their readers."[10]

The references to the Teacher of Righteousness in the so-called Karaite literature have caused much speculation.[11] These and other connective links, however, are too remote from the era under discussion to shed any light on the early history of Qumran. It is in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes that we must begin our search, and from thence review the list of candidates for the number one position as they appear in the annals of history.[12] The origin of this band remains uncertain. Perhaps

---

[10] Wiesenberg, op. cit., p. 304.

[11] P. Kahle, "The Karaites and the MSS from the Caves," Vetus Testamentum, III (1953), 82-5.

[12] Cf. 2 Macc.3 and 4. For a brief introduction to the history of this period, see Norman H. Snaith, The Jews from Cyrus to Herod (New York: Abingdon Press, n.d.).

they hark back to the Chasidim and perhaps Wiesenberg is right when he writes,[13]

> To the writers themselves the founders of the sect and their opponents were legendary figures looming dim and blurred through the mist across the vast expanse of many centuries.

Candidates for the Title of Teacher of Righteousness

Antiochus Epiphanes and his immediate predecessors were somewhat harsh in their treatment of the Jews, not, of course, without considerable provocation. Part of this harsh treatment involved the imposition of heavy taxation, a factor which caused a rift in the priestly circles, the one group being known as the House of Onias, the other the House of Tobias. The rivalry between these two factions caused numerous disturbances. Onias III, High Priest under Selecus IV, undertook a trip to this King for help to quell these riots. The premature death of the King enabled another rival faction to seize control. Manalaus, the leader of the new faction, finally murdered Onias in Antioch, although public Jewish opinion still regarded the line of Onias as the legitimate line. This pious man, Onias III, is a strong contender for the title of Teacher of Righteousness.

Both H. H. Rowley and A. Michel are ardent advocates of this theory. Michel has taken great pains in trying to identify the exact period. In doing so he has drawn up a long list

---

[13] Wiesenberg, loc. cit. Others favor connections with the Maskilim of Daniel also, cf. F. F. Bruce, Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing Company, 1956), p. 99.

of passages from Daniel, first and second Maccabees and the Qumran literature itself, which he believes are parallel[14] and depict just this period. Rowley sees a reference to the murder of Onias in Daniel 9:26.[15] But was the Teacher of Righteousness murdered at all? It is doubtful!

The material dealing with Onias III is rather scant, unfortunately. A rather pertinent passage is found in second Maccabees. Here we are told of a certain dream of Judas Maccabaeus in which Onias introduces the venerable old prophet Jeremiah who hands over a sword of gold to Judas (2 Macc. 15:11-16).[16] The whole context reveals the high esteem in which Onias was held, and in a sense he could be called a prophet, a judge and an intercessor. Although these points of contact with the Teacher of Righteousness are rather dubious, the villains of the play, the Wicked Priest and so on, can readily be matched with any number of usurpers, deceivers, murderers and thieves from this period. Likewise, the connection with Jeremiah has not passed unnoticed.[17]

The hellenizing policy of Antiochus Epiphanes sought to consolidate his vast empire. In Israel, however, it served only to embitter the Jews still further (1 Macc. 1:10ff.).

---

[14] A. Michel, Le Maitre de Justice (Paris; Maison Aubanel Pere, 1954), pp. 75ff.

[15] H. H. Rowley, The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1952), pp. 67ff.

[16] Cf. Sir. 5:26, Enoch 62:2, II Macc. 4:33,34.

[17] Cf. Schonfield, op. cit., pp. 8ff.

The first spark of rebellion came through the efforts of Mattathias, the father of Judas Maccabaeus.

This fanatical Jew, fired with the zeal of the Lord, had slain two men at the public altar as an expression of indignation against the sacriligeous sacrifices of his day. Thereupon, with a pious call to retreat, he fled to the wilderness and gathered a band who were zealous for the law and adherents of the covenant. His course was later espoused by the Chasidim and perpetuated by his famous sons (I Macc. 2:1ff.). These factors have led Grieg to identify Mattathias with the Teacher of Righteousness.[18] Of course, Mattathias, as the account shows, was a man of war and bloodshed, who was concerned more with the Jewish revolt than the letter of the law. His retirement reflects little of the peaceful community seen in the Manual of Discipline.

Among the Chasidim themselves there is another revered personality, Joseph ben Joezer. It seems that when Judas Maccabaeus had gained power (165-160 B.C.), one group of the Chasidim, led by Joseph ben Joezer, favored Alcimus as High Priest contrary to the plans of Judas. Alcimus, however, turned the tables on these faithful Chasidim and had some sixty of them massacred, a rather foolish thing to do! Tradition concerning this Joseph ben Joezer in the Mishnah and early Midrashic literature is rather impressive. For example, he is

---

[18] J. C. G. Greig, "The Teacher of Righteousness and the Qumran Community," New Testament Studies, II, No. 2 (November, 1955), 124f.

called "the most pious in the priesthood" (Hagigah 2:7).[19] Schonfield has assembled these and numerous other scraps of history and arrived at the following conclusion,

> I believe that on the basis of the party's traditions and of intimations found in the pseudepigraphic literature, there developed an idealised representation of the Suffering Just One and those expectations of a corresponding Messianic figure in the Last Days. As we have seen in Chpts. ix-x, both legends about such an individual taking their origin at the time of the Maccabean revolt, and prophecies to which those legends gave rise, are met with in the literature of the Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes and Samaritans, as well as the New Covenanters and the Christians. Variously presented to us as the Unique Teacher of Righteousness, the Just One, Asaph, the Son of Berechiah, Joseph the Just, Joseph ben Joezer, his actual identity remains shrouded in mystery.[20]

Certain connections with the great leader Judas Maccabaeus might also be mentioned. One pertinent passage reads,

> The same things also were reported in the writings and commentaries of Neemias; and how he founding a library gathered together the acts of the kings, and the prophets, and of David, and the epistles of the kings concerning the holy gifts. In like manner also Judas gathered together all those things that were lost by reason of the war we had, and they remain with us (2 Macc. 2:13f.).

From this passage and the context, it can be seen that this man was careful to preserve the law and the prophetical writings, as well as to purify his people from heathen and impure elements. His identification with the Teacher of Righteousness, however, is very improbable, although, in part, Rabinowitz

---

[19] Schonfield translates "a Chasid of the priesthood." Cf. Hag. 2:2, Sot. 9:9, Eduy. 8:4, Ab. 1:4. For more complete study of this figure see Schonfield, op. cit., p. 18, Millar Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls (New York: The Viking Press, c.1955), p. 169.

[20] Schonfield, op. cit., pp. 149ff.

favors this interpretation.[21]

The brothers of Judas fell one by one at the hand of the Seleucids. Eventually John Hyrcanus, the nephew of Judas, was able to extend his power throughout Israel, both as High Priest and as King. His reign has little to commend it. In fact, he thoroughly deserved the censure of Eleazor.[22]

This Elezaor, it seems, had a variety of names. In the Talmud he is called Judah ben Jedidiah and Judas the Essene.[23] Judas the Essene, of course, is quite a well-known name. According to Josephus he "never missed the truth in his predictions" (Antiq. XII, 11:2). The account which follows merely bears out this statement. Other than that the activities of this figure are rather vague. To identify him with the Teacher of Righteousness requires much imagination. At this point, we ought to bear in mind that coins found at Khirbet qumran are dated from this reign onward.

The sons of Hyrcanus were worse scoundrels than their father. His second son, Alexander Janneus (102-76), committed several heinous crimes. His splendid qualification have

---

[21]Greig, ibid., Isaac Rabinowitz, "Sequence and Dates of the Extra-Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls Texts and 'Damascus' Fragments," Vetus Testamentum, III (1953), 184.

[22]Josephus Antiquities XIII, 10:5f. Hyrcanus qualifies as the wicked priest also, cf. W. H. Brownlee, "The Historical Allusions of the Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, CXXVI (April, 1952), pp. 12-15, and L. E. Toombs, "The Early History of the Qumran Sect," Journal of Semitic Studies, I (October, 1956), p. 376.

[23]For a study of this figure, see Brownlee, op. cit., p. 18; William H. Brownlee, "Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament," New Testament Studies, III (November, 1956), 14f.

induced many to identify him with the villain of the Qumran drama.[24] In this connection Allegro makes much of the reference to a certain Demetrius in the Nahum Commentary (1QpNah. fr. on ch. 2). This figure, he believes, is none other than Demetrius III, the famous Seleucid warrior[25] who tangled with Alexander Janneus (the Lion of Wrath). However, as H. H. Rowley has pointed out, this Demetrius may refer to several other historical personalities. Demetrius I, who was active during the Maccabaean era, is the most likely.[26] The chief drawback of all theories centering about this era is that they can posit no specific name with which to identify the Teacher of Righteousness.

During the reign of the two sons of Janneus, namely Hyrcanus II (75-66 B.C.) and Aristobolus II (66-63 B.C.), the Roman pressure upon the Jewish nation became more intensive and the internal rivalry even more acute. This did not make for harmonious living at all. In fact the whole unfortunate situation culminated in the capture of Jerusalem by the unwelcome Pompey. It seems that this event took place on the Day of Atonement (63 B.C.). Dupont-Sommer and others find this

---

[24]For example, Brownlee, "The Historical Allusions of the Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash," pp. 12-15.

[25]J. M. Allegro, The Dead Sea Scrolls (Baltimore: Penguin Books Inc., 1956), pp. 95ff. Cf. M. H. Segal, "The Habakkuk 'Commentary' and the Damascus Fragments," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXX (1951), 133ff.

[26]1 Macc. 7, Josephus Antiquities XII, 5:4, cf. H. H. Rowley, "4QpNahum and the Teacher of Righteousness," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXV (September, 1956), 188ff.

rather rude interruption indicated in the scrolls themselves. In fact, Dupont-Sommer believes that the conflict with Pompey is the key which unlocks the door to the history of the Habakkuk Commentary.[27]

At this juncture we can introduce Onias the Just. Was he the Teacher of Righteousness? R. Goosens is of this opinion![28] Onias the Just was truly a man of power and prayer. During his lifetime his prayers had been effective in breaking a serious drought. Alas, the poor man suffered stoning when he refused to curse the faction of Aristobolus II. God thereupon wrought judgement upon his murderers.[29] Once again, however, the evidence is inadequate to formulate any definite conclusion.

The first period of occupation at Qumran ends soon after this date. That the Teacher of Righteousness lived during the second period of occupation is rather improbable. Nevertheless a number of men from this period have been considered.

Perhaps the most startling is that of Teicher.[30] The Qumran community, he believes, is the Christian sect of the Ebionites, the Teacher of Righteousness is Christ, the Preacher

---

[27] A. Dupont-Sommer, The Dead Sea Scrolls (Oxford; Basil Blackwell, c.1952), pp. 25ff.

[28] R. Goosens, "Onias le Juste, le Messie de la Nouvelle Alliance, lapide a Jerusalem en 65 au Jesus Christ," La Nouvelle Clio, (1950), pp. 440-69. Cf. A, Michel, op. cit., pp. 276ff., for a discussion and rebuttal of Goosens proposals.

[29] Josephus Antiquities XIV, 2:1f. Taanith III:9.

[30] J. L. Teicher, "The Damascus Fragment and the Origin of the Jewish Christian Sect," The Journal of Jewish Studies II, III (1951), 115-43.

of Lies is the Apostle Paul. This idea has met with little or no favor!

Another Essene, Menahem, has been suggested by Del Medico.[31] This Menahem was a man of war, an active soldier before the Destruction of Jerusalem (70 A.D.). He and a zealous band of insurgents made a bold seige of the city, but alas, his fate was short-lived and he fell foul of his enemies.[32] It is interesting to note that Schonfield, too, views the Habakkuk Commentary and several other scrolls as being relevant to this final struggle. In his opinion they are a history designed to prepare those who must live during the final period of testing, a history written shortly before the events took place.[33] Such a theory has little support from the evidence of Archeology and Paleography.

The Significance of this Survey

If we parade these candidates before us once more, we see but few in the line up who can answer to the description of the Teacher of Righteousness. Likewise, the history, teachings, and peculiarities of these men have only incidental connections with the leader of Qumran. To go one step further and compare these figures with Jesus Christ is almost laughable. Could any one of these figures, as their sources describe them, have been

---

[31] Cf. Michel, op. cit., pp. 282ff. for a complete discussion and rebuttal of this suggestion.

[32] Josephus Bel. Jud. II, 17:8-10. Cf. Antiquities XV 10:4f.

[33] Schonfield, op. cit., p. 158.

a pattern for the Galilean Master? The evidence in each case is far too scant to make such an assertion.

Onias IV was a powerful high priest, saintly no doubt, but engrossed in a somewhat questionable religious dispute. Mattathias, too, was a man of God, but just as much a man of war. Indeed he was urgent in his call to renew the covenant, but he was just as urgent in his call to arms. And Joseph ben Joezer, who received a rather rude welcome from the two-faced Alcimus, has little but tradition to support him. The stories about these men are a far cry from the narratives of the Gospels.

Judas the Essene may have claimed to be a prophet, Onias the Just may have acted like a prophet, and Menahem may have exhibited the fanatical zeal of a prophet, but there the comparison ends. The biography (as we know it) of none of these men could have prompted Dupont-Sommer to say, "The Galilean Master, as He is presented to us in the writings of the New Testament, appears as an astonishing reincarnation of the Master of Justice (Teacher of Righteousness)," whether or not Dupont-Sommer is justified in making such a statement.[34]

All this only serves to underscore the distinctive features of the Teacher of Righteousness. He was a teacher, interpreter and prophet of a far higher calibre than anything which tradition or history has handed down from this era. At least this is the impression which the Qumran literature gives us. Perhaps one of those mentioned is the Teacher of Righteousness.

---

[34]Dupont-Sommer, op. cit., p. 99.

His testimony, alas, is very meagre and we are at a loss to single him out. Accordingly, it is to the scrolls themselves that we must now turn as a suitable basis for comparing the Teacher of Righteousness with the Teacher from Galilee.

CHAPTER V

JESUS AND THE TEACHER OF RIGHTEOUSNESS: ANTITHESES IN TEACHING

The first major part of our study is complete. The Teacher of Righteousness has been isolated and the testimony of his disciples presented. The men of history which approximate to his ideals have been reviewed. His background and personality are now familiar to us. Hence, we are in a position to tackle the other part of this study, namely, the comparison of this figure according to the Qumran scribes with the Teacher of Galilee according to the New Testament historians. A priori, we must state that the New Testament writers will be given credence in regard to the historical data which they supply for this study.

The very name, Teacher of Righteousness, may imply much that is disturbing for the person who would dare to take the remark of A. Powell Davies seriously, for he writes, "The only element of importance that is found nowhere in Paganism is the portrait of Jesus the Teacher."[1] And although we cannot endorse the remarks of Davies, the challenge still stands! Do the teachings of Qumran anticipate much that is found in the Gospels? Is the portrait of Jesus the teacher nothing but a "reprint" of the Teacher of Righteousness?

---

[1] A. Powell Davies, Dead Sea Scrolls (New York: Signet Key Books, The New American Library of World Literature, Inc., c.1956), p. 91.

The answer to such questions does not lie in the enumeration of verbal parallels, current terminology or even similar quotations from Scripture.[2] When two movements are born in the same era and area, and arise within a similar milieu, such verbal and ideological affinities are inevitable. Nor is it of great value to examine every small detail of the message of Jesus and search for possible connections in Qumran usage. This is no more than "laboratory work." We must penetrate a little deeper and expose the basic tenets of each school. Herein we will see whether or not their teachings really jibe.

The ἐξουσία of the Two Teachers[3]

St. Matthew's Gospel records how the Sermon on the Mount convinced many people that Jesus spoke with ἐξουσία (Matt. 7:29). The author of the pesher on Habakkuk claims that the Teacher of Righteousness, too, spoke with ἐξουσία. Thus he could say, "it was God who made known to him (i.e. the Teacher of Righteousness) all the mysteries of the prophets" (1QpHab. 7:4f.). The students of each teacher acknowledged the divine

---

[2]For a very useful list of terms and ideas parallel with those of the New Testament, see Roland E. Murphy, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and New Testament Comparisons," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XVIII (July, 1956), 265-72. Note the approach of F. F. Bruce, Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956), pp. 131f. For further parallel treatments, see G. Kuhn, "Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament," Zeitschrift fuer Theologie und Kirche (1950), pp. 192-211, and W. Grossouw, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament," Studia Catholica, XXVI (1951), 289-99; XXVII (1952), 1-8.

[3]We chosse the term ἐξουσία in the New Testament sense. This term involves much more than the English word "authority."

ἐξουσία of their respective master. This factor, at least, is plain.

In the case of Jesus, it is possible to make a distinction between the ἐξουσία which he claimed and that which he exhibited to substantiate his claims. The Gospel record of his own words is adequate for this purpose. The teachings of the Teacher of Righteousness, alas, are not given verbatim, unless we maintain that certain of the Qumran Hymns came from his own pen. Nevertheless we do possess the testimony of his students and associates, and we can take it for granted that he espoused the leading principles of documents such as the Manual of Discipline. Assuming this to be true, we can apply the same criteria to the examination of his ἐξουσία as we do in the case of Jesus of Nazareth.

The ἐξουσία of the Teacher of Righteousness was, first of all, a prophetic ἐξουσία . He was accorded greater prophetic insight than Habakkuk, his comprehension of prophetic mystery was perfect, and his words flowed directly from the mouth of God (1QpHab. 2:2, 7:1-5). Furthermore, the ἐξουσία of his teachings was binding and faith in his person rewarding (CDCb 9:53f.). This compelling force of his ἐξουσία must not be underestimated.

A similar claim is heard in certain of the Qumran hymns. It seems like the voice of the Teacher of Righteousness that cries, "Thou hast made me a banner for the chosen of righteousness, and an interpreter of knowledge through marvellous mysteries, to put to the test (those who desire) truth and to try

out those who love correction" (1QH 2:13f.). The writer claims to be a banner (ܢܣ) which leads the way, an interpreter (ܦܫܪܢܐ) of glorious secrets and a touchstone for men of like mind.

This theme is reiterated throughout the Qumran Hymns.[4] Interpretation through divine revelation is the central motif. This interpretation is tantamount to truth. It is a mystery fit for the inner circle of Qumran. One passage has the significant addition that this insight is mediated through the Holy Spirit (1QH 12:11f). The ἐξουσία from above establishes the right to interpret. Whether directly or indirectly, the ideals of the Teacher of Righteousness are reflected in these themes from the Qumran Hymns. The interpretation from the school of the Teacher of Righteousness bears the stamp of his prophetic ἐξουσία, an ἐξουσία that is normative for the consciences of his adherents.

Does Jesus merely imitate the pretensions of this forerunner? Was he just another prophetic teacher? We note that the people were struck by the bold exegesis of Jesus at Capernaum. There he claimed that the prophesy of Isaiah chapter sixty-one applied to himself, just as Qumran exegesis had found direct references to the Teacher of Righteousness even in rather obscure places. A posteriori, of course, we can understand the claim of Jesus to be the fulfilment of Isaiah sixty-one, yet for the audience of his day, this "personal" exegesis was

---

[4]For further passages on this theme, see 1QH 4:10,27f., 5:9,15f.,25, 7:20,26f., 8:16 et alii. Note the prevalence of ܪܙ and ܣܬܪ in these and similar passages.

tantamount to personal effrontery. The significant feature, however, was the admission of the audience that in this case also, his words were ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ (Luke 4:16-32). Even the official emissaries of the chief priest were forced to admit, "Never man spoke like this man" (John 7:46).

"Personal" exegesis was nothing new. The exaltation of a teacher was nothing new. These ideals Jesus could have stolen from Qumran patents. But--and here is the rift--Jesus was not concerned about becoming a great teacher. His exegesis, parables and sermons are directed to a higher goal. The very choice of his own disciples was a breach with the traditional practice. Few men chose disciples of their own accord. Few men had commanded such ἐξουσία at the first invitation. At his word, fishermen, publicans and the like left all and followed him; they followed one who claimed to be more, much more than a teacher. He claimed to be the Sons of God. He not only brought the message of forgiveness but claimed the ἐξουσία to forgive sins (Mat. 9;6). Thus the "teacher" motif must be viewed against the background of a higher ideal. Jesus is not merely another interpreter. He claimed that not only his ἐξουσία but his very person was from above (John 3:31).

Of course, it is one thing to make such assertions and another thing to summon power enough to substantiate them. The record of the Qumran teacher leaves much to be desired in this respect. The personal triumph of the Teacher of Righteousness over the Man of the Lie may have been regarded as a personal vindication of his message in the sight of his members. It

was not however, an external σημεῖον for Israel at large. The approach of Nicodemus, on the other hand, is without parallel in Qumran. His words are plain, "We know that you are a teacher who has come from God, for no one can do these signs (σημεῖα) which you do unless God is with him" (John 3:2).[5] Nor is the challenge of the Man of the Lie comparable to the challenge of the demonaical forces which Jesus overcame repeatedly. The miracles of Jesus are an unequivocal testimony. "The works (τὰ ἔργα) I do in my Father's name, these bear witness concerning me" (John 10:25); this is Jesus' personal evaluation of his miracles.

The σημεῖα, τέρατα and ἔργα of Jesus are tangible proofs. The [illegible] of Qumran are chiefly esoteric; its [illegible] belong to the realm of thought.

Thus, as we noted earlier, it is one thing to claim such ἐξουσία and another to have the ability to substantiate. This Jesus has done openly and without deceit! Yet even though Jesus could vindicate his ἐξουσία it does not mean that he may not have incorporated some of the messages of this teacher into his own system. The next step then is to examine some of those messages which appear pertinent.

The Message of the Two Teachers

The message of Qumran was twofold; the call back to the

---

[5]Miss Mowry makes much of John chapter three, Lucetta Mowry, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Background of the Gospel of John," The Biblical Archeologist, XVII (December, 1954), pp. 78ff.

Old Covenant of Moses and the demand of the New Covenant of the sons of righteousness. Anyone desiring entrance into the Qumran assembly was required to acknowledge the Mosaic law in toto, and to maintain rigid conformity to its tenets in order to fulfil his first part of the covenant (1QS 5:8). The new covenant of Qumran was, first of all, a new emphasis on the old covenant. A special significance of the new covenant will be noted in the next chapter.

The ultimate consequence of this new emphasis can be seen in the case of the Sabbath laws outlined in the Damascus Document. These regulations are full of trivial minutiae (cf. CDC 13:1-27). This legalistic tendency was, no doubt, prevalent in the tenets of the Teacher of Righteousness, a tendency which Jesus brands as a "merciless" doctrine (Mat. 12:7). The attitude of Jesus to the Sabbath would have been quite blasphemous in the eyes of the Teacher of Righteousness. Nevertheless, the miracles which Jesus performed on the Sabbath vindicate his claim to be "Lord also of the Sabbath" (Mat. 12:8).[6]

The Teacher of Righteousness, after having been aggravated by the theft and plunder of the Wicked Priest from Jerusalem (1QpHab. 12:7-9) would have applauded the action of Jesus in purging the temple and would have seconded his exclamation that the temple had become "a den of thieves" (Mat. 21:13). The Teacher of Righteousness, however, would never have tolerated the claim of Jesus to be greater (μείζων) than the temple

---

[6]Cf. O. Cullmann, "The Significance of the Qumran texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIV (1955), 217.

(Mat. 12:6), nor endorsed his prophesy of the temple's demolition (Mat. 24:1). The anxious expectation of the day when fitting temple sacrifices would again be executed is reflected in the War Scroll (1QM 2:3-5 cf. Jn. 4:21). The Qumran priests envisioned a new Kingdom in which the temple would maintain a perpetual priesthood (1QSb 4:25f.).[7] The worship laws of Qumran were fixed by divine decree. Thus it was nothing short of a mortal sin for the wicked priest to intrude on the day of atonement (1QpHab. 11:7f.).

As these worship regulations illustrate, there is much that is obviously an interpretation or extension of the basic Mosaic Law. Apparently it is these interpretations that bear that system of exegesis championed by the Teacher of Righteousness, the great interpreter of prophecies (1QpHab. 7:1-5, cf. 1QH 2:13). And it is clear that the cardinal feature of this interpretation is asceticism, an asceticism which calls for strict laws of daily administration and severe punishment for minor breaches of discipline (1QS 5:20-7:25). The ideal goal of those who followed this interpretation was to become a living "holy of holies" (1QS 8:5).

Many of these regulations have their counterpart in facets of Pharisaic legislation which Jesus denouneed.[8] Hence there

---

[7]Cf. F. F. Bruce, "Qumran and Early Christianity," New Testament Studies, II (February, 1956), 187.

[8]Christian D. Ginsburg, The Essenes, The Kabbalah (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1956), p. 21. For a discussion of Qumran and the Essenes, cf. Charles T. Fritsch, The Qumran Community (New York: The Macmillan Company, c.1956) pp. 90ff.

are but few of these legislative ideals which Jesus reiterated. One worth nothing, however, is the procedure for church discipline in which each teacher follows the same three stages (Mat. 18:15-17, 1QS 5:24-6:1).[9] In general, the attitude of Jesus toward asceticism is quite clear, while the contrast of his life to that of the Teacher of Righteousness is quite sharp.[10] The pious Teacher of Righteousness could never have been derided as a "winebibber" or a friend of publicans and sinners (Mat. 11:9).

To note such disagreements in Sabbath regulations, ascetic legislation and the like is only the first step. What is more important is the manner in which Jesus treats the ideals of Moses and tradition. For he does not interpret Moses, he supercedes Moses. His formula is not, "I interpret Moses as saying," but "I say." The ἐξουσία of Jesus in his teaching is superior to that of Moses. This is the unifying theme of Matthew chapter five, a theme which culminates in the glorious high point, "You have heard that it has been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy, but say unto you (ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν), love your enemies. . .".(Matt. 5:43f.). Not only does Jesus advance far beyond tradition, but he also advances beyond the ethics of the perfectionists in the "holy of holies" of Qumran.

---

[9]Cf. ibid., p. 119.

[10]Cf. Cullmann, op. cit., p. 217, Geoffrey Graystone, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Originality of Christ (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1956), p. 50, and A. Dupont-Sommer, The Jewish Sect of Qumran and The Essenes (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956), p. 161.

We hear the Qumran counterpart to this theme in connection with the initiants commitment to "love all the sons of light but to hate all the sons of darkness" (1QS 1:9f.). Truly a remarkable difference!

Yet, on the other hand, in connection with this same chapter, we might venture to say that most of the beatitudes could have been spoken by the Teacher of Righteousness. In the victory hymn of the War Scroll we have various epithets for those who have effected peace on the earth (the peace-makers). They are called "pure" or "perfect" (תמים) and "poor in spirit" (עני רוח) (1QM 14:7).[11] Those who hunger after righteousness are the sons of God, or sons of righteousness who, with their leader, suffer for righteousness sake (1QpHab. cf. QH 9:9f.). Likewise they are merciful and meek in their own circles and hope to inherit the earth (cf. 1QS 1:9). However, such terms can be traced to a common Old Testament background and such a selection at random reveals how picayune it is to base arguments upon terminology, for without the context we are not aware of the legalistic shadow which falls over all the Qumran usage, nor of the new content with which Jesus invested the same terms.[12] Another significant point is the fact that Jesus directed his beatitudes to a great crowd and even invested his own disciples with ἐξουσία to preach abroad. There were no secret doctrines

---

[11]Note the common use of אביון also. Cf. 1QM 11:9,13, 1QH 2:32, CDC 8:17 et alii.

[12]Cf. Graystone, op. cit., p. 56.

with Jesus (cf. 1QS 4:6).[13] And, as Cullmann adds, "This is the exact opposite of what was drilled into the members of the Qumran sect."[14]

As we have noted, much of the terminology of Qumran with parallels in New Testament literature can be traced to a common Old Testament background. To this we might add certain concepts which have a common Old Testament root, viz., justice, truth, mercy or repentance which figure prominently in Qumran literature.[15] In this respect Qumran followed, in the main, the regular stream of Judaism. More important, however, is the question as to what new elements were infused into the teachings of this group which would distinguish it from the main stream of Judaism. We have mentioned asceticism, although this could have arisen within the movement itself. More to the point is the influx of a foreign dualism.

Whether or not the Teacher of Righteousness had been a descendant of the original Babylonian exiles and had returned to Israel at the time of the glorious Maccabean revivla, we do not know. But one thing we do know; the dualism of Qumran has an Iranian flavor and it may have been this interpretation of the Old Testament by such dualistic insights that enabled the Teacher of Righteousness to lead these blind Jews to the light (CDC1:6-8).[16]

---

[13]The so-called "Messiasgeheimnis" does not enter into the question at this point.

[14]Cullmann, op. cit., p. 217. For the prevelance of [illegible] see footnote 3 supra.

[15]Graystone, op. cit., p. 58.

[16]Cf. Dupont-Sommer, op. cit., p. 128.

The doctrine of the two spirits in the Manual of Discipline is the locus classicus for Qumran dualism. A few verses will serve to illustrate its bold nature. The section begins "All that exists or has existed stems from the knowledge of God. And before any of these came into existence God determined their pattern" (1QS 3:15). Furthermore, "He appointed two spirits," to rule over man, "the spirit of light and the spirit of darkness" (1QS 3:18f.). The Prince of Light becomes the guardian angel of the righteous and the Angel of Darkness the counterpart for the unrighteous (1QS 3:20-23). It is from the latter that all human affliction must come (1QS 3:23). Yet in contrast to this dualism is the Old Testament background of repentance; there is an obvious tension between these two motifs in the Qumran literature.[17]

It is just at this point where the Gospel of Jesus is so different. There is no child of Belial who could not be reclaimed by Jesus, no lost sheep of Israel who could no be found, no person burdened with sin who could not come to Jesus, no harlot or sinner who could not hear his message. His message was all-embracing and his invitation all inclusive. There is no Gospel message in the dualism of Qumran, and there is no

---

[17]This dualism is very strong in the War Scroll. For a discussion of this dualism and its relation to the New Testament, especially to the Gospel of John, see Mowry, op. cit., pp. 78ff., Raymond E. Brown, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johanine Gospel and Epistles," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XVII (July, 1955), pp. 403-19, and XVII (October, 1955), 559-74, also G. Kuhn, "Die Sektenschrift und die iranische Religion," Zeitschrift fur Theologie und Kirche (1952), pp. 296ff.

determinism in the Gospel of Jesus. There is no Gospel in Qumran because there is no Jesus. The Teacher of Righteousness is but a Lawgiver, a man with a bent for levitical legalism, a reinterpreted legalism, no doubt, but still dominated by the spirit of Moses.

Hence we can say that not only does the ἐξουσία of each teacher differ but the content of their message conflicts on issues that are vital, issues such as legalism, asceticism, mosaic authority, and dualism; on the positive side, the stress of Jesus on the Gospel message is unique. This uniqueness is illustrated also by the response of those who heard the Gospel message. In conclusion then, it is worth making a note of this fact.

The Response to the Two Teachers

As soon as Jesus spoke, the crowds swelled. His word convinced the leper and the lunatic, the publican and the priest. We recall the positive response of Zachaeus and the sister of Lazarus. "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" was the pointed confession of Peter (Mat. 16:16). Paul, too, was persuaded that the Gospel was "the power of God unto salvation for everyone who believes" (Rom. 1:16) and this belief in Jesus, this faith, is the significant touchstone for Paul. Its significance is seen already in the Old Testament prophecy, "the just shall live by faith" (Hab. 2:4) and for Paul faith is the God-given response to the message of Jesus about himself.

This same Old Testament prophecy (Hab. 2:4) figures prominentl

in the Habakkuk Commentary. There, faith in the Teacher of Righteousness is a necessary prerequisite for deliverance (1Qp Hab. 8:1-3). However, this intimate response was not possible for the masses but only for the privileged priests of Qumran. Even so, the response of these priests may, at first glance, appear to anticipate the Pauline teaching of faith as the response to Jesus.

The comment of the Habakkuk pesher on this verse reads, "This refers to all the doers of the law in the House of Judah whom God will rescue from the house of judgement because of their labor and faith in the Teacher of Righteousness" (1QpHab. 8:1-3). Here the commentator urges faith as the necessary response to the Teacher of Righteousness. Is this response identical with the Pauline response? Dupont-Sommer seems to answer in the affirmative.[18] But is he correct? When Paul speaks of faith as the necessary response he excludes the need for any supplementary efforts according to the law (cf. Gal. 2:16). Such efforts according to the law, however, were foremost in the demands of Qumran disciples, thus they could be designated "doers of the law" and their leader the "lawgiver." And it is noteworthy that the response of these "doers of the law" is first of all labor (עמל), that is, efforts to comply with the legal demands of their teacher, regardless of the consequence. The secondary response of faith (אמונה) which follows, must

---

[18] Dupont-Sommer, The Jewish Sect of Qumran and The Essenes. p. 56, and A. Dupont-Sommer, The Dead Sea Scrolls (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, c.1952), p. 44.

be understood in connection with the preceeding. Accordingly, we could not speak of faith in the Teacher of Righteousness as a Savior in the Christian sense, but as a Teacher, Lawgiver or Prophet in the same way that their forefathers had trusted in Moses.[19] Confirmation of this view might be seen in the Damascus Document whose later attempt to glorify the past omits any reference to faith, but demands strict obedience to the voice, laws and statutes of the Teacher of Righteousness (CDCb 9:53f.).

In brief, then, response to the Teacher of Galilee meant faith in Jesus the person, Jesus the centre of the Gospel teaching. Response to the Teacher of Righteousness meant faith in the Teacher, whose teachings were normative but whose historical person was only primus inter pares.

The negative or antagonistic response on the part of certain who heard each of these teachers also reveals a number of interesting facts. As we noted in chapter three, the reaction against the Teacher of Righteousness seems to have been both from the inner circle of Qumran and from individuals outside. This theme of adverse reaction and consequent distress is prominent in the Habakkuk Commentary and Qumran Hymns. In part this theme is found also in the Gospels. There is not real comparison, however, between the fall of Judas and the challenge of the Man of the Lie (1QpHab. 5:11). What concerns us is the

---

[19]Cf. F. F. Bruce, Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls (Grand Rapids, Michigan; Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956), p. 96, and Graystone, op. cit., p. 23.

constant barrage of accusations which the Pharisees and priestly circles sustained against Jesus.

In connection with these accusations, G. Graystone[20] has pointed out a significant factor which answers the challenge of E. Wilson[21] and indirectly that of A. Davies,[22] who claim that the early life of Jesus was somehow bound up with the community of Qumran itself. As Graystone has pointed out, the Jews who murmured against Jesus were unanimous in their confession that Jesus sprang from Galilean stock, from the family of Joseph (John 6:42). To this testimony we might add many others. "How does this man know letters, never having learned" (John 7:45) is the response of the temple audience. Likewise Jesus' Galilean origin was thrown back at him as something incompatible with his claims (John 7:41,52). Yet in all this there is no indication of Essene affiliations or Qumran associations. Surely if Jesus had been in any way connected with this movement his enemies would have ferreted out this information and have branded him with this stigma. Thus the confessions of Jesus' foes are a strong piece of historical evidence against assuming any direct contact between Jesus and the Teacher of Righteousness, or even the Qumran movement as a whole.

This is only one piece of evidence, however, and it might

---

[20] Graystone, op. cit., p. 81ff.

[21] Edmund Wilson, The Scrolls from the Dead Sea (London: W. H. Allen, 1955), pp. 99,135.

[22] A. Powell Davies, op. cit., p. 113.

be argued that the numerous high points of Jesus' life can be matched by similar features in the life of the Teacher of Righteousness, regardless of the fact that the ἐξουσία, certain teachings and the response to these two teachers may differ. It is to this argument which we direct out next chapter.

CHAPTER VI

JESUS AND THE TEACHER OF RIGHTEOUSNESS: COMPARISONS OF LIFE AND PRINCIPLES

Two men, two distinctive historical figures, the one a carpenter, the other a priest, stood side by side in the pattern of time. Both men enjoyed considerable fame even in their lifetime, and the biography of each has certain points of contact with the other. Is this purely coincidental, or did their paths cross? Was one man influenced by the other? Are we justified in ranking Jesus above his Qumran counterpart? Or is Edmund Wilson nearer the truth when he asserts that the stone walls of Qumran rather than the manger of Bethlehem may be the true cradle of Christianity?[1]

These are not mere idle questions. Nor do they merely repeat the issues of the previous chapter, even though certain discussions may overlap. We are concerned now with the distinctive elements in the activity and life of each teacher. This does not eleminate the introduction of new highlights of thought, however, for the biography of any teacher cannot be divorced from his teaching.

Their Youth and Baptism

"And thou shalt call his name Jesus for he shall save his

---

[1]Edmund Wilson, The Scrolls from the Dead Sea (London: W. H. Allen, 1955), p. 129.

people from their sins" (Mat. 1:21). This oracle is the high-point of the infancy narratives of Jesus, and the name that it discloses must be underscored. Jesus, "Savior," is the name of a carpenter's son from Nazareth, while "a light for the Gentiles" and "the glory of Israel" are the glorious epithets of praise for this Jewish child, a child awaited by many in Israel (Luke 2:32-38). Can the priest of Qumran boast such an auspicious beginning?

The name Teacher of Righteousness is probably no more than a later title; his original name is still a mystery! Two explanations are offered for this phenomenon. Dupont-Sommer believes that "his name was unpronounceable, like the name of Yahweh."[2] We ask Dupont-Sommer whether this also applies to the Man of the Lie and the Wicked Priest who are not given their true names either. More probably, the title Teacher of Righteousness was only assigned when this Teacher had become important. There was nothing in his youth that was in any way ominous, and hence none of his youthful names were significant.

It might be argued that the Teacher of Righteousness was expected by the community, as Jesus was awaited, that is if we regard the Manual of Discipline as quite early. We noted that the Teacher of Righteousness is not mentioned in this work, yet

---

[2]A. Dupont-Sommer, The Dead Sea Scrolls (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, c.1952), p. 33.

[3]For a study of this figure, cf. W. H. Brownlee, "The Servant of the Lord in the Qumran Scrolls, II," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, CXXXV (October, 1954), pp. 35ff.

its author does expect a certain figure, tentatively called "a man" or "a gibhor," who corresponds in all but name to the Teacher of Righteousness (1QS 4:18-23).[3] This "man" was to herald the end of days, even as the child of Bethlehem came in the fulness of time. Yet only one of these was hailed at his birth.

We have already discussed the import of the name Teacher of Righteousness in chapter three. In brief this title denotes a preacher or prophet whose object is to impart Mosaic righteousness,[4] or more correctly, a guide to the salvation of Sinai. His aim is to revive Israel's ancient glory. The name Jesus, however, implies more than guidance to salvation or the imparting of salutary truth. Jesus means savior, that is, himself the salvation, the light, the glory of Israel. The Teacher of Righteousness was a guide, but the carpenter of Nazareth was more than a guide. Even his initial name implies this, to say nothing of later titles such as Christ, and Son of Man.

The portrait of the Teacher of Righteousness as a child is a complete blank. That children were later part of the Qumran movement cannot be denied (CDC 9:1ff.), and this fact has led certain writers to reflect on the familiar episode of the youthful Jesus in the temple. The argument of Davies on this question proceeds in this way, "Suppose that Jesus was taken when he was a boy, . . . not only would he learn the canonical

---

[4]For some representative passages on the use of פרץ see CDC 1:1.12, 3:2, CDCb 9:37,50-54, 1QS 3:20, 4:2,24, 9:17, 1QH 4:37, 9:9, 11:31.

scriptures, those that all Jews accepted, but also the sectarian writings with their special point of view."[5] To take this stand, however, is to discredit the rest of the episode, and particularly the central idea, "Knew you not that I had to be in my Father's house?" (Luke 2:49). This statement, with its implications of divine sonship, would never have been tolerated in Qumran circles.

The baptism of Jesus is the next event of signal importance in his life (cf. Mat. 3:13-17, 4:17). This historical event was associated with supernatural signs such as the descent of the Holy Spirit and the cry of a voice from the heavens. It constituted part of the divine plan to "fulfil all righteousness"; it brought into the public eye a figure in whose wake would follow repentance and baptism for all men. In fact, "Repent and be baptized" is the keynote of Jesus' first recorded messages, a note that had already been struck by Qumran teachers and John the Baptist.

A glance at the expected "gibhor" of Qumran (1QS 4:20-23) reveals further possible connections in this area. Yet when it speaks of his purification (טהר) by the Holy Spirit and his baptism (רחץ) by the Spirit of Truth as a purifying water (4:21), it implies an original impurity on the part of this expected "gibhor." The baptism of Jesus, however, is not necessary (δεῖ) to purify Jesus, but as Jesus put it, it was

---

[5]A. Powell Davies, Dead Sea Scrolls (New York: Signet Key Books, The New American Library of World Literature, Inc., c.1956), p. 110.

fitting (πρέπον) in order to fulfil all righteousness. And although the future "gibhor" was expected to "instruct the sons of heaven with wisdom" (4:22), he is nowhere given a name that implies a divine origin as in the case of Jesus (Mat. 3:16f.).

And although there is no express mention of an actual baptism by water for either the expected "gibhor" or the historical Teacher of Righteousness, we can assume that the regular baptismal washings included these figures also. Baptism in Qumran, however, was not a singular event which occurred but once; on the contrary, it is a repeated affair like repentance. The two go hand in hand all through life (1QS 3:8f.).

Accordingly, the apparent linkage between the youth and baptism of Jesus proves illusory. The expected "gibhor" was still a man, a sinful man. And whether or not the Teacher of Righteousness was later equated with the "gibhor," his later life nowhere indicates sinlessness. For him it was necessary (δεῖ) to be baptized and so purified by the Spirit of Truth, for Jesus the water and the Spirit proclaimed his divine commission and approval. Furthermore it is debatable whether we can speak of the Spirit of Truth or the Holy Spirit of Qumran in the New Testament sense, for its usage is conditioned by an iranian dualism.[6]

Their Foundation of a Congregation

"It is not certain that Jesus founded--or intended to

---

[6]For the dualism of spirit see 1QS 3:13-4:26, G. Kuhn, "Die Sektenschrift und die iranische Religion," Zeitschrift fur Theologie und Kirche (1952), pp. 296ff.

found--the eventual Christian church." These words of A. Powell Davies are a blunt statement of what several other modern scholars have expressed more tactfully.[7] It is true that history reveals but few men of yore who have deliberately set out to form a nucleus of followers according to a pre-determined pattern. The opportunity of the moment and the stress of circumstance usually play a very decisive rule. This, however, does not affect the uniqueness of Christian origins. The church of Jesus Christ was more than a circumstantial development. When Jesus spoke to Peter, it was an incisive stroke of God in the course of time. "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church!" (Mat. 16:18). οἰκοδομήσω τὴν ἐκκλησίαν -- there is no duplicity in such words! And yet the question is broached, "How could Jesus plan a church whose very nature was contrary to the world around it, whose actions were at loggerheads with normal custom, and whose whole life was a scandal?" This whole affair seemed without precedent until the Teacher of Righteousness came into the limelight. Of him A. Michel writes, "La vie du Maitre de Justice fut, sans doute consacree a l'enseignment, a la fondation, et a l'organisation de la Nouvelle Alliance."[8] This view of Michel is quite representative of modern scholars.

---

[7]Cf. A. Powell Davies, op. cit., p. 85; Edmund Wilson, op. cit., p. 100.

[8]A. Michel, Le Maitre de Justice (Paris: Maison Aubanel Pere, 1954), p. 270, cf. Dupont-Sommer, op. cit., p. 97; F. F. Bruce, Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956), p. 85.

What is the basis for this view? A posteriori it has been argued that such reverence for this Teacher's name must stem from his foundation of the movement. This does not follow! Hence we are justified in asking whether he really was the first leader. Brownlee points to the title מורה as meaning "shower."[9] But what does that prove? This meaning could just as well symbolise the revival of a dying sect.

Much has been made of the fragmentary peshers on Ps. 37 and Micah. Part of the latter reads "(This refers to) the Tea-(ch)er of Righteousness who is the one who (teaches the law to) his (council) and to all who are willing to join his ele(ct)" (1QpMic. fr. on 1:5,6). When we realize that the translation "his elect" is very doubtful,[10] and that the idea of founding is here no more than an inference, this passage has little real force.

On the other hand, however, the author of one of the Qumran Hymns could speak of "my covenant" as though he were its originator (1QH 5:23), and the connection of the Teacher of Righteousness with the covenant idea is quite clear elsewhere.[11] Moreover the passage from the pesher on Ps. 37 produces a new slant if we read as Brownlee suggests, "It refers to the priest, the Teacher of Righteousness (. . . and God) has established

---

[9]William H. Brownlee, "Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament," New Testament Studies, III (November, 1956), p. 13.

[10]The text can just as well be read בחירי .

[11]Cf. Footnote 35 of Chapter 3.

him to build for Him the congregation of (his elect)" (4QpPs. 37 fr. on vv. 23f.).[12] Tying this up with the beginning of the Damascus Document the issue becomes more apparent. In the latter passage, the Teacher of Righteousness is exalted as the first real guide of the community (CDC 1:7). There is nothing to prevent this personality from being the original founder of this congregation, and a very great founder at that.[13] It was either a fool or a great leader who wrote, "Thou hast made me a father for sons of mercy, and as a guardian for men of wonder" (1QH 7:20f.).[14]

"A divine founder of the New Covenant," exclaimed Dupont-Sommer.[15] A founder perhaps, but divine, no! A great founder perhaps, but a founder much different from the Jesus of Christianity. The entire Weltanschauung of the movement which he began was decidedly inferior. There was nothing radically new in what he proposed. His voice was just another prophet crying, "Prepare to meet your God," (Amos, 5:12) and the voice of the prophet was usually a lonely one at that. Whether or

---

[12]Brownlee, ibid., p. 16.

[13]The twenty years (which figure may be symbolical) of searching in blindness do not demand that the community was in operation for twenty years before the Teacher of Righteousness came on the scene. Rather it is twenty years of degradation in Israel as a whole.

[14]Cf. 1QH 8:16, 14:18.

[15]Dupont-Sommer, op. cit., p. 44. For further views on the Teacher of Righteousness as founder, see D. Flusser, "The Apocryphal Book of Ascensio Isaiae and the Dead Sea Sect," Israel Exploration Journal, (1953), p. 39; J. M. Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXV (September, 1956), p. 176.

not he played the role of Moses the second, his aim was little more than to revamp the laws of his glorious predecessor. The new Lawgiver produced new laws, but they followed the old vein. In this he had many equals of long standing.

One thing ought to be remembered, however. His call to repentance was at the same time an extreme repudiation of the rest of the nation. In this he re-echoed the absolute tones of Jeremiah. His was an order of perfectionists (cf. Mat. 5:48). How different the church of Jesus, a unity of publicans, harlots and beggars. Jesus, it is true, could call his nation a "faithless and perverse generation" (Mat. 17:17), yet the very purpose of his coming was not to vindicate the righteous, but to call perverse sinners (Mat. 9:13), to seek the lost (Mat. 18:11) and to gather the lost sheep of that generation (Mat. 15:24). His outlook was universal (Mat. 28:18), his purpose eternal (John 1:14) and his church original (Eph. 5:23). "I am the way, the truth and the life," (John 14:6) are words too daring for the Teacher of Righteousness to have uttered to all the world. It is thus that Paul could speak of the church as the body of Christ (Gal. 1:18-24). His person, not his interpretation, is the cornerstone of the church (Eph. 2:20), and his church is a world wide ἐκκλησία, not a congregation of cells.

Their New Covenant and Common Meal

The covenant ideal is fundamental in the New Testament kerygma. A similar ideal is prominent in Qumran also. In both cases the ideal is termed a new covenant, a new pledge,

and in both cases a communal meal expresses a bond of fellowship for its adherents. Is the connection merely coincidental? This question is basic! For when A. P. Davies challenges the originality of the Lord's Supper he strikes at the key witness to the καινὴ διαθήκη of the New Testament.[16]

The New Covenant (ברית חדשה) of Qumran is a rigid pact. To join this new covenant a binding oath is required. Man's part is severe; he has to be בן ברית. The terms of the covenant are legal and binding; and any breach of faith means a breach of the covenant. The conditions of the covenant are Mosaic; thus we might term it a "back to Moses" pledge. Admittedly, these conditions or laws bear the stamp of the Teacher's interpretation, but they are Mosaic to the core. Thus the community is termed a household of the law, while their efforts are directed toward digging the "well of the law." The legal element is an integral part of this covenant. Forgiveness is doled out only to those who fulfil these laws explicitly.[17]

The founder of this new movement is appropriately called a Lawgiver or Student of the law. Strictly speaking he is a new interpreter of the law of Moses. His interpretation becomes law and his covenant exclusive. Thus, any who do not heed the Teacher of Righteousness thereby repudiate their affiliation with the covenant. For the faithful adherents there

---

[16]Davies, op. cit., p. 99.

[17]For the law-covenant relationship, see 1QS 1:3,5,7,8, 6:6, 5:7f., 8:14f., CDC 6:5, 8:6, b 9:35,49,53f.

is the glorious blessing of God. We must stress again, however, that this Teacher's system demands conformity to an external norm. First and foremost, it is his word and not his person which stands supreme.[18]

At first glance, it might appear that Jesus, in his sermon on the mount, endorsed these ideals. "Do not think that I have come to destroy the law," he exclaims. "I have not come to destroy but to fulfil" (Mat. 5:17f.). He adds further that man's righteousness must surpass that of the Pharisees, that he must be perfect (i.e. תמים) (Mat. 5:20,48). And in this same context it may be argued that his words are a reinterpretation of the Law of Moses (5:21-48). It is true that the Teacher of Righteousness reinterpreted, hoped to fulfil and demanded perfection in, the law! But the πληρῶσαι of Jesus was more than the pledge of Qumran, for the δικαιοσύνη he demanded he also gave! The righteousness of Jesus is based on the forgiveness of sins. "Thy sins be forgiven thee," reveals his unique ἐξουσία from God. His word made the paralytic righteous (Luke 5:23f.). Thus the paralytic entered the covenant by faith, no more. There were no two years of probation as in Qumran.

The New Covenant, as Jeremiah had visualised it by prophetic inspiration, was to be something new, i.e. radically different (Jer. 31:31-34). "Inwardness" and "onesidedness" would make it unique. The covenant of Qumran, however, failed to incorporate

---

[18] For the Teacher of Righteousness, the Lawgiver and the Covenant Law, see 1QpHab. 1:1-4, 5:9-12, CDC 8:1-10, 9:8, b 9:50-54.

either of these features. Primarily the covenant of Qumran was not something new; it was only a revival of the covenant of Moses. This contradicts the hopes of Jeremiah that the New Covenant would not ape the features of the Exodus covenant "לא כברית אשר כרתי את אבותם" he cried (Jer. 31:32). But, "לעשות על תורה משה" is the response of Qumran. Under such a regime man was sworn to a task of absolute obedience, under the covenant of Jeremiah it was the eternal Ego of God which both planned and perfected this new covenant. Not only was the covenant of Qumran two-sided, but the weight of the balance was on man's side. And again the New Covenant of Jeremiah posited an indwelling of God's Torah; God would set (נתן) a new revelation in man's heart. The counterpart of Qumran was a stringent νόμος, a rigid external code. It was a new interpretation rather than a new revelation or a new indwelling, for the Teacher of Righteousness was still shackled to the law of old.

In Christianity the hopes of Jeremiah were fulfilled. Jesus was the πληρωτής of Jeremiah's revelation, the fulfillment of the Torah which was to dwell in believers. Here was Emmanuel, the revelation of God, the λόγος made flesh, not the νόμος of Moses (John 1:14-18). With Jesus as the New Torah[19] the revelation of the New Covenant, Paul could say, "ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ Χριστός" (Gal. 2:20). And Jesus could say "my yoke is

---

[19] We observe the proper distinction between תורה and νόμος. For an interesting discussion of Jesus as the New Torah (not νόμος), see W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (London: S.P.C.K., 1955), pp. 147ff. Cf. Brownlee, op. cit., p. 20.

easy" (Mat. 11:30), or "I am the light of the world" (John 8:12). Jesus superceded the Torah of old, the light and revelation from Sinai (cf. Prov. 6:23).

To leave the testimony of Qumran stand here, however, would be doing an injustice to the evidence. Let us assume for a moment that it is the Teacher of Righteousness who speaks to us in column four of the Qumran Hymns. Here it seems he stands anew on Sinai and cries, "Thy covenant, O Lord, has illumined my face (4:5), and thy Torah thou hast engraved in my heart (4:10), so that through me Thou hast illumined the faces of many (4:27). Truly thou has made me cognizant with mysterious secrets so that I have become the agent of thy power (4:27f.). Thy righteousness has atoned for my sins, and thy covenant has sustained me (4:37,39)."

Perhaps the writer is a second Moses, and stands again on Sinai; perhaps he returns as a Teacher like unto Moses. But what he sees is the same law, the same revelation, and the light he has is only a reflected light. To such a man the words of St. John could well apply, "He was not the light, but came to bear witness of that Light" (John 1:8). Yet the testimony of John the Baptist looked forward to a new Light, that of the Teacher of Righteousness looked backward to the old Light of Sinai. The alliance of Qumran was not new, but renewed; it was akin to the covenant of Ezra (Nah. 9:10).[20]

---

[20] Cf. Geoffrey Graystone, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Originality of Christ (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1956), p. 43.

When we see in Jesus a full expression of the new inward revelation (גלה) of Jeremiah's New Covenant (Jer. 31:33), a revelation that is unprecedented, we see only that part which bears a somewhat loose resemblance to certain Qumran expressions. The Covenant of the New Testament, however, is more than the revelation of God's will and grace, it is a pledge of God's grace sealed with blood, un fait accompli. God not only spoke of his grace, he acted on the basis of it. Christ the μεσίτης of the New Covenant sealed this covenant with his own blood (Heb. 9:15). τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον is the very heart of the matter. This is a sacrifice ἐφάπαξ. In the blood of this covenant there is justification and redemption (Rom. 3:25; 5:8f.). In Qumran there is no new sacrifice, no blood, no ὑπέρ . It is each man for himself according to the statutes he knows. There is a man who lays down his laws for others but no man who lays down his life for others (John 10:15).

With this element of sacrifice absent in Qumran, it might be argued that their common meal could have no vital connection with the Christian Eucharist. Basically this is true! Yet there are certain aspects that must be treated further. Table fellowship in itself was nothing new in that age. It was a mark of intimacy between participants and a mark of their concord of outlook. "This man receives sinners and eats with them" (Luke 15:2) is consequently a severe rebuke for Jesus. It

indicates his oneness with them.[21] We need not doubt that the same ideal is spelled out by the Qumran practice (1QS 6:2-5). Likewise there is nothing odd about the priest blessing the food and wine before the meal (1QS 6:5). It is the eschatological Ausblick that needs special attention. Consider the approach of A. P. Davies,

> In the account of the Last Supper as observed by Jesus we are told (Mark's Gospel) that he used the words "Truly I say unto you, I shall not drink again of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the Kingdom of God" (xiv, 25). Jesus is thus identifying himself with the Messiah anticipated in the sacred meal of the Essenes (and of his own community?) and informing his hearers that he will not again participate in the sacred meal as a communicant but only when he has become manifest as the visibly present Messiah. In the Pauline account of the Christian Last Supper, there is again this clear connection between the meal and the Messiah represented in it by anticipation.[22]

The debate hinges on a document which Gaster has entitled, "Manual of Discipline for the Future Congregation of Israel" (1QSa).[23] This work has eschatological overtones throughout.

The pertinent section begins with the introduction "This is (the order) for a session of the men of renown invited to an assembly of the community council, in the event that the Messiah is pres(ent)[24] with them" (1QSa 2:11f.). Thereupon

---

[21]Cf. Joachim Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, translated from the second German edition by Arnold Ehrhardt (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), p. 136.

[22]Davies, op. cit., p. 99.

[23]Theodor H. Gaster, The Dead Sea Scriptures (New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1956), p. 307.

[24]Milik restores here [illegible] which can be translated "when God begets the Messiah." See his footnote where he defends this. D. Barthelemy and J. T. Milik, Discoveries in

follows the order of rank and seating arrangements. The section concludes with the proviso,

> And if they happen to assemble for the common meal (and to drink) wine, then, after the common table has been spread and the drinking wine (mixed), (no one is to stretch) his hand for the first mouthful of bread or wine before the Priest. For (he) must bless the first mouthful of bread and wine, and he (stretches out) his hand for the bread before them. After him the Messiah of Israel stretches out his hand to the bread, and after that all the members of the entire community in order of rank. Follow this procedure whenever there are at least ten men assembled for (a meal)!" (1QSa 2:17-22).[25]

Analyzing this protocol we see that whenever the group of the community met for a common meal they were to follow the ritual prepared for the day when the Messiah would be present. Their meal, therefore, was to anticipate the Messianic Banquet of the new era or Kingdom. Assuming that this is one of the many statutes (פ׳ here also) of the Teacher of Righteousness, we have a possible parallel with the words of Jesus. Consider the interpretation of Jeremias on the words, " τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν (Luke 22:20). He writes,

> If we understand the command to repeat the rite like that, it makes sense only if Jesus Himself gave it. He desired that His disciples should continue to meet together daily at the table fellowship of the Messiah during the short interval between His departure and the parousia, and thereby beseech God to remember His Messiah by bring the consummation to pass.[26]

---

the Judaean Desert (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), I, p. 117. Gaster calls this an "unfortunate conjecture," op. cit., p. 279. The restoration [illegible] seems just as possible. Cf. Allegro, op. cit., p. 177.

[25]This translation is made from the text of Barthelemy and Milik, op. cit., p. 110f.

[26]Jeremias, op. cit., p. 165.

Each Eucharist, then, is held in view of the coming Messiah. Add to this the words of Jesus, "I shall not again drink of the fruit of the vine until the Kingdom of God comes" (Luke 22:18).[27]

The same anticipation of a future banquet is present in each case, but there the apparent similarity ends. In the one case the Messiah is already present, in the other he is only future. In the former the eschatological Kingdom is heavenly, in the latter it is earthly. And even if the interpretation of Jeremias is correct for Luke 22:20, there is still the retrospective aspect of the Christian eucharist which looks back on a covenant sealed by blood of the Messiah. Hence the reminder of Paul, " καταγγέλλετε the death of the Lord" (1 Cor. 11:26)! The future aspect of the Eucharist then sees Jesus in his parousia effecting the consummation of a work already begun. Thus men proclaim his death, ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ . And we repeat, the element of blood is absent from the Qumran meal, likewise the other "elements of surprise" and importance which we find in the Lord's Supper.[28]

Incidentally, we might also mention tha way in which Jesus answered the mother of the sons of Zebedee (Mat. 20:20ff.). The prevalent idea that the future kingdom would be earthly and that the seating arrangement would be indicative of one's rank is found also in the Qumran banquet just discussed.

---

[27]Cf. 1QSb 3:5, 4:26, 5:21, 1QM 3:11, 7:4.

[28]Cf. Graystone, op. cit., p. 35.

Jesus rejects this view without further ado. Likewise the action of Jesus in washing his disciples' feet was quite contrary to the protocol of Qumran (John 13:4ff.). And the repeated statement of Jesus the "many who are first shall be last" and vice versa, finds no precedent in the Qumran literature (Mat. 19:30).

The reader may feel that much of this discussion is not concerned with the explicit word or action of the Teacher of Righteousness. In a sense this may be true; nevertheless, the covenant ideal and the stress on the common meal are so bound up with the basic structure of Qumran life that we cannot divorce the Teacher of Righteousness from the leading ideals and principles of life of the community which the Teacher of Righteousness did so much to establish and strengthen. The ideals of Qumran reflect the life of its greatest member.

Their Suffering and Death

The blood of the New Covenant leads over to the suffering and death of its donor. Jesus gave his blood to ratify the covenant. The vow of abstinence at the celebration of the Lord's Supper (Luke 22:16-18) reveals that his course was irrevocable. He was already conscious of the Gethsemane struggle and the Calvary tension. To suffer and die was part of his mission, a mission that he had clearly outlined to his "blind" disciples. He was the suffering servant who gave his life a λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν (Mat. 20:28). This briefly is the central force in Jesus' suffering.

The question of opposition and suffering in Qumran revolves around the community of Qumran as a living "holy of holies," as a corporate expression of the suffering servant. This question must be studied first in order that the role of the Teacher of Righteousness in the whole scheme may become apparent.

Within the Qumran community there was a presbytery of twelve priests and three laymen. This core of fifteen was "schooled to perfection in the entire revelation of the Torah" (1QS 8:1). Their life was to be the acme of perfection, a paragon of holiness, and an example of purity for all the community (1QS 8:2-4). Through them the community was to become witnesses of the Truth for Judgement (משפט) and the elect (רצון) of God's favor to render atonement (כפר) for the earth (1QS 8:6). The community was to be a bulwark that had been tried (בחן), it is a precious cornerstone (cf. Is. 28:16). The priesthood was to become the seat of the holy of holies (בית קודש קודשים), and the community a house of perfection (בית תמים). Accordingly, God would accept their life of self-denial as an atonement for the earth. Thereupon they would be qualified to execute judgement upon the wicked. And finally, the extermination of all evil would be complete (1QS 8:8-10).[29]

Likewise in the Habakkuk Commentary, the faithful are

---

[29]Cf. 1QS 5:6ff., 9:3ff. Note W. H. Brownlee, "The Servant of the Lord in the Qumran Scrolls, II," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, CXXXV (October, 1954), pp. 34ff.

destined to judge the world (1QpHab. 5:4).[30] The same judgement is depicted by the eschatological warfare in the War scroll, where the priests, resplendent in their white robes, represent the unblemished agents of God (cf. 1QM 13:1ff.).

Does all this represent the embodiment of the servant ideal? F. F. Bruce believes that it does! He writes further,

> This extension of the propitiatory efficacy to the life of the community confirms the suggestion that they regarded themselves as the maskilim of Daniel. When we consider the solemn responsibility to which these sons of the Covenant had dedicated themselves, we may appreciate, the severe discipline by which they were bound. Only by perfect law-keeping could their task of vicarious expiation be accomplished.[31]

In the close context of these passages where the community regards itself as perfect or as the future judge, there is little mention of suffering. The suffering pattern is to be found only in the wider context. Moreover even in the passages just reviewed, the vicarious element has its limitations. Their perfection qualifies them to be the agents of God, but their perfection is not efficacious for all people. The wicked are to be damned, come what may! In other words when they speak of removing the guilt of the earth it means little more than removing the guilty, i.e. the evil nations. Accordingly, the sufferings of Qumran, as the servant, were not meant as a

---

[30] [illegible] in 1QpHab. 5:4 is not singular but collective. The plural suffix on the following [illegible] verifies this assumption. Thus it is the community and not the Teacher of Righteousness who is to judge, as Dupont-Sommer would have us believe. Dupont-Sommer, op. cit., p. 43.

[31] F. F. Bruce, "Qumran and Early Christianity," New Testament Studies, II, No. 3 (February, 1956), 185.

punishment for the sins of others but as a purification for their own preparation. To what extent their purification was efficacious for the spiritual welfare of their fellow Israelites is debatable. That they expected to make complete atonement for the sins of all Israel, as Bruce believes, is doubtful.[32]

Rather the situation seems analogous to the Sodom and Gemorrah episode in which the holiness of a select few would prevent the complete destruction of the land. Their vicarious effort was to prevent the annihilation of Israel along with the other evil nations on the day of visitation. Because of their holiness, God would not condemn the nation as a whole. Thereupon Qumran was to provide the scourges for the imminent visitation and the rulers for the new rule of the purified Israel, for it was Qumran which had established truth in the land. Qumran, then, would be like Zion to whom the people would flock.

The suffering and distress of the Teacher of Righteousness, so prominent in the Habakkuk Commentary, however, induces us to ask whether or not in the Teacher of Righteousness the ideal reaches a higher climax. Is his suffering perhaps vicarious, at least for his fellows? Reviewing his life, we find that the Habakkuk Commentary regards his opposition as the typical resistance against any radical prophet. When rebuked by the Man of the Lie it seems that he did not retaliate

---

[32] F. F. Bruce, Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 102f.; cf. 1QS 3:13, 8:1-10.

(1QpHab. 5:10). It is true that the Wicked Priest was smitten with a divine scourge for attacking the sacred Teacher (9:9-11). In fact the object of this priest was to kill (יגע) the Teacher of Righteousness, but whether he executed his plans is not stated (11:4-7).[33] Yet in all this persecution, constant and severe as it may have been, there is no hint of it being vicarious in any special way, nor is it stated that he suffered a violent end comparable to that of Jesus.[34]

Once again, if we allow that certain of the Qumran Hymns were written by the Teacher of Righteousness, or that the Hymns represent the ideals of the community as a whole, then the analogy with the suffering servant becomes a little more likely. In column five, for example, the author is depicted as exhibiting God's power from the crucible of God's testings. He writes,

> Lest they (harm) the life of thy Servant (עבדך), and in order to exhibit Thy power through me before the sons of men (בני אדם) thou hast worked wonders in a poor wretch by putting him in a fur(nace for purifying gold) under treatment by fire, and like refined silver in the crucible of smelters to cleanse him sevenfold (1QH 5:15,16).

---

[33]Cf. 1QpHosea, J. M. Allegro, The Dead Sea Scrolls (Baltimore: Penguin Books Inc., 1956), p. 148. The conjecture of Dupont-Sommer that it was the Teacher of Righteousness who suffered the torturous judgements in the body of his flesh depends upon a very doubtful restoration of a lacunae after 1QpHab. 8:16. Cf. Dupont-Sommer, op. cit., p. 34. Compare the answer of F. M. Cross, "The Essenes and Their Master," Christian Century, LXXII (August 17, 1955), 945.

[34]Michel, op. cit., p. 271. Cf. J. M. Allegro, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 98, where the thought is expressed that the Teacher of Righteousness was crucified by Alexander Jannaeus.

The term servant (עבד) is quite frequent in the Qumran Hymns and is often coupled with distress and severe anguish of soul.[35] In the passage just quoted, the writer is depicted as a humble אביון who sees a twofold divine telos (קץ) in his suffering. He sees, first of all, the evidence of God's power when God works wonders through him. And he views this as a sevenfold purification that will lead to perfection (תמים). Elsewhere we find the expression, "I am content with my afflictions . . . for Thou hast placed a prayer for mercy (תחנה) in the mouth of Thy servant" (1QH 9:11). Likewise the very moving passage in column three, where the author is pictured as a woman in birth pains, must be underscored (1QH 3:6-12).

To this group must be added the passage from the Manual of Discipline which we have already translated in chapter two.[36] Here the figure, whether the Teacher of Righteousness, or the community personified, is purified (ברר) more than the sons of men (מבני אדם). In so doing God has qualified this man to instill wisdom into the minds of the perfect (תמים).[37]

The ideal of suffering, torment and consequent purification is basic throughout. The community and its Teacher become perfect (תמים) through suffering. With this we must

---

[35]Cf. 1QH 5:28, 7:16, 11:30, 17:23,25, 18:10.

[36]1QS 4:20-2, cf. 1QH 11:10-14.

[37]Note the possible connection with the "maskilim" of Daniel 12:3.

compare the words from the Epistle to the Hebrews where it is stated that it was fitting for Jesus "to be made perfect through suffering" (διὰ παθημάτων τελειῶσαι --Heb. 2:10). In this connection, Brownlee writes, "The fact that the sinless Jesus must nevertheless be perfected through suffering marks clearly the borrowed theme and also the extent of its adoption."[38] It is possible, however, that both passages hark back to Isaiah chapter fifty-three.[39] Jesus is to suffer not in order to become sinless, but to fulfill the τέλος of God. Thus, as the suffering servant his παθήματα culminate in his tasting death for all (ὑπὲρ πάντος γεύσηται θανάτου , Heb. 2:9), for the Lord "laid on him the iniquity of us all" (Is. 53:6). And it is here that the Qumran interpretation of the suffering servant misses the mark completely.

When Qumran is seen portraying the servant ideal it hoped to be perfected by sufferings. But there is nowhere a suffering unto death--always there is the joy of deliverance! Nowhere is there an atoning death--these trials purify only the community itself. Much of their suffering is self-imposed legislation and asceticism. They were sinless through segregation. But Jesus was sinless despite his association with

---

[38] W. H. Brownlee, "Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament," New Testament Studies, III (November, 1956), p. 30.

[39] Cf. the following parallels outlined by Brownlee, ibid., pp. 18-20. Note further the introduction of אשם into the Qumran Scroll of Is. 52:14. Cf. W. H. Brownlee, "The Servant of the Lord in the Qumran Scrolls, I," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, CXXXII (December, 1953), p. 10.

the world. We must bear anew the cry of the Pharisees, "Behold he receives sinners and eats with them" (Luke 15:2).

If then Jesus used the Teacher of Righteousness as a model of "perfection through suffering," he changed the basic ideals of his model radically. More probably we have two variant lives fulfilling the servant ideal. In short there is no evidence that Jesus was influenced by the Qumran portrayal of the Teacher of Righteousness.[40] Others would point to the Messiah ben Joseph and Taxo as significant personifications in this discussion of a suffering and dying Messiah.[41] As Mowinckel has pointed out, this Messiah ben Joseph has a lower status than the Messiah who was to follow him and he must fall in the battle against the enemy.[42] A possible parallel may be found in the Damascus Document where the Teacher of Righteousness must die (ηοκ)[43] before the coming of the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel; in fact another forty years of warfare are to follow his death before the company of the foe is annihilated (CDCb 9:29,39).

Thus there is a slight possibility that the Teacher of Righteousness who had been perfected in the crucible of torment,

---

[40]Charles T. Fritsch, The Qumran Community (New York: The Macmillan Company, c.1956), p. 122.

[41]Cf. W. D. Davies, op. cit., pp. 276f.

[42]S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), pp. 290f., 315f.

[43]This term is often used to denote death in the Old Testament. Cf. Gen. 25:8, Num. 20:4, Jude 2:10.

had certain significance placed on his death. But the basic difference still remains. His life was in no way a λύτρον (Mat. 20:28), in no way the אשם of Is. 53:10. Salvation for his followers only came through obedience to his statutes. They had to become מאמינים and trust in his interpretation of the Mosaic law (CDCb 9:53). The people did not have faith in him as their substitute (John 10:15), but as their teacher (1QpHab. 8:2f.). Every doer of the law had to pass through a similar ordeal (יסורים) (1QpHab. 8:2) if that person wished to reach the perfection of the suffering servant (Cf. Is. 53:11, יסורים)! But to the bitter end, the community and its Teacher abhored their enemies, while even in the last agonizing moments, Jesus could cry, "Father, forgive them."

Hence it can be shown that the apparent similarities between the suffering and death of the Teacher of Righteousness and Jesus can be seen to stem from a common source. Fundamentally, however, the resultant interpretations are radically different. For the members of Qumran it was salvation by imitation of the Suffering Servant; in Christianity it is salvation by faith in the atonement of the suffering servant. These viewpoints are poles apart.[44] In conclusion we might also add the note that the idea of resurrection seems to be totally absent from the Qumran theology. This community expected another Teacher of Righteousness to return, but any expression of resurrection from the grave is lacking. The position of Dupont-Sommer

---

[44]Cf. F. F. Bruce, Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 98.

cannot be maintained.[45] He states that in 1QpHab. 11:4-8 a supernatural reappearance of the Teacher of Righteousness is mentioned. The whole debate hinges on the word יוֹפִיעַ. Originally, the word denoted a brilliant theophany associated with devouring fire and brilliant light and in a derived sense to the shining of a bright light.[46] In Qumran usage the meaning of this word has become much broader. While it is true that in some cases it does mean the appearance of God's glory (CDCb 9:49), the more common meaning is nothing more than "appear" or "become evident." Typical is the phrase, "Their plan became plain to me" (1QH 5:29)[47] and since the context of the disputed passage favors the wicked priest as the subject,[48] and since the verb need mean nothing more than "appear," there is no basis for assuming a supernatural resurrection of the Teacher of Righteousness here. Eschatological hopes are another question and without this passage the concept of resurrection seems to be disregarded in the Qumran literature. The eschatological hopes of the community are another question.

In general this present chapter has differentiated between

---

[45] A. Dupont-Sommer, The Jewish Sect of Qumran and The Essenes (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956), p. 35.

[46] Cf. Deut. 33:2, Ps. 50:2, Ps. 94:1, Ps. 80:2, Job 3:4, 10:22, 37:15.

[47] Cf. 1QH 4:6,23, 7:24, 9:31, 11:26, 18:6, 1QM 1:15, 12:13, 18:11, CDCb 9:31,33.

[48] The context favors the wicked priest as the subject although grammar would allow either. Cf. Dupont-Sommer, The Jewish Sect of Qumran and The Essenes, p. 34.

the ideals presented by the Qumran literature and those of the New Testament itself concerning the high points in the life and activity of the Teacher of Righteousness and Jesus of Nazareth. The vital events of Jesus' baptism, eucharist, and church foundation are seen to differ from possible parallels in the life of the Teacher of Righteousness, and particularly in the great motifs of the New Covenant and the suffering servant there are irreconcilable differences which argue against any significant dependence of Jesus on his predecessor, the Teacher of Righteousness, in this area. From the suffering servant ideal we move over quite naturally into the concept of the Messiah. Here we ask whether the Teacher of Righteousness was a Messiah and whether the messianic concepts of Qumran are reflected in the New Testament. This problem is the topic of our next chapter.

CHAPTER VII

JESUS AND THE TEACHER OF RIGHTEOUSNESS: STUDIES IN ESCHATOLOGICAL IDEALS

The correlation between Jesus Christ and the Teacher of Righteousness is not restricted to the roles of teacher, organizer, servant and the like, but overlaps also into the area of eschatology in the narrow sense. For the Qumran scribes the end of days had come and the eschatological fires of hope were burning strongly. There is little doubt that the personal predictions of the Teacher of Righteousness had much to do with arousing these hopes (1QpHab. 7:1-14). It is not only these teachings of the Teacher of Righteousness, however, that are drawn into this fray, but his very person as well. The Teacher of Righteousness has been identified with one of the Messiahs of Qumran. Such an identification has its repercussions in our study of the relationship between Jesus and the Teacher of Righteousness. It is necessary, then, to investigate whether the Messiah of Christianity is in any way dependent upon the Qumran Messiah, and just what part the Teacher of Righteousness played in this eschatological picture!

The Teacher of Righteousness and The Messiahs of Qumran

Dupont-Sommer[1] has identified the Teacher of Righteousness

---

[1]A. Dupont-Sommer, The Jewish Sect of Qumran and The Essenes (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956), p. 160.

with a Messiah of Qumran and Edmund Wilson[2] has followed blindly in his steps. Fritsch too,[3] with some reservations has seen distinct Messianic implications in connection with the Teacher of Righteousness as he appears in the Damascus Document. Amplification of the list is not necessary. Suffice it to say that the battle is not one-sided and the need for us to take up the cudgels in defense of our present thesis is necessary in this field also. In so doing, we must first obtain a clear picture of the Messianic figures as the Qumran literature presents them to us.[4]

4Q Testimonia, as its name implies, is a small collection of texts which are regarded as prophetic testimonia for the future. In these we have a brief survey of what eschatological figures were to be expected in the near future. In order of listing, we can mention the prophet of Deuteronomy 18:15, the star and the sceptre of Numbers 24:17, and a priest with Urim and Thummim from Deuteronomy 33:8.[5] The sceptre (שבט) is identified with the future war prince (נשיא) who is to conquer all opposition (CDC 9:8). This war prince

---

[2]Edmund Wilson, The Scrolls from the Dead Sea (London: W. H. Allen, 1955), p. 122.

[3]Charles T. Fritsch, The Qumran Community (New York: The Macmillan Company, c.1956), p. 81.

[4]The reader is referred to a number of passages dealing with the Messiah of Qumran which were translated in chapter two under the head "Alleged references."

[5]An advance publication of this document has appeared in J. M. Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXV (September, 1956), 174ff.

is singled out for a special blessing in the text of 1Q Benedictions[6] (1QSb 5:20-29). His task is to renew God's covenant and to establish the Kingdom of His people. His Davidic origin seems certain, for parts of Isaiah 11:1-4 are applied to him. Thus he will devastate the land with his staff and slay the wicked with the breath of his mouth, for he is imbued with the spirit of wisdom and eternal power, of understanding and the fear of the Lord (1QSb 5:24f.). God will establish him as a mighty sceptre (שבט) over rulers and they will serve him (1QSb 5:27f.). Elsewhere it seems, this figure is termed the Messiah of Righteousness corresponding to the שבט of Genesis 49:10. Here the covenant of the Kingdom is entrusted to him as he rules over the people (4QpGen. fr. on 49:10).

This future war prince is regarded by most scholars to be the Messiah of Israel,[7] although when he bears this title the indications of his precise function are vague.[8] Nevertheless, he is a divinely appointed warrior who is to purify the earth from its guilty ones.[9] His campaign against Jerusalem as the literal fulfilment of Zechariah chapter twelve, seems to be

---

[6]D. Barthelemy and J. T. Milik, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert I (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), pp. 127ff.

[7]Ibid., p. 121.

[8]Cf. 1QS 9:11, CDC 9:8-10.

[9]Cf. J. M. Allegro, The Dead Sea Scrolls (Baltimore: Penguin Books Inc., 1956), p. 15, and F. F. Bruce, "Qumran and Early Christianity," New Testament Studies, II, No. 3 (February, 1956), 180.

outlined strategically in a fragment of the Isaiah pesher (4QpIs. fr. on chapters 10 and 11).[10] It is small wonder then that we find this same prince (נשיא) as commander in chief of the armed forces of the War Scroll (1QM 5:1), and it is possible that it is in honor of this mighty warrior (גבור) that the war hymn is sung (1QM 12:10ff.).

Here, too, Numbers 24:17 is quoted by the community as textual support for their victorious star or sceptre who conquers all evil and even Gog himself (1QM 11:6,16). The reliance upon Ezekiel, too, seems clear. The same exaltation of the Messianic prince (נשיא) and the same condemnation of Gog (גוג) are dominant themes (Ezekiel 34:24, 38:21). It is not at all certain, however, that this figure is all supreme in the new commonwealth of the Qumran Scrolls. His task is to establish and maintain the Kingdom in all its glory, yet he is still subject to the glorious High Priest. This subordinate position can be inferred from the War Scroll (1QM 15:4) and is quite explicit in the Manual for the Future Congregation (1QSa 2:11ff.). Here the Messiah is ranked below the priest and eats this meal only after the High Priest has begun. Likewise, his blessing follows that of the High Priest (1QSb).[11] This reflects the same relative superiority of the Priesthood as seen in Ezekiel's new commonwealth.

---

[10] The text of this fragment was published by Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," p. 181.

[11] Cf. Barthelemy and Milik, op. cit., p. 118.

Summarizing then, we may say that this נשיא is designated "Prince of the Community," "Mighty Warrior," "Messiah of Righteousness" and "Messiah of Israel." His office is military, his rank subordinate, and his campaign victorious. He is of Davidic descent and can hardly be the same person as the Messiah of Joseph in rabbinic Judaism, a figure which Mowinckel has entitled the "War Messiah."[12]

The prophecy concerning this נשיא in 4Q Testimonia precedes the blessing pronounced by Moses upon Levi which begins, "Give to Levi thy Thummim, and thy Urim to thy godly one." If this is designed as a prophetic witness for the future it must have reference to some levitic priest, a priest who knew the will of God in a particular way, and presumably a High-priest.

In an interesting passage from the Tosefta an almost identical figure is expected. This passage illustrates that the hope of a priest who could use Urim and Thummim was kept alive in other circles also long after the time of Ezra (2:63). The passage reads,

> Since the destruction of the first temple the kingdom ceased from the house of David, and Urim and Thummim ceased, and the cities of refuge ceased, as it is said; "and the Tirshatha said unto them that they should not eat of the most holy things, till there stood up a

---

[12] S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), p. 291. W. D. Davies, however, doubts the prevalence of the ideal of a Messiah ben Joseph at such an early date, W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (London: S.P.C.K., 1955), pp. 266ff. Nevertheless this figure is stressed by Hugh J. Schonfield, Secrets of the Dead Sea Scrolls (London: Vallentine, Mitchel & Co. Ltd., 1956), pp. 70ff.

> priest with Urim and Thummim." As a man says to his friend, "Until the return of Elijah," or "Until the rising of the dead." From the death of Haggai, Zecharia, Malachi, the latter prophets, the Holy Spirit ceased from Israel (Sotah 13:2).[13]

The scroll of Benedictions outlines a special blessing for the future High Priest (1QSb 1:21-3:21). Alas, most of the text is fragmentary. It appears, however, that he is to be a glorified High Priest who graciously endows others with the Holy Spirit (2:24). He too, is active in the eschatological battle to establish the final kingdom (3:5-7).

This last feature seems to identify th s figure with the grand High Pirest who plays a distinctive part in the battle of the war scroll (1QM 15:4). And the High Priest of the eschatological banquet of the future community is, in all probability, the same person (1QSa 2:11-22). In all this, however, there is no express mention of the title Messiah, although most scholars identify this figure with the Messiah of Aaron.[14] Is this identification correct?

La Sor has shown that it is doubtful whether the title Messiah of Aaron and Israel or even Messiahs of Aaron and Israel can denote two persons. He writes, "I have not a single example of the use of one <u>nomen regens</u> annexed to two (or more) genetives where the genetives could not be viewed as a single

---

[13]This quotation is taken from W. D. Davies, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 331.

[14]Barthelemy and Milik, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 122.

called the Anointed High Priest as in Testament of Reuben 6:8, and where, as above, the salvation of God is mediated through him. Although Higgins feels that this High Priest is not, strictly speaking, a Messiah,[17] nevertheless his office bears many of the earmarks of the Messianic ideal. Thus in chapter twenty-four of the Testament of Judah we have the hymn to the Messiah from Judah and in chapter eighteen of Testament of Levi the corresponding hymn to the Messiah of Levi or New Priest as he is called. In the latter passage the exaltation of this new priest is especially significant. The eschatological glory he bears is obviously Messianic. The Rabbinic exegesis of passages such as Zechariah 4:14 shows a similar trend.[18] The ideal of two leading figures in the paradise of the new Kingdom seems quite obvious. The difficulty comes, however, when we try to establish the precise function of the Elijah to come, a very popular figure in Rabbinic expectations of the future.[19] In certain instances he seems quite separate from either of the Messiahs, and in other cases he appears to be identical with one of them. Silberman points out that in certain cases he is to restore the Anointed High

---

[17] A. J. B. Higgins, "Priest and Messiah," Vetus Testamentum, III (1953), 330.

[18] H. L. Strack und P. Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash (Munchen: Oskar Beck, 1926), III, 696.

[19] The following passages from the Mishnah are pertinent, Baba Metzia 1:8, 2:8, 3:4f., Eduyoth 8:7, Shekalim 2:5, Sotah 9:15, cf. F. W. Young, "Jesus the Prophet: a Re-examination," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVIII (1949), 291.

Priest in the new Kingdom.[20] In this capacity he acts as the prophetic forerunner.

Quite frequently, however, we find that Elijah is described as the great High Priest. Thus in the Jerusalem Targum (I Deuteronomy 30:4) we read, "Though you may be dispersed unto the ends of the heavens, from then will the word of the Lord gather you together by the hand of Elijah the High Priest and from thence he will bring you by the hand of the King Messiah." The contrast in this passage seems to indicate that Elijah is seen as the Priestly Messiah[21] and, as Schonfield points out, it is hard to see how the people could have regarded John the Baptist, a priest, as the Messiah if some such ideal were not current.[22] In one passage of the Mishnah (Sotah 9:15) the Messianic role of Elijah seems to include resurrecting the dead. In any case we ought not minimize his significance as a Messianic figure which can shed light on the picture of the two Messiahs in Qumran.[23]

---

[20] L. H. Silberman, "The Two Messiahs of the Manual of Discipline," Vetus Testamentum, V (1955), 81.

[21] Cf. Higgins, op. cit., p. 324. This same equation of Elias with the High Priest Messiah is made by Jeremias in Gerhard Kittel, editor, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testaments (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933), II, 934.

[22] Hugh J. Schonfield, op. cit., pp. 62ff. It is interesting to note that the Mandaeans believed John the Baptist was directly descended from Moses.

[23] Ibid.

unit."[15] In the last analysis, however, the existence of these two figures is not determined by this stereotype phrase, but by the separate expection and function of these two figures as separate individuals. From other intertestamental sources the various features of these two figures are clarified.

The Two Messiahs in Intertestamental Literature

The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs breathes the same spirit as the eschatological literature of Qumran. The dual pattern of salvation is evident throughout the book. Both Levi and Judah are to produce victorious leaders for the era of the last days. A clear passage is found in the Testament of Simeon,

> Now my children, obey Judah and Levi, and be not lifted up against these tribes, for from them shall rise unto you the salvation of God. For God shall raise up from Levi as it were a High Priest, and from Judah as it were a King (7:1-2).

Texts such as this one could be multiplied.[16] We stress especially those passages where this High Priest of Levi is

---

[15] W. S. La Sor, "The Messiahs of Aaron and Israel," Vetus Testamentum, VI (October, 1956), pp. 425ff. Rabinowitz says that the final yodh was omitted in the passages which merely have משיח . The original was plural, Isaac Rabinowitz, "A Reconsideration of 'Damascus' and '390 Years' in the 'Damascus' ('Zadokite') Fragments," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIII (1954), 28. Cf. G. Kuhn, "Die Beiden Messias Aarons und Israels," New Testament Studies, I (1955), 168-70.

[16] Testament of Reuben 6:7-12, Testament of Simeon 5:5f., Testament of Issachar 5:7, Testament of Daniel 5:4,10, Testament of Napthali 5:3,4, 8:2, Testament of Gad 8:1. Cf. R. H. Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913).

called the Anointed High Priest as in Testament of Reuben 6:8, and where, as above, the salvation of God is mediated through him. Although Higgins feels that this High Priest is not, strictly speaking, a Messiah,[17] nevertheless his office bears many of the earmarks of the Messianic ideal. Thus in chapter twenty-four of the Testament of Judah we have the hymn to the Messiah from Judah and in chapter eighteen of Testament of Levi the corresponding hymn to the Messiah of Levi or New Priest as he is called. In the latter passage the exaltation of this new priest is especially significant. The eschatological glory he bears is obviously Messianic. The Rabbinic exegesis of passages such as Zechariah 4:14 shows a similar trend.[18] The ideal of two leading figures in the paradise of the new Kingdom seems quite obvious. The difficulty comes, however, when we try to establish the precise function of the Elijah to come, a very popular figure in Rabbinic expectations of the future.[19] In certain instances he seems quite separate from either of the Messiahs, and in other cases he appears to be identical with one of them. Silberman points out that in certain cases he is to restore the Anointed High

---

[17] A. J. B. Higgins, "Priest and Messiah," Vetus Testamentum, III (1953), 330.

[18] H. L. Strack und P. Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash (Munchen: Oskar Beck, 1926), III, 696.

[19] The following passages from the Mishnah are pertinent, Baba Metzia 1:8, 2:8, 3:4f., Eduyoth 8:7, Shekalim 2:5, Sotah 9:15, cf. F. W. Young, "Jesus the Prophet: a Re-examination," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVIII (1949), 291.

Priest in the new Kingdom.[20] In this capacity he acts as the prophetic forerunner.

Quite frequently, however, we find that Elijah is described as the great High Priest. Thus in the Jerusalem Targum (I Deuteronomy 30:4) we read, "Though you may be dispersed unto the ends of the heavens, from then will the word of the Lord gather you together by the hand of Elijah the High Priest and from thence he will bring you by the hand of the King Messiah." The contrast in this passage seems to indicate that Elijah is seen as the Priestly Messiah[21] and, as Schonfield points out, it is hard to see how the people could have regarded John the Baptist, a priest, as the Messiah if some such ideal were not current.[22] In one passage of the Mishnah (Sotah 9:15) the Messianic role of Elijah seems to include resurrecting the dead. In any case we ought not minimize his significance as a Messianic figure which can shed light on the picture of the two Messiahs in Qumran.[23]

---

[20] L. H. Silberman, "The Two Messiahs of the Manual of Discipline," Vetus Testamentum, V (1955), 81.

[21] Cf. Higgins, op. cit., p. 324. This same equation of Elias with the High Priest Messiah is made by Jeremias in Gerhard Kittel, editor, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testaments (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933), II, 934.

[22] Hugh J. Schonfield, op. cit., pp. 62ff. It is interesting to note that the Mandaeans believed John the Baptist was directly descended from Moses.

[23] Ibid.

The Teacher of Righteousness as Messiah

The foregoing discussion concerning the Two Messiahs is not irrelevant when we realize that there are certain scholars who would identify a future Messiah with the Teacher of Righteousness. If the future coming of this historical personage has Messianic import, then his historical life takes on new significance. And if the historical life of this figure has Messianic associations, a comparison with Jesus is also necessary on this score.

The principal ground for the belief in the return of the Teacher of Righteousness is found in a number of passages from the Damascus Document. Thus we read, "Without these (statutes) they would never have attained their goal prior to the rise of the Teacher of Righteousness at the end of days" (CDC 8:10).[24] The critical Hebrew section reads עד עמוד יורה הצדק בראחרית הימים. It might conceivably be argued that since the community believed that it was already in the last times this statement may be no more than a prophecy ex eventu. Nevertheless, the expression עד עמוד seems to denote a specific event yet to come.[25] Moreover, if our previous discussion is currect, the historical life of this figure, under the title of Lawgiver, immediately precedes this passage. The contrast is between the past and future perspective of this figure; as the

---

[24]It is to this passage that many appeal, cf. Dupont-Sommer, op. cit., p. 54, Fritsch, loc. cit.

[25]Cf. CDCb 9:30.

Lawgiver he is described as past, as the Teacher of Righteousness as future. Thus, the passage we have just quoted which concludes this section in the Damascus Document, has definite eschatological connotations.

The arguments in favor of identifying the (or a) Teacher of Righteousness with the Priestly Messiah are not without weight. In the passage just quoted, the Teacher of Righteousness is expected to rise after a period of wickedness. Likewise the Messiah of Aaron is to arise after a period of wickedness (CDC 15:4). Are these two passages exact parallels? Fritsch thinks that they are![26] Rather more cogent is the reasoning of Allegro who argues from the Samuel Pesher. The crucial passage reads, "He is the Shoot of David who will arise with the Student of the Law" (4Qp2 Sam.).[27] The Student of the Law is an historical figure elsewhere, while the shoot of David is clearly a Messiah. It is an easy jump to the conclusion of Allegro, "The Most striking feature of the whole document is the identification of one of the Messiahs with the interpreter (Student) of the law previously referred to in CDC as a leading figure in founding the sect."[28]

The third argument for the identification of these two characters is the one maintained by Dupont-Sommer. His argument depends upon the striking similarity between passages from the

---

[26] Ibid., p. 82.

[27] Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," p. 176.

[28] Ibid.

Testament of Levi and the passages dealing with the Teacher of Righteousness. In the Testament of Levi, the New Priest, the High Priest of the New Era or the Priestly Messiah is spoken of as receiving all divine revelation and that his star should rise in Heaven (Testament of Levi XVIII). We note that the Teacher of Righteousness too, understood all the mysterious revelations of God (1QpHab. 7:2-5) and that the Student of the Law is also termed the star in the Damascus Document (CDC 9:8). If this Student of the Law, or Lawgiver, who has affinities with the Teacher of Righteousness, is equated with the "man who renews the law" (Testament of Levi XVI) as Dupont-Sommer suggests, then many more parallels between this figure and the Teacher of Righteousness are evident. Of course, it is still a debatable question whether the "man who renews the law" is identical with the Priestly Messiah.[29] However, we meet conclusions such as those of Dupont-Sommer,[30]

> Let me say at once: it seems to me that this new Priest, "to whom all the words of the Lord shall be revealed," is the Teacher of Righteousness himself, who we know from the Habakkuk Commentary was a priest (ii, 8) and whom "God made to know all the mysteries of the words of His Servants, the prophets" (vii, 4-5). After his earthly career and his ignominous death, he is now to be seen translated to an eschatological plane invested with full Messianic glory, and enthroned as chief of the new universe. "Saviour of the World"--that is how Chapters X and XIV of the Testament of Levi describe him.

---

[29] For full details of the study of Dupont-Sommer, see Dupont-Sommer, op. cit., chapter three.

[30] Ibid., p. 51. Cf. Allegro, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 148.

The contenders in the other camp of this battle would, first of all, minimize the reliability of the Testament of Levi. Cross, for example, maintains that these documents "fairly swim with Christian interpolations and revisions."[31] Schonfield, too, feels that the "man who renews the law" is a Christian interpolation.[32] On the other hand, we cannot escape the conclusion of a dual Messianic ideal in the Testament of Levi. The evidence for identifying either of these Messiahs with the Teacher of Righteousness, however, is still very meagre.

Perhaps the most formidable objection to this identification is the apparent distinction of personalities in Manuscript B of the Damascus Document. Here we read, ". . . from the day that the Teacher of the community is gathered in until the rise of the Messiah of Aaron and Israel" (CDCb 9:29f.). Here the Teacher (presumably the Teacher of Righteousness) is distinguished from the Messiahs. Schonfield has made the allegation that, "there is no evidence in the Testaments or in other apocalyptic and pseudepigraphic writings of the first century B.C. of the recognition of any Messiah who

---

[31] F. M. Cross Jnr., "The Essenes and Their Master," Christian Century, LXXII (August 17, 1955), 944.

[32] Schonfield, op. cit., p. 68. Graystone is even more emphatic on this point, Geoffrey Graystone, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Originality of Christ (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1956), p. 88.

had already come."[33] This is very pertinent! It does not mean, however, that the Qumran community, if they expected their Teacher to return as a Messiah, could not have invested his historical activity with Messianic import also. The evidence so far is not conclusive either way. Hence for the sake of argument and completeness, we will assume, for the moment, that the Messianic character of the future Teacher of Righteousness is a possibility, and we will compare some of the Messianic ideals of Qumran with those of Christianity. A later discussion will deal with the second way in which we could regard the future Teacher of Righteousness.

Jesus Christ and the Qumran Christ

The importance of this section is seen in the challenge of Edmund Wilson, "It would appear, in other words, that Jesus may well have found prepared for him, by the teaching of the Dead Sea sect, a special Messianic role, the pattern of a martyr's career, to which he aspires."[34] Here Wilson imposes a Messianic stamp on the historical career of the Teacher of Righteousness. His return, then, becomes the glorious parousia of the Priestly Messiah.

First and foremost, it ought to be evident that Jesus did not stem from the tribe of Levi, so that for him to

---

[33]Schonfield, op. cit., p. 70. For further objections, see Bruce, op. cit., p. 187.

[34]Wilson, op. cit., p. 122.

follow the ideal of the Priestly Messiah from Qumran would have been precarious. In this he would have been given no credence at all. Moreover, it is clear from the Gospel records that Jesus was acclaimed as the Kingly Messiah, the Prince who was to restore the Kingdom. In this we see the wisdom of Jesus in evading the title Messiah, a title which was loaded with these sectarian overtones. Thus the attempt of the crowd to make Jesus king would have meant a call to arms (John 6:15). It was the task of the Messiah of Judah to re-establish the Kingdom. This move Jesus opposed. Likewise after the resurrection of Jesus, the disciples hoped that Jesus would restore the Kingdom of Israel (Acts 1:6). Perhaps we have here a remnant of the Qumran ideal that the second appearance of the leader as Messiah would be the great demonstration of his power. Thus when Jesus stated, "My Kingdom is not of this world," he expressed a Messianic ideal that was diametrically opposed to the ideas promulgated by the Qumran movement. Jesus did not sanction the sword (John 18:36)!

When we compare the parousia of each of these two figures, assuming, for the moment, the Messianic character of each, we see a stark contrast! Basically, the eschatological discourse of Jesus (Mat. 24f.) has little in common with the Benedictions of the Two Messiahs. Qumran did not expect any cosmic upheaval, but merely the end of the present unsatisfactory situation by the re-establishment of the Davidic dynasty and the legitimate High Priesthood. The

advent of Jesus from the clouds is to be with splendor and glory to judge with a word; the advent of the Qumran Messiah was to be from on earth with war and bloodshed to judge with the sword. The one ideal is sublime, the other crass.[35] Qumran expected to fight Gog and Magog literally.

This, however, does not rule out the possibility that later New Testament writers may have tried to show that Jesus was both the Priestly and Kingly Messiah. In this respect the writer to the Hebrews has to be mentioned. His discussion of Christ's priesthood according to the Melchizedek order does not prove any connection with Qumran whatsoever. Mowinckel believes that the priestly function of the Messiah was inherent in the ideal even in the early Old Testament references to the Messiah.[36] In any case this Melchizedek passage (Ps. 110) was a live issue apart from any Qumran influence.[37] Hence there is really no need to see a dependence on this score at all.

The third century testimony of Hyppolytus that Jesus was descended from the tribe of Judah on the one side and from the tribe of Levi on the other, thus fulfilling both

---

[35]Cf. Lou H. Silberman, op. cit., p. 82. Graystone, op. cit., p. 63.

[36]Mowinckel, op. cit., p. 179.

[37]For a discussion on this passage in Rabbinic tradition, see Strack und Billerbeck, op. cit., IV, 461ff. Cf. F. M. Cross Jnr., "The Scrolls and the New Testament," Christian Century, LXXII (August 24, 1955), 969, and Higgins, op. cit., p. 332.

the priestly and Kingly functions as Messiah, is too late to reveal any direct dependence of Christianity on Qumran.[38]

Then the question arises whether the Qumran Messiah has any indications of being of divine origin, or more precisely of having a place in a trinity. The trinity according to Dupont-Sommer is evident in the Damascus Document. He writes,[39]

> The Master of Justice has revealed the Mysteries of God: "God," it is said, "through His Anointed One, has made us to know His holy Spirit" (Dam.A. 2:12). In this sentence is outlined something like a trinitarian theology: God, the Anointed One of God, the Spirit of God such are the three great divine entities in the sect of the New Covenant.

This contraverted passage is not taken by Gaster to refer to <u>the</u> Messiah, but rather to the priests in general who are the custodians of God's truth.[40] Rather more significant is the claim of Yadin that Schechter has read the original manuscript incorrectly and proposes the translation, "and he made them know--through the hand of His Anointed ones with the Holy Spirit and through His seers of

---

[38] J. T. Milik, "Une Lettre de Simeon bar Kokheba," <u>Revue Biblique</u>, LX (1953), 291. Cf. Kuhn, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 178f.

[39] A. Dupont-Sommer, <u>The Dead Sea Scrolls</u> (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, c.1952), p. 65.

[40] Theodor H. Gaster, <u>The Dead Sea Scriptures</u> (New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1956), pp. 65, 100. Schechter's transliteration of the manuscript is במשיחו ורוח קודשו והוא אמרת. It is given in Leonhard Rost, <u>Die Damascusschrift</u> (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter & Co., 1933), p. 9.

the truth--their exact names."[41]

The suggestion of Yadin is very possible, but even if we allowed it to stand that the Messiah is referred to here, there is no implication of divinity. It is a much different thing for this Messiah to make known about the Holy Spirit than to actually send the Holy Spirit. The ἐγώ of Jesus in sending (πέμψω) the Holy Spirit, the παράκλητος, is quite unique (John 15:26).

The implication of divine sonship, however, has also been seen in the introduction to the Messianic Banquet already mentioned (1QSa 2:11f.). Here the corroded manuscript is taken by Barthelemy to read, ". . . au cas ou Dieu menerait (יולד--begets) le Messie avec eux." The יולד is very obscure in the text.[42] This, it seems, has not deterred Allegro from stating that, "It is not impossible that we have in this phrase a contributary factor to the church's conception of the 'only-begotten of the Father.'"[43]

Nevertheless, if we allow this reading to stand, we must allow the other Qumran Literature to interpret it. A very probable explanation can be seen in a "Dolores Messiae" passage of the Qumran Hymns. Here, it appears as though the writer speaks for the holy community which is pregnant and

---

[41] Y. Yadin, "Three Notes on the Dead Sea Scrolls," Israel Exploration Journal, VI, No. 3 (1956), 158. The transliteration of Yadin reads תעיר רוח קדשו ותודיעם.

[42] Barthelemy and Milik, op. cit., p. 117. Barthelemy and Milik are divided between יולד and יולד for this reading.

[43] Allegro, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 152.

in travail with a child, viz. the Messiah. Baumgarten and Mansoor translates the key section, "And with infernal pains there breaks forth from the womb of the pregnant woman a Wonderous Counsellor in his might. And there shall come forth safely a male child from the throes of birth" (1QH 3:9f.).[44] Now since Hebrew thought stresses the part of God in child birth, and more particularly since Qumran scribes were so sure of God's activity in their midst, they could speak of God's begetting the Messiah in a sense. It is the legal purity of the sect that has qualified them to produce the Messiah. It amounts to little more than the ideal that the Messiah would come from their ranks. Any eternal begetting would conflict with their normal this-worldly emphasis for the Messiah. We remind the reader again that this whole discussion only stems from the rather uncertain reading [illegible], a reading which Gaster has termed "A daring but unfortunate conjecture."[45]

On shaky foundations such as these a case can be made. Yet even if we allow the begetting of a Messiah the idea of

---

[44]For the full discussion of this psalm see Joseph Baumgarten & Menahem Mansoor, "Studies in the New Hodayoth II," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIV (1955), 188ff., and John V. Chamberlain, "Another Qumran Thanksgiving Psalm," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, XIV (January, 1955), 32ff., and (July, 1955), 181. Note, however, that others translate differently, e.g. "The Wonderful one takes counsel in his might and a son comes forth safely out of labor." L. H. Silberman, "The Language and Structure in the Hodayot," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXV (June, 1956), 97.

[45]Gaster, op. cit., p. 279.

his being essentially part of the Godhead is entirely absent. He is nothing more than a man among men, primus inter pares, a fighter and a ruler, perhaps without any connection with the Teacher of Righteousness at all. Furthermore, we need only glance at the sublime nature of Christ's high priestly prayer (John 17) to notice the tremendous rift between it and any of the Qumran Hymns (e.g. 1QH 4) which may bear some similarity, and to consider closely the cry of Jesus, "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." (John 17:5). He, the eternal Jesus, is a Messiah above, while the earthly Messiah of Qumran is confined to the presupposed concepts of his adherents, the students of Qumran.

It is not necessary to discuss all the various facets of Jesus' Messianic character to reveal that Jesus is radically different in this respect also. We have noted the suffering servant question in the previous chapter. His divine sonship is eternal, his divine Kingship is other-worldly, his divine priesthood is spiritual and his salvation is complete for man. Qumran was still shackled to an earthly Messiah and to a legal salvation.

The Prophet Ideal of Qumran

The two Messiahs of Qumran, it seems, were not the only eschatological figures that were expected. There was also to be a prophetic forerunner, the prophet like Moses.

This seems to be quite evident in the Testimonia of Qumran which quotes Deuteronomy 18:15ff. prior to the testimonies for the future Messiahs of Judah and Levi.[46] This prophetic figure is explicitly mentioned in the Manual of Discipline, perhaps the earliest of these manuscripts, but is nowhere given that same name in later texts. The text from the Manual of Discipline reads, "They shall not depart from every counsel of the law . . . until the prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel arise" (1QS 9:9-11). Here he seems to be the forerunner to the Messiahs.[47] But why no explicit reference to this figure in later works? The answer possibly lies in the fact that Qumran later equated this prophet with the Teacher of Righteousness redivivus. Thus the Damascus Document expects the Teacher of Righteousness to rise at the end of days (CDC 8:10) and the death of this Teacher (or prophet) precedes the reign of the Messiahs by some forty years (CDCb 9:29,39). And even if it is argued that these last two passages are not eschatological, the portrait of the Teacher of Righteousness as the prophet like Moses is quite clear. That the Teacher of Righteousness was hailed as a prophet we know from the Habakkuk Commentary (1QpHab. 7:2-5) and we have already noted that his word, like that of Moses, was law for the community (cf. CDCb 9:50-54). Under his

---

[46]Cf. Bruce, op. cit., p. 179.

[47]Gaster, op. cit., p. 5; Higgins, op. cit., p. 331.

leadership the community made its exodus from the land of evil to the desert where they were preparing the way of God (cf. 1QS 8:14, CDC 8:6, 9:8). In fact this whole section (CDC 7:19-8:10) seems to contrast the work of Moses of old with his counterpart in Qumran. This aspect has already been stressed by Jeremias in his article on Moses. He writes,

> ihr Führer, der auch sonst mit Moses in Parallele gestellt wird, wie Moses, Lehrer, Gesetzgeber, heisst, und dass er zu einem Exodus aufgerufen hat, der mit dem Zug Israels in das gelobte Land verglichen wird.[48]

The prophet ideal in the intertestamental period, like that of Qumran, bears eschatological import. The task of this prophetic figure varied. First of all he was to decide, once and for all, the problems of community life and law, and then to designate the rightful High Priest.[49] The former of these functions is the obvious function of the Teacher of Righteousness in the Damascus Document (CDC 8:10). His word, too, was final. There seems to be considerable fluidity, however, in the designation of this intertestamental prophet. Sometimes he is called the future Elijah rather than the prophet like Moses. In this the idea of prophet and priestly Messiah converge.[50] And it seems that

---

[48]Gerhard Kittel, op. cit., IV, 865.

[49]Cf. L. H. Silberman, "The Two Messiahs of the Manual of Discipline," p. 80ff. F. W. Young, op. cit., p. 287ff.

[50]Higgins, op. cit., p. 324. Note also the article of Jeremias on Elijah in Kittel, op. cit., II, 932ff.

the reason why the Jews wished to make Jesus king was because he exhibited all the qualifications of "that prophet." (John 6:14f.). This would also imply royal overtones in the term prophet. Nevertheless the existence of three eschatological figures is already presupposed by the question put to John the Baptist, "Art thou Elias?", "Art thou that prophet?", "Art thou the Messiah?" When, therefore, Jesus designated John the Baptist as "Elias" he used a term that was loaded, a term that in some circles meant the Priestly Messiah. The idea of the prophet like Moses, however, is applied to Jesus himself just as it was applied to the Teacher of Righteousness. In this connection too, then, we can compare these two figures, Jesus and the Teacher of Righteousness.

The Two Prophets like Moses

Samaritan eschatology, as we might expect, stressed the future prophet from Deuteronomy. Taheb was the usual name given to that figure in their circles.[51] Hellenistic Judaism exalted Moses as the "göttliche Prophet für alle Welt," and made the future prophet a glorious antitype of Moses.[52] And as we have seen this same figure was idealized in Qumran also. One thing is clear. The idea of a prophet

---

[51]Schonfield, op. cit., p. 71.

[52]Cf. the article on Moses by Jeremias, Kittel, op. cit., IV, 857ff.

like Moses and the eschatological traits which he bore were prevalent prior to the advent of Jesus of Nazareth. It is not without significance that when Theudas arose to redeem Israel he too claimed to be a prophet.[53] At the outset then, because of the widespread use of this concept, it would seem precarious to draw any conclusion as to the dependence of Jesus on the prophetic ideal of the Teacher of Righteousness, historical, or redivivus. Nevertheless, certain comparisons are illuminating in this sphere also.

What led people to call Jesus a prophet? The Samaritan woman called him a prophet because of his insight and peculiar knowledge of her condition (John 4:16-19). Prophetic "intuition" was expected of this prophet by the Pharisees (John 7:39). Of this attribute we find hints in the Qumran Literature. Knowledge of mysteries and secrets, and otherwise unknown details is ascribed to the Teacher of Righteousness, and claimed by the writer of the Qumran Hymns. This feature we have already noted.

The particular differences between the two are seen first of all, in the execution of deeds. Raising the widow's son of Nain evoked the comment, "A great prophet has risen among us" (Luke 7:16). Prophetic works of this nature are not alluded to in Qumran Literature at all. The Teacher of Righteousness was not a prophet mighty in word and deed

---

[53]Josephus Antiquities XX, 5:1.

(Luke 24:19) but only in word. When Jesus died, it did not nullify his reality as a prophet. The concern of those two travellers to Emmaeus, was not so much his death as his apparent inability to redeem Israel. It is not surprising, then, to realize that the Teacher of Righteousness as the prophetic forerunner, must die before the various Messiahs rule in the new kingdom (CDCb 9:29).[54]

The suffering of the Teacher of Righteousness for the prophetic tenets he revealed was of course nothing new in prophetic work. Jeremiah is another typical example. Jesus too sees in his office as prophet, the inevitability of suffering and death at Jerusalem, the slaughter house of prophets (Luke 13:33f.). Thus it is very unlikely that Jesus should have derived the suffering prophet ideal from the Teacher of Righteousness.[55]

According to St. John's account of the feeding of the five thousand, Jesus seems to identify himself as the Prophet like Moses. Thus it is that Jesus in this desert place (cf. Matthew 14:15), repeats the manna miracle (John 6:11f.) and is acclaimed as a prophet (John 6:14). It is noteworthy that John precedes this account with the note that Jesus maintained that Moses predicted that he, Jesus, would arise

---

[54]For further details of Jesus as prophet see Mark 6:1-4, 6:15, 8:27f., Matthew 21:11,46.

[55]For a survey of the "suffering prophet" concept, see Matthew Black, "The Servant of the Lord and the Son of Man," Scottish Journal of Theology, VI (1953), 1ff.

(John 5:46). The conclusion that Jesus is the prophet like Moses seems inevitable. Of course, there is no "manna" episode in Qumran parallels. Moreover Jesus goes on to compare his position as "the" bread from heaven to that of Moses who merely ate bread from heaven (John 6:31ff.). Such superiority of the new Prophet to the old is not explicit in Qumran. Even the advent of the Teacher of Righteousness did not nullify the Mosaic law. Rather he ratified it! In fact no one could enter the community without sworn adherence to Mosaic legislation (cf. CDC 19:8f.). The idea of Jesus as a new lawgiver has no apparent connections with the Qumran "Lawgiver like Moses."

Thus far the idea of a prophet can in each case, be traced back either to a common Old Testament origin or a common environment. The one section that perhaps suggests some intercourse of ideas is the speech of Stephen in Acts. Here Stephen identifies the prophet like Moses (Acts 7:37) with Jesus and calls him the Righteous One (7:52), just as Qumran Literature had identified this same figure with their leader and called him the Teacher of Righteousness, as we noted above. Cullmann explains this infusion of ideas as due to an influx of converted Qumran supporters. The great company of priests mentioned in Acts (Acts 6:7), are some of the band of priests from Qumran. He believes, too, that the Jewish Hellenists are just these converted Qumran

adherents.[56]

The stress upon the "prophet like Moses" was, of course, nothing new as can be seen from the speech of Peter (Acts 3:22f.) who made the same identification with Jesus, the Righteous One (Acts 3:14). Needless to say, the Righteous One is a term denoting the subjective attributes of Jesus while the name Teacher of Righteousness exhibits an objective genetive. Thus it is that in this problem also, most of the evidence is only tendential, and no direct dependence can be proved.

These are isolated points of contact which certain students have tried to establish in order to find some direct interaction between the two movements. Much of it is just clutching at straws. The superiority of Jesus testimony and claim is clear! Whether we think of Jesus the Prophet, or Jesus the Messiah, he is always Jesus the Son of God, and at this point there is no possible contact with the Teacher of Righteousness.

Where then do we stand? What conclusion can we draw from the various studies that we have presented in our paper? The brief review of our final chapter will make this plain to us.

---

[56]For details re the arguments of Cullmann, see O. Cullmann, "The Significance of the Qumran texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIV (1955), 220ff.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

The various avenues of research in this paper must now be directed to a common end. We must present a conclusion that goes no farther than the evidence produced thus far in our paper. To do this we will take, once again, a striking passage quoted above (p. 13) and point for point state the various comparisons and antitheses that can be stated in connection therewith. The passage reads,

> This refers to all the doers of the law in the house of Judah whom God will rescue from the house of judgement because of their labor and faith in the Teacher of Righteousness. (1QpHab. 8:1-3.)

The very first expression, "This refers to," demands that we ask what kind of exegesis is presented here, and what authority is present for employing such hermeneutics. Here we see in the background the ἐξουσία of the Teacher of Righteousness whose prophetic claims are reflected in the work of his students. But whereas the Teacher of Righteousness could speak of such a powerful authority, yet he could never, like Jesus, summon the power to substantiate his claims. Furthermore, the authority of the Teacher of Righteousness was no more than a prophetic ἐξουσία , there were no implications of divine origin in connection with it, as we see in the case of Jesus.

With the next phrase, "doers of the law," we come face to face with the real heart of Qumran theology. In this

phrase is implied the whole background of asceticism, legalism and dualism which the Teacher of Righteousness championed. The Teacher of Righteousness with his select, segregated group of zealots had cut himself off from the doers of evil. He, with the doers of the law, hoped to reach perfection by executing the law of Moses. In such a way of life, Jesus had no part. His Gospel was universal, embracing harlots and sinners, a Gospel that was no longer shackled to legalism. Moses was no longer the greatest mediator between God and man. Here, too, it is clear that Jesus and the Teacher of Righteousness are poles apart in their principles and activity. In connection with this legal element we might range numerous points in the life of the Teacher of Righteousness. Suffice it to say that the legalism of Qumran is nowhere reflected in the life of Jesus.

The third expression that we might fasten upon in our present comparison is the relative clause, "whom God will rescue from the house of judgement." This expression involves the whole area of soteriology and eschatology. In brief we can state that deliverance or salvation for the Teacher of Righteousness and his adherents was "this-worldly." They expected a Messianic era in which the legitimate rulers of civil and ecclesiastical order would be established. This was quite earthly; it embraced none of the "other-worldly" eschatology of Jesus. For the followers of Jesus the <u>parousia</u> meant a return to his heavenly abode; their

Messiah had already come once. For the adherents of the Teacher of Righteousness the Messiah was still to come, and to come with weapons of war at that. Once again the antitheses between the ideals of Jesus and the Teacher of Righteousness are sharply defined. The same can be said of the whole area of eschatology as we have discussed it in chapter seven.

We now turn to the phrase, "because of their labor." It is the word "labor" (עמל) which is particularly significant. The presence of this same word in the crucial passage of Isaiah 53:11 must be underscored. Here it refers to the vicarious labor of the suffering servant. In the life of the Teacher of Righteousness and the community this word takes on a new meaning for the suffering servant ideal is given a new interpretation by Qumran exegetes. The whole community led by the Teacher of Righteousness felt they were imitating the suffering ideal and thereby gaining salvation; the followers of Jesus saw their salvation in the vicarious atonement of Jesus as the suffering servant. Every student of the Teacher of Righteousness had to go through the same ordeal to gain personal salvation. The keynote of one sufferer, one atonement, one λύτρον for many, is not spelled out either in the life or the teachings of the Teacher of Righteousness. This is the heart of the Gospel message, and the basis for the christian Eucharist. Neither the suffering nor the common meal of Qumran incorporate either

of these features. This conclusion of chapter six must be stressed here also.

Last, but not least, we must state certain conclusions from the controversial expression "faith in the Teacher of Righteousness." Faith in Jesus was faith in his atoning death. This was a faith that required no supplementary efforts in order to assure divine reconciliation. It was faith in one who was more than a teacher, more than a lawgiver, more than a powerful human figure; it was faith in the Son of God. But faith in the Teacher of Righteousness meant faith in him as a teacher. Perhaps he was a great teacher, a prophet like Moses, a man of God who might return as a prophet redivivus, yet he was just a sinful man. Faith in him was not justifying faith. Justification came through obedience to his legalistic teachings and those of his predecessor, Moses. Faith in the Teacher of Righteousness meant allegiance to his cause. Here, too, when we reach the core of this matter we see irreconcilable conflict.

These issues are basic! In certain peripheral areas possible contacts may be proposed, but in the central motifs of the two movements represented by Jesus and the Teacher of Righteousness there is no obvious connection or interaction. And even those points where the Teacher of Righteousness and Jesus Christ use similar ideas or execute similar practices, it has been shown that no direct

dependence can be proved. Our conclusion then is clear. As far as the textual evidence stands at this point one cannot prove any reliance of Jesus on the Teacher of Righteousness in the basic ideals of their teaching, or their life. The Teacher of Qumran was a guide to the righteousness of the law. The Teacher of Galilee was a guide to the righteousness of the Gospel. The former was a lawgiver, the latter the very righteousness of the Gospel!

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albright, W. F. "The Chronology of the Dead Sea Scrolls," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, Supplementary Studies, Nos. 10;12 (1951).

Allegro, J. M. The Dead Sea Scrolls. Baltimore: Penguin Books Inc., 1956.

------. "Further Light on the History of the Qumran Sect," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXV (June, 1956), 89ff.

------. "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXV (September, 1956), 174ff.

Barthelemy, D., and J. T. Milik. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert I. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.

Baumgarten, Joseph, and Menahem Mansoor. "Studies in the New Hodayoth I," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIV (1955), 115ff.

------. "Studies in the New Hodayoth II," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIV (1955), 188ff.

------. "Studies in the New Hodayoth III," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXV (June, 1956), 107ff.

Bible, Holy. Revised Standard Version.

Black, Matthew. "The Servant of the Lord and the Son of Man," Scottish Journal of Theology, VI (1953), pp. 1-11.

Brown, Raymond E. "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johanine Gospel and Epistles," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XVII (July, 1955), 403-419.

------. "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johanine Gospel and Epistles," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XVII (October, 1955), 559-574.

------. "The Messianism of Qumran," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XIX (January, 1957), 53-82.

Brownlee, W. H. "The Jerusalem Habakkuk Scrolls," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, CXII (December, 1948), 8ff.

------. "Further Light on Habakkuk," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, CXIV (April, 1949), 9f.

-----. "Further Corrections of the Translation of the Habakkuk Commentary," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, CXVI (December, 1949), 14ff.

-----. "The Historical Allusions of the Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, CXXVI (April, 1952), 10-20.

-----. "The Servant of the Lord in the Qumran Scrolls, I," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, CXXXII (December, 1953), 8-15.

-----. "The Servant of the Lord in the Qumran Scrolls, II," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, CXXXV (October, 1954), 33-38.

-----. "Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament," New Testament Studies, III (November, 1956), 12-30.

Bruce, F. F. "Qumran and Early Christianity," New Testament Studies, II (February, 1956), 176ff.

-----. Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956.

Burrows, Millar. The Dead Sea Scrolls of the St. Mark's Monastery. Volume I. New Haven: The American School of Oriental Research, 1950.

-----. The Dead Sea Scrolls of the St. Mark's Monastery. Volume II. New Haven: The American School of Oriental Research, 1951.

-----. The Dead Sea Scrolls. New York: The Viking Press, c.1955.

Chamberlain, John V. "Another Qumran Thanksgiving Psalm," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, XIV (January, 1955), 32ff.

-----. "Another Qumran Thanksgiving Psalm," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, XIV (July, 1955), 181.

Cross, F. M. Jnr. "The Essenes and Their Master," Christian Century, LXXII (August 17, 1955), 944ff.

-----. "The Scrolls and the New Testament," Christian Century, LXXII (August 24, 1955), 968ff.

Cullmann, O. "The Significance of the Qumran texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIV (1955), 213-226.

Davies, A. Powell. Dead Sea Scrolls. New York: Signet Key Books, The New American Library of World Literature, Inc., c.1956.

Davies, W. D. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. London: S.P.C.K., 1955.

Dupont-Sommer, A. The Jewish Sect of Qumran and The Essenes. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956.

------. The Dead Sea Scrolls. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, c.1952.

Flusser, D. "The Apocryphal Book of Ascensio Isaiae and the Dead Sea Sect," Israel Exploration Journal (1953), pp. 30ff.

Fritsch, Charles T. The Qumran Community. New York: The Macmillan Company, c.1956.

Gaster, Theodor H. The Dead Sea Scriptures. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1956.

Ginsburg, Christian D. The Essenes. The Kabbalah. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1956.

Goosens, R. "Onias le Juste, le Messie de la Nouvelle Alliance, lapide a Jerusalem en 65 avec Jesus Christ," La Nouvelle Clio (1950), pp. 440-69.

Graystone, Geoffrey. The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Originality of Christ. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1956.

Greig, J. C. G. "The Teacher of Righteousness and the Qumran Community," New Testament Studies, II, No. 2 (November, 1955), 119ff.

Grossouw, W. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament," Studia Catholica, XXVI (1951), 289-99.

------. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament," Studia Catholica, XXVII (1952), 1-8.

Higgins, A. J. B. "Priest and Messiah," Vetus Testamentum, III (1953), 321.

Jeremias, Joachim. The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. Translated from the second German edition by Arnold Ehrhardt. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.

Kahle, P. "The Karaites and the Manuscripts from the Caves," Vetus Testamentum, III (1955), 82-85.

Kittel, Gerhard, editor. Biblica Hebraica. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Wurttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1937.

------. Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testaments. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933.

Kuhn, G. "Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament," Zeitschrift fur Theologie und Kirche, (1950), pp. 192-211.

------. "Die Sektenschrift und die iranische Religion," Zeitschrift fur Theologie und Kirche (1952), pp. 296ff.

------. "Die Bieden Messias Aarons und Israels," New Testament Studies, I (1955), 168ff.

Michel, A. Le Maitre de Justice. Paris: Maison Aubanel Pere, 1954.

Mowinckel, S. He That Cometh. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956.

------. "The Hebrew Equivalent of Taxo in the Ass. Mox. IX," Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, I (1953).

------. "Some Remarks on Hodayoth 39:5-20," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXV (December, 1956), 265ff.

Mowry, Lucetta. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Background of the Gospel of John," The Biblical Archeologist, XVII (December, 1954), 78.

Murphy, Roland E. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and New Testament Comparisons," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XVIII (July, 1956), 263-272.

Rabin, C. "Notes on the Habakkuk Scroll and the Zadokite Documents," Vetus Testamentum, V (1955), 148ff.

Rabinowitz, Isaac. "Sequence and Dates of the Extra-Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls Texts and 'Damascus' Fragments," Vetus Testamentum, III (1953), 175ff.

------. "A Reconsideration of 'Damascus' and '390 Years' in the 'Damascus' ('Zadokite') Fragments," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIII (1954), 11-35.

Reider, Joseph (and Wm. H. Brownlee). "On MSHTY in the Qumran Scrolls," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, CXXXIV (April, 1954), 27f.

Rost, L. Die Damascusschrift. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter & Co., 1933.

-----. "Der Lehrer der Einung und der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit," Theologische Literaturzeitung, Jahrgang 78, No. 3 (Marz, 1953), 143-148.

-----. "Das Verhältnis von 'Damaskusschrift' und 'Sektenrolle,'" Theologische Literaturzeitung, Jahrgang 77, No. 12 (December, 1953), 723.

Rowley, H. H. The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1952.

-----. "4QpNahum and the Teacher of Righteousness," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXV (September, 1956), 188f.

Schonfield, Hugh J. Secrets of the Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Vallentine, Mitchel & Co. Ltd., 1956.

Segal, M. H. "The Habakkuk 'Commentary' and the Damascus Fragments," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXX (1951), 131-147.

Sellers, O. R. "A Possible Old Testament Reference to the Teacher of Righteousness," Israel Exploration Journal, V (1955), 93ff.

Silberman, Lou H. "The Two Messiahs of the Manual of Discipline," Vetus Testamentum, V (January, 1955), 77.

-----. "The Language and Structure in the Hodayot," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXV (June, 1956), 96ff.

La Sor, W. S. "The Messiahs of Aaron and Israel," Vetus Testamentum, VI (October, 1956), 425ff.

-----. Amazing Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Faith. Chicago: Moody Press, 1956.

Snaith, Norman H. The Jews from Cyrus to Herod. New York: Abingdon Press, n.d.

Strack, H. L., und P. Billerbeck. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash. Munchen: Oskar Beck, 1926.

Sukenik, E. L. The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1955.

Talmon, S. "Notes on the Habakkuk Scrolls," Vetus Testamentum, I (January, 1951), 33-8.

-----. "The Sectarian [illegible] -- a Biblical Noun," Vetus Testamentum, III (1953), 133ff.

Teicher, J. L. "The Damascus Fragment and the Origin of the Jewish Christian Sect," The Journal of Jewish Studies II, III (1951), 115-43.

Toombs, L. E. "The Early History of the Qumran Sect," Journal of Semitic Studies, I (October, 1956), 367ff.

Yadin, Y. "Three Notes on the Dead Sea Scrolls," Israel Exploration Journal, VI, No. 3 (1956), 158ff.

Young, F. W. "Jesus the Prophet: a Re-examination," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVIII (1949), 285ff.

Wallenstein, M. "A Hymn from the Scrolls," Vetus Testamentum, V (1955), 277.

Weiss, P. R. "The Date of the Habakkuk Scrolls," Jewish Quarterly Review, XLI (1950).

Wernberg-Moller, P. " [illegible] and [illegible] in CDC, DSD, and DSH," Vetus Testamentum, III (1953), 310ff.

Wiesenberg, E. "Chronological Data in the Zadokite Fragments," Vetus Testamentum, V (1955), 284ff.

Wilson, Edmund. The Scrolls from the Dead Sea. London: W. H. Allen, 1955.