

# The Poetry of the Damascus Document

by Mark Boyce

Ph.D.

University of Edinburgh

1988



**For Carole.**

I hereby declare that the research undertaken in this thesis is the result of my own investigation and that it has been composed by myself. No part of it has been previously published in any other work.

*Mark Boyce.*

## Acknowledgements

I should begin by thanking my financial benefactors without whom I would not have been able to produce this thesis – firstly Edinburgh University who initially awarded me a one year postgraduate scholarship, and secondly the British Academy who awarded me a further two full year's scholarship and in addition have covered my expenses for important study trips.

I should like to thank the Geniza Unit of the Cambridge University Library who gave me access to the original Cairo Document fragments: T-S 10 K6 and T-S 16-311.

On the academic side I must first and foremost acknowledge the great assistance and time given to me by my supervisor Prof.J.C.L.Gibson. In addition I would like to thank two other members of the Divinity Faculty, Dr.B.Capper who acted for a time as my second supervisor, and Dr.P.Hayman, who allowed me to consult him on several matters. I would also like to thank those scholars who have replied to my letters.

Finally I must acknowledge the use of the *Multi-Lingual Scholar* package which is responsible for the interleaved pages of Hebrew, and I would also like to thank the Edinburgh Regional Computing Centre who have answered all my computing queries over the last three years and so helped in the word-processing of this thesis.

## Aim

The central aim of this thesis is to analyse the text of the Damascus Document, plates I-VIII and XIX-XX, with a view to separating out the original underlying poetical passages. The germ of this idea came from Soloff's article 'Towards Uncovering <sup>Original Texts in</sup> the Zadokite Documents' (NTS, 5, p62-67) where he reconstructed the underlying poetry of CD 1<sup>1</sup>-2<sup>1</sup> and suggested that further poetry existed in the following columns. I have therefore tried to demonstrate the full extent of this poetry and have brought in parallel passages from the Manual of Discipline where relevant.

Having identified the poetry, I have subsequently shown in the second chapter that three basic strands exist in the Damascus Document, poetical, redactional, and midrashic, all of which can help determine the *Sitz im Leben* and the date of both the individual components and the overall document. Finally in a chapter of corollaries, I have briefly considered the wider context in order to demonstrate how these conclusions help to clarify our understanding of Qumran theology and history.

Mark Boyce - July 1988.

Total text - 93,000 words.

## Table of Contents.

### Abbreviations.

<b>Chapter 1: An analysis of the Hebrew Text of the Damascus Document, I-VIII and XIX-XX.</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Preface: The Facets of Poetry.</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1: The First Poem: 1 <sup>1</sup> -2 <sup>1</sup> .	14
1.2: The Second Poem: 2 <sup>2</sup> -13.	50
Appendix I: The Two Spirits Passage: 1QS.3 <sup>13</sup> -4 <sup>26</sup> .	67
1.3: The Third Poem: 2 <sup>14</sup> -3 <sup>20</sup> .	86
1.3.1: The Ezekiel 44 <sup>15</sup> Midrash: 3 <sup>20</sup> -4 <sup>6</sup> .	128
1.3.2: The semi-poetic redactional passage: 4 <sup>6</sup> -12.	138
1.4: The Nets of Belial and the Builders of the Wall: 4 <sup>12</sup> -5 <sup>11</sup> .	149
1.4.1 The Midrash on the Nets of Belial: 4 <sup>12b</sup> -19a	151
1.4.2 The two nets that have ensnared the Builders of the Wall: 4 <sup>19</sup> -5 <sup>11</sup> .	155
1.5: The Fourth Poem: 5 <sup>11</sup> -6 <sup>3</sup> .	168
1.5.1 The Well Midrash: 6 <sup>3</sup> -11.	185
1.6: The Twelve Duties for those who have entered the Covenant: 6 <sup>11</sup> -7 <sup>10</sup> = 19 <sup>1</sup> -6.	195
Appendix I: A parallel credal passage in 1QS.1 <sup>1</sup> -15.	225
1.7: The Warnings: 7 <sup>10</sup> -8 <sup>21</sup> and 19 <sup>6</sup> -20 <sup>34</sup> .	231
1.7.1 The 'Parallel' Passages of 7 <sup>10</sup> -8 <sup>2</sup> and 19 <sup>6</sup> -14.	233
1.7.2 The Textual Problems of Manuscript A: 7 <sup>10</sup> -21.	242
1.7.3 The Textual Problems of Manuscript B: 19 <sup>7</sup> -13.	248
1.7.4 The leaders of Judah: 8 <sup>3</sup> -19 = 19 <sup>15</sup> -33.	252
1.7.5 The Redactor's Warnings: 19 <sup>33</sup> -20 <sup>27</sup> .	275
1.7.6 The Second Promise: 20 <sup>27</sup> -34.	294
<b>Chapter 2: The Literary Genres of the Damascus Document and their bearing on the wider field of Qumran Studies.</b>	<b>300</b>
2.1: An examination of the literary genres found within CD.	300

2.2: The Damascus Document in its wider environment.	310
2.2.1 The poetry of the Damascus Document in the wider context of the Scrolls and contemporary literature.	310
2.2.2 The Redactor(s) of the Damascus Document and the Pesharim.	315
2.2.3 The Author of the four Midrashim and 4QFlorilegium.	319
2.3: The <i>Sitz im Leben</i> of the Damascus Document.	323
2.3.1 The Babylonian Theory.	324
2.3.2 The Annual Covenant Festival Theory.	326
2.3.3 The non-Qumran Essene Theory.	329
2.4: The date of the Damascus Document.	330
2.4.1 Palaeography and the Qumran manuscripts of CD.	330
2.4.2 The dating of the poetical sections of the Damascus Document.	332
2.4.3 The dating of the Redactor of the Damascus Document.	333
2.4.4 The dating of the four Midrashim of the Damascus Document.	335
Appendix I: The Laws of CD IX-XVI.	337
I.I. The Composite Nature of the Laws.	337
I.II. The relative dating of the Laws (IX-XVI) to the other Scrolls.	342
Chapter 3: Corollaries.	348
3.1: Corollaries regarding the Theology of Qumran.	348
3.1.1 Messianism.	348
3.1.2 Temple.	357
3.1.3 Law.	370
3.1.4 Covenant.	382
3.2: Corollaries regarding the History of Qumran.	387
3.2.1 The External Evidence of the Scrolls: Archaeology and the Historical record.	387
3.2.2 The Internal Evidence of the Scrolls: The Identity of the Wicked Priest.	393
Bibliography of Books.	401
Bibliography of Articles.	409

## Abbreviations.

- Charles = Charles, R.H. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, Volume 2, p785-834, Oxford 1913.
- Charlesworth = Charlesworth, J.H. The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, London, Volume 1 1983, Volume 2 1985.
- Davies = Davies, P.R. The Damascus Covenant; an interpretation of the Damascus Document, Sheffield 1983.
- Dupont-Sommer, = Dupont-Sommer, A. The Essene Writings from Qumran, Oxford 1961.
- Fitzmyer refers to the 'Prolegomenon' by J.A.Fitzmyer in the reprinted 1970 edition of S.Schechter's Documents of the Jewish Sectaries, p9-24.
- Ginzberg = Ginzberg, L An Unknown Jewish Sect, 1976 - revised and updated translation of Eine unbekante judische Sekte, 1922.
- Knibb = Knibb, M.A. The Qumran Community, (Cambridge Commentary on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200B.C. to A.D.200, volume 2), Cambridge 1987.
- Kuhn = Kuhn, K.G. Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten, Göttingen 1960. (Supplement in RQ, 4 (1963/64), p163-234.)
- Kutscher, 1QIs<sup>a</sup> = Kutscher, E.Y. The Language and Linguistic Background to the Isaiah Scroll (1QIs<sup>a</sup>), (Studies in the Texts of the Desert of Qumran, Vol. VI), Leiden 1974, (with corrections by E.Qimron, Leiden 1979).
- Lohse = Lohse, E. Die Texte aus Qumran hebräisch und deutsch, München 1964, second edition 1971.
- Maier = Maier, J. The Temple Scroll: an introduction, translation and commentary, Sheffield 1985.
- Qimron = Qimron, E. The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Atlanta Georgia 1986.
- Rabin = Rabin, Ch. The Zadokite Documents, Oxford 1954.



- Schechter = Schechter, S. Documents of the Jewish Sectaries, Cambridge 1910; reprinted in New York 1970 with a Prolegomenon by J.A.Fitzmyer.
- Schürer = Schürer, E. The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, 3 volumes; revised by Goodman, H., Millar, F., and Vermes, G. in 1980-1987.
- Stegemann = Stegemann, H. Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde, Bonn 1971.
- De Vaux = Vaux, R.de Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls, London 1962, revised edition 1973.
- Vermes = Vermes, G. The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, Harmondsworth 1962, third edition 1987; second edition indicated by 'DSSE2'.
- Watson = Watson, G.E.W. Classical Hebrew Poetry - A Guide to its techniques, Sheffield 1984.

Articles are referred to in full the first time they are mentioned, after which only the initials of the Journal followed by the volume and page number is given.

The normal abbreviations are used for biblical books (Gen., Ex., etc.), pseudepigraphical works (Jub., etc.), and Qumran texts (1QS, 1QM, etc.).

In presenting Hebrew text, Hebrew transliterated text, or the English translation, the following brackets have been used as indicated:

- < > = text which constitutes a gloss or secondary addition of some kind.
- { } = restored text which has been accidentally omitted by the scribe.
- [ ] = text which is illegible in the original Hebrew manuscript.
- ( ) = words supplied in the English translation which have no equivalent in the Hebrew text.

## CHAPTER 1

### AN ANALYSIS OF THE HEBREW TEXT OF THE DAMASCUS DOCUMENT, I-VIII AND XIX-XX

#### Preface: The Facets of Poetry.

Before embarking on the reconstruction of the Hebrew text of the Damascus Document in an attempt to recover the original underlying poetry, there are a number of important *methodological* considerations which need to be examined. The first is to consider what actually constitutes poetry, or to put it another way, how we are to distinguish between prose and poetry. A decade ago Freedman<sup>1</sup> devised a mechanical test to separate prose from poetry, for he found that statistically the particles 't (the accusative) 'šr (the relative pronoun) and h- (the definite article) occur six to eight times more frequently in prose passages than in poetic ones. 'What (this) means is that, when a writer composed a prose work, he naturally and inescapably used these particles in the normal fashion described in the grammars; but when he or anyone composed poetry, he naturally did not use them, or if he did, very sparingly.'<sup>2</sup> Watson takes this point a step further by arguing that to obtain the most primitive form of a (poetic) text all prose elements ('t, 'šr, h-, w-) must be deleted.<sup>3</sup> Whilst this might be true of the earlier poetical texts of the prophets, it seems that with time the number of particles original to poetical texts increased so that by Maccabean times one would almost certainly be unjustified in *a priori* excluding all such particles, though on the other hand

---

<sup>1</sup>Freedman, 'Pottery, poetry, and prophecy: an essay on biblical poetry', JBL, 96, (1977), p5-26.

<sup>2</sup>Freedman, JBL, 96, p7.

<sup>3</sup>Watson, p37 and p58.

this is not to say that all are original.

An analysis of the prose and poetry sections of the Damascus Document yields the following information:

**The occurrence of particles every x lines of Hebrew text.**

	't	'šr	h-	w-
CD: Ms.A poetry (98 lines)	2.91	4.45	2.04	0.61
Ms.A prose (70 lines)	2.88	2.12	0.67	0.87
Ms.B poetry (16.5 lines)	5.5	5.5	1.5	0.92
Ms.B prose (49.5 lines)	4.13	2.54	0.82	0.57
1QS: 3 <sup>15</sup> -4 <sup>14</sup> (26 lines)	Never	Never	5.2	0.4
10 <sup>9</sup> -11 <sup>22</sup> (40 lines)	40	8	10	0.45
1QM: 10 <sup>8-18</sup> (8 lines)	Never	0.375	2	2.375
12 <sup>10-16</sup> (6 lines) <sup>4</sup>	Never	Never	Never	2.17
14 <sup>4-16</sup> (10 lines)	Never	Never	3.3	2.7
1QApGen.20 <sup>2-8</sup> (7 lines) <sup>5</sup>	Never	Never	Never	0.46

From this table it is apparent that the accusative and relative pronoun are scarce or absent from poetical sections of the Scrolls; in the whole of the

---

<sup>4</sup>1QM.19<sup>2-8</sup> represents another copy of this poem, 12<sup>10-16</sup>.

<sup>5</sup>Identified as poetry by VanderKam, 'The Poetry of 1QApGen.XX,2-8a', RQ, 10 (1979-81), p57-66.

Hodayot they are only attested twelve and forty-five times respectively.<sup>6</sup> The article is also uncommon, whilst the conjunction supplies little information. When one turns to the Damascus Document it is immediately noticeable that these particles appear more frequently. Yet in the case of the relative pronoun and the article there is a definite preference of two or three times magnitude for the prosaic sections over the poetic ones.<sup>7</sup> True, the comparisons between prose and poetry in the occurrence of these particles are not so clearly defined in this document as they are in the Masoretic Text or in the other Scrolls, but this is not to say that there is no poetry here. For as we have already indicated, no scribe would remove such particles from the text, other than by accident, but many would add them. From this point of view it has to be remembered that this document has gone through at least two stages of copying when any harsh poetic traits could have been smoothed over by the addition of an appropriate particle. The first is the Qumran stage when the seemingly originally independent poetical pieces were welded together with midrashic and other elements to form the proto-Damascus Document, and then over a period of time further redacted. The second is the post-Qumranic stage up to our ninth and eleventh century copies during which the manuscript(s) would have been copied and re-copied by a series of scribes who, while preserving the sense, might well have tried to improve the reading of the text.

Of course the absence or relative scarcity of such particles is not the only

---

<sup>6</sup>In view of the fragmentary nature of 1QH it is difficult to calculate the number of lines of Hebrew and therefore difficult to provide statistics. However, if we take an approximate figure of say 500 lines, it is clear that these particles are rare occurring every 42 and 11 lines respectively.

<sup>7</sup>In 1QS the ratio's of occurrences of 't and 'sr in prose to poetry are 4:1 and 11:1 respectively.

characteristic of poetry. Watson<sup>8</sup> lists a whole stream of traits which occur in poetry: parallelism, metre, archaisms, chiasmus, inclusios, assonance and alliteration, unusual vocabulary or word-order, word-play of various forms, similes and metaphors, and so on. Of these perhaps the first two are the most important or at least the most typical. Lowth back in 1753 insisted that the principle of parallelism constituted the basic essence of poetry and is the point from which any study of metre should begin. 'He recognized that every "line" of Hebrew poetry fell into at least two parts, in which the thought was not continuous but parallel - the same thing said over again in another way.'<sup>9</sup> Thus one of the major implications of parallelism is 'that it implies a rhythm, a balance, a regularity, *not of sound but of thought*'<sup>10</sup> Based on this principle it is possible to statistically consider the presence of parallelism in the poetry of the scrolls as follows: the first column gives the number of cases of parallelism, the second the number of cola of poetry with parallelism out of the total number of cola in the poem,<sup>11</sup> while the third represents the second column as a percentage.

---

<sup>8</sup>Watson, p46-57.

<sup>9</sup>Lowth, De Sacra Poesi Hebraeorum, (1753) as outlined by Robinson, 'Some Principles of Hebrew Metrics', ZAW, 54 (1936), p29.

<sup>10</sup>Robinson, ZAW, 54, p30.

<sup>11</sup>This is about twice the number of cases of parallelism (=column 1) since the majority of cases of parallelism occur over a bicolon, though tricola, etc. do occur.

CD: 1 <sup>1</sup> -2 <sup>1</sup>	16	33/43	77%
2 <sup>2</sup> -13	7	16/25	64%
2 <sup>14</sup> -3 <sup>20</sup>	20	44/73	60%
5 <sup>11</sup> -6 <sup>3</sup>	9	18/27	67%
8 <sup>4</sup> -9	4	9/15	60%
19 <sup>16</sup> -21	5	11/14	79%
20 <sup>27</sup> -33	8	16/17	94%
CD poetry	69	147/214	69%
1QS.3 <sup>15</sup> -4 <sup>14</sup>	26	63/69	91%
4 <sup>16</sup> -25	11	22/39	56%
10 <sup>9</sup> -11 <sup>22</sup>	47	112/137	82%
1QM 12 <sup>10</sup> -16	10	24/24	100%
14 <sup>4</sup> -16	12	25/40	62.5% <sup>12</sup>
1QApGen.20 <sup>2</sup> -6	6	15/15	100%
20 <sup>6</sup> -8	0	0/10	0% <sup>13</sup>

This naturally leads us into an analysis of metre, and here we shall restrict ourselves to a few comments on the traditional stress, or accentual theory, and on the more recent concept of syllable counting.<sup>14</sup>

### The Stress or Accentual Theory.

Watson briefly outlines four arguments as to why the stress or accentual theory of metre should be adopted in analysing poetry.<sup>15</sup> They are:

---

<sup>12</sup>1QM.10<sup>8</sup>-18 is a list of God's qualities and thus difficult to represent in terms of parallelism.

<sup>13</sup>The second of VanderKam's two units consists of only 'incomplete parallelism', which we have not counted in our above analysis - VanderKam, RQ, 10, p63-64.

<sup>14</sup>Watson also mentions: alternating (stress) metre, the word foot, the thought-unit, and letter counting - p103-106.

<sup>15</sup>Watson, p99-100.

1. The stress is phonemic, allowing us to distinguish, for instance, between bnw 'in vs' and bnw 'they built'.
2. There may be a silent stress.
3. Unusual word-order, such as in Isaiah 19<sup>8</sup> where the three stresses in the first line are balanced by breaking a construct chain to create an additional stress in the second.
4. The use of the chiasmic pattern in contravening the principle that two accents should never directly follow one another, such as in Proverbs 10<sup>9</sup>.

Robinson<sup>16</sup> contends that the accentual theory has the disadvantage of concentrating on sound rather than on thought, for, as we have already mentioned, rhythm is one of thought, and so the balancing units will necessarily be thought-units. Yet this criticism could also be levelled at all other metrical counting systems; consequently we shall have to assume that poets, in addition to balancing 'thought-units', also followed to a greater or lesser extent some mechanical form of metre.

The real problem with this traditional method is in deciding whether a certain word is stressed, such as a particle, independent pronoun, construct and so on. It seems that one has to frequently allow for anacrusis; that is, a word, usually at the beginning of the line, which lies outside of the metre. The

---

<sup>16</sup>Robinson, ZAW, 54, p33.

introductory strophe of the first poem in the Damascus Document demonstrates this well, since both 'th and ky are examples of anacrusis. Some particles and conjunctions contain no stress and in the Massoretic text this is graphically represented by the presence of a maqqef. The relative particle is rarely stressed unless it occurs with a preposition or conjunction. In the unpointed Hebrew text found in the scrolls it is much more up to the reader to decide from the context whether these particles, conjunctions and the like are stressed. Constructs also present no easy solution; Longman considers that they only have one stress, whereas Robinson believes that they have two unless the two words are very closely connected.<sup>17</sup> The latter is the procedure we shall adopt, giving the first word in a construct formation a secondary stress unless there is good evidence to the contrary. Watson also notes that where expected 'lenition' is absent from the first letter of a word one can determine which words bear a primary stress, or in Longman's terminology the absence or presence of spirantization can help to isolate word-complexes.<sup>18</sup> Finally, it is possible for a word to have two stresses, a primary and a secondary. In conclusion, all this adds up to a pretty subjective set of rules for determining the number of stresses in a colon, and this is perhaps why recently scholars have been looking to other methods of metrical analysis.

### Syllable Counting.

In recent years syllable counting has been gaining in popularity. One of its

---

<sup>17</sup>Longman, 'A Critique of two recent Metrical Systems', *Biblica*, 63 (1982), p240 and Robinson, *ZAW*, 54, p37.

<sup>18</sup>Watson, p100 and Longman, *Biblica*, 63, p240.



most enthusiastic exponents is Freedman who has outlined and demonstrated the principle in a number of papers.<sup>19</sup> As he himself says 'there are more arguments about the number of stresses than about the number of syllables, or I should say that syllable-counters tend to be more accommodating and less dedicated because one syllable more or less does not make as much difference as one stress more or less.'<sup>20</sup> In the poetry of the Scrolls this method of syllable counting has also gained a number of advocates. Kittel in his book 'The Hymns of Qumran' solely restricts himself to this method as does VanderKam in his article 'The Poetry of 1Q.Ap.Gen.XX,2-8a' - RQ, 10, p357-66. Yet the former gives a maximum and minimum count for each line to allow for the disagreement over the way to count segolates and vocal-šewas. It is these and similar problems raised by the peculiarity of the Qumran orthography that we must now consider.

Vocal-šewa. The problem of the vocal-šewa stems from the fundamental problem of what constitutes a syllable. If C = Consonant and V = Vowel, are there only two possible syllable arrangements in Hebrew, CVC and CV, or are there a further two, namely CCVC and CCV? It seems that the word š<sup>e</sup>wā means 'nothing' (from the Hebrew šāw 'nothingness), and that the 'hatephs' are simply "a stronger variation of 'nothing'".<sup>21</sup> This is strengthened when one considers the situation where an imperfect of a regular root is yiktob, etc., whilst a pe-guttural root would have a hateph , viz. ya'<sup>a</sup>bor, etc.; if these

---

<sup>19</sup>Freedman: 'The Structure of Psalm 137', in Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William Foxwell Albright, (ed. H.Goedicke,) p187-205; 'Acrostics and Metrics in Hebrew Poetry', HTR, 65 (1972), p367-392; with C.F.Hyland, 'Psalm 29: A Structural Analysis', HTR, 66 (1973), p237-256; 'Strophe and Metre in Exodus 15', in A Light unto My Path: Old Testament Studies in Honor of Jacob M.Myers, (eds. H.N.Bream, R.D.Heim, C.A.Moore, Philadelphia, 1974), p163-203; JBL, 96, p11-12.

<sup>20</sup>Freedman, JBL, 96, p11.

<sup>21</sup>Gibson, 'The Massoretes as Linguists', OTS, 19 (1974), p87.

formed part of a balanced bicolon surely one would not give the former a two syllable count and the latter a three? Many vocal-šewa's were later innovations. The concept that a *shewa* following a long vowel is vocal was not recognized by the grammarians before Moshe and David Kimḥi. Indeed, Ibn Ezra asserts specifically that the *shewa* in *tēšbī* and *ya'āspū* is quiescent.<sup>22</sup> The problem of the *shewa* was further complicated by Bernard Stade (d.1906), who, under the influence of Solomon Hanau (1687-1746), introduced the principle of *shewa* medium, according to which every *shewa* which replaces a vowel is vocal, e.g. *mal<sup>e</sup>k<sup>e</sup>* (from *m<sup>e</sup>lākīm*), *kit<sup>e</sup>b<sup>u</sup>* (from *k<sup>e</sup>tob*).<sup>23</sup> Thus Chomsky concludes that the pre-Kimhian grammarians only vocalized a šewa 'at the beginning of the word, after a vowelless consonant (*yišp<sup>e</sup>t<sup>u</sup>*) and in the case of the concurrence of two identical consonants (*hin<sup>e</sup>n<sup>i</sup>*).<sup>24</sup> Yet even this may be over estimating the use of the vocal-šewa since the following notes on the orthography of Qumran verbal forms will narrow even this set, especially the second category. Thus we should at least be prepared to consider the possibility that in Qumran Hebrew there was no such thing as a vocal-šewa, and thus that the syllable constructions of CCV and CCVC did exist.

Segolates. In some ways this is an extension of the above problem, for here we are considering whether segolates originally took the form CVCC. The evidence that they did stems from Origen's Hexapla which, for example, transcribes *gbr* 'man' as γαβρ; viz. *gbr* would have been pointed *gab<sub>r</sub>* and not

---

<sup>22</sup>Cf. Saḥoth,11a and Moznayim,28a; so Chomsky, 'The Pronunciation of the Shewa', JQR, 62 (1972), p89.

<sup>23</sup>Chomsky, JQR, 62, p90.

<sup>24</sup>Chomsky, JQR, 62, p93.

geber at this time. This should be extended to other segolate forms; feminine particles, such as kotebet would be kotabat, apocopated forms, such as wayyigel would be wayyigl, and longer segolate nouns such as maḥ<sup>a</sup>šebet would be maḥ<sup>a</sup>šabat. But does all this square with the Qumran evidence? In 1QIs<sup>a</sup> we come across segolates of the 'qutl' pattern appearing three times in the form qwtwl; that is, the second vowel which is an 'a' or 'e' in the Tiberian system is a 'u' or 'o' in 1QIs<sup>a</sup>.<sup>25</sup> A similar form appears in the LXX which has Βοοs for Β'z and Μολοκ for Molek. Kutscher argues consequently that such evidence of an evolutionary chain of: LXX - qoṭol (qoṭel) > Origen - qoṭl > Hieronymus - qoṭel is unconvincing.<sup>26</sup> Thus we should consider the possibility of two distinct dialects, the one represented by the LXX, 1QIs<sup>a</sup>, and Hieronymus which has the qoṭol or qoṭel form, the other represented solely by Origen's Hexapla has the qoṭl form. Yet there is one further point that we should consider, which is that the orthography of the Isaiah Scroll may not be representative of the Qumran writings and their orthography, for it is possible that it predates the existence of the Qumran sect. The main corpus of the Scrolls may, in view of the lack of a second waw, belong to the other side of the equation along with Origen's Hexapla, so that the forms are: hōṣk, sēḡr, malk, etc. and should therefore be treated as monosyllables.

The Verb. The verb in the present tense shows a number of variations from the Tiberian system. The third feminine singular was katabaḥ accented on the penultimate syllable, and only became kātḥ later when a retraction of the stress occurred. The second feminine occasionally appeared as qaṭalt ḥ

---

<sup>25</sup>1QS.4<sup>11</sup> has the form 'kybwd' - a scribal mistake or an attestation of this form at Qumran?

<sup>26</sup>Kutscher, 1QIs<sup>a</sup>, p68.

(škh̄ty in 1QIs<sup>a</sup>.17<sup>10</sup>), but this is no more than a reintroduction of an archaic form under the influence of Aramaic. Finally the second plural masculine (and feminine) appears as q̄altimmâ (wš'btmh in 1QIs<sup>a</sup>.12<sup>3</sup>), though these last two forms are not attested in our document. More significant for us are the imperfect forms which occur plene written in the Scrolls as one would expect - yq̄twl, tq̄twl, etc. - and more importantly, the preservation of the pausal vocalization in non-pausal forms, namely tq̄twly (2fsg), yq̄twlw (3mpl) and tq̄twlw (2mpl). What has puzzled many scholars however is why this appears in some roots - drš, ktb, mšl, npl, 'br, pqd - and not others - 'kl, 'mr, b'r, dbq, hlk, yš', mš', š'l, šm'. It seems to me that the grammatical rule is as follows; if the masculine third singular is yiq̄ôl the forms will be tiq̄ôlî, yiq̄ôlû and tiq̄ôlû, whilst if the masculine third singular is yib'ar

the forms will be tib'arî, yib'arû, and tib'arû. That is to say, if the third masculine singular has an 'ô' it will be retained throughout, but if it has an 'a' then the 'a' will be retained throughout.<sup>27</sup> This means that the three forms that in the Tiberian pointing have a šewa, now have a full vowel and thus have three not two syllables.

Miscellaneous. There are a couple of minor points left to be considered. Firstly, should we count the conjunction 'w<sup>e</sup>-' as a syllable. It has been suggested that we do when it connects sentences but not when joining nouns. Yet we have already considered the possible secondary nature of 'w<sup>e</sup>-' when it joins sentences so perhaps the problem should not arise so that we can disregard the šewa in all its manifestations. Secondly, how should we treat dual endings? Halle and McCarthy avoid them in their discussion of Psalm 137

---

<sup>27</sup>The above nine verbs which have an 'a' throughout are final-aleph, etc. verbs, or stative verbs such as 'dbq'.

assigning them only one stress,<sup>28</sup> and the Scrolls do not add a second yodh as a vowel-letter in the cases of *yrvšlm/-lym*, or *šmym*.

The above four or five points should then be borne in mind when one comes to reconstructing the poetry of the Damascus Document, for it will be necessary in some places to reconstruct the earlier pronunciation in order to give an accurate syllable count. Yet there is one further point to be made on the use of metre for emendation which is that we should guard against the practice of conjectural emendation solely on the grounds of metre. However the additions/glosses are often clearly recognizable, being in prose and separating clauses and words that belong together, for it was the desire of the redactor or glossator to instruct or clarify rather than to preserve the poetry.

Thus we have considered the advantages and disadvantages of the two methods of metrical counting which will be used in the reconstruction of the poetry of the Damascus Document. However before proceeding, the following stylistic points should be appreciated in considering the subsequent analysis of the text. Firstly, the stress and syllable count for each cola will appear in this order, and occur to the left of the Hebrew text preceding each section and to the right of the transliterated Hebrew text used in the subsequent notes. Secondly, brief linguistic points which have little or no bearing on the understanding of the text, will precede the fuller discussion of a passage. Thirdly, the nomenclature used in describing the poetic features is basically that outlined by Watson in his book. Finally, it should be stressed that the aim of this thesis is to reconstruct the underlying poetry of the Damascus Document, and consequently it is the text, rather than the interpretation of the

---

<sup>28</sup>Halle & McCarthy, 'The Metrical Structure of Psalm 137', JBL, 100 (1981), p163.

text, that receives primary attention; the two though are inter-related, and in addition, for the sense of completeness, I have commented on what I see as the key issues in the non-poetic passages.

And so to the text.

The Hebrew of the First Poem.

1+3	2+6	ועתה שמעו כל יודעי צדק
3	6	ובינו במעשי (2) אל
1+3	1+6	כי ריב לו עם כל בשר
3	9	ומשפט יעשה בכל מנאציו (3)
1+3	1+6	כי במועלם אשר עזבוהו
3	8<5>	הסתיר פניו מישראל >וממקדשו< (4)
2	5	ויתנם לחרב
3	7	ובזכרו ברית ראשנים
3	7	השאיר שאירית (5) לישראל
3	5	ולא נתנם לכלה
		ובקץ חרון >שנים שלוש מאות (6) ותשעים לתיתו אותם
3	5	ביד נבוכדנאצר מלך בבל< (7) פקדם
3	9<4>	ויצמח מישראל >ומאהרן< שורש
3	8	מטעת לירוש (8) את ארצו
3	7	ולדשן בטוב אדמתו
2	7	ויבינו בעונם
3	7<2>	וידעו כי (9) >אנשים< אשימים הם
2	6	ויהיו כעורים
2	4<4>	וכימגששים דרך (10) >שנים עשרים<
3	8	ויבן אל אל מעשיהם
3	7	כי בלב שלם דרשוהו (11)
3	8	ויקם להם מורה צדק
3	6	להדריכם בדרך לבו
3	8	ויודע (12) לדורות אחרונים
4	7<4>	את אשר עשה בדור אחרון >בעדת בוגדים (13)
		הם סרי דרך היא העת אשר היה כתוב עליה
		כפרה סורירה (14) כן סרר ישראל<
3	8	בעמוד איש הלצון
4	10	אשר הטיף לישראל (15) מימי כזב
3	7	ויתעם בתוהו לא דרך
3	6	להשח גבהות עולם
3	6	ולסור (16) מנתיבות צדק
3	6<6>	ולסיע גבול >אשר גבלו ראשנים ב<נחלתם

4 11  
4 9

למען (17) הדבק בהם את אלות בריתו  
להסגירם לחרב נקמת נקם (18) ברית

### בעבור אשר

2+2 5+8  
2+2 6+8  
2+2 6+6  
2+2 5+5

דרשו בחלקות ויבחרו במהתלות  
ויצפו (19) לפרצות ויבחרו בטוב הצואר  
ויצדיקו רשע וירשיעו צדיק (20)  
ויעבירו ברית ויפירו חוק

3 8  
4 10  
2 5  
3 6

ויגודו על נפש צדיק  
ובכל הולכי (21) תמים תעבה נפשם  
וירדפום לחרב  
ויסיסו לריב עם

3 8  
3 6  
3 8

ויחר אף (1) אל בעדתם  
להשם את כל המונם  
ומעשיהם לנדה לפניו



Translation of the First Poem: 1<sup>1</sup>-2<sup>1</sup>.

*And now, listen all who understand righteousness,  
and consider the works of<sup>2</sup> El.  
For, He has a dispute with all flesh,  
and will execute judgment against all who despise Him.<sup>3</sup>*

*For, when they acted perversely by forsaking Him,  
He hid His face from Israel <and from His sanctuary>,<sup>4</sup>  
and delivered them up to the sword;  
But when He remembered the covenant of the ancestors,  
He left a remnant<sup>5</sup> to Israel,  
and did not give them up to complete destruction.*

*And in the period of wrath <three hundred<sup>6</sup> and ninety years  
after He gave them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar,  
king of Babylon<sup>7</sup> > He visited them,  
And He caused a root to grow from Israel <and from Aaron>,  
a plantation to possess<sup>8</sup> His land  
and to grow fat on the goodness of His soil.*

*And they perceived their iniquity,  
and knew that<sup>9</sup> they (were) guilty <men>;  
And they were like blind (men),  
and like (men) groping for the way,<sup>10</sup> <twenty years>.*

*And El considered their deeds,  
because with a perfect heart they sought Him;<sup>11</sup>  
And He raised up for them a Teacher of Righteousness,  
to guide them in the way of His heart.*

*And he made known<sup>12</sup> to the last generations,  
what He had done with the last generation <with the  
congregation of traitors.<sup>13</sup>  
They are the apostates of the way ; this is the time of which it  
was written concerning her:  
'Like a heifer that apostatises,<sup>14</sup> thus did Israel apostatise.'>  
When there arose the Man of Derision,  
who spouted to Israel<sup>15</sup> waters of falsehood.*

*And He caused them to stray in a pathless wilderness,  
that they might bring low the ancient heights,  
that they might turn aside<sup>16</sup> from the living-paths of  
righteousness,  
that they might remove the boundary <which the ancestors  
had put around> (of) their inheritance.*

*So that,<sup>17</sup> He might cause the curses of His covenant to  
cleave to them,  
to deliver them up to the sword which executes the  
vengeance<sup>18</sup> of the covenant.*

*Because, they searched for smooth things and chose  
delusions,  
and they watched<sup>19</sup> for loopholes and chose the fair neck;  
And they justified (the) wicked and condemned (the) righteous,  
<sup>20</sup>  
and they transgressed the covenant and violated the precept;*

*And they banded together against the life of the righteous,  
and their soul abhorred all who walked<sup>21</sup> perfectly;  
And they persecuted them with the sword,  
and they rejoiced at the people's strife.*

*So the wrath of El<sup>1</sup> was kindled against their congregation;  
to lay waste all their multitude,  
and their deeds to remove from before Him.*

## 1.1. The First Poem: 1<sup>1</sup>-2<sup>1</sup>.

This section has been taken as poetry by more scholars than any other part of the Damascus Document. Charles back in 1913 considered that 1<sup>1</sup>-2<sup>1</sup> constituted the first poetical unit of a large number to be found in the document.<sup>29</sup> Smith seems to be of a similar opinion, for he suggested that the Admonition may represent a collection of poetic prophecies with later prose interpolations, and this idea was investigated by other members of Drew University resulting in a short paper by Soloff outlining the poetry of 1<sup>1</sup>-2<sup>1</sup>.<sup>30</sup> Gert Jeremias, in his chapter on 'Die Aussagen der Texte über den Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit', takes 1<sup>1</sup>-11 as a poetical piece,<sup>31</sup> and Davies has followed Jeremias' scansion of this passage.<sup>32</sup> Most recently Knibb has taken 1<sup>1</sup>-2<sup>1</sup> as poetry, though like Stegemann (and Davies) he considers 1<sup>13-18a</sup> to be a secondary prosaic addition.<sup>33</sup> Thus the following outline of the poetry of 1<sup>1</sup>-2<sup>1</sup> is by no means a totally original idea, although I hope my analysis of the poetry is more complete than the majority of my predecessors.

The poem can be neatly divided up into four main stanzas, with in addition an introduction and a conclusion:

---

<sup>29</sup>Charles (p799-823) arrives at similar conclusions as I do as to what constitutes poetry within CD, viz. 1<sup>1</sup>-3<sup>20</sup>, 4<sup>6-11</sup>, 5<sup>13-17</sup>, 6<sup>2-4</sup>, 8<sup>2-10</sup>, 19<sup>15-22</sup>, 20<sup>33-34</sup>, followed largely by Rabinowitz, 'A Reconsideration of "Damascus" and "390 years" in the "Damascus" ("Zadokite") Fragments', JBL, 73 (1954), p11-35. Neither analyse the poetry.

<sup>30</sup>'Towards Uncovering Original Texts in the Zadokite Documents', NTS, 5 (1958-59), p62-67.

<sup>31</sup>Jeremias, Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit, 1963, p151-152.

<sup>32</sup>Davies, p62.

<sup>33</sup>Knibb, 1987, p17-18. Stegemann, p132-145; followed by Davies, p69-71 and p235.

Introduction: God has a rîb.	1 <sup>1-2</sup>
Stanza 1: the origin of the sect.	1 <sup>3-8</sup>
Stanza 2: the rise of the Teacher of Righteousness.	1 <sup>8-11</sup>
Stanza 3: 'the last generation' and the Man of Lies.	1 <sup>13-18</sup>
Stanza 4: the transgression of 'the last generation'.	1 <sup>18-21</sup>
Conclusion: God will punish them.	1 <sup>21-2</sup>

The Introduction: 1<sup>1-2</sup>.

w'th šm'w kl ywd'y šdq	1+3	2+6
wbynw bm'šy <sup>2</sup> 'l	3	6
ky ryb lw 'm kl bšr	1+3	1+6
wmšpṭ y'šh bkl mn'šyw <sup>3</sup>	3	9

*And now, listen all who understand righteousness,  
and consider the works of<sup>2</sup> El.  
For, He has a dispute with all flesh,  
and will execute judgment against all who despise Him.<sup>3</sup>*

---

mn'šyw: plural Piel participle from the root n's with suffix; appears in  
TS 10 K6 with Babylonian pointing: m<sup>e</sup>nā'ēšāyw.

---

The introduction consists of two bicola, each exhibiting complete ('proper congruence') parallelism, and in addition, extended parallelism occurs between 'El' and 'Him' at the end of the second and fourth cola. The main issue of this section is whether the particles w'th and ky occur inside or outside the metre; viz. are they cases of anacrusis? We should be able to deduce that the latter is the case by comparisons with the opening line of the following two poems

where w'th also appears. In 2<sup>2-3</sup> the introductory bicolon has metre of:

w'th šm'w 'ly kl b'y bryt	1+4	2+8
w'glh 'znkm bdrky rš'ym	4	8

While in 2<sup>14-15</sup> the first colon stands by itself, followed by two bicola which together make up the introductory five-line stanza. This gives metre of:

w'th bnym šm'w ly	1+3	2+5
w'glh 'ynykm lr'wt	3	8
wlhbyn bm'sy 'l	3	6
wlbhwr 't 'šr ršh	3	6
wlm'ws k'sr šn'	3	6

From 1<sup>1</sup> and 2<sup>2</sup> it is apparent that w'th lies outside both the syllable and stress metre, and whilst the form occurs in a monocolon in 2<sup>14</sup> this conclusion would still appear to be correct. However, I do not feel that this factor can be used to argue that w'th was added to create a false unity between these three poems.

The importance of biblical Hebrew to the poet is clear from the outset. The opening colon here comes from Isaiah 51<sup>7</sup>:

šm'w 'ly yd'y šdq

*Listen to Me those who understand righteousness*

The third colon, on the other hand, is a telescoped quotation of Jeremiah 25<sup>31</sup>, which reads:

ky ryb lyhwh bgwym nšpt hw' lkl bsr

*For the Lord has a dispute with the nations; He will judge all flesh.*

This biblical basis is further demonstrated when one compares our text with Hosea 4<sup>1</sup> and Micah 6<sup>2</sup> both of which read:

šim<sup>o</sup>'û.....ky ryb lyhwh 'm.....

*Listen .... for YHWH has a dispute with ...*

This strong use of biblical phrases and vocabulary occurs throughout the poetical sections of this document in contrast to the generally sectarian language of the redactional material and the totally different use of biblical texts in the midrashic passages. Elsewhere it is unlikely that I will do more than mention these biblical parallels, and many of my references will come from Rabin's analysis.<sup>34</sup> Isaiah 51<sup>7</sup> could be seen as evidence that w'th is a case of anacrusis, whilst conversely Hosea 4<sup>1</sup> and Micah 6<sup>2</sup> as evidence that ky occurs inside the metre. Yet I do not believe that the latter constitutes hard evidence since the poet uses these biblical phrases for his own purposes and is not limited by the biblical material.

Throughout the Cairo Geniza copy of the Damascus Document there is a kind of mixed attitude to *plene* writing. This is to be expected of a document that was Qumranic in origin<sup>35</sup> so that it shares some of the orthography of the scrolls, but which has been subjected to subsequent external influences probably from a number of different sources over some eight to ten centuries. Thus in this document it is always k1 not kw1, whilst elsewhere in the scrolls kw1 is the norm,<sup>36</sup> yet we do have here ywđ'y for the biblical yd'y. The Damascus Document fragments from Qumran published to date make it quite

---

<sup>34</sup>Rabin p78-89 where he gives a full list of Old Testament, Pseudepigrapha and Qumran passages used in the text of CD; in the notes on the text, he distinguishes between literal quotations, quotations with a grammatical adaptation, telescoped quotations, and allusions or reminiscences. See also Fitzmyer, 'The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in the Qumran Literature and in the New Testament', NTS, 7 (1960-61), p297-333.

<sup>35</sup>The Qumran origin of this document will be justified later.

<sup>36</sup>Compare: 'ky' in CD.1<sup>2</sup> et al to 'ky' elsewhere in the scrolls; 'l' in CD.1<sup>5</sup> et al, to 'lw' elsewhere in the scrolls.

clear that this document in its Qumranic form shared the same orthography as that found in the other Scrolls.

The first stanza: 1<sup>3-8b</sup>.

3 ky b <sup>w</sup> 'l <sup>m</sup> 'š <sup>r</sup> 'z <sup>b</sup> w <sup>h</sup> w	1+3	1+6
h <sup>s</sup> t <sup>y</sup> r p <sup>n</sup> y <sup>w</sup> m <sup>y</sup> š <sup>r</sup> 'l <w <sup>m</sup> m <sup>q</sup> dš <sup>w</sup> > 4	3	8<5>
w <sup>y</sup> t <sup>n</sup> m l <sup>h</sup> r <sup>b</sup>	2	5
w <sup>b</sup> z <sup>k</sup> r <sup>w</sup> b <sup>r</sup> y <sup>t</sup> r' <sup>š</sup> n <sup>y</sup> m	3	7
hš' <sup>y</sup> r š' <sup>y</sup> r <sup>y</sup> t 5 l <sup>y</sup> š <sup>r</sup> 'l	3	7
wl' n <sup>t</sup> n <sup>m</sup> l <sup>k</sup> l <sup>h</sup>	3	5
w <sup>b</sup> q <sup>š</sup> ḥ <sup>r</sup> w <sup>n</sup> <š <sup>n</sup> y <sup>m</sup> š <sup>l</sup> wš <sup>š</sup> m' <sup>w</sup> t 6 w <sup>t</sup> š' <sup>y</sup> m l <sup>t</sup> y <sup>t</sup> w 'w <sup>t</sup> m b <sup>y</sup> d		
n <sup>b</sup> w <sup>k</sup> d <sup>n</sup> 'š <sup>r</sup> m <sup>l</sup> k b <sup>b</sup> l 7> p <sup>q</sup> d <sup>m</sup>	3	5(x)
w <sup>y</sup> š <sup>m</sup> ḥ <sup>ḥ</sup> m <sup>y</sup> š <sup>r</sup> 'l <w <sup>m</sup> 'ḥ <sup>r</sup> n> š <sup>w</sup> rš <sup>š</sup>	3	9<4>
m <sup>t</sup> 't l <sup>y</sup> r <sup>w</sup> š <sup>š</sup> 8 't 'r <sup>š</sup> w	3	8
w <sup>l</sup> dš <sup>n</sup> b <sup>t</sup> w <sup>b</sup> 'd <sup>m</sup> t <sup>w</sup>	3	7

*For, when they acted perversely by forsaking Him,  
He hid His face from Israel <and from His sanctuary>, 4  
and delivered them up to the sword;  
But when He remembered the covenant of the ancestors,  
He left a remnant 5 to Israel,  
and did not give them up to complete destruction.*

*And in the period of wrath <three hundred 6 and ninety years  
after He gave them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar,  
king of Babylon 7> He visited them,  
And He caused a root to grow from Israel <and from Aaron>,  
a plantation to possess 8 His land  
and to grow fat on the goodness of His soil.*

---

b<sup>w</sup>'l<sup>m</sup>: b + infinitive mo'lām, with the wāw representing a short vowel.

š'<sup>y</sup>r<sup>y</sup>t - written with two yodhs as in 2<sup>6</sup>, and in contrast to the form

elsewhere in the scrolls.<sup>37</sup>

k1h is a polysemantic pun, having the meanings 'completely' and 'destruction'; I have thus given a double translation 'complete destruction'.

qṣ: generally means 'period' in the scrolls, in contrast to its biblical meaning of 'end, limit'.<sup>38</sup>

šnym: the noun appearing before the numeral is a late Biblical Hebrew feature which is also found in the scrolls<sup>39</sup>

ltytw: infinitive of the root ntn, tēt, with suffix tittô, so that the yodh again represents a short vowel; literally, 'to give He (them)', thus 'His giving (them)'.

pqd: there is a choice of two opposite meanings here 'to punish' and 'to visit' (in a positive sense); elsewhere in the Admonition the former meaning is the one found for this root.<sup>40</sup>

wyṣmḥ: an apocopated Hiphil form, wayyaṣmah, as found in Gen.2<sup>9</sup>.

ldšn: this could be either Qal 'to become fat', or Piel 'to make fat'.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup>Schechter, p118 and Davies, p232 transcribe only one yodh.

<sup>38</sup>Wieder, 'The Term 'qṣ' in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in Hebrew Liturgical Poetry', JJS, 5, p22-31.

<sup>39</sup>So Qimron, p85 - see also CD 1<sup>10</sup>, 14<sup>22</sup>, 20<sup>15</sup>.

<sup>40</sup>CD.5<sup>15</sup>, 7<sup>9</sup>=19<sup>6</sup>, 8<sup>2</sup>=19<sup>14</sup>, 8<sup>3</sup>=19<sup>15</sup>.

<sup>41</sup>The root 'dšn' occurs elsewhere in the scrolls only in the Hiphil - 1QS 10<sup>15</sup>, 1QH 10<sup>26</sup>, 1QM 2<sup>5</sup>.



This stanza which deals with the origin of the sect consists of two strophes. The first has two tricola, with a respective syllable count of 20:19,<sup>42</sup> which neatly complement each other; the same 'b' + verbal noun + suffix construction occurs in the first and fourth cola; 'from Israel' in the second colon is paralleled by 'to Israel' in the fifth; the root ntn is paralleled in the third and sixth cola. This means that without doubt wmmqdšw is a later addition, as it destroys the metre and the parallelism.<sup>43</sup> Why then was wmmqdšw added? There seem to be two possible reasons which are not mutually exclusive:

1. So that the subsequent addition of '390 years...' would be interpreted as from 587/6 B.C. viz. when Jerusalem and its temple were destroyed, rather than from 597 B.C. when king Jehioachin went into exile and from which Ezekiel 4<sup>5</sup> dates the period of the exile.
2. Or because El again had removed His presence from the sanctuary;<sup>44</sup> this could either be the desecration of the second temple by Antiochus IV in 167 B.C., or it could be a veiled polemic against the Hasmonean High Priest who usurped the Zadokite priesthood which lead to the sectarians avoiding or being banned from the temple.

---

<sup>42</sup>As in the previous section, 'ky' occurs outside the metre.

<sup>43</sup>So Soloff, NTS, 5, p64; Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*, p151; Dayies, p233. mqdš also occurs in 4<sup>1,18</sup>, 5<sup>6</sup>, 6<sup>12,16</sup>, 12<sup>1,2</sup>, & 20<sup>23</sup>; cf. 1QpH 12<sup>9</sup>, IQM 2<sup>9</sup>, 7<sup>11</sup>, 4QF11<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>44</sup>This idea is found in Lam.2<sup>11</sup>, Ezk.8<sup>6</sup>, 10<sup>18-19</sup>, 11<sup>22-23</sup>.

The first colon of the first tricolon stems from Lev.26<sup>40</sup> - *bm'lm šr m'lw* by - whilst the initial colon of the following tricolon is taken from Lev.26<sup>45a</sup> - *wzkrty lhm bryt r'snym*. Thus the *r'snym* are the ancestors of the Israelite race, specifically Abraham, Isaac and Jacob who are mentioned in Lev.26<sup>42</sup>. Yet does *r'snym* always have this meaning in this document? Clearly, the similar contexts of 3<sup>10</sup> and 6<sup>2</sup> demand the same interpretation, while conversely, in 4<sup>6(8,9)</sup> the *r'snym* must be the 'ancestors' of the sect, i.e. the founder members. It seems then, that in the original poetic sections *r'snym*, qualified by *bryt*, refers to the 'ancestors' of the Israelite nation, whilst in the secondary poetical sections and the prosaic sections the unqualified *r'snym* refers to the founder members of the sect.<sup>45</sup> However, it is likely that a certain ambiguity was deliberately created by the use of *r'snym*.

There are two additions in the second strophe of the first stanza. The first is the lengthy chronological reference which completely breaks up the metre. This has been interpreted in a number of ways. If we have here a real chronology<sup>46</sup> then the 390 years, started in 587/6 B.C. when Jerusalem, temple and all, was destroyed, brings us down to 197/6 B.C.. However, Ezekiel 40<sup>1</sup> clearly dates the period of the exile from 597 i.e. the year king Jehoiachin went into exile:

---

<sup>45</sup>Viz. Abraham etc. meant in 1<sup>4</sup>, 3<sup>10</sup> and 6<sup>2</sup>; the founder members are meant in 1<sup>16</sup> (=secondary), 4<sup>6,8,79</sup>, 8<sup>17</sup>=19<sup>29</sup>. (*r'snym* means 'first' in 3<sup>10</sup> - though still referring to Abraham etc., 4<sup>17</sup>, 7<sup>21</sup>=19<sup>11</sup>, and 20<sup>8,31</sup>, plus 1QS9<sup>10</sup>, 1QM.2<sup>10</sup> et al, and 1QH.9<sup>13</sup>, 17<sup>18</sup>.)

<sup>46</sup>Charles, p800; Rowley, 'The 390 years of the Zadokite Work', in *Mélanges bibliques rédigés en l'honneur de André Robert*, p341-347; Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran*, p178-184 and p211-212 and 'The Date of the Eschaton in the Book of Jubilees: A Commentary on Jub.49:22-50:5, CD 1:1-10 and 16:2-3', *HUCA*, 56 (1985), p87-101; Beckwith, 'Daniel 9 and the Date of the Messiah's Coming in Essene, Hellenistic, Pharisaic, Zealot and early Christian Computation', *RQ*, 10 (1979-81), p521-42 and 'The Significance of the Calendar for Interpreting Essene Chronology and Eschatology', *RQ*, 10 (1979-81), p167-201 - for a discussion of Beckwith's position see Chapter 2.4.3, p333-335.

*In the twenty-fifth year of our exile, at the beginning of the year, on the tenth day of the month, in the fourteenth year after the city was conquered, ..<sup>47</sup>*

Thus 390 years after 597 B.C. would bring us to 207 B.C. as the date of the period of wrath. The main reason why most scholars are currently so sceptical about taking these figures literally is because they seem to place the origin of the sect far too early.

Alternatively, many scholars regard this chronological reference as fictitious or 'chronomessianic'.<sup>48</sup> This is because the figure 390 is no arbitrary one, but apparently originates from Ezekiel 4<sup>5</sup>:

*For I assign to you a number of days, three hundred and ninety days, equal to the number of years of their punishment; so long shall you bear the punishment of the house of Israel.*

It is therefore a sectarian interpretation of this prophecy, and if accurate a *prophecy ex eventu*. This view is further substantiated when one considers Bruce's observation. He notes that 390 + 20 (years of wandering until the rise of the Teacher) + x (years of the Teacher's ministry) + 40 (years for the time between the death of the Teacher and the end of the age), gives a total of 450+x years, and if x = 40, which would be reasonable, then the total comes to 490, viz. the seven times seventy weeks of years found in Daniel 9<sup>24</sup>.<sup>49</sup> This would mean that the glossator was also responsible for the chronological

---

<sup>47</sup>See 2 Kings 24<sup>8-17</sup>.

<sup>48</sup>Gressmann - as outlined in Davies, p11; Rowley The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls, p62-69; Bruce, 'The Book of Daniel and the Qumran Community', in Neotestamentica et Semitica (ed. Ellis and Wilcox), p232. If the chronology is fictitious perhaps 'Nebuchadnezzar' is a cipher for Antiochus IV Epiphanes, as it is in Judith and 1 Esdras - see Gardner, 'The Purpose and Date of 1 Esdras', JJS, 37 (1986), p19.

<sup>49</sup>Bruce, *ibid.*

reference in 20<sup>15</sup>, and thus seemingly deliberately interpreted the current situation in the light of Daniel's prophecy.

Rabinowitz<sup>50</sup> argues that the preposition ל- of לtytw never means 'after', which is how nearly all translators take it. Thus he translates it : '*at (the time of) His giving...*' or '*as of His giving..*'; that is to say, the period of wrath was itself 390 years in length and culminated in God's visitation when Israel was given into the hands of king Nebuchadnezzar. The regnal years of the kings of Judah from Rehoboam to Zedekiah total 393 years, but this number can be emended to 390 years since according to 2 Chron.11<sup>16-17</sup> the monarchy officially began in Judah in the fourth year of king Rehoboam's reign, viz. 977B.C.. This hypothesis has the advantage of not dating the Qumran sect, since the 390 years is now seen as referring to the pre-exilic time, and 'the root' to the post-exilic remnant.

The secondary nature of this chronological reference means that the date of this poem, indeed of the whole of this document and even of the Scrolls, is freed from the dating usually derived from this reference. This means that 'the root' can be dated later than a literal reading of the chronology, to, say, the middle of the second century. The glossator seems to me to interpret the period of wrath as the period of the exile, which at Qumran, as in much of the post-exilic and intertestamental literature, was viewed as an on going process.<sup>51</sup> Whilst he may have been simply trying to clarify the issue as to

---

<sup>50</sup>JBL, 73, p14; compare: Ginzberg, p257-260; Walker, 'Concerning the 390 years and the 20 years of the Damascus Document', JBL, 76 (1957), p57-58; Wiesenberg, 'Chronological Data in the Zadokite Fragments', VT, 5 (1955), p284-308.

<sup>51</sup>See Jer.24,29; Ezk.4; the 'SER' passages of the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs'; Jub.1<sup>9-18</sup>; Tobit 14<sup>4-7</sup>; the authors of Baruch, 4 Ezra and the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch write as though Israel is still in a state of exile - see Knibb, 'The Exile in the Literature of the Intertestamental Period', HJ, 17 (1976), p253-272.

when 'the root' arose, he may equally have been deliberately falsely archaising the sect's antiquity by using a well-known apocalyptic figure.

The second addition is *wm'hrn*. Omitting this gloss leaves a metrical count of 3,8, thus balancing that of 3,7 in the first line. Furthermore, elsewhere in this document *'hrwn* precedes *yšr'l* in the Messianic title, indicating the greater importance of the priesthood over the monarchy, but here in tacking *wm'hrn* onto the poetry he reverses the normal order. The glossator reflects the strong priestly nature of the early community in demonstrating that he adheres to those biblical statements which credit the Zadokites with Aaronite descent.<sup>52</sup>

The plantation imagery for the sect (and its leader) is also found in 1QS.8<sup>5</sup>, 11<sup>8</sup> and in 1QH.6<sup>15</sup>, 8<sup>6-10</sup>, and, intriguingly, in some of the intertestamental literature: Jubilees 1<sup>16</sup>, 21<sup>24</sup>, Ps.Sol.14<sup>3-4</sup>, T.Judah 24<sup>6</sup>, and 1Enoch.62<sup>8</sup>, 93<sup>2,5,10</sup>.<sup>53</sup> The problem here though lies with the words: *šwrš mṭ't*. Most scholars take *šwrš* as a construct for *mṭ't* : Schechter - 'a root of a plant'; Rabin - 'a root of cultivation';<sup>54</sup> Jeremias and Davies - 'a root for planting'. However Soloff<sup>55</sup> splits the words up:

*And caused a root to grow out of Israel < and out of Aaron >, Planted to inherit His land.*

I would agree with this analysis, for the two words never occur together

---

<sup>52</sup>1 Chron.24<sup>2-3</sup> makes Zadok a descendant of Eleazar. Yet as Cody notes, the origin of Zadok is a mystery; he seems to come from nowhere - Cody, A History of Old Testament Priesthood, p89-92.

<sup>53</sup>See: Ringgren, 'The Branch and the Plantation in the Hodayot', BR, 6 (1961), p3-9 and Fujita, 'The Metaphor of Plant in Jewish Literature of the Intertestamental Period', JSJ, 7 (1976), p30-45.

<sup>54</sup>He points to Isaiah 60<sup>21</sup> where we read '*nšr mṭ'w*', as the origin of the phrase - Rabin, p3

<sup>55</sup>NTS, 5, p64.



The second stanza: 1<sup>8-11</sup>.

wybynw b'wnm	2	7
wyd'w ky <sup>9</sup> <'nšym> 'šymym hm	3	7<2>
wyhyw k'wrym	2	6
wkymgššym drk <sup>10</sup> <šnym 'šrym>	2	4<4>
wybn 'l 'l m'šyhm	3	8
ky blb šlm dršwhw <sup>11</sup>	3	7
wyqm lhm mwrh šdq	3	8
lhdrykm bdrk lbw	3	6

*And they perceived their iniquity,  
and knew that<sup>9</sup> they (were) guilty <men>;  
And they were like blind (men),  
and like (men) groping for the way,<sup>10</sup> <twenty years>.*

*And El considered their deeds,  
because with a perfect heart they sought Him;<sup>11</sup>  
And He raised up for them a Teacher of Righteousness,  
to guide them in the way of His heart.*

---

kymgššym: Piel participle from gšš, a root which only occurs in Isaiah 59<sup>10</sup> in the MT; the first yodh again represents a short vowel - kim<sup>e</sup>gaššēšîm.

mwrh šdq: usually translated 'the Teacher of Righteousness'. Weingreen however argues that šdq means 'true' which 'has no moral content at all' but rather 'conveys the idea of legitimacy', whilst 'mwrh is a technical term designating legal authority; so one might translate, somewhat clumsily,

'one who gives true authoritative decision'.<sup>57</sup> If anything, I would be inclined to follow Weingreen's initial suggestion, and translate 'the True (=Legitimate) Teacher' who was in opposition to 'the Wicked (=Illegitimate) Priest'.

---

The first strophe of the second stanza deals with the guilt of 'the root'; even though they had set themselves apart they still believed they were at fault, a theme which is found elsewhere in the poetical sections, most notably in 3<sup>17-18</sup>. One could leave this strophe as it is, with alternate short and long cola, yielding a metrical pattern of sorts - 2,4,2,4 and 8,12,8,13. Yet in view of the secondary nature of the chronological reference in the preceding strophe, the words 'twenty years' are almost certainly also secondary. This leaves us with a long second colon, and while it is possible that all of this colon is original, the parallelism with the previous colon strongly suggest that there also is a secondary gloss in this second colon. Thus, either 'šymym is a gloss on 'nšym, the original colon therefore suggesting that they realised their fallibility as mere mortals,<sup>58</sup> or 'nšym is simply a gloss on 'šymym, added solely to smooth out the text by a (post-Qumran?) scribe who did not appreciate the poetical nature of the text. Both proposals would leave a metrical count of 3,7, taking ky as being unstressed, thus balancing the previous colon of 2,7. Thus this strophe originally consisted of two well-balanced bicola, exhibiting straight parallelism.

---

<sup>57</sup>'The Title Moreh Sedeq', JSS, 6 (1961), p162-174.

<sup>58</sup>So Soloff, NTS, 5, p64 - viz. 'And they knew they (were mere) men'.



For the glossator, there were twenty years from the foundation of the community to the rise of the Teacher as its leader. A literal reading of this figure would bring us down to either 187 B.C. (from Ezk.4<sup>5</sup>), or 177/6 B.C.. A number of scholars, while not adhering to the 390 year figure because of the known inaccuracy of dating the exile in Jewish literature, do consider the 'twenty year' figure as precise; Albright and Mann believe it represents the twenty years under Jonathan, 161-142 B.C., a view also held by Cross who asserts that this was the period when the Hasidim were in active support of the Maccabees.<sup>59</sup> Alternatively, taking the figure symbolically, Ginzberg thinks it refers to the twenty kings who reigned from Saul to Josiah, whereas Rabinowitz considers it refers to the twenty years Israel struggled for existence on returning from exile.<sup>60</sup>

The second strophe consists of a quatrain of a:b:c:b' pattern with good internal parallelism. There are 'ayin-yodh/waw roots byn and qwm at the start of the first and third cola; in addition the particle 'l in the first colon has been deliberately used to parallel lhm in the third, (rather than using lm'syhm in the first colon,) and by doing so this creates an extra 'word count' to match the four in the third colon. The second and fourth cola mirror each other in their use of lb, and in their alliterative roots containing the common element 'dr'. Finally there is extended parallelism between mwrh ṣdq at the end of the third colon of this strophe, and the reference to the figure 'yš hlṣwn at the end of the third colon of the following strophe.

---

<sup>59</sup>Albright and Mann, 'Qumran and the Essenes: Geography, Chronology, and Identification of the Sect', in The Scrolls and Christianity, (ed. M.Black), p19; Cross, The Ancient Library of Qumran, p101.

<sup>60</sup>Ginzberg, p258; Rabinowitz, JBL, 73, p15. As the figure '390 years' is derived from Ezekiel 4<sup>5</sup>, there may be some symbolic relation with the forty years Ezekiel was instructed to lie on his right side for the house of Judah.

The importance of this strophe is that it contains no glosses; that is, that most significantly the phrase *mwrh ṣdq* is an integrated part of this piece of original text. Yet this reference to the Teacher has raised a number of problems: firstly that the Teacher of Righteousness only appears in Ms B in the Damascus Document outside of this passage; secondly, the future figure, *ywrh ṣdq*, in 6<sup>11</sup> complicates the issue – is this a reference to the Teacher who in 6<sup>11</sup> is still to be expected, or to some kind of Messianic figure, the Teacher *redivivus* even; finally, it is argued that a different view of the Teacher is presented here when compared to the pesharim. These factors have led Davies to regard the reference to the Teacher here as secondary, and consequently he deletes the second two cola of our suggested quatrain.<sup>61</sup> Yet this conclusion is also partly (if not largely) dependant on his desire to see the whole of CD.1<sup>1</sup>-7<sup>9</sup> as an originally pre-Qumranic (and hence pre-Teacher of Righteousness) text, which only at a later date was redacted and supplemented by the Qumran sectarians. However, I believe that the evidence of the poetry cannot be ignored, for the metre is almost perfect plus there seems to be no linguistic evidence for removing this reference. This means that this poem (and the second and third poems as well) must date from either the lifetime of the Teacher, or after his death; they cannot pre-date the Teacher of Righteousness. The alleged difference in the character of the Teacher found here, in Ms B, and in the pesharim, can be satisfactorily accounted for by the composite nature of the Damascus Document which consequently dates to more than one period within the history of the text; at the time this passage was written the Teacher may still have been alive, yet in

---

<sup>61</sup>Davies, p17-18, p63-64 and esp. p200.

Ms.B and in the pesharim the Teacher has died, in the former quite recently.<sup>62</sup> Consequently Davies' theory of a pre-Qumranic recension of the Damascus Document can be rejected as erroneous.

The third colon may actually be a biblical quotation, for Joel 2<sup>23</sup> reads:<sup>63</sup>

ky ntn lkm 't hmwrh lšdqh

which the R.S.V. typically translates:

*For He has given the early rain for your vindication.*

However, in the light of the sect's well documented biblical re-interpretation of texts, I see no reason why this biblical verse could not have been translated along the following lines:<sup>64</sup>

*For He has given to you the teacher for righteousness*

It is perhaps significant that the MT has the root ntn, whereas in CD the root qwm occurs; is this a deliberate substitution? The root qwm would seem to imply that the Teacher was raised up from within the sect rather than given (root ntn) to them by God from outside the sect. This would then militate against scholars who see the Teacher as an influential figure, (namely, the usurped High Priest of the *Interregnum*) who joined an already existing sect,

---

<sup>62</sup>See Chapter 2.4.2-3, p332-335.

<sup>63</sup>Ginzberg, (p211 and p221) and Rabin (p3) see the biblical origin of this colon as Hosea 10<sup>12</sup> - 'd ybw 'wywrh šdq lkm' - omitting the waw on 'ywrh' (with LXX,P,V) and taking 'ywrh' as a participle. The first colon of this strophe is almost a direct quote of Psalm 33<sup>15</sup> which has: 'hmbyn 'l kl m 'syhm'. (\* BHS and BHK have 'yrh ' ;Snith has 'wywrh'.)

<sup>64</sup>The article is slightly awkward; the sectarians may have had a slightly different 'MT'. Unfortunately this passage is not preserved in either the Minor Prophet Scroll from Murabbaat (DJD.II), or the Minor Prophet Scroll from Qumran, (DJD.VIII, due to appear shortly under the editorship of E.Tov.)

rather than founding a new one.<sup>65</sup> This latter view in fact seems unlikely precisely because the Teacher, (especially if he is the Interpreter of the Law,) is credited with the foundation of the sect.

The third stanza: 1<sup>11-15</sup>.

wywd' <sup>12</sup> ldwrwt 'hrwnym	3	8
't 'šr 'šh bdwr 'hrwn <b'dt bwgdym <sup>13</sup>	4	7<4>
hm sry drk hy' h't 'šr hyh ktwb 'lyh		
kprh swryrh <sup>14</sup> kn srr yšr'l>		
b'mwd 'yš hlšwn	3	8
'šr hšyp lyšr'l <sup>15</sup> mymy kzb	4	10
wyt'm btwhw l' drk	3	7
lhšh gbhw t'wlm	3	6
wlswr <sup>16</sup> mntybwt šdq	3	6
wlsy' gbwl <'šr gblw r'šnym b>nšltm	3	6<6>
lm'n <sup>17</sup> hdbq bhm 't 'lwt brytw	4	11
lhsgyrm lšrb nqmt nqm <sup>18</sup> bryt	4	9

*And he made known <sup>12</sup> to the last generations,  
what He had done with the last generation <with the  
congregation of traitors. <sup>13</sup>  
They are the apostates of the way ; this is the time of which it  
was written concerning her:  
"Like a heifer that apostatises, <sup>14</sup> thus did Israel apostatise.">  
When there arose the Man of Derision,  
who spouted to Israel <sup>15</sup> waters of falsehood.*

*And He caused them to stray in a pathless wilderness,  
that they might bring low the ancient heights,  
that they might turn aside <sup>16</sup> from the living-paths of  
righteousness,  
that they might remove the boundary <which the ancestors  
had put around> (of) their inheritance.*

*So that, <sup>17</sup> He might cause the curses of His covenant to  
cleave to them,*

---

<sup>65</sup>Stegemann, p212-220; see also: Murphy-O'Connor, 'Demetrius I and the Teacher of Righteousness (IMacc.X,25-45)', RB, 83 (1976), p400-420.

*to deliver them up to the sword which executes the  
vengeance<sup>18</sup> of the covenant.*

---

wywd': apocopated Hiphil imperfect, wayyôda' as in Judges 8<sup>16</sup>.

'dh: the term has both a positive sense, in 7<sup>20</sup>, 20<sup>2,3</sup> and the Laws of IX-XVI, and a negative sense, in 1<sup>12</sup> (here), 2<sup>1</sup>, 3<sup>9</sup>, 8<sup>13</sup>=19<sup>26</sup>.

'yš h1šwn: only here, but the plural 'nšy h1šwn, presumably his followers, occurs in CD.20<sup>11</sup> and 4Qpls<sup>b.26,10</sup>.

sry: construct of the Qal active participle - sārê, from the root swr, 'to apostatise'; the phrase sry drk also occurs in 4QFl.1<sup>14</sup>. swryrh: Qal feminine active participle, written *plene*, from the root srr, 'to rebel'; srr a masculine perfect from the same root, but problematically occurring with ysr 'l which is feminine. The root (swr) used by the glossator in the previous line is therefore not the same as the root found in the Hosea passage which he quotes.

gbhwt: can be pointed in one of two ways; gabhût, 'pride, arrogance', or g<sup>e</sup>b<sup>o</sup>hôt, 'high, tall', thus 'high (place)'. This can perhaps be resolved by referring to Hab.3<sup>6</sup> where the same phrase occurs, viz. šhw gibhôt 'wlm, which the N.E.B. translates: '*the everlasting<sup>a</sup> hills subside*' - (<sup>a</sup> or 'ancient'). Thus we could translate here '*the high things of antiquity*' or '*the ancient things of value*'; and this should be taken as a reference to the Mosaic law.

.1sy': defectively written Hiphil infinitive 1hsy' from the root ns'; the hē may have been deliberately or accidentally omitted because it was no longer

pronounced.<sup>66</sup>

---

This third stanza concerns itself with the fate of 'the last generation' (= 'the congregation of traitors?'). It consists of two strophes, the first of which has been considerably expanded. To begin with its first two lines are not of equal length, so that either the phrase *bḏwr ḥrwn* or *b'dt bwgdym* is a gloss. Soloff suggests in his alternative translation:

"He made known to the later generations  
that which He did in the last (pre-exilic?) generation."

As what follows must constitute a short midrashic insertion, this proposal means there is only one addition - *b'dh . . . . ysr'l*. Three points help to further substantiate this view: firstly the parallelism between *ldwrwt ḥrwnym* and *bḏwr ḥrwn* in what would be the original bicolon; secondly, since the more difficult (here 'vague') reading should always be preferred, the more graphic and precise reading *b'dt bwgdym* is more likely to be secondary; thirdly the position of *b'dt bwgdym* after *bḏwr ḥrwn*. The problem, as to what is secondary, is compounded by the problematical interpretation of the phrase *dwr ḥrwn*. In 1QpHab.7<sup>2</sup> the phrase *dwr ḥrwn* appears to mean 'the final generation (=period) of the age (of wrath);<sup>67</sup> there the future tense is used to create a *prophecy ex eventu*, here however we need the past tense because it is clear from the following strophe (1<sup>15-16</sup>) that God has already acted against

---

<sup>66</sup>Kutscher, A History of the Hebrew Language, p235 and 1QIs<sup>a</sup>, p508-9.

<sup>67</sup>The phrase 'dwr ḥrwn' also occurs three times in the Psalms - 48<sup>14</sup>, 78<sup>4</sup>, 102<sup>19</sup>, cf. 109<sup>13</sup>, and elsewhere in the scrolls in 1QpHab.1<sup>2</sup> (restoring 'ḥrwn'), 2<sup>7</sup>; 1Q14. 18<sup>3</sup>; 4QCatend<sup>98</sup> - cf 4QpHos<sup>b</sup> frg 2, 3.

this wicked generation and as such we could render *dwr ḥrwn*, 'previous generation'. The parallels with 1QpHab.2<sup>1-10</sup> and 7<sup>1-5</sup> also resolve the problem as to the subject of the initial verb of this stanza; it is the Teacher, as prophet, who makes known to them all that God has done or is about to do.<sup>68</sup>

The quote from Hosea 4<sup>16a</sup> follows on from the phrase *b'dt bwgdym*, and further re-interprets the phrase *bḏwr ḥrwn*. It is therefore obviously secondary which is further confirmed by the fact that it breaks up the metre. Furthermore, such midrashic sections, re-interpreting biblical quotations, are always secondary to the poetry in this document,<sup>69</sup> and are the work of a later redactors whose concern was not for the niceties of poetry, but for the need to give 'biblical proof' to certain current events. The reference to 'Israel' in the Hosea quote confirms the fact that the phrase *bḏwr ḥrwn* refers to almost everyone outside of the sect, rather than being a reference to a specific opposing sectarian group. Such biblical quotes are often imprecise when compared to the Massoretic Text, and the same situation has been noticed by Kittel in 1QH, where he states: 'In most cases, the Hodayot passage .... employs different forms of the verb, and different pronominal suffixes, and stand in syntactical relationships quite different from the biblical passage.'<sup>70</sup> The MT of Hosea 4<sup>16a</sup> shows that the differences between it and our passage lie in the particles - CD *k-* for *ky*, and *kn* where MT has nothing.

---

<sup>68</sup>1QpHab.2<sup>7</sup>: 'the man of violence and the breakers of the covenant, will not believe when they hear all that [is to happen to] the final generation from the Priest (=the Teacher)', cf. 1QpHab.7<sup>4-5</sup>; see Chapter 3.2.2, p393-401 on the interpretation of 1QpHab.

<sup>69</sup>See for instance the Ezekiel 44<sup>15</sup> Midrash, 3<sup>20-46</sup>; the Well Midrash, 6<sup>4-11</sup>; etc.

<sup>70</sup>Kittel, The Hymns of Qumran, p49; cf. the MT found in CD of Ezk.44<sup>15</sup> in 3<sup>21-42</sup> or Is.10<sup>2</sup> in 6<sup>16-17</sup>.

To some, my secondary material will not extend nearly far enough. Stegemann has argued strongly that 1<sup>13-18b</sup>, that is, the whole of my third stanza less the first bicolon, is secondary. He gives three reasons:<sup>71</sup>

1. 1<sup>13-18a</sup> parallels 1<sup>18-21</sup> in form and content, so that consequently both cannot be original.
2. 1<sup>18-21</sup> is stylistically similar to 1<sup>7f</sup>, especially in its use of a metrical pairing of verbs; thus it is more likely than 1<sup>13f</sup> to be original.
3. 1<sup>13-18</sup>, 4<sup>19f</sup>, 8<sup>12f-19<sup>25f</sup></sup> and 20<sup>13-15</sup> are all secondary expansions of the original text, referring to a group who once belonged to the sect.

Davies cautiously agrees with Stegemann as to the secondary nature of 1<sup>13-18a</sup>. However, he considers that 'another possibility might be left open for further investigation: that 12b-18a is original, and that it refers to the pre-exilic generation, which is elsewhere characterised in CD (V,20f) as having been led astray by false prophets.'<sup>72</sup> I prefer to follow Murphy-O'Connor<sup>73</sup> in rejecting Stegemann's hypothesis, for on stylistic grounds the poetry clearly continues throughout this section, the two sections complementing rather than duplicating each other, our third stanza 1<sup>12-18</sup> dealing with God's action on 'the last generation', the fourth 1<sup>18-21</sup> on what 'the last generation' had done to deserve this punishment. Furthermore, two vocabulary points can be

---

<sup>71</sup>Stegemann, p132-145, 183-185.

<sup>72</sup>Davies, p70.

<sup>73</sup>'A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document XIX,33-XX,34', RB, 79 (1972), p563-4 including note 61.



produced as evidence that at least 1<sup>15a-18</sup> is original: firstly the root t'h occurs seven times in the poetry of this document but only once in prose in a biblical quotation,<sup>74</sup> and secondly the word 'wlm occurs only in the poetry of this document.<sup>75</sup> Murphy-O'Connor goes on to attribute the historical introduction, 1<sup>1</sup>-2<sup>1</sup>, to the author of 4<sup>19</sup> and 8<sup>13</sup>=19<sup>25</sup>, because of the common reference to the Man of Derision or Lie using the rare root 'ntp'. My attempt to separate the poetry from the prosaic sections means that I cannot concur with this view, nor do I really see the justification for omitting the final bicolon of this strophe as Soloff does solely on the grounds of the presence of this root.<sup>76</sup> The root 'ntp' was therefore used by two writers in this document to indicate 'false prophecy', the later redactor following the lead created by the poet. Consequently, both writers, in using the root 'ntp', refer to the same figure here, in 4<sup>19</sup> and in 8<sup>13</sup>=19<sup>25-26</sup>, and I would concur with Davies that the Man of Derision or Lie 'represents a misleader of *Israel*, not of a sectarian group'.<sup>77</sup>

Thus originally this strophe read:

*And he made known to the last generations,  
 what He had done with the last generation,  
 When there arose the Man of Derision,  
 who spouted to Israel waters of falsehood.*

It consists of two bicola, with a subsidiary clause making up the second colon in each case. There is no parallelism in the second bicolon except for that

---

<sup>74</sup>Poetry: 1<sup>15</sup>, 2<sup>13,17</sup>, 3<sup>1,4,14</sup>, 5<sup>20</sup>; in prose in the Ezekiel 44<sup>15</sup> quotation in 4<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>75</sup>In: 1<sup>15</sup>, 2<sup>7,10(x2)</sup>, 3<sup>4,13</sup>.

<sup>76</sup>Soloff, NTS, 5, p64.

<sup>77</sup>Davies, p70; see chapter 3.2.2, p393-398 on the identification of the Wicked Priest.

already noted between 'the Man of Lie' and 'the Teacher of Righteousness' in the preceding strophe; instead we have poetic narrative.

Turning to the second strophe, the first and third cola clearly parallel each other with their respective references to: *twhw l' drk* and *mntybwt šdq* - note the two segolate nouns. Therefore, we seem to have here a quatrain of a:b:a:b or a:b:a:c pattern, depending on how we reconstruct the final colon to which something appears to have been added. Alternatively, the first three lines could be taken as a tricolon of a:b:a pattern, and then the final colon could be combined with the following bicolon to produce a second tricolon as follows:

wlsy' gbwl 'šr gblw r'šnym bnħltm	5	12
lm'n <sup>17</sup> hdbq bhm 't 'lwt brytw	4/5	11
lhsgyrm lħrb nqmt nqm <sup>18</sup> bryt	4/5	9

*And to remove the boundary which the ancestors bound onto  
their inheritance,  
so that <sup>17</sup> He might make cleave onto them the curses of the  
covenant;  
to deliver them up to the sword which executes the  
vengeance of <sup>18</sup> a covenant.*

The conjunction in the second line of the first tricolon can in this case be translated 'so as'. Yet while this solution avoids the need to emend the offending colon, stylistically a quatrain seems more probable with an infinitive beginning all but its initial line, the latter two in particular being in parallel - *lāsôr* and *lassî'*. Thus we have a fairly long, concluding bicolon to this stanza, exhibiting simple parallelism between the two lines with *bryt* ending both, and this stands in deliberate contrast to the shorter than average bicolon which ends the following stanza in 1<sup>21</sup>.

Returning to the quatrain, the first problem lies in the subject of the verb *t'h* in the opening colon (1<sup>15</sup>); who caused whom to stray? Since Davies

regards 1<sup>13-18</sup> as secondary, he takes the subject to be 'the Man of Derision', but as Soloff points out 'yš hlšwn is in a subsidiary clause, so that on grammatical grounds 'El' must be the subject here.<sup>78</sup> Consequently, since God would not cause the faithful community to stray, the object must be 'the last generation' (= 'the congregation of traitors'). This colon occurs as a biblical phrase in Ps.107<sup>40</sup> and at Job 12<sup>24</sup>.

The final colon of this strophe is too long. Soloff therefore sees the following sections as additions:<sup>79</sup>

wlsy' gbwl <'šr gblw> r'snym <bnhltm>

*And to remove the boundary of the first ones,  
<which they set in their inheritance.>*

This yields good sense and gives a suitable metrical count; the 'boundary of the ancestors' would be the bound of the torah which 'the first ones', the patriarchs (as in 1<sup>3</sup>), had been given by God. My reconstruction, taking 'šr gblw r'snym b- as secondary, has the advantage of there only being one insertion. Furthermore, biblical support can be found for the phrase gbwl nhltn in Joshua 16<sup>5</sup>, 19<sup>10,41</sup> - (cf. also Ezk.47<sup>13</sup> where the phrase gbwl 'šr ttnhlw occurs). It means that the unfaithful Israelites, 'the last generation', have removed (violated) the bound of the torah (=11QT?), which was their guarantee of a sure future under God's care. The poet, in referring to the Mosaic (or sectarian) law here, parallels the allusion to the Mosaic law in the second line of the quatrain, and so creates a quatrain with a:b:a:b (or a:b:a:b') pattern. The glossator re-interprets (or clarifies) this 'bound' as the bound of

---

<sup>78</sup>Davies, p235; Soloff, NTS, 5, p65-66 (note on L.19).

<sup>79</sup>Soloff, NTS, 5.

the sectarian law (=11QT), which 'the first ones', namely, the founders of the sect had set up.<sup>80</sup> Rabin<sup>81</sup> points to Dt 19<sup>14</sup> as the origin of the whole line; it reads:

l' tsyg gbwl r'k 'šr gblw r'šnym bnḥltk...

However, as the pausal sign '^' occurs on the word r'šnym this line should be translated:

*You must not displace your neighbours bound(ary mark) set(=bound) by (your) ancestors, in your inheritance that you inherited, in the land which the Lord God gave to you for your possession.*

The stanza divisions were of course set by the Massoretes and so could be misplaced, and so the glossator may have had this text in mind.

There are a number of biblical phrases in the final bicolon: kkl 'lwt hbryt - Dt.29<sup>20</sup> ; wysgr lḥrb 'mw - Ps.78<sup>62</sup> ; whby'ty 'lykm ḥrb nqmt nqm-bryt - Lev.26<sup>25</sup> - note the metheg which implies that nqm-bryt, a construct formation, only had one stress. The subject of this bicolon has to be the same as that of the preceding quatrain and thus the same arguments apply. So while Davies takes the subject as 'the Man of Derision', it seems far more likely that God is the subject, especially in view of the biblical parallels to various phrases in this stanza where God is also the subject; 'them' therefore refers to 'the last generation' (= 'the congregation of traitors').

---

<sup>80</sup>As I have already noted at 1<sup>4</sup>, 'r'šnym' in the poetry of this document never has the meaning 'founders of the sect'.

<sup>81</sup>Rabin, p4.

The fourth stanza: 1<sup>18-21</sup>.

b'bw r 'šr		
dršw bhlqwt wybħrw bmhtlwt	2+2	5+8
wyšpw <sup>19</sup> lpršwt wybħrw bṭwb hšw'r	2+2	6+8
wyšdyqw rš' wyršy'w šdyq <sup>20</sup>	2+2	6+6
wy'byrw bryt wypyw ħwq	2+2	5+5
wygwdw 'l npš šdyq	3	8
wbkl hwky <sup>21</sup> tmym t'bh npšm	4	10
wyrdpwm lħrb	2	5
wysysw lryb 'm	3	6

*Because, they searched for smooth things and chose  
delusions,  
and they watched <sup>19</sup> for loopholes and chose the fair neck;  
And they justified (the) wicked and condemned (the) righteous,  
<sub>20</sub>  
and they transgressed the covenant and violated the precept;  
  
And they banded together against the life of the righteous,  
and their soul abhorred all who walked <sup>21</sup> perfectly;  
And they persecuted them with the sword,  
and they rejoiced at the people's strife.*

---

lpršwt: lip<sup>e</sup>rāšôṭ is from the segolate noun prš and is usually translated 'break', thus 'loophole', on the basis of the MT and Talmudic usage. Glück however, contends that this line parallels the preceding one, and so translates: *'And they saw violence coming, and they chose falsehood (as their line of policy);'*<sup>82</sup> yet he produces little evidence to support this claim other than the parallelism.

---

<sup>82</sup>Glück, 'The Verb prš in the Bible and in the Qumran Literature', RQ, 5 (1964-66), p127.

wypyrw: Hiphil imperfect from the root prx 'to violate, break, annul' -  
wayyāpêrû; or Hiphil imperfect from the root pwr, 'to break, violate' -  
wayyāpîrû - cf. Ezk. 17<sup>19</sup>.

wyrdpwm: although spelt *plene* in the imperfect in 1QM.9<sup>5</sup>, with the suffix it  
should probably be pointed wayyird<sup>e</sup>pûm; if a full vowel were retained  
however, this would give this colon six syllables so balancing the following  
colon.

wysysw: pointed wayyāsîsû, Hiphil imperfect from the root sys/sws. In 20<sup>33</sup>  
the form yśyśw occurs from the root śyś/śwś 'to exult, to be joyful'.<sup>83</sup> The  
substitution of a śin by a sāmek was quite common at this time<sup>84</sup> and as both  
occur in poetical texts it would seem that a later scribe using Ms A made this  
change.

---

The fourth and final stanza, concerning the sins of 'the last generation'  
(='the congregation of traitors'), is one of the best pieces of poetry of this  
opening poem. It consists of two strophes, the first comprising a pair of  
phrases per colon, the second of two bicola. Thus the form wybḥrw with 'b'  
appears in the second half of the initial two lines, the third line exhibits a:b b:a  
parallelism, and the final line is paralleled by the use of the word-pair bryt :  
ḥwq. Alliteration occurs at the beginning of the second line with ṣādê and pê,  
and in the beginning of the fourth line with bēt and rēš; plus, the first three

---

<sup>83</sup>The root is also found in: 1QM 13<sup>13</sup>, 1QH 10<sup>30</sup> with śin.

<sup>84</sup>Kutscher, The History of the Hebrew Language, p13f and Qimron, p28-29.

phrases end with the feminine plural ending -ôt. The third masculine plural form of the verb occurs throughout; the first two cola using Qal forms, the second two cola using Hiphil forms, which perhaps suggests we should take these lines as two bicola. The introductory phrase b'bw'r š'r lies, of course, outside of the metre.

All of the language used here is biblical; the first colon is taken from Isaiah.30<sup>10</sup>:

dbrw-lnw ḥlqwt ḥzw mhtlwt

*Speak to us smooth things; prophecy (to us) delusions.*

Elsewhere in the Scrolls the term bḥlqwt is associated with a specific opposition group, usually considered to be the Pharisees or their precursors.<sup>85</sup> The phrase ṭwb ḥšw'r for which it is difficult to find an English idiomatic equivalent, is found in Hosea 10<sup>11</sup>. The 'neck' represents 'subjugation', so that the term 'the fair neck' figuratively conveys 'freedom, strength', neither of which would be inappropriate in our context.<sup>86</sup> The closest biblical parallel to the third colon is Proverbs 17<sup>15,87</sup> yet more significant is the converse phrase in CD.4<sup>7</sup> which is the work of a later redactor. Finally the fourth line finds a loose parallel in Is.24<sup>5</sup>:

ky-'brw twrt ḥlpw ḥq  
hprwbryt 'wlm

---

<sup>85</sup>The term also occurs in 1QH.2<sup>15,32</sup>, 4<sup>10</sup>; 4Qpls<sup>C</sup>.frg23,2<sup>10</sup>; 4QpNah.1<sup>2,7</sup>, 2<sup>2,4</sup>, 3<sup>3,7</sup> – this document seems to deal specifically with Alexander Jannaeus and the Pharisees, which led to 800 of the latter being crucified at the end of the Civil War in 88B.C.; 4Q184.1<sup>17</sup>; 4Q185 frgs1-2, 2<sup>14</sup>; ?4Q186 frg2, 1<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>86</sup>Glück renders 'falsehood', partly because the throat was connected with speech and partly because of the parallelism with 'bmhtlwt' – see Glück, RQ, 5, p126.

<sup>87</sup>Compare too: Is.5<sup>23</sup>, Ps.82<sup>3</sup>, Job.40<sup>8</sup>.

*..for they have transgressed the laws,  
violated the statutes,  
broken the everlasting covenant.*

The second strophe consists of two bicola. However, the second line of the first bicolon appears to be too long, and maybe  $\text{npšm}$  should be deleted as a clarificatory gloss; we are then left with a chiasmic arrangement. The initial phrase of this colon has however many parallels in biblical and Qumran Hebrew which counts against the presence of a gloss.<sup>88</sup> Other biblical references in this section include the first line which is a direct quote from Ps.94<sup>21</sup> where a metheg does occur in the MT after 'l, designating only one stress here and so three for the line.<sup>89</sup> The 'righteous' here is meant to designate the sect, who by implication (as 'the root') are the only ones who could have been righteous. The reference to the  $\text{ryb 'm}$  in the final bicolon, in contrast to God's  $\text{ryb}$  in 1<sup>2</sup>, is a deliberate poetical device; it demonstrates among other things irony, the deeds 'the last generation' do, such as 'inciting a dispute of the people', are the very factors which led to God's 'dispute' with this 'generation'. The final bicolon is short, yet thus parallels the longer than average final bicolon of the previous stanza.

These last two stanzas could be applied to any time and any 'group' in the period of the final centuries of the millennium. However the poetry is couched in very general terms which suggests to me that a whole generation had, in the eyes of the sect, been led astray by a misleader of Israel, and this would

---

<sup>88</sup>See: Ps.101<sup>6</sup> plus also Ps.84<sup>12</sup>, Prv.2<sup>7</sup> 28<sup>18</sup>; CD 2<sup>15</sup>, 1QS2<sup>2</sup>, 1QSb.1<sup>2</sup>; Amos 5<sup>10</sup> is the only case where 't'b' and 'tmym' occur together.

<sup>89</sup>The reading here may count against the suggested emendation for Ps.94<sup>21</sup>, viz.: l. prb.  $\text{ygrw}$  with Targum.



square with the general sectarian outlook which saw all who were not for them as being against them.

Conclusion: 1<sup>21</sup>-2<sup>1</sup>.

wyhr 'p 'l b'dtm	3	8
lhšm 't kl hmwnm	3	6
wm'syhm lndh lpnyw	3	8

*So the wrath of El<sup>1</sup> was kindled against their congregation;  
to lay waste all their multitude,  
and their deeds to remove from before Him.*

Here we have a concluding tricolon of possibly a:b:b' structure. The phrase in the first line often occurs in concluding sections of this document,<sup>90</sup> and its past tense confirms the past sense adopted for 'śh in 1<sup>12</sup>. The only problem is in the final line with lndh which is usually taken as a noun l<sup>e</sup>niddâ 'uncleanness, impurity' from the root ndd:

*So as to lay waste to all their multitude,  
And their deeds were impure before Him.*

This destroys any parallelism there was with the preceding line and results in a detached sense for the final colon. Thus the noun should be translated with the sense 'for removal' > 'to remove'.

---

<sup>90</sup>See: 2 21, 3<sup>8-9</sup>, 19<sup>13,26,31</sup>, 20<sup>15,16</sup>, plus also 1QS2<sup>15</sup> and 1QM4<sup>1, 6<sup>3</sup></sup>. It is also a common biblical phrase whilst the final two lines can perhaps be compared with 1Kgs 20<sup>28</sup> and Ezk.36<sup>17</sup> respectively.

If we look back over 1<sup>11</sup>-2<sup>1</sup> a cycle, a chiasitic structure, can be observed:

- 1<sup>11</sup>-15 The Teacher makes known to the latter generation what  
God had done to 'the last generation' (= 'the  
congregation of traitors').
- 1<sup>15</sup>-16 El caused them to go astray.
- 1<sup>16</sup>-18 So that the curses of the covenant might cleave onto  
them.
- 1<sup>18</sup>-21 Because they have sinned in a multiplicity of ways, in  
particular in persecuting the righteous (=the sect).
- 1<sup>21</sup>-2<sup>1</sup> And thus the wrath of El was kindled against their  
congregation, to destroy both them and their works.

## The Hebrew of the Second Poem.

1+4	2+8	ועתה שמעו אלי כל באי ברית ואגלה אזנכם בדרכי (3) רשעים
4	8	
3	5	אל אהב דעת
4	9	חכמה ותושייה הציב לפניו (4)
4	8	ערמה ודעת הם ישרתוהו
4	9	ארך אפים עמו ורוב סליחות (5)
3	6/7	לכפר בעד שבי פשע
4	8	וכוח וגבורה וחמה גדולה
4	8	בלהבי אש (6) בידו כל מלאכי חבל
4	8	על סורי דרך ומתעבי חק
4	8	לאין שאירית (7) ופליטה למו
5	1+10	כי לא בחר אל בהם מקדם עולם
4	10	ובטרם נוסדו ידע (8) את מעשיהם
3	8	ויתעב את דורות מן הקדם
3	9<4>	ויסתר את פניו מן הארץ (9) <מי עד תומם>
3	7	וידע את שני מעמד
3	9	ומספר ופרוש קציהם
3	8	לכל (10) הוי עולמים ונהיית
5	11	עד מה יבוא בקציהם לכל שני עולם (11)
4	9	ובכולם הקים לו קריאי שם
3	8	למען התיר פליטה לארץ
3	9	ולמלא (12) פני תבל מזרעם
3	7	ויודיעם ביד <משיחו רוח קדשו ו<חוזי (13) אמת
3	7/8	ובפרוש שמו שמותיהם
3	6	ואת אשר שנה התעה

Translation of the Second Poem: 2<sup>2</sup>-13.

*And now, listen to me all who enter (the) covenant,  
And I will open your ears to the ways of<sup>3</sup> the wicked.*

*El loves knowledge;  
wisdom and counsel He has set before Him,<sup>4</sup>  
prudence and knowledge they serve Him.  
Long-sufferance (is) with Him and much forgiveness,<sup>5</sup>  
to atone for those who turn from sin.*

*But power, might, and great wrath,  
with flaming-fire<sup>6</sup> by the hand of all the angels of  
destruction,  
(come) upon 'the apostates of the way' and 'the abhorers of  
the precept';  
For no remnant<sup>7</sup> or survivor shall be left to them.*

*For El did not choose them from the beginning of the world,  
and before they were established He knew<sup>8</sup> their deeds.  
And He abhorred (their) generations from the beginning,  
And hid His face from the land,<sup>9</sup> <until their destruction.>*

*And He knows the years of (their) ascendancy,  
and the exact duration of their life-spans,  
For all<sup>10</sup> ages that are and will be,  
until He brings their lives to an end for all the years of  
eternity.<sup>11</sup>*

*But during all of them He raised up for Himself those called by  
name,  
that He might leave some survivors for the land,  
and fill<sup>12</sup> the face of the world from their seed.*

*And He has made them known through the hand of <those  
anointed by His holy spirit and> the seers of<sup>13</sup> truth,  
and in a list their names are set;  
but those whom He hates He led astray.*



## 1.2. The Second Poem: 2<sup>2-13</sup>.

The brevity of this poem coupled with the lack of any chronological or historical allusions, and the similarity of the first and third poems, has meant that scholars have commented only cursorily on it. Murphy-O'Connor devotes barely a page to this section, describing it as a 'Theological Introduction' addressed to the members of the community.<sup>1</sup> While the text may not have received the attention it deserves, this general view would seem to be correct, as is his assertion that the *Weltanschauung* (=philosophy of life) found here is very similar to that found in the Two Spirits passage, 1QS.3<sup>13-4</sup><sup>26</sup>. Davies also notes the 'similarities in vocabulary and theology (of this passage) with the dualistic catechism of 1QS.3<sup>14f</sup>', and gives his own list of parallels.<sup>2</sup> This marked connection between these two discourses justifies an examination of the Two Spirit passage along the lines given to the poems in this document, and this I have undertaken in an independent section appending this poem; significantly, though unsurprisingly in my view, the Two Spirits passage exhibits good poetry.

### Introduction: 2<sup>2-3</sup>. The Fate of the Wicked.

w'th šm'w 'ly kl b'y bryt	1+4	2+8
w'qlh 'znkm bdrky <sup>3</sup> rš'ym	4	8

*And now, listen to me all who enter (the) covenant,  
And I will open your ears to the ways of <sup>3</sup> the wicked.*

---

<sup>1</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, 'An Essene Missionary Document? CD.II,14-VI,1', RB, 77 (1970), p227-8.

<sup>2</sup>Davies, p72; list p72-73.

This introductory bicolon sets the scene for this short poetical piece by introducing 'those who enter the covenant', namely the new initiates of the sect, who must guard themselves against 'the ways of the wicked', where the wicked appear to be all those outside the sect. Such a hortatory introduction suggests that like the first and third poem, this one was also originally composed to be read aloud at sectarian gatherings, and in particular at the Annual Covenantal Festival when these new initiates would have been admitted.

As we have demonstrated above, w'th is a case of anacrusis from the point of view of the metre.<sup>3</sup> The parallelism is rough, being restricted to the verbs, and could be represented as - a:b,a':c. The phrase bđrky rš'ym has its closest biblical equivalent in Ps.1<sup>6</sup> which has the singular wđrk rš'ym; the plural is found however in CD.19<sup>21</sup>, though the parallel Ms.A passage has the singular.

The first stanza: 2<sup>3-7</sup>. God's Omnipotence.

'l 'hb d't	3	5
ħkmh wtwšyyh hšyb lpnyw <sup>4</sup>	4	9
'rmh wd't hm yšrtwhw	4	8
'rk 'pym 'mw wrwb slyħwt <sup>5</sup>	4	9
lkpr b'd šby pš'	3	6/7
wkwh wgbwrh whmh gdwlh	4	8
blhby 'š <sup>6</sup> by{d} kl ml'ky ħbl	4	8
'l sr̄ry drk wmt'by ħq	4	8
l'yn š'yryt <sup>7</sup> wplyth lmw	4	8

*El loves knowledge;  
wisdom and counsel He has set before Him;*<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>See note on 1<sup>1</sup>, p19-20.

*prudence and knowledge they serve Him.  
Long-sufferance (is) with Him and much forgiveness,<sup>5</sup>  
to atone for those who turn from sin.*

*But power, might, and great wrath,  
with flaming-fire<sup>6</sup> by the hand of all the angels of  
destruction,  
(come) upon 'the apostates of the way' and 'the abhorers of  
the precepts';  
For no remnant<sup>7</sup> or survivor shall be left to them.*

---

twšyyh: plene written noun, pointed tûšîyyâ;<sup>4</sup> the word occurs twice elsewhere in the scrolls spelt with just one yodh, 1QS 10<sup>24</sup>, 11<sup>6</sup>.

---

This, the first of three stanzas, can be subdivided into two strophes; the first of which deals with El's positive values and how they benefit 'those who turn from sin', the second with El's negative (destructive) values and how they will effect sinners. Thus we have a fair degree of dualism present here. The first strophe consists of either a tricolon + bicolon, or monocolon + tricolon + monocolon. The content favours the former division, so that there is a tricolon on God's values demonstrating his omnipotence, with the word d't beginning and ending these values in a chiastic arrangement, followed by a bicolon on forgiveness. On the other hand, the middle three lines are metrically almost exactly the same length, whereas the opening line in particular is much

---

<sup>4</sup>The Cairo Manuscript (T-S.10.K6) clearly has two yodhs; Schechter (p117) mistakenly transcribes twšwyh - see Fitzmyer, p20.

shorter. The second and third lines create the best parallel, with the noun forms ḥokmâ and 'ormâ, and the third person suffix referring to God. The second strophe consists of a single quatrain.<sup>5</sup> The initial wāw (=‘but’) is very strong, and the first colon exhibits good alliteration with the repetition of ḥ ḥ ḥ ḥ word endings, and thus good assonance with ‘â’ or ‘ô’. In the next two cola there are four construct-noun formations, appearing in pairs: b<sup>e</sup>lah<sup>a</sup>bê 'ēš / mal'<sup>a</sup>kê ḥabl and sor<sup>e</sup>rê dark / m<sup>e</sup>tā'<sup>a</sup>bê ḥoq. These each have three syllables, the middle two with segolate nouns, the other two with monosyllabic nouns and 'ayin-guttural roots. This leads to strong assonance between diametrically opposite construct formations, giving therefore the chiasmic pattern – a:b,b:a.

The word-pair d't and ḥkmh are often found in the MT., in particular in the book of Ecclesiastes – 1<sup>16</sup>, 2<sup>26</sup>, 7<sup>12</sup>, 9<sup>10</sup> – and also Is.33<sup>6</sup>. However, this does not mean the two should be taken together here because, as I have already indicated, ḥkmh is paralleled by 'rmh; in addition there is no wāw between the two words here, and perhaps thirdly because in Prv.12<sup>1</sup> we have the phrase 'ohēb da'at, that is, without ḥkmh. The phrase 'rk 'pym is common in the Old Testament, and in four cases occurs with wrb ḥsd.<sup>6</sup> In considering the phrase šby pš' we need to bear in mind 20<sup>17</sup> where the same phrase occurs with the word y'qb, making it clear that its biblical origin is Is.59<sup>20</sup>. The poet's correct use of biblical phrases, means that we can translate, ‘those who turn from sin’, taking šby as a plural construct participle of šwb with the same sense as the MT. The identical form šby in the phrase šby y'sr'l must however be given far

---

<sup>5</sup>Or, if one takes the preceding strophe as monocolon + tricolon + monocolon, then we have here a tricolon + monocolon; thus the overall pattern for the verse is M+T+M+T+M.

<sup>6</sup>Ps.86<sup>15</sup>, 103<sup>8</sup>; Joel.2<sup>13</sup>; Jonah 4<sup>2</sup>; cf. 1QS.4<sup>3-5</sup>.



greater attention, not least because it is the product of the midrashic author who was liable to re-interpret any biblical phrase.<sup>7</sup>

The main problem with the second strophe is the form by in the third colon, which makes no sense as it stands.<sup>8</sup> There are three possibilities:

- Emend to bw, 'with it (=the fire)'.<sup>9</sup>
- Emend to wbk1 (or even bkw1) to give *with flaming-fire and with all the angels of destruction*
- Take by as an abbreviation or mistake for byd; the resultant phrase is then found in 1QS.4<sup>12,10</sup>

A number of biblical parallels can be found in this strophe: the word-pair kwh wgbwrh in 2Chr.20<sup>6</sup>, the construct formation lhby 'š in Is.66<sup>15</sup>, and most notably the final colon which is a direct quote from Ezra 9<sup>14</sup> less the particle lmw. The 'angels of destruction' are not found in the Old Testament, though there are a couple of equivalents: 'the angels of wickedness' in Ps.78<sup>49</sup>, and 'the angels of Mot (=death)' in Prv.16<sup>14</sup>. However, they do occur in Enoch 56<sup>1</sup>, *et al*, and in the scrolls themselves in 1QS.4<sup>12</sup> and 1QM.13<sup>12</sup>.

One notable factor about this stanza is the number of words which are

---

<sup>7</sup>The phrase 'šby pš' is also found in: 1QS.10<sup>20</sup>; 1QH.2<sup>9</sup>, 6<sup>6</sup>, 14<sup>24</sup>.

<sup>8</sup>T-S 10 K6 clearly reads a yodh here and not a waw as Schechter (p117) transcribes it. Rabin notes that there is a dot above and below the yodh, a sign usually of an error. Charles (p803) takes the phrase as a gloss, presumably because of this corruption - (cf. 'my' in 2<sup>9</sup>.)

<sup>9</sup>Davis, p237.

<sup>10</sup>Rabin, p6; Vermes, p83; Fitzmyer, p20; Knibb, p25.

*hapax legomena* in this document. Yet more significant still, is that many of these words appear in 1QS, in particular in the Two Spirits passage (=2Sp) and the Master's Hymn (=MH), the two poetical sections of 1QS. Thus, the following are *hapax legomena* in CD, with the number of times the word or phrase appears in 1QS also given:<sup>11</sup> d't - twice here and CD.10<sup>10</sup>, 17x 1QS of which 3x 2Sp and 6x MH; ḥkmh - 4x 1QS all in 2Sp; twšyyh - only here and twice in MH in the Scrolls (with one yodh); the root nšb; 'rmh - 4x 1QS, 2x 2Sp and 2x MH; the root šrt; the phrase 'rk 'pym - only here and in 1QS.4<sup>3</sup> (=2Sp) in the scrolls; rwb - 13x 1QS, 8x 2Sp and 1x MH; slyḥh - 1x 1QS; kwḥ - here and 13<sup>11</sup> in CD, 4x in 1QS, 1x MH; gbwrh - here and 13<sup>8,11</sup> in CD, 7x 1QS, 1x 2Sp and 5x MH; ḥmh - here and 8<sup>9</sup>=19<sup>22</sup> in CD, 1x 1QS; gdwlh - 4x 1QS; the root lhb; the phrase ml'ky ḥbl - here, 1QS.4<sup>12</sup> and 1QM.13<sup>12</sup> in the scrolls; the phrase srry drk - here and 1QS.10<sup>21</sup> in the scrolls; the root t'b - twice elsewhere in CD, 3x 1QS all in 2Sp; the colon l'yn š(y)ryt wplyḥh lmw also appears in 1QS.4<sup>14</sup>. In all there are ten true *hapax legomena* in this stanza, around 26% of the vocabulary and this strong connection with 1QS, in particular the two poetical sections, suggests a common school of authorship.<sup>12</sup>

The second stanza: 2<sup>7-10</sup>. The Predestined Fate of the Wicked.

ky l' bḥr 'l bhm mqdm 'wlm	5	1+10
wbṭrm nwsdw yd' <sup>8</sup> 't m'šyhm	4	10
wyt'b 't dwrwt m{q}dm	3	8
wystr 't pnyw mn h'rš <sup>9</sup> <my 'd twmm>	3	9<4>

<sup>11</sup>N.B.: unless otherwise indicated the word given also occurs outside 1QS.

<sup>12</sup>These linguistic parallels with 1QS, both here and elsewhere in this document (e.g. 5<sup>11-63</sup>, 6<sup>11-74</sup>, 20<sup>1-8,22-27</sup>) would seem to be further evidence against giving this document a pre-Qumranic date.

wyd' 't šny m'md	3	7
wmspr wprwš qšyhm	3	9
lkl <sup>10</sup> hwy 'wlmym wnhyyt	3	8
'd mh ybw' bqšyhm lkl šny 'wlm	5	11

*For El did not choose them from the beginning of the world,  
and before they were established He knew<sup>8</sup> their deeds.  
And He abhorred (their) generations from the beginning,  
And hid His face from the land<sup>9</sup> <until their destruction.>*

*And He knows the years of (their) ascendancy,  
and the exact duration of their life-spans,  
For all<sup>10</sup> ages that are and will be,  
until He brings their lives to an end for all the years of  
eternity.<sup>11</sup>*

---

prwš:<sup>13</sup> the biblical equivalent to this form is p<sup>e</sup>rāšâ, Esther 4<sup>7</sup> and 10<sup>2</sup>, which has the meaning 'exact statement', from the root prš 'to declare distinctly' (e.g. Lev.24<sup>12</sup>.) A literal translation here (2<sup>10</sup>) would be, *The number and exact list of their life-spans*; hence 'exact duration'; in 2<sup>13</sup> the sense is simply '(exact) list'.

qšyhm: not qšytm as Schechter<sup>14</sup>; if the singular has the sense 'period' at Qumran (rather than 'end-time'), then the plural in the context of mankind apparently means '(the length of one's) life-time'.

---

<sup>13</sup>See also: CD 2<sup>13</sup>, 4<sup>4,6,8</sup> 6<sup>14,18,20</sup>, 13<sup>6</sup>, 14<sup>17,18</sup>, 16<sup>2</sup> and 1QM 4<sup>6,7,8,11,12</sup>.

<sup>14</sup>Schecher, p64.

This stanza consists of two bicola and a quatrain, perhaps representing two strophes. The first bicolon exhibits chiasmic parallelism, a:b,b':a' with the ky lying outside the metre, while the second has straight parallelism with roots in Qal. and Hi. respectively. The stanza is concerned solely with 'the wicked' who are damned from the beginning of the world, so introducing the theme of predestination which is also found strongly in the Two Spirits passage of 1QS. Consequently the language is almost totally sectarian in style so that there are virtually no biblical parallels of any line or even any phrase within this stanza.

There are a number of minor points worth noting in the first bicolon. Firstly the use of the root bḥr often associated with those specifically elected by God, but here conversely emphasizing that God had not chosen the wicked. The root ysd, here in the Niphal<sup>15</sup>, can mean both 'to be founded, established' or 'to sit together for consultation, to plot'; however the parallels with 1QS.3<sup>15</sup>, 1Enoch 9<sup>11</sup>, and Ps Sol.14<sup>8</sup> count against the latter rendering.<sup>16</sup> The root yd' 'to know' is often associated with predestination language in the sense of 'special knowledge', viz. 'gnosis' from γινωμαι. Both in the first and seventh line of this stanza 'wlm has the meaning 'world' or 'age', whereas it has its other meaning of 'everlasting' in the final line of the stanza and elsewhere in the poetry of CD - 1<sup>15</sup>, 3<sup>4,13</sup>. The former sense emphasizes that the battle against 'the wicked' is being fought on a cosmic scale.

There are two problems in the second bicolon. Firstly the phrase dwrwt mḏm which as it stands reads 'the generations from (their) blood', and yields

---

<sup>15</sup>Only Niphal here in the scrolls; six times elsewhere in the Qal.

<sup>16</sup>So Rabin, p7.

quite an intelligible sense.<sup>17</sup> Vermes renders *And He hated their generations* probably reading mhm for mđm, whilst Rabin emends to 'mđm 'when they arose'.<sup>18</sup> However the most popular emendation is to đwrwtm mqđm which was suggested by Schechter and adopted by Charles and Davies – mqđm would then parallel its use in the initial line of this stanza.<sup>19</sup> The lack of a suffix on đwrwt is a poetical feature and should not be explained by the suffix on twmm doing double-duty since the latter is probably secondary.

This neatly brings us on to our second problem, the phrase my 'đ twmm, where twmm is an infinitive construct with suffix – tđmmām. This phrase occurs in the scrolls without the suffix in 1QS.10<sup>21,23</sup>, 1QM.1<sup>8,12</sup> and CD 20<sup>14</sup>. Yet first one needs to explain my: Schechter takes it as a remnant of lhšmyđm<sup>20</sup>; Charles considers 'rš my to be a corruption of 'ršm,<sup>21</sup> but this form is not found in the scrolls, surely because the land was viewed as God's and not the people's; Hvidberg takes it as a remnant of my'mđm, 'from their arising (until their destruction)';<sup>22</sup> Ginzberg reads mw'd, 'at the time that was appointed for their destruction';<sup>23</sup> Rabin, Lohse and Knibb suggest that we have an abbreviation for my'sr 'l which would then read as a gloss on h'rš;<sup>24</sup> Vermes and Davies simply

---

<sup>17</sup>Schechter, p64; Ginzberg, p9 (though emending 'mđm' to 'đmym' in line with Ps.5<sup>7</sup>); Knibb, p25 and p27.

<sup>18</sup>Vermes, p84; Rabin, p6-7.

<sup>19</sup>Schechter, p64; Charles, p803; Davies, p237 – although he keeps 'đwrwt'.

<sup>20</sup>Schechter, p64.

<sup>21</sup>Charles, p803.

<sup>22</sup>As cited by Rabin, p7.

<sup>23</sup>Ginzberg, p9.

<sup>24</sup>Rabin, p7; Lohse, p68; Knibb, p25.

omit my as an error, a position I feel compelled to follow;<sup>25</sup> finally Callaway argues that my 'd twmm preserves the abbreviated gloss, mywm h'sp ywrh hyhyd 'd tm kl 'nšy hmlh̄mh found in 20<sup>14</sup>.<sup>26</sup> It is clear that there is really no general agreement, and whilst it does not solve the problem of the form my, I would question whether this whole phrase is not a corrupt addition to the text. As it stands, although this colon may seem to counterbalance the final long colon in this stanza (2<sup>10</sup>), the metre within this bicolon is unbalanced: having a syllable count of 8:13. However, if we remove the phrase it balances perfectly:

wyt'b 't dwrwt m{q}dm	3	8
wystr 't pnyw mn h'rš	3	9

Each cola now consists of: verb in *mpf.* + accusative particle + x + min/mi- + segolate noun. The extra phrase, which reads as a gloss, reassures the righteous that God's presence would only be hidden from the land for as long as the wicked existed; He had not totally abandoned them. This theological concept is one that arose at the time of the exile, and now survives because of the belief that the exile was still an ongoing event.<sup>27</sup>

The quatrain has further sectarian language displaying a predestination theme, for again we have the use of yd'. The phrase šny m'md probably refers to the years of their standing within the sect. The third line contains two difficulties in the parsing of the two forms from the root hyh. Similar phrases are found elsewhere: CD.13<sup>8</sup> - wyspr lpnyhm nhywt 'wlm; 1QS.3<sup>15</sup> - ..kwl hwwh wnhyh..; 1QS.11<sup>3-4</sup> - brz nhyh whww' 'wlm; 1QM.17<sup>5</sup> - kwl hwwh wnhyh ..

---

<sup>25</sup>Vermes, p84; Davies, p237 where he writes 'the translation ignores the problematic 'my' of the Hebrew'

<sup>26</sup>Callaway, 'MΓ 'ad tōmām: an abbreviated gloss?', RQ, 12 (1985-87), p263-8.

<sup>27</sup>See Knibb, JSOT, 25, p99-117.

bkwl nhyy 'wlmym. From this evidence, the form hwy should be kept (cf. esp. CD 13<sup>8</sup>) as a Qal participle construct before 'wlmym - howê;<sup>28</sup> nhyyt then needs to be pointed as a Niphil feminine plural participle, nihyô<sub>t</sub> so emending the second yodh to a waw.<sup>29</sup>

The third stanza: 2<sup>11-13</sup>. The chosen remnant.

wbkwlm hqym lw gry'y šm	4	9
lm'n htyr plyth l'rš	3	8
wlml' <sup>12</sup> pny tbl mzz'm	3	9
wywdy'm byd <mšyhw rwh qdšw w>hwzy <sup>13</sup> 'mt	3	7
wbprwš šmw šmwtyhm	3	7/8
w't 'šr šn' ht'h	3	6

*But during all of them He raised up for Himself those called by name,  
that He might leave some survivors for the land,  
and fill <sup>12</sup> the face of the world from their seed.*

*And He has made them known through the hand of <those anointed by His holy spirit and> the seers of <sup>13</sup> truth,  
and in a list their names are set;  
but those whom He hates He led astray.*

---

htyr: an infinitive construct, hattîr, from the root ntr, paralleling the infinitive construct lml' in the following line.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup>So Lohse, p68 and seemingly Kuhn, p55.

<sup>29</sup>T-S 10 K6 has two yodh's despite Fitzmyer's correction to the contrary on the basis of CD 13<sup>8</sup> - p20.

<sup>30</sup>So Thorion-Vardi, 'The Use of the Tenses in the Zadokite Documents', RQ, 12 (1985-87), p79.

plyṭh: singular noun with plural sense.

prwš: cf.2<sup>9</sup>.

---

This final stanza consists of two tricola. The first is well-balanced of the form a:b:b', with the second two lines paralleling each other to create the pattern - x:y:z,x':z':y' - where: x = an infinitive, y = a noun representing the remnant, z = a noun representing the land. It is unclear if the words lw and lm'n merit their own stress; a stress count of 3 in the third colon probably suggests they do not. The suffix on 'wbkwlm refers back to 'the ages of the world' in the previous stanza; note that kwl is spelt *plene* in this compound form. The phrase qry'y šm is biblical, occurring as qr'y šmw in Ps.99<sup>6</sup>; there the participle is active qor<sup>e</sup>'ê, here it is passive q<sup>e</sup>rî'ê. The phrase is also found in CD.4<sup>4</sup> where it refers to those who later came to join the sect which would seem to be the sense here as this discourse is addressed to new initiates - 2<sup>2</sup>.

The second 'tricolon' (as it was originally) contains the more difficult issues. The first problem lies with the phrase byd mšyḥw rwḥ qdšw wḥwzy 'mt. We must begin with the facts, the first of which is that CD.6<sup>1</sup> contains a similar phrase, bmšyḥ. hqwdš. What is important to us though, is not the identity of the missing letter, but that this phrase is secondary to its context:<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup>The Cairo manuscript has a small hole at this point, so that it is unclear whether it is a reference to 'His Messiah', or to 'the anointed ones of holiness' (=the prophets). Furthermore, Baillet's transliteration 'bmsy[h]y' in 6QD.fragment 3 is not as strong as it first seems since there is also a hole here (obscuring the ḥet), to the extent that he writes "On pourrait aussi lire avec CD 'mšyḥw.'" - 'Fragments du Document de Damas. Qumrân, grotte 6', RB, 63 (1956), p517-8 note 4, cf.DJD, III, p130.



*For, they spoke falsehood against the commandment of El  
given by the hand of Moses <and also by His holy  
Messiah>,<sup>32</sup>  
And they prophesied lies to cause Israel to turn away from  
following El.*

The second fact to note is that the Cairo manuscript (T-S 10 K6) does read ḥwzy and not hw'.<sup>33</sup> Thus, returning to our current text the reference to the Messiah mšyḥw is secondary, and to create a balanced cola either rwḥ qdšw or whwzy 'mt must also be secondary. Thus the following two translations are possible which give metre of 3,8 and 3,7 respectively:

*And He made them known through the hand of the seers of  
truth.*

*And He made known to them His holy spirit.*

'The seers of truth' is a unique phrase and therefore likely to be original, plus this would require only one omission. While the gloss may have been mšyḥw rwḥ qdšw, it is likely that Davies' translation, 'those anointed by His holy spirit', is correct;<sup>34</sup> this would be a secondary gloss referring to the prophets clarifying the more difficult phrase 'the seers of truth'. Thus there are three stages here; an original poetical text, the secondary Qumranic gloss, and the final corruption of mšyḥy to mšyḥw, (post-Qumran under Christian influence?) to yield a Messianic reference.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup>Or, 'and also by the holy anointed ones'.

<sup>33</sup>The second letter is a ḥet as the vertical extends above the horizontal (Davies transcribes a hē - p236), the waw is clear, the bottom and very top part of the zayin, and the bottom third of a further letter (=a yodh) is visible; so too Fitzmyer, p20.

<sup>34</sup>Davies, p237 - he does not suggest emending to 'mšyḥy' which seems necessary for the translation; perhaps then he is reading 'mšyḥw' as 'mšyḥyw', cf.7<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>35</sup>At this final stage the waw was inserted between the two phrases 'mšyḥw rwḥ qdšw whwzy 'mt' to show that they were now not referring to the same entity.

The second problem in this tricolon is the form šmw. Various suggestions have been proposed following two basic lines of thought. It could be read as šēmô, 'his name', and thus Charles translates:

*And he is true and in the true interpretation of his name  
are their names.*

He suggests that the name of the Messiah hinted at may be hšdyq, 'the Righteous One', (as in 1Enoch 38<sup>2</sup>, 53<sup>6</sup>, cf.4QPBless.) and that they are hšdyqym, (as in 1Enoch 38<sup>3</sup>, 47<sup>1f.</sup>).<sup>36</sup> The alternative, and more likely view, is that this form comes from the root šym. If this is the case we can keep the text and read šāmû, a Qal 3rd plural masculine used indefinitely, or alternatively we can emend the text from šmw to šm, corrupted by dittography under the influence of the following šmwtyhm, and read 'He has set their names'.<sup>37</sup>

Thus having dealt with these problems, this final tricolon can be seen to exhibit two forms of parallelism. Firstly, loose proper-congruent parallelism between the first and second cola, both of which deal with 'those called by name'; secondly, antithetic parallelism between the second and third cola, where 'those called by name' are contrasted with 'those whom He hates' in dualistic style.

---

The theological nature of this second poem, sets it slightly apart from the

---

<sup>36</sup>Charles, p803; see also: Ginzberg, p10 who notes that 'šām šēm', 'to make a name for himself', occurs, as in Berakhoth 7b; Teicher, 'Puzzling Passages in the Damascus Document', JJS, 5 (1954), p139-143.

<sup>37</sup>Rabin, p8; Vermes, p84; Schechter omits the whole of š/šmw on grounds of dittography - p65.

historical nature of the other poems found in this document, and consequently this poem shares a number of common concepts with the Two Spirits passage to which we will now turn.

The Hebrew of the Two Spirits Passage.

(13) למשכיל להבין וללמד את כול בני אור בתולדות כול בני איש (14)  
 לכול מיני רוחותם באותותם למעשיהם בדורותם ולפקודת נגיעיהם עם  
 (15) קצי שלומם

4	10	מאל הדעות כול הווה ונהייה
4	10	ולפני היותם הכין כול מחשבתם (16)
4	12	ובהיותם לתעודותם כמחשבת כבודו
4	8	ימלאו פעולתם ואין להשנות
4	9	בידו (17) משפטי כול
4	8	והואה יכלכלם בכול חפציהם
4	9	והואה ברא אנוש לממשלת (18) תבל
4	7	וישם לו שתי רוחות
4	10	להתהלך במ עד מועד פקודתו
4	9	הנה רוחות (19) האמת והעול
4	7	במעון אור תולדות האמת
4	9	וממקור חושך תולדות העול (20)
3	4	ביד שר אורים
3	5	ממשלת כול בני צדק
3	5	בדרכי אור יתהלכו
3	5	וביד מלאך (21) חושך
3	6	כול ממשלת בני עול
3	7	ובדרכי חושך יתהלכו
5	9	ובמלאך חושך תעות (22) כול בני צדק
5	16	וכול חטאתם ועוונותם ואשמתם ופשעי מעשיהם
5	10	בממשלתו (23) לפי רזי אל עד קצו
5	16	וכול נגיעיהם ומועדי צרותם בממשלת משטמתו (24)
5	10	וכול רוחי גורלו להכשיל בני אור
4	9	ואל ישראל <ומלאך אמתו> עזר לכול (25) בני אור
4	9	והואה ברא רוחות אור וחושך
3	8	ועליהון יסד כול מעשה (26)
3	7	[ועל דרכי]הן כול עבודה
		<ועל דרכיהן [כול עבוד]ה>
5	10	אחת אהב אל לכול (1) עדי עולמים
4	10	ובכול עלילותיה ירצה לעד
3	6	אחת תעב סודה
4	9	וכול דרכיה שנא לנצח

5	12	(2) ואלה דרכיהן בתבל להאיר בלבב איש
5	10	ולישר לפניו כול דרכי צדק אמת
4	8	ולפחד לבבו במשפטי (3) אל
4	7	ורוח ענוה ואורך אפים
4	7	ורוב רחמים וטוב עולמים
4	8	ושכל ובינה וחכמת גבורה
3	6	מאמנת בכול (4) מעשי אל
3	5	ונשענת ברוב חסדו
4	8	ורוח דעת בכול מחשבת מעשה
3	5	וקנאת משפטי צדק
4	7	ומחשבת (5) קודש ביצר סמוך
4	7	ורוב חסדים על כול בני אמת
5	12	וטהרת כבוד מתעב כול גלולי נדה
4	6	והצנע לכת (6) בערמת כול
4	8	וחבא לאמת רזי דעת
5	10	אלה סודי רוח לבני אמת תבל
4	7	ופקודת כול הולכי בה
5	8	למרפא (7) ורוב שלום באורך ימים
5	9	ופרות זרע עם כול ברכות עד
4	9	ושמחת עולמים בחיי נצח
6	13	וכליל כבוד (8) עם מדת הדר באור עולמים
4	6	(9) ולרוח עולה רחוב נפש
4	8/9	ושפול ידים בעבודת צדק
4	7	רשע ושקר גוה ורום
3	7	לבב כחש ורמיה
3	6	אכזרי ורוב חנף
6	4+3+4	קצור אפים ורוב אולת וקנאת זדון
4	7	מעשי תועבה ברוח זנות
4	9	ודרכי נדה בעבודת טמאה (11)
6	5+4+4	ולשון גדופים עורון עינים וכבוד אוזן
4	4+3	קושי עורף וכיבוד לב
5	9	ללכת בכול דרכי חושך וערמת רוע

4	7	ופקודת (12) כול הולכי בה
5	8	לרוב נגיעים ביד כול מלאכי חבל
5	11	לשחת עולמים באף עבדת אל נקמת
4	7	לזעות נצח וחרפת עד (13)
4	9	עם כלמת כלה באש מחשכים

3	7	וכוכ קציהם לדורותם
5	10	באבל יגוו ורעת מרורים בהוות חושך
5	12	עד (14) כלותם לאין שרית ופליטה למו

(15) באלה תולדות כול בני איש ובמפלגיהן ינחלו כול צבאותם לדורותם  
ובדרכיהן יתהלכו וכול פעולת (16) מעשיהם במפלגיהן לפי נחלת איש  
בין רוב למועט לכול קצי עולמים

5	10	כיא אל שמו בד בבד עד קץ (17) אחרון
5	12	ויתן איבת עולם בין מפלגותם
4	7	תעובת אמת עלילות עולה
4	8	ותעובת עולה כול דרכי אמת
4	8	וקנאת (18) ריב על כול משפטיהן
4	8	כיא לוא יחד יתהלכו

ואל

4	9	ברזי שכלו ובחכמת כבודו
5	8	נתן קץ להיות עולה
4	11	ובמועד (19) פקודה ישמידנה לעד
4	9	ואז תצא לנצח אמת תבל
4	8	כיא התגוללה בדרכי רשע
5	12	בממשלת עולה עד (20) מועד משפט נחרצה

5	11	ואז יברר אל באמתו כול מעשי גבר
4	6	וזקק לו מבני איש
5	11	להתם כול רוח עולה מתכמו (21) בשרו
5	11	ולטהרו ברוח קודש מכול עלילות רשעה
4	6	יז עליו רוח אמת
4	10	כמי נדה מכול תועבות שקר
3	6	והתגולל (22) ברוח נדה
4	8	להבין ישרים בדעת עליו
5	10/11	וחכמת בני שמים להשכיל תמימי דרך

5	10	כִּי אִם בָּחַר אֶל לְבַרְיִת עוֹלָמִים (23)
3	6	וְלֹהֵם כּוֹל כְּבוֹד אָדָם
3	5	וְאִין עוֹלָה יִהְיֶה
3	6	לְבוֹשֶׁת כּוֹל מַעֲשֵׂי רַמְיָה
5	11	עַד הִנֵּה יִרְיָבוּ רוּחֵי אִמֶּת וְעוֹל
5	10	בְּלִבָּב גִּבֹּר (24) יִתְהַלְכוּ בַחֲכָמָה וְאוֹלֶת
4	7	וְכַפֵּי נַחֲלַת אִישׁ בְּאִמֶּת
4	8	יִצְדַּק [בו] וְכִי יִשְׁנֵא עוֹלָה
3	8	וְכִירְשָׁתוּ בְּגוֹרֵל עוֹל
4	7	יִרְשַׁע בּוּ וְכִי (25) יִתְעַב אִמֶּת
4	7	כִּי אִם בַּד בְּבַד שְׁמוֹ אֶל
4	9	עַד קֶץ נַחֲרָצָה וְעִשׂוֹת חֲדָשָׁה
6	14/15	וְהוֹאָה יָדַע פְּעוּלַת מַעֲשִׂיהֶן לְכוֹל קְצֵי (26) [עוֹלָם]
6	13	וַיִּנְחִילוּן לְבַנֵּי אִישׁ לְדַעַת טוֹב [וְרִשְׁעָה]
4	7	לְהַפְּיֵל גּוֹרְלוֹת לְכוֹל חַי
5	10	לְפִי רוּחוֹ ב[מו] ... עַד מוֹעֵד] פְּקוּדָה

Translation of the Two Spirits Passage.

<sup>13</sup> *(It is) for the Master to instruct and to teach all the sons of light: concerning the origin of all men <sup>14</sup> in accordance with the various kinds of their spirits, regarding the signs (given) by their actions during their time on earth, and regarding the chastisements visited upon them along with <sup>15</sup> the periods of their reward.*

*From the God of knowledge (comes) everything that is and will be,  
And before their existence He had established all their purposes <sup>16</sup>;  
And upon their existence at their attested times in accordance with His glorious purpose  
They will fulfil their assignments without deviation.  
In His hand (are) <sup>17</sup> the judgments of everything (that is and will be),  
And He it is who sustains them in all their needs,  
And He it is who created mankind to govern <sup>18</sup> the earth.*

*And He assigned to (mankind) two spirits,  
in which to walk until the time of His visitation;  
They (are) the spirits of <sup>19</sup> truth and iniquity:  
in a spring <sup>37b</sup> of light is the origin of truth,  
but from a well of darkness is the origin of iniquity. <sup>20</sup>*

*In the hand of the Prince of Lights  
is the governance of all the sons of righteousness;  
in the ways of light shall they walk.  
And in the hand of the Angel of <sup>21</sup> Darkness,  
is the governance of all the sons of iniquity, <sup>38</sup>  
and in the ways of iniquity shall they walk. <sup>39</sup>*

*And by the Angel of Darkness <sup>22</sup> all the sons of righteousness  
are led astray,  
And all their sins, iniquities, guiltiness and acts of  
transgression,  
are by his governance in <sup>23</sup> accordance with the mysteries of*

---

<sup>38</sup> Repositioning 'kol' after 'governance' in according with the parallel three lines above.

<sup>39</sup> The conjunction at the beginning of this colon may be secondary, or it is missing in its parallel colon?

<sup>37b</sup> IQS has 'm'wn' (lurking-place, dwelling); emend to 'm'yn', spring.



*God, until his end.  
And all their chastisements and the times of their sufferings,  
are by the governance of his malignity;<sup>24</sup>  
And all his allotted spirits are to cause the sons of light to  
stumble.*

*But the God of Israel <and His Angel of Truth> helps all<sup>25</sup> the  
sons of light.  
For He it is who created the spirits of light and darkness,  
And upon them established every deed,<sup>26</sup>  
[And upon] their [ways] every action<sup>40</sup>.  
The one, God loves for all<sup>1</sup> the ages of eternity,  
and over all its doings He delights forever<sup>41</sup>;  
The other, He abhors its company,  
and all its ways He hates forever.*

---

<sup>2</sup> *And these are their ways in the world: to illumine the heart  
of man,*

*To make straight before him all the ways of true  
righteousness,  
And to put fear in his heart through the judgments<sup>3</sup> of God.*

*A spirit of humility and long-suffering  
And of great mercy and unending goodness,  
And of understanding, discernment, and mighty wisdom  
which trusts in all<sup>4</sup> the works of God,  
and which leans on His abundant steadfast-love.*

*And a spirit of knowledge in every purpose of work,  
And of zeal (for) the judgments of righteousness,  
And of<sup>5</sup> a holy purpose with an 'uplifted imagination',  
And of great mercy towards all the sons of truth,  
And of glorious purity which abhors all the idols of  
uncleanness.*

*And to act humbly (by) walking<sup>6</sup> with prudence (in) all things,  
And to conceal faithfully the mysteries of knowledge.*

*These are the counsels of the spirit to the sons of truth of the*

---

<sup>40</sup>Dittography occurs here.

<sup>41</sup>The root 'rsh' takes 'b' unlike the root 'sn' in the final line of this section; viz. nothing has been accidentally omitted here.

*world.*

*And the visitation (upon) all who walk therein is:  
for healing<sup>7</sup> and much peace in a long life,  
and an abundance of offspring with every eternal blessing,  
and unending joy in a life without-end,  
and a glorious crown<sup>8</sup> with a majestic garment in unending  
light.*

<sup>9</sup> *But to the spirit of falsehood (belongs) wideness of appetite,  
And slackness of hands in the service of righteousness;  
Wickedness and lies, haughtiness and pride,  
A lying heart and deceitfulness;<sup>10</sup>  
Cruelty and much blasphemy  
Short-temper and much folly and brazen insolence;  
Works of abomination in a spirit of lust,  
And ways of impurity in the service of uncleanness;<sup>11</sup>  
And a reproachful tongue, blindness of eye and heaviness of  
ear,  
stiffness of neck and heaviness of heart;  
To walk in all the ways of darkness and wicked deceit.*

*And the visitation<sup>12</sup> (upon) all who walk therein is:  
for much chastisement at the hand of all the Angels of  
Destruction,  
for unending damnation by the furious wrath of the God of  
vengeance,  
for everlasting terror and continual reproach,<sup>13</sup>  
with shameful destruction in the fire of the Dark Regions.*

*And all of their time on earth for their generations  
(shall be spent) in sorrowful mourning and bitter misery in  
the calamities of darkness,  
until<sup>14</sup> they are destroyed without remnant or survivor (left)  
to them.*

---

<sup>15</sup> *Through these (two spirits) (comes) the origin of all  
men, and in their divisions all their hosts have a portion during  
their lifetime, and in their ways they will walk. And all the  
rewards<sup>16</sup> of their deeds, in their divisions (shall depend on*

*whether<sup>42</sup>) each man's portion is great or small for all the ages of eternity.*

*For God has established them in equal measure until the<sup>17</sup> Last Age,  
And has set everlasting hatred between their divisions:  
truth abhors the works of falsehood,  
and falsehood abhors all the ways of truth.  
And the zeal<sup>18</sup> of strife is over all their judgments,  
for they do not walk together.*

*And God  
- in His mysterious understanding and in His glorious wisdom -  
has given a time-limit for the existence of falsehood,  
And at the appointed time<sup>19</sup> of the visitation He will destroy it forever.  
And then truth will go out forever (into) the world;  
for it had been rolling about in the ways of wickedness,  
during the governance of falsehood until<sup>20</sup> the appointed time of judgment.*

*And then God will purify with His truth every deed of man,  
And will refine for Himself from the sons of man;  
To remove completely the spirit of falsehood from the bounds<sup>21</sup> of his flesh,  
And to cleanse him with a spirit of holiness from all the works of wickedness;  
And He will shed upon him a spirit of truth,  
like the 'waters that purify' from every abominable lie;  
And he shall be rolled around in a<sup>22</sup> spirit of purification -  
to instruct the upright in the knowledge of the Most High,  
and the wisdom of the angels to teach to the perfect of the way.  
For God chose them for an everlasting covenant,<sup>23</sup>  
and for them (shall be) all the glory of Adam;  
And there shall be no more falsehood,  
all the works of deceit (shall) be shamed.*

*Until then, the spirits of truth and iniquity will struggle (with one another);  
in the heart of man<sup>24</sup> they will walk in wisdom and folly.  
And according to each man's portion in truth,*

---

<sup>42</sup> For 'lpy ..byn'

*will he have righteousness {in him}<sup>43</sup> and thus will he hate  
falsehood,  
And according to his inheritance in the lot of iniquity,  
will he have wickedness in him and thus<sup>25</sup> will he abhor  
truth,*

*For God established (them) in equal measure,  
until the appointed period and the making of things anew.  
And He it is who knows the reward of their deeds  
for all the ages<sup>26</sup> [of eternity];  
And He has allotted them to mankind,  
for the knowledge of good [and evil].  
To {bring to}<sup>44</sup> an end the destiny of all the living  
in accordance with his spirit in [him .. at the time] of the  
visitation.*

---

<sup>43</sup>Emending 'wšdq' to 'yšdq' and restoring 'bw' by paralleling this colon with its antithesis; 'mt' then paralleled with 'wl' as in 3<sup>19</sup> and 4<sup>23</sup>.

<sup>44</sup>Restoring 'lhpyl' as Kuhn; the last three letters are visible.

## The Poetry of the Two Spirits Passage.

The structure of the Two Spirits Passage should be easily discernible from this poetical reconstruction of the text.

### The Introduction, 3<sup>13-15</sup>.

This is prosaic, and thus likely to be a secondary redactionary addition. What follows are not detailed instructions from the Maskil to members and novices of the sect, but rather a poetical sermon (a credal poem?) on the Doctrine of the Two Spirits. Thus it seems probable that originally this sermon was an independent unit or units which was adapted and incorporated into the Manual of Discipline; this for Murphy-O'Connor occurred in the fourth and final stage of the document's composition.<sup>45</sup>

'The sons of light' are only mentioned (twice) in the immediately following section, 3<sup>15-4<sup>1</sup></sup>, whereas it is the 'sons of truth' who appear in 4<sup>2-14</sup>. However the theme of 'light' and 'darkness' is strongly present throughout 3<sup>15-4<sup>14</sup></sup>, though being totally absent from the subsequent section, 4<sup>15-26</sup>. This suggests to me that this introduction, 3<sup>13-15</sup>, was composed solely for 3<sup>15-4<sup>14</sup></sup> and that 4<sup>15-26</sup> should be treated as an independent unit which has in any case its own prosaic introductory lines, 4<sup>15-16</sup>.<sup>46</sup> Thus 'the sons of light' = 'the sons of righteousness' = 'the sons of truth', are the members of the sect, who are in opposition to 'the sons of iniquity', namely everyone else. Conversely, 'the

---

<sup>45</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, 'La Genèse Littéraire de la Règle de la Communauté', RB, 76 (1969), p542-3.

<sup>46</sup>Both Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 76, p542 and Leaney, The Rule of the Community and its meaning, p120f see 3<sup>13-4<sup>14</sup></sup> and 4<sup>15-26</sup> as separate units, although they do not distinguish the secondary prosaic introductions.

sons of man' is a generic term signifying all of mankind, both good and bad.<sup>47</sup>

The first poetical passage: 3<sup>15</sup>-4<sup>14</sup>. The Two Spirits.

The first stanza: 3<sup>15</sup>-4<sup>1</sup>. God, the Angelic Forces and the Two Spirits.

The first seven lines of poetry deal with the omnipotence of God, and exhibit predestination theology. The poetry is good, having a regular metre of 4,9/10 and exhibits a pattern in its cola of - a:b:b':c:a':d:d'. The first colon parallels the fifth in that (in my view) the object of kôl in the latter is best fulfilled by understanding hwwh wnhyyh (comparing with line 1), rather than by translating, somewhat limply, 'all things'. The second and third cola (b:b) have hywtm and mḥšbt as common elements,<sup>48</sup> while the fourth, and middle, colon, stands by itself and is distinctive in containing the only negative element. The sixth and seventh cola both begin with whw'h; in addition bkw1 ḥpšyhm (sixth colon) parallels kw1 mḥšbtm in the second colon whilst there is alliteration and assonance between lmmšlt (seventh colon) and kmḥšbt in the third colon.

The next strophe introduces the two spirits of truth and iniquity and begins with an unbalanced bicolon followed by a tricolon of a:b:b' pattern. The bicolon contains the 'parallel' particles 'lw' and 'bm', found only here in the section 3<sup>15</sup>-4<sup>1</sup>. There follows as a third strophe, two tricola of pattern, a:b:c a':b':c'; the

---

<sup>47</sup>Cf. 'the son of man', a title used by Jesus as a circumlocution for himself - see: Vermes, Jesus the Jew, chapter 7, and Lindars, Jesus Son of Man.

<sup>48</sup>The slightly high syllable count of the third colon is perhaps countered by the short fifth line, which if one does not include the metre of 'hwwh wnhyyh', counts 6; thus 13+6 / 2 = 9.5, cf. 9 and 10 counts elsewhere.

varying position of 'kol' in the second and fifth cola should perhaps be emended by moving the 'kol' in the latter colon to conform, and similarly, the presence of the waw at the start of the sixth colon in contrast to third would perhaps suggest that it has been added to smooth the join between the final two cola of this strophe.

There follows a fourth strophe which deals with the relationship between the Angel of Darkness and the 'sons of righteousness'. This five line structure shows some evidence of being chiasmic, for the first and last cola parallel the 'sons of righteousness' with the 'sons of light', and similarly the parallel between the roots t'h and kšl. The contents of the middle three cola exhibit b:c:b:c pattern, namely: man's sin, the Angel of Darkness' governance, (and again) man's sin, the Angel of Darkness' governance. Yet this would yield metre of 5,4,4,1 (stress) and 16,10,10,5 (syllable) for these proposed cola, whereas the current division of the text creates a regular metre in the strophe as a whole of: 4,5,4,5,4 and 10,16,11,15,10, giving a pattern of a:b:c:b+c:a. Note the alliteration of the word-endings in the second colon, and to a lesser extent in the fourth.

The final strophe has a problem in its opening colon which is that it has two subjects, 'the Angel of Truth' and 'the God of Israel', and singular verbs in 'zr, br' and ysd (the latter two in the following cola.) Although the first of these could be taken as a participle that still leaves a slightly awkward change from a plural to a singular sense. It would also create an unbalanced first bicolon:

<i>But the God of Israel and the Angel of Truth</i>	2(4)	9
<i>are a help to all the sons of light.</i>	3	5

Thus we shall have to regard wml'k 'mtw as an addition since God is clearly

the subject of what follows, plus one would expect  $\acute{s}r$  'wrym if this strophe were to parallel the 'Angel of Darkness' in the third strophe. We are now left with metre of 4,9 which creates a balanced bicolon when combined with the following colon, and in addition by referring to 'the sons of light' at the end of the first colon of this strophe parallels their appearance in the last colon of the previous strophe. 'zr with 'l-' means simply 'to help', or it can be taken as a participle. The following bicolon is well-balanced, the verb doing double-duty; the suffix on w'lyhwn is an Aramaic form and the second colon of this bicolon was written twice by error enabling the reconstruction of this colon. This strophe (and stanza) concludes with a well-balanced quatrain of a:b:a':b' pattern, the shorter third colon compensating for the extra stress in the first colon.

The second stanza: 4<sup>2-8</sup>. The Spirit of Truth.

This second stanza deals with 'the spirit of truth' (although it is not named as such), with the main strophe (4<sup>2-6</sup>) arranged in a chiasmic structure with pattern a:2b:5c:5c:2b:a. The opening introductory colon with its positive content can only be referring to the 'spirit of truth', and not to both the 'spirits of truth and iniquity'. Like its chiasmic counterpart in 4+(6) it begins with 'lh and contains tb1, thus creating a certain degree of extended parallelism. There follows a bicolon which again, like its chiasmic counterpart, begins each line with an infinitive, although in the second bicolon in 4<sup>5-6</sup> we do not have the prefixed 'l-' of the infinitives; both bicola deal with how the spirit should act. The central part of this strophe lists the attributes of the spirit so that it is impossible to talk in terms of bicola or tricola, unless one sees two pentacola both beginning with the word wrwh, which is understood in the subsequent cola. The first half of this list has a variation in that its final two cola form a



subsidiary clause (bicolon) which in itself is well-balanced, consisting of a participle followed by parallelism between *bkw1* and *brwb* and between '1 and the suffix.

There follows in 4<sup>6-8</sup> a strophe on the rewards awaiting those who walk in this spirit. The pattern is basically a:b4, although the latter four lines can be divided into two bicola which deal respectively with the earthly and heavenly rewards. The earthly rewards of long-life and many descendants are those characteristic of the Old Testament doctrine on death at the time before belief in any kind of positive afterlife, whilst the second bicolon raises the question of what form of afterlife the sect believed in, earthly or heavenly immortality?

The third stanza: 4<sup>9-14</sup>. The Spirit of Falsehood.

The third stanza outlines the ways of the 'spirit of falsehood'. The first strophe consists of a list of attributes, although generally these can be divided into bicola. Like *rwḥ* in the above stanza, the 'spirit of falsehood' is carried over to subsequent lines as the subject. The first bicolon pairs '*wlh* with *ṣdq*, whilst the latter segolate is paralleled by *nepeš*; both cola contain Qal. infinitives. The form *npš* should be translated 'appetite' here, especially as it is associated with the root *rḥb*, for two almost identical biblical parallels can be found to this text:<sup>49</sup>

Isaiah 5<sup>14</sup>: *lkn hrḥybḥ š'wl npšh*

Habakkuk 2<sup>5</sup>: *'šr hrḥyb kš'wl npšw*

There follow four cola which can really only be seen in terms of a list,

---

<sup>49</sup>See: Wolff, Anthropology of the Old Testament, chapter 1 'Nepes-Needy Man', p11-14.

although the first colon consists of two pairs of words, the next two cola roughly balance, and the final cola consists of three related phrases. Then there follows a list of five parts of the body which the spirit of falsehood would have influenced, though the second and fourth and especially the third and fifth pairs are in parallel.<sup>50</sup> This leaves a final monocolon which gives emphasis. The poorer poetry of this strophe which deals with the ways of the spirit of falsehood, in contrast to the chiasmic poetical arrangement of the first strophe of the previous stanza which deals with the spirit of truth, is perhaps deliberate and meant to reflect the respective subject-matter of these two strophes.

The second strophe of this stanza follows in 4<sup>11-14</sup>, outlining the 'rewards' of those who walk in this spirit, and thus creating an antithetic parallel with the second strophe of the previous stanza (4<sup>6-8</sup>). The imagery of darkness and destruction is strong in this strophe, in contrast to the imagery of light and life in 4<sup>6-8</sup>. After the introductory colon there follows a quatrain on their fate after their death, and then a tricolon with pattern a:b:b' on their time on earth prior to their death. This reverse order, together with the uneasy balance of the tricolon and the parallel structure and content of the second strophe in the preceding stanza, may suggest that this tricolon was added as an afterthought to cover their fate on earth. k1h in the fifth colon of the strophe creates a problem in that one has to try to avoid translating it with the sense 'extinction' since this would contradict the previous three lines which speak of 'unending punishment'.

---

<sup>50</sup>Emend 'lbb' to 'lb', perhaps, so as to give the phrase 'heaviness of heart' a syllable count of four in line with the other parts of the body. Note the varying spelling of 'k(y)bwd'.

The second Introduction, 4<sup>15-16</sup>.

This second secondary prosaic introduction contains a number of phrases and words found in the first prosaic introduction. The most notable of these is the phrase *twldwt kwl bny 'yš* in 3<sup>13</sup> and 4<sup>15</sup>, plus the occurrence of the word *dwrwtm* in 3<sup>14</sup>, 4<sup>15</sup> and perhaps significantly in 4<sup>13</sup> in the tricolon which, as I have just hinted at, maybe a secondary addition. This then forms a link with the previous introduction in addition to acting as an introduction to what follows.

The second poetical passage, 4<sup>16-25</sup>. God's plan for the Two Spirits.

There seems to a definite shift in theology between the previous poetical section and this one. For here there is no reference to the dualistic theme of 'light' and 'dark', nor to the accompanying angelic forces of good and bad, but rather God is the sole mediator to mankind of the Two Spirits. Nor is there any reference to 'the sons of truth / righteousness / light' and their adversaries 'the sons of iniquity', but rather the references are to 'the sons of man' and 'mankind' in general. Finally, it seems possible to detect a different theological interpretation (or at least a different emphasis) from that in the previous poetical sections; there 'man' could choose to walk in the way of light or in the way of darkness - 3<sup>20-21</sup>, 4<sup>2-8</sup> and 4<sup>8-11</sup>, here, however, we have the concept of every person having both 'truth' and 'falsehood' in his heart, and it being up to the individual to decide how much he is influenced by each spirit - 4<sup>17,19f,23-25</sup>.

This stanza is introductory in nature, further confirming that this source was originally independent; it consists of a quatrain of a:b:c:c' pattern followed

by an unbalanced bicolon. The first five words of the first colon are also found in 4<sup>25</sup> - the first colon of the last strophe of this poetical section. The use of *mplgh* in the second colon led the 'author' of the prosaic introduction, 4<sup>15-16</sup>, to use *mplg* twice. The third and fourth cola of the quatrain exhibit strong parallelism / dualism; notably, it is *'wlh* that is paralleled with *'mt*, and not *'wl* as in 3<sup>19</sup> and 4<sup>23-24</sup>.<sup>51</sup>

The second stanza of two strophes concerns God's final plan for the Two Spirits, 4<sup>18-23</sup>, the first strophe dealing with the end of *'wlh*, the second with the purification of man by truth. The poetical units (bicola, etc.) are more difficult to define in this section because of the poorer quality of the poetry; this and the occurrence again (and thus duplication) of the theme of 'visitation' found already in 4<sup>6f</sup> and 4<sup>11f</sup>, further testifies to the different authorship behind this section. The first strophe of two tricola begins with a subsidiary clause on God's attributes which 'interrupts' the first colon; leaving aside this subsidiary clause the remaining two cola are in parallel so that the pattern created for this tricolon is a -:b- a:a'. In the second tricolon *'mt* and *rš'* form a word-pair over the first two lines, whilst the last line best parallels the final line of the preceding tricolon. The second strophe on God's purification of man by truth begins with an unbalanced bicolon (though with two parallel double-ayin roots), followed by a well-balanced bicolon each line beginning with an infinitive. After this the poetical units are more difficult to discern; seemingly we have another unbalanced bicolon followed by a tricolon of a:b:b pattern. We are then left with a very badly balanced quatrain which introduces some totally foreign elements, namely, the idea of election, 'the everlasting

---

<sup>51</sup> *'wlh* occurs 6 times in the section 4<sup>16-23</sup>, plus once in 4<sup>9</sup> and 4<sup>24</sup>, whilst *'wl* occurs three times in 3<sup>15-4</sup> and twice in 4<sup>23-26</sup>.

covenant' and 'the glory of Adam', which may suggest that this is a later redactional gloss.

The final stanza of two strophes, 4<sup>23-26</sup>, deals with the time between now and the visitation. The first strophe considers the current strife between the Two Spirits, whilst the second returns to the theme of God's omnipotence and the doctrine of predestination. Although Murphy-O'Connor believes 4<sup>23-26</sup> to be a further independent unit, I believe that it forms a consistent whole with 4<sup>16-23</sup> especially since the phrase ky bđ bbd 'l śmn also occurs in 4<sup>16</sup> (with slight variation in order - ky' 'l śmn bđ bbd), thus acting as an envelope structure.<sup>52</sup> Thus the first strophe begins with a bicolon which exhibits a chiasmic structure a:b:b':a'. The quatrain that follows should be supplied with bw in its second colon, having also emended wšdq to yšdq; one would expect 'wlh not 'wl in the third colon picking up from the first. The second strophe exhibits poor poetry which, coupled with its fragmentary character, makes it difficult to determine bicola, etc.. A new theme appears in the sixth line, that of 'knowledge of good and evil' (Genesis 1).

### Conclusion and Summary.

It seems to me that there are in fact three 'authors' of the Two Spirits passage, 3<sup>13-4<sup>26</sup></sup>. Two wrote in poetry, namely 3<sup>15-4<sup>14</sup></sup> and 4<sup>16-26</sup>, the former exhibiting a better poetical style than the latter. The third is the redactor who supplied the two prosaic introductions, 3<sup>13-15</sup> and 4<sup>15-16</sup>, the gloss in 3<sup>24</sup> 'and His Angel of Truth', and perhaps a couple of further glosses in 4<sup>13-14</sup> 'And all...', and 4<sup>23-24</sup> 'For God chose them...'.  

---

<sup>52</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 76, p542.

The Two Spirit Passage can therefore be summarized as follows.

Redactor: Introduction.	3 <sup>13-15</sup>
Poet 1:	3 <sup>15-414</sup>
Stanza 1: The Cosmic Setting.	3 <sup>15-41</sup> .
Strophe 1 - God's omnipotence. a:b:b':c:a':d:d'	
Strophe 2 - The Two Spirits. a:b a:b:b'	
Strophe 3 - The Angelic Forces. a:b:c:a':b':c'	
Strophe 4 - The Angel of Darkness. a:b:c:b+c:a	
Strophe 5 - The God of Israel. a:b a:a'<a'> a:b:a':b'	
Stanza 2: The spirit of truth.	4 <sup>2-8</sup> .
Strophe 1 - Its characteristics. a:2b:5c:5c:2b:a	
Strophe 2 - The rewards for following it. a:4b	
Stanza 3: The spirit of falsehood.	4 <sup>9-14</sup> .
Strophe 1 - Its characteristics. List in form.	
Strophe 2 - The 'reward' for following it. a:4b a:b:b'	
Redactor: Introduction.	4 <sup>15-16</sup> .
Poet 2:	4 <sup>16-26</sup> .
Stanza 1 - Introduction.	4 <sup>16-18</sup>
Strophe 1: a:b:c:c' a:b	
Stanza 2 - God's final plan for the Two Spirits.	4 <sup>18-23</sup>
Strophe 1: The end of falsehood. a-:b-a:a' a:b:b'	
Strophe 2: Purification. a:b a:a' a:b a:b:b' a:a':b:b'	
Stanza 3 - The time before the End.	4 <sup>23-26</sup>
Strophe 1: The Two Spirits' struggle. a+b:b'+a' a:b:a':b'	
Strophe 2: God's omnipotence. Pattern?	

The Hebrew of the Third Poem.

1+3	2+5	ועתה בנים שמעו לי
3	8	ואגלה עיניכם לראות
3	6	ולהבין במעשי (15) אל
3	6	ולבחור את אשר רצה
3	6	ולמאוס כאשר שנא
4	8	להתהלך תמים (16) בכל דרכיו
3	6	ולא לתור במחשבות
4	7	יצר אשמה ועני זנות
4	6	כי רבים (17) תעו במ
4	9	וגבורי חיל נכשלו במ
2	6	מלפנים ועד הנה
3	7	בלכתם בשרירות (18) לבם
3	7	נפלו עירי השמים
2	4	בה נאחזו
4	7	אשר לא שמרו מצות אל (19)
4	9	ובניהם אשר כרום ארזים גבהם
4	10	וכהרים גויותיהם כי נפלו (20)
4	12	כל בשר אשר היה בחרבה כי גוע
3	6	ויהיו כלא היו
2	6	בעשותם את (21) רצונם
4	8	ולא שמרו את מצות עשיהם
4	7	עד אשר חרה אפו במ (1)
4	5+5	בה תעי בני נח ומשפחהותיהם
3	5	בה הם נכרתים (2)
4	7	אברהם לא הלך בה
5	11	ויע[ל או]הב בשמרו מצות אל
4	7	ולא בחר (3) ברצון רוחו
3	8	וימסור לישחק וליעקב
4	12	וישמרו ויכתבו אוהבים (4) לאל
3	6	ובעלי ברית לעולם
3	6	בני יעקב תעו במ
3	8	ויענשו לפני (5) משגותם
4	10<2>	ובניהם <במצרים> הלכו בשרירות לבם
3	7	להיעץ על (6) מצות אל
3	8	ולעשות איש הישר בעיניו

2	7	ויאכלו את הדם
3	9	ויכרת (7) זכורם במדבר
3	7	{וידבר} להם בקדש
3	6	עלו ורשו את {הארץ
3	8	ויבחרו ברצון} רוחם
4	7	ולא שמעו (8) לקול עשיהם
		<מצות יוריהם>
2	7	וירגנו באהליהם
4	7	ויחר אף אל (9) בעדתם
3	6	ובניהם בו אבדו
3	7	ומלכיהם בו נכרתו
3	7	וגיבוריהם בו (10) אבדו
3	6	וארצם בו שממה
5	11	בו הבו באי הברית הראשנים
2	7	ויסגרו (11) לחרב
3	5	בעיבם את ברית אל
2	7	ויבחרו ברצונם
4	10	ויתורו אחרי שרירות (12) לבם
3	6	לעשות איש את רצונו
3	8	ובמחזיקים במצות אל (13)
2	5	אשר נותרו מהם
3	6	הקים אל את בריתו
2	6	לישראל עד עולם
3	7	לגלות (14) להם נסתרות
3	8	אשר תעו במ כל ישראל
2+2	4+5	שבתות קדשו ומועדי (15) כבודו
2+2	4+4	עידות צדקו ודרכי אמתו
		וחפצי רצונו
		<אשר יעשה (16) האדם וחיה בהם>
4	9	פתח לפניהם
4	9	ויחפרו באר למים רבים (17)
3	7	ומואסיהם לא יחיה



2	4	והם התגוללו
2+2	3+5	בפשע אנוש ובדרכי נדה (18)
3	8	ויאמרו כי לנו היא
3	5	ואל ברזי פלאו
2+2	5+5	כפר בעד עונם וישא לפשעם (19)
5	11	ויבן להם בית נאמן בישראל
5	13	אשר לא עמד כמהו למלפנים ועד (20) הנה
4	9	המחזיקים בו לחיי נצח
3	7	וכל כבוד אדם להם

הוא כאשר (21) הקים אל להם ביד יחזקאל הנביא לאמר  
הכהנים והלויים ובני (1) צדוק אשר שמרו את משמרת מקדשי בתעות בני  
ישראל (2) מעלי הם יגישו לי חלב ודם  
הכהנים הם שבי ישראל (3) היוצאים מארץ יהודה ו{הלויים הם} הנלויים  
עמהם  
ובני צדוק הם בחירי (4) ישראל קריאי השם העמדים באחרית הימים

4	10	הנה פרוש (5) שמותיהם לתולדותם
4	11	וקץ מעמדם ומספר צרותיהם
4	11	ושני (6) התגוררם ופירוש מעשיהם
5	13	הק{דו}{שנים הרא}{שוניים אשר כפר (7) אל בעדם
4	12	ויצדיקו צדיק וירשיעו רשע
3	7	וכל הבאים אחריהם (8)
3	7	לעשות כפרוש התורה
3	9	אשר התושרו בו הראשנים
4	10	עד שלים (9) <הקץ השנים האלה
4	10	כברית אשר הקים אל לראשנים
3	7	לכפר (10) על עונותיהם
3	6	כן יכפר אל בעדם
4	10	ובשלום <הקץ >למספר< השנים (11) האלה
4	8	אין עוד להשתפח לבית יהודה
4	8	כי אם לעמוד איש על (12) מצודו
4	9	נבנתה הגדר רחק החוק

Translation of the Third Poem (2<sup>14</sup>-3<sup>20</sup>), and 3<sup>20</sup>-4<sup>12</sup>.

*And now children listen to me;  
And I will open your eyes to see  
and understand the ways<sup>15</sup> of El.  
And to choose what He likes,  
And to reject what He hates.*

*To walk perfectly<sup>16</sup> in all His ways,  
And not to stray in thoughts  
of a guilty nature or (with) lustful eyes;  
For many<sup>17</sup> were led astray by such things.  
And mighty men have stumbled upon them,  
from of old even until now.*

*When they walked in the stubbornness<sup>18</sup> of their hearts  
the Heavenly Watchers fell;  
By it they were caught,  
for they did not keep the commandments of El.<sup>19</sup>  
And their children - whose height was that of cedars,  
and like mountains (were) their bodies - surely fell.<sup>20</sup>*

*All flesh that was on dry land surely expired,  
and became as though it were not;  
Because they practised<sup>21</sup> their will,  
And they did not keep the commandments of their Maker,  
until His wrath was kindled against them.<sup>1</sup>  
Because of it the sons of Noah and their families went astray,  
Because of it they were cut off.<sup>2</sup>*

*Abraham did not walk in it  
And he was accounted a friend for he kept the commandments  
of El  
and did not choose<sup>3</sup> the will of his spirit.  
And he taught (them) to Isaac and Jacob,  
And they kept (them) and were recorded as friends<sup>4</sup> of El  
and masters of the covenant forever.*

*The children of Jacob were led astray by such things,  
and were punished for<sup>5</sup> their transgressions.  
And their children <in Egypt> walked in the stubbornness of  
their heart;  
to conspire together against the<sup>6</sup> commandments of El,  
and to practise everyman what was right in his eyes.*

*And they ate blood  
And<sup>7</sup> their men were cut off in the wilderness.  
{And He spoke} to them at Kadesh:  
‘Go up and possess {the land’  
But they chose the will} of their spirit,  
And they did not listen<sup>8</sup> to the voice of their Maker  
    <the commandments which He taught them>  
And they murmured in their tents.*

*And the wrath of El was kindled<sup>9</sup> against their congregation:  
And their children because of it were lost,  
And their kings because of it were cut off,  
And their warriors because of it<sup>10</sup> were lost,  
And their land because of it became desolate.*

*Because of it, the first members of the covenant were guilty  
and they were delivered up<sup>11</sup> to the sword,  
Because they forsook the covenant of El  
and chose their own will,  
And they went about after the stubbornness<sup>12</sup> of their heart,  
every man practising his own will.*

*But with those who held fast to the commandments of El<sup>13</sup>  
who were left of them,  
El established His covenant  
in Israel forever;  
To reveal<sup>14</sup> to them (the) ‘hidden things’,  
by which all Israel had gone astray:*

*His holy Sabbaths and<sup>15</sup> His glorious feast days;  
His righteous testimonies and His true ways.  
And the desires of His will  
    <which<sup>16</sup> man should practise and live by>  
    He uncovered before them.*

*And they dug a well of many waters;<sup>17</sup>  
And those who reject them shall not live.*

*For they had rolled about  
in the transgression of the common people and in ways of  
uncleanness,<sup>18</sup>  
And had said, ‘This is for us’.  
But El in His wonderful mysteries,  
Pardoned their iniquity and forgave their transgression.<sup>19</sup>*

*And He built for them ‘a sure house’ in Israel,  
like which none stood from of old until<sup>20</sup> now;  
Those who hold fast to it shall live forever,  
and all the glory of Adam (shall be) for them.*

---

*This is as <sup>21</sup> El established for them by the hand of Ezekiel, the prophet, saying:*

*The priests and the Levites and the children <sup>1</sup> of Zadok, who kept watch on My sanctuary when the children of Israel went astray <sup>2</sup> from Me, shall draw near to Me with fat and blood.*

*'The priests' are those who turn back in Israel <sup>3</sup> who went out of the land of Judah, and {'the Levites'} are those who were joined with them. And 'the children of Zadok' are the chosen ones <sup>4</sup> of Israel, those called by name, who stand firm during the last days.*

*Behold the list <sup>5</sup> of their names according to their generation, And the period of their standing and the number of their sufferings,*

*And the years <sup>6</sup> of their wandering and the list of their deeds:*

.....

---

*(They are) the {fi}rst holy {ones} whom <sup>7</sup> El pardoned, And they justified the righteous and condemned the wicked.*

*And all those who enter after them: <sup>8</sup>*

*(Are) to live according to the exact interpretation of the law in which the first ones were instructed;*

*until the period <sup>9</sup> of these years is complete;*

*(And) in accordance with the covenant which El established for the first ones:*

*to make atonement <sup>10</sup> for their iniquities - thus will El atone for them.*

*And when the period <according to the number> of <sup>11</sup> these years is complete,*

*No more shall it be (possible) to be joined to the House of Judah;*

*But rather, every man must stand firm upon <sup>12</sup> his own fortification/(net):*

*'The wall is built, the precept far removed'.*

### 1.3. The Third Poem: 2<sup>14</sup>-3<sup>20</sup>.

This similar formulaic introduction marks the start of a third section, or in our case poem, within the Damascus Document. It is addressed to the 'bnym' who must learn from the lessons of history and in particular from the unfaithfulness of the 'bnym' of subsequent, past Israelite generations. Thus 'bnym' is a keyword in this poem appearing in the address of 2<sup>14</sup> and in a historical context in 2<sup>19</sup>, 3<sup>1,4,5,9</sup>, and the theme is also found in the appended midrashic section in 3<sup>21</sup>, 4<sup>1,3</sup>. However, the extent of this section, and in particular the precise identity of those addressed is not a matter which has generally been agreed upon.

Murphy-O'Connor believes that the sectarians originated from Babylon (termed 'Damascus' in CD) and returned from exile following the Maccabean Wars because of the independence Israel had acquired and the resulting anti-semitism of the surrounding countries. Yet Israel was not as they expected, the law being lax and foreign influence being rife. Thus the Missionary Document, 2<sup>14</sup>-6<sup>11</sup>, was written which 'was both a blanket condemnation of what was commonly accepted in Palestine as safe orthodoxy (CD.4<sup>13</sup>-5<sup>15</sup>) and at the same time an appeal to join the Essenes before it was too late (CD.3<sup>19</sup>, 4<sup>9-12</sup>).<sup>1</sup> Consequently, the bnym are for Murphy-O'Connor, 'outsiders'.<sup>2</sup> Davies, whilst adopting Murphy-O'Connor's basic assertion that the sectarians originated from Babylon, believes it is 'preferable to think of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, 'The Essenes in Palestine', BA, 40 (1977), p109; originally, Murphy-O'Connor viewed 2<sup>14</sup>-6<sup>1</sup> as the Missionary Document (RB, 77, p201-229) yet he changed his view to include the Well Midrash (6<sup>1-11</sup>) in the Missionary Document - 'The Damascus Document Revisited', RB, 92 (1985), p232 - following Davies' (p121-125) and Knibb's (JSOT, 25, p111) criticism; Knibb (p16) also considers 2<sup>14</sup>-6<sup>11</sup> constitutes a section in CD.

<sup>2</sup>RB, 77 (1970), p204-5.

function of the discourses as catechetical rather than apologetic' so that our current text is 'directed to *initiates in the process of making their choice*'<sup>3</sup> Finally Stegemann suggests 'bnym' are those members who are in danger of falling into apostasy. Yet there is no indication of apostasy here, especially when compared to, say, the 'Warnings' of 19<sup>33</sup>-20<sup>27</sup>.

In my view these alternative explanations have all made one basic erroneous presupposition which is that all of them have failed to take into account the composite nature of this document and consequently have tried to interpret originally poetical passages by their later prosaic counterparts. Whilst this may be justifiable on some occasions, in the majority of cases the various literary strands mirror the development of the community and its thought. Once the original underlying poetical text is appreciated, the poem can be seen to extend only as far as 3<sup>20</sup>; appended to this is a midrashic section, 3<sup>20</sup>-4<sup>6</sup>, and a secondary semi-poetical section, 4<sup>6</sup>-11. The poem, 2<sup>14</sup>-3<sup>20</sup>, was originally addressed to the new members of the community at the Annual Covenant Festival of the sect, but with its incorporation into the Damascus Document it was re-addressed to those later members (as against 'the founders') who lived away from Qumran amidst the indigenous Jewish and gentile population. Both the original and reinterpreted sense of 'bnym' in 2<sup>14</sup> is entirely understandable in view of the main theme of the poem, viz. the unfaithfulness of the preceding Israelite generations.

Finally, the historical subject matter of this poem means that the poetry can often better be described as 'poetical narrative'.

---

<sup>3</sup>Davies, p77 - Davies' third discourse ends at 4<sup>12a</sup> 'for no single compelling reason, but for a number of minor reasons, the most telling of which is that (he) cannot find any other plausible termination' - p78.

The first stanza: 2<sup>14-17</sup>. The Introduction.

w'th bnym šm'w ly	1+3	2+5
w'glh 'ynykm lr'wt	3	8
wlhbyn bm'sy <sup>15</sup> 'l	3	6
wlbhwr 't 'šr ršh	3	6
wlm'ws k'sr šn'	3	6
lhthlk tmym <sup>16</sup> bkl drkyw	4	8
wl' ltwr bmḥšbwt	3	6
yšr 'šmh w'ny znwt	4	7
ky rbym <sup>17</sup> t'w bm	4	6
wgbwry ḥyl nkšlw bm	4	9
mlpnym w'd hnh	2	6

*And now children listen to me;  
And I will open your eyes to see  
and understand the ways <sup>15</sup> of El.  
And to choose what He likes,  
And to reject what He hates.*

*To walk perfectly <sup>16</sup> in all His ways,  
And not to stray in thoughts  
of a guilty nature or (with) lustful eyes;  
For many <sup>17</sup> were led astray by such things.  
And mighty men have stumbled upon them,  
from of old even until now.*

---

wlm'ws: the root should be translated 'to reject' not 'to despise' on grounds of parallelism, and this meaning should be adopted elsewhere in this document - 3<sup>17</sup>, 7<sup>9</sup>=19<sup>5</sup>, 8<sup>19</sup>=19<sup>32</sup>, 20<sup>8,11</sup>.

wl' ltwr: l' is used instead of the grammatically correct negative particle for infinitives lbtly; ltwr has Babylonian pointing - lātûr.

w'ny znwt: 'ny defective for 'yny; znwt should be pointed z<sup>e</sup>nû<sub>t</sub>

'whoredom' – the phrase also appears in 1QS.1<sup>6</sup>.

---

The initial monocolon parallels 1<sup>1</sup> and 2<sup>2</sup>, though with *bnym* interrupting the usual construction of 'th šm'w for emphasis, and with *ly*, in contrast to 'ly in 2<sup>2</sup>; *w'th* lies outside of the metre. There follow two bicola, each colon having an infinitive. The first is a chiasmic structure with ballast variants; the future tense of *w'glh* is rhetorical and should not be taken literally to suggest that those addressed are at present totally lacking in any sectarian teaching. The second exhibits straight (proper congruence) parallelism, with *k'sr* being a nice poetic touch instead of the repeated 't 'sr. The dualistic terminology here has close parallels in 1QH.17<sup>24</sup> and 1QS.1<sup>3-4</sup>, and, since in the latter case it is the Maskil who is teaching the saints (*gdwšym*) how to live, one could question whether the Maskil is not also speaking in this passage.

There follow two tricola. The initial tricolon exhibits enjambment in its second and third cola, and the prefixed 'b' on *mšbwt* does double-duty; it has typical sectarian language.<sup>4</sup> The obvious question is whether these two phrases are meant to represent general categories or refer to specific sins current in Israel at the time? While the former phrase has a more general sense, the widespread condemnation of *znwt* in this document suggests that the latter at least is meant to be specific.<sup>5</sup> This paradoxical juxtaposition of general and specific warnings may suggest that the latter phrase is a

---

<sup>4</sup>The opening colon is echoed in 1QS.2<sup>2</sup> and 1QSb.5<sup>22</sup> – cf. Gen.6<sup>5</sup>, and Num.15<sup>39</sup>; the second and third cola have parallels in part in 1QS.5<sup>5</sup> and 1QH.6<sup>32</sup>; the phrase 'yny znwt' in 1QS.1<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>5</sup>See especially the first 'net', 4<sup>17</sup> 4<sup>20-56</sup>; plus 7<sup>1</sup>, 8<sup>5-19</sup>, 1QS.1<sup>6</sup> and 4<sup>10</sup>.



secondary gloss deliberately pointing to the first of Belial's nets, a suggestion which could be further advanced by the defective and un-prefixed form of this phrase. This would leave a well-balanced bicolon (8:9 syllable count) with proper anti-congruent parallelism (a+b:a'+b').

The second, well-balanced tricolon has a pattern - a:a':b. The two masculine particles *bm* create good parallelism; both refer to the five nouns of the previous tricolon of which only *yšr* is masculine. *Rabbîm* has here the wider sense of 'Israelite', and is perhaps meant to be a pun on the *rbym* of the community so providing a solemn warning.<sup>6</sup> The parallelism dictates that *gbwry hyl* should be translated 'mighty men' rather than with a military sense, which would be too specific and out of place in this context. Charles considers the final words *w'd hnh* to be secondary, so that the phrase *gbwry hyl* refers to the 'Nephilim' who are termed in Genesis 6<sup>4</sup> - *hgbrym 'šr m'wlm 'nšy hšm*; they are then the subject of the following verb, *blktm*.<sup>7</sup> This though seems unlikely since the phrase *mlpnym w'd hnh* also occurs in 3<sup>19-20</sup>, and because the historical account has not yet begun. The tricolon is therefore meant as an overview, stating that the *rabbîm* (the ordinary Israelite?) and the *gbwry hyl* (their leaders?) have been going astray throughout time.

The second stanza: 2<sup>17-19</sup>. The Heavenly Watchers.

<i>blktm bšryrwt</i> 18	<i>lbn</i>	3	7
<i>nplw 'yry hšmym</i>		3	7
<i>bh n'hzw</i>		2	4
<i>'šr l' šmrw mšwt</i> '1	19	4	7

<sup>6</sup>For the 'many' of the sect see Chapter 2, Appendix I,II, p343-347 on the Laws of IX-XVI.

<sup>7</sup>Charles, p805.

wbnyhm 'šr krwm 'rzym gbhm  
wkhrym gwywtyhm ky nplw <sup>20</sup>

4 9  
4 10

*When they walked in the stubbornness <sup>18</sup> of their hearts  
the Heavenly Watchers fell;  
By it they were caught,  
for they did not keep the commandments of El. <sup>19</sup>  
And their children - whose height was that of cedars,  
and like mountains (were) their bodies - surely fell. <sup>20</sup>*

---

'yry: T-S 10 K6 probably reads a rēš rather than a dālet, which yields the correct sense, 'watchers', rather than 'witnesses'.

mšwt: is this form singular, mišwat, or plural, mišwot? The form mšwt never appears in the Scrolls, whilst the *plene* form mšwwt does - 1QpH.5<sup>5</sup>, 1QH.16<sup>13</sup>, 1QSb.1<sup>1</sup> and 4QpHos<sup>a</sup>.2<sup>4</sup> - and with the root šmr in all but the final case. Thus a plural sense would seem to be demanded here, and elsewhere in this document - 2<sup>21</sup>, 3<sup>2,6,8,12</sup>, 5<sup>21</sup>, 8<sup>19</sup>=19<sup>32</sup>, 9<sup>7</sup>, 19<sup>5</sup>.<sup>8</sup>

bh: bāh, feminine and so referring to šryrwt (l<sub>bm</sub>) which is also feminine singular; there is no need to emend to bm 'by them = the list of sins referred to in 2<sup>16</sup>.

gbhm: from the noun gōbah, with suffix gobhām.

---

<sup>8</sup>In the MT 'mišwat yhwh' occurs three times (once with the root 'šmr'), whilst the plural 'mišwot yhwh' occurs twenty times (seven times with the root 'šmr').

We have here either a loose quatrain of metre 3,3,2,4 exhibiting enjambment or a bicolon with longer than average cola of metre 6.6<sup>9</sup> Elsewhere in this poem there are other examples of 'quatrains' exhibiting poor poetry which can be construed as bicola with longer than usual cola - 2<sup>20-21</sup>, 3<sup>10-11</sup>, and 3<sup>12-13</sup>. The first colon contains typical biblical and sectarian phraseology.<sup>10</sup> The 'they' refers to the Heavenly Watchers themselves and not those that were their victims, while bh refers to 'the stubbornness of their heart'; thus the sense is:

*When they (=the Heavenly Watchers) walked in the  
stubbornness of their heart the Heavenly Watchers fell,<sup>11</sup>  
By it (=the stubbornness of their heart) they (=the Heavenly  
Watchers) were caught, for ...*

The pattern created by this parallelism is therefore: a+b+c:b'+c'+d where b = 'the stubbornness of their heart' and c = the Heavenly Watchers who fell/were caught; the parallelism between the roots np1 and 'hz heightens the effect. One might have expected 'yny znwt as being more appropriate than šryrwt lbn (cf. Jub.7<sup>21</sup>), and the fact one does not find it may be a further indication that this phrase is secondary in the introductory stanza.

It is significant that this account of Israel's history begins with the Heavenly Watchers of Genesis 6<sup>1-5</sup> rather than with Adam. The former are often held responsible in the intertestamental literature for man's fall into sin.<sup>12</sup> They are mentioned twice elsewhere in the scrolls, in the Genesis Apocryphon

---

<sup>9</sup>So Charles, p805.

<sup>10</sup>Jer.9<sup>13</sup>, 13<sup>10</sup>, 23<sup>17</sup>; CD.3<sup>5</sup>, 20<sup>9</sup>, 1QS.1<sup>6</sup>, 2<sup>14,26</sup>, 5<sup>4</sup>, 7<sup>19,24</sup>, 9<sup>10</sup>.

<sup>11</sup>Translate: 'When the Heavenly Watchers walked in the stubbornness of their heart they fell'.

<sup>12</sup>Jubilees 4<sup>15</sup>, 5<sup>1-2,6-11</sup>, 7<sup>21</sup>; T.Reuben.5<sup>6</sup>, T.Naph.3<sup>5</sup>; 1Enoch.6-16; Sibyl.Oracles 1<sup>97-104</sup> - see Barker, 'Some Reflections upon the Enoch Myth', JSOT, 15 (1980), p7-29.

(1QA<sub>p</sub> Gen.2<sup>1</sup>) and in 'The Ages of Creation' (4Q180):

*And the interpretation concerns Azazel and the angels who [came to the daughters of men; and] they bore to them giants. And concerning Azazel...and iniquity, and to cause them to inherit wickedness...judgments and judgment of the congregation...<sup>13</sup>*

Adam on the other hand seems to be regarded as the ideal man. The proper noun, 'ādām, occurs three times in the scrolls in identical formats: CD.3<sup>20</sup>, 1QS.4<sup>23</sup> and 1QH.17<sup>15</sup>. In all three cases the cognate is needed and supplied in the future, making Adam's state the promised heavenly ideal. Yet one could easily read: '*..and all the glory of Adam is for them!*' This would then imply that all members who lived according to the sectarian way of life will acquire Adam's glory now. Although this may seem to be conjuring up concepts of 'realized eschatology' comparable to that of the fourth gospel, the meaning may in fact have been that whoever follows the ways of the sect will attain Adam's sinless state.

The final bicolon exhibits a chiasmic structure a+b:b'+a with good parallelism between b:b' positioned to delay the main meaning - 'their children also/surely fell'. The ky here is thus in a postponed position and should therefore be stressed; ky with the sense 'surely' is found in Gen.29<sup>32</sup> and Ex.3<sup>12</sup>, and ultimately derives from the 'k' in Ugaritic.<sup>14</sup> These 'children' are the 'giants' or 'n<sup>e</sup>pīlīm' referred to in Gen.6<sup>4</sup>, 4Q180, 1QA<sub>p</sub>Gen.2<sup>1</sup> and the intertestamental literature: Jub.5<sup>1</sup>, 7<sup>22</sup>, 1En.7<sup>2-4</sup>, 9<sup>9</sup>, et al.

---

<sup>13</sup>Vermes, p261.

<sup>14</sup>See Gibson, Canaanite Myths and Legends, p148.

The third stanza: 2<sup>20</sup>-3<sup>1</sup>. Noah and the Flood.

kl bśr 'šr <sup>15</sup> hyh bħrbh ky gw'	4	12
wyhyw kl' hyw	3	6
b'šwtm 't <sup>21</sup> ršwnm	2	6
wl' šmrw 't mšwt 'šyhm	4	8
'd 'šr ħrh 'pw bm <sup>1</sup>	4	7
bh t'y <sup>16</sup> bny nh wmsphwtyhm	4	5+5
bh hm nkrty <sup>2</sup>	3	5

*All flesh that was on dry land surely expired,  
and became as though it were not;  
Because they practised<sup>21</sup> their will,  
And they did not keep the commandments of their Maker,  
until His wrath was kindled against them.<sup>1</sup>  
Because of it the sons of Noah and their families went astray,  
Because of it they were cut off.<sup>2</sup>*

---

gw': singular and thus grammatically correct, referring back to bśr, whilst the following two verbs are plural referring to bśr semantically; a similar effect can be seen in Genesis 6<sup>13</sup> and 7<sup>21</sup>.

t'y: one has to emend to t'w.

wmsphwtyhm: there is an extra hē, carelessly inserted by a scribe who thought he was writing the singular.

---

<sup>15</sup>T-S 10 K6 has the relative pronoun, omitted by Schechter, p117 and Davies, p238.

<sup>16</sup>Read t'w

This stanza is one of the rougher poetical pieces in this poem. On metrical grounds one could divide it into three bicola (combining the second and third cola), yet this does not agree with the division of the text on grounds of sense which is how I have split it up. Thus we have a bicolon on the flood, followed by a tricolon of a:a':b pattern dealing with the reasons for the flood and God's subsequent action. The bicolon uses *ky* again with the sense 'surely' thus paralleling the final line of the previous stanza, whilst the terminology of the first colon reflects that found in Genesis 6<sup>17</sup>, 7<sup>21-22</sup> and Jubilees 5<sup>20</sup>. The tricolon also reads as a polemic against the current unfaithful sectarians, since there were no *mšwt* in Noah's day.<sup>17</sup> The final colon of the tricolon stands rather by itself for emphasis, since the concept of God's anger is prominent in the Flood story.

The final bicolon of this stanza is unbalanced, yet there seems no reason for removing *wmšpḥhwtyhm* or adding anything to the final colon. It moves to the events after the flood and resumes the theme of the disobedience of 'the children'. The particles *bh* have the same sense as in the previous stanza, referring to 'the stubbornness of their heart'. What were the sins of Noah's sons? Genesis 9<sup>22-27</sup> gives an account of Ham's sin in seeing his father's nakedness. More encompassing is Jubilees 11<sup>2</sup>, which reads:

*And the sons of Noah began fighting in order to take captive and to kill each other, to pour the blood of man upon the earth, to eat blood, to build fortified cities and walls and towers, so that (one) man will be raised up over the people, to set up the first kingdoms to go to war, people against people and nation against nation and city against city, and everyone (will act) to do evil and to acquire weapons of battle and to teach their sons war.*

---

<sup>17</sup>The second colon of this tricolon has biblical parallels in 1Sam.13<sup>13</sup>, 2Kgs.17<sup>16</sup>, 1Chron.28<sup>8</sup> and in the scrolls in CD 2<sup>21</sup>, 3<sup>2</sup>, 19<sup>2</sup>, 1QSb.1<sup>1</sup>, 1QH.16<sup>13,17</sup>.

Jubilees therefore attributes to the sons of Noah the rise of the city-state system from the nomadic way of life,<sup>18</sup> and this seems to indicate that the poet used or at least knew of Jubilees. If, on the other hand, mšphwt has the wider meaning of 'descendants' then the reference may be to the tower of Babel, yet these people seem not to be descended from Noah.<sup>19</sup> The use of the root krt refers ironically to the Noahic covenant – Genesis 9<sup>8-17</sup> and Jubilees 6<sup>4-16</sup>.

The fourth stanza: 3<sup>2-4</sup>. The Patriarchs.

'brhm l' hlk bh	4	7
wy'[l 'w]hb bšmrw mšwt 'l	5	11
wl' bhr <sup>3</sup> bršwn rwhw	4	7
wymswr lyšhq wly'qb	3	8
wyšmrw wyktbw 'whbym <sup>4</sup> l'l	4	12
wb'ly bryt l'wlm	3	6

*Abraham did not walk in it  
 And he was accounted a friend for he kept the commandments  
 of El  
 and did not choose<sup>3</sup> the will of his spirit.  
 And he taught (them) to Isaac and Jacob,  
 And they kept (them) and were recorded as friends<sup>4</sup> of El  
 and masters of the covenant forever.*

---

wyšmrw wyktbw: in light of our discussion on Qumran orthography these

---

<sup>18</sup>See too Jubilees 7<sup>14-17</sup>.

<sup>19</sup>The flood left only Noah and his family alive, so that ipso facto all subsequent peoples are descended from him. According to Jub.10<sup>18</sup> Peleg (the great, great, grandson of Shem – Gen.11<sup>16</sup>) went into the land of Shinar (Jub.10<sup>19</sup>) to see/take part in the building of the tower of Babel.

forms should be pointed, wayyišmorû wayyikkātebû, viz. with four and five syllables respectively; wyktbw is a Niphal.

---

In contrast to the last stanza this stanza consists of well-balanced poetry. The two tricola have a total syllable count of 25:26, each with long middle lines which contain 'whb and end in 'l, so creating extended parallelism between the tricola. A waw-consecutive begins every line except the first where the main subject Abraham is introduced abruptly to emphasis his importance.

The first tricolon deals specifically with Abraham who is presented as the model Israelite in that he did not walk in it (= the stubbornness of his heart), but rather kept God's commandments (cf. 2<sup>18</sup>, 3<sup>6</sup>) and he did not chose his own will (cf. 2<sup>20-21</sup>, 3<sup>7,11,12</sup>.) The lacuna of three to four letters has led to a number of similar proposals: Schechter restores wy'['śh 'w]hb, 'And he became friend'; Charles restores wy'[lh ' ]hb, 'And he was <recorded> friend' on the basis of the use of the root in 1Chr.27<sup>24</sup> and 2Chr.20<sup>34</sup>; Rabin and Davies restore wy'[l '(w)]hb, 'And he was accounted a friend'.<sup>20</sup> Although Abraham is called a friend in Isaiah 41<sup>8</sup>, 2Chr.20<sup>7</sup>, and T.Abraham 2<sup>3</sup>, none of the above suggested restorations have biblical or Qumranic parallels. The form Abraham is found in this document here, 12<sup>11</sup> and 16<sup>6</sup> and is the name given to the patriarch by God in connection with the covenant - Genesis 17<sup>5</sup>.

The second tricolon deals with Abraham's offspring, giving him the credit

---

<sup>20</sup>Schechter, p65; Charles, p806; Rabin, p10 and Davies, p238, respectively.



for instructing both Isaac his son and Jacob his grandson (although this could merely be the result of poetical 'licence'.) There are a couple of typically poetic devices here: the use of the poetical form of Isaac, *yšḥq* not *yṣḥq*, as in the Psalms, Amos and Jeremiah,<sup>21</sup> and the absence of pronouns in the first two cola to refer to *mšwt 'l*. The root *msr* only occurs here and in 19<sup>10</sup> in the scrolls, and only occurs in the MT in Numbers 31, as a Qal infinitive in verse 16 and as a Niphal imperfect third plural in verse 5, though the Vulgate has *dederuntque* (=wayyims<sup>e</sup>rû) for the latter.

The fifth stanza: 3<sup>4-6</sup>. The Exile in Egypt.

bny y'qb t'w bm	3	6
wy'nšw lpny <sup>5</sup> mšgwtm	3	8
wbnyhm <bmsrym> hlkw bšryrwt lbm	4	10<2>
lhy'š 'l <sup>6</sup> mšwt 'l	3	7
wl'šwt 'yš hyšr b'ynyw	3	8

*The children of Jacob were led astray by such things,  
and were punished for<sup>5</sup> their transgressions.  
And their children <in Egypt> walked in the stubbornness of  
their heart;  
to conspire together against the<sup>6</sup> commandments of El,  
and to practise everyman what was right in his eyes.*

---

*lhy'š*: the form is corrupt as it stands. It is probably a Hithpael infinitive construct with the *tāw* omitted through a scribal error, *hi{t}yā'ēš*, giving the sense 'to conspire together' as in Ps.83<sup>5</sup>. Alternatively one could emend to

---

<sup>21</sup>4Q180 though has 'yšḥq', the poetic form, as does 4Q191 frg. 2<sup>1</sup>.

lhw's and read the Niphal infinitive - l<sup>e</sup>hiwā'ēš.

---

This stanza consists of a bicolon and a tricolon. The bicolon deals with Jacob's children, and there is no positive reference to Joseph. However the use of mšgwtm appears to denote only the eleven (i.e. excluding Joseph) since its only biblical occurrence is in Genesis 43<sup>12</sup> where Jacob is speaking to the eleven. Jacob's sons had transgressed in selling Joseph to the Ishmaelites, Genesis 37<sup>20-28</sup>, yet this may also be referring to incidents such as the Judah-Tamar story (Gen.38) or the Reuben-Bilhah account (Jub.33<sup>1-9</sup>), both of which deal with sins committed with 'yny znwt. We have a reversion to the particle bm, last used in 2<sup>17</sup>, which is thus a reference back to 'the thoughts of a guilty nature and eyes of lust' of 2<sup>16</sup>.

The tricolon of a:b:b' construction has a somewhat disproportionately long initial line, and so the word bmsrym could be taken as a clarificatory gloss. Our poem makes the plight of the Israelites in Egypt very much due to their own sinfulness, yet both Exodus 1 and Jubilees 46<sup>11-16</sup> relate how the ever growing number of Israelites in Egypt led to a new Pharoah enslaving them.<sup>22</sup>

The sixth stanza: 3<sup>6-8</sup>. The Wilderness.

wy'klw 't hdm	2	7
wykr <sup>t</sup> 7 zkwrm bmdbr	3	9

---

<sup>22</sup>The final line can be paralleled in Judges 17<sup>6</sup>, 21<sup>25</sup> - 'yš hyšr b'ygyw y'sh', but the phrase 'yš hyšr b'ynyw' is only found in the scrolls in CD, here and 8<sup>7</sup>=19<sup>20</sup>.

{wydbr} <sup>23</sup> lhm bqdš	3	7
'lw wršw 't {h'rs	3	6
wybhrw bršwn} rwhm	3	8
wl' šm'w <sup>8</sup> lqwl 'šyhm	4	7
<mšwt ywryhm>		
wyrgnw b'hlyhm	2	7

*And they ate blood  
 And<sup>7</sup> their men were cut off in the wilderness.  
 {And He spoke} to them at Kadesh:  
 'Go up and possess {the land'  
 But they chose the will} of their spirit,  
 And they did not listen<sup>8</sup> to the voice of their Maker  
 <the commandments which He taught them>  
 And they murmured in their tents.*

---

wy'klw: in line with my suggested orthography, point wayyō'kalû, keeping the pataḥ that is found elsewhere in the imperfect of this root; the *plene* form yw'klw is found in 1QS.6<sup>2</sup>.

---

This stanza exhibits a number of textual problems. Firstly, the scribe has corrupted by haplography the original text of bmdbr (w)ydbr to simply bmdbr.<sup>24</sup> Secondly, there is the careless omission of a number of words after the accusative particle, thus totally destroying what should be a tricolon.<sup>25</sup> Nearly all scholars agree that the text ought to be reconstructed by comparing it with

---

<sup>23</sup>Lost by haplography with 'bmdbr'.

<sup>24</sup>So Lohse, Vermes, Davies and Knibb.

<sup>25</sup>The text reads: 'lw wršw 't rwhm' - 'Go up and possess their spirit'.

*And when the Lord sent you from Kadesh-Barnea, he said, "Go up and take possession of the land" I have given you." But you rebelled against the command of the Lord your God. You did not trust Him or listen to His voice.<sup>26</sup>*

Yet there is a third problem, namely the questionable origin of the phrase  $\text{m}\dot{\text{s}}\text{w}\text{t } \text{y}\text{w}\text{r}\text{y}\text{h}\text{m}$ . The lines each side are taken from Psalm 106<sup>25</sup>:

wyr $\check{\text{g}}$ nw b'hlyhm  
l' šm'w bqwl yhwh

*And they murmured in their tents;  
They did not listen to the voice of the Lord.*

It is inaccurate for Rabin to claim that these three lines are an amalgamation of Deuteronomy 9<sup>23d</sup> and Psalm 106<sup>25</sup> by their common element, since the former reference really has no equivalent for  $\text{m}\dot{\text{s}}\text{w}\text{t } \text{y}\text{w}\text{r}\text{y}\text{h}\text{m}$ .<sup>29</sup> It seems to me more likely that the line has been inserted in order to create a degree of ambiguity in the interpretation of  $\text{y}\text{w}\text{r}\text{y}\text{h}\text{m}$ ; that is, in the context of Kadesh as applying to God and His commandments, but also in the contemporary context of the community as referring to the Teacher and his commandments (11QTorah). This is strengthened by the fact that whereas  $\text{y}\text{o}\text{r}\hat{\text{e}}$  is never used of God Himself but only of His emissaries in the MT,  $\text{y}\text{o}\text{r}\hat{\text{e}}$  is the term used for

---

<sup>26</sup>Charles (p806) prior to the discovery of the Scrolls, compared the text with Deut.1<sup>21,46</sup> and Ps.106<sup>33</sup> and read: 'lw wršw 't {h'rš wyqšw} rwħm' - "Go up and possess the land", but they hardened their spirit'.

<sup>27</sup>Hebrew: 'lw wršw 't-h'rš'.

<sup>28</sup>Hebrew: 'wl' šm'tm bqlw'.

<sup>29</sup>Deut.1<sup>26</sup> and 9<sup>23</sup> both read: 'wtmrw 't-py yhwh'.

the Teacher of the sect in the prosaic sections.<sup>30</sup> Thus by the addition of this phrase we have again a polemic against those who have left the sect, yet it should be remembered that this belongs to a secondary redaction of the text and thus to a later period in the life of the sect. This addition might also explain why the quotation from the Psalms has been inverted, though it is possible this latter point is due to a different manuscript tradition.<sup>31</sup>

According to our text the greatest sin the Israelites committed is not the worship of the golden calf, but rather the eating of blood. This is forbidden throughout the Pentateuch,<sup>32</sup> yet more significantly it is Jubilees 6<sup>1-16</sup> which makes the prohibition against eating blood the central point of the Noahic covenant:

*But flesh which is (filled) with life, (that is) with blood, you shall not eat – because the life of all flesh is in the blood – lest your blood be sought for your lives.<sup>33</sup>*

And secondly, the Temple Scroll which reiterates the same principle that blood contains somehow the lifeforce ('soul') of the animal concerned:

*Only pay firm attention not to eat the blood, which you shall pour on the ground like water and cover <sup>6</sup> with dust, for blood is life, and you may not eat life with flesh – in order <sup>7</sup> that it will go well with you and your sons after you for ever. So do what is right and good <sup>8</sup> before me, I, (who am) YHWH your*

---

<sup>30</sup>CD.19<sup>35</sup> (written and then crossed out and replaced by 'mwrh'), 20<sup>14</sup>; cf.'mwrh' in the poetry of 1<sup>11</sup>, and 20<sup>28,32</sup> and elsewhere in the scrolls; Rabin (p10-11) notes the possible translation 'the commandments of their teacher' = Moses.

<sup>31</sup>If the following colon is placed with this stanza it may represent a further deliberate ambiguous 'pun' on the form 'b'dtm', referring on the one hand to the congregation of Israelites who had rebelled (Ex.12<sup>19</sup> et al), and on the other hand to 'the congregation of traitors' led by the Man of Lies mentioned in 1<sup>12-14</sup>; this colon therefore may have contributed to the decision to place this gloss, 'mšwt ywryhm', here.

<sup>32</sup>Gen.9<sup>4</sup>; Lev.7<sup>26-27</sup>, 17<sup>12</sup>; Deut.12<sup>16,23</sup>.

<sup>33</sup>Jubilees 6<sup>7a</sup> – Charlesworth, Vol.2, p66.

God?<sup>4</sup>

The reference to 'their men being cut off' is to the fact that of the Israelites who escaped from Egypt, only Caleb lived to enter the Promised Land because of his obedience to God.<sup>35</sup> This incident at Kadesh occurs in Numbers 13<sup>30</sup>, where Caleb urges the Israelites to go up and possess the land, but instead they rebelled (Num.14). However, the account found in this stanza is based on the summary given in Deut.9<sup>23</sup> (quoted above - p107) and 1<sup>19-27</sup>:

*..and so we reached Kadesh-Barnea.<sup>20</sup> Then I said to you, "You have reached the hill country of the Amorites, which the Lord our God is giving us."<sup>21</sup> See, the Lord your God has given you the land. Go up and take possession of it as the Lord, the God of your fathers, told you. ....<sup>26</sup> But you were unwilling to go up; you rebelled against the commandments of the Lord your God.<sup>27</sup> You grumbled in your tents.<sup>26</sup>*

The seventh stanza: 3<sup>8-10</sup>. The exile.

wyḥr 'p 'l <sup>9</sup> b'dtm	4	7
wbnyhm bw 'bdw	3	6
wmlkyhm bw nkrtw	3	7
wgybwryhm bw <sup>10</sup> 'bdw	3	7
w'rṣm bw šmmh	3	6

*And the wrath of El was kindled<sup>9</sup> against their congregation:  
And their children because of it were lost,  
And their kings because of it were cut off,  
And their warriors because of it<sup>10</sup> were lost,  
And their land because of it became desolate.*

---

<sup>34</sup>11QT 53<sup>5-8</sup> from Maier, p46-47.

<sup>35</sup>Deut.1<sup>35-36</sup>, cf. also Num.14<sup>24,30,38</sup>, 26<sup>65</sup>, 32<sup>12</sup>.

<sup>36</sup>Hebrew: 'wtrgnw b'hlykm...':

---

gybwryhm: *plene* spelt here.

šmmh: should be pointed as a pausal form šāmēmâ, as in Ezk.35<sup>15</sup> where one reads ‘..the house of Israel became desolate.<sup>37</sup>

---

Having covered the period from the Heavenly Watchers to the wandering in the Wilderness, this stanza seems to conclude the historical account by briefly alluding to the monarchy which ended in disaster with the exile. The all-embracing categories here heighten the concluding effect of what is the first half of this poem. It seems likely therefore that the initial monocolon prefixes the following quatrain rather than referring back to the previous stanza. Perhaps though it does double-duty and can be described as a linking phrase which in concluding the previous stanza is developed in the subsequent quatrain.

The quatrain is as well-balanced as one could wish; it is metrically perfect with each cola consisting of a subject with 3rd.m.pl.suffix + particle bw + perfect in the 3rd.m.pl. (except for the final colon). The parallelism is further heightened between the first and third cola with the use of the same verb. The particle bw refers to ‘the wrath of God’ which makes the initial monocolon an important turning point separating man’s sin (marked by the particle bh prior

---

<sup>37</sup>Lohse (p70) points ‘š<sup>e</sup>māmā’, a feminine noun, ‘desolation’.

to this point) from God's wrath (marked by the particle bw from this point onwards.) It is unclear whether all the verbs relate to the pre-exilic time in general or specifically to the destruction of the exile, in that with the exile the monarchy was ended, the army was crushed and disbanded,<sup>38</sup> 'the children' would have been sold as slaves if not killed in battle,<sup>39</sup> and the land was totally ravished.

The eighth stanza: 3<sup>10-12</sup>. The Unfaithful of the pre-exilic age.

bw hbw b'y hbryt hr'šnym	5	11
wysgrw <sup>11</sup> lħrb	2	7
b'zbm 't bryt 'l	3	5
wybħrw bršwnm	2	7
wytwrw 'hry šryrwt <sup>12</sup> lbm	4	10
l'swt 'yš 't ršwnw	3	6

*Because of it, the first members of the covenant were guilty  
and they were delivered up <sup>11</sup> to the sword,  
Because they forsook the covenant of El  
and chose their own will,  
And they went about after the stubbornness <sup>12</sup> of their heart,  
every man practising his own will.*

---

wysgrw: Niphal, wayyissāgerû.

hr'šnym: adjective masculine plural, thus 'first members of the covenant' and not 'covenant (of) the ancestors' as in 1<sup>4</sup> = Lev.26<sup>45</sup>. For the sectarians, it

---

<sup>38</sup>2Kgs 24<sup>14</sup>, 25<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>39</sup>2Kgs 24<sup>14</sup>, 2Chr.36<sup>20</sup>.



was not a case of an old covenant being replaced by a new one, but of the one covenant begun under Noah being taken on and renewed by the sect.<sup>40</sup>

---

In this stanza we again are confronted with the problem of whether to follow the metre and see a longer, but well-balanced, initial bicolon followed by a tricolon, or whether to disregard the metre and arrange the Hebrew into three bicola. The first of these suggestions would parallel the term *bryt* found twice in the bicolon, and the term *ꠏꠗꠗꠗ* found in the first and last cola of the tricolon. In either case, there is a distinct lack of any poetical devices within this stanza.

The textual problem here, lies with the initial two words of the first colon for which the Cairo manuscript (T-S 10 K6) clearly reads *bw hbw*. In line with the previous stanza one would expect *bw* to refer to 'the wrath of El'. The form *hbw* is senseless as it stands so we can emend to *ḥbw* (from the root *ḥwb*) – *because of it (=the wrath of El) they were guilty...*<sup>41</sup>; this is a very plausible mistake, for according to Kutscher many errors occurred in the use of laryngeals and pharyngeals (of 1QIs<sup>a</sup>) apparently because they had become so weak that no differentiation was made between alep and 'ayin or hē and ḥēt.<sup>42</sup> Thus the reasoning is, that since the wrath of God was kindled against them at the time of the Babylonian exile, it must be because they were guilty, and

---

<sup>40</sup>See Chapter 3.1.4 on 'Covenant', p382-386.

<sup>41</sup>Rabin has 'become culpable' – p10; Davies reads 'ḥbw' 'incurred guilt' (p238-9) and then argues in a note that it should be emended to 'hbw' and 'bw' supplied before it – p243.

<sup>42</sup>Kutscher, 1QIs<sup>a</sup>, p57.

the form this guilt took is expounded in what follows.<sup>43</sup> Alternatively, one could emend the wāw of bw to a yodh<sup>44</sup> and then combine it with hbw to read one word byhbw. This would then be an infinitive from the root yhb, viz. b<sup>o</sup>yoh<sup>e</sup>b<sub>u</sub>ô, thus:

*When He gave up those who entered the first covenant,  
they were delivered to the sword...*

Again in this stanza (and those that follow) the author is strongly dependent on the Deuteronomist; here 29<sup>24-29</sup> (Heb. 23-28):

*“Why has the Lord done thus to the land? What means the heat of this great anger?”<sup>25</sup> Then men would say: “It is because they forsook the covenant of the Lord,<sup>45</sup> ... ,which He made for them when He brought them out of the land of Egypt,<sup>26</sup> and went and served other gods...;<sup>27</sup> therefore the anger of the Lord was kindled against this land, bringing upon it the curses written in this book;<sup>28</sup> and the Lord uprooted them from their land in anger and fury and great wrath, and cast them into another land, as at this day”.<sup>29</sup> The secret things belong to the Lord our God; but the things that are revealed belong to us and our children forever, that we may do all the words of this law.’*

The ninth stanza: 3<sup>12-14</sup>. The Faithful.

wbmḥzyqym bmswt 'l 13	3	8
'šr nwtrw mhm	2	5
hqym 'l 't brytw	3	6
lyšr 'l 'd 'wlm	2	6

---

<sup>43</sup>An easier solution which bypasses the tricky theology found here is to argue that bw is merely the result of dittography with hbw.

<sup>44</sup>It is slightly shorter than most waw's in T-S 10 K6, though does not seem to be short enough to be a yodh.

<sup>45</sup>'l 'šr 'zbow 't bryt yhwh' paralleling our text: 'b'zbm 't bryt 'l'.

lglwt <sup>14</sup> lhm nstrwt	3	7
'šr t'w bm kl yšr'l	3	8

*But with those who held fast to the commandments of El<sup>13</sup>  
who were left of them,  
El established His covenant  
in Israel forever;  
To reveal<sup>14</sup> to them (the) 'hidden things',  
by which all Israel had gone astray:*

---

There is a small gap in the manuscript which sets off this stanza from what precedes it, perhaps because we are now dealing with the faithful who should naturally be set apart from the unfaithful of the previous verses. Yet again the opening lines of this stanza could be construed as either a quatrain with subsidiary clauses in the second and fourth cola, or as a bicolon with longer than average lines. The main verb is not encountered until the third colon-hqym. The stanza ends with a bicolon.

The first question is who are meant by 'those who hold fast? Chronologically, one would expect the next reference after the sinful pre-exilic nation to be to the remnant of the early post-exilic period. Yet elsewhere in the scrolls, and in particular in this document, the term mḥzyqym clearly refers to the sect: CD.3<sup>20</sup>, 7<sup>13-14</sup>, 20<sup>27</sup> and 1QS.5<sup>3,46</sup>. Of these CD.7<sup>13-14</sup> seems to come closest to our text, because it also appears to be referring to the proto-sectarian community:

---

<sup>46</sup>In the MT the phrase 'wmḥzyqym bbryty', 'and those who hold fast to My covenant', occurs twice in Isaiah 56<sup>4,6</sup> of eunuchs and proselytes respectively.

*And all those who fell away were delivered up to the sword,  
But those who held fast escaped to the land of the north.*

The only way to do justice to these apparently conflicting points is to consider that the poet is referring to the early post-exilic period, and that he is claiming the origin of the sect can be traced back to this period.

Yet we must also consider the phrase 'šr nwtrw mhm in this context. Does the masculine suffix on mhm refer to the pre-exilic sinful Israelites, or to the post-exilic remnant? The former would mean that only the righteous (those who held fast) survived the exile, the latter that 'those who held fast' were only a proportion of the remnant so implying that some sinners survived. If we adopt the former interpretation the poet is equating the remnant with the sect and so claiming false antiquity for the sect, a conclusion that we have arrived at once already, whilst if we adopt the latter then the poet is simply stating that the sect stemmed from the righteous remnant. Charles believes the former is the case, yet consequently regards the words 'šr nwtrw mhm as a clarificatory gloss.<sup>47</sup>

Furthermore, there is in this stanza both a positive and a negative reference to Israel, which is somewhat of a paradox. Consequently, Charles contends that we have an Aramaic construct form brytw lyšr 'l 'the covenant of Israel'<sup>48</sup>, which therefore removes the direct reference to Israel of the former reference. Yet such unqualified references to the covenant (brytw) almost always refer to the covenant of the sect,<sup>49</sup> which would then mean that

---

<sup>47</sup>Charles, p807.

<sup>48</sup>Charles, p807; literally 'its covenant, namely of Israel'.

<sup>49</sup>See: Collins, 'The Berith-Notion of the Cairo Damascus Covenant and its comparison with the New Testament', ETL, 39 (1963), p562 - see Chapter 3.1.4 on 'Covenant', p382-386.

the latter was for anyone in Israel who wanted it, as 15<sup>5</sup> seems to imply - *And whoever has entered the covenant appointed for all Israel for ever..* Furthermore, if 'those who hold fast' are the remnant then the second reference to Israel must be to the pre-exilic Israel; alternatively if the sect is meant then the second reference to Israel must be to the contemporary nation of Israel. There are two other ways of removing this paradox: delete *lyśr`l* as a gloss<sup>50</sup>, or argue that the sect is the true Israel so that the covenant is *lyśr`l*.

The term *nstrwt* is usually translated 'hidden things,' and then seen as a claim by the sect to have some kind of divinely revealed knowledge, very similar to the *γνωσις* of Gnosticism. In the MT the word *nstrwt* occurs twice. Once in Deuteronomy 29<sup>29</sup><sup>(v28)</sup> (quoted above); there the *nistaroth* are solely in God's domain and are contrasted with 'the things that are revealed' (*w<sup>e</sup>hanniglōt*) which help the individual obey all the words of the torah. The other occurrence of *nistaroth* is in Psalm 19<sup>13</sup>; there, after a number of verses dealing with God's torah, we read:

*Who can discern his errors?  
 Forgive my hidden faults,<sup>14</sup>  
 Keep your servant also from wilful sins;  
 May they not rule over me.<sup>51</sup>*

Many scholars dismiss this reference because *nistaroth* has in this psalm a negative meaning, but this meaning is if anything more appropriate to our passage than simply 'hidden things'. The poet used both biblical passages to inform 'those who had held fast' that God had revealed some special

---

<sup>50</sup>As Charles tentatively suggests - p807

<sup>51</sup>v13-14 (v12-13 in English) - NIV translation.

knowledge of a divine nature (Deut.29<sup>29(Heb.23)</sup>) for the first time, and that these 'nistaroth' ('hidden faults' - Ps.19<sup>13</sup>) were a list of the current sins of Israel as summarized in the following stanza.

So how do we resolve the problems posed in the opening paragraph of this section on the ninth stanza? The evidence would seem to lead to an interpretation of the bicolon along the following lines:

*But with those who held fast (= the precursors of the sect) on to the commandments of El (= the Mosaic covenant), <sup>13</sup> of those (= the remnant) who were left, El establish His covenant for Israel (= the sectarian covenant which was for any individual in Israel / (or the sect as the true Israel)) forever, so as to reveal <sup>14</sup> to them (= the proto-sectarians) the 'hidden faults' by which all Israel (= the pre-exilic nation) had gone astray.*

If the sect are claiming a long antiquity here, then they may be referring to the origins of their sect in the Hasidim movement. Although the latter were only founded in the second century, they stemmed from a movement or trend that lies behind much of the literature of the early post-exilic period.<sup>52</sup>

The tenth stanza: 3<sup>14-17</sup>. The 'nistaroth'.

šbtwt qdšw wmw'dy <sup>15</sup> kbwdw	2+2	4+5
'ydw t šdqw wdrky 'mtw	2+2	4+4
wḥpsy ršwnw		
<'šr y'sh <sup>16</sup> h'dm wḥyh bhm>		
pth lpnyhm	4	9
wḥprw b'r lmym rbym <sup>17</sup>	4	9
wmw'syhm l' yḥyh	3	7

*His holy Sabbaths and <sup>15</sup> His glorious feast days;*

<sup>52</sup>See: Morgenstern, 'The Ḥasidim - Who were they?', HUCA, 38 (1967), p59-73, but compare: Davies, 'Ḥasidim in the Maccabean Period', JJS, 28 (1977), p127-140.

*His righteous testimonies and His true ways.  
And the desires of His will  
<which<sup>16</sup> man should practise and live by>  
He uncovered before them.*

*And they dug a well of many waters;<sup>17</sup>  
And those who reject them shall not live.*

---

'ydw̄t: with *plene* yod but no *plene* wāw 'êdw̄ot, which is the converse of its *plene* spelling in 20<sup>31</sup> and 1Q22.2<sup>1</sup> - 'dww̄t(y).

wyḥprw: wayyaḥporû as CD.6<sup>3</sup> where the *plene* form appears.

---

These then are the nistārôṭ, the list of the ways in which Israel had strayed. Many scholars see here a list of five factors with a concluding refrain exhorting the reader to obedience. However they are then confronted with the problem of the following colon pth̄ lpnyhm which is abrupt, too short from the poetical point of view, and needs the addition of an explanatory 'these'. The solution is to take the revealed nistaroth as pairs, as their content implies, and then take out the refrain as a gloss and read 'the desires of His will' as the object of the verb pth̄.<sup>53</sup> We have then a tricolon of a:a':b pattern. The initial two lines each have two pairs, with gender-matching parallelism between the nouns in construct: šbtw̄t, mw'dy, 'ydw̄t, drky, and with the word-pair 'mt :

---

<sup>53</sup>So Charles, p807; Lohse, p73; Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 77, p208.

שדג occurring in the second colon; all five pairs have the masculine suffix referring to God. All this leads to a good deal of assonance between pairs.

The first pair implies that the sect held a different calendar from normative Judaism. The Temple Scroll has confirmed what many scholars had already deduced, which is that while normative Judaism adhered to a lunar calendar of 354 days the sect followed a solar calendar of 364 days. This meant that for the sect the religious festivals always fell on the same day of the week; the New Year was always a Wednesday, the Day of Atonement a Friday, and so on.<sup>54</sup> Although the feast days would not often coincide with those of mainstream Judaism, the normal days of the week would do. Yet it appears there was also some disagreement regarding the Sabbath, and there are other texts to this effect in this document:

*They shall keep the Sabbath day according to its exact interpretation.. (6<sup>18</sup>)*

*No man shall work on the sixth day from the moment the sun's orb is distant by its own fullness from the gate (wherein it sinks); for this is what He said, "Observe the Sabbath and keep it holy." (10<sup>14-17</sup>)*

Talmon<sup>55</sup> has suggested that the sectarians day started at sunrise and was reckoned to the following sunrise, whereas in normative Judaism the day would have run from sunset to sunset. CD.10<sup>14-17</sup> thus forbids work from sunset to sunrise of what was part of the sixth day of the week for the sect, but what would be part of the Sabbath for normative Judaism. It is perhaps surprising to find the sect accommodating itself in this way to the practices of

---

<sup>54</sup>See: Jaubert, The date of the Last Supper, p27-28; Talmon, 'The Calendar reckoning of the Sect from the Judaean Desert' in Scripta Hierosolymitana, 4 (1958), p162-199; Maier, p71-76.

<sup>55</sup>Scripta Hierosolymitana, 4, p187.



normative Judaism, yet if this document was written for sectarians living away from Qumran then this is perhaps not so surprising.<sup>56</sup> Thus one could summarize:

The sect: used a solar calendar with the day beginning at sunrise; thus they were 'sons of light'.

Judaism : used a lunar calendar with the day beginning at sunset; thus they were 'sons of darkness'.

The second pair of the nistaroth seem to be general requirements. The use of the word  $\text{\$dqw}$  may be deliberately ambiguous, for it could be understood as an adjective with suffix  $\text{\$addiq\hat{o}}$  - 'the testimonies of His righteous one', viz. the teachings (=11QTorah) of the Teacher of Righteousness - cf.20<sup>11,29-30</sup>.

The secondary refrain was no doubt added at a time of wavering adherence to the sect's laws, and originates from Lev.18<sup>5</sup>:

$\text{w\`smrtm 't hqty w't m\`spty 'sr y'sh 'tm h'dm wh\`y<sup>57</sup> bhm}$

*You shall keep my precepts and my judgements, which mankind should practice and by which they should live.*

The phrase  $\text{wyhprw b'r}$  is unique to this document occurring here and in the Well Midrash of 6<sup>3-11</sup>, with the well theme also being found in 19<sup>34</sup>. From

---

<sup>56</sup>The principle is basically that stated by Paul in 1Corinthians.8-9 esp.8<sup>9,13</sup> and 9<sup>20</sup>; thus (paraphrasing): 'if my action causes my brother to fall into sin I will not do it' and thus: 'To the Jews, I am like a Jew to win the Jews. ...I become all things to all men so that I might save some.' Talmon however writes: 'It seems reasonable to suppose that the copyist of CDC, who lived in the 10<sup>th</sup>-11<sup>th</sup> centuries (or one of his predecessors), whether a Karaite or a Rabbanite, altered the ancient wording which originally had been similar to the version of Jubilees, and adjusted the text to the current laws prevailing in his community' - Scripta Hierosolymitana, 4, p193.

<sup>57</sup>Samaritan reads 'wh\`yh' as in our text.

the Well Midrash it is clear that b'r represents the sectarian torah (11QT), so that lmy m rby m represents the 'many teachings' of the torah. The following colon is problematical. To begin with there is the change of 'number' from the plural participle mw'syhm to the singular imperfect yhyh. Charles and Rabin<sup>58</sup> translate *'And he that despises...'* (though without any explanation) which yields the appropriate sense; thus, we shall either have to emend mw'syhm to mw'sm, the former occurring as an unconscious alteration due to the plurals in the vicinity,<sup>59</sup> or read yihyû for yihyê. The subject of the verb would seem to be non-sectarians who scoff at the sect's torah:

*Interpreted, this concerns the House of Absalom<sup>10</sup> and the members of its council who were silent at the time of the chastisement of the Teacher of Righteousness<sup>11</sup> and gave him no help against the Man of Lie who rejected<sup>12</sup> the torah in the midst of their whole [congregation].<sup>60</sup>*

Alternatively, it could refer to potential apostates within the sect, to whom it is meant is a warning. The suffix refers to the 'many waters' of the previous line, confirmed by the fact this root m's is regularly connected with twrh or mšwt.<sup>61</sup>

The eleventh stanza: 3<sup>17-18</sup>. Past sinfulness.

whm htgwllw	2	4
bpš' 'nws wbd rky ndh 18	2+2	3+5

<sup>58</sup>Charles, p807; Rabin, p12.

<sup>59</sup>Davies suggests it was corrupted under the influence of the following plural particle hm - p89.

<sup>60</sup>1QpH.5<sup>9-12</sup>, cf. 4QpIs<sup>c</sup> 23, 2<sup>10-14</sup> where 'the seekers of smooth things' (=the Pharisees) are similarly accused.

<sup>61</sup>With 'twrh': (CD.20<sup>8-9</sup>) 1QpHab.1<sup>11</sup> 5<sup>12</sup> (quoted above - p121), 4QpIs<sup>c</sup> 23, 2<sup>10-14</sup>; with 'mšwt': CD.19<sup>5</sup> 8<sup>19</sup>=19<sup>32</sup>; with 'bryt': CD.20<sup>11-12</sup>, 1QH.15<sup>18</sup>. Davies considers the line is a gloss on Lev.18<sup>5</sup> - p89.

wy'mrw ky lnw hy'	3	8
w'l brzy pl'w	3	5
kpr b'd 'wnm wys' lpš'm <sup>19</sup>	2+2	5+5

*For they had rolled about  
in the transgression of the common people and in ways of  
uncleanness,<sup>18</sup>  
And had said, 'This is for us'.  
But El in His wonderful mysteries,  
Pardoned their iniquity and forgave their transgression.<sup>19</sup>*

---

htgwlw: hithpoel from the root gl1.

wy'mrw: wayyo'marû - cf. wy'klw in 3<sup>6</sup>.

brzy: T-S 10 K6 is unclear but does seem to read a zayin,<sup>62</sup> a fact made more probable since the same phrase rzy p<sup>l</sup> (with various suffixes) is found in: 1QS.9<sup>18</sup>, 11<sup>5</sup>; 1QH.1<sup>21</sup> *et al*

---

This section is in fact well-balanced, with the literary units being basically of two stresses. Moreover, a neat rhetorical poetical device can be discerned once one realizes that *'the transgression of men and the ways of uncleanness'* are neatly balanced and negated by *'(He) pardoned their sin and forgave their transgression'*. The combination of conjunction and pronoun (whm) add heavy emphasis here to the wicked.

---

<sup>62</sup>Schechter (p116) reads 'brwy', which he sees as a corruption of 'brwb' (p66).

But who are these sinners, 'those who dug the well', 'those who reject them (=the teachings of the sect)', or some further group whose identity can be deduced from their alleged sins? A closer examination of htgw11w shows that while it is always associated with sin in the scrolls, only here does forgiveness follow for the transgressors, strongly suggesting that the sect is meant.<sup>63</sup> The key lies in parallels to the phrase pš' 'nwš elsewhere in the scrolls:

*And in His great goodness He will pardon my iniquities,  
And in His righteousness He will cleanse me from the  
uncleanness of man.<sup>64</sup>*

*For the sake of Thy glory  
Thou hast purified man of sin  
that he may be holy for Thee,....  
that he may be one [with] the children of Thy truth  
and partake of the lot of Thy Holy Ones:..<sup>65</sup>*

Thus we have here, couched in poetry, further evidence that the sect believed they had sinned and needed forgiveness. These transgressions must have either occurred in their pre-sectarian days, or during the early days of the sect (=the twenty years of groping) prior to the revelation of the 'nistaroth'; they had in either event been unknowingly defiling themselves.<sup>66</sup> We can therefore concur with Davies in adopting the pluperfect - 'But they had been defiling themselves..<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup>This root occurs in: CD.8<sup>5</sup>=19<sup>17</sup>; 1QS.4<sup>19,21</sup>; 1QH.6<sup>22</sup>, 17<sup>19</sup>.

<sup>64</sup>1QS 11<sup>14-15</sup> in the Master's Hymn; Hebrew 'mndt 'nwš'.

<sup>65</sup>1QH 11<sup>10-12</sup> - Hebrew here 'nwš mps'.

<sup>66</sup>Note the phrase 'šby pš' in CD 2<sup>5</sup> and 20<sup>17</sup> cf. 4<sup>9-10</sup>, 14<sup>19</sup>. Alternatively, all three of these texts could be referring to non-specific sins in a symbolic poetical fashion.

<sup>67</sup>Davies, p87-90. There is no need to go to Murphy-O'Connor's extreme and see these three lines (17b-18a) as an interpolation, added when it had become clear that the appeal of 17a had been refused - RB, 77, p209 - since this would remove the parallel between the two categories of sins and the double pardoning.

The phrase *drky ndh* also has some interesting parallels. The only actual occurrence of the phrase in the scrolls is in 1QS.4<sup>10</sup>:

*Works of abomination in a spirit of lust,  
And ways of impurity in the service of uncleanness.*

Parallelism would suggest some kind of sexual transgression, which the nearest equivalent in this document (8<sup>5</sup>=19<sup>17</sup>) confirms:

wytg(w)llw bdrky zwnwt ..

*But they(=the leaders of Judah) rolled about in ways of lust ..*

Thus the phrase *drky ndh* has the sense of sexual purity which is a theme that occurred in the introductory stanza of this poem with the phrase '(y)ny znwt, and one explicitly dealt with in the Midrash on the Nets of Belial. This suggests we are dealing with real sexual impurity rather than with idolatry on the metaphoric plane. The sectarians were open to such sexual impurity in their pre-sectarian days but on entering the sect God had forgiven them; however such 'sexual purity' was still rife in the wider Jewish population.

If the phrase *lnw hy'* is biblical it probably comes from Ezekiel 11<sup>15</sup>.<sup>68</sup>

lnw hy' ntnh h'rš lmwršh

*..the people of Jerusalem have said, 'They(=the house of Israel) are far away from the Lord; this land was given to us as our possession.'*

Are the sectarians saying that prior to their membership of the sect, at least some of them were among those (in Jerusalem) who were claiming the land for themselves? If so, this could either be at the time of the Maccabean revolt

---

<sup>68</sup>Note the use of 'ky' in CD indicating direct speech, like 'OT 1 in Greek.

(which the Hasidim were clearly involved in), or at the time when independence was granted in 142 B.C. under Simon?<sup>69</sup> If the former, then this may be a positive reference, that under the influence of Hellenism the cry went up: 'This land is ours'. Why would this be considered a sin? Probably because of the greed and civil power-struggles that developed once the Seleucid oppressors had been defeated.<sup>70</sup> Alternatively, the phrase may have no reference to the land, and simply have the sense of doing something which is in accordance with one's own wishes: 'This is for us!'. In the light of its context this then might either refer to varying calendrical practices (revealed as erroneous by the 'nistaroth') or even to the dispute associated with the legitimate priesthood, a theme found in the following Ezekiel 44<sup>15</sup> Midrash.

The twelfth stanza: 3<sup>19-20</sup>. The 'sure house'.

wybn lhm byt n'mn byśr'l	5	11
'śr l' 'md kmhw lmlpnym w'd <sup>20</sup> hnh	5	13
hmḥzyqym bw lhyy nṣḥ	4	9
wk1 kbwd 'dm lhm	3	7

*And He built for them 'a sure house' in Israel,  
like which none stood from of old until <sup>20</sup> now;  
Those who hold fast to it shall live forever,  
and all the glory of Adam (shall be) for them.*

This concluding stanza consists of two reasonably well-balanced bicola, both of a:b pattern. The initial bicolon deals with 'the sure house', which

---

<sup>69</sup>The coin inscriptions 'Yehohanan the high priest, head of the Jewish community' of John Hyrcanus' reign showed the Hasmoneans styled themselves as 'Judeans' in possession of Israel, just as in Ezekiel.

<sup>70</sup>We know the Hasidim split with the Maccabees shortly after the Temple was rededicated - 1Mac.2<sup>42</sup>, 2Mac.14<sup>6</sup>; Josephus, Antiquities, 12,10,2; cf. 1Mac.7<sup>12-14</sup>.

comes from 1 Samuel 2<sup>35,71</sup>

*I will raise up for myself a faithful priest who will do according to what is in My heart and in My mind; and I will build him a sure house<sup>72</sup>, and he will minister before my anointed one always.*

The Samuel account tells of the replacement of the priestly line of Eli by a faithful priest, namely Samuel. Yet in typical sectarian style this phrase is reinterpreted by the following Ezekiel quotation and midrash as applying to the Zadokite priestly line. Yet the Ezekiel 44<sup>15</sup> Midrash is a secondary prose addition appended to the original poem, which quite logically ends with the promise of eternal life.<sup>73</sup> The 'sure house' is therefore the community in the original poem, and in view of its origin in 1 Samuel 2<sup>35</sup> the community is probably to be taken here as 'a spiritual temple'.<sup>74</sup> The concept of the sect as a 'House' (with temple symbolism overtones) is one found also in 1QS:

*...<sup>5</sup> the Council of the Community shall be established in truth. It shall be an everlasting plantation, a House of holiness for Israel, an assembly of supreme<sup>6</sup> holiness for Aaron. ..<sup>7,8</sup>.. It shall be a most holy dwelling<sup>9</sup> for Aaron... It shall be a House of perfection and truth in Israel... (1QS 8<sup>5-9</sup>.)*

*At that time, the men<sup>6</sup> of the community shall set apart a House of holiness for Aaron in order that it might be united to the most holy things and a House of community for Israel, for*

---

<sup>71</sup>There is another reference to 'byt n'mn' in 1 Kings 11<sup>38</sup>, where God is speaking to Jeroboam about the future Northern Kingdom of Israel: 'If you (Jeroboam) do whatever I command .. I will be with you. I will build you a dynasty as enduring as the one I built for David and will give Israel to you.'

<sup>72</sup>Hebrew: 'wbnyty lw bayit n'mn'.

<sup>73</sup>So: Rabinowitz, JBL, 73, p13-14 n8a; Davies, p90, suspects it 'was originally an independent source'. I certainly cannot agree with Schwartz that CD 3<sup>18b-412a</sup> is a literary unit for this totally disregards the different genre of 2<sup>14-320</sup> (poetic), 3<sup>20-46</sup> (midrashic), and 4<sup>6-12</sup> (semi-poetic redaction) - "'To Join Oneself to the House of Judah" (Damascus Document IV,11)', RQ, 10 (1981), p437-8.

<sup>74</sup>See Chapter 3.1.2 on 'Temple', p357-370; Gärtner, The Temple and the Community in Qumran and in the New Testament, and Aalen, "'Reign" and "House" in the Kingdom of God in the Gospels', NTS, 8 (1961-2), p233-240.

*those who walk in perfection. (1QS 9<sup>5-6</sup>.)*

In the second bicolon the form *mḥzyqym* appears again – cf. 3<sup>12</sup> above. The two are not necessarily synonymous, since an ever-decreasing group is being defined – those who held fast to it (=the sure house) of those who (had) held fast to the commandments of El.

There seems to be a conscious attempt by scholars to water-down any reference to the afterlife found in the scrolls. Yet both *lḥyy nṣḥ* and *wk1 kbwd 'dm lhm* have further parallels in the Two Spirits passage in 4<sup>8</sup> and 4<sup>23</sup> respectively, and the latter also in 1QH.17<sup>14-15</sup>:

*...and that their seed may be before thee forever. ...Thou wilt cause them to inherit all the glory of Adam and abundance of days.<sup>75</sup>*

With 1QH.17<sup>15</sup> and 1QS.4<sup>23</sup>, this passage is one of three cases where *'dm* is taken as a proper noun 'Adam'.<sup>76</sup> This poem began its historical account with the Heavenly Watchers, who were considered to be the initial perpetrators of sin; in contrast, it ends with Adam, who is seen as the archetypal man, existing in the world prior to the introduction of sin, thus sinless, and so the ideal at which to aim.

---

<sup>75</sup>Josephus also relates that the sect had a positive concept of the afterlife in his book – The Jewish War, 2,8,11.

<sup>76</sup>Some scholars prefer to translate 'mankind/man' – Rabin, p12 and Charles, p808: 'all the glory of man'; Rabinowitz, JBL, 73, p16 'shall have all human glory'.



Concluding remarks to the third poem: 2<sup>14</sup>-3<sup>20</sup>.

The poetry of this poem is not as good as the previous two poems, although there are a number of high spots. This I suggest is largely due to the historical subject matter which led to the use of 'poetic narrative' by the original poet. Furthermore, like the first poem, the historical issues dealt with here lent themselves to subsequent corruption and expansion (especially in the latter half) as the sect's own history developed, and with the poetry being less well defined in the first place the additions are far more difficult to detect.

The poem is basically an account of Israel's history, concentrating on the sinfulness of successive ages. It is the unfaithfulness of the children of every generation that is highlighted, and this is because the poet is addressing the children, namely, the new members of the sect, who must not fall into the same trap. The poem can be dated to the second half of the second century B.C. (c140-128) after the founder-members had dug the well (11QT) and the sect had been established at Qumran.<sup>77</sup>

1.3.1. The Ezekiel 44<sup>15</sup> Midrash: 3<sup>20</sup>-4<sup>6</sup>.

hw' k'šr <sup>21</sup> hqym 'l lhm byd yhzq'l hnby' l'mr  
hkhnym whlwym wbny <sup>1</sup> šdwq 'šr šmrw 't mšmrt mqdšw<sup>78</sup> bt'wt  
bny yšr'l <sup>2</sup> m'ly{ }hm ygyšw ly ḥlb wdm  
hkhnym hm šby yšr'l <sup>3</sup> hywš'ym m'rš yhwđh w{hlwym hm}  
hnlwym 'mhm wbny šdwq hm bḥyry <sup>4</sup> yšr'l qry'y ḥšm h'mdym  
b'ḥryt hymym

---

<sup>77</sup>See Chapter 3.2 on the History of the Sect, p387-401.

<sup>78</sup>Emend to 'mqdšy'.

*This is as <sup>21</sup> El established for them by the hand of Ezekiel, the prophet, saying:*

*The priests and the Levites and the children <sup>1</sup> of Zadok, who kept watch on My sanctuary when the children of Israel went astray <sup>2</sup> from Me, shall draw near to Me with fat and blood.*

*The priests' are those who turn back in Israel <sup>3</sup> who went out of the land of Judah, and {the Levites} are those who were joined with them. And 'the children of Zadok' are the chosen ones <sup>4</sup> of Israel, those called by name, who stand firm during the last days.*

---

We should begin by considering the MT of Ezekiel 44<sup>15</sup>:

whkhnym hlwym bny sdwq 'šr šmrw 't mšmrt mqđšy bt'wt  
bny yśr'l m'ly hmh yqrbw 'ly lšrtny w'mdw lpny lhqryb ly  
h1b wdm n'm 'dny yhwh

*But the Levitical priests, the sons of Zadok, who kept the charge of My sanctuary when the people of Israel went astray from Me, shall come near to Me to minister to Me; and they shall attend to Me to offer Me the fat and the blood, declares the Lord.*

From this there emerge a number of points. The addition to our text of two wāws is seen by the majority of scholars as a deliberate textual alteration made in order to create three groups out of the original one. Only Schwartz is more cautious, suggesting that it may be question of an old textual variant as both the Vulgate and the Syriac have the first of these two wāws. One could also suggest this was the reason for the omission of the phrase: hmh yqrbw 'ly lšrtny w'mdw lpny; alternatively this phrase was omitted through haplography of the root qrb for which the author consciously substituted the root ngš. mqđšw should probably be emended to mqđšy on the basis of the MT. Most scholars believe it is necessary to divide m'lyhm into

m'ly hm (with hm for MT hḥh); perhaps again though, the author had this reading in his biblical text - 'the children of Israel went astray from them (=the Zadokite priests)'. It is generally agreed that one needs to supply hlwym hm, lost through haplography with wnhlwym.

As most scholars of the scrolls will appreciate, there are two major problems to be discussed here. The first is the identity of the three groups for which there are two lines of argument:

1. The first group of scholars - Stegemann, Murphy-O'Connor<sup>79</sup> - consider that we have here three different terms for the same entity, viz. the whole community. In favour of this approach is the meaning of the original Ezekiel passage (where the ambiguity is not present); it is 'the priests who are Levites and descendents of Zadok' who are to be God's sole ministers.. cf. also 40<sup>46</sup>, 43<sup>19</sup>, 44<sup>10-31</sup>.
2. The second group of scholars think that the three terms refer to three parts of the community. From this premise two solutions have been proposed:

- Some scholars envisage a hierarchical structure of priests Levites and laymen.<sup>80</sup> Murphy-O'Connor considers that identifying the 'sons of Zadok' with

---

<sup>79</sup>Stegemann, p121-122; Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 77, p211 - also Cothenet, Les textes de Qumran, 2, p160, n3.

<sup>80</sup>E.g.: Betz, Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte, p180-181.

the laity is absurd because elsewhere in the scrolls the phrase is qualified - 'the sons of Zadok, the Priests'.<sup>81</sup> Yet here we have one of the two instances of *bny šdwq* appearing in an unqualified form, and furthermore in a midrashic text where it is open to reinterpretation. Thus *bny* does not mean 'sons' in the literal sense here (or in the 1QS texts?), for the whole of the third poem is a warning to the *bny* who are the new members of the community. The 'children of Zadok' are therefore the new lay-members who have subsequently joined the sect, but who are disciples ('sons') of the legitimate Zadokite priests, and, in the light of the priestly purity observed at Qumran, living as priests in the last days.<sup>82</sup>

- Schwartz<sup>83</sup>, on the other hand, concludes that the terms apply to different stages of the past, present and future of the community. Dupont-Sommer also takes this view by seeing the priests as the founders, the Levites as those who joined them later, and the sons of Zadok as

---

<sup>81</sup> 1QS.5<sup>2,9</sup>; 1QSa.1<sup>2,24</sup> 2<sup>3</sup>; 1Qsb.3<sup>22</sup>. Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 77, p211. Most recently Davies has suggested that 1QS.5<sup>2,9</sup> echoes CD.3<sup>20-4</sup> - Behind the Essenes, p52-72.

<sup>82</sup> This idea of a community of priests is found in: Ex.19<sup>6</sup>, Is.61<sup>6</sup>, 1Peter 2<sup>5,9</sup>, Rev.1<sup>6</sup> and 5<sup>10</sup>.

<sup>83</sup> Schwartz, Der erste Teil der Damaskusschrift und das AT, Diest 1965, p155f.

the eschatological members;<sup>84</sup> the latter are the current members, living, so they thought, in the last age. This would make excellent sense if the cause of the split with mainstream Judaism was occasioned by Simon gaining the High Priesthood for himself and his descendants, thus ousting the Zadokite line for good. The first members would therefore be 'the Priests' who fled into exile, with their supporters = the Levites, who were then later joined by the sons of Zadok.

Before we finalize our identification of the above three groups, we ought to consider the second interrelated problem, namely the translation of the enigmatic phrase *šby yśr 'l*. As all three terms are positive, since they are all contrasted with the wicked 'children of Israel', then so must their midrashic counterparts be, including this phrase. The phrase also occurs twice elsewhere in this document in 6<sup>4-5</sup> and 8<sup>16-19</sup><sup>29</sup>, the first of which contains the same phrase:

*The well' is the law, and 'those who dug it' are the šby of Israel who went out from the land of Judah and gathered together in the land of Damascus, ...*

From this we can deduce that 'the priests (and Levites)' are to be equated with 'those who dug it (=the well)'.  
  

---

<sup>84</sup>Dupont-Sommer, p127, n1; followed by: Brooke, Exegesis at Qumran, p158; Gärtner, The Temple and the Community in Qumran and in the NT, p4; Liver, 'The "Sons of Zadok the Priests" in the Dead Sea Sect', 6 (1967-69), p3-30; Knibb, p36.

The form šby can be vocalised in one of two ways:

š<sup>e</sup>bî, a noun 'captivity' from the root šbh. Schechter first proposed this translation, followed by Rabinowitz who points to Ezra 2<sup>1</sup> and Nehemiah 7<sup>6</sup> where we have the expression š<sup>e</sup>bî hgwłh 'the captivity of the exile'.<sup>85</sup> More recently Davies has adopted this view because he says "the ideology of the community is...not, at least theologically, 'returned', but is still in the exilic 'period of wrath'."<sup>86</sup>

šābê, a participle which can be understood either in the religious sense 'those who turn back' thus 'the repenters/converts', or in a geographical sense 'the returnees'. In support of the religious meaning is the parallel phrase šby pš' which obviously has this meaning, as does this phrase in CD.8<sup>16</sup>=19<sup>29</sup>. Knibb<sup>87</sup> has shown that there are a number instances in the MT where the root has this meaning: Isaiah 6<sup>10</sup>, Jeremiah 5<sup>3</sup>, Hosea 11<sup>5</sup> and especially Isaiah 1<sup>27-28</sup>.

*Zion shall be redeemed by justice,  
and her repentees/converts by righteousness.<sup>28</sup>  
But rebels and sinners shall be destroyed together,  
and those who forsake Yahweh shall be consumed.*

Thus whilst Murphy-O'Connor is correct in asserting that there is no biblical parallel to the construct state found here in this document, the biblical usage does not count against this meaning.<sup>88</sup> Nor can it be argued that this meaning

---

<sup>85</sup>Schechter, p67; Rabinowitz, JBL, 73, p16-17 note 20.

<sup>86</sup>Davies, p94 - see also Behind the Essenes, p43-44.

<sup>87</sup>JSOT, 25 (1983), p105-7 - cf.Knibb, p33.

<sup>88</sup>RB, 77, p211 cf.RB, 92, p232-233; Davies (p92) similarly writes that 'on purely linguistic grounds it is undoubtedly the weakest of the three alternatives'.

requires the subsequent clause (here and especially in 6<sup>5</sup>) to be taken independently, for this is only the case if one proceeds to take the root *yš'* in a literal, geographical sense.

In support of the geographical meaning Iwry argues that 'just as the early Israelites,..the members of this community .. conceive of themselves as repeating at a later stage the experience of return and of repossessing the land, ..', and he sees this as a return from exile in Damascus during the time of the Maccabees.<sup>89</sup> Murphy-O'Connor agrees with this view, though he considers that Damascus symbolically represents Babylon.<sup>90</sup> Davies however contends that this 'predicament is the *exact opposite* of that of the 5th century returnees - going into exile instead of returning from it - and the Qumran community could..compare itself with them only with great difficulty.<sup>91</sup> This is an important point, for it is paradoxical to speak of 'the returnees of Israel' (in a geographical sense) who are going out from the land of Judah.

In concluding, we ought to bear in mind that the midrash falls into two equal sections, that on the 'priests and Levites' and that on 'the children of Zadok', and this may reflect a second original waw (as indicated by the Vulgate and the Syriac) in the sectarians' Ezekiel manuscript. Thus in fact two categories are alluded to: 'The priests and Levites, and the children of Zadok' (cf.CD 14<sup>4</sup>), so mirroring the two categories found elsewhere in this document; in 4<sup>6-8</sup> there are 'the first holy ones' and 'those who entered after them', while

---

<sup>89</sup>Iwry, 'Was there a migration to Damascus? The problem of *šby yš' l'*, Eretz Israel, 9 (1969), p87 (quote) and p88.

<sup>90</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 77, p212-213, yet he changed his view in a subsequent article, translating 'captivity of Israel' - RB, 92, p232-233.

<sup>91</sup>Davies, p93-94.

in the Well Midrash (6<sup>3-10</sup>) there are 'those who dig it (=the well)' and 'the nobles of the people who have entered (the covenant) to dig the well ..'. Thus, the first category are those who first made the exile to Qumran (after the Teacher was usurped by Jonathan in 150B.C., or with the election under Simon of the Hasmoneans as High-priests in 140B.C.); they consist of two groups, the actual legitimate Zadokite priests, and their supporters many of whom were probably Levites. The second category are the 'children of Zadok', the new members of the sect, (who joined the sect in large numbers during the Civil War of 94-88B.C.). Thus whilst the first category can be literally interpreted, the second is symbolic for the new members who are 'children of Zadok' in the sense of being disciples of the legitimate Zadokite priests and under their care. Furthermore, to avoid any paradox, I would give a symbolic sense to 'those who turn back (=repent)', 'who go out from Judah' (=the symbolic exile to Qumran, namely 'Damascus').

Finally the phrase b'hryt hymym needs to be considered since there is disagreement as to whether it refers to the end time ('the end of days'), or to the time just before the end ('the latter days').<sup>92</sup> Here and in most other texts, the sense demanded seems to be that of just prior to the end (viz. 'the latter days'), for the events they describe are those of the current era.<sup>93</sup> However, it would appear that the translation 'the end of days' is needed in 6<sup>11</sup> if we are to take ywrh šdq as a Messianic figure and not as the Teacher of Righteousness. To solve this apparent anomaly we could assume that the sect

---

<sup>92</sup>Kosmala, 'At the End of the Days', ASTI, 2 (1963), p27-37 and Carmignac, 'La Notion d'Eschatologie dans la Bible et à Qumran', RQ, 7 (1969-71), p25-26 represent the respective two views; see also Brooke's discussion: Exegesis at Qumran, p175-8.

<sup>93</sup>The phrase occurs in: CD.4<sup>4</sup>, 6<sup>11</sup>; 1QSa.1<sup>1</sup>; 1QpHab.2<sup>5</sup> 9<sup>6</sup>; 4QFl.1<sup>2,12,15,19</sup>, 1Q14.6<sup>2</sup>; 4Qpls<sup>a</sup> frags 5-6, 10; 8-10, 17; 4Qpls<sup>b</sup> 2<sup>1</sup>; 4Qpls<sup>c</sup> frags 4-7, 2<sup>14</sup>; 23, 2<sup>10</sup>; 4QpNah.3-4, 2<sup>2</sup>; 4QCaten<sup>a</sup> 12-13, 1<sup>2</sup>; 4QCaten<sup>b</sup> 1<sup>2</sup>, 2<sup>1</sup>.



regarded the Messianic figure *ywrh šdq* as coming in the current age, to put an end to it and herald in the new age, rather than coming at the 'actual' end of the age. Yet an alternative suggests itself, which is that the sect knew (so they thought) the date of the end of the eschaton, namely that it was 490 years after the exile to Babylon, and when this date passed without any event, the sect came to consider that they were now living in the *ḥryt hymym* ('the Last Days'), namely, in the period following 'the period of wrath'. This interpretation seems to make sense of all the evidence.<sup>94</sup>

The Introduction to the List: 4<sup>4-6</sup>.

<i>hnh prwš</i> <sup>5</sup> <i>šmwtyhm ltwldwtm</i>	4	10
<i>wqš m'mdm wmspr šrwtyhm</i>	4	11
<i>wšny</i> <sup>6</sup> <i>htgwrrm wpyrwš m'syhm</i>	4	11

*Behold the list* <sup>5</sup> *of their names according to their generation,  
And the period of their standing and the number of their  
sufferings,  
And the years* <sup>6</sup> *of their wandering and the list of their deeds:*  
.....

---

*prwš* / *pyrwš*: two forms are represented in this tricolon and should be pointed *pērûš*.<sup>95</sup> The *plene* form is also found in 6<sup>20</sup>, *kpyrwšyhm*, although in 6Q15 we have *kprw[šyhm..]*, and this variation in orthography is also found in

---

<sup>94</sup>The date for the beginning of 'the latter days' could therefore be 107/97 B.C. (597/587 - 490), yet it seems likely that the sect placed the exile slightly later than (587 B.C.) - see chapter 2.3. In considering the other references to 'the latter days' careful consideration of the prefixed 'b-' or 'l-' is needed.

<sup>95</sup>Lohse, p72.

As the above Ezekiel 44<sup>15</sup> Midrash is a secondary prose addition, then this section could either belong with it and refer to 'the priests, Levites, and children of Zadok', or it could be original following on from 'the glory of Adam shall be for them' and refer then to 'those who hold fast'. It is a poetical section consisting of a tricolon of a:b:b' pattern, with the latter two cola exhibiting good parallelism. The exclamatory hnh is taken by nearly all scholars to refer to the lacuna after m'šyhm where originally there probably existed a list of 'their names according to their generation...'.<sup>96</sup> This lacuna therefore marks the break between this section and the poor poetical section which follows.

What is the precise meaning of ltwldwtm? In Ezra the returnees had to prove their Israelite descent or if priests their priestly lineage, and if they could not were excluded - Ezra 2<sup>59-63</sup>. Iwry therefore contends that the community also kept genealogical records, true to tradition.<sup>97</sup> Undoubtedly the Zadokite priests at Qumran would wish to record their genealogy in order to prove that they were the rightful heirs of the Jerusalem priesthood, and if this is the case this section must follow on from the Ezekiel section. But then what of the 'children of Zadok' who as new members would have no genealogy? Thus, there was probably more than one list; one a record of the Zadokite

---

<sup>96</sup>Rabinowitz denies the presence of such a lacuna seeing 'hnh' as the author's way of referring to the written work which is his source, namely Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah, and furthermore a similar use of 'hnh' is found in CD.16<sup>3-4</sup> referring to Jubilees - JBL, 73, p17, n24.

<sup>97</sup>Iwry, Eretz Israel, 9, p87.

priestly chronology (and that of the Levites), another constituting a list of all members as referred to elsewhere in this document - 19<sup>35</sup>, 20<sup>19</sup>. In view of the following phrases the latter list would seem to be the one referred to here.

The period of their standing presumably refers to period of their membership of the community; this would probably be marked as the year they entered. The number of their sufferings may refer to some period of persecution the individual underwent, either at the time of Antiochus IV in resisting the Hellenistic practices, or later as a member of the sect persecuted by their opponents. Alternatively, it could be referring to the transgressions by an individual of the precepts of the sect as outlined in CD IX-XVI. Such a record might well be expected, whilst a record of the persecution suffered by a person would be much more difficult to chronicle. The years of their wandering - the problem here revolves around the meaning of the root gr. The noun gr means 'proselyte' in 14<sup>6</sup> so it would seem that the sense is that of 'wandering outside (the sect)', viz. their age (on joining). The list of their deeds - one needs a good parallel with 'the number of their sufferings (=bad deeds)', so that the sense is 'a record of their (good) deeds'. Thus we had here originally a list of members, with details as to their age on joining, the year they joined, their transgressions of the sect's precepts and conversely their actions which benefited the sect.

### 1.3.2. The semi-poetic redactional passage: 4<sup>6-12</sup>.

#### The New Members: 4<sup>6-10</sup>.

hq{dw}š{ym hr'}šwnym' 'šr 7 kpr 'l b'dm 5 13

wyṣdyqw ṣdyq wyršy'w rš'	4	12
wkl hb'ym ḥryhm <sup>8</sup>	3	7
l'šwt kprwš htwrh	3	7
'šr htwsrw bw hr'šnym	3	9
'd šlym <sup>9</sup> <h>qṣ hšnym h'lh	4	10
kbryt} 'šr hqym 'l lr'šnym	4	10
lkpr <sup>10</sup> 'l 'wnwtyhm	3	7
kn ykpr 'l b'dm	3	6

*(They are) the {fi}rst holy {ones} whom <sup>7</sup> El pardoned,  
And they justified the righteous and condemned the wicked.*

*And all those who enter after them: <sup>8</sup>  
(Are) to live according to the exact interpretation of the law  
in which the first ones were instructed;  
until the period <sup>9</sup> of these years is complete;  
(And) in accordance with the covenant which El established for  
the first ones:  
to make atonement <sup>10</sup> for their iniquities -  
thus will El atone for them.*

---

htwsrw: Hithpael of the root ysr, hit<sub>w</sub>ass<sup>e</sup>rû, which is also found in 20<sup>31</sup> spelt with a yodh; such intensive forms of pe-yod verbs is a late biblical Hebrew development.

šlym: emend to šlwm, an infinitive, in accordance with 4<sup>10</sup>.

---

The secondary nature of this poor poetry section can initially be demonstrated by considering the textual parallels that can be found for each of the above cola in this document:

Colon 1b: cf. 20<sup>34</sup> - wkpr 'l b'dm.

Colon 2 : cf. 1<sup>19</sup> - wysdyqw rš' wyršy'w sdyq.  
 Colon 3 : cf. 8<sup>17</sup>=19<sup>30</sup> - (w)'hb 't hb'ym 'hryhm.  
 Colon 4 : cf. 6<sup>14</sup> - l'swt kprwš htwrh.  
 Colon 5 : cf. 20<sup>31</sup> - whtysrw bmsptym hr'swnym.  
 Colon 6 : cf. 4<sup>10</sup> - wbšlwm hqš lmspr hšnym h'lh.  
 Colon 7 : cf. 3<sup>13</sup> - hqym 'l 't brytw lyšr'l.  
 Colon 8 : cf. 3<sup>18</sup> - kpr b'd 'wnm, and 14<sup>19</sup> - wykpr 'wnm.  
 Colon 9 : cf. 20<sup>34</sup> - wkpr 'l b'dm.

Thus this section (including the following quatrain) is made up of phrases found elsewhere in the poetical sections of this document. In addition to this, the following arguments can be forwarded confirming  $\text{†}^{b-12}$  as a secondary composition:

1. It exhibits poor poetry, with the cola difficult to discern; perhaps it ought to be left as prose?
2. It brings the history up to date, telling of the new members and the coming endtime.
3. It mirrors the Ezekiel Midrash, (or vice-versa,) in having two historic groups: 'the first holy ones' and 'those who entered after them'.
4. It has the sectarian interpretation of: r'snym as the ancestors of the sect, and twrh as the sectarian torah (11QT).

Having demonstrated the secondary nature of this section, composed later and by another author than the poetry of this document, we can move on to consider the text. It consists of an initial bicolon, probably followed by a monocolon introducing the 'new members' with a tricolon on obedience to the law (though this could be taken as a quatrain,) and a tricolon on obedience to the covenant.

There are two proposed emendations to the erroneous *hqwdššwnym*, which was separated by a later scribe to give one intelligible word *hqwdš*.<sup>98</sup>

1. *hq{dw}š{ym hr'}šwnym*.<sup>99</sup>

2. *{'nšy} hqwdš {hr'}šwnym*.<sup>100</sup>

The former seems more likely as it only requires haplography and a minor emendation ('wd' > 'dw'), whilst the latter requires both haplography and a lacuna. As we have seen these 'Holy Ones' are the founding members of the sect.

The monocolon introduces the 'new members' who are the same as the 'children' in the original poem, and 'the children of Zadok' in the Ezekiel 44<sup>15</sup> Midrash. The first tricolon deals with the obedience to the law; this must be the sectarian law (11QT), obedience to which constitutes the first duty of the credal section, 6<sup>14</sup>. The 'ancestors' (of the sect) were instructed in this law for they are 'those who dig the well' in 6<sup>4-7</sup>. 'These years' are presumably the years of the on-going 'period of wrath'; there is no mention here of the 'latter days'. There is a problem with the third colon since the form *qš* is not in construct so that perhaps *lmspr* has been omitted and should be restored in line with 4<sup>10</sup>; Charles and Knibb conversely omit *lmspr* in 4<sup>10</sup> and this alternative certainly gives a better balance to the poetry of both these

---

<sup>98</sup>The scribe may have had '*hqdwššwnym*', and in separating out '*hqwdš*' he reversed the *dālet* and the *waw* of the original plural.

<sup>99</sup>So Charles, Rabinowitz with 'hm', Murphy-O'Connor and Davies.

<sup>100</sup>So Rabin on the basis of CD 20<sup>2</sup> '*nšy tmyh hqds*'; followed by Cothenet, Maier, Dupont-Sommer, Lohse.

passages.<sup>101</sup>

In the second tricolon, the 'covenant' is the original covenant of Noah and the patriarchs which the sect had renewed. Here we have a further indication that the founders of the sect regarded themselves as living in sin prior to their formation and thus in need of atonement. It follows that all subsequent new-members also need God's atonement - *'He will atone for them (=the new members)'*. These admissions of past transgressions are in no way out of place nor should they be considered as mere poetical devices, for surely the first step to salvation in any religion (or sectarian group within a religion) begins with recognizing one's past sin, for only then can one overcome it.

The endtime: 4<sup>10-12</sup>.

wbšlwm <sup>101b</sup> <h>qš <lmspr> hšnym <sup>11</sup> h'lh	4	10
'yn 'wd lhštpḥ lbyṯ yhwḏh	4	8
ky 'm l'mwḏ 'yš 'l <sup>12</sup> mšwdw	4	8
nbnth hgdr rḥq ḥwq	4	9

*And when the period <according to the number> of <sup>11</sup> these years is complete,*

*No more shall it be (possible) to be joined to the House of Judah;*

*But rather, every man must stand firm upon <sup>12</sup> his own fortification/(net):*

*'The wall is built, the precept far removed'.*

---

<sup>101</sup> Charles, p809; Knibb, p33.

<sup>101b</sup> T-S 10 K6 definitely reads 'wbšlwm' (with a wāw) ; cf. 4<sup>8</sup> and note on p139.

This is the final stanza, before a lengthy prosaic section on the three nets of Belial. In view of this, there are a number of links between this quatrain which tie it in with what follows. The period  $\text{hšnym h'lh}$  is also referred to in the opening line of the Nets of Belial Midrash in 4<sup>12b</sup>; the word  $\text{mšwd}$  is a polysemantic pun, having the meaning 'watchtower' here (in the masculine) and 'net' in 4<sup>15</sup> (in the feminine); the theme of 'the wall' which is built is picked up in the phrase  $\text{bwny hḥwš}$  in 4<sup>19</sup>. Thus, this section ends with the quotation from Micah 7<sup>11</sup>, which is not subjected to reinterpretation in a midrashic manner; instead the opening lines of the Nets of Belial Midrash cite and interpret Isaiah 24<sup>17, 102</sup>.

The initial bicolon sets the scene, 'when the period is complete', viz. the period of wrath;  $\text{lmspr}$  was added to overcome the definite form of  $\text{qš}$  so rendering the first bicolon top-heavy. The second line of this bicolon looks forward to a time when individuals will no longer be able to join the community, and if my previous conjecture is correct this would be 'the latter days'. The Hithpael of the root  $\text{šph}$  is only found with a samek  $\text{spḥ}$  in the MT, and then only once in 1 Samuel 26<sup>19</sup>:

*If it is the Lord who has stirred you (=Saul) against me (=David), may He accept an offering; but if it is men, may they be cursed before the Lord, for they have driven me out this day that I should have no share (mhstph) in the heritage of the Lord.*

Since the latter was the case (see 1 Samuel 26<sup>1</sup>), David is complaining that he had been driven into hiding in the desert (Jeshimon). The first-ones of the community were forced to flee for their lives, just as David was; furthermore

---

<sup>102</sup>So Rabin, p14,16 and Davies, p243; for Rabinowitz (JBL, 73, p15-19) and Schwartz (RQ, 10, p437-438) this is the end of a literary unit running from 3<sup>18b-4<sup>12a</sup></sup>.



the first-ones 'went out from the land of Judah' as did David who fled to Jeshimon which was not part of Judah until John Hyrcanus' time.<sup>103</sup> Alternatively, Schwartz believes the root *špḥ* echoes the Qal imperative form found in 1 Samuel 2<sup>36</sup>, which is the stanza following the reference to the 'sure house':

*Then everyone in your (=Eli's) family line will come .. and plead, "Appoint me to some priestly office that I might have food to eat".*

Like the descendants of Eli who had their chance, so those not joining the sect had had their chance and would now suffer the consequences of not joining the sect which represented the true High priestly line.<sup>104</sup>

There has in the past been a certain amount of confusion regarding the interpretation of the phrase *'yn 'wā lhštph lbyt yhwḏh*, and more particularly whether 'Judah' should be taken in a negative or positive sense. Many scholars have wanted to understand this phrase in a negative sense on the basis of texts elsewhere in the scrolls. Dupont-Sommer is typical of this viewpoint when he writes: "it (=the house of Judah) has fallen and been replaced by the Community of the Covenant, henceforth the only 'sure House in Israel'".<sup>105</sup> Rabin takes a slightly more moderate view, regarding the House of Judah "as (a) name of a group ..(that) consists of 'fools' .. who will be punished ..(and) 'doers

---

<sup>103</sup>It would seem dangerous to argue from this, that for the parallel to be justified, the first ones of the sect must have gone into exile at a time when Jeshimon was still part of Idumea, viz. in the early part of John Hyrcanus' High Priesthood or more probably in the time of Simon's High Priesthood.

<sup>104</sup>Charles (p809), followed by Davies (p103), takes Isaiah.14<sup>1</sup> as the source: *'wnsphw 'l byt y'qb'* - "And unite with the house of Jacob".

<sup>105</sup>Dupont-Sommer , p128, n2.

of the Law'. They are thus closer to our sect than the rest of the Jews...".<sup>106</sup> In fact yhwdh can have both a positive and a negative sense in the scrolls. It is the inhabitants of Judah who are viewed in a negative light, as in CD.8<sup>3f</sup>=19<sup>15f</sup> and 20<sup>25-27</sup>, and in the two passages which speak of the šby of Israel who went out from the land of Judah, CD.4<sup>2-3</sup> and 6<sup>4-5</sup>. As Judaeans going into exile they obviously went out of the land of Judah (symbolically if not quite literally); yet there is also a sense of escaping something evil, namely the land and its inhabitants. However, the evidence that it is the community who are termed the 'House of Judah', can be deduced unequivocally from the other occurrence of the phrase in 1QpHab:

*['But the righteous shall live by faith.'](2<sup>4b</sup>)*

*<sup>1</sup> Interpreted, this concerns all those who observe the law in the House of Judah, <sup>2</sup> whom God will deliver from the House of Judgment because of their suffering and because of their faith <sup>3</sup> in the Teacher of Righteousness.<sup>107</sup>*

Furthermore, we find that the members of the sect are termed 'the simple (pty / pt'y) of Judah':

*'For the violence of Lebanon shall overwhelm you and the destruction of beasts shall terrify you...'(2<sup>17</sup>)*

*<sup>2</sup> Interpreted...<sup>3</sup>.. 'Lebanon' is<sup>4</sup> the council of the community, and 'the beasts' are the simple of Judah who keep<sup>5</sup> the law.<sup>108</sup>*

Finally, there are a number of passages where 'Judah' is contrasted favourably

---

<sup>106</sup>Rabin, p15, n11:2. Thus Rabinowitz translates, (without a word of explanation): "...it will no longer be necessary to attach oneself to the household of Judah, .." - JBL, 73, p19.

<sup>107</sup>1QpH.7<sup>17</sup>-8<sup>3</sup>. 4QFI.4 also has the phrase 'house of Judah' in a fragmentary passage.

<sup>108</sup>1QpH.11<sup>17</sup>-12<sup>5</sup>.

with 'Ephraim', as in 4QpNah. frg 3-4, 3<sup>4-5</sup>; <sup>109</sup>

*When the glory of Judah shall arise, the simple of Ephraim shall flee from their assembly; they shall abandon those who led them astray and join Israel.*

Thus, yhwdh can equally well have a positive sense as a negative one, and in our current passage it has a positive sense, indicating that when 'the period (of wrath)' is complete it will be too late to join the community (=the house of Judah).

The second bicolon warns of the judgment that will follow at the end of 'the period (of wrath)'. The word mšwdw, meaning 'watchtower', implies that everyone is to be judged according to his beliefs - 'stand on his watchtower'; only those who have chosen to adhere to 'the House of Judah' will receive a favourable judgment when the period of wrath comes to an end. I would concur with Murphy-O'Connor that the sense demanded here by mšwd has been drawn from Hab.2<sup>1</sup>, basically because this verse is interpreted here along remarkably similar lines to the interpretation found in 1QpHab.:<sup>110</sup>

*'I will take my stand to watch <sup>13</sup> and will station myself upon my fortress'. (Hab.2<sup>1</sup>)*

*[The explanation of this ...] <sup>1</sup> and God told Habakkuk to write down that which would happen to <sup>2</sup> the last generation, but He did not make known to him when time would come to an end.<sup>111</sup>*

---

<sup>109</sup>See also: CD 7<sup>12,13</sup> = 14<sup>1</sup>; 4QPB 1; 4Q504(DibHam) 4<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>110</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 77, p218, followed by Knibb, p38. Davies argues that the interpretation of the biblical text in CD and 1QpHab is quite different - Davies, p104. - but I would suggest that this viewpoint stems from his desire to avoid a 'pesher-based reconstruction' at all costs, not least because he wishes to see CD as pre-Qumranic.

<sup>111</sup>1QpHab 6<sup>12-72</sup>; we have already referred to this passage in 1<sup>12</sup>; this does not necessarily imply a dependence of 1QpHab. on CD, or vice-versa, but rather a common school of interpretation.

The final line is a paraphrase of Micah 7<sup>11</sup>:

ywm lbnwt gdryk ywm hhw' yrhq hq

*A day for building up your walls,  
In that day the boundary shall be far extended.*

The deliberate use of the past tense for the future is to indicate that when the period is complete this time will have come. How did the sectarians interpret this phrase? The 'wall' is the one separating the sectarians from the rest; but which side built this wall? The subsequent phrase 'the builders of the wall' obviously refers to those outside the sect.<sup>112</sup> Thus having built the wall, those outside the community have cut themselves off from the true precept. Yet this phrase may have a literal meaning, and so 'the wall' could be that built around the torah by the sectarians – the wall is built, (and when the endtime comes) the precept is far removed (from outsiders).

Thus in conclusion, this section, 4<sup>6-12</sup> is not the work of the poet. Its purpose was to bring the poem up to date, and so provide a link between the preceding poem and the following midrash. The Ezekiel 44<sup>15</sup> Midrash also refers to the new members and the time after 'the period of wrath' (= 'the latter days'), and this duplication would suggest that it is most unlikely that it too is the work of the writer of this section. Furthermore, had the midrash already been in the text the writer of 4<sup>6-12</sup> was presented with, he may well have not felt it necessary to add anything. Consequently, I believe that originally 4<sup>6-12</sup> followed directly on from 3<sup>20</sup>, and that later still the writer of the midrash (3<sup>20-46</sup>) inserted it at the end of the original poem (3<sup>20</sup>) (as with the other midrashic sections) because it expanded on 'the sure house' and deals with

---

<sup>112</sup>CD.4<sup>19-20</sup>, 8<sup>12-13</sup> = 19<sup>24-26</sup>, 8<sup>18</sup>=19<sup>31</sup>.

'the latter days'. Thus we have a total of three different 'writers' for the text of  $2^{14}-4^{12}$ .

Translation of the Nets of Belial Passage: 4<sup>12</sup>-5<sup>11</sup>.

*And during all of these years <sup>13</sup> Belial shall be let loose upon Israel; as El spoke through the hand of Isaiah the prophet, son of <sup>14</sup> Amos, saying:*

*'Fear, (the) pit and (the) snare,  
are upon you, O inhabitant of the land.'*

*Its peshet: <sup>15</sup> (these are) the three nets of Belial of which Levi, son of Jacob spoke, <sup>16</sup> by which he ensnared Israel and made them appear to them as three kinds of <sup>17</sup> 'righteousness': the first is whoredom, the second wealth, the third <sup>18</sup> uncleanness of the sanctuary; he who flees from the one will be ensnared by another, and he who escapes from that one will be ensnared <sup>19</sup> by the third.<sup>2</sup>*

*The 'builders of the wall' who walked after the Command - the Command is the one who spouted(propheesied) <sup>20</sup> when he said 'They will surely spout(propheesy)' - were ensnared by two (things):*

- 1. By whoredom in taking <sup>21</sup> two wives during their lifetime, whereas the basis of creation is 'male and female He created them'; <sup>1</sup> and those who entered the ark 'two by two they entered into the ark'. And concerning the prince it is written: <sup>2</sup> 'he shall not multiply wives for himself'; but David had not read the sealed book of the law <sup>3</sup> which lay in the ark (of the covenant), for it was not opened in Israel from the day of the death of Eleazar, <sup>4</sup> Joshua<sup>3</sup> and the elders, because they worshipped the Ashtoreth, but <sup>5</sup> 'that which was revealed' was hidden until Zadok arose. And the deeds of David were forgiven him except the blood of Uriah, <sup>6</sup> and El left it to him.*
- 2. Furthermore they made the sanctuary unclean because none of them <sup>7</sup> separated according to the law, for they slept with one who sees the blood of her flux, and each man took <sup>8</sup> the daughter of his brother or the daughter of his sister. But Moses said: 'You must not draw near to <sup>9</sup>*

---

<sup>1</sup>Isaiah 24<sup>17</sup>; a small gap follows this word.

<sup>2</sup>Hebrew has 'mzh..bzh, mzh..bzh', but it is the three nets 'whoredom, wealth, and uncleanness of the sanctuary' which are represented here, and the implication is that a man ensnared by Belial will inevitably fall into one of these three sins; a slight gap follows 'bzh'.

<sup>3</sup>Dittography: 'wyhwš' <wywšw'>.

<sup>4</sup>Emending the suffix to the singular.

*the sister of your mother; she is the blood-relative of your mother'. And the Law of incest for men<sup>10</sup> is (also) written and it is the same for women: 'And if the daughter of the brother reveals the nakedness of the brother of<sup>11</sup> her father, and she is a blood-relative....'"*

#### 1.4. The nets of Belial and the Builders of the Wall: 4<sup>12</sup>-5<sup>11</sup>.

There is general agreement that a new section of some kind begins at this point. Undoubtedly the opening phrase 'and during all these years' refers to the same period as that in 4<sup>10</sup>, yet as some scholars have appreciated, these words comprise no more than a thematic link. For Davies, this link in fact extends to 4<sup>19a</sup> and provides a transition from the historical section, 1<sup>1</sup>-4<sup>12</sup>, to a section which he entitles 'Laws'. Thus 'the Isaiah midrash in IV,12b-19a is dependent on IV,19bff for its inclusion here, but did not originally belong with it',<sup>1</sup> and in view of the abrupt transition (lacuna?) in 4<sup>19</sup> and the midrashic flavour of this linking passage, this suggestion should be seriously considered.

##### 1.4.1. The Midrash on the Nets of Belial: 4<sup>12b-19a</sup>.

The quote from Isaiah 24<sup>17</sup> corresponds exactly to the MT. The three alliterative nouns should be translated 'fear, (the) pit and (the) snare' since the following 'pesher' has the theme 'net/snare', and not as synonymous nouns: 'fear, ruin and destruction'.

pšr. In the context of the scrolls the presence of the word pēšer here is unique in the 'rules', occurring only in the Pesharim and 4QFI elsewhere, and consequently this links our current passage to these Qumran writings. There has been much ink expended as to the exact meaning of the word at Qumran. Bruce<sup>2</sup> starts from the biblical evidence, and in the Hebrew of the MT the word only appears once in Ecclesiastes 8<sup>1</sup>:

---

<sup>1</sup>Davies, p106 - cf. too Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 77, p219.

<sup>2</sup>Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts, p7-10.



*Who is like the wise man?  
And who knows the interpretation of a thing?*

The context implies that such interpretation calls for wisdom, and this is confirmed when we consider the thirty references to p<sup>e</sup>šar in the Aramaic part of Daniel. This relatively simplistic explanation has much to commend it, especially when one realizes that the phrase pšr hđbr occurs in a number of places in Qumran.<sup>4</sup> Both Carmignac and Van der Ploeg associate the word exclusively with the Teacher of Righteousness, the latter believing that it is the Teacher's knowledge of the divine plan which is the key to understanding his ability to interpret the scriptures, and that as such much of the material of the Damascus Document can be called pesher even though the word only occurs there once.<sup>5</sup> There has also been considerable discussion as to the relationship of 'pesher' with 'midrash'.<sup>6</sup> At one end of the spectrum Rabinowitz states that 'neither in method nor in form is a pesher any kind of midrash as familiar to us from Rabbinic Literature'.<sup>7</sup> In the middle ground, (that a pesher is some kind of midrash,) Schiffman declares that 'the distinction between midrash and pesher lies in the use of evidence from the Scriptures. A midrash requires such references, while a pesher does not'.<sup>8</sup> While towards the other end of the spectrum, Brooke in his conclusion writes: 'to use the word pesher as a

---

<sup>3</sup>Hebrew: 'pšr dbr'.

<sup>4</sup>See: 1QpH 2<sup>5</sup>, 5<sup>3</sup>, 10<sup>9,15</sup>, 12<sup>2,12</sup>; 4Qpls<sup>b</sup> 1<sup>2</sup>, 2<sup>1</sup>; 4Qpls<sup>c</sup> frags 4-7, 2<sup>4,14</sup>; frg 22, 1; frg 23, 2<sup>10</sup>; 4QFl. 1<sup>14,19</sup> → cf. Eccles. 8<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>5</sup>Carmignac, 'Le Genre Littéraire du 'Pesher' dans la Pistis-Sophia', RQ, 4 (1963-4), p497-522 and Van der Ploeg, *Bijbelverklaring te Qumran*, p23 as summarized by Brooke, 'Qumran Pesher: Towards the Redefinition of a Genre', RQ, 10 (1979-81), p486.

<sup>6</sup>The latter occurs in CD in 20<sup>6</sup> 'according to the word of the midrash of the torah in which <sup>7</sup> the men of perfect holiness walk'.

<sup>7</sup>Rabinowitz, "'Pēsher/Pittārōn.'" Its Biblical Meaning and its Significance in the Qumran Literature', RQ, 8 (1972-74), p225-6.

<sup>8</sup>Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran*, p60.

generic classification, in association with midrash, in anything like its translation (i.e. "interpretation") is purely tautological. At worst, to use the description *peshar* with no reference to midrash unnecessarily multiplies generic categories through scholarly invention.<sup>9</sup>

*mšwdwt* - the feminine equivalent of *mšwd* in 4<sup>12</sup>; the meaning 'net/snare' is also found in 1QH.3<sup>26</sup>, 4<sup>12</sup>, but in 1QH.9<sup>28</sup> that of 'fortress'.

*'šr hw' tps' bhm bysr`l* - literally, *which he (=Belial) ensnared by them (=the nets) Israel*, taking the masculine suffix of *bhm* to refer to the feminine noun 'nets', a not uncommon occurrence in the scrolls. The root *tps'* with the meaning 'to lay hold of, seize' takes 'b-'.  
*šr hw' tps' bhm bysr`l* - literally, *which he (=Belial) ensnared by them (=the nets) Israel*, taking the masculine suffix of *bhm* to refer to the feminine noun 'nets', a not uncommon occurrence in the scrolls. The root *tps'* with the meaning 'to lay hold of, seize' takes 'b-'.

*wytnm pnyhm lšlwšk myny hšdq* - literally: *'and he gave them their faces to the three kinds of righteousness'*. In the MT the grammatical construction would be *wytn pnyhm b-*, *'he set their face against...'* and in our passage a similar translation would give an intelligible sense, though leaving the suffix on *wytnm* untranslated.<sup>10</sup> The second proposed solution is to translate along the lines: *'and he placed them (=the nets) before them (=Israel) as three kinds of righteousness'*. This means we have *pny* for *lpny* which occurs a couple of times in the MT and presumably became more common later.<sup>11</sup> The final proposal, involving the least amount of linguistic juggling, is to translate: *'he made them (=the nets) appear to them (=Israel) as three kinds of*

---

<sup>9</sup>Brooke, RQ, 10, p502 - cf. too Brownlee, The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk.

<sup>10</sup>Thus Schechter (p67) reads: 'and directed their faces to the three kinds of righteousness'. Cf. too Kosmala, 'The Three Nets of Belial. A Study in the terminology of Qumran and the New Testament', ASTI, 4 (1965), p92-93, note 5.

<sup>11</sup>So Rabin, p16, n16:2, although he translates as our final proposal, and Fitzmyer (p21), though he feels compelled to emend to 'lpnyhm'.

*righteousness*;<sup>12</sup> and this is the translation I myself favour.

The reference to Levi son of Jacob has no exact parallel though there are a number of close parallels to this text.<sup>13</sup> One though that perhaps has not been noted before is that of T.Levi.Bodleian b which also refers to the 'true law' and goes on to deal with incest laws:

Bodleian b: ...bry mn kl phz wtm'h wmn kl znwt ...

T.Levi 9<sup>9-10</sup>: ...ἀπὸ παντὸς συνουσιαμοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας καὶ ἀπὸ πάσης πορνείας...<sup>14</sup>

Now my son (Levi) I will show you the true law and I will not hide any word from you to teach you the law of the priesthood. First of all, beware my son of all fornication, impurity, and of all harlotry. And do take a wife from my family, and do not defile your seed with harlots ....<sup>15</sup>

Of the three nets only two are subsequently mentioned, the first and the last. The second hwn, says Kosmala, is property of any kind and occurs twice elsewhere in a negative sense in this document: 6<sup>15-16</sup> and 8<sup>5,7=19</sup><sup>17,19</sup>. In the latter text, hwn again occurs with znwt, and it seems that all three passages are referring to the wealth being misused within Israel. The sect themselves avoided all such problems by their practice of common ownership outlined in

---

<sup>12</sup>So Rabin, p16; Davies translates p243 'and presents them in the guise of three kinds of righteousness'

<sup>13</sup>Nets are referred to only in T.Dan 2<sup>4</sup> - 'the net of the spirit of anger'; Jub.7<sup>20</sup> reads: 'preserve themselves from fornication and pollution and from all injustice'; Ps.Sol.8<sup>10-12</sup>: '10 Everyone committed adultery ... 11 They stole from the sanctuary of God ... 12 They walked on the place of sacrifice of the Lord, (coming) from all kinds of uncleanness'; Eph.5<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>14</sup>The Hebrew appears in Bodleian b Hebrew (MS.Heb.c.27,Fol.56) - Charles and Cowley, 'An early source of the Testament of the Patriarchs', JQR, 19 (1906-07), p571-2 - they give the parallel Greek text alongside the Hebrew text.

<sup>15</sup>Hollander and De Jonge, The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs: a commentary, p462.

1.4.2. The two nets that have ensnared the Builders of the Wall: 4<sup>19-5<sup>11</sup></sup>.

A number of scholars see grammatical problems with the middle of line 19 since there is both a change in subject (from 'nets' to 'builders of the wall') and the lack of a corresponding verb.<sup>17</sup> I would agree that the transition is sudden, for the theme of 'the wall' most naturally follows on from 4<sup>12a</sup>. If then 4<sup>12-19</sup> were a secondary thematic link, this would explain the problem of 'the builders of the wall' being ensnared by only two (things)', whilst the midrash speaks of the three nets of Belial. Yet the apparent lack of a verb may be explained if one takes 4<sup>19b-20a</sup> as a secondary gloss,<sup>18</sup> thus leaving *bwny h̄yṣ hm nytp̄śym* which can be compared to similar constructions in other midrashic passages, viz. 4<sup>3</sup> and 6<sup>8-9</sup>.<sup>19</sup> Alternatively, the text can be taken as it stands, with the verb somewhat removed from the subject due to a subsidiary clause.

But who are these enigmatic 'builders of the wall? The biblical origin of the phrase would seem to be Ezekiel 13<sup>10</sup> which refers to 'false prophets' who have led Israel astray:

---

<sup>16</sup>See: Capper, 'The Interpretation of Acts 5.4', JSNT, 19 (1983), esp p126-128. However it seems that some Qumran sectarians did hold property - see CD.10<sup>10-12</sup><sup>18</sup> and my discussion on the Laws of IX-XVI in Chapter 2, Appendix I.I, p337-342.

<sup>17</sup>Schechter, p68; Rabin, p16.

<sup>18</sup>Viz. '(hlkw 'hry ṣw) h̄ṣw hw' m̄tyṣ 'sr 'mr h̄ṣp ytyṣwn'. On first sight the gloss would seem to be the subsidiary clause on 'the command' (so Davies, p243 following Stegemann, p159), yet it seems likely that the purpose of the gloss was to introduce 'the command' as well as interpreting the reference.

<sup>19</sup>4<sup>3</sup>: 'bny ṣdwq hm bh̄yry ṣr 'l'; CD.6<sup>8-9</sup> 'ndyby h'm hm hb 'ym ...'

*<sup>9</sup> My hand will be against the prophets who see false visions and utter lying divinations...<sup>10</sup> Because they lead my people astray, saying 'Peace' when there is no peace, and because when a flimsy wall is built they plaster it with mortar.*

This sense would be appropriate in our text (and in 8<sup>12,18</sup>) in view of the use of the root nṭp, so that 'the builders of the wall' are those promulgating some form of 'false teaching' (as countered in 4<sup>20</sup>-5<sup>11</sup>), and these are often identified as the Pharisees.<sup>20</sup> This polemic against 'false teachers' can be compared to other biblical passages also found or alluded to in this document: Mic.2<sup>6</sup> - CD.4<sup>20</sup>, Is.30<sup>10</sup> - CD.1<sup>18</sup>, Jer.5<sup>31</sup> - CD.6<sup>1</sup>. More recently scholars have tried to identify this group by identifying its leader 'the Command'; they equate him with 'the Man of Lie' on the basis of the presence of the root nṭp and usually take him to be one of the Maccabean brothers.<sup>21</sup> This would square with Winter's view that the phrase 'the builders of the wall' should be interpreted literally, namely, as those who helped rebuild Jerusalem.<sup>22</sup>

*Interpreted, this concerns the spouter of lies who led many astray that he might build a city of vanity...<sup>23</sup>*

This then is strong evidence for equating 'the Command' with 'the Man of Lie', and would, on the other hand, seem to count against the identification of the Pharisees with the 'builders of the wall' since the texts imply that it is the wider body of Israel who were involved in this rebuilding project. This identification (of 'the builders of the wall' with the wider body of Israel) can be

---

<sup>20</sup>Schechter, p68 and Charles, p810.

<sup>21</sup>See Chapter 3.2.2 on the identity of the Wicked Priest, p393-401.

<sup>22</sup>Winter, 'Two Non-Allegorical Expressions in the Dead Sea Scrolls', PEO, 91 (1951), p39-42. For the rebuilding of Jerusalem in Maccabean times, see: 1Mac.10<sup>10-11,45</sup>, 12<sup>36-39</sup> (Antiquities, 13,2,1-3 and 13,5,11) under Jonathan, and 1Mac.13<sup>10,48,52</sup> (Antiquities, 13,6,4 and 7) under Simon.

<sup>23</sup>1QpH.10<sup>9-10</sup>; see also 4QTestimonia 22-26 quoted on p396.

further advanced by the fact 4<sup>13</sup> talks of Belial being let loose upon Israel, so that it would be paradoxical to proceed to criticise a group within Israel. Personally I feel that some compromise between these two positions is called for, namely that 'the builders of the wall' are those that set the standards of religious life who consequently are leading all Israel astray.<sup>24</sup>

'šr hlkw 'hry šw. Significantly, this phrase comes from Hosea 5<sup>11,25</sup> and obviously this passage was of some importance to the sect, for verse 10, which deals with 'the princes of Judah', is quoted in 19<sup>15-16</sup>. Hosea was thinking of two groups, Judah and Ephraim, and if our writer was following this biblical lead then 'the princes of Judah' (in CD.19<sup>15</sup>) and 'the builders of the wall' (=Ephraim) cannot be the same adversary. More immediate to this phrase is the sense of šw which is usually taken as a noun 'command' or 'commander', the latter making some sense if this figure is one of the Maccabees. The LXX has ματαιων 'vanity' for the Hebrew šw which has led some scholars to suggest emending the text here to šāw'.<sup>26</sup> In Isaiah 28<sup>10</sup>, where we also have this form šw (four times), 1QIs<sup>a</sup> has šy (four times), but this would seem to be no easier since šiy = 'ship' as in Is.33<sup>21</sup>. Yet according to Fohrer šy can also mean 'demon',<sup>27</sup> and this sense would be quite intelligible - 'and they followed after a demon (wild beast)'.

---

<sup>24</sup>Davies believes the 'builders of the wall' are the whole of Israel outside of the sect in 4<sup>18</sup> (p112), but that in 8<sup>12-13</sup> they are 'those who set the standards of religious life' (p166).

<sup>25</sup>Hosea 5<sup>11</sup> reads: Ephraim is oppressed, crushed in judgment, because he was determined to go after a command; Hebrew: 'hlk 'hry šw'.

<sup>26</sup>Job 15<sup>31</sup> has 'šāw' for šāw'. Rabin (p17) writes: "In Ex.32<sup>25</sup> Aq.,Sy.,Tg.,P. translate 'l'ešimšā': 'in the name of dirt', i.e. they read 'lsmšw' like Sam."

<sup>27</sup>Fohrer, Hebrew and Aramaic Dictionary of the Old Testament, p234; compare Davidson, who parses 'šiyiy' as a denominative from 'šiy, šiyā', 'desert' - The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon. In Modern Hebrew the word 'šiy' has the meanings: 'navy/fleet' and 'wild beast'.

nytpśym: a Niphal ptc. pl. of the root tpś with the plene spelling again indicating a short vowel: nītpāsîm, 'they were trapped'.

bštyṃ, 'by two things', i.e. by two of the nets. However disagreement occurs among scholars as to what in the following text constitutes the two (nets). For Charles the problem is so acute that he has to overcome it by removing bštyṃ as dittography with the subsequent šty.<sup>28</sup> Yet if one sees the abrupt introduction of 'the builders of the wall' as beginning a new section, there is less need to equate bštyṃ with two of the three nets. Thus, both Rabin and Murphy-O'Connor regard the 'two (things)' that the builders of the wall were ensnared by as:<sup>29</sup>

1. Marrying (root lqh) two women ... (4<sup>20</sup>-5<sup>7</sup>).
2. Marrying (root lqh) each man the daughter ... (5<sup>7-11</sup>).

They are then confronted with the section concerning lying with a woman during her menstrual period (5<sup>6b-7a</sup>), which consequently they have to then take as a gloss.<sup>30</sup> Alternatively, those scholars that relate the 'two (nets)' with the three mentioned above, then pick up the identical phrases in the following discourse:

1. Whoredom, in marrying two women ... (4<sup>20</sup>-5<sup>6</sup>).
2. Making the sanctuary unclean:
  - by lying with a woman during her menstrual period. (5<sup>6-7</sup>).
  - by marrying each man the daughter... (5<sup>7-11</sup>).

---

<sup>28</sup>Charles, p810.

<sup>29</sup>Rabin, p17; Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 77, p220.

<sup>30</sup>Rabin, p19 note 6:3 'Gloss?'; Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 77, p220-1.

The problem here is that having picked up the 'two (nets)' we have to subdivide the second (=third net) as shown, and take them as two aspects of the 'uncleanness of the sanctuary'.<sup>31</sup> I feel that whilst 4<sup>12-19</sup> and 4<sup>19-5<sup>11</sup></sup> may have originally been independent sections, there is a deliberate correspondence between the two, so picking up the parallel phrases. Davies is not the only scholar to outline a further section, namely that of making their holy spirits unclean (5<sup>11b-15a</sup>).<sup>32</sup> Yet this section (5<sup>11f</sup>) is strongly poetic, in contrast to the heavy law terminology and structure of the preceding section, and therefore begins another section.

The First 'Net': 4<sup>20-5<sup>6</sup></sup> - znwt.

znwt: The word z<sup>e</sup>nûṭ occurs elsewhere in the scrolls as a warning to members of the sect: in CD.2<sup>16</sup> and 1QS.1<sup>6</sup> against 'eyes of lust'; in CD 7<sup>1</sup> in a credal section (as is 1QS.1<sup>6</sup>); in 1QS.4<sup>10</sup> where one of the characteristics of the spirit of falsehood is 'deeds of abomination committed in a spirit of lust'. Yet it is 'the princes of Judah' in 8<sup>3</sup> who are the only group outside this passage accused of znwt; they like 'the builders of the wall' have been leading Israel astray.

lqḥt šty nšym bḥyyhm. .: As it stands the implication of the masculine suffix on bḥyyhm is that the husband cannot re-marry during his lifetime, even if he is divorced or widowed. However many scholars believe that we should emend bḥyyhm to bḥyyhn, 'during their(=f) lifetimes', pointing to Leviticus 18<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup>For Kosmala these three sections are all forms of 'znwt' - ASTI, 4, p99.

<sup>32</sup>Davies, p113; cf.Stegemann, p159.



and to 11QT.57<sup>17-19</sup>.<sup>33</sup>

*And he (=the king) may not take any other woman in addition to her, but she alone shall be with him all the days of his life. And if she dies, he shall take for himself another from his father's house..*

Recently, however, Davies has argued strongly that it is a false assumption to regard the law of the king as applying equally to the people, for the king is a special case and would always be expected to have a queen.<sup>34</sup> He goes on to write that 'it is precarious to fall back on what here would amount to .... (an) unfortunate coincidence, whereby a "slip of the pen" creates a legal dispute of some complexity.'<sup>35</sup> The following passage, which tries to explain David's apparent polygamous action and which parallels 11QT, could be used to support either interpretation; viz. the subsequent two proof-texts, Gen.1<sup>27</sup> and 7<sup>9</sup>, could either be arguing that a man should only have one wife during his lifetime, or that he should have only one wife at a time. The choice is difficult, but in the end I prefer to keep the text and see this as prohibiting 'remarriage', especially since the Essenes were known to avoid marital relationships probably because, like the early church, they considered that the end of the age was imminent.

David and the Law: 5<sup>1-6</sup>.

As I have mentioned, this section deals with the problem of David's polygamous custom, and has recently been subjected to quite heated debate

---

<sup>33</sup>Ginzberg, p19-20 and Yadin, The Temple Scroll, 2, p258; Charles, Dupont-Sommer and Knibb understand the feminine sense even if they do not actually emend.

<sup>34</sup>Davies, Behind the Essenes, p77-78.

<sup>35</sup>Davies, Behind the Essenes, p79.

because of its direct reference to Zadok.<sup>36</sup> Analysis of the passage is not helped by the apparent grammatical and other anomalies within it. Some scholars consider that this section is secondary but there seems little hard evidence for this position.<sup>37</sup>

The basic law outlined here comes from Deuteronomy 17<sup>17</sup> and is paralleled by 11QT.56<sup>18</sup>: *And he shall not acquire many wives, lest they turn his heart away from me.*

wdwyd l' qr' bspr htwrh hhtwm 'šr hyh b'rwn. The sealed book of the law is taken by most commentators to be Deuteronomy, which in Israelite tradition 'was placed by the side of the ark of the covenant..' (Deut.31<sup>26</sup>.) Yet CD.5<sup>2-3</sup> takes miššad of Deut.31<sup>26</sup> as 'inside' like other Jewish commentators. Similar accounts of the law being concealed can be found in the Testament of Moses 1<sup>16-18</sup> by Joshua, and in 2 Mac.2<sup>5</sup> where Jeremiah conceals the ark. Yet for Wacholder, this 'sealed book of the law' is none other than the Temple Scroll. Furthermore, using Jeremiah's allegory in 32<sup>3-16</sup>, Wacholder argues that both the public and the sealed copy of the law had been hidden, (contrary to Moses' command in Deut.31<sup>26</sup>.) by Joshua, Eleazar and the elders who were thus guilty of worshipping the Ashtoreth.<sup>38</sup> Finally, he considers that as David was not the only king to have more than one wife, but that he is mentioned because he was unworthy of revelation, having failed to obey the first torah.

---

<sup>36</sup>See: Wacholder, The Dawn of Qumran, p112-114 and his article 'The "Sealed" Torah versus the "Revealed" Torah: An Exegesis of Damascus Covenant V,1-6 and Jeremiah 32,10-14', RQ, 12 (1985-87), p351-368; VanderKam, 'Zadok and the Spr Htwrh Hhtwm in Dam. Doc. V,2-5', RQ, 11 (1982), p561-570; Schiffman, The Halakhah at Qumran, p30-31. (Both Murphy-O'Connor and Davies completely pass over the problems of this passage.)

<sup>37</sup>So Davies, p245; Maier, Die Texte vom Toten Meer, vol.2, p48.

<sup>38</sup>Wacholder, RQ, 12, p566-567.

The fundamental objection to this interpretation is that if the public copy of the law had been hidden how could David be said to disobey it? Furthermore, elsewhere in the scrolls the references to David are positive<sup>39</sup> and whilst David is accused of 'the blood of Uriah' he seems to be being absolved of his multiple marriages on the grounds of not being able to read the law.

mywm mwt 'l'zr wyhwš' wywšw' whzqnym 'šr 'bdw 't h'strt.<sup>40</sup> The main point to consider here is that the worship of the Ashtoreth began only after the death of Eleazar, Joshua and the elders – Judges 2<sup>11</sup>, for whilst they were alive Israel was faithful – Joshua 24<sup>31</sup> and Judges 2<sup>7</sup>. Thus, we should render 'šr as 'because' as in Nehemiah 2<sup>3</sup>, and so translate:<sup>41</sup>

*.. from the day of the death of Eleazar, Joshua, and the elders, because they (=the Israelites) worshipped the Ashtoreth ..*

wyṭmwn nglh 'd 'mwd šdwq. The most common translation of this phrase involves supplying the negative particle w'l', and then either seeing yṭmwn as an active form with passive meaning or emending it to the Niphal – wyṭmn:<sup>42</sup>

*..and it was hidden and was {not} revealed until the ...*

However, a different line of thought, avoiding the need to supply a negative

---

<sup>39</sup>1QM.11<sup>2</sup>, 11QPs<sup>a</sup>.27<sup>1-11</sup>, compare David's Messianic line: 4QPB.2,4; 4Qpls<sup>a</sup> frags 8-10,17; 4QF.1<sup>11-13</sup>.

<sup>40</sup>The aleph and lamed of 'Eleazar' are written as in Ms.B since they form the divine name 'El'; there is dittography of the name 'Joshua', the latter spelling being attested in Palestinian sources.

<sup>41</sup>So: Ginzberg, p20-21; VanderKam, RQ, 11, p567.

<sup>42</sup>Thus: Schechter, p68 reading 'wyṭmn w'l' nglh', and so Charles, p810; Rabin, p18, though keeping 'wyṭmwn' as an active for a passive, and noting that the same mistake (omission of 'l') occurs in 7<sup>12</sup>; Dupont-Sommer, Vermes, Davies, Knibb.

participle, was forwarded by Ginzberg,<sup>43</sup> who emends yṭmyn to hṭmwn and 'd to 't, rendering:

*And that which was hidden was revealed at the time when Zadok arose*

More recently Schiffman has argued strongly that nglh refers to 'scripture', pointing to a number of texts in 1QS and CD, including 5<sup>4-5</sup> which he renders:

*..since they (=Israel) worshipped the Ashtoreth, the nigleh (=the torah) was hidden until the coming of Zadok<sup>44</sup>*

The advantage with this latter translation is that it does not require any emendations yet makes perfect sense of the text, although it would be more convincing if nglh was definite.

Zadok - ṣḏwq. Outside of the Copper Scroll<sup>45</sup>, this is the only reference to the actual figure of Zadok in the Scrolls. Consequently, both Rabin and Ginzberg supply bn - 'the son of Zadok', which either dropped out or was removed, arguing that it was Zadok's grandson Hilkiah that found 'the sealed book of the law' (=Deuteronomy) according to 1Chr.5<sup>38-39</sup>.<sup>46</sup> It was Wacholder in his book The Dawn of Qumran<sup>47</sup> who created quite a stir by declaring that

---

<sup>43</sup>Ginzberg, p21; Schechter, p68, also suggested tentatively reading mglh for nglh, 'and it was hidden, that which is revealed, ..'.

<sup>44</sup>Schiffman, The Halakhah at Qumran, p30 with references to 1QS 1<sup>9</sup>, 8<sup>1-16</sup>, 9<sup>18-20</sup>, CD 5<sup>1-5</sup>, 7<sup>14-16</sup> - p23-32. VanderKam follows Schiffman's argument, translating 'the revelation remained hidden until Zadok assumed office', taking 'mwd' as 'assume office' as in Ezra.2<sup>63</sup> - RQ, 11, p567.

<sup>45</sup>The Copper Scroll (3Q15) reads: 'Nearby, below the southern quarter of the portico, at the tomb of Zadok under the pillar of the vestibule: a vase of fir balsaam, (a vase of) senna perfume. And nearby, in a garden (situated) on the top of the rock, facing west towards the courtyard (of the tomb) of Zadok, under the large flat stone found in the water channel: anathema.' (11<sup>2-7</sup>) - translation from Wacholder, The Dawn of Qumran, p100.

<sup>46</sup>Rabin, p18-19; Ginzberg, p21.

<sup>47</sup>See also Yadin, The Temple Scroll: the Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect, p227-8.

Zadok was here the Teacher of Righteousness and that 'the sealed book of the law' being the Temple Scroll was written by him, so that it was hardly surprising that David had not read it! Wacholder, further outlined his theory in a subsequent paper in response to an article by VanderKam, yet he failed to answer the latter's basic criticism.<sup>48</sup> For VanderKam asserts that Wacholder's theory opposes the simple plain meaning of the text, for 'on *a priori* grounds one would assume that, as the author is writing about David in these lines, the Zadok of V,5 is David's priest – the most famous Zadok in the Bible. If he were referring to another, less well known man of that name, he would virtually have been compelled to clarify whom he meant for the sake of his readers.'<sup>49</sup> Whilst this argument may not be convincing in view of the sect's love for cryptic references, VanderKam goes on to point out that after David brought the ark to Jerusalem he placed Zadok in charge of it so that it was the latter who put the torah (=Deuteronomy) into effect – 1Chron.16<sup>39-40</sup>. Then, as he notes, 'the only woman whom David married after the ark and the enclosed spr htwrh reached Jerusalem and Zadok took up his office was Bathsheba, and Dam.Doc.V,5-6 speaks critically of the shameful circumstances which surrounded that union... (for) by the time he married Bethsheba David would have known about the law of the king...'<sup>50</sup> This natural interpretation which VanderKam forwards requires no emendations in the whole of the passage (5<sup>1-6</sup>), and is, in my opinion, more credible than that of Wacholder. This passage is therefore a typical, almost rabbinic, digression, in an attempt to

---

<sup>48</sup>Wacholder, RQ, 12, p351-36, in reply to VanderKam, RQ, 11, p561-570.

<sup>49</sup>VanderKam, RQ, 11, p564. Perhaps one could argue that since the sect obviously knew who was meant any clarification was unnecessary, even undesirable, since the identity of the Teacher was best kept secret.

<sup>50</sup>VanderKam, RQ, 11, p569.

absolve Israel's greatest king of much of his apparent guilt.

wy'lw m'sy dwyd mlbd dm 'wryh wy'zbn lw 'l. The problem here is that the root 'zb can be rendered in one of two ways - 'to leave, forsake' which is its usual biblical meaning, and 'to forgive' which is found once in Neh.5<sup>10</sup> but which is a common meaning of the parallel Aramaic root šbq.<sup>51</sup> However, since we have argued that David was largely forgiven for his sins we must translate the verb 'lh 'to forgive', so rendering *'the (wicked) deeds of David were forgiven'*. This leaves us with: *'..except the blood of Uriah, and God left them to him'*<sup>52</sup> the plural suffix on the verb can therefore be understood to imply that 'the blood of Uriah' meant David was guilty of a number of sins - *'..and God left them (=those sins) to him'*. Alternatively, it is possible that a hasty scribe, familiar with Aramaic, misread the text along the lines - 'and God forgave them (David's sins) him' - thus corrupting an original singular suffix to a plural one.

The Second 'Net': 5<sup>6-11</sup> - tm' hmqdš.

wgm mṭm'ym hm 't hmqdš. Is this the real or the symbolic temple, 'the sure house'? Kosmala states: "God's miqdāš was no longer the temple of Jerusalem, but the new Israel itself, no longer a building of stone, but a miqdāš 'ādām... As the temple in Jerusalem meant very little to the sect, if anything at all, the purity of the miqdāš was understood as the purity and the holiness of the

---

<sup>51</sup>So Sutcliffe, 'The Translation of CDC 5:5-6', VT, 11 (1961), p91-94 - he translates: 'the deeds of David were of small moment, except for the blood of Uriah, and God forgave them', on the basis of the use of the root 'lh' in Ps.62<sup>10</sup> and in Mishnaic Hebrew.

<sup>52</sup>The blood of Uriah was David's only sin in bShabbath, 56a, and similar excuses were made for other notables: Reuben in Jub.33<sup>16</sup> and Boaz in R.Ruth 8<sup>1</sup>.

people, that is, of every individual member as well as of the community of the New Covenant as a whole.<sup>53</sup> That such spiritualization of the temple motif is present in the scrolls is undeniable, and since it has already been encountered in this document in the Ezekiel 44<sup>15</sup> Midrash there is no reason why this text cannot have a similar nuance.<sup>54</sup> However a literal reading of the text seems to be required here.

hm mbdyl ktwrh wšwkbym 'm hrw'h 't dm zwbh. The form of the Hiphil participle is singular mab<sub>d</sub>îl, yet a plural is demanded; thus Charles and Schechter emend to mbd(y)lym.<sup>55</sup> The absence of a biblical proof text here has led some scholars to see this passage as secondary, yet this absence is because this law is explicitly stated twice in the MT in Lev.15<sup>24</sup> and 18<sup>19</sup>, in contrast to the other two issues dealt with in 4<sup>20-5<sup>1</sup></sup> and 5<sup>7-11</sup>; it seemingly also occurs in 4QDam.<sup>56</sup> In Ginzberg's view, this polemic is directed against the more liberal Sadducees who would seem to declare dm zbh to be clean.<sup>57</sup>

wlwqḥym 'yš 't bt 'ḥyhw<sup>58</sup> w't bt 'hwtw.<sup>59</sup> This law of not marrying one's niece is not found in the MT, yet the sect argue that it is incestuous on the grounds of a similar case prohibited in Leviticus 20<sup>19-20</sup>, that of marrying one's aunt. The distance of the relationship between a man and his aunt and a man

---

<sup>53</sup>Kosmala, ASTI, 4, p103.

<sup>54</sup>See Chapter 3.1.2 on 'Temple', p357-370.

<sup>55</sup>Schechter, p68 and Charles, p810 (without the first yodh.)

<sup>56</sup>Milik writes that the numerous fragments belonging to the material before XV contain: '.... an expanded version of Lev.15 (fluxes of men and women) ...' - Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, p152.

<sup>57</sup>See Horayoth I<sup>3</sup> - Ginzberg, p22-3.

<sup>58</sup>Emended in T-S 10 K6 from 'ḥyhm

<sup>59</sup>Schechter (p69) however emends to 'ḥwtḥym 'their sisters' which is wrong .

and his niece is the same, and so prohibition against marrying one's niece is implied in the Mosaic law prohibiting a man marrying his aunt. In 11QT.66<sup>14-17</sup> both cases are explicitly stated:

*A man may not take the sister of his father or the sister of his mother for that is a disgrace. A man may not take the daughter of his brother or the daughter of his sister, for it is an abomination.*

Our text goes on to state that the converse is equally true, viz. that a woman cannot marry her uncle. For the Samaritans and the Karaites such marriages were incestuous, yet the Talmud commends precisely such marriages as acts especially pleasing to God.<sup>60</sup> If the Pharisees, who were more pious than most other groups within mainstream Judaism, approved of such marriages then we can assume that such marriages were generally accepted by the large majority of Jews outside of the sect. This, says the author, is another example of Belial's subtlety – he has trapped you unknown to yourselves.

In conclusion, this passage, 4<sup>19-5<sup>11</sup></sup>, seems to deal with those that have misinterpreted the law, and this then stands in a direct parallel with the following poetical passage, 5<sup>11-6<sup>3</sup></sup>, which deals in part with those that have abandoned the law altogether. The former assertion confirms our identification of 'the builders of the wall' as 'those who set the standards of religious life', and who have, as such, led Israel astray.

---

<sup>60</sup>Yevamoth 62b, though opposition even in Pharisaic circles seemed to exist as the story of R.Eliezer ben Hyrcanus indicates – TP.Yevamoth XIII,13c (Ginzberg, p23-24.)



The Hebrew of the Fourth Poem.

3	7<1>	ו>גם< את רוח קדשיהם טמאו
4	9	ובלשונו (12) גדופים פתחו פה
3	5	על חוקי ברית אל
3	6	לאמר לא נכוננו
4	7	ותועבה (13) הם מדברים במ
3	5	כלם קדחי אש
2	5	ומבערי זיקות
3	8	קורי (14) עכביש קוריהם
3	9	וביצי צפעונים ביציהם
4	9	הקרוב אליהם (15) לא ינקה
3	6<4>	כהר ביתו יאשם <כי אם נלחץ>
1+4	1+10<1>	כי <אם> למילפנים פקד (16) אל את מעשיהם
3	10	ויחר אפו בעלילותיהם
4	6	כי לא עם בינות הוא (17)
4	6	הם גוי אבד עצות
3	7	מאשר אין בהם בינה
6	15	כי מלפנים עמד (18) משה ואהרן ביד שר האורים
5	17	ויקם בליעל את יחנה ואת (19) אחיהו במזמתו
3	11	בהושע ישראל את הראשונה
3+3	6+7	(20) ובקץ חרבן הארץ עמדו מסיגי הגבול
2+2	7+5	ויתעו את ישראל (21) ותישם הארץ
6	12	כי דברו סרה על מצות אל ביד משה
		<וגם (1) במשיח. הקודש>
6	15	וינבאו שקר להשיב את ישראל מאחר (2) אל
4	8	ויזכר אל ברית ראשנים
3	8	ויקם מאהרן נבונים
2	7	ומישראל (3) חכמים
3	10	וישמיעם ויחפורו את הבאר

Translation of the Fourth Poem: 5<sup>11</sup>-6<sup>3</sup> and the Well  
Midrash, 6<sup>3-11</sup>.

*<Furthermore> they made their holy spirits unclean,  
And with a <sup>12</sup> blaspheming tongue they opened (their) mouth  
against the precepts of the covenant of El,  
saying 'They should not be upheld';  
And they <sup>13</sup> speak abominable things about them.*

*'All of them are kindlers of fire,  
and burners of brands<sup>5</sup>; <sup>14</sup>  
Spiders webs are their webs,  
basilisk's eggs are their eggs.<sup>6</sup>*

*He who draws near to them <sup>15</sup> shall not go unpunished,  
He that chooses his house shall be held guilty <unless he was  
forced>.*

*Even in former times <sup>16</sup> El punished their deeds,  
And His wrath was kindled against their actions:  
'For this is a people of no understanding.'<sup>7</sup> <sup>17</sup>  
They are a nation devoid of counsel,  
because none among them understands<sup>8</sup>.*

*For in former times <sup>18</sup> Moses and Aaron arose by the hand of  
the Prince of Lights,  
And Belial raised Jannes and <sup>19</sup> his brother by his evil  
practices,  
when Israel was saved (the) first time.<sup>20</sup>*

*And in the period of the land's desolation 'the removers of the  
bound' arose,  
And they led Israel astray<sup>21</sup> and the land was laid waste;  
And they spoke falsehood against the commandment of El  
given by the hand of Moses, <and also <sup>1</sup> by His holy  
Messiah>  
And they prophesied lies to cause Israel to turn away from  
following El.*

*But El remembered the covenant of the ancestors,*

---

<sup>5</sup>Isaiah 50<sup>11</sup>.

<sup>6</sup>Isaiah 59<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>7</sup>Isaiah 27<sup>11</sup>.

<sup>8</sup>Deut.32<sup>28</sup>.

*And He raised from Aaron men of understanding,  
and from Israel<sup>3</sup> men of wisdom.  
And He caused them to listen and they dug the well.*

---

*The well which the princes dug,  
which<sup>4</sup> the nobles of the people delved with a staff.<sup>5</sup>*

*The well' is the law, and 'those who dug it' are<sup>5</sup> the returnees of Israel who went out from the land of Judah and sojourned in the land of Damascus;<sup>6</sup> all of whom El called 'princes' because they sought Him and<sup>7</sup> their splendour was not rejected by anyone. And 'the staff/lawgiver' is the Interpreter of the Law, of whom<sup>8</sup> Isaiah spoke: 'He who brings forth a tool for his work.'<sup>10</sup> 'The nobles of the people' are<sup>9</sup> those who have entered in order to dig the well, with (the help of) the staves/lawgivers which the staff/lawgiver provided,<sup>10</sup> so as to walk in them during the whole period of wickedness, <and without them they will not succeed,> until there stands<sup>11</sup> the one who will teach righteousness in the latter days.*

---

<sup>9</sup>Numbers 21<sup>18</sup>.

<sup>10</sup>Isaiah 54<sup>16</sup>.

## 1.5. The Fourth Poem: CD.5<sup>11</sup>-6<sup>3</sup>. The Lessons of History – the law.

### Introduction

What makes this a new section? Firstly and most importantly it is poetical in form, in contrast to the section on the Nets of Belial (4<sup>12-19</sup>) which is midrashic, and that of the two 'nets' which the 'builders of the wall' have fallen into which is expounded in almost rabbinic fashion. Secondly, however, close the parallel may seem to be between the uncleanness of the sanctuary and the uncleanness of their holy spirits, the former does not necessarily have a spiritual sense. Yet some scholars believe that there is a direct progression from defiling the spiritual temple of the community to defiling their spirits. In Pauline terminology this would be described in terms of the body being the temple of the holy spirit<sup>1</sup> and it is the influence of the latter which, in my opinion, has led many scholars to link these two passages,<sup>2</sup> for nowhere else in the scrolls is the symbolism of the temple extended to the physical body of the individual. Thirdly, the section above deals with those who in the eyes of the sect have misinterpreted the law, whilst this section is directed against those who oppose the law completely. The poet starts with the current problem and then shows that throughout Israelite history there have been people who have rebelled totally from the law, a format already encountered in the third poem. Thus this section, directed at those who do not observe the law, would appear to be pointing towards the Hellenizers whose liberal attitude

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g. 1Cor.3<sup>16-17</sup>, 6<sup>14-20</sup>; Eph.2<sup>19-22</sup>.

<sup>2</sup>E.g. Kosmala, ASTI, 4, p104.

is fiercely frowned upon by the sect.

The first stanza: 5<sup>11-15</sup>. The current lawlessness.

w<gm> 't rwh qdšyhm tm'w	3	7<1>
wblšwn <sup>12</sup> gdwpym pthw ph	4	9
'l hwqy bryt 'l	3	5
l'mr l' nkwnw	3	6
wtw'bh <sup>13</sup> hm mdbrym bm	4	7
klm qdhy 'š	3	5
wmb'ry zyqwt	2	5
qwry <sup>14</sup> 'kbyš qwryhm	3	8
wbyšy šp'wnym byšyhm	3	9
hqrwb 'lyhm <sup>15</sup> l' ynqh	4	9
chr <sup>3</sup> bytw y'šm <ky 'm nlḥš>	3	6<4>

*<Furthermore> they made their holy spirits unclean,  
And with a <sup>12</sup> blaspheming tongue they opened (their) mouth  
against the precepts of the covenant of El,  
saying 'They should not be upheld';  
And they <sup>13</sup> speak abominable things about them.*

*'All of them are kindlers of fire,  
and burners of brands<sup>4</sup>; <sup>14</sup>  
'Spiders webs are their webs,  
and basilisk's eggs are their eggs.<sup>5</sup>*

*He who draws near to them <sup>15</sup> shall not go unpunished,  
He that chooses his house shall be held guilty <unless he was  
forced>.*

This stanza exhibits well-balanced poetry. The introductory monocolon is followed by a quatrain where the first and last cola parallel each other creating a chiastic pattern of a:b:c:a'. The opening particle, gm, is a secondary gloss

---

<sup>3</sup>Emend to bhr.

<sup>4</sup>Isaiah 50<sup>11</sup>.

<sup>5</sup>Isaiah 59<sup>5</sup>.

which ties this passage to the preceding section on 'uncleanness of the sanctuary'. In the first line of the quatrain the omission of the suffix is a good poetical device. The first two cola of this poem can be compared with Mark 3<sup>29-30.6</sup>

ὅς δ' ἂν βλασφημήσῃ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον  
οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἀλλὰ ἔνοχός  
ἐστὶν αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος - <sup>30</sup> ὅτι ἔλεγον,  
Πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει.<sup>7</sup>

*'..But whoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit never has forgiveness, but is guilty of eternal sin' - for they had said 'He has an unclean spirit'.*

The only other occurrence of the phrase lšwn gđwpyṁ in the scrolls is in 1QS.4<sup>11</sup> where it is one of the ways of the spirit of

falsehood. This is one of a number of links that we find between this poem and the poetry of the Two Spirits passage in 1QS; other notable examples include the phrase rwh qwdš in 1QS.4<sup>21,8</sup>, the words tw'bh and 'lylh are found four and three times respectively in 1QS.4, the phrase šr 'wryṁ in 1QS.3<sup>20</sup>, and the word šqr found twice in 1QS.4<sup>9,21,9</sup>. The latter (špr) is also associated with the 'Spouter' in 1QpHab.10<sup>10,12</sup>, whilst the Wicked Priest is twice accused of abominable (tw'bh) acts in 1QpH.8<sup>13</sup> and 12<sup>8</sup>; however, only here do we hear of abominable things being spoken.

---

<sup>6</sup>Knibb (p44) points to the Hebrew (not the Greek) Testament of Naphtali, 10<sup>9</sup>, which reads: 'Blessed is the man who does not defile the holy spirit of God which has been put and breathed into him'.

<sup>7</sup>Delitzsch's Hebrew translation of this is: 'k. hmgdp 't rwh hqdš 'yn-lw slyḥh l'wlm ky y 'šm b'wnw lnšḥ: <sup>30</sup> ky-hmh 'mrw rwh ṭm 'h bw:'

<sup>8</sup>Also found in 1QS.9<sup>3</sup> and 1QSb.2<sup>24</sup> and with the second person singular suffix eight times in 1QH.

<sup>9</sup>Also found in 1QS.5<sup>15</sup> and 1QpHab.10<sup>10,12</sup>; in addition 'bynh' (20x) and 'mzṁh' (8x) only occur in the poetry of the scrolls.

The phrase 'the precepts of the covenant of El' could either refer to the Mosaic Pentateuch, or to the sect's own interpretation of the law (11QT); the former would mean that this stanza is a polemic against the Hellenistic practices rife throughout Israel, the latter an apologetic against those who have ridiculed the covenant of the sect. The phrase *hwqy* (h)bryt appears three times elsewhere, in CD.20<sup>29</sup>, 1QH.16<sup>15</sup> and 1QSa.1<sup>5,7</sup>. The latter text bears quoting:

*<sup>1</sup> This is the rule for all the congregation of Israel in the last days, when they shall join [the Community to walk] <sup>2</sup> according to the law of the sons of Zadok the Priests ..<sup>3</sup>..<sup>4</sup>.. they shall summon them all, the little children and the women also, and they shall read into their [ears] <sup>5</sup> all the precepts of the covenant and shall expound to them all their statutes that they may no longer stray in their [errors]. <sup>6</sup> And this is the rule for all the hosts of the congregation, for every man born in Israel. From his youth (=age of 10) <sup>7</sup> they shall instruct him in the Book of Hagi and shall teach him, according to his age, the precepts of the covenant. He shall be educated in their statutes for ten years...*

Thus at 'the end of days' the 'congregation of Israel' would join the community and be instructed in its covenant. Yet this is also God's covenant to which all Israel should be bound, but to which only the sect were obedient. Consequently, this stanza is both apologetical and polemical in character, both defending the true covenant of God to which the sect adhere and attacking those outside the sect who speak against this covenant. Thus, 'the precepts of the covenant' must be those of the sectarian covenant, and thus of the sectarian torah (11QT).

The two quotations which follow help to illustrate the serious nature of the current situation. The first is from the third Servant Poem, Isaiah 50<sup>11</sup>: our text agrees with 1QIs<sup>a</sup> in having *k(w)lm* for the MT *k1km*, however both the MT and 1QIs<sup>a</sup> have *m'zry* for *wmb'ry* here, although the LXX and Syriac perhaps read

m'yrw for m'zry which would be nearer our text. Isaiah is giving a warning to those who walk in their own light rather than following God through the darkness (v10), and this is probably also the sense in our passage that 'these people' were following their own light (laws) rather than God's. Alternatively it may be portraying 'all of them' as those people who stir up trouble, and this would be more in line with the following quotation. The second quotation is from Isaiah 59<sup>5</sup>:

CD : qwry 'kbyš qwryhm wbyšy šp'wnym byšyhm

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: bšy šp'wnym ybq'w wqwry 'kbyš y'rgw

Is.: byšy šp'wny bq'w wqwry 'kbyš y'rgw

- . There are some interesting variations in the above three versions, in particular the reversed order of the cola in our text. Isaiah is appealing to Judah for repentance in chapter 59, yet the implication of 59<sup>5</sup> is that the whole community is contaminated. Similarly, the poet saw the whole of the current 'Israel' as polluted and following after devious plans and schemes.

There are a number of grammatical problems with the final bicolon of this stanza. The first is the form of hqrbw which should be emended to hq(w)rb in view of 6Q15 which reads hqrb, a Qal active participle; at some point a scribe of our text wrote a passive participle by mistake. More problematical is the first word of the second colon which as it stands reads: *'like the mountain of his house shall he be held guilty'*. The mountain of the house' is, according to Dalman's dictionary, a name for the outermost tower of the temple, and it is possible that a later scribe thought this text contained such an allusion and substituted it for the real text. Naturally enough, most scholars find it necessary to emend the text. Rabin suggests combining the first two words



k<sup>e</sup>har<sup>e</sup>bōtō rendering 'the more he does it the guiltier he shall be'.<sup>10</sup> Yet it is Charles' methodology that should be followed, for he realizes this is a small poetical passage and that as such we should use parallelism to solve the anomaly. Thus, a parallel to hq(w)rb is needed, namely bōhēr:<sup>11</sup>

He that draws near	to them	shall not go unpunished,
He that chooses	his house	shall be held guilty.

Charles also suggests emending bytw to bhm to improve the parallelism still further, yet the change from plural to singular (or vice-versa) in parallel cola should be regarded as a poetical feature especially since byt (= the community) has a plural sense.<sup>12</sup> We are left then with the phrase 'unless he was forced'; this reads like a gloss, does not fit in with the parallelism, and makes the metre unbalanced - it is therefore secondary. This bicolon concludes what is the first stanza of this short history, starting as it does with the evils of the current times.

The Second Stanza: 5<sup>15-19</sup>. The Egyptian Exile and God's salvation.

ky <'m> lmylpnym pqd <sup>16</sup> 'l 't m'syhm	1+4	1+10< >
wyhr 'pw b'lylwtyhm	3	10
ky l' 'm bynwt hw' <sup>17</sup>	4	6
hm gwy 'bd 'swt	4	6
m'sr 'yn bhm bynh	3	7

<sup>10</sup>Rabin, p20; followed by Lohse, Maier, Davies and Murphy-O'Connor, the latter arguing that this only makes sense if the passage 'is addressed to uncommitted outsiders whose normal way of life would bring them into contact with those criticised' - RB, 77, p223.

<sup>11</sup>Charles, p811.

<sup>12</sup>Charles, p811. Schechter (p69) (as an alternative to his main suggestion) tentatively suggests emending 'khr' to 'k's' - 'like a moth his house shall be held guilty' - which he compares to Job 27<sup>18</sup>: 'He builds like a moth his house', which the Syriac and LXX translate as 'He builds like a spider his house' - cf. Is 59<sup>5</sup> quoted above.

ky mlpnym 'md <sup>18</sup> mšh w'hrn byd śr h'wrym	6	15
wyqm bly'l 't yḥnh w't <sup>19</sup> 'ḥyhw bmzmtw	5	17
bhwš' yśr'l 't hr'šwnh	3	11

*Even in former times <sup>16</sup> El punished their deeds,  
And His wrath was kindled against their actions:  
'For this is a people of no understanding'.<sup>13 17</sup>  
They are a nation devoid of counsel,  
because none among them understands<sup>14</sup>*

*For in former times He raised <sup>18</sup> Moses and Aaron by the hand  
of the Prince of Lights,  
And Belial raised Jannes and <sup>19</sup> his brother by his evil  
practices,  
when Israel was saved the first time.*

---

lmylpnym: only here with this *plene* form, elsewhere being written as lmlpnym.

bmzmtw: the noun mzmh, 'design' appears to be used in either a positive or negative sense; it is used in a positive one in 1QS.11<sup>6</sup>, and in a negative one here and in 1QH.2<sup>16</sup> - 'and the designs of Belial (were) all their thoughts'.

---

The apparent randomness of the themes presented in this passage has led to numerous different views being forwarded as to its division. For Stegemann, 15b-16a is a conclusion of a source, whilst what follows is made

---

<sup>13</sup>Isaiah 27<sup>11</sup>.

<sup>14</sup>Deut.32<sup>28</sup>.

up of largely scriptural glosses and is redactionary, with a new section beginning in 17b referring to the second period of destruction.<sup>15</sup> For Davies, 15b-16 is a redactional link and a new section begins with the words 'They are a nation devoid of council...'.<sup>16</sup> Yet once the poem has been marked out and its theme clearly discerned, then it becomes apparent that this is the second stanza which deals with the period up to the exodus. The poet is trying to draw a parallel between the current lawless nation of Israel and the lawlessness of the nation in the past which led to the first exile to Egypt.

The 'm must be omitted on grounds of dittography with the preceding ky 'm.<sup>17</sup> The particle ky is a case of anacrusis, leaving a bicolon with strong parallelism. In every case elsewhere, mlpnym refers to the earliest period of Israelite history,<sup>18</sup> and this passage is no exception. A comparison with the third poem, 3<sup>4-5</sup>, would suggest that the phrase 'El punished their deeds' refers to the exile in Egypt, and this is supported by the subsequent appearance of Moses who delivers Israel for the first time from exile.

The first quotation conforms exactly to the MT, the ky being part of the quotation. The second comes from Dt.32<sup>28a</sup>:

CD: hm gwy 'bd 'šwt                      m'šr 'yn bhm bynh

Dt: ky gwy 'bd 'šwt hmh                      w'yn bhm tbwnh

Both biblical quotations are taken by the author to refer to Israel, as they do in

---

<sup>15</sup>Stegemann, p160.

<sup>16</sup>Davies, p119-120; Knibb (p44) begins a new section with 'ky 'm', 5<sup>15b</sup>.

<sup>17</sup>So Davies, p247; Schechter, p69 and Charles, p811, omit all of 'ky 'm' on grounds of dittography.

<sup>18</sup>CD 2<sup>17</sup>, 3<sup>19</sup>, 5<sup>15,17</sup> and 4QpNah frags 3-4, 1<sup>8</sup>.

their biblical contexts.<sup>19</sup>

The final tricolon of this stanza at first sight appears to be prosaic or, at least, having rather lengthy cola. Yet closer examination reveals strong parallelism between the initial two cola, with Moses and Aaron being opposed by Jannes and his brother (=Jambres), (the root 'mā paralleling qwm), and with the assistance given by 'śr h'wrym' paralleling the opposition of bly'l. All this means that the tricolon has the pattern a:a':b, with the first two cola exhibiting a certain degree of chiasmic parallelism. This could be schematized as follows:

First colon: x + verb + Moses & Aaron + Cosmic Helper.

Second Colon: verb + Cosmic Helper + Jannes & Jambres + x.

For both Moses and Aaron are connected with the law, as are Jannes and his brother who were the two Egyptian sorcerers who tried to oppose them, Exodus 7<sup>11</sup>.<sup>20</sup> Consequently we can reject Murphy-O'Connor's suggestion that this dualistic section is secondary on the grounds that it plays no part in the argument.<sup>21</sup>

Who is the 'śr h'wrym? This figure has already been encountered in 1QS.3<sup>20</sup> in the Two Spirits passage,<sup>22</sup> where he was paralleled with ml'k h'wšk, 'the Angel of Darkness', which would suggest that the 'śr (h)'wrym must also be

---

<sup>19</sup>The theme of 'understanding' has been treated at length by Denis in his book, Les thèmes de connaissance dans le Document de Damas.

<sup>20</sup>Their names are not given there, being supplied by Jewish tradition; thus in 2Timothy 3<sup>8</sup> we read: 'As Jannes and Jambres opposed Moses, so these men also oppose truth..' The book entitled 'Jannes and Jambres' can be found in Charlesworth, Vol.2, p427-442; it dates to the first to third century A.D. The earliest attested reference to the name(s) of these sorcerers is therefore in our current passage of CD.

<sup>21</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 77, p224-5 followed by Knibb, p45-46.

<sup>22</sup>There we have the indefinite form: 'śr 'wrym'.

an angelic figure. CD 16<sup>5</sup> refers to the 'Angel of Persecution' who is referred to in Jubilees as the 'Prince of Persecution';<sup>23</sup> similarly, in Test.Simeon 2<sup>7</sup> the Greek has 'Prince of Deceit' for the Armenian 'Angel of Deceit'. Thus the word *śr* has an angelic sense and should perhaps be translated as such. The next question is whether *śr* (h) 'wrym is meant to be any particular angelic figure. In 1Enoch 20<sup>2</sup> the angel Uriel 'wry'1 is described as the first of the angels and their prince, and is set over the lights of heaven.<sup>24</sup> Thus the prince of lights, namely Uriel the chief of the angels, is here paralleled with Belial the chief of the forces of evil and darkness, whilst on earth Moses and his older brother Aaron are pitted against Jannes and his brother, Jambres. The battle between good and evil, or obedience and disobedience to the law, is fought on a cosmic as well as a temporal level.

*bhwš' yśr'1 't hr'šwnh*. Some scholars have found this phrase slightly awkward. Schechter emends 't to 't rendering 'when Israel was delivered for the first time', whilst Charles moves the accusative particle before *yśr'1*, rendering 'when the former delivered Israel', that is, Moses who is called the first redeemer in R.Ruth.5<sup>6</sup>.<sup>25</sup> The text, though, is fine as it stands: *bhwš'* being a Hiphil infinitive, *hr'šwnh* having the meaning 'first' as in 14<sup>3,5</sup>.

The third stanza: 5<sup>20</sup>-6<sup>3</sup>. The Babylonian exile and God's salvation.

*wbqš ḥrbn h'rš 'mdw msygy hgbwl*

3+3 6+7

<sup>23</sup>*ml'k hmštmh'*, cf. Jub.11<sup>5</sup>, 17<sup>16</sup>, 18<sup>9</sup>.

<sup>24</sup>Origen shows that Uriel was regarded as the chief of the angels in his Commentary on John, 2<sup>5</sup>, even though Uriel is the fourth of the four great archangels - Michael, Gabriel, Raphael and Uriel. It is also possible that 'šwry'1 is none other than Uriel - Ginzberg, p26-27.

<sup>25</sup>Schechter, p69 - for the weakening of gutturals, see Kutscher, 1QIs<sup>a</sup>, p57; Charles, p811-12.

wyt'w 't yśr'l <sup>21</sup> wtyšm h'rš	2+2	7+5
ky dbrw srh 'l mšwt 'l byd mšh	6	12
<wqm <sup>1</sup> bmšyḥw hqwdš>		
wynb'w šqr lhšyb 't yśr'l m'hr <sup>2</sup> 'l	6	15
wyzkr 'l bryt r'šnym	4	8
wyqm m'hrn nbwnym	3	8
wmyśr'l <sup>3</sup> ḥkmym	2	7
wyšmy'm wyḥpwrw 't hb'r	3	10

*And in the period of the land's desolation 'the removers of the bound' arose,*

*And they led Israel astray <sup>21</sup> and the land was laid waste;*

*And they spoke falsehood against the commandment of El given by the hand of Moses, <and also <sup>1</sup> by His holy Messiah>*

*And they prophesied lies to cause Israel to turn away from following El.*

*But El remembered the covenant of the ancestors,*

*And He raised from Aaron men of understanding,*

*and from Israel <sup>3</sup> men of wisdom.*

*And He caused them to listen and they dug a well.*

---

ḥrbn is unique to the scrolls and does not occur in the MT, ḥrbh being the more normal form.<sup>26</sup>

tēšam: the *plene* form is also found in 6QD, while the biblical form is tēšam which is found in Ezekiel 12<sup>19</sup> and 19<sup>7</sup>; the form is from the root yšm, 'to be desolate', not from šmm, 'to be destroyed', which occurred in 2<sup>1</sup> and 3<sup>10</sup>.

wyḥpwrw: written *plene* - see 3<sup>16</sup>.

---

<sup>26</sup>There is no connection here with 'the period of wrath' of 1<sup>5</sup> as Charles (p812) and Rabinowitz (JBL, 73, p19-20) suggest.

wyšmy'm: the manuscript, T-S 10 K6, is unclear but the second yodh may be present making the form a Hiphil. Alternatively, taking the text as wyšm'm, it could be a Piel, 'he summoned them', as we find in 1Sam.15<sup>4</sup> and 23<sup>8</sup>.

---

This final stanza has two clearly defined strophes, the first dealing with the lawlessness of the pre-exilic nation which resulted in the Babylonian exile, the second with the post-exilic remnant. Much of the phraseology of this stanza is found in the preceding historical poetical accounts, and of course in the MT.

The first strophe opens with a bicolon exhibiting chiasmic (reflexive congruence) parallelism in its subject matter, (a:b:b':a'). The period of the land's desolation is mentioned in 3<sup>10</sup> and in the MT, e.g. Jeremiah 25<sup>11</sup> – 'This whole land shall become a ruin and a waste'.<sup>27</sup>

msygy hgbwl occurs only here and in 19<sup>15-16</sup> where Hosea 5<sup>10</sup> is fully quoted. In CD 19<sup>15-16</sup> (and Hosea 5<sup>10</sup>) the princes of Judah are not equated with 'the removers of the bound', they are merely described as being like them. As apostates, 'the princes of Judah' are like those at the time of the exile who are accused of overstepping the bound of the law. Yet it is only to the past 'removers of the bound' that our present text refers.

wyt'w 't yšr'l. Similarly phraseology referring to the pre-exilic Israel is found in 3<sup>14</sup>, 4<sup>1</sup> and Jeremiah 23<sup>13</sup>. This is the second reference to the desolation of the land and creates a nice chiasmic structure in this bicolon.

---

<sup>27</sup>Compare: Jer.29<sup>10</sup>, 44<sup>2,22</sup> and Dan.9<sup>2</sup>.

The second bicolon of this strophe has a secondary Messianic reference, as a close examination of the parallelism here clearly shows:

ky dbrw srh 'l mšwt 'l byd mšh <wgm bmšyḥw hqwdš>  
w ynb'w šqr lhšyb 't yśr'l m'ḥr 'l

The form *srh*, a *hapax legomenon* in the scrolls, must be translated 'falsehood' as in Deuteronomy 19<sup>16</sup> in order to create the parallelism with *šqr*, and not 'rebellion' which is its more common meaning. *wgm* is again secondary as in 5<sup>11</sup> and introduces the secondary addition of *wgm bmšyḥy/w hqwdš*.<sup>28</sup> The words also appear in 6QD but, as even Baillet admits, the text is also unclear there, so that the text could either read *wgm bmšyḥy hqwdš*, 'and also by the holy anointed ones' (=the prophets), or *..mšyḥw ..* 'and also by His holy Messiah.'<sup>29</sup> The meaning of the text with this secondary reference is that 'they' spoke rebellion not only against the commandments of God as given by Moses but also against the teachings of the prophets, so that the gloss creates an all embracing set, the law and the prophets. Later the gloss was (deliberately) corrupted so that it referred to the commandments of God given by His Messiah, viz. the sectarian torah (11QT) given by the Teacher of Righteousness, thus creating an all embracing pair of the first and second torah.<sup>30</sup> Finally, the sense demanded of *lhšyb*, a Hiphil infinitive, is: 'to cause (them) to turn (away)'.

The second strophe deals with Israel's second deliverance from Babylon. While the following midrashic section (6<sup>4-11</sup>) may have been composed to

---

<sup>28</sup>Charles (p812) also sees an addition here, though not on metrical grounds.

<sup>29</sup>See notes on 2<sup>12</sup> and Baillet, RB, 63, p517-519, especially note 4 on p518.

<sup>30</sup>If, as I believe, the Teacher of Righteousness is 'the Interpreter of the Law' then 7<sup>18-19</sup> would give the Teacher a Messianic status.



expand on the Numbers quotation which would then end this poem, it seems more likely that the quotation is part of the following midrashic section and that the midrash (6<sup>3-11</sup>) was added here because of the original reference to the well. Thus, rather than having two tricola here, the first on the remnant, the second on the well, we have a quatrain. The parallel with the last strophe of the previous stanza is noticeable; there God raises Moses and Aaron who helped save Israel by leading them out of exile and by giving them the law, here God raises 'men of understanding and wisdom' from Israel and Aaron respectively, who dig the well = the law. If it was the law that saved Israel the first time, is it the law, (viz. the sect's interpretation of it,) that will save Israel the second time. It is this latter point that is then expounded upon in the following 'Well Midrash', thus explaining why it was appended to this poem. Here, as in the historical account of the third poem, the period between the end of the exile and the formation of the sect is totally passed over, either because the sect wished to suggest that they (or their 'forbears) originated shortly after the exile or because they viewed the exile as an ongoing process.

CD.6<sup>2</sup>: wyzkr 'l bryt r'snym.  
 6Q15: wyzkwr 'l bryt ry'swnym.<sup>31</sup>  
 CD.1<sup>4</sup>: wbzkrw bryt r'snym.

The parallel between the first colon and 1<sup>4</sup> confirms the view established already that we are now dealing with the remnant community from whom God raised men of understanding and wisdom. The following two cola allude to Deut.1<sup>13,32</sup> and could be said to show *qinah* metre.

---

<sup>31</sup>6QD exhibits plene forms.

<sup>32</sup>Which reads: 'Give for yourself men of wisdom and understanding and experience for your tribal leaders - cf. 1QSa.1<sup>28</sup>.

## Conclusion

Thus the format of this poem could be summarized as follows:

Stanza 1: The current lawlessness of Israel.

Stanza 2: The lawlessness of the early Israel.  
God's deliverance of Israel from exile (in Egypt.)  
- He gave them the Pentateuch.

Stanza 3: The lawlessness of the pre-exilic Israel.  
God's deliverance of Israel from exile (in Babylon)  
- He gave them 11QT.

The stanzas have respectively: 11,8,8 lines; 35,34,34 stresses; 76,83,85 syllables, thus yielding a pretty well-balanced poetic structure overall.

### 1.5.1. The Well Midrash: 6<sup>3-11</sup>.

Is this an independent literary unit or does it belong to one of the sections on either side of it? All scholars agree that the following section (6<sup>11f</sup>) begins a new section, thus our choice is reduced to two. Davies has argued that it belongs to the previous section as the perspective is historical, and thus the two historical accounts of 2<sup>17b-4<sup>4a</sup></sup> and 5<sup>17b-6<sup>11a</sup></sup> have parallel midrashic sections in 3<sup>21-4<sup>4a</sup></sup> and 6<sup>3b-9</sup>.<sup>33</sup> Murphy-O'Connor has found this argument so convincing that he has emended his position so that he now regards the well midrash as belonging to his 'Missionary Document', being of the same literary level as 'the Introductions' of 1<sup>1-2<sup>1</sup></sup> and 2<sup>2-13</sup>.<sup>34</sup> However there is a definite

---

<sup>33</sup>Davies, p121-2.

<sup>34</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, 'A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document VI:2-VIII:3', RB, 78 (1971), p228-31 - compare RB, 92 (1985), p232-3.

change in style here from poetry to prose. Furthermore, as we have seen, stanzas 2 and 3 of the poem deal respectively with the two exiles and God's subsequent deliverance. Thus for the parallel between these two stanzas to remain valid, the poem must end with the words 'and they dug the well'; what follows is merely a midrashic text on 'the well' for which there is no parallel.

The 'well' as a symbol for the law is a theme that is not attested outside of this document. However, the related motif of 'waters' representing the 'teachings' of the torah (=well) is a more common theme in the scrolls,<sup>35</sup> for instance 1QH.8<sup>6-7</sup>:

*[For Thou didst set] a plantation ...  
And they put out a shoot(=Teacher of Righteousness)  
of the everlasting plant(=Davidic dynasty).<sup>7</sup>  
Yet before they did so, they took root  
and sent out their roots to the watercourse (=the law)  
that its stem might be open to the living waters ...(=living  
teachings)*

The latter confirms that the root (=some group of men) came before the shoot (=the Teacher of Righteousness) as CD.1<sup>7,11</sup> relates. Furthermore, the root, prior to the coming of the Teacher, took up 'living waters' (1QH.8<sup>7</sup>) / 'dug the well' (CD.6<sup>3</sup>); that is to say, they searched for the correct interpretation of the law, yet until the coming of the Teacher they, 'the root', groped for the way - CD.1<sup>9</sup>. Likewise in the 'Well Midrash' it is the Interpreter of the Law who actually interprets the law correctly, and who instructs others as to its meaning 6<sup>7-9</sup>.<sup>36</sup> Furthermore, it is implied that he is the founder (or at least

---

<sup>35</sup>Compare CD 3<sup>16</sup> and 19<sup>34</sup>. See also the my ndh in 1QS 3<sup>4-9</sup> and 4<sup>21</sup> - might these not be 'the waters (=teachings) which cleanse (the soul)'; 1QH.8 in its entirety.

<sup>36</sup>In the historical account of 2<sup>14-320</sup> it is 'the sure house' which is built following the well. Might this not refer to the Teacher of Righteousness, or at least the Zadokite Priestly line of which the Teacher was the true heir, especially when one compares it to 4QFl. where a similar biblical passage (2Sam.7<sup>11-14</sup>) is used for the Branch and the Interpreter?

'leader') of the group, and all of this points to the conclusion that 'the Teacher of Righteousness' = 'the Interpreter of the Law'.<sup>37</sup> Davies raises what appears to be a fundamental objection to this equation; he writes, 'if we identify them, as is the usual procedure, why do we want to do so, and why should the document confuse us with two titles?'<sup>38</sup> Yet Davies has made a false presupposition (or, alternatively, an erroneous conclusion) in that he believes that the core of the Admonition, 1<sup>1</sup>-7<sup>9</sup>, all stems from the same hand. Once the various *genres* are separated out and the full composite nature of the document is appreciated, then the obvious possibility that these two titles originated from different authors has to be faced. Thus, to pre-empt my conclusions for a moment, I believe that the poet (first?) used the title 'the Teacher of Righteousness' which the later redactor adopted when he came to compile the 'original' document, whilst the author of the midrashic sections used another title for the same figure, namely 'the Interpreter of the Law', mainly because the sect's concept of this figure had changed from that of leader to that of lawgiver.

šby yśr'l hywš'ym m'rš yhwđh. This phrase also occurs in the Ezekiel midrash where it is the priests who are so described; therefore 'the priests' = 'those who dug the well'. In both cases they are the first 'members', and are followed by later members = 'the sons of Zadok' = 'the nobles of the people...'.  
dmśq. The word appears seven times in this document but never in any

---

<sup>37</sup>So, for instance: Brown, 'The Teacher of Righteousness and the Messiah(s)', in the The Scrolls and Christianity, (ed.M.Black) p38; Wacholder, The Dawn of Qumran, p110; Knibb, p49.

<sup>38</sup>Davies, Behind the Essenes, p28.

other scroll.<sup>39</sup> The choice here is firstly between a literal or symbolic interpretation, and then if the latter between Babylon or Qumran. Somewhat significantly, 'until the discovery of the scrolls from Qumran, students and scholars had no hesitation in accepting the "literal" interpretation of these passages; some sect had travelled to Damascus and its members had made a covenant among themselves there'.<sup>40</sup> Yet there is something to be said for a literal understanding of Damascus, namely that as it is the first Syrian city outside Israel it would constitute the obvious place to escape to for anyone wishing to escape Israelite (or Egyptian) influence. In addition, Damascus was the oldest Jewish settlement outside of Palestine,<sup>41</sup> and if the founder members of the sect fled there we certainly should not expect a historical reference (in Josephus or Maccabees for instance) when elsewhere this large sectarian group within the very heart of Israel occasions but scanty comment.

The first symbolic interpretation, that 'Damascus' represents 'Babylon', would seem to be the sense demanded by the context in the *Amos-Numbers-Midrash* (7<sup>14-21</sup>), for there in the quotation of Amos 5<sup>26-27</sup> 'Damascus' symbolizes 'Babylon'. Scholars who adhere to this view often appear to do so largely on grounds of their historical conclusions: for Murphy-O'Connor the sect originated in Babylon, CD.2<sup>14-6</sup><sup>11</sup> being a 'Missionary Document' preached by these returning exiles, and similarly for Davies who believes CD.1<sup>1-7</sup><sup>9</sup> constitutes the original pre-Qumran document so that consequently

---

<sup>39</sup>The other references to 'Damascus' are: 6<sup>19</sup>, 7<sup>15,19</sup>, 8<sup>21-19</sup><sup>34</sup>, 20<sup>12</sup> - the word also appears in its geographical sense in 1QGenAp.22<sup>5,10</sup>.

<sup>40</sup>Milikowsky, 'Again: Damascus in the Damascus Document and in Rabbinic Literature', RQ, 11 (1982), p97. Thus so Schechter, p45 and p58; Charles, p812; Ginzberg, p262-272.

<sup>41</sup>So Iwry, *Eretz Israel*, 9, p88.

'Damascus' cannot be referring to Qumran.<sup>42</sup> Until recently the most telling objection to the equation Damascus = Qumran was that since Qumran was in Judah, how could the sect be said 'to go out of the land of Judah', in order to reach it. North argued unconvincingly that Qumran was at this time part of the western limit of the Nabatean Kingdom.<sup>43</sup> More recently, Milikowsky has tried to show that 'Damascus', both in this document and in the Rabbinic Literature, was a code-name for any 'place of exile'.<sup>44</sup> Thus Qumran as the sect's place of exile could be referred to as 'Damascus', and therefore for the sect the exile could be said to be a current reality and thus an ongoing process. Perhaps the most paradoxical question of all, and one that is rarely faced, is why 'Damascus' is only mentioned in this document of all the scrolls? The answer, I would suggest, is that, as this document was written for those sectarians who lived outside of Qumran, then only in this document would the readers wish to refer to 'Qumran' as a place other than where they were, and that they did this in a cryptic fashion using typically exilic terminology in order to preserve its identity.

wl' hwšbh p'rtm bpy 'hd. Emend p'rtm to tp'rtm, and take hwšbh as 'rejected' from the Hophal of šwb;<sup>45</sup> thus reading: 'their splendour was not rejected'.<sup>46</sup> bpy 'hd is an Aramaism for bph 'hd.

---

<sup>42</sup>The latter writes, 'There is no point in arguing at length that Damascus is used as a symbol of Babylon ... since this interpretation is demanded by the context, and it is for scholars of a different persuasion to establish their case' - Davies, p122-123; in total contrast Cross argues that 'Damascus' must represent Qumran, for if not the problem is insurmountable - Cross, The Ancient Library of Qumran, p66 n46.

<sup>43</sup>North, 'The Damascus of Qumran Geography', PEQ, 87 (1955), p34-48.

<sup>44</sup>Milikowsky, RQ, 11, p104-106; see also Vermas, Scripture and Tradition in Judaism, p44-45.

<sup>45</sup>As in Num.23<sup>20</sup>, CD 20<sup>32</sup>, 1QS 5<sup>15</sup>, 6<sup>25</sup> - cf. Aramaic root twb in the Aphel.

<sup>46</sup>Schechter, (p70) reads: '..hšbrh p' bpry ..'; 'their bough was not turned by the fruit of another'; Charles (p812) emends to the singular 'His glory ..'; Ginzberg, (p28,) on comparison with Is.20<sup>5</sup> reads: 'hwšh', '..the object of their pride did not become a cause of shame'.

mḥwqg. This form occurs seven times in the MT, having the meaning 'ruler' in Deut.33<sup>21</sup>, Ju.5<sup>14</sup> and Is.33<sup>22</sup> and the meaning 'staff' in Gen.49<sup>10</sup> (cf.4QPBI.), Num.21<sup>18</sup> (here), Ps.60<sup>9</sup> and 108<sup>9</sup>;<sup>47</sup> There is a nice play on words with ḥqg, mḥwqg, mḥwqgwt.

ḏwrš htwrh. This figure also occurs in 7<sup>18</sup>, 4QFI.1<sup>11</sup> and 4QCatena<sup>a</sup> 10-11<sup>5</sup>.<sup>48</sup> If we exclude the latter fragmentary passage, the other three passages all refer to two figures, 'the Interpreter of the Law' and 'the one who shall teach righteousness' (= the Sceptre = Branch of David.) We have already argued that 'the Teacher of Righteousness' is 'the Interpreter of the Law' and thus 1<sup>11</sup>, this passage and 7<sup>18</sup> all describe a past (or current) leader of the sect, whilst the latter two along with 4QFI.1<sup>11</sup> also look forward to another righteous teacher in the future.<sup>49</sup> As ḏwrš htwrh, the Teacher was in the eyes of the sect, the second Moses.<sup>50</sup>

Isaiah 54<sup>16</sup> as MT. with *plene* written 1m'šyhw as in 1QIs<sup>a</sup>.<sup>51</sup>

ndyby h'm = the sons of Zadok in 4<sup>3-4</sup> = the subsequent members of the sect.

bmh. Some scholars choose to emend this form to give the sense 'in

---

<sup>47</sup>Rabin (p22) writes that "the rendering 'lawgiver' seems not to be attested before Joseph Albo (1380-1444)".

<sup>48</sup>For the latter reference see DJD, V, p71.

<sup>49</sup>These two figures are not necessarily to be equated with the priestly Messiah and the kingly Messiah - see Chapter 3.1.1 on 'Messiah', p348-357.

<sup>50</sup>See: Teeple, The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet, p53-56; Wacholder, The Dawn of Qumran, p227-9.

<sup>51</sup>The text is also used of Paul in Acts 9<sup>15</sup>.

them',<sup>52</sup> but Ginzberg argues there is no need for this since bnh (=bmw) is quite in place here.<sup>53</sup>

qš hršy'. Charles and Ginzberg argue for the need to emend to rš'h found in 6<sup>14</sup>, whilst Rabin notes that its form is like ngy' > nega' in 1QpH.9<sup>1</sup>, 1QS.3<sup>14,23</sup> and 4<sup>12</sup>. This period is to be equated with that of 1<sup>5</sup>, 4<sup>9f</sup>, 5<sup>20</sup>, 6<sup>14</sup>, 12<sup>23</sup> and 15<sup>7</sup>, i.e. 'the period of wrath' which began with the exile and still continues, until the following period, 'the last days' arrive.

wzwltn l' yšygw. Often an unexpressed object is understood in this clause - *'and without them they cannot succeed'*, whilst Rabin is alone in supplying a subject by comparing with 1QS.6<sup>14</sup> - *'without which they will not grasp <instruction>'*.<sup>54</sup> Murphy-O'Connor however, argues that if one assumes nšg is the root, then one needs to add yd as in Lev.25<sup>47</sup>. Consequently, he suggests that the root is in fact swg/šwg, thus reading, *'without these they shall turn away (from God)'*, and proposes that when the samek became a šin the negative particle was added by mistake.<sup>55</sup> In the wider perspective, both Murphy-O'Connor and Davies suggest that the following 'd produces an absurd reading so that it would be easier to omit this whole phrase as a redactional insertion underlining the importance of the precepts, leaving an original text of *'... during the whole period of wickedness until there stands...'*<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup>Schechter (p70) to 'bhm', Rabin (p22-23) to 'bhmh'.

<sup>53</sup>Ginzberg, p28.

<sup>54</sup>Rabin, p22-23; one could simply read - *'without which they will not acquire (it) (=instruction)'*.

<sup>55</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 78, p230-231; the root appears with a šin in CD.19<sup>15</sup> and Job 24<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>56</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 78, p231 and Davies, p247; Ginzberg (p29-30) transposes it - *'for the whole period of wickedness until the Teacher of Righteousness shall arise, and apart from these (laws) they cannot achieve anything'*.



'd 'md ywrh hsdq. It is possible that we have here an allusion to Hosea  
10<sup>12b</sup>:

'd ybw' wywrh sdq lkm

*(for it is time to seek the Lord,  
that He may come and rain salvation upon you.*

Yet the Hebrew could be rendered as follows:

*..that he might be revealed and teach righteousness to you.*

It is unlikely that we should emend the form ywrh to mwrh as the former is found in 19<sup>35</sup> (corrected to mwrh in 20<sup>1</sup>) and 20<sup>14</sup> as ywrh hyhyd. This seems to suggest that this is none other than the Teacher of Righteousness, spoken of in a future tense.<sup>58</sup> However, other scholars have suggested that this is the Teacher of Righteousness *redivivus*,<sup>59</sup> and if this is the case, I would suggest that this text would have to be later to allow for the shock of his death found in the Pesharim (and Ms.B), to be replaced by a more reasoned view that he might return.

b'hryt hymym - see 4<sup>4</sup> for a discussion on the phrase. If, as we concluded there, 'the last days' is the period following the 'period of wrath', (which ended 490 years after the exile into Babylon,) then this figure was expected to appear at this time. Thus, in view of the fact that the Teacher arose 410 years after the exile to Babylon, this is then further evidence that the figure in 6<sup>11</sup> cannot

---

<sup>58</sup>So Davies, p123-4 who in seeing 1<sup>1</sup>-7<sup>9</sup> as an original pre-Qumran document, is forced to take the reference in 1<sup>11</sup> as secondary.

<sup>59</sup>Dupont-Sommer, p131; Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 78, p230-231.

be the Teacher of Righteousness.

---

A Summary of the Historical Sections.

Three out of four of the poems, plus the two midrashic passages that we have encountered so far, have given historical details relating to the foundation of the sect. It is perhaps therefore instructive to compare the appropriate passages in a chronological fashion, noting in particular the common terminology. We will start though from the period of the exile to Babylon, since prior to that the history is fairly clear:

**Pre-exilic Israel:**

- 'they forsook El / the covenant' (root 'zb): 1<sup>3</sup>, 3<sup>11</sup> cf.5<sup>21</sup>.
- 'the land became desolate' (root šmm / yšm): 3<sup>10</sup>, 5<sup>21</sup>.
- 'they were delivered to the sword' (root ntn / sgr): 1<sup>4</sup>, 3<sup>10-11</sup> cf.7<sup>13</sup>, 8<sup>1</sup>.

**Post-exilic Israel:**

- 'El remembered the covenant...' (root zkr): 1<sup>4</sup>, 6<sup>2</sup> cf.3<sup>13</sup>.
- 'He left a remnant' (root š'r / ntr / ytr): 1<sup>4</sup>, 2<sup>11</sup>, 3<sup>13</sup>.

**The proto-sectarians:**

- 'He raised men / a root from Israel': 1<sup>7</sup>, 2<sup>11-12</sup>, 3<sup>12</sup>, 6<sup>2</sup> cf.4<sup>2-3,6</sup>, 6<sup>4-5</sup>.
- 'He revealed the nistaroth': 3<sup>14</sup>.
- 'they dug the well': 3<sup>16</sup>, 6<sup>3</sup>, cf.1<sup>9-11</sup>.
- 'He raised for them a Teacher of Righteousnes': 1<sup>11</sup>.

**The proto-sectarians fall into sin:**

- the sectarians' sin and God's forgiveness: 3<sup>17-18</sup>, 4<sup>9-10</sup>, cf.20<sup>29-31</sup>.

**The sect at Qumran:**

- 'He built for them a sure house': 3<sup>19</sup> cf. 4<sup>3</sup> and 6<sup>5</sup>.
- the new members: 2<sup>14(-16)</sup>, 4<sup>7</sup> cf.4<sup>3-4</sup>, 6<sup>8-10</sup>.

This demonstrates the extent the various poems go in their respective histories, the most up-to-date of which is the third poem. It is significant that while the third and fourth poems mention 'the well', the first does not; yet it

does tell of the groping of 'the root' and subsequent arrival of the Teacher of Righteousness who leads them in the way of 'His heart' which could be said to imply that he interpreted the law for them - cf. 1QH.8<sup>6-7</sup>. Although the exile to Qumran is only mentioned in the third poem, the setting up of 'the sure house' is symbolically interpreted as an exile from Judah in the subsequent midrashic passages. The latter tend to overlap the tail end of their respective poems, since they re-introduce the founder members. Yet they, along with the secondary semi-poetical section (4<sup>6-11</sup>), take the history further in telling of 'the new members' who will arise prior to, or during, 'the last days'.

The Twelve Duties of CD.6:11-7:4.

3	6	וכל אשר הובאו בברית (12)	
3	7	לבלתי בוא אל המקדש	
3	6	להאיר מזבחו חנם	
		<ויהיו מסגירי (13) הדלת אשר אמר אל	
		מי בכם יסגיר דלתו	
		ולא תאירו מזבחי חנם>	
2	4	אם לא ישמרו	
5	11	לעשות כפרוש התורה לקץ הרשע	1
3	9	ולהבדל (15) מבני השחת	2
4	12	ולהנזר מהון הרשעה הטמא <בנדר ובחרם (16)>	3
2	6	ובהון המקדש	
		<ולגזול את עניי עמו	
		להיות אלמנות שללם (17)	
		ואת יתומים ירצחו>	
4	10	ולהבדיל בין הטמא לטהור	4
4	9	ולהודיע בין (18) הקודש לחול	
4	10	ולשמור את יום השבת כפרושה	5
		<ואת המועדות (19) ואת יום התענית	
		כמצאת באי הברית החדשה בארץ דמשק> (20)	
3	10	להרים את הקדשים כפירושיהם	6
4	10	לאהוב איש את אחיהו (21) כמהו	7
4	10	ולהחזיק ביד עני ואביון וגר	8
4	8	ולדרוש איש את שלום (1) אחיהו	9
		<ולא ימעל איש בשאר בשרו>	
4	9	להזיר מן הזונות (2) כמשפט	10
4	10	להוכיח איש את אחיהו כמצוה	11
4	6	ולא לנטור (3) מיום ליום	
4	12	ולהבדל מכל הטמאות כמשפטם	12
		<ולא ישקץ (4) איש את רוח קדשיו	
		כאשר הבדיל אל להם>	

5	12		כל המתהלכים (5) באלה בתמים קדש <על פי כל יסודו>
4	7		ברית אל נאמנות להם (6)
3	5		לחיותם אלף דור

<ואם מחנות ..(7)..(8).. ובין אב (9) לבנו>

4	7	A	וכל המואסים {באלה}
3	6	B	בפקד אל את הארץ
4	7		להשיב גמול רשעים (10) עליהם

בבוא הדבר אשר כבות בדברי ישעיה בן אמוץ הנביא (11) אשר  
אמר

יבוא עליך ועל עמך ועל בית אביך  
ימים אשר (12) באו מיום סור אפרים מעל יהודה

בהפרד שני בתי ישראל (13)  
שר אפרים מעל יהודה

X	וכל הנסוגים הוסגרו לחרב
Y	והמחזיקים (14) נמלטו לארץ צפון

<כאשר אמר..(15)... (21) את כל בני שת>

Y'	אלה מלטו בקץ הפקודה הראשון (1)
X'	והנסוגים הסגירו לחרב

4	8		וכן משפט כל באי בריתו
3	7	B'	אשר (2) לא יחזיקו באלה
4	8	A'	לפוקדם לכלה ביד בליעל..>

Translation of 6<sup>11</sup>-7<sup>10</sup> (=19<sup>1-6</sup>).

*And all those who were admitted into the covenant,<sup>12</sup>  
(are) not to go into the sanctuary  
to light His altar in vain;  
<But they are those who close<sup>13</sup> the door of whom El said:  
'Who from among you will close My door,  
and not light My altar in<sup>14</sup> vain?'<sup>11</sup> >  
Unless they are watchful:*

*To act according to the exact interpretation of the law for the  
period of wickedness;*

*And to be separated<sup>15</sup> from the sons of corruption;*

*And to abstain from the unclean wealth of wickedness <by  
vowing and devotion,><sup>16</sup>  
and from<sup>12</sup> the wealth of the sanctuary -  
<(That is) To rob the poor of His people  
that widows might be their spoil,<sup>17</sup>  
and they murder orphans.><sup>13</sup>*

*And to separate between clean and unclean,  
And to distinguish between<sup>18</sup> holy and unholy.*

*And to keep the Sabbath-day in according with its  
interpretation,  
<along with the festivals<sup>19</sup> and the Day of Atonement  
according to the finding of those who entered the new  
covenant in the land of Damascus,><sup>20</sup>  
To offer the holy things in accordance with their interpretation.*

*To love each man his brother<sup>21</sup> as himself,  
And to assist the poor, needy and stranger.*

*And to seek each man his<sup>1</sup> brother's well-being,  
<and not anyone be dishonest against his flesh-kin.>*

*To abstain from harlotry<sup>2</sup> as is the judgment.*

*To correct each man his brother as is the commandment,  
and not to retain anger<sup>3</sup> from one day to the next.*

*And to be separated from all unclean practices according to*

---

<sup>11</sup>Malachi 1<sup>10</sup>.

<sup>12</sup>Emending prefix to 'm-'.  
<sup>13</sup>Isaiah.10<sup>2</sup>.

*their judgment,  
<and not anyone contaminate<sup>4</sup> his holy spirit  
which El has separated for them.>*

*All who walk<sup>A5</sup> in these things in perfect holiness,  
<in accordance with the word of His every instruction>  
-the covenant of El<sup>1 B1</sup> was established for them<sup>A6</sup>  
to give them life for a thousand generations.*

*<As it is written:  
'He who keeps the covenant and steadfast-love<sup>B2</sup> for a  
friend,  
and for the keepers of My commandments for a thousand  
generations'.><sup>14</sup>*

*<And if they live in camps according to the rule<sup>15 B3</sup> of the  
land<sup>a</sup> which was from of old<sup>16</sup>, and take<sup>A7</sup> wives<sup>a</sup> according to  
the findings of the Law<sup>17</sup> and beget children,<sup>B4</sup> then they shall  
walk<sup>18</sup> according to the letter of the Law, and according to the  
'Judgment of<sup>A8</sup> the Injunctions',<sup>19</sup> according to the 'Rule of the  
Law',<sup>B5</sup> which says:*

*'Between a man and his wife,  
and between a father<sup>A9</sup> and his son'.<sup>20</sup>*

*And all who reject<sup>a</sup> the commandments<sup>B6</sup> and the precepts<sup>a21</sup>  
-when El visits the earth,<sup>22</sup>  
to bring the reward of wickedness<sup>A10</sup> against them.*

---

<sup>14</sup>Deut.7<sup>9</sup> only in Ms.B.

<sup>15</sup>Ms.B reads 'precepts'.

<sup>16</sup>a-a only in Ms.B.

<sup>17</sup>a-a only in Ms.B.

<sup>18</sup>Ms.B reads the Jussive.

<sup>19</sup>Ms.B reads 'Foundations'.

<sup>20</sup>Numbers 30<sup>17</sup>.

<sup>21</sup>a-a only in Ms.B.

<sup>22</sup>Order of this and the following colon, following Ms.A.

## 1.6. The Twelve Duties for those who have entered the Covenant: 6<sup>11</sup>-7<sup>10</sup> = 19<sup>1-6</sup>.

The bounds of this section and its literary genre are generally recognized and agreed upon by most scholars. For Stegemann 6<sup>11</sup>-7<sup>4</sup> constitutes the *Gemeinderegel* and is followed by a blessing formula in 7<sup>4-6b</sup> and a curse formula in 7<sup>9b-13b</sup>, the two being separated by an interpolation.<sup>1</sup> For Denis it is a 'petit code' of twelve precepts,<sup>2</sup> whilst for Murphy-O'Connor 6<sup>11</sup>-8<sup>1</sup> forms a Memorandum which has two additions at 7<sup>6b-8</sup> and 7<sup>13c-8<sup>1</sup></sup>.<sup>3</sup> Davies agrees with the latter's description though ends his section at 7<sup>9</sup>, stating that the text 7<sup>6-9</sup> makes these duties applicable to the children of members of the sect who would not themselves have entered into the covenant.<sup>4</sup> I would agree that this section is a Memorandum but this is to slightly underestimate its importance, for it seems that we have here twelve precepts which in a number of cases correspond to those of the 'Ten Commandments'. Thus if 'the Temple Scroll' comprised the sectarian torah then perhaps these precepts could be said to comprise the sectarian '(Do)decalogue'. Some of these laws are qualified by the prefixed particle 'k' + noun (viz. *prwš*, *mšpt*, or *mšwh*), and '..these precepts refer to an interpretation of the Law which is more rigorous than that in force outside the community ..'.<sup>5</sup> From this I would contend that such qualifications using 'k' make better sense if the reader was living away

---

<sup>1</sup>Stegemann, p165-166.

<sup>2</sup>Denis, Les thèmes de connaissance dans le Document de Damas, p137.

<sup>3</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 78 (1971), p211.

<sup>4</sup>Davies, p142.

<sup>5</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 78, p217.



from the Qumran community, for if he was living at Qumran he is less likely to have been tempted by the more liberal interpretation of mainstream Judaism. That though is not to say that he is a non-member, but rather a member who lives away from Qumran in one of the "camps" among the indigenous population. We know from Philo and Josephus that there were some 4,000 Essenes living in Palestine,<sup>6</sup> and these statements are backed up by the Laws of IX-XVI many of which only make sense when considered in a Jewish-Hellenised milieu.<sup>7</sup>

The Introduction and its Secondary Embellishments: 6<sup>11-14</sup>.

wkl 'šr hwb'w bbryt <sup>12</sup>	3	6
lblty bw' 'l hmqdš	3	7
lh'yr mzbhw hnm	3	6
<wyhyw msgyry <sup>13</sup> hdlt 'šr 'mr 'l		
my bkm ysgyr dltw		
wl' t'yrw mzbhy <sup>14</sup> hnm>		
'm l' yšmrw	2	4

*And all those who were admitted into the covenant,<sup>12</sup>  
 (are) not to go into the sanctuary  
 to light His altar in vain;  
 <But they are those who close<sup>13</sup> the door of whom EI said:  
 'Who from among you will close My door,  
 and not light My altar in<sup>14</sup> vain?>  
 Unless they are watchful:*

---

<sup>6</sup>Philo, Quod omnis probus, 12 (75); Josephus, Antiquities, 18,1,5 – see Schürer, Vol.2, p562, n1.

<sup>7</sup>See Chapter 2, Appendix I, on the 'Laws of IX-XVI', p337-347; cf.1QpHab.12<sup>9-10</sup>.

hwb`w: the Hophal of the root bw'; it explicitly refers to the act of entry into the covenant in the sense of reminding the members that they were admitted on the grounds outlined in the following duties.

lbtly is the correct grammatical form to negate an infinitive, in contrast to l' which is used in 7<sup>1,2</sup>. A negative particle never begins any of the duties below and thus it is unlikely that it does so here.<sup>8</sup>

ysgyr: T-S 10 K6 has seemingly the second yodh thus making this a Hiphil; it should be emended to a wāw to give the Qal, in line with the MT.

dltw: the MT of Mal.1<sup>10</sup> has dltym 'doors' and Schechter and Charles emend dltw accordingly. Yet the MT seems to represent a different textual tradition; as it stands the text reads 'its (=the temple's) door', yet the waw should be read as a yodh - 'My door'.

---

This first passage is by far the most contentious of the whole section since it deals with the attitude of the sect towards the temple, a problem which is compounded by the ambiguous or corrupt nature of the text. A number of scholars have been misled into translating: '..an agreement not to enter the sanctuary..'; viz. taking the phrase as a whole and taking bryt, not in the sense of the covenant of the sect but as a reference to an otherwise unknown and distinct covenantal agreement banning members from entering

---

<sup>8</sup>Yet Davies (p126) begins his first injunction with this negative.

the temple.<sup>9</sup> This seems distinctly unlikely, and consequently we should adopt the normal meaning for *bryt* and take the negative particle as beginning the main clause,<sup>10</sup> a fact made more obvious when the underlying poetry is appreciated.

We then have two other interrelated problems. The first is that in the original biblical context of Malachi 1<sup>10</sup> 'the closing of the doors is a good act, because its purpose is to impede the offering of insincere sacrifices. Hence, there is an implicit distinction between those who close the door and those who offer sacrifice; the former are good, the latter are wicked.'<sup>11</sup> Yet the sense here is directly contrary to this, for we read *'they are those who close the door ... unless they are watchful to act according to the exact interpretation of the law..'* This implies that if they obey the sect's law they will keep the door open! In addition there is also a certain amount of tautology between the quotation and the previous two cola.

The second problem concerns the presence of 'm 1' 'unless'; a straight translation yields no sense and so Schechter and Rabinowitz emend to 'm whilst Vermes does not translate it.<sup>12</sup> Alternatively Murphy-O'Connor attempts to solve both problems by interpreting *wyhyw* as an interrogative, so yielding:

*All those ... to kindle His altar in vain, shall they be 'closers of the door', as God said: 'Who among you will close its door that they may not enter to kindle my altar in vain?', unless they*

---

<sup>9</sup>Ginzberg, p30-31; Murphy-O'Connor, 'The Translation of Damascus Document VI;11-14', RQ, 7 (1969-71), p553-6; Rabin (p22-23) supposes a lacuna '...a covenant not to (walk in the stubbornness of their heart, but have not fulfilled their words), have come...' - this is highly conjectural.

<sup>10</sup>So Fitzmyer, NTS, 7 (1960-61), p311 - and followed by Davies, p137-139 and Knibb, p51-53.

<sup>11</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RQ, 7, p554.

<sup>12</sup>Schechter, p70; Rabinowitz, JBL, 73, p22; Vermes, p87.

*shall...?'*

None of these solutions is convincing since they yield clumsy or disjointed translations. Most recently, however, Davies has put forward a very credible solution to this problem, which is that we have a secondary addition so that the original text read:

*And all who have been admitted into the covenant (are not) to enter the sanctuary "to light His altar in vain" unless they are observant in doing according to the law as detailed for the period of wickedness.<sup>13</sup>*

This solution preserves the biblical sense of Malachi 1<sup>10</sup>, removes the tautology, avoids the need for emending 'm 1', and most importantly yields a fluent and intelligible translation.<sup>14</sup> The motive for the addition would appear to be a desire to reflect 'a more hostile attitude towards the Temple than the original source',<sup>15</sup> and Davies points to 8<sup>3</sup> as similar example of a biblical allusion which has later been expanded into a complete quotation in 19<sup>15-16</sup>. He contends that the more hostile attitude is due to a Qumran glossator at a time when the sect had abandoned the temple completely, but that prior to this, the original pre-Qumranic text had only emphasized the need for sacrifices to be offered in a proper manner.

I would agree with Davies' general analysis of the text, although not with all of his conclusions. The problem with this position is the immediate question as to what constituted the schism with the temple that produced the

---

<sup>13</sup>Davies, p139.

<sup>14</sup>Verbal constructs, such as 'msgyry hdlh', are often found in secondary passages; compare: 1<sup>13</sup>, 2<sup>12</sup>, 4<sup>3-4</sup>, 4<sup>19</sup>, 6<sup>1</sup>, 6<sup>5,9</sup>, etc.

<sup>15</sup>Davies, 'The Ideology of the Temple in the Damascus Document', JJS, 33 (1982), p297.

secondary addition. The most obvious answer would at first seem to be Jonathan's usurpation of the High Priesthood in 150B.C. or the installation of the Hasmoneans as High Priests 'forever' in 140B.C., but this would place the original 'Twelve Duties' very early, near the genesis of the sect, and would consequently tend to support Davies' pre-Qumranic date for the original text. So it seems that a later date for this schism must be found, yet no event springs readily to mind. Most problematic in this whole position, and a question that has not been addressed, is why the temple, noticeable by its absence in the original poetic text of this document,<sup>16</sup> is suddenly given prominence here at the very beginning of the 'Twelve Duties', so that the following phrase 'm l' yšmrw (taking out the secondary addition) implies that they can enter the temple only if they adhere to these 'duties'. This enigma, almost paradox, leads me to suggest that the original author meant mqđš in 6<sup>12</sup> to be a spiritual reference to the sect:<sup>17</sup>

*All those who were admitted into the covenant (of the sect)  
(Are) not to enter into the temple (=the community)  
"to light His altar in vain", ..*

This yields excellent sense and is precisely what one would expect at the beginning of this list of twelve precepts. Consequently, this secondary addition does not represent a later stage in the development of the attitude of the sect towards the Jerusalem temple, nor mark the schism between the sect and the temple authorities. Why, though, it was added is less clear: did the glossator fail to appreciate the original sense of mqđš and take it literally, or are 'the

---

<sup>16</sup>The only references to 'mqđš' in the poetry of this document is in this credal section in 6<sup>12,16</sup>; it is secondary in 1<sup>3</sup> and elsewhere in CD it occurs in the later redactional and midrashic material.

<sup>17</sup>For the concept of the community as a 'spiritual temple' see the Ezekiel 44<sup>15</sup> Midrash, the following reference in 6<sup>16</sup>, and Chapter 3.1.2 on 'Temple', p357-370.

closers of the door' meant to represent all members of the sect who in separating from mainstream Judaism have in fact stopped 'lighting My altar in vain? Both these proposals imply that the sect abstained from the Jerusalem temple, though it appears that this was probably already the case at the time of the original text. In any event, any participation in the temple institutions would be difficult and be restricted to weekdays, and not involve Sabbaths or Festivals which, because of the different calendar followed by the sect, would have been celebrated on a different day, and this in turn explains the scarcity of laws that deal with the temple in this document.

The 'Twelve Duties' of the Sectarian Covenant: 6<sup>14</sup>-7<sup>4</sup>.

There are fourteen infinitives in the section 6<sup>14</sup>-7<sup>4</sup> plus three negative infinitives. Yet the latter are all subsidiary clauses, as is the infinitive beginning the secondary Isaiah quotation; of the remaining thirteen, one appears to be a pair as it occurs as such in the Pentateuch and the Laws of IX-XVI. We are left therefore with twelve which could be termed a 'dodecalogue', and these have a cola of, on average, nine or ten syllables in length. These are listed in the table that follows, which also indicates the relevant parallel passages in the Laws of IX-XVI,<sup>18</sup> the Decalogue, and the Holiness Code.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup>It should be borne in mind that the lack of an apparent parallel in the Laws of this document may be rectified when the material found in the Qumran recensions of CD, before column XV (XV-XVI being placed before IX) and after column XVII, is published - see Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, p151-2, n3.

<sup>19</sup>'The Holiness Code' = Leviticus 17-26, the parallels with which are outlined by Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 78, p212-4.

No.	Infinitive(s)	Laws of IX-XVI	10C.	Holiness Code
1	l'swt..	cf.13 <sup>5-6</sup> , 16 <sup>7-8</sup> .		
2	wlhbdl..	13 <sup>14</sup> .	1st	
3	wlhnzr..	16 <sup>13-16</sup> .	2nd	
4	wlhbdyl..wlhwdy'..	12 <sup>19-20</sup> .		Lev.10 <sup>10</sup> .
5	wlšmwr..	10 <sup>14</sup> -11 <sup>18</sup> .	4th	Lev.23 <sup>3(-8)</sup> .
6	lhrym..	4QDam.		Lev.22 <sup>2</sup> .
7	l'hwbd..		5th	Lev.19 <sup>18</sup> .
8	wlhzyq..	14 <sup>4-6,13-15</sup> .	5th	Lev.19 <sup>9-10,33-34</sup> .
9	wldrws..	9 <sup>2-8</sup>	6th	Lev.19 <sup>17</sup> .
10	lhzyr..		7th	Lev.18 <sup>6-23</sup> .
11	lhwyh..wl' lntwr..	9 <sup>2-8</sup> .	9th	Lev.19 <sup>17-18</sup> .
12	wlhbdl..	12 <sup>11-18</sup> .		Lev.20 <sup>25</sup> .

Duty 1: Obey the sectarian torah.

l'swt kprwš htwrh lqš hrš'. Significantly the first infinitive refers to the sectarian torah. Consequently, the preceding line 'm l' yšmrw is meant to apply to all of the following laws, so that we should translate: 'unless they are watchful/careful'. kprwš only has a legal sense in this document - here, 4<sup>8</sup>, 13<sup>6</sup>, 14<sup>17-8</sup>, and 16<sup>2,20</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup>So Schiffman - "pesher is a term used to denote 'aggadic' interpretation, while perush denotes interpretation for the purpose of discovering the details of the halakha. ... (both) imply the same exegetical method in that neither requires the use of further evidence from biblical literature." - The Halakha at Qumran, p41.

## Duty 2: Keep away from the gentiles.

wlhbd1 mby hšht. The prefixed waw is a strong indication that this is not the first duty, although the poetry would be more balanced if this were the case, for we would then read:<sup>21</sup>

*Unless they continually live (lit: they keep to do) 3 7  
according to the exact interpretation of the torah for the  
period of wickedness. 3 9*

The root bd1 occurs three times in this code, emphasizing how important it was for the individual to remain unpolluted. The phrase bny hšht only occurs here and in 13<sup>14</sup> in the scrolls; the nearest equivalent is 'nšy (h)šht in 1QS.9<sup>16,22</sup>, 10<sup>19</sup>. In Jubilees 10<sup>3</sup>, 15<sup>26</sup> the phrase denotes those who refuse circumcision, and in Ezekiel 31<sup>18</sup>, 32<sup>18f</sup> the nether world or Pit is spoken of as the final habitation of the uncircumcised. It seems likely therefore that it also has this sense in the scrolls, viz. 'to separate oneself from the gentiles'. Furthermore, as it is through the gentiles that one comes into contact with other gods, this is an implicit reference to the first commandment.

## Duty 3: Abstain from wealth.

wlhnzr mhwn hrš'h htm' <bndr wbhrm> 4 12  
wbhwn hmqdš 16 2 6  
<wlgzwl 't 'nyy 'mw  
lhywt 'lmnwt šllm 17  
w't ytwmym yršhw>

We must begin by considering the MT of Isaiah 10<sup>2</sup> which is quoted in this third duty:

lhwt mdyn dlym

---

<sup>21</sup>Rabin (p24), Murphv-O'Connor (RB, 78, p212) and Knibb (p51), take this as the first duty.



wlqzl mšpt 'nyy 'my  
lhywt 'lmnwt šllm  
w't ytwmym ybzw.

*To turn aside the needy from justice  
and to rob the poor of my people of their right,  
that widows might be their spoil,  
and they might make the fatherless their prey.*

The variations in our text to the MT are threefold. The most significant is the absence of the first colon of Isaiah 10<sup>2</sup> which results in only one subject in the main clause, namely 'the poor' who are the sect, as they are in 19<sup>9,22</sup>. Then there is also the deliberate omission of mšpt; it was not merely the lack of 'justice' that the sect had been robbed of, rather they, (especially those living away from Qumran to whom this document is addressed,) had been quite literally robbed as 1QpHab.12<sup>9-10</sup> relates:

*"The violence done to the land": these are the cities of Judah where he (=the Wicked Priest) robbed the Poor of their possessions*

This in turn means that mqđš in 6<sup>16</sup> must again be referring to the sect as a 'spiritual temple'. Finally there is the deliberate change of verb, from bzz 'to take as prey' - MT and 1QIs<sup>a</sup> - to ršh to kill.<sup>23</sup> This becomes more significant once one notes that 'the orphans' are paralleled with 'the poor' in a passage in the Hodayot indicating that the former should also be interpreted in a symbolic sense as a reference to the sect:

*Blessed art Thou, O Lord,*

---

<sup>22</sup>Elsewhere in the scrolls 'bywn' is the word meaning 'poor' that is used of the sect: 1QpH.12<sup>3,6,10</sup>, 1QH.5<sup>16,18,22</sup>, 1QM.11<sup>9,13</sup>, 13<sup>14</sup>, 4QPP.1<sup>10</sup>; the singular sense, 'the Poor One', is found in 1QH.2<sup>32</sup> and 3<sup>25</sup> referring presumably to the Teacher.

<sup>23</sup>Murphy-O'Connor (RB, 78, p212) takes this final colon from Psalm 94<sup>6</sup> which reads: 'Imnh wgr yhr gw wytwmym yršhw' - 'they slay the widow and the sojourner, and murder the fatherless'; the apparatus criticus (in BHK) suggests reading 'gr w'

*for Thou has not abandoned the orphans  
or despised the needy ....*<sup>24</sup>

If the latter is correct, then the implication of the final colon of this quotation is that the sect were now fatherless, viz. the Teacher of Righteousness had died. The level of deliberate corruption associated with this quotation, plus its unique presence within the code and its sectarian re-interpretation, lead me to concur with Murphy-O'Connor and Davies that it is secondary to the original context.<sup>25</sup> Yet how does this quotation fit, in the grammatical sense, into the preceding material? The quotation is elaborating on the phrase 'the wealth of the sanctuary', and since 'the temple' here symbolises the sect then one needs to translate 'this is "to rob ..."', rather than provide the negative particle "And not 'to rob..'",.

The preceding bicolon is not much easier, mainly because of its use of prefixed particles. To keep the text as it stands subsidiary verbs need to be supplied: *"to refrain from unclean wealth of wickedness (acquired) by vowing and devotion and (appropriating) the wealth of the sanctuary"*.<sup>26</sup> However the most natural way to take this bicolon seems to be to regard *hṭm'* as masculine adjective agreeing with *hwn*, and to emend the prefixed 'b' on the second occurrence of *hwn* to 'm' so that the reader is now abstaining from two different things.<sup>27</sup> If we do this, the phrase *'by vowing and devotion'* now appears to be secondary so that we have a gloss on both cola:

---

<sup>24</sup>1QH.5<sup>20</sup>; Hebrew: 'l' 'zbth ytwm wl' bzyth rš'.

<sup>25</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 78, p214 and Davies, p126 and p129 and p249.

<sup>26</sup>So Rabin, p24.

<sup>27</sup>So: Schechter, p70; Charles, p813-4; Knibb, p51. Ginzberg writes that 'the emendation 'wmhwn' is superfluous since 'bhwn' depends on the preceding 'hṭm', "to keep from the possessions of the sanctuary which are defiled by a vow or ban or its belonging to the sanctuary".' - p31.

*And to abstain from the unclean wealth of wickedness <by  
vowing and by devotion>, 4 12  
and from the wealth of the temple (=the sect); <...> 2 6*

The unbalanced nature of this bicolon could be improved a little if the adjective *hṭm'* was considered to belong to the gloss; this would then leave *qinah* metre.<sup>28</sup> Perhaps however even this does not seem satisfactory in light of the unevenness of the poetry, the corrupt nature of the text, and the fact that these two cola are directed respectively at external and internal wealth. If so, we could go still further and reduce this bicolon to a colon to be read with the previous colon:

*And to be separated from the sons of corruption, 3 9  
And to abstain from the unclean wealth of wickedness. 4 12*

Yet the diverse nature of the gloss would seem to count against this.

Duty 4: Do what is holy.

<i>wlhbđyl byn hṭm' lṭhwr</i>	4	10
<i>wlhwdy' byn hqwdš lḥwl</i>	4	9

This pair of injunctions occur in perfect parallelism and stem from Ezekiel 22<sup>26</sup>, and this allows us to regard them as one duty rather than taking the two infinitives as an indication of there being two duties:

*byn qdš lḥl l' hbđylw  
wbyn hṭm' lṭhwr l' hwdy'w*

The transposition of the verbs may have been influenced by Leviticus 11<sup>47</sup> where *hbđyl* is connected with our first clause. Davies rightly points out that

---

<sup>28</sup>This could be compared to 8<sup>5</sup> where the verb (root 'gll') carries over to both halves of the bicolon; cf. also 6<sup>2-3</sup>.

'in the Ezekiel passage the responsibility .. for teaching .. lies with the priests, (and) it is therefore significant that in CD this responsibility is laid upon the members of the community'.<sup>29</sup> This would then seem to be further evidence that the community behind this document considered themselves to be 'a spiritual temple'.

Duty 5: Keep the Sabbath.

wlšmwr 't ywm hšbt kprwšh	4	10
<w't hmw'dwt w't ywm ht'nyt		
kms't b'y hbryt hḥdšh b'rš dmšq>		

I follow Davies in believing that this precept was expanded at a later date. The second colon is secondary because there is no festival legislation in the Laws of CD whilst there is a considerable volume of Sabbath legislation,<sup>30</sup> and because it occurs after the qualifying kprwšh.<sup>31</sup> The third, because it duplicates the sense of prwš, creates a longer than average colon from the metrical point of view, and has the phrase hbryt hḥdšh which is not found in any of the original poetic texts, occurring rather in 8<sup>21=19</sup><sup>34</sup>, 20<sup>12</sup>, (and 1QpHab.2<sup>3</sup>).<sup>32</sup> On

---

<sup>29</sup>Davies, p130.

<sup>30</sup>Of course 'the festival legislation' may originally have been found in the missing sections of CD XVIII<sup>f</sup>, yet Milik's note in his book *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*, p151-152 does not mention any such prescriptions other than the Annual Covenant Festival. 11QT contains, of course, a large number of prescriptions for the festivals, yet this was for the future earthly temple. 4QMMT, does not contain any reference to the 'calendar', which is somewhat surprising, yet Milik seemingly holds (as yet unpublished) the pages preceding 4QMMT which do deal with the calendar; perhaps these two documents on the same manuscript should be treated as one?

<sup>31</sup>So Davies, p130. However on poetical grounds 'kprwšh' could not be placed at the end of the second colon, for this would give a syllable count of 7,13 (or 11,9 redefining the cola) whilst as it stands it has a syllable count of 10,10.

<sup>32</sup>Compare Davies (p130) who argues the phrase 'the new covenant' is a specifically Qumranic feature and that therefore the colon is secondary. For a fuller discussion of the phrase 'the new covenant' see Chapter 3.1.4 on 'Covenant', p382-386.

the textual side, the text of the third line clearly begins with the word  $k\bar{m}\bar{s}'t$ ,<sup>33</sup>  $k^e m \bar{o} \bar{s}^e 'at$ , an unique occurrence of the feminine singular construct noun with prefixed 'k', with the Mishnaic meaning 'to arrive at a conclusion, to hold a legal opinion'.<sup>34</sup>

Thus the original precept was directed simply at keeping the Sabbath, and as we discussed in 3<sup>14</sup>, this probably included the requirement to abstain from work on what was for the sect the eve of the Sabbath (from sunset to sunrise of the sixth day) but which was the Sabbath for normative Judaism. The secondary addition was probably added at a time when the calendrical differences between the sect and mainstream Judaism lead to increased persecution, and because the sect now had members living away from Qumran who are reminded that they are still subject to 'the findings of the new covenant in the land of Damascus (=Qumran)'. However perhaps the addition is more complex or subtle than that. Did the sect and the proto-sectarians always hold to a solar calendar, while mainstream Judaism always held to a lunar one, or were there two calendrical disputes, one related to whether the day began at sunrise or sunset, and the other to whether to adopt a solar or lunar calendar (which would lead to festivals being placed on different days of the week.)? If so, the original text of our document would relate to the former dispute, and the secondary text to the latter dispute.

---

<sup>33</sup>Schechter (p71) did not see the final  $\bar{t}\bar{a}w$  which confused Charles, Levi and Lagrange. There have also been a number of attempts to read or emend to  $k\bar{m}\bar{s}'w't$  - 'according to the commandments of ...' - so Rabinowitz, JBL, 73, p23 n65 and Dupont-Sommer, p132.

<sup>34</sup>The noun occurs twice in the MT, once with the sense 'origins / goings out' in Micah.5<sup>1</sup>, (5<sup>2</sup> in the English): 'But you, O Bethlehem Ephrathah, though you are small among the clans of Judah, out of you will come for me one who will be ruler over Israel, whose 'goings out' ( $'m\bar{w}\bar{s}'tyw'$ ) are from of old, from ancient days.

Duty 6: Offer the appropriate tithes.

lhrym 't hqdšym kpyrwšyhm<sup>35</sup>

3 10

This colon forms an original bicolon with the previous duty of a:a' pattern on 'religious observance', both cola having ten syllables. The qdšym probably refers to the tithes and first-fruits rather than sacrifices. Firstly, because whilst there is little reference to 'sacrifices' in the Laws (IX-XVIf), there are, according to Milik in the material following column XIV, 'prescriptions relating to agricultural life' and 'the payment of tithes'.<sup>36</sup> Secondly, because we have Josephus' statement:<sup>37</sup>

*They send offerings to the Temple but offer no sacrifices since the purifications to which they are accustomed are different.*

Duty 7: Love one's fellow members.

l'hwb 'yš 't 'hyhw kmhw

4 10

This colon forms a well-balanced tricolon with the following precept. For Davies, the form l'hwb is introductory, beginning a section concerned with insiders, and this broadly seems to be the case so mirroring the credal passage in 1QS.1<sup>1-15</sup> and the Decalogue.<sup>38</sup> What is clear though is that 'h always refers to fellow sectarian members, here, in the ninth and eleventh precepts, and seemingly in most of the sectarian literature.<sup>39</sup> This precept is

---

<sup>35</sup>6Q15 has 'kprw[šyhm]', viz. no yodh after the pē.

<sup>36</sup>Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, p151-52.

<sup>37</sup>Antiquities, 18,1,5.

<sup>38</sup>Davies, p126-7.

<sup>39</sup>CD 7<sup>1,2</sup>, 20<sup>18</sup>, 14<sup>5</sup>; 1QS.6<sup>10,22</sup>; 1QSa.1<sup>18</sup>; (1QM.13<sup>1</sup>, 15<sup>4,7</sup>), CD.5<sup>8,10</sup> and 8<sup>6</sup>=19<sup>18</sup> are alluding to scripture and therefore use 'h in the sense of fellow Israelite.

developed from the fifth commandment, to honour one's mother and father, to that of loving one's neighbour.<sup>40</sup> It is significant that there is no reference to hating those who are not members in this document which was used in the wider Palestinian environment, as there is in the credal passage of 1QS.1<sup>1-15</sup>.

Duty 8: Take care of the disadvantaged.

wlhḥzyq byd 'ny w'bywn wgr

4 10

For Davies 'the poor, needy and foreigner' are those within the sect for whom two days wages in every month are set aside - CD.14<sup>13-15</sup>. This seems correct; however there are a couple a problems. Firstly gr cannot be translated as 'foreigner' since 4QFlor.1<sup>4</sup> relates:

*This is the House into which <sup>4</sup> [the unclean shall] never [enter..] ... nor the foreigner, ..*

However Josephus seems to provide the solution to this problem, for there we read:<sup>41</sup>

*... they carry nothing at all with them when they travel into remote parts .. Accordingly, there is, in every city where they live, one appointed particularly to take care of strangers, and to provide garments and other necessaries for them.*

Secondly, who are 'the poor' here: those who are literally poor? Yet we know that the Qumran community practiced 'common ownership', so theoretically there should be no 'poor or needy'. Perhaps we should take it to mean that members are to take care that none of their number goes unfed or unclothed,

---

<sup>40</sup>Jub.20<sup>2</sup>, Mt.19<sup>19</sup>, 22<sup>39</sup> etc.

<sup>41</sup>The Jewish Wars, 2,8,4.

yet this sense creates a certain degree of tautology with the ninth precept.

Duty 9: Seek the well-being of one's brother.

wldrwš 'yš 't šlwm 'hyhw  
<wl' ym'l 'yš bš'r bšrw>

4 8

The first colon is to help to secure the well-being of a fellow member, and since some crimes carried the death penalty then this precept is warning members not to bear false witness against their fellow-members, a topic also covered in 11QT.61<sup>7-12</sup>. This precept is very similar to the sixth commandment, 'Thou shalt not kill', which does not refer to capital punishment or the killing involved in war, but to illegal killing which is hurtful to the community. The reason our passage does not read the more straight-forward command, 'Do not bear false witness', is because the writer wished to preserve the unnegated infinitive construction which begins all these precepts.

The problem with this precept lies with the second colon. To begin with it is secondary since the syntax suddenly shifts from the normal w + l + infinitive in the first colon, to wl' plus an imperfect here. Furthermore the phrase š'r bšrw refers to relatives of members and can thus be lumped with the interpolation in 7<sup>6-9</sup> as belonging to a later period when marital relationships were permitted by the sect. Cothenet believes on the basis of the occurrence of the phrase š'r bšrw in Leviticus 18<sup>6</sup> that it 'condamnéés les unions incestueuses'.<sup>42</sup> Murphy-O'Connor believes that a stronger sense is demanded for the root m'l which does not have the sense of 'sexual betrayal' but rather is treachery in the sense of 'a deliberate failure to fulfil an

---

<sup>42</sup>Cothenet, quoted by Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 78, p215 - Lev.18<sup>6</sup> reads: 'None of you shall approach any one near of kin to him to uncover nakedness'.



obligation'.<sup>43</sup> Davies seems to combine both positions in concluding that 'm'l can apparently be used in CD for any offence within the community, (and) accordingly, this injunction is best taken as applying to any offence in respect of family obligations (e.g. ge'ullah)..'.<sup>44</sup> He thus translates - '*And not sin each one against his kinsman*'.<sup>45</sup>

Duty 10: Abstain from harlotry.

lhzyr mn hzwnwt kmšpṭ

4 9

The root nzx, here in the Hiphil with a stronger sense than the Niphal of the root in 6<sup>15</sup>. zwnwt translates as 'harlots' as it stands and so most scholars emend to znwt 'whoredom'. Yet Qimron notes that the form zwnwt meaning znwt is found in CD.8<sup>5</sup> cf.19<sup>17</sup>, 4QMMT B 69,76, and in some Mishnaic Hebrew manuscripts.<sup>46</sup> More interesting is why we have mšpṭ here whilst we have prwš above three times? Is a different source being alluded to? I would suggest it refers back to the first of Belial's nets 4<sup>20</sup>-5<sup>6</sup> which as we saw forbade polygamy. Charles' suggestion that the previous colon should be transposed to after this colon has a lot to commend it; this would then give a bicolon on sexual relations, the first colon forbidding fornication (viz. adultery, prostitution, etc.) and the second incestuous relationships.<sup>47</sup>

*To abstain from harlotry as is the judgment;*

4 9

---

<sup>43</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 78, p215:16.

<sup>44</sup>Davies, p131 - why does Davies think this section is secondary if he regards 7<sup>6-9</sup> as being original? Ginzberg (p31-32) however emends to wym'lw, while Charles (p814) translates 'commit a trespass', followed by Rabin, p26.

<sup>45</sup>Davies, p249.

<sup>46</sup>Qimron, p99.

<sup>47</sup>Charles, p814.

Duty 11: Correct one's 'brother'.

lhwyh 'yš 't 'hyhw kmšwh	4	10
wl' lntwr mywm lywm	4	6

This bicolon is the only original example of a law which is outlined in both a positive and negative sense. The latter seems to be original since it contains an infinitive, and this is negated by l' rather than blty, a later practice in Hebrew syntax used in particular in commands;<sup>48</sup> metrically, though, this colon is rather short. The full sense here is not appreciated until one looks at the relevant passage of CD 9<sup>2-8</sup> where this duty is expanded and seen to refer to bearing false witness. Once this is appreciated one can understand the presence of mšwh which tells the reader that this duty is to be interpreted in the light of the commandment, namely the ninth, 'Do not bear false witness against your neighbour'; thus one should reprove one's 'brother' (fellow-member) if he sins but not do so unjustly. Ginzberg quotes a similar passage from the Talmud where a certain Pharisee, Mar Zutra, before getting into bed each night spoke the words - 'Forgiven is everyone who has insulted me'.<sup>49</sup> This precept seems somewhat tautological when compared to the ninth duty so that perhaps the slant here is contained more in the second colon.

Duty 12: Separate from unclean things.

wlhbdl mkl htm'wt kmšptm	4	12
--------------------------	---	----

---

<sup>48</sup>So Qimron, p78.

<sup>49</sup>Ginzberg, p32 - Megillah 28a, TPTaanith 3,67a.

<wl' yšqš 'yš 't rwh qdšyw  
k'šr hbdyl 'l lhm>

As we again have the use of the qualifying mšpṭ does it also refer back, this time to the third of the nets of Belial, viz. 'the uncleanness of the sanctuary', (5<sup>6-11</sup>)? The reference in the second colon to the 'holy spirits' could then refer to 5<sup>11</sup> which is the only other occurrence of this phrase in this document, thus introducing the section 5<sup>11</sup>-6<sup>3</sup> creating an envelope structure which ties these two sections together. However most commentators agree that this is a reference to the dietary laws in 12<sup>11-18</sup> since the form ṭm'wt refers to 12<sup>16</sup>, while the root šqš occurs only in 12<sup>11</sup> outside of this passage. Yet this second colon is probably secondary since, like the ninth precept, its syntax consists of wl' plus imperfect instead of the usual infinitive;<sup>50</sup> it may have been borrowed therefore from 5<sup>11</sup>. The third colon belongs with the second mainly because this then leaves the three line blessing, 7<sup>4-6</sup>, which begins kl hmthlkym, paralleling the three line warning, 7<sup>9-10</sup>=19<sup>5-6</sup>, which begins wkl hmw'sym. In addition it is unlikely that such an important part as the blessing would begin with the prosaic relative particle with prefixed 'k';<sup>51</sup> this colon may have originated from Lev.20<sup>25</sup>.

The Blessing: 7<sup>4-6</sup> = 19<sup>1-2</sup>.

kl hmthlkym <sup>5</sup> b'lh btmy m qdš	5	12
<'l py kl yswrw>		
bryt 'l <sup>B1</sup> n'mnwt lhm A6	4	7
lhyw tm l'lp y dwrwt <sup>52</sup>	3	7
<kk šw mr hbryt whšd <sup>B2</sup> l'hb		

<sup>50</sup>So Davies, p249.

<sup>51</sup>Most commentators take this clause with the preceding material: Charles, p815; Rabin, p26; Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 78, p214; Davies, p250-1.

<sup>52</sup>Ms.A 'lp dwr.

wlšmry mšwty l'lp dwr>

This section, as I have said, parallels the warning which can be detected in 7<sup>9-10</sup>=19<sup>5-6</sup>. The word 'lh refers back to the dodecalogue. The phrase btmym qdš may be associated with the phrase 'nšy (h)tmym (h)qdš found in 20<sup>2,5,7</sup> and 1QS 8<sup>20</sup> which denotes all the members of whatever standing;<sup>53</sup> Murphy-O'Connor, on the other hand, believes that it is inspired by the Holiness Code.<sup>54</sup>

The main problem though lies with the words ..kl yswrw bryt 'l. Some form of emendation is necessary, for as it stands yswrw has a singular suffix where a plural is needed. In view of the similarity of waw and yod, one could read yswry;<sup>55</sup> However, commentators who adopt this reading<sup>56</sup> are compelled to add hbryt before bryt which dropped out through haplography, since otherwise the blessing is ungrammatical being left without any main verb; this then yields:

*'And those who walk in these things in perfect holiness in accordance with all the instructions of {the covenant}; the covenant of El was established for them ...'.*

Yet the need to emend the text to the extent of supplying a second bryt besides the first seems unlikely to me. Thus I follow Dupont-Sommer in understanding the final waw as a defective form of the suffix, yswryw, quite a

---

<sup>53</sup>So Denis, Les thèmes de connaissance dans le Document de Damas, p136.

<sup>54</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 78, p221 - Lev.19<sup>2</sup>, 20<sup>26</sup>, 22<sup>32</sup>.

<sup>55</sup>T-S 10 K6 clearly has a waw but this is not to say that the text was not corrupted prior to this.

<sup>56</sup>E.g.: Ginzberg, p32; Rabin, p26-27; Lohse, p78; Knibb, p51.

common grammatical feature;<sup>57</sup> this then reads *'..all His instructions; the covenant of El ..'*<sup>58</sup> From this point we must consider 14<sup>1-2</sup>:

wk1 hmthlkym b'lh  
bryt 'l n'mnwt lhm..

The text is identical and thus this second colon is secondary, acting as a gloss on 'lh which brings the predicate, n'mnwt, (a Niphal participle meaning literally - 'reliable things',) much nearer the subject; the form hn'mn is found in Deuteronomy 7<sup>9</sup> just prior to the quotation. We could perhaps also remove the words btmyr qdšw in light of 14<sup>1-2</sup>, which would leave an opening line of 3,8 balancing the two cola that follow.

'lp dwr / l'lpw dwrwt. The singular form of this phrase found in Ms.A is taken from Deuteronomy 7<sup>9</sup> which the copyist of Ms.B has made explicit by quoting this text; yet which is original, the singular or plural form? The latter would give a more balanced metre; thus, the scribe of Ms.A emended the plural form to the singular so as to allude to Deut.7<sup>9</sup>, whilst the scribe of Ms.B simply added the Deuteronomy quotation. In this quotation in Ms.B, kk is a rabbinic type of abbreviation for kktwb; the suffix from l'hbyw (19<sup>2</sup>) is omitted perhaps due to a different MT tradition, while mšwtwy should be emended to mšwtw.<sup>59</sup> The idea the author is trying to get across is that only the sect's interpretation of the law can give life since salvation comes from obedience to the law. This theological principle, of an earthly reward for a life of obedience, is a common theme in the Old Testament prior to the advent of belief in life

---

<sup>57</sup>Qimron, p59 notes that there are thirty cases of '-w' for '-yw'; Kutscher, 1QIs<sup>a</sup>, p51 and p447.

<sup>58</sup>Dupont-Sommer, p132 - followed by Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 78, p221 and Davies, p140-141.

<sup>59</sup>The apparatus criticus shows that V,LXX,Sy and 47 Ms. read 'mšwtw' here in contrast to MT 'mšwtw'; there is a line over this word in Ms.B.

after death.<sup>60</sup> For many Jews, the martyrdom of a large number of their righteous fellow-countrymen during the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes helped lead to the adoption of the belief that God would vindicate His justice beyond the grave. Yet for the sect such an argument would be invalid; these Jews were deservedly dying for their failure to observe, or their misinterpretation of, the torah - God was still righteous in their eyes.<sup>61</sup>

The Interpolation: 7<sup>6-9</sup> = 19<sup>2-5</sup>.

w'im mħnwt yšbw ksrk<sup>62</sup> h'rš <'šr hyh mqdm> wlqħw nšym  
 <kmnhg htwrh> whwlydw bnym whthlkw<sup>63</sup> 'l py htwrh wkmšpt  
 hyswrym<sup>64</sup> ksrk htwrh k'šr 'mr  
 byn 'yš l'štw  
 wbyn 'b lbnw

I follow the majority of scholars who see this section as an interpolation in view of its conditional style and because it appears to have been inserted between the blessing and curse of the 'Twelve Duties'.<sup>65</sup> It was added to take account of children of members of the sect, who were born rather than admitted into the sect; this corresponds to a later period in the life of the sect when members lived away from Qumran in 'camps'.

---

<sup>60</sup>E.g.: Gen.15<sup>15</sup>, 25<sup>8</sup>; Job; Ps.90<sup>10-12</sup>.

<sup>61</sup>See my MTh. Dissertation: 'Death and the Hereafter in the Old Testament', (available in New College Library).

<sup>62</sup>Ms.B khwqy.

<sup>63</sup>Ms.B wythlkw.

<sup>64</sup>Ms.B hyswdym.

<sup>65</sup>So Cothenet, Maier, Stegemann, Murphy-O'Connor and Knibb; Denis, Les thèmes de connaissance dans le Document de Damas, p137 and Davies, p142 think it is original.

Where Ms.B has a longer text in two places these are glosses since they not only read as such, but their absence in Ms.A cannot be explained. In addition *mqdm* only occurs twice elsewhere in CD in the predestinarian poem of 2<sup>2-13</sup> whilst *mnhg* is a *hapax legomenon* in the Scrolls. *srk* would seem the original reading, and since R.Hananel explains *srk* as *mnhg* in his commentary on Yoma 30a,<sup>66</sup> I suggest that the copyist altered *srk* to *hwqy* when he added *kmnhg htwrh* to avoid tautology. The verb *hlk* begins a second part of this construction and thus the sense demanded is 'Then they shall walk..' which is the meaning of Ms.A *whthlkw*. Ms.B has altered this to the Jussive (*wythklw*) - 'Then let them walk..'.<sup>67</sup> Finally, in the choice between *hyswrym* 'instructions' and *hyswdym* 'foundations' the former reading would seem to make more sense.

The 'Torah', 'The Judgment of the Instructions' and 'The rule of the Torah' are possibly the titles of various documents which those sectarians who lived away from Qumran had to adhere to. If the first is the Mosaic torah, then perhaps the latter is 11QTorah, and the middle one the latter half of this document (CD IX-XVI). In view of the apparent division between I-VIII and IX-XVI one can speculate as to whether they existed separately on the same scroll in the manner of 1QS, 1QS<sup>a</sup> and 1QS<sup>b</sup>; and if this were the case one would expect the first words of the second section to be *mšpt̄ hyswrym*. The order is as one might expect, the torah being the torah is mentioned first, followed by this document which was compiled specifically for those living outside of Qumran, and finally 11QTorah is referred to since its rules were

---

<sup>66</sup>See Ginzberg, p33.

<sup>67</sup>Thus I follow Rubinstein, 'Notes on some Syntactical Irregularities in Text B of the Zadokite Documents', VT, 7 (1957), p356, against Carmignac, 'Comparaison entre les Manuscrits "A" et "B" du Document de Damas', RQ, 2 (1959-60), p58, who believes Ms.B is the original.

largely for the future earthly temple.

The Curse: 7<sup>9-10</sup> = 19<sup>5-6</sup>

wkl hm(w)'sym <sup>a</sup> bmswt wbhqym <sup>a68</sup>	4	9
bpqd 'l 't h'rs	3	6
lhšyb gmwl rš'ym 'lyhm <sup>69</sup>	4	7

The parallel between wkl hm(w)'sym here and kl hmthlkym is evidence that these two passages are in opposition as the blessing and curse at the end of the Twelve Duties. Many scholars believe that something has dropped out in Ms.A after hmw'sym, but that the text of Ms.B does not represent the original text since the pair bmswt wbhqym is not found elsewhere in the scrolls although it is found in the Holiness Code (Lev.26:14-15).<sup>70</sup> Coupled with this is the problem of the varying position of the phrase bpqd 'l 't h'rs in Mss.A and B; in Ms.A it 'defines the purpose of the divine visitation but in the B text (it) describes the consequence of rejection of the law'.<sup>71</sup> However the parallelism between the Blessing and Curse can be extended so that it becomes apparent that text B gives the better parallel; for obedience to the law leads to life for a thousand generations whilst disobedience to His law leads to His visitation upon them.<sup>72</sup> On this basis we can adopt the order of the final two cola found in Ms.B, and to create the best parallel between the

---

<sup>68a-a</sup> only in Ms.B.

<sup>69</sup>Latter two cola according to the order found in Ms.A.

<sup>70</sup>So Charles, p815 who leaves a gap after the verb, and Rabinowitz, JBL, 73, p24 n77; Strickert, 'Damascus Document VII,10-20 and Qumran Messianic Expectation', RQ, 12, (1985-87), p331 who points to the fact that many of the additions in Ms.B stress the importance of the commandments; Ginzberg, p33, emends the text: 'wkl hmw'sym bp<sup>e</sup>qude ...'

<sup>71</sup>Davies, p149.

<sup>72</sup>Whilst this does not explain precisely how one text has diverged from the other, no one has been able to produce a logical reason for this divergence. That Ms.A appears to possess a lacuna would suggest that of the two it was more likely to be corrupt.



first colon of the blessing and curse we can either remove  $\text{bm}\dot{\text{s}}\text{wt } \text{w}\dot{\text{h}}\text{qym}$  and read  $\text{b}'\text{lh}$  in its place, or remove  $\text{b}'\text{lh}$  from the blessing (though  $14^1$  counts against this). Thus the text *could* be restored as follows:

$\text{kl } \text{hmthlkym } \underline{\text{b}'\text{lh}} / \text{btmym } \text{qd}\dot{\text{s}}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\frac{8}{9}$
$\text{bryt } 'l \text{ } \text{B}' \text{ n}'\text{mnwt } \text{lh}\text{m}$	4	7
$\text{lh}\text{ywtm } \text{l}'\text{lpy } \text{dwrwt}$	3	7
$\text{wkl } \text{hm(w)'}\text{sym } \{\underline{\text{b}'\text{lh}}\} / \text{bm}\dot{\text{s}}\text{wt } \text{w}\dot{\text{h}}\text{qym}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\frac{7}{9}$
$\text{lh}\dot{\text{s}}\text{yb } \text{gmwl } \text{r}\dot{\text{s}}'\text{ym } 'l\text{yhm}$	4	7
$\text{bpqd } 'l 't \text{ h}'\text{r}\dot{\text{s}}$	3	6

The Hebrew of 1QS.1:1-15.

3	8	ל[משכיל ללמד את הקדו]שים	
4	8	1 לחיו[ת כספר סר]ך היחד	
4	8	2 לדרוש (2) אל [בכול לב ובכול נפש	
4	9	3 ל]עשות הטוב והישר לפניו	
3	7	כאשר (3) צוה ביד מושה	
3	8	וביד כול עבדיו הנביאים	
3	6	4 ולאהוב כול אשר בחר	
3	7	ולשנוא את כול אשר מאס	
3	5	5 לרחוק מכול רע	
3	6	ולדבוק בכול מעשי טוב	
5	11	6 ולעשות אמת וצדקה ומשפט (6) בארץ	
5	10	ולוא ללכת עוד בשרירות לב אשמה	
4	7	ועיני זנות (7) לעשות כול רע	
3	9	ולהבי את כול הנדבים	
4	8	7 לעשות חוקי אל (8) בברית חסד	
3	7	8 להוחד בעצת אל	
3	8	9 ולהתהלך לפניו תמים	
4	9	כול (9) הנגלות למועדי תעודותם	
3	5	10 ולאהוב כול בני אור	
3	7	איש (10) כגורלו בעצת אל	
3	5	ולשנוא כול בני חושך	
3	7	איש כאשמתו (11) בנקמת אל	
		>וכול הנדבים לאמתו יביאו כול דעתם וכוחם (12) והונם ביחד	
		אל<	
5	9	11 לברר דעתם באמת חוקי אל	
4	7	12 וכוחם לתכו (13) כתם דרכיו	
4	7	וכול הונם כעצת צדקו	
3	6	>ולוא לצעוד בכול אחד (14)	
3	8	מכול דברי אל בקציהם	
3	6	ולוא לקדם עתיהם	
3	9	ולוא להתאחר (15) מכול מוצדיהם	
4	8	ולוא לסור מחוקי אמתו	
3	6	ללכת ימין ושמאל<	

Translation of 1QS.1<sup>1-15</sup>.

*It is for [the Maskil to teach the holy] ones:*

*To live [according to the book of the rule of the commu]nity;  
To seek<sup>2</sup> El [with all (their) heart and with all (their) soul;  
To] practise good and what is right before Him,  
as<sup>3</sup> He commanded by the hand of Moses,  
and by the hand of all His servants, the prophets.*

*And to love all<sup>4</sup> whom He chooses,  
And to hate all whom He rejects;*

*To draw away from all evil (things)<sup>5</sup>  
But to cleave to all deeds of goodness.*

*And to practise truth, righteousness, and justice<sup>6</sup> in the land,  
and not to walk again in the stubbornness of a guilty heart,  
or with eyes of lust<sup>7</sup> practising all (kinds of) evil.*

*And (it is for the Maskil) to admit all who freely devote  
themselves:*

*To practise the precepts of El in<sup>8</sup> the Covenant of Mercy;  
To be united in the counsel of El;  
And to walk before Him perfectly  
(in accordance with) all<sup>9</sup> that was revealed of their  
appointed times.*

*And to love all the sons of light  
each man<sup>10</sup> according to his lot in the counsel of El;  
And to hate all the sons of darkness  
each man according to his guilt<sup>11</sup> in the vengeance of El.*

*<And all who freely devote themselves to His truth shall bring  
all their knowledge, strength<sup>12</sup> and wealth into the  
community of El.>*

*To purify their knowledge with the truth of the precepts of El,  
and their strength to order<sup>13</sup> according to His perfect ways,  
and all their possessions according to His righteous counsel.*

*<And not to depart in any particular one<sup>14</sup>  
from all of the words of El concerning their periods;  
And not to arrive early for their times,  
or to arrive late<sup>15</sup> from any of their appointed times;  
And not to stray from His true precepts  
by walking to the right or to the left.>*

## I. Appendix: A parallel credal passage in 1QS.1<sup>1-15</sup>.

As in the credal section in the Damascus Document this parallel passage in 1QS has twelve precepts:

Introductory: l[m'skyl 't llmd hqdw]šym

1. lhywt ..
2. ldrwš ..
3. l]šwt ...
4. wl'hwb .. wl'snw' ..
5. lrhwq .. wldbwwq ..
6. wl'swt .. wl' llkt ..

Introductory: wlhby 't kwł hndbwm

7. l'swt ..
8. lhwbd ..
9. wlhthlk ..
10. wl'hwb .. wl'snw' ..
11. lbr ..
12. ltkn ..
  
13. wl' lš'wd ..
14. wl' lqdm .. wl' lht'hr ..
15. wl' lswr ..

If one turns to consider these twelve laws it is immediately apparent that they appear in two groups of six, with the first six being more general than the following six. Though the first law is fragmentary it seems to refer to the Community Rule (1QS) and comes before the (second) law to seek God, with which it forms a bicolon; this strongly emphasizes to the individual that he is first and foremost a member of the sect. The third law is a tricolon with a:b:b' pattern, where the general injunction to practice good is further defined as following the commands of Moses (namely the Pentateuch) and the teachings of the prophets. This should be compared with the seventh law where 'those who freely devote themselves' are to practice 'the precepts of the law in

accordance with the covenant of mercy'. The latter seems to be a reference to the sectarian law and covenant especially as the phrase 'the precepts of E1' has a sectarian sense in CD.5<sup>12</sup>; thus a stronger requirement is demanded of this latter group. Both groups are to love those of the sect and hate everyone else, yet the tenth law is defined in more detail using stronger language. The fifth law is equally general and like the fourth is a well-balanced bicolon of a:a' pattern. The sixth, a tricolon of a:b:b' pattern, has the same terminology as that found in CD 2<sup>16,18</sup>, which, as the introductory part of the third poem, was (also) directed at the 'children', viz. the new members of the sect.

Laws 7-12 also begin with an opening introductory colon; the Maskil should be supplied as the subject since this preserves the parallelism with the opening introductory colon in 1<sup>1</sup> and because it is clear from 1QS.9<sup>12f</sup> that it is he who decides whom to admit. The next four cola (laws 7-9) exhibit poor parallelism and constitute as such two bicola of a:b pattern. In the seventh law, the phrase bryt ḥsd is also found in a fragment of the Hodayot,<sup>7</sup>; otherwise the nearest parallel is in 1QM.14<sup>4</sup>, ḥšwṁr ḥsd lbrytw, and in the Deuteronomic quote found in CD.19<sup>1-2</sup>, although a similar sense is found in the phrase bbryt tšwbh in CD.19<sup>16</sup>. The hebrew noun 'šh in the eighth law is difficult to translate since it can either be rendered 'Council' or 'counsel'; however its use in the tenth law where it is paralleled with nqmt suggests that the latter sense should probably be adopted. The phrase lmw'dy t'wdwtm in the ninth law also occurs in 3<sup>10</sup> (=t'wdtyw); this is typical predestination language as found also in the following tenth law which exhibits strong dualism and thus parallelism, being a quatrain with a:b:a':b' pattern. In the final two laws there is a secondary, prosaic addition, which has the imperfect in the middle of the 'colon' rather than the usual infinitive at the start of the colon; furthermore, it is somewhat tautological as it restricts this command(s) to

'those who freely devote themselves'. Thus removing this we are left with a tricolon, in which the original author omitted a verb from the third colon in order to create twelve laws , the sense of ltkn being carried over which is a nice poetic touch. The three final negative laws were added at a later date when the sect were faced with members deserting, disregarding the (solar) calendar, and overstepping the (sectarian) law, respectively; the use of l' to negate the infinitive (instead of lblty) is a later Hebrew practice found in particular in the negation of commands.<sup>73</sup>

It is clear from the above analysis of this section that we have two distinct groups; the first are designated 'the holy ones', the second 'those who freely devote themselves'. These two groups each seem to have separate sections later in this document, the former in 8<sup>17</sup>-9<sup>11</sup> and the latter in 5<sup>1</sup>-6<sup>24</sup>. From these passages we learn of the former, that they belong to the Council of holiness (8<sup>21</sup>), that they participate in the Purification (5<sup>13</sup>) and the Pure Meal (8<sup>17</sup>) of the holy, that they are to obey every word of the law of Moses (8<sup>22</sup>), and that 'no man of holiness shall be associated in his property or counsel' (8<sup>23-24</sup>). Whilst of the latter we learn that they are entering the Council of the Community (5<sup>7</sup>), that in doing so they are to obey the law of Moses 'in accordance with all that has been revealed of it to the sons of Zadok' (5<sup>8-9</sup>), and that after two years they can participate in the Pure Meal (6<sup>20-21</sup>) and 'his property shall be merged and he shall offer his counsel and judgment to the community' (6<sup>22-23</sup>). Thus, in my view, those in their initial two years of training can be termed h(mt)ndbym, the stronger laws (7-12) being directed at them, whilst on the completion of their two years they join 'the men of perfect

---

<sup>73</sup>So Qimron, p78.

holiness' as full members; to a certain extent however, all full members have at one time 'freely volunteered themselves'. Equally important to realise is that there are other passages in 1QS which seem to have an abundance of infinitives, such as 5<sup>20-24</sup> and 9<sup>12-23</sup>, and of these the latter is especially interesting as it begins: 'These are the precepts for the Maskil...' Thus there may be some particular relationship between the use of infinitives and the Maskil figure, and consequently we can speculate that it is the Maskil who is speaking in CD.6<sup>11-74</sup> and whose responsibility it was to see that these duties were adhered to.

*...when the prophecy comes to pass which was written in the words of Isaiah, son of Amos, the prophet,<sup>11</sup> who said:*

*There shall come against you, your people, and the house of your fathers,*

*days which have {not}<sup>12</sup> come since the day Ephraim was removed from Judah.<sup>23</sup>*

*When the two houses of Israel were divided;<sup>13</sup>  
Ephraim was removed from Judah.*

*And all those who fell away were delivered up to the sword.  
And those who held fast<sup>14</sup> escaped to the land of the north.*

*As he said: 'And I will take into captivity the shrine of your kings,<sup>15</sup> and the kiyyun of your images, {and the star of your God,} from My tent (to) Damascus.'<sup>24</sup> The books of the law are the tabernacle of<sup>16</sup> the king, as he said: 'And I will raise up the tabernacle of David which has fallen.'<sup>25</sup> The 'king'<sup>17</sup> is the assembly and the 'kiyyun of the images' are the books of the prophets<sup>18</sup> whose words Israel despised. And the star is the one who seeks the torah<sup>19</sup> who came (to) Damascus, as it was written: 'A star treads forth from Jacob, and a sceptre will arise<sup>20</sup> from Israel.'<sup>26</sup> The 'sceptre' is the Prince of the whole congregation and when he arises he will destroy<sup>21</sup> all the children of Seth.*

*These escaped during the period of the first visitation,<sup>1</sup>  
But those who fell away were delivered up to the sword.*

*And thus is the judgment on all those who enter his covenant,  
who<sup>2</sup> have not held fast to these (things),  
to be visited for destruction by the hand of Belial.*

---

<sup>23</sup>Isaiah 7<sup>17</sup>

<sup>24</sup>Amos 5<sup>26-27</sup>

<sup>25</sup>Amos 9<sup>11</sup>.

<sup>26</sup>Numbers 24<sup>17</sup>, also 4QTest. 12-13 ; and 1QM.11<sup>6</sup>.



...<sup>7</sup> when the prophecy comes to pass that was written by the hand of Zechariah, the prophet:

*"O sword, awake against<sup>8</sup> my shepherd,  
and against the man of my society", declares the Lord;  
"Smite the shepherd, and let the sheep be scattered,<sup>9</sup>  
And I will turn My hand against the false shepherds.<sup>27</sup>*

*And those who heed him are the poor of the sheep;<sup>10</sup>  
These shall escape during the period of punishment.  
But those who are left behind shall be delivered up to the  
sword,  
when the Messiah of<sup>11</sup> Aaron and Israel comes.*

*As it was during the period of the first visitation, when He  
said<sup>12</sup> through the hand of Ezekiel:*

*"To make a mark upon the foreheads  
of those who sigh and lament."<sup>28 13</sup>*

*But those who were left behind were delivered up to the  
sword  
which executes the vengeance of the covenant.*

*And thus is the judgment on all those who enter<sup>14</sup> His  
covenant,  
who have not held fast to these precepts,  
to be visited for destruction by the hand of Belial.<sup>15</sup>*

---

<sup>27</sup>Zechariah 13<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>28</sup>Ezekiel 9<sup>4</sup>.

## 1.7. The Warnings: 7<sup>10-8</sup><sup>21</sup> and 19<sup>6-20</sup><sup>34</sup>.

### 1.7.1. The 'Parallel' Passages of 7<sup>10-8</sup><sup>2</sup> and 19<sup>6-14</sup>.

Which came first and why? This is a question that has raised considerable discussion.<sup>1</sup> The various theories advanced to solve this problem will be examined and their positive points noted, before I go on to propose my own solution.

Rabin (1954), Carmignac (1959), Denis (1964), and most recently White (1987), all regard both the text of A and B as original.<sup>2</sup> For Rabin, the original order was 7<sup>10-20a</sup> + 19<sup>7b-13</sup>, haplography occurring in Ms.B with the introductory quotation formula, the lacuna being evident in 19<sup>7</sup> by the fact that elsewhere *byd* follows *'mr*, whilst Ms.A makes one visitation out of the two in Ms.B again due to haplography.<sup>3</sup> White conjectures the reverse in positing that the original order was 19<sup>7-13</sup> + 7<sup>10-21</sup>, again with two cases of haplography firstly in Ms.A where the introductory quotation formula caused 19<sup>7-13</sup> to drop out and secondly in Ms.B after *hsgrw lhrb* which caused 7<sup>10-21</sup> to drop out.<sup>4</sup> Denis, on the other hand, suggests a more complex original order for the mss.: 7<sup>10-13c</sup> + 19<sup>7b-9</sup> + 7<sup>13c-21a</sup> + 19<sup>10-13</sup> on grounds of continuity of theme. Finally,

---

<sup>1</sup>In order of publication: Rabinowitz, JBL, 73, p24-31; Carmignac, RQ, 2, p53-69; Murphy-O'Connor, 'The Original Text of CD 7:9-8.2 = 19.5-14', HTR, 64 (1971), p379-386 - and RB, 78, p223-227 and RB, 92, p241-244; Brooke, 'The Amos-Numbers Midrash (CD 7:13b-8:1a) and Messianic Expectation', ZAW, 92 (1980), 397-404; Davies, p143-155 and Behind the Essenes, p38-40; Strickert, RQ, 12, p327-350; White, 'A Comparison of the "A" and "B" Manuscripts of the Damascus Document', RQ, 12 (1985-87), p537-552.

<sup>2</sup>Respectively: Rabin, p28-33; Carmignac, RQ, 2, p53-69; Denis, Les thèmes de connaissance dans le Document de Damas, p131-135, p146; White, RQ, 12, p537-552.

<sup>3</sup>Rabin, p30-31 esp note 20a.2.

<sup>4</sup>White, RQ, 12, p545.

Carmignac proposes that: "les deux textes (=7<sup>10-21</sup> and 19<sup>7-9</sup>) pourraient être tous les deux authentiques et remonteraient effectivement à l'auteur du *Document de Damas*, mais l'un des deux aurait été transporté ici pour combler une lacune accidentelle."<sup>5</sup> He prefers the reading of Ms.A as the original because it is more in line with the preceding context and, in view of its length, is less at risk of being transported; 19<sup>10-13</sup> has been omitted from Ms.A at 7<sup>21</sup> by a 'saut visuel dus à la répétition de termes semblables'.<sup>6</sup> The basic objection to this kind of approach, and one I am inclined to agree with, questions the likelihood that such large sections would have accidentally been omitted by the scribe. What makes it more incredulous is that, in a large part of the small amount of parallel text that we have, we are meant to suppose that at least two major scribal slips occurred which by 'coincidence' resulted in neither manuscript containing any of the main body of text of the other.

The most popular view in recent years was advanced by Murphy-O'Connor.<sup>7</sup> His hypothesis basically falls into four stages:

1. The original text was 7<sup>9-13b</sup> + 19<sup>7-14</sup>.
2. The copyist of Ms.A then accidentally omitted 19<sup>7-13a</sup>, through his eye jumping from wk1 hnswgym hwsgrw lhrb (7<sup>13</sup>) to whnš'rym hsgrow lhrb (19<sup>13</sup>).
3. This accidental omission may have been the reason for the secondary addition of the Amos-Numbers Midrash. The

---

<sup>5</sup>Carmignac, RQ, 2, p66.

<sup>6</sup>Carmignac, RQ, 2, p60.

<sup>7</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, HTR, 64, p379-86; followed by Brooke, Davies, and Knibb - see below.

phrase *hnswgym hsgyrw lhrb* in 8<sup>1</sup> could be a redactional suture designed to take up the theme of the original narrative again (compare 7<sup>13</sup>); this and the repetition in 7<sup>21</sup> of *'lh mlṭw* with 7<sup>13c-14a</sup> 'is one of the clearest indications of an interpolation.'<sup>8</sup> In addition, this midrash adds nothing to the main point of the text.

4. The accidental omission of the Isaiah quotation (7<sup>10b-13a</sup>) in Ms.B through confusion of the introductory formulae (as Rabin).

Brooke agrees with Murphy-O'Connor's conclusion as to what constitutes the original text, but not with his reasons, for as he remarks: 'One cannot but wonder whether the occurrence of so many accidents in transmission is so very accidental.'<sup>9</sup> He asserts that the Zechariah-Ezekiel section was omitted and the Amos-Numbers Midrash inserted at the same time. This deliberate alteration occurred because the redactor wished to replace the concept of a single Messiah found in the B text, with that of the two Messiahs (the Star and the Sceptre) of the Amos-Numbers Midrash; the former is the traditional view of CD, whilst the latter is the view prevalent in 1QS, 1QSb, 4QTest., and 4QFlor. Thus Brooke's proposal only requires three people - author, copyist of "B", redactor of "A" - while Murphy-O'Connor requires four people, i.e. two copyists.

---

<sup>8</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, HTR, 64, p382.

<sup>9</sup>Brooke, ZAW, 92, p399.

Yet more recently Strickert has levelled a number of serious criticisms at Brooke's proposal. Firstly, why did the redactor not simply emend the phrase 'the Messiah of Aaron and Israel' from the singular to the plural as in 1QS.9<sup>11</sup>? Secondly, why did the redactor omit the Zechariah and Ezekiel quotations neither of which relate to the Messiah? Thirdly, like Murphy-O'Connor before him, Brooke is unable to explain satisfactorily the accidental omission of the Isaiah text. Finally I would add a fourth criticism which is that we do not really have two Messianic figures in Ms.A and only one in Ms.B., but rather 'the Star' who is 'the Interpreter of the Law' is 'the Teacher of Righteousness' and can therefore also be equated with 'the Shepherd' in Ms.B, while 'the Sceptre' who is 'the Prince of the Congregation' is (so most scholars) 'the Messiah of Aaron and Israel' who will arise at the time of the final visitation. So whilst the Teacher is merely God's chosen agent in Ms.B, he is given messianic status in Ms.A, a fact which strongly suggests that Ms.A., or at least 'the Amos-Numbers Midrash', postdates the text of Ms.B. In a later article Murphy-O'Connor has modified his original position, for he now asserts that the Amos-Numbers passage is the original text, and that the Ms.B text represents a Qumranic recension on the grounds of the occurrence of 'nyy' which alludes to the Teacher and his community.<sup>10</sup> This is the view Strickert has himself followed, for he reasons that the Zechariah quotation (19<sup>7-10</sup>) was added to show that the death of the Teacher was, in fact, a necessary step in God's plan in preparing for the coming Messiah, while 19<sup>10-13</sup> is an expansion of 7<sup>21b</sup>-8<sup>1c</sup>. Thus Ms.A represents the earlier text which was deliberately omitted in Ms.B since its original purpose was to justify the presence of the community in Damascus during the 'twenty years of groping', a point which

---

<sup>10</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 92, p242-3.

became irrelevant once the community had moved to Qumran.<sup>11</sup>

Davies follows Murphy-O'Connor's original theory in conjunction with Brooke's assertion that the process was deliberate rather than accidental although he suggests an alternative motive for this deliberate substitution. He considers that we have in the Amos-Numbers Midrash a reference to the law which was taken from 'my tent to Damascus', "presumably at the time of exile, when the Temple was destroyed and the community, according to CD, was established."<sup>12</sup> This would also further explain the attitude of the sect to 'the Temple which remains legitimate *for those, and only those, who have the law*.'<sup>13</sup> This suggestion is thus merely open to Strickert's third criticism, that the Isaiah quotation has not been sufficiently well accounted for. Equally interesting is Davies' recent rejection of Murphy-O'Connor's modified view, for he writes: 'If the Amos-Numbers Midrash is a unit, which is probable, it has been borrowed from a florilegium and inserted here, probably as an amplification of the escape to the "land of the north".'<sup>14</sup> I would agree with this analysis and would therefore accept Murphy-O'Connor's original proposal (outlined in point 3) that the Amos-Numbers Midrash is a later insertion on the grounds indicated. However, Murphy-O'Connor's later modification does demonstrate to me that the text of Ms.B is also Qumranic, contrary to Davies' claims.

For myself it seems that Rabinowitz comes closest to understanding the

---

<sup>11</sup>Strickert, RQ, 12, p334-5.

<sup>12</sup>Davies, p148.

<sup>13</sup>Davies, *ibid*.

<sup>14</sup>Davies, Behind the Essenes, p39.

divergent texts of Mss.A and B for he notes that the Isaiah prophecy is made to apply to both the ancient and the final visitation, whilst in the B text Zechariah's prophecy is made to apply to the final visitation and Ezekiel's to the ancient visitation.<sup>15</sup> The reasons for this alteration by the copyist of Ms.B are threefold: firstly the Isaiah quotation is too vague and general; secondly that 'the Isaiah passage required an additional series of scriptural quotations and explanations (=the Amos-Numbers Midrash) which the editor of the B recension wished to eliminate as contributing nothing of essential importance to the main point, namely, proof of the certainty of the final visitation from its "ancient" analogue';<sup>16</sup> thirdly the copyist of Ms.B has produced a smoother and more uniform text when compared to the comment and glosses of Ms.A. Thus, originally the words 'That is the day when God will visit..' (8<sup>2-3</sup>) followed immediately on from the quotation of Isaiah 7<sup>17</sup>, since this is the only place in the Admonition where we find a reference to the Day of Judgment.<sup>17</sup>

So what can we conclude from our analysis of the various theories put forward to explain the two 'parallel' texts of Ms.A and B? I believe that the first conclusion we can draw is that the Amos-Numbers Midrash is secondary to the text of Ms.A because it adds nothing to the text, occurs as a redactional suture (marked X-X' and Y-Y'), exhibits a totally different approach to biblical texts which it re-interprets midrashically,<sup>18</sup> and separates the original text

---

<sup>15</sup>Rabinowitz, JBL, 73, p24-25, notes 79 and 82.

<sup>16</sup>Rabinowitz, JBL, 73, p25 n75 - brackets mine.

<sup>17</sup>This point counts strongly against Murphy-O'Connor's basic theory, since if the original text was 7<sup>10-13</sup> + 19<sup>7-13</sup> + 8<sup>11</sup> the theme of the Day of Judgment is separated and we have instead the theme of the past and future visitation.

<sup>18</sup>Fitzmyer considers the biblical quotation of 7<sup>10-12</sup> to be 'eschatological', whilst those of the Amos-Numbers Midrash are either 'modernized' or 'accomodated' texts; he also describes the biblical quotations in 19<sup>7-13</sup> as 'eschatological' which would mean that Murphy-O'Connor's basic theory consists of three 'eschatological' texts - Fitzmyer, NTS, 7, p311-2, 321-2, 325-6.

which dealt with the Day of Judgment. This can be represented graphically by summarizing the text:

*There shall come upon you, your people and your father's house,  
days which have {not} come since the Day Ephraim departed from Judah.'*

*When the two houses of Israel were divided;  
Ephraim was removed from Judah.*

*And all who turned back were delivered to the sword, X  
But those who held fast escaped to the land of the north. Y*

<The Amos-Numbers Midrash.

*These escaped at the time of the first visitation, Y'  
But those who turned back were delivered to the sword.> X'*

*And thus is the judgment on all those who enter His covenant,  
who have not held fast to these things,  
to be visited for destruction by the hand of Belial.  
This is the Day when El shall visit 'the princes of Judah'  
-upon whom Thou wilt pour out wrath.*

The Amos-Numbers Midrash is thus basically a gloss on the words 'land of the north'; the latter phrase refers to Babylon in its biblical context and hence the parallel suture line (Y') erroneously reads 'the first visitation'.

So far so good, but what of Ms.B. and its relationship with Ms.A.? It seems to me that Ms.B yields a much smoother text and a more intelligible content, usually the sign of a later passage since the more difficult reading should normally be taken as being the original. The Zechariah quotation, expanding on the phrase 'when El visits the land', is used to demonstrate that the final visitation is almost here, for the 'Shepherd' (= the Teacher) has been killed and his death would in a sense inaugurate the end-time.<sup>19</sup> The Ezekiel quotation

---

<sup>19</sup>See 19<sup>35</sup>-20<sup>1</sup> and 20<sup>13</sup>-15 where the Messiah's coming is again linked to the Teacher's death.



parallels the first visitation with the final visitation in order to emphasize that, as in the first visitation, a remnant are marked for salvation. Finally the scribe of Ms.B returns to the final visitation, but this time to issue a warning to those of the sect not to stray from the sectarian covenant lest they too fall into sin to be destroyed by Belial. In addition to the clearer style of Ms.B, it also uses some text from the earlier Ms.A and where it does so it expands on it, e.g.: the clause *bbw' mšyh 'hrn wyšr 'l* in 19<sup>10-11</sup>;<sup>20</sup> the phrase *nwqmt nqm bryt* in 19<sup>13</sup>; the word *hḡym* in 19<sup>14</sup>;<sup>21</sup> the expansion of the allusion to Hosea 5<sup>10</sup> in 8<sup>3</sup> to a direct quotation with introductory *k'šr dbr* in 19<sup>15-16</sup>.

Milik has indicated that the 'text that the Qumrân exemplars present is substantially that of the A recension found in Cairo'.<sup>22</sup> Yet if he had had before him a text containing 19<sup>7-13</sup> but NOT the Amos-Numbers Midrash of 7<sup>14-21</sup>, I find it unlikely that he would have made such a claim, for the text before him would resemble that of Ms.B and not Ms.A in its only parallel passage. Thus although Ms.B is later than Ms.A (less the Amos-Numbers Midrash) it is not the text that in the end came to be adopted as the standard text of CD. Two further points support this fact. One, which I have already noted, is that the Amos-Numbers Midrash represents a later stage in the attitude of the sect towards the Teacher, for he is here given messianic status whereas he is simply God's chosen instrument in Ms.B. The second is that the vocabulary and religious concepts found in Ms.A are more typically Qumranic

---

<sup>20</sup>This indicates that some part of the so-called sutured text in Ms.A (X-X',Y-Y') is original to the Isaiah 7<sup>17</sup> textual level.

<sup>21</sup>Strickert notes of Ms.B that 'numerous additions stress the importance of keeping the commandments' and refers to 19<sup>1-2,3,5-6,14</sup> - RQ, 12, p331.

<sup>22</sup>Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, p38.

in style than those found in Ms.B.<sup>23</sup> This means therefore that when the scribe of Ms.B composed the Zechariah-Ezekiel text he was working with Ms.A which at this point did not have the Amos-Numbers Midrash in it (so following Rabinowitz). This leaves one final question to be considered: why did the smoother text of Ms.B fall out of use? The answer I believe is quite straight-forward, and ties in with why the Ms.B text was adopted in the first place. We have already indicated that one of the main points for the Zechariah-Ezekiel text being included was to account for the Teacher's death in terms of the imminent end-time. The reason it was removed (or, at least, was not adopted as the standard text) is because the end-time did not materialize in the manner the sect expected it. When the date of the beginning of the eschaton passed without event the sect came to believe that they were now living in the 'latter days', and this led in turn to a re-evaluation of the life of the Teacher with the result that he was now elevated to messianic status in the Amos-Numbers Midrash.

So to conclude. The poetical 'blessing' and 'curse' attached to the Twelve Duties, also had longer poetical equivalents in 8<sup>4-9</sup>=19<sup>16-21</sup>, (the second 'curse' or warning,) and 20<sup>27-34</sup>, (the second 'blessing' or promise.) However, to pre-empt my conclusions for a moment, when the redactor incorporated these sections into the document he was compiling, he expanded the 'curse' in 7<sup>9-10</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup>The following are my statistics compiled using Kuhn: In Ms.A of 103 words (or 'literary units') 5 are hapax legomena (= h.l.) in CD and 3 are h.l. in the scrolls. Conversely, in Ms.B of 51 words, 6 are h.l. in CD and 9 h.l. in the Scrolls. Thus, Ms.A has 8% vocabulary unique to CD, and 3% unique to the scrolls, whereas, Ms.B has 30% and 18% respectively. In terms of the religious concepts found in Ms.A: the idea of the swkt is also found in 4QFI; the Sceptre-Star quotation (Num.24<sup>17</sup>) is also found in 1QM 11<sup>6</sup>, 4QTest. 12-13 and 4QP Bless; the Interpreter of the Law also occurs in CD 6<sup>7</sup>, 4QFI.1<sup>11</sup> and 4QCatena<sup>10-11</sup><sup>5</sup>; Damascus occurs six times elsewhere in CD, though, of course never outside it; the Prince of the Congregation in 1QSb.5<sup>20</sup>, 4Qpls<sup>a</sup> frags 5-6, 7 and 1QM 5<sup>1</sup>. In Ms.B, both quotations are unique to the scrolls; the figure of the Shepherd however appears in 1Q34<sup>b</sup> frag.3, 2<sup>8</sup> (cf. CD 13<sup>9</sup> of the 'mebaqer'), the symbolism of 'the poor' as the sect is also found in the secondary passage CD 6<sup>16</sup> - elsewhere in the scrolls the word 'bywn' that is used of the sect.

by including the Isaiah quotation and a further reference to the Day of Judgment, and in doing so created a further redactional suture:

*And all who reject these (things)  
to return the reward of the wicked upon them* A  
*when El visits the earth.*<sup>24</sup> B

*Isaiah quotation and comment.*

<The Amos-Numbers Midrash.>

*And thus ... hand of Belial.  
This is the Day when El shall visit 'the princes of Judah B'  
- upon whom Thou wilt pour out wrath. A'*

Characteristic of the material supplied by the redactor elsewhere it consists of odd semi-poetical sections and a biblical quotation which was not midrashically re-interpreted. Later the Amos-Numbers Midrash was added to the text of Ms.A, whilst in Ms.B (prior to the addition of the Amos-Numbers Midrash) the scribe added the Zechariah-Ezekiel text; both these additions must be Qumranic.

### 1.7.2. The Textual Problems of Manuscript A: 7<sup>10-21</sup>.

#### The Isaiah Quotation: 7<sup>10-13</sup>.

This Isaiah quotation also appears in [13<sup>23</sup>]-14<sup>1</sup> where it has the negative particle which consequently one needs to supply here before b'w (19<sup>12</sup>).<sup>25</sup> This is the second link with this section of the Laws, for we have already noted

---

<sup>24</sup>Following the text of Ms.B would give B.A B':A' suture.

<sup>25</sup>The MT also has the tetragrammaton after 'ybw' which both quotations in CD omit as one would expect.

that much of the 'curse' is found in 14<sup>1-2</sup>. Do both these texts (7<sup>9-12</sup> and 13<sup>23-14<sup>2</sup></sup>) stem from the same literary level, or has one been borrowed from the other?

In the bicolon following the quotation the form  $\acute{s}r$  should be emended to  $sr$ , for as it stands the statement 'Ephraim became ruler above Judah' is grammatically impossible and historically untrue.<sup>26</sup> However, the emended text then merely duplicates part of the second colon of the Isaiah quotation; is this merely for emphasis, or is it meant to be an allusion to the later alleged schism between the sect (Judah) and the Pharisees (Ephraim)? If the latter is the case, then it would seem that deliberate ambiguity has been employed here.<sup>27</sup>

The redactional suture - X-X' and Y-Y' - 7<sup>13-14</sup> + 7<sup>21-8<sup>1</sup></sup>.

hnswgym hwsgrw lhrb. The context of Isaiah 7<sup>17</sup> has led many scholars to see this as a reference to the invasion by the king of Asshur in 722-1 B.C.,<sup>28</sup> Other scholars, who re-interpret the previous clause, see this as a reference to current times; for Davies it is therefore a threat to would be deserters, whilst for Dupont-Sommer it refers to Pompey's destruction of Jerusalem.<sup>29</sup> Again, I believe, the writer is being deliberately ambiguous.

---

<sup>26</sup>So nearly all scholars; only Rabin keeps the text, arguing that 'Sar is explained twice, once literally, the second time by a play on sar 'ruler' (cf.6<sup>6</sup>), perhaps inspired by the implication of the superiority in me-'al.' - Rabin, p28-29.

<sup>27</sup>Murphy-O'Connor's reconstruction of the original text as 7<sup>10-13</sup> + 19<sup>7-13</sup> means that he can regard this passage as one of a number of passages which contrast the majority who are in the wrong, with the minority (=the sect) who are in the right; viz. Ephraim ruled over Judah, the poor of the sheep, those with the mark upon their foreheads.

<sup>28</sup>So Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 78, p225.

<sup>29</sup>Davies, p144 and Dupont-Sommer, p133 n3.

whmḥzyqym nmlṭw l'rṣ ṣpwn. Both here and in the parallel line (Y') the root mlṭ has a past tense, whereas its different context in Ms.B (19<sup>10</sup>) has led to it being deliberately altered to a future tense. The phrase 'rṣ ṣpwn can be found in Jeremiah 16<sup>15</sup> and Zechariah 6<sup>8</sup> where it refers to Babylon, while the closest Qumran parallel is the phrase 'kings of the north' in 1QM.1<sup>4</sup> which is also found in Jeremiah 25<sup>26</sup> and in the singular in Daniel 11<sup>6-15,40</sup>.<sup>29b</sup> Thus it is clearly the Babylonian exile that is being referred to here, yet the text is probably again ambiguous alluding also to the exile to Qumran (= 'Damascus' = 'the land of the north'), and a sectarian nuance is further confirmed by the use of the root ḥzq cf.3<sup>12</sup>. The form hr 'šwn in 7<sup>21</sup> conveys the former sense, although it should be emended to hr 'šwnh.

The Amos-Numbers Midrash: 7<sup>14-21</sup>.

We have already suggested that part of the reason this midrash was inserted here was in order to expand on the phrase 'the land of the north'. But was this the only reason why it was written; Brooke would argue it was in order to present the concept of two Messiahs,<sup>30</sup> whilst Davies believes that it was to explain further the attitude of the sect towards the Jerusalem temple.<sup>31</sup>

The first quotation comes from Amos 5<sup>26-27a</sup>, and I have indicated by underlining where this corresponds to our text:

wnś'tm 't skwt mlkkm w't kywn slmykm kwkb 'lhykm 'šr  
'šytm lkm: whglyty 'tkm mhl'h ldmśq ...<sup>32</sup>

<sup>29b</sup> Isaiah 41<sup>25</sup> has 'ḥyrtwy mṣpwn' – 'I stirred up one from the north.'

<sup>30</sup> Brooke, ZAW, 92, p397-404.

<sup>31</sup> Davies, p147-8.

<sup>32</sup> CD 7<sup>14-15</sup> reads: 'whglyty 't skwt mlkkm w't kywn ṣlmykm m 'hly dmsq'.

*You shall take up Sakkuth your king and Kaiwan your images, your star-god which you made for yourselves; <sup>27</sup> therefore I will take you into exile beyond Damascus, ...*

This is the key text since those that follow only help to interpret, that is re-interpret, this one. There are a number of variations from our text. The first point is that 'the star' which occurs in the MT and is midrashically interpreted below is not found here, and Rabin therefore argues, correctly in my view, that kwkb 'lhyhm, 'the star of your God', must be supplied.<sup>33</sup> The second point is that we have m'hly dmsq instead of the MT mhl'h ldmśq; is this a simple mistake, a genuine variant reading,<sup>34</sup> or a deliberate alteration.<sup>35</sup> In my opinion the whole Amos text has been deliberately altered so that rather than God simply exiling 'them' ('tkm), the verb has been moved so that He is now responsible for exiling 'the Sikkuth of your king, the Kaiwan of your images, {and the star of your God}' all of which are re-interpreted in the following lines. This is backed up by Stephen's quotation of Amos 5<sup>26-27a</sup> in Acts 7<sup>43</sup> which corresponds with the MT, though it deliberately substitutes 'Babylon' for 'Damascus'.<sup>36</sup>

spry htwrh hm swkt hmlk. The author has deliberately taken skwt in Amos 5<sup>26</sup> as swkt, the plural construct of sūkkâ > sūkkōt, 'booths, tabernacles'.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup>Rabin, p28-29.

<sup>34</sup>So Rabin (p29) who believes the author would surely have retained the 'l-' had it been there as it supports his interpretation'.

<sup>35</sup>So Strickert (RQ, 12, p334) who argues that changing the sense from 'beyond Damascus' (viz. Babylon), to 'from my tent to Damascus', indicates Damascus was literally meant.

<sup>36</sup>Acts 7<sup>43</sup> reads: και ἀνελάβετε τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ Μόλοχ καὶ τὸ ἄστρον τοῦ θεοῦ (ὑμῶν) ῥαιφάν τοὺς τυποὺς οὓς ἐποιήσατε προσκυνεῖν αὐτοῖς καὶ μετοικιῶ ὑμᾶς ἐπέκεινα Βαβυλῶνος.

<sup>37</sup>The MT text is pointed 'sikkūt': 'shrine' - so Davidson, The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, p576, or read 'sakkūt', Sakkuth = Saturn, a deity - so Fohrer, Hebrew and Aramaic Dictionary of the OT, p189.

Having done so, he is then able to introduce a further quotation from Amos 9<sup>11</sup> which also contains the form *skt*, 'tabernacle'. This Amos text seems to exist in two textual traditions:

CD:	whqymwty 't swkt dwđ hnwplt.
4QF1.1 <sup>12</sup> :	whqymwty 't swkt dwđ hnwplt
Acts 15 <sup>16</sup> :	καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυὶδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν.
MT:	bywm hhw' 'qym 't sukkaṭ dwyd hnplt
Murabaat Sc.:	[.. hhw]' 'qym 't [.....]
LXX:	Ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀναστήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυὶδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν.

From this it can be seen that that CD, 4QFlorilegium, and Acts have a parallel tradition of a perfect tense, whilst the MT, Murabaat Scroll and LXX have the imperfect and the additional words 'on that day'. Thus it is 'the books of the law' which have fallen that are to be raised up. The following phrase *hmlk hw' hqhl* refers back to the primary Amos quotation and yields good sense.<sup>38</sup>

The second part of the primary Amos text concerns the interpretation of 'the Images'. Dittography has occurred in the text; the first *wkynyy hšlmym* is the original, the second *wkywn hšlmym* is the corrected version. Rabinowitz contends that the author understood *kywn* as deriving from the root *kwn*, thus 'something firmly established', namely the scriptures. *šlmym* may be an anagram for *mlyšym* 'interpreters'.

The final part of this threefold midrash on Amos 5<sup>26-27</sup> deals with the interpretation of 'the Star'. In the Pseudepigrapha, the Rabbinic literature and

---

<sup>38</sup>There is no need to see a lacuna here as Rabin (p28-29) does, who suggests we restore: 'hmlk hw' [nsyḡ. kl h'dh whšlmym hm mškyly] hqhl' - this introduces unnecessary complications.

the New Testament *kwkb* is a term for the Messiah.<sup>39</sup> In our text the terms 'star' and 'sceptre' are interpreted independently; the former is the 'Interpreter of the Law' (=the Teacher of Righteousness), the latter is the 'Prince of the whole congregation' who is also promised in 1QSb.5<sup>20</sup>, 4Qpls<sup>a</sup> frags 5-6,3 and 1QM 5<sup>1</sup>, and probably to be equated with 'the Messiah of Israel' since only the Davidic Messiah was supposed to wield a sword.<sup>40</sup> Consequently, on the linguistic front, the participle *hb'* should be given a past tense 'who came', rather than a future one 'who is coming' - cf. 8<sup>11</sup>=19<sup>24</sup>. God's purpose for 'the Prince of the Congregation' is explained in the phrase, *wb'mdw wqrqr 't kl bny št*, the words underlined also being derived from Num.24<sup>17</sup>. The verb *qrqr* has been variously translated but seems to have the basic meaning of 'to destroy', while the phrase *bny št* denotes all those who like Seth in Genesis 4<sup>26</sup> 'do not call upon the name of the Lord'.

Thus, if we reconstruct the main Amos quotation with the midrashic interpretation written into it, the result is as follows:

*I will take into captivity the books of the law of your assembly, and the books of the prophets, and {your Interpreter of the Law whom you made for yourselves} from My tent (to) Damascus.*

From this we can conclude that perhaps all three of the reasons given for this composition may be correct to varying degrees: it gives messianic status to 'the Interpreter of the Law' (namely the Teacher), it argues that the temple had been superceded because the law (=11QT) had been removed, and it justifies

---

<sup>39</sup> See: T. Levi 18<sup>3</sup>, T. Judah 24<sup>1</sup>; TPTaanith iv 68d, Shahrastani i 170; Matthew 2<sup>2-10</sup> Rev.22<sup>16</sup> - respectively. In the Scrolls 4QTest.12 and 1QM.11<sup>6</sup> also both cite Numbers 24<sup>17</sup>; cf. also the Bar Kochba Scrolls of the Dead Sea.

<sup>40</sup> See Strickert, RQ, 12, p339.



'Damascus' (=Qumran) as a place of exile.

### 1.7.3. The Textual Problems of Ms.B.: 19<sup>7-13</sup>.

#### The Zechariah Quotation: 19<sup>7-11</sup>.

The MT of Zechariah 13<sup>7</sup> has the same text as in our document.<sup>41</sup> The main problem lies with the form hšw'rym which has a variety of textual traditions: LXX<sup>A</sup> and Peshitta read 'shepherds',<sup>42</sup> LXX<sup>B</sup> and Vulgate read 'small men',<sup>43</sup> while the Targum reads 'governors'. Most scholars see hšw'rym as the sect who are in the minority, whilst the 'sheep' are the majority, namely mainstream Jewish society. This quotation therefore implies two things: that the Shepherd, who is the Teacher, did not die of natural causes but was murdered and this would accord with 1QpHab.11<sup>4-8</sup>, and that his death in hastening the coming of the end-time causes the sheep to scatter.

The problem with the following phrase whšwmrym 'wtw hm 'nyy hš'n (19<sup>9</sup>), especially the part underlined, is that it does not come from the preceding Zechariah 13<sup>7</sup>, but from Zechariah 11<sup>11</sup>:

wtpr bywm hhw' wyd'w kn 'nyy hš'n hšmrym 'ty ky dbr  
yhwh hw'

Is there therefore a lacuna here, or conversely is the presence of this allusion to Zechariah 11<sup>11b</sup> a gloss in our text? It is surely significant that Zechariah

---

<sup>41</sup>The only variations lie in the plene forms preserved in our text, viz. 'rw'y', 'tpwšynh', whšybwt'y', and 'hšw'rym', plus Zeck. 13<sup>7</sup> has 'yhwh šb'wt' while CD 19<sup>8</sup> has 'l'.

<sup>42</sup>So Rabin, p30-31.

<sup>43</sup>So the majority of scholars for our text: Vermes, p88; Davies, p257; Knibb, p57.

11<sup>11</sup> lies in a lengthy section which deals with the 'Shepherd' who is opposed by the false shepherds in 11<sup>8</sup>, and in addition the form *whnš'rw* (in 19<sup>10</sup> below) appears in Zechariah 11<sup>9</sup>. This helps clarify the next issue as to whether *'wtw* refers to the covenant, the Shepherd or God; the consensus seems to lie with the latter<sup>44</sup>, although some scholars prefer to emend *'wtw* to *'wtm* and see it as a reference to the covenant.<sup>45</sup> I though see it as a reference to the Shepherd since this seems the most logical in the context of Zechariah 13<sup>7</sup> and 11<sup>11</sup>; the form *hšwrmym* can either be translated 'to heed, revere (him)' or 'to watch (for him)'.

In the phrase *'lh ymlṭw bqš hṗqdḥ* in 19<sup>10</sup>, 'these' refers to 'the poor', and the future tense of *mlṭ* is used (cf. Ms.A) to indicate that the final judgment is meant. The Messianic phrase *mšyh 'hrn wyśr'l* occurs four times in CD: here, 12<sup>23</sup>-13<sup>1</sup>, 14<sup>19</sup> and 20<sup>1</sup>, the latter being the only variant reading - *mšyh m'hrn wmyśr'l*; the singular sense seems original being attested at 14<sup>19</sup> in the Cave 4 manuscripts.<sup>46</sup>

#### The Ezekiel Quotation: 19<sup>11-13</sup>.

The phrase *bqš ṗqdt hr'šwn* in 19<sup>11</sup> is ungrammatical and so various suggestions have been forwarded: Rabin in combining Mss.A and B changes *hr'šwn* to *hr'šwnym*, whilst Davies uncertainly decides on *hr'šwnh*;<sup>47</sup> Rabinowitz

---

<sup>44</sup>Charles, Rabin, Dupont-Sommer, Vermes, Knibb.

<sup>45</sup>Ginzberg, p101-102, followed by Davies, p257,259.

<sup>46</sup>So Priest, 'Mebaqqer, Paqid, and the Messiahs', JBL, 81 (1962), p57; see Chapter 3.1.1. for a discussion on 'Messiah', p348-357.

<sup>47</sup>Rabin, p30; Davies, p153 and p253.

reads pqdtw, whilst Murphy-O'Connor reads pqdh, which arose through the confusion of the hē and the tāw.<sup>48</sup> In any event it is a reference to the destruction of both kingdoms at the time of the exile.

There are a number of divergencies between the MT of Ezekiel 9<sup>4</sup> and that found here:

CD: lhtwt htyw 'l mšḥwt                      n'nḥym wn'nqym.  
MT: whtwyt tw 'l mšḥwt h'nšym hn'nḥym whn'nqym.

*Go through the city, through Jerusalem and make a mark on the foreheads of the men who sigh and groan over all the abominations that are committed in it*

The main difference is that our text omits h'nšym, and reads htyw 'a mark', along with LXX<sup>AQ</sup>, Aq., Th., and Tg., in contrast to tw 'a sign' of the MT; the latter, (possibly both,) seems to be due to a variant textual tradition. There are a number of themes here: the small percentage of those saved of the whole, that those who are saved were predestined, and the implication that the sect originated at the time of the exile. The rest of this verse from Ezekiel 9<sup>4</sup> should also be noted, and may have seemed particularly relevant to the sect whose founders probably fled Jerusalem after the Hasmoneans usurped the High Priesthood and committed abominable acts, (cf. 1QpHab.8<sup>13</sup>, 12<sup>8</sup>.) The phrase nḡqmt nqm bryt in 19<sup>13</sup> is drawn from the Holiness Code (Lev.26<sup>25</sup>) and was probably added as a gloss when the scribe of Ms.B recognized the influence of the Holiness Code on the 'twelve precepts' passage.

---

<sup>48</sup>Rabinowitz, JBL. 73, p29 n97; Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 78, p225-6 and HTR, 64, p384 including footnote 16.

The Final Judgment: 7<sup>21</sup>-8<sup>2</sup> and 19<sup>13-14</sup>.

After the sutured addition of the Amos-Numbers Midrash the text now returns to the theme of the Isaiah 7<sup>17</sup> text, namely the Day of Judgment. These lines 7<sup>21</sup>-8<sup>3</sup> = 19<sup>13-16</sup> are the work of the redactor, as I have already argued; here (7<sup>21</sup>-8<sup>2</sup> = 19<sup>13-14</sup>) he concludes his redactional addition to the Twelve Duties, namely 7<sup>10-14</sup>+7<sup>21</sup>-8<sup>2</sup> whilst in 8<sup>2-3</sup>=19<sup>15-16</sup> he supplies some introductory lines to the following poetry in 8<sup>4-9</sup>=19<sup>16-21</sup>. He thus ties two sections of original poetry neatly together.

The phrase *wkn mšpt*.. (8<sup>1</sup>-19<sup>13</sup>) indicates that those who stray from the covenant of the sect will face the same judgment as their predecessors at the time of the first visitation. The use of the root *ḥzq* in a negative sense is done deliberately to parallel its positive use in 7<sup>14</sup>, and the word *'lh* (correctly clarified as 'precepts' in 19<sup>14</sup>) refers back to the 'Twelve Duties'.

The Hebrew of CD.8:2-9.

הוא היום (3) אשר יפקד אל  
היו שרי יהודה אשר תשפוך עליהם העברה (4)

4 9 כי יחלו למרפא ויד[ב]ק מום  
5 12 כל מורדים מאשר לא סרו מדרך (5) בוגדים

3 7/8 ויתגוללו בדרכי זונות  
2 4 ובהון רשעה

4 7 ונקום וניטור (6) איש לאחיו  
3 7 ושנא איש את רעהו  
4 9 ויתעלמו איש בשאר בשרו (7)

2 5 ויגשו לזמה  
3 9 ויתגברו להון ולבצע

4 9 ויעשו איש הישר בעיניו (8)  
4 10 ויבחרו איש בשרירות לבו  
3 5 ולא נזרו מעם

3 7 ויפרעו ביד רמה (9)  
3 5 ללכת בדרך רשעים

.  
.

*This is the day<sup>3</sup> on which El shall punish;  
The leaders of Judah have become the ones against whom You will  
pour out wrath.<sup>4</sup>*

*For they were too sick to be healed and the blemish stuck;  
All are rebels because they did not turn from the way of<sup>5</sup>  
traitors.*

*But they rolled about in ways of harlotry  
and in the wealth of wickedness.*

*And with vengeance and rancour<sup>6</sup> every man for his brother,  
And every man hating his companion,  
And every man hid himself from the blood-relative of his flesh.<sup>7</sup>*

*And they drew together for a purpose,  
And schemed<sup>29</sup> for wealth and plunder.*

*And every man did what was right in his eyes,<sup>8</sup>  
And every man chose the stubbornness of his own heart;  
And they did not separate from the people.*

*But they became lawless with a high-hand<sup>9</sup>  
by walking in the way of wicked men.*

---

*Concerning whom El said:  
The venom of serpents is their wine,<sup>10</sup>  
and the head of asps is deadly.*

*The 'serpents' are the kings of the nations, and 'their wine'  
is<sup>11</sup> their ways. And 'the head of asps' is the head of the kings  
of Greece who came to inflict<sup>12</sup> upon them vengeance.*

*And in all these things 'the builders of the wall' and 'the daubers*

---

<sup>29</sup>T-S 10 K6 is unclear but probably agrees with TS 16-311.

of plaster' did not understand; for <sup>13</sup> a raiser of wind and spouter of lies spouted to them, against all of whose congregation the wrath of El was kindled.

<sup>14</sup> And as Moses said:  
'Not because of your righteousness or because of the uprightness of your heart are you coming to possess <sup>15</sup> these nations.'  
Rather 'because He loved your fathers, and because He kept the promise'.

And thus is the judgment for those who return of Israel {who<sup>30</sup>} had departed from the way of the people. Because El loved <sup>17</sup> the 'ancestors' who testified <sup>31</sup> concerning Him, He loves those who entered after them because for them is <sup>18</sup> the covenant of the fathers. But because of His hatred of 'the builders of the wall' His wrath was kindled. And like <sup>19</sup> this judgment (it is) for all who reject the commandments of El or forsake them or turn in the stubbornness of their hearts. <sup>20</sup> This is the word which Jeremiah spoke to Baruch son of Neraiah, and Elisha <sup>21</sup> to Gehazi his servant.

---

<sup>30</sup> Restored in both Mss.A and B following Ginzberg, p37.

<sup>31</sup> Following Ms.B; Ms.A unintelligible.

(15) הוא היום אשר יפקד אל

כאשר דבר

היו שרי יהודה כמשיגי (16) גבול

עליהם אשפך כמים עברה:

4	7	כי באו בברית תשובה (17)
4	7	ולא סרו מדרך בוגדים
3	7	ויתגללו בדרכי זנות
2	5	ובהון הרשעה (18)
4	8	ונקום ונטור איש לאחיהו
3	7	ושנא איש את רעהו
4	9	ויתעלמו איש (19) בשאר בשרו
2	5	ויגשו לזמה
3	8	ויתגברו להון ולבצע
4	10	ויעשו את (20) איש הישר בעיניו
4	10	ויבחרו איש בשרירות לבו
4	10	ולא נזרו מעם (21) ומחטאתם:
3	7	ויפרעו ביד רמה
3	6	ללכת בדרכי רשעים:

.  
.



*This is the day on which El shall punish; as He spoke:  
The princes of Judah are like those who remove<sup>16</sup> the bound;  
upon them will I pour out (My) wrath like water.*

*For they entered the covenant of repentance,<sup>17</sup>  
Yet they did not turn from the way of traitors,*

*But they rolled about in ways of harlotry  
and in the wealth of wickedness.<sup>18</sup>*

*And with vengeance and rancour every man for his brother,  
And every man hating his companion,  
And every man hid himself from the<sup>19</sup> blood-relative of his  
flesh.*

*And they drew together for a purpose,  
And schemed for wealth and plunder.*

*And<sup>20</sup> every man did what was right in his eyes,  
And every man chose the stubbornness of his own heart;  
And they did not separate from the people<sup>21</sup> or from their  
sins.*

*But they became lawless with a high-hand  
by walking in the ways of wicked men.*

---

*Concerning whom<sup>22</sup> El said:  
'The venom of serpents is their wine,  
and the head of asps is deadly'.*

*The 'serpents' (are)<sup>23</sup> the kings of the nations, and 'their  
wine' is their ways. And 'the head of asps' is the head of<sup>24</sup> the  
kings of Greece who came against them to execute vengeance.*

*And in all these things 'the builders of<sup>25</sup> the wall' and 'the  
daubers of plaster' did not understand; for a walker of wind and  
raiser of storms and spouter to men<sup>26</sup> of lies {spouted to*

*them<sup>2</sup> against all of whose congregation the wrath of El was kindled.*

*And as Moses said<sup>27</sup> to Israel:*

*'Not because of your righteousness or because of the  
uprightness of your heart  
are you coming to possess<sup>28</sup> these nations.'  
Rather 'because He loved your fathers,  
and because He kept the promise'.*

*Thus is {the<sup>33</sup>}<sup>29</sup> judgment for those who return of Israel {who<sup>34</sup>} had departed from the way of the people. Because El loved the 'ancestors'<sup>30</sup> who testified for the people concerning El, and He loves those who entered after them because for them is<sup>31</sup> the covenant of the fathers. But El hates and abhors 'the builders of the wall' and His wrath is kindled against them and against all<sup>32</sup> who walk after them. And like this judgment (it is) for all who reject the commandments of El or<sup>33</sup> forsake them or turn in the stubbornness of their hearts.*

---

<sup>32</sup>Restored from Ms.A following Davies, p261.

<sup>33</sup>Restored from Ms.A.

<sup>34</sup>Restored in both Mss.A and B following Ginzberg, p37.

#### 1.7.4. The leaders of Judah: 8<sup>3-19</sup> = 19<sup>15-33</sup>.

The redactional introduction: 8<sup>2-3</sup> = 19<sup>15-16</sup>.

These two lines form the introduction to the following section, 8<sup>4-19</sup> = 19<sup>17-33</sup>, which appears to be a collection of poetic, semi-poetic, and midrashic passages that the redactor has placed together.

It is generally agreed that the original allusion to Hosea 5<sup>10</sup> in Ms.A has been fully expanded by the scribe of Ms.B who also supplied the introductory k'šr dbr; the former is confirmed by the fact that in Ms.B the form 'brh has not been corrected to 'brty in accordance with the MT and all versions.<sup>49</sup> The main question though is whether this section ends with the phrase hw' hywm 'šr ypqd 'l or with this allusion to Hosea 5<sup>10</sup>. Davies believes that the current text is impossible and so suggests that the original text read:<sup>50</sup>

hw' hywm 'šr ypqd 'l t śry yhwđh ..

*This is the day on which El shall punish the princes of Judah,  
'against whom you pour out your wrath'.*

The accusative was later omitted, the phrase śry yhwđh was attached to the quotation, and hyw added. For Murphy-O'Connor on the other hand, Ms.A begins a new section with the words hyw śry yhwđh ..., a fact which has been lost by the actions of the scribe of Ms.B who has smoothed over this

---

<sup>49</sup>So Carmignac, VT, 7, p63-64. However, the form has lost the article, cf.8<sup>3</sup>, perhaps suggesting that the author had a variant text before him.

<sup>50</sup>Davies, p158-9.

seam by adding  $k\check{s}r\ dbr$ .<sup>51</sup>

There is a great deal of difference of opinion concerning the identity of the  $\acute{s}ry\ yhw\delta h$ . Jeremias thinks the reference is to the sect on the grounds of the reference in 4<sup>11</sup> to 'House of Judah' and that in 6<sup>6</sup> – 'El called all of them  $\acute{s}rym$ ', and because of the presence of several verbs of treason.<sup>52</sup> Murphy-O'Connor agrees with Stegemann's opinion that the solution should be sought in the biblical evidence where 'the closest parallels to the type of accusations found here (8<sup>4f</sup>) are the criticisms of the wealthy, corrupt, upper classes found in the prophetic writings'<sup>53</sup> The verbs of treason should be seen to be directed against non-members rather than ex-members, e.g. they are being criticised for not 'forsaking the way of traitors'. Furthermore, continue both Murphy-O'Connor and Davies, this outburst against the 'establishment' was in the context of a returning group of exiles who found life in Judah not at all as they expected.

This problem can largely be solved by considering the precise translation of the word  $\acute{s}r$ . The most common occurrence of  $\acute{s}r$  in the scrolls occurs in 1QM.3-5 (eleven times) where it has the accepted meaning 'leader, chief', and similarly in 1QSa (three times) and 1QpH.4<sup>3</sup>. The word is also found in this document in a positive sense in 6<sup>3,6</sup> and for the former Numbers 21<sup>18</sup> quotation the LXX text reads  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  = 'rulers'. The phrase  $\acute{s}r\ 'lym$  (1QH.10<sup>8</sup>) is best rendered 'ruler of gods', whilst the phrase  $\acute{s}r\ (h)\ 'wrym$  in

---

<sup>51</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 78, p226-7.

<sup>52</sup>Jeremias, Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit, p110f.

<sup>53</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, 'The Critique of the Princes of Judah (CD VIII:3-19)', RB, 79, p207 (brackets mine) – cf. Stegemann, p111 and Davies, p166.

1QS.3<sup>20</sup> and CD.5<sup>18</sup> has the sense 'ruler/commander of lights'<sup>54</sup> Thus the phrase here (especially in Ms.A) should be translated as 'leaders/rulers of Judah', and compared to the similar phrase in 4QpPss<sup>a</sup>. 3<sup>7</sup> śry h[rs']h, 'the rulers of wickedness'. The polemic can now clearly be seen to be directed at the Jewish establishment; furthermore in the parallels of the criticisms below with other parts of the Admonition, especially the 'Twelve Duties', a deliberate attempt is being made by the author to accuse the 'leaders of Judah' of many of the faults that he beseeches his own followers to avoid.

mśygy gbwl (19<sup>15-16</sup> only). It should be noted that the 'leaders of Judah' are not equated with this group but merely likened to them. This group is also found in 5<sup>20</sup> where they are made responsible for leading Israel astray at the time of the exile, which is the sense of Hosea 5<sup>10,55</sup> and thus the current leaders of Israel can be likened to the removers of the bound of the exilic period in that they led Israel away from true interpretation of the law.

The second warning: 8<sup>4-9</sup> = 19<sup>17-21</sup>.

We have already shown that when the redactor incorporated this originally poetic piece into the document he supplied the subject, namely 'the leaders of Judah'.

Ms.A: ky yhlw lmrp' wydqmwm kl mwrđym.	5	12
Ms.B: ky b'w bbryt tśwbh	4	7

<sup>54</sup>Cf. also 1QM.13<sup>10</sup> with 'm'wr'; see too my notes on 5<sup>18</sup> - p179-180.

<sup>55</sup>The spelling here with a 'śin' represents MT usage, whilst that of 5<sup>20</sup> with a samek represents current usage - Qimron, p28-29.

The problems lie in the A text. Firstly the root of  $y\dot{h}lw$ , which is either from  $y\dot{h}l$  'to hope'<sup>56</sup> or  $\dot{h}lh$  'to be sick, ill',<sup>57</sup> and secondly the corrupt  $wy\dot{d}qmwm$ . For the latter Rabin's suggestion to read  $wy\dot{d}bq mwm$  'the blemish clove/stuck' seems to have been almost universally accepted;<sup>58</sup> the form  $m\dot{u}m$  being a contraction of  $m^e \dot{u}m$ .<sup>59</sup> Parallelism would then strongly support the meaning 'to be sick, ill' for the form  $y\dot{h}lw$ . Murphy-O'Connor points to the *hapax legomena* of roots  $y\dot{h}l/\dot{h}lh$  and  $mrd$  and of the words  $mrp'$  and  $mwm$  which he says militate against Ms.A being a substitution, because a glossator would not have used unfamiliar language. Thus the scribe of Ms.B emended the text because it was corrupt and cryptic to give instead a more obvious meaning.<sup>60</sup> Ginzberg adds that Ms.A tells of the events under Demetrius I and of his army which crushed the leaders of Judah; by the time Ms.B was copied these events were too far in the past and were therefore substituted.<sup>61</sup> However, from the poetical point of view Ms.B represents the better text, since if we combine this cola with the following we have a bicolon of 4:4 stress and 7:7 syllables, but why would it have been altered? The answer maybe because Ms.A text alludes to Hosea 5<sup>13</sup>:

*When Ephraim saw his sickness,  
and Judah his wound,  
then Ephraim turned to Assyria,  
and sent to the great king for help.*

---

<sup>56</sup>Kuhn, p89; Carmignac, RQ, 2, p65; Rabin, p32; Davies, p253 - the root occurs four times in 1QH.

<sup>57</sup>Schechter, p73 (reading 'l'yn mrp'); Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 79, p201 - the root occurs twice in 1QH.

<sup>58</sup>Rabin, p32.

<sup>59</sup>The elision of the aleph is a common feature in Qumran Hebrew, e.g. 'rws' for 'rw's/r'ws' - see: Kutscher, 1QIs<sup>a</sup>, p20-23 cf.p167f and Qimron, p20-22.

<sup>60</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 79, p202.

<sup>61</sup>Ginzberg, p35.

*But he is not able to cure you,  
not able to heal your sores.*

This biblical passage would clearly have been re-interpreted in the light of the envoy of the Pharisees (=‘Ephraim’) to Demetrius III which is related in 4QpNah.1<sup>1-3</sup>, especially in light of the Deut.32<sup>33</sup> Midrash in 8<sup>9-12</sup> = 19<sup>21-24</sup>.<sup>62</sup> Thus it could be argued that this colon originated from the same hand that is responsible for the allusion to Hosea 5<sup>10</sup> in the Ms.A text, and, of course, also the Isaiah 7<sup>17</sup> quotation which refers to the two houses of ‘Ephraim’ and ‘Judah’. If this is correct then the poetry would have originally begun with the unique phrase *bbryt tšwbh* (19<sup>16</sup>), which indicates that the following list of iniquities was originally a warning to, or condemnation of, those sectarians who have turned away from the sect. This position is further suggested once it is realized that this ‘list’ of iniquities in 8<sup>4-9</sup> = 19<sup>17-21</sup> have all been legislated against elsewhere; thus the second colon of this opening bicolon would seem to be alluding to 1<sup>12</sup> and 2<sup>6</sup>.

Ms.A - *wytwgllw bdrky zwnwt*  
Ms.B - *wytwgllw bdrky znwt*

A close look at the original Cairo manuscript T-S 16-311 clearly reveals that the verb is *gll*, and not *’ll* as Schechter transcribed it.<sup>63</sup> The plene form of the verb in Ms.A also helps to solve the related problem, which is that *znwt* and *zwnwt* are merely variant spellings rather than alternative readings, and

---

<sup>62</sup>If then, this allusion to Hosea 5<sup>13</sup> is secondary, the redactor must have worked after this event, viz. post-88 B.C.

<sup>63</sup>Schechter, p101; with ‘*gll*’: Kuhn, p45 and Lohse, p102 (although they read the plene *wytwgllw*.) and Carmignac, RQ, 2, p54.

thus the waw represents what would be a šewa in the Tiberian pointing.<sup>64</sup> The verb gll is also found at 3<sup>17</sup>, 1QS.4<sup>19,21</sup>, 1QH.6<sup>22,17<sup>19</sup></sup>, whilst 'harlotry' is forbidden or warned against in 2<sup>16</sup>, 4<sup>17,20</sup> (=Belial's first net) and 7<sup>1</sup>, and 1QS.1<sup>6</sup> and 4<sup>10</sup>. To balance this colon with the previous one a silent stress is presumed in the following colon (wbhwn hrš'h), namely wytg(w)llw which counts four syllables. hwn is the second of Belial's net, and is also found in 6<sup>16</sup> so again picking up an issue that members of the sect have already been warned against.

The following tricolon (8<sup>5b-6</sup> = 19<sup>18-19a</sup>) is fairly straight-forward and parallels 6<sup>20-7<sup>1</sup></sup>. In the first colon we have a further instance of plene spelling in Ms.A over against B, and again the *plene* letter in nytwr represents what was a šewa in the Tiberian pointing.<sup>65</sup> The suffix -yhw (on 'hyhw) in Ms.B is a historical spelling which was preserved in the scrolls, replacing the biblical suffix "-yw" ('hyw) which is found in Ms.A.<sup>66</sup> The verb yt'lmw is uncommon in the Hithpael,<sup>67</sup> and it is difficult to yield an appropriate sense. Thus both Schechter and Charles on the basis of 7<sup>1</sup> read wym'lw: 'And they committed trespass every man against his next of kin';<sup>68</sup> certainly, a sense such as this is required.

The bicolon wygšw lzmh wytgbrw lhwn wlbs' in 8<sup>7</sup> = 19<sup>19</sup> has no parallels

---

<sup>64</sup>See Qimron, p17 and p99 where he notes that 'zwnwt' (=zwnwt') is also found in 4QMMT B 69 and 76. Cf. also CD 7<sup>1</sup>. Carmignac, RQ, 2, p53-54 lists 8 cases where Ms.A has plene writing where the B text does not, as against only 2 where the reverse is the case.

<sup>65</sup>See again Carmignac, RQ, 2, p54 and Qimron ,p17.

<sup>66</sup>See Qimron, p60 and Kutscher, 1QIs<sup>a</sup>, p443 and p447.

<sup>67</sup>Only here in the scrolls, (the Niphal participle 'n'lmym' occurs four times elsewhere in the scrolls, but this has the sense 'cunning'); the Hithpael occurs once in Job 6<sup>16</sup> in the phrase 'the snow hides itself'.

<sup>68</sup>Schechter, p73 and Charles, p817.



in this document; is it therefore secondary? A close examination of T-S 10 K6 and T-S 16-311 reveals that both manuscripts read *wytgbrw*, a verb also found in 20<sup>33</sup>, and not *wytnkrw* as Schechter transcribes in 8<sup>7</sup>.<sup>69</sup> The pair *lhwn wlbš'* also occurs in 1QpHab.9<sup>5</sup> in relation to the last priests of Jerusalem = the Hasmonean dynasty, further evidence that the *šry yhwdh* are the leaders in Jerusalem and not a rival faction.<sup>70</sup> This is the second bicolon to have an uneven stress thus paralleling in a way the previous bicolon.

The second tricolon (8<sup>7b-8</sup> = 19<sup>19c-21a</sup>) closely parallels its initial two cola with the warning found in 2<sup>16-18</sup> addressed to new members, and the criticism found in 3<sup>5-6</sup> of the Israelites during their exile in Egypt. The clause *wmḥt 'tm* appears only in Ms.B. Murphy-O'Connor argues that it is secondary because in 1QpH., 1QS and 1QM *'m* in the singular always has a positive value, yet here *'tm* is a pejorative and the function of this addition is to make this point clear.<sup>71</sup> Yet on poetical grounds it is preferable to see it as an original part of the text.

The final bicolon has a parallel in the phrase *bḏrk(y) rš'ym* with 2<sup>3</sup>; the plural there would agree with Ms.B. Yet perhaps this bicolon is secondary, for firstly the section markers ':' in Ms.B divide this bicolon off from the rest of the poetry, and secondly the root *pr'* only occurs elsewhere in the scrolls in 1QS.6<sup>26</sup> where the word *'myty* also occurs, the latter only appearing elsewhere in CD 19<sup>8</sup>, a secondary section.

Thus in conclusion, the poet, in compiling this passage deliberately uses phrases that he had used elsewhere in the previous poetical sections. This

---

<sup>69</sup>Schechter, p111

<sup>70</sup>The word *'zmh'*, 'plunder', is a hapax legomenon within the scrolls.

<sup>71</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 79, p202.

perhaps suggests that this poetical passage was originally composed as a 'warning' (condemnation) to be appended to the Twelve Duties in the manner of a 'curse', and is paralleled by the 'blessing' found in 20<sup>27-34</sup>. The redactor however redirected this passage against 'the leaders of Judah', namely the Hasmonean dynasty, and the allusion to Hosea 5<sup>13</sup> suggests this occurred after the Civil War of 88 B.C.. Somewhat surprisingly, the poetry of this section is better (metrically) in Ms.B, and perhaps this is because the latter was not the main version of this document and so not subject to continuous revision and updating.

The Deuteronomy 32<sup>33</sup> Midrash: 8<sup>9-12</sup> = 19<sup>21-24</sup>.

If we put the midrashic expansions back into the quotation one gets:

*'The poison of the kings of the peoples are their ways,  
And the head of the kings of Greece is deadly.'*

The word ywn is the usual biblical term for the Greeks - Daniel 8<sup>21</sup>, 10<sup>20</sup>, 11<sup>2</sup> - after the son of Japheth, the alleged founder of the Greek nation - Genesis 10<sup>2,4</sup>. In the Scrolls a further reference to the kings of Javan is found in 4QpNah Frgs 3-4, 1<sup>1-3</sup>:

*Whither the lion goes, there is the lion's cub,<sup>2</sup> [with none to disturb it] (2<sup>2b</sup>). [Interpreted, this concerns Deme]trius king of Javan who sought, on the counsel of those who seek smooth things,<sup>3</sup> to enter Jerusalem. [But El did not permit the city to be delivered] into the hands of the kings of Javan, from the time of Antiochus until the coming of the rulers of the Kittim.*

Obviously Javan is Greece, the Kittim are the Romans, and Antiochus is Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Demetrius is almost certainly Demetrius III who would be the natural ally of the Pharisees (=the seekers of smooth things) against

the Sadducean Alexander Jannaeus (=the furious young lion of the following sections of 4QpNah). So if we return to our passage, 'the head (=chief/strongest) of the kings of Greece' is seemingly Antiochus IV, the only Greek king in recent time to have conquered Jerusalem and by definition therefore the greatest of them;<sup>72</sup> thus the participle hb' has a past sense 'who came' as it has in 7<sup>19</sup>. The 'kings of the peoples' are the kings of the gentile nations. Thus the midrash is saying that 'the leaders of Judah' (who are still the subject) are falling into Hellenistic beliefs and practices which are consequently poisoning the bloodstream of Jewish life, and this poison had basically been introduced into the Jewish life by 'the head of the Kings of Greece' (=Antiochus IV). There is no need to argue that because this is a reference to the Greeks and not the Romans that this passage and thus this document must pre-date the Romans, for even after the latter's conquest in 63 B.C. Greek culture still predominated throughout the Mediterranean area including Palestine.<sup>73</sup>

Ms.A: hb' l'swt bhm nqmh.  
 Ms.B: hb' 'lyhm lnqm nqmh.

How did these divergent texts originate? Carmignac suggests that there was a visual jump from hb' to bhm in Ms.B with a later restoration of the sense.<sup>74</sup> Murphy-O'Connor notes that hb' is singular in sense and so does not accord with the plural 'kings of Javan', and thus originally nqmh was the subject of

---

<sup>72</sup>Davies suggests translating 'r'x' as 'poison' > 'the poison of the kings of Greece', thus making it a general condemnation of the Greeks and their Hellenistic practices - p259.

<sup>73</sup>See: Dupont-Sommer, p133 n3 - cf.p119-120.

<sup>74</sup>Carmignac, RQ, 2, p62.

hb' and began a new sentence.<sup>75</sup> Yet surely the latter is making a grammatical problem out of nothing, for r's is the singular subject of the verb, since it was only Antiochus IV who came to inflict vengeance (viz. capture Jerusalem - 4QpNah.). I feel that Ms.A is a bit clumsy and the scribe of Ms.B simply tried to smooth out the text, changing the 'inflict vengeance' to the more normal 'execute vengeance' in line with 1<sup>17</sup> and 19<sup>13</sup>.

The Builders of the Wall: 8<sup>12-13</sup> = 19<sup>24-26</sup>.

wbkl 'lh l' hbynw bwny hḥwṣ wṭḥy htpl<sup>76</sup> The first problem is what constitutes the subject of the verb, hbynw; is it 'the builders of the wall and the daubers of plaster' who did not understand,<sup>77</sup> or is the subject still 'the leaders of Judah' who did not seek to understand 'the builders of the wall and the daubers of plaster'?<sup>78</sup> The theme of lack of understanding has already been met with in 5<sup>17</sup> where Deut.32<sup>28</sup> is quoted, and in 1<sup>1,8,10</sup>, 2<sup>14</sup> and 6<sup>2</sup>.

The biblical background for the phrase bwny hḥwṣ is Ezekiel 13<sup>10-11</sup>:

*..they (=false prophets) lead My people astray, saying 'Peace' when there is no peace; and because when the people build a wall, these prophets daub it with whitewash; <sup>11</sup> say to those that daub it with whitewash that it shall fall! There will be a deluge of rain, great hailstones will fall, and a stormy wind break out.*

In the MT there is a distinction between the people who build the wall and

---

<sup>75</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 79, p208.

<sup>76</sup>Ms.B has hḥwṣ (yodh) and tpl (no article).

<sup>77</sup>Charles, p818-819; Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 79, p209; Davies, p255.

<sup>78</sup>Rabin, p34.

those that plaster it; only the latter are condemned, for their message was like whitewash on a mud-brick wall which provided no protection against the storm. However here, 'the builders of the wall' are placed, though not necessarily equated, with 'the daubers of plaster', and the passage seems to be saying that the mass of the Jewish population along with their religious leaders do not understand 'these things', namely the general wickedness of 'the leaders of Judah', because of the false testimony of 'the spouter of lies'. Thus the phrase 'the builders of the wall' has a wider meaning than that found in 4<sup>19</sup> which is more in line with the Ezekiel passage, but that unlike the biblical passage both groups are condemned here.

Ms.A: ky šwql rwḥ wmtyp kzb hṭyp lhm.

Ms.B: ky hwlk rwḥ wšql swpwt wmtyp 'dm lkzb.

This text alludes to Micah 2<sup>11</sup>:

lw 'yš hlk rwḥ wšqr kzb  
 'ṭp lk lynn wlškr  
 whyh mṭyp h'm hzh.

*If a man should walk (in) the wind/spirit and utter falsehood,  
 (saying) 'I will spout to you of wine and strong drink',  
 He would be a spouter for this people!*

This biblical passage is the only place the root nṭp is found in the MT and must therefore be the origin for the use of this verb in our document. The reference to 'wine' perhaps ties our passage in with the preceding Deut.32<sup>33</sup> Midrash, whilst the 'Spouter' is, both here (8<sup>13</sup>=19<sup>25-26</sup>=Mi.2<sup>11</sup>) and in 4<sup>19-20</sup>, again accused of false prophecy. Murphy-O'Connor argues that Ms.B has developed from Ms.A in its attempt to make a more direct reference to Micah

2<sup>11</sup>, (as with Hosea 5<sup>10</sup> in 19<sup>15-16</sup>),<sup>79</sup> whilst both Rabin and Carmignac try to construct an original text from combining the readings of both manuscripts.<sup>80</sup> As it is so difficult to fully explain the discrepancies between Mss.A and B, then perhaps an equally valid approach is to look at the possible original poetic structure of this text:

wbkl 'lh l' hbynw	4	8
bwny h̄yṣ w̄ḥy t̄pl	2-4	9
ky hwlk rwh w̄sq̄l swpwt	2-4	8
wm̄ṭyp kzb h̄ṭyp lhm	4	9
'šr hrh 'p 'l bkl 'dtw.	4	8

The metre is very regular, with the second and third cola each containing two construct constructions; there is a bicolon on the 'builders of the wall,..' and one on 'the spouter' with a concluding line on God's wrath. If poetry really underlies this text then it may belong to the same level as the poetry found in 8<sup>4-9</sup> = 19<sup>16-21</sup>. However, the allusion to 'the leaders of Judah' suggests that this passage is the work of the redactor. But who is the Spouter spouting to? In Ms.B it is explicitly stated to be 'mankind' which suggests a clarificatory gloss, whilst in Ms.A he spouts 'to them', namely either 'the leaders of Judah' or 'the builders of the wall'. However, if 'the builders of the wall' are the common people (as they are in Ezekiel 13<sup>10</sup>), then this would agree with the secondary 'dm in Ms.B. Thus the above text has the following sense:

*And all these things (=the wickedness of 'the leaders of Judah') 'the builders of the wall and the daubers of plaster' (=the common people with their religious leaders) did not understand; for a*

---

<sup>79</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 79, p203. The suggestion that Ms.B is closer to the biblical text than Ms.A is not undeniably the case, for the first four words of Ms.A are equally close to Micah 2<sup>11</sup>, especially since T-S 10 K6 actually reads 'swql' (as Ms.B) and not 'mbwhl' as Schechter transcribes it - p111.

<sup>80</sup>Rabin, p34-35: ky hwlk rwh w̄sq̄l swpwt wm̄ṭyp 'dm lkzb h̄ṭyp lhm; Carmignac, RQ, 2, p64 under 'Cas inexpliques': 'dm hwlk rwh w̄sq̄l swpwt wm̄ṭyp kzb h̄ṭyp lhm.

*walker of wind, and raiser of storms, and spouter of lies spouted to them (=the common people ...), against all of whose congregation the wrath of El was kindled.*

The two Deuteronomic Quotations: 8<sup>14-15</sup> = 19<sup>26-28</sup>.

The first quote from Deuteronomy 9<sup>5</sup> has been deliberately altered:

*Not because of your righteousness or the uprightness of your heart did you come to possess their land; but because of the wickedness of these nations.*

In abbreviating this quotation 'the leaders of Judah' come to possess 'the nations' not 'the land', and by using Deut.7<sup>8</sup> our author has also changed the reason why they were victorious. Thus 'the leaders of Judah' (Ms.B adds 'Israel') came to possess 'these nations', namely the petty states and kingdoms that were conquered under John Hyrcanus and Alexander Jannaeus, (as they had been previously under Joshua); thus this text must post-date at least some of these military campaigns.

Those who betray the sect: 8<sup>16-21</sup> = 19<sup>28-33</sup>.

(w)kn (h)mšpṭ lšby yśr'l srw mdrk h'm.

Charles and Rabinowitz both begin a new section here, and the paragraphing in Ms.A perhaps seems to support this.<sup>81</sup> Yet the Hebrew particle kn always refers to what becomes before it, and so 'the judgment' must therefore refer back to that inflicted against 'the Spouter and his congregation' in 8<sup>13</sup> = 19<sup>26</sup>.

---

<sup>81</sup>Charles, p819; Rabinowitz, JBL, 73, p30.

The phrase šby yśr 'l to a certain degree parallels śry yhwdh.<sup>82</sup> Ginzberg contends that we need to read the relative pronoun before srw as in 8<sup>4</sup>, or read srw as sry as in 1<sup>13</sup> and 2<sup>6</sup>.

Ms.A: b'hbt 'l 't <sup>17</sup> hr'šnym 'śr hy'yrw  
'hryw 'hb ...<sup>18</sup>. h'bwt.

Ms.B: b'hbt 'l 't hr'šnym <sup>30</sup> 'śr h'ydw  
'l h'm 'hry 'l w'hb ...<sup>31</sup>. 'bwt.

Murphy-O'Connor has forwarded a theory which seems to account for these variant texts.<sup>83</sup> First, as is generally agreed, hy'yrw does not yield much sense and so should be emended to accord with Ms.B - h(y)'ydw, hē'îdû - arising from the confusion of resh and dalet and with a mistaken *mater lectionis*<sup>84</sup> He then argues that 'l h'm is secondary, because the noun 'm made the suffix on 'hryw ambiguous, resulting in the redactor of Ms.B needing to supply 'l. Finally the wāw in w'hb seems redundant.<sup>85</sup> The r'šnym are here the founder members of the sect as they are in 4<sup>6-9</sup> which shares some common terminology with our passage. The phrase bryt h'bwt refers however to the covenant of the patriarchs which the sectarian 'covenant' had renewed rather than replaced.<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup>Murphy-O'Connor (RB, 79, p211) originally argued that the meaning here was different from the geographical sense ('returnees') found in 4<sup>2</sup> and 6<sup>5</sup>, yet following Davies' criticism (p93-95 and p167-168, cf. Knibb, p36f) he now believes that the phrase has the sense 'converts' in all passages (RB, 92, p222-3); Davies sticks to his original translation, 'captivity of Israel' - Behind the Essenes, p43-44.

<sup>83</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 79, p203.

<sup>84</sup>Davies argues that this reconstruction in MsA is impossible and that we should instead emend to hlkw (cf. 4<sup>19</sup>, 19<sup>32</sup> and 11<sup>5</sup>), although he admits he "cannot explain the corruption" - p255, note 17. T-S 16-311 seemingly has a dalet although all that is left is the horizontal bar; T-S 10 K6 does have a resh.

<sup>85</sup>So too: Rubinstein, VT, 7, p357.

<sup>86</sup>The phrase is also found in 1QM.13<sup>7</sup> and 14<sup>9-10</sup>; see Chapter 3.1.4. on 'Covenant', p382-386.



Ms.A: wśwn'y 't bwny hḥwṣ.  
Ms.B: wśwn' wmt'b 'l 't bwny hḥyṣ.

wśnw'y needs to be emended to wśnw'w to obtain the correct negative sense for 'the builders of the wall'. Carmignac argues that the words mt'b 'l were lost from Ms.A and therefore a later copyist supplied the prefixed 'b' and the pronoun suffix.<sup>87</sup> Alternatively Murphy-O'Connor follows Jeremias in pointing to the parallel between b'hbt 'l and bśnw'w, so favouring the Ms.A text.<sup>88</sup> The 'builders of the wall' are here 'those who set the standards of religious life', as they are in 4<sup>19</sup>.

Ms.A: ḥrh 'pw.  
Ms.B: wḥrh 'pw bm wbkl hhlkym 'ḥryhm.

Murphy-O'Connor argues that Ms.B represents a redactional addition aimed at reorientating the text towards a present/future context, and certainly (like w'hb in 19<sup>30</sup>) it 'falsely leads one to anticipate a recital of future events'.<sup>89</sup> However as the root ḥrh never occurs elsewhere in this document without an object then it seems likely that Ms.A is missing something which Ms.B has tried to supply; to provide a perfect metrical balance with the preceding colon in Ms.A one could restore b'lylwtyhm on the basis of 5<sup>16</sup>.

wkmšptṭ hzh lkl hm(w)'s bmswt 'l  
wy'zbn wypnw bšryrwt lbn

There is a problem of 'number' here, for the text begins with lkl + the singular participle hm's (as in 20<sup>8</sup>), followed by the form wy'zbn which can

---

<sup>87</sup>Carmignac, RQ, 2, p64.

<sup>88</sup>Jeremias, Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit, p115-6 note 4; Murphy-O'Connor RB, 79, p204.

<sup>89</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 79, p204; the quote is from Rubinstein, VT, 7, p358. Carmignac tries to explain it as a 'visual jump' from 'ḥrh 'pw' to 'ḥryhm' - RQ, 2, p62-3.

either be rendered: 'they left them' (=mšwt)<sup>90</sup> or 'He (God) left them' (=k1 hm's).<sup>91</sup> The former would seem preferable because it avoids the change of subject of the latter translation and agrees with the following wypnw; thus wy'zbn is defective for wy'zbnm. The mšwt 'l are those of the Mosaic covenant, so that this bicolon returns once against to those that are adopting Hellenistic practices and consequently rejecting the law of Moses.

Ms.A only: hw' hdbꝛ 'šꝛ 'mr yrmyhw lbrwk bn nryyh  
w'lyš' <sup>21</sup> lghzy n'rw.

Gehazi was Elisha's successor as Baruch was Jeremiah's. This gloss seems to be referring to Jeremiah 45<sup>4-5</sup> and 2Kings.5<sup>26-27</sup> respectively, both of which talk of impending judgment.<sup>92</sup> Thus this is a further example of a reference to a biblical passage being used as evidence of the inevitability of the oncoming judgment - cf. Isaiah 7<sup>17</sup> in 7<sup>10-13</sup>.

It is possible to reconstruct this passage 8<sup>16-19</sup> = 19<sup>28-33</sup> as poetry,<sup>93</sup> taking into account the above comments, and so yield the following text of an introductory bicolon followed by two four-line stanzas:

kn hmšꝛꝛ lšby yšꝛ'l	4	9
'šꝛ <sup>94</sup> srw mdrk h'm	3	7
b'hbt 'l 't hr'snym	3	8

---

<sup>90</sup>Charles, p820; Rabin, p36; Vermes, p90; Davies, p255; Knibb, p66.

<sup>91</sup>Schechter, p75.

<sup>92</sup>Ginzberg (p38) notes that Damascus was the scene of Gehazi's sinful behaviour - TP Sanhedrin X,29b and TB Sanhedrin 107b.

<sup>93</sup>Represented as a paragraph in Ms.A; Ms.B continues to 'hhyym' (19<sup>34</sup>) before putting a section marker ':

<sup>94</sup>After Ginzberg, p37.

'šr h'ydw 'hryw <sup>95</sup>	2	6
'hb 't hb'ym 'hryhm	3	9
ky lhm bryt h'bwt	3	7
wbśwn'w 't bwny hḥys	3	9
ḥrh 'pw b'lylwtyhm <sup>96</sup>	3	9
wkmšpṭ hzh lkl hm's bmswt 'l	4	12
wy'zb{w}m wypnw bšryrwt lbm <sup>97</sup>	4	12

But what is the purpose of these lines? The main subject is šby yśr 'l, namely those who joined the sect, and this seems tautological in light of the following section 19<sup>33</sup>-20<sup>1</sup>. Consequently, the latter, which betrays to my mind a number of linguistically late features for this document,<sup>98</sup> appears to begin a 'secondary' addition introducing the section 20<sup>1</sup>-27. Our current text refers to all those that transgress the sectarian torah, and who thus receive the same judgment as those (outside the sect) who have abandoned the Mosiac torah; thus only one type of transgression is envisaged in our current text. Finally there does seem to be a number of semi-poetical passages here in addition to the poetry of 8<sup>4-9</sup> = 19<sup>16-21</sup>; do we have therefore some form of original poetical under-structure which has been considerably reworked by the redactor?

---

<sup>95</sup>Ms B yields metre of 3,10.

<sup>96</sup>After 5<sup>16</sup>.

<sup>97</sup>Ms.A would give metre 4,11 6,14 for the final bicolon.

<sup>98</sup>Viz.: the reference to: 'the new covenant', 'the land of Damascus', 'the council of the people' (giving 'm a positive sense in contrast to 8<sup>16</sup> = 19<sup>29</sup>), the death of the Teacher and the coming of the Messiah.

*<Therefore> all the men who entered into <sup>34</sup> the new covenant in the land of Damascus and turned again and acted treacherously and turned aside from the well of the waters of life, shall not be reckoned in the assembly of the people and in their register <sup>35</sup> they shall n[ot] be written, from the day of the gathering in of the <sup>1</sup> Teacher of the community until there stands a Messiah from Aaron and Israel.*

*And thus is the judgment <sup>2</sup> for all those who enter the congregation of the men of perfect holiness yet are loath to fulfil the precepts of the upright; <sup>3</sup> this is the man who is to be melted in the midst of a furnace - when his works become apparent he shall be sent from the congregation <sup>4</sup> as though his lot had never fallen in the midst of those taught by El. According to the word of his treachery the men of <sup>5</sup> knowledge will rebuke him until the day when he once more stands in the place of the men of perfect holiness. <sup>6</sup> And when his works become apparent according to the interpretation of the law in which <sup>7</sup> the men of perfect holiness walk, let no man agree with him in wealth or in labour, <sup>8</sup> for all the holy ones of the Most High have cursed him.*

*And it is like this judgment for all those who reject both the former and <sup>9</sup> latter (commandments), who place idols upon their hearts and walk in the stubbornness of <sup>10</sup> their hearts - there shall be no portion for them in the House of the Law. Like the judgment of their companions - who turned back <sup>11</sup> with the men of scoffing - shall they be judged; for they spoke apostasy against the precepts of righteousness and rejected <sup>12</sup> the sure<sup>35</sup> covenant that was set up in the land of Damascus <this is the new covenant>. <sup>13</sup> And there shall not be for them or for their families, a portion in the House of the Law.*

*And from the day <sup>14</sup> of the gathering in of the Teacher of the community until the destruction of all the men of war who <sup>15</sup> [turn]ed back with the Man of Lie, is about forty years. And during this period <sup>16</sup> the wrath of El will be kindled against Israel, as He said, '(There is) no king, prince or judge, or anyone <sup>17</sup> who arbitrates with righteousness.'<sup>36</sup> But 'those who turn from the sin of J[acob]' <sup>37</sup> (are) the keepers<sup>38</sup> of the covenant of*

---

<sup>35</sup>Emending 'w 'mnh' to 'n 'mnh'.

<sup>36</sup>Hosea 3<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>37</sup>Isaiah 59<sup>20b</sup>.

<sup>38</sup>Emending 'šmrw' to 'šmry'.

*El; Then shall [speak]<sup>39</sup> every man<sup>18</sup> to his com[panion] so as to [make righteous every m]an his brother, that their step may hold fast to the way of El; 'And<sup>19</sup> El hearkened and listened' to their words, 'and a book of remembrance was written [before Him] for those who fear El and honour<sup>20</sup> His name,'<sup>40</sup> until salvation and righteousness are revealed 'to those who fear El.'<sup>41</sup> 'And you will discern once more between (the) righteous and<sup>21</sup> (the) wicked; between the servant of El and (him) who is not His servant.'<sup>42</sup> 'And He will show mercy [to thousands] to those who love Him<sup>22</sup> and who wait for Him for a thousand generations.'<sup>43</sup>*

*[ (Those) fro]m the House of Separation, who went out from the city of holiness,<sup>23</sup> and who placed their trust in El during the period of Israel's treachery, and declared the sanctuary unclean, and turned again<sup>24</sup> to the prince of the people in a fe[w] respects; [all of] them, every man according to his spirit, shall be judged by the congregation of<sup>25</sup> holiness.*

*And everyone who breached the bound of the law from those who entered the covenant, when<sup>26</sup> the glory of El becomes apparent to Israel, shall be cut off from the midst of the camp along with all the wicked of<sup>27</sup> Judah during the days of its purgings.*

---

<sup>39</sup>Reading 'ybdr' instead of the biblical 'nbdw' as Rabin, p40.

<sup>40</sup>Malachi 3<sup>16</sup>

<sup>41</sup>Taken from Malachi 3<sup>16</sup>.

<sup>42</sup>Malachi 3<sup>18</sup>

<sup>43</sup>Exodus 20<sup>6</sup> and Deut.7<sup>9</sup> combined.

### 1.7.5. The Redactor's Warnings: 19<sup>33</sup>-20<sup>27</sup>.

Most scholars begin a new section here and this would seem to be correct.<sup>1</sup> Murphy-O'Connor considers that there are three strands in this section:<sup>2</sup>

1. *Grundschrift* 19<sup>33b</sup>-20<sup>1</sup>, 20<sup>8b-13</sup>, and 20<sup>17b-22</sup>.
2. Interpolations: 20<sup>1c-8a</sup> and 20<sup>13c-17a</sup>.
3. Conclusion: 20<sup>22c-34</sup> which has two parts - 20<sup>22c-27a</sup> and 20<sup>27b-34</sup>.

Davies broadly agrees with the above outline except that he views 20<sup>13c-17a</sup> as part of the *Grundschrift*<sup>3</sup> However the main thrust of Davies' interpretation is that the community behind this section is different from that outlined in the rest of the Admonition, and so he arrives at some very different conclusions to those of Murphy-O'Connor. For Davies, the two main issues are those of apostasy of insiders, and the death of the Teacher of Righteousness who is not the same figure as the 'Teacher' mentioned in 20<sup>28-34</sup>.<sup>4</sup> Finally, Stegemann views the passage as a series of independent sources which have been redacted and to which glosses have been added in 20<sup>1c-8a</sup> and 20<sup>13c-15b</sup>.<sup>5</sup>

### The apostates of the sect: 19<sup>33</sup>-20<sup>1</sup>.

kn - not in Ms.A. which breaks off at the end of column 8 and has only a

---

<sup>1</sup>So Charles, p820; Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 79, p544-64; Davies, p173f; Knibb, p69f.

<sup>2</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 79, p544.

<sup>3</sup>Davies, p173-176.

<sup>4</sup>Davies, p174-5.

<sup>5</sup>Stegemann, p170-171.

few words of this section.

The reference to 'the new covenant' at the beginning of this section (19<sup>33</sup>-20<sup>27</sup>) is significant for Davies, for it indicates that this redactional section belongs to the Qumran recension of this document; the sect now looks back to this covenant made by the parent community in Babylon (= 'the land of Damascus').<sup>6</sup> Certainly both these phrases 'the new covenant' and 'the land of Damascus' represent a later outlook of the sect but I find no hard evidence to suggest that the outlook is pre-Qumranic; rather the latter interpretation seems to be based on some dubious exegesis (which removes the Teacher from the original 'pre-Qumran' document) and on the interpretation of 'Damascus' as Babylon.

The meaning of the form *wšbw* in 19<sup>34</sup> has been neatly summarized by Rubinstein:<sup>7</sup>

1. 'turned back'. This is the translation adopted by Davies who points to 20<sup>10,14,20,23,32</sup> as evidence that this root can be 'used...without qualification to connote defection from the community'.<sup>8</sup> This though creates a certain amount of tautology with *wysrw*.
2. 'returned (whence they came)'. Murphy-O'Connor favours this geographical sense, maintaining that not all those who

---

<sup>6</sup>Davies, p176-178.

<sup>7</sup>Rubinstein, VT, 7, p358.

<sup>8</sup>Davies, p76; so too Schechter, p75 and Charles, p820.

entered the new covenant in Damascus returned to Judah; thus this passage only concerns those who both entered the new covenant and returned to Judah and the waw is therefore a simple copulative.<sup>107</sup> Yet as Rubinstein asserts, if this were the case one would expect some form of qualification, such as 'rṣ yhwḏh.<sup>108</sup>

3. 'returned and ..' suggesting a repetition of an action, viz. 'and again did'; Rubinstein and Rabin favour this sense.<sup>109</sup> It cannot be argued that it is difficult to suppose a previous sinful act,<sup>110</sup> because this document has already indicated that the sect believed they had sinned once before in following the ways of Israel - 3<sup>17-18</sup>, 4<sup>9-10</sup>. Thus this sense seems to give the appropriate meaning.<sup>111</sup>

The roots bgd and šwb are elsewhere associated with the Man of Lie (1<sup>12-14</sup>, 20<sup>10-15</sup>), and the following words in 19<sup>35</sup> - 1' yḥšbw bswd 'm wbktbm 1' yktbw - are taken from Ezekiel 13<sup>9</sup>, the subsequent verse of which has already been alluded to in 8<sup>12-13</sup> = 19<sup>24-25</sup>. The same Hebrew roots denoting treachery are therefore being used of both 'the Spouter' and his followers, and those who

---

<sup>107</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 79, p545-6.

<sup>108</sup>Rubinstein, VT, 7, p358.

<sup>109</sup>Rubinstein (VT, 7, p358) notes that 'wayšwbw' would be more appropriate, whilst Rabin (p36) justifies his interpretation by pointing to the use of the root in 1QpHab.2<sup>3</sup> as restored by Rabinowitz, 'The Second and Third Columns of the Habakkuk Interpretation Scroll', JBL, 69 (1950), p39.

<sup>110</sup>Cf. Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 79, p545.

<sup>111</sup>Alternatively, it may be possible to read a hendiadys, as in 20<sup>20</sup>, so that 'wšbw wybgdw' should be rendered 'they continued to act treacherously' rather than translating with the sense 'they again acted treacherously'.



have left (turned away from) the sect.

The first mistake (ywr) in the title 'Teacher of Righteousness' arose through confusion of ywrh and mwrh. The redactor, realizing that ywrh ṣdq was a Messianic figure in 6<sup>11</sup>, corrected his text to mwrh to agree with 1<sup>11</sup>, 20<sup>28,32</sup>; however he forgot to correct it in 20<sup>14</sup>. In addition mwrh occurs twice through dittography as the scribe moved on to the next column. The phrase mwrh hyḥyḏ

can be translated, 'the Unique Teacher'.<sup>112</sup> However Segal emends yḥyḏ to yḥḏ 'community', a word not found in this document and consequently later wrongly emended by the Medieval copyists to yḥyḏ;<sup>113</sup> this is further supported by Wernberg-Møller who argues that our reading is simply the Samaritan pronunciation of yḥḏ, so that no emendation is necessary in order to translate 'community';<sup>114</sup> Murphy-O'Connor considers this text implies that only the Teacher can admit penitents, a concept which he says is completely at variance with Essene teaching; he thus suggests 20<sup>1b</sup> is a gloss.<sup>115</sup> Yet as Davies conversely contends, this is the meaning of the text; the coming Messiah will bring the final judgment by which time it will be too late to join the community and thus a man's only chance was to accept the authority of the Teacher whilst he was alive.<sup>116</sup> It was believed that his death would not predate the coming of the Messiah by any great length of time - 20<sup>15</sup> gives a

---

<sup>112</sup>After Schechter, p75, 'the only teacher'.

<sup>113</sup>Segal, 'The Habakkuk "Commentary" and the Damascus Fragments (A Historical Study)', JBL, 70 (1951), p132.

<sup>114</sup>Wernberg-Møller, 'Ṣdq, Ṣdyq, and Ṣdwq in the Zadokite Fragments (CDC), the Manual of Discipline (DSD), and the Habakkuk Commentary (DSH)', VT, 3 (1953), p311-2, note 1. Murphy-O'Connor postulates that the text originally simply had hyḥyḏ and that mwrh and ywrh 20<sup>14</sup> are later additions - RB, 79, p546 n6.

<sup>115</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 79, p546.

<sup>116</sup>Davies, p180. As we have seen in 1QS.1<sup>1-15</sup> it is the Maskil who admits, or recommends for admission, new members, under the approval of the rabbim; perhaps this reflects a later practice which developed after the Teacher died when the end of the age failed to come as expected.

figure of 'forty years' – and a similar idea is found in the New Testament where Jesus' death was thought in some way to bring on the Messianic age.

Those who are loath to fulfil the precepts of the upright: 20<sup>1-8</sup>.

The majority of scholars agree that this passage is an interpolation for the following reasons.<sup>117</sup> Firstly on grounds of vocabulary, for the passage contains three *hapax legomena* in the Scrolls, plus six *hapax legomena* in this document.<sup>118</sup> Furthermore, much of this vocabulary, which is unique or rare to this document, has parallels in 1QS, in particular the phrase 'nšy tmym (h)qdš in 20<sup>2,5,7</sup> which is only found elsewhere in 1QS.8<sup>20</sup>.<sup>119</sup> Secondly, whereas the *Grundschrift* witnesses a sect deep in trouble, 20<sup>1-8</sup> exhibits a community that is self-confident and secure,<sup>120</sup> and I would suggest that this change is because 20<sup>1-8</sup> dates from the lifetime of the Teacher whilst the *Grundschrift* is from a period after the Teacher's death. Murphy-O'Connor also considers that the interpolation is earlier, and argues that it is most closely related with Stage II of 1QS (c130 B.C.), whilst the *Grundschrift* equates with Stage IV (100-75 B.C.).<sup>121</sup>

Finally I would like to point to an additional factor which is that this passage seems to be connected with 20<sup>22-27</sup>: the form bhwp' is peculiar in this

---

<sup>117</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 79, p552-555; Davies, p181-182; Stegemann, p171; Schwartz, Der erste Teil der Damaskusschrift, p153-154.

<sup>118</sup>The following are my statistics compiled using Kuhn; the 3 Scroll *hapax legomena* are the roots 'qws', 'ntk', and 'wt'; the 6 *hapax legomena* in this document are: 'ysrym', 'kwr', 'lmwd', the root 'ykh' in the Hiphil, 'mdrs', and 'lywn' – of course all *hapax legomena* in the Scrolls are automatically *hapax legomena* in CD. There are also four words that only occur elsewhere in CD in the Laws of IX-XVI: the prefixed relative 's-', 'gwrl', 'bwdh', and the root 'rr'.

<sup>119</sup>Note also: 'ysrym' (20<sup>2</sup>) 1QS.3<sup>1</sup>, 4<sup>22</sup>; 'mdrs' (20<sup>6</sup>) 1QS.6<sup>24</sup>, 8<sup>15,26</sup>, plus 4QFl.1<sup>14</sup>; 'lywn' (20<sup>8</sup>) 1QS.4<sup>22</sup>, 10<sup>12</sup>, 11<sup>15</sup>, plus twice in 1QH.4<sup>31</sup> and 6<sup>33</sup>.

<sup>120</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 79, p555.

<sup>121</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 76, p548-9, and RB, 79, p555-556.

document to 20<sup>3,6</sup> and 20<sup>25</sup>, whilst the verbal noun ma'al is only found in 20<sup>4</sup>, 20<sup>23</sup> and 10<sup>8</sup>; thematically 20<sup>1-8</sup> deals with 'the men of perfect holiness' (cf. 1QS.8<sup>20</sup>), whilst 20<sup>24-25</sup> talks of 'the council of holiness' (cf. 1QS.2<sup>25</sup>, 8<sup>21</sup>) and includes references to 'the city of holiness' (20<sup>22</sup>) and the uncleanness of the sanctuary (20<sup>23</sup>); in 20<sup>6</sup> the apostate member is examined with respect to 'the midrash of the torah', whilst 20<sup>25b-27a</sup> is directed against 'all who breach the bound of the law'; in 20<sup>3</sup> the apostate member is melted (ntk) in the midst of the furnace, whilst in 20<sup>26</sup> he is cut off (krt) from the midst of the camp. All this suggests to me a common source for both these fragments.

---

wyqwš (20<sup>2</sup>): Schechter favours seeing this form as from the root qšš 'he will cease ..'.<sup>122</sup> Most scholars however favour the root qwš 'to loath, abhor',<sup>123</sup> Certainly the waw prefixing the form wyqwš should be taken in an adversive sense because yšrym is a title for the sect in 1QS.3<sup>1</sup> and 4<sup>22</sup>; it may also be the name of a group in Ps.Sol.8<sup>7</sup>: 'As for the Upright, their ways are righteous'.

'nšy . 'wt (20<sup>4-5</sup>): Schechter reads 'nšy m'wt 'men of perversion'. Yet a close examination of T-S 16-311 reveals that the first letter is unclear but that it could well be part of a dalet; this is how most scholars have read the text, viz. 'nšy d'wt 'men of knowledge'.<sup>124</sup> Do these 'men of knowledge' form some kind of inner council?

---

<sup>122</sup>Schechter, p75.

<sup>123</sup>Viz.: Rabin, Denis, Davies; Charles (p820) - though emending to 'whqš'; Rubinstein (VT, 7, p358) though emending to 'w<sup>e</sup>qāš'.

<sup>124</sup>So Kuhn, Murphy-O'Connor, Vermes and Davies - cf. CD 15<sup>15</sup> where the same phrase may have been present.

y'wt (20<sup>7</sup>): most scholars point yē'ôṭ, from the root 'wt 'to consent'. Ginzberg however reads yē'āḥ from the root 'ḥh, 'to unite, bind together', a common Talmudic root.<sup>125</sup>

qdwšy 'lywn (20<sup>8</sup>): angelic beings maybe meant here.<sup>126</sup>

Those who reject the Mosaic and sectarian torah – 20<sup>8-13</sup>.

The interpretation of this passage hangs on the understanding of the opening line: kl hm's br'šwnym wb'ḥrwnym – 20<sup>8-9</sup>. There are two ways to interpret this phrase: to give a personal interpretation to the terms br'šwnym wb'ḥrwnym, or to take them as adjectives and supply a direct object.<sup>127</sup> The sole point in favour of the first interpretation is that in 4<sup>6-9</sup> and 8<sup>17</sup> the founders of the sect are referred to as hr'šwnym 'the first ones', yet nowhere in the scrolls are those who joined the sect at a later point in time referred to as 'the latter ones'. In support of the second interpretation is the formula bmšpṭym

hr'šwnym found in 20<sup>31</sup> and 1QS.9<sup>10</sup>, and the fact that with the exception of 2<sup>15</sup> the root m's is always associated with 'the commandments' or 'the torah'.<sup>128</sup> But what then are 'the former and latter (commandments)? Both Murphy-O'Connor and Davies concur that 'the latter (precepts)' are those of

---

<sup>125</sup>Ginzberg, p102-103.

<sup>126</sup>See: Brooke, Exegesis at Qumran, p182-3; cf.1QS.11<sup>7-8</sup> and 4QFI.1<sup>19</sup>.

<sup>127</sup>Respectively: Schwartz, Maier, Rabinowitz, Vermes, Ginzberg, Jeremias, and Lohse; Dupont-Sommer, Cothenet, Denis, Murphy-O'Connor, Davies, and most extensively Laperrousaz, 'Les "Ordonnances Premières" et les "Ordonnances Dernières" dans les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte', in Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer; Rabin (p37) seems to combine both views with his translation 'who depises<the law> amongst the former ones and the latter ones.'

<sup>128</sup>See: CD 3<sup>17</sup>, 7<sup>9</sup>=19<sup>5</sup> – the former without qualification, 8<sup>19</sup>=19<sup>31</sup>, 1QpH.1<sup>11</sup>, 5<sup>11</sup>, 1QS.3<sup>5</sup>; 4Qpls<sup>c</sup> Frq.23.2<sup>11</sup>. The root is also associated with 'bryt' in CD.20<sup>11-12</sup>, 1QS.2<sup>25</sup>, and 1QH.15<sup>18</sup>.

the Teacher of Righteousness, in contrast with 20<sup>31</sup>, 'the former judgments', which are those prior to the Teacher, those therefore of the parent community.<sup>129</sup> Yet Davies has perhaps not realized the full importance of Jubilees 1<sup>26</sup> which he quotes:

*And do thou write down for thyself all these words which I declare unto thee on this mountain, the first and the last, which shall come to pass in all the divisions of the days in the law ...*

He writes "in Jubilees the phrase 'the first and the last' may mean either 'totality' or 'from beginning to end', but also it may mean 'what has been revealed at first' (Torah) and 'what has been revealed subsequently' (the teaching of the book of Jubilees)."<sup>130</sup> We know that our author used Jubilees (quoted in 16<sup>3-4</sup>) and thus it seems very likely he was familiar with the idea of two torahs; thus 'the former (commandments)' refers to the Mosaic torah (as it does in Jubilees), whilst 'the latter (commandments)' must refer to the sectarian torah, namely the Temple Scroll.<sup>131</sup> This in turn has strong implications as to those addressed in 20<sup>8b-10a</sup>, for clearly they must be members of the sect since only they could transgress the sectarian torah.

The phrase 'šr šmw glwlym 'l lbm (20<sup>9</sup>) seems to originate from Ezekiel 14<sup>3</sup> where the subject are 'certain of the elders of Israel'. Similar accusations using glwl are levelled at 'the interpreters of falsehoods and seers of deceit' in 1QH.4<sup>15,19</sup> and at 'the sons of Zadok who seek their own counsel' in 4QFI.1<sup>17</sup>. Yet I do not consider that this is strong enough evidence for the

---

<sup>129</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 79, p548 and Davies, p183.

<sup>130</sup>Davies, p183.

<sup>131</sup>If there is connection between Jubilees, 11QTorah, and CD as some scholars have suggested such an interpretation is even more attractive - so Brooke, 'The Temple Scroll: a law unto itself' (unpublished), cf. Wacholder, HUCA, 56, p87-101.

subject of 20<sup>8b-10a</sup> to be 'outsiders', for we have already suggested that the same vocabulary can be used of external and internal 'enemies'. What is clear though is that *glwlym* are here covert sins, which helps to explain why in the two parallel phrases *'yn lhm (wlmšpḥwtyhm) ḥlq bbyt htwrh* (20<sup>10,13</sup>) only the latter mentions 'their families', *mšpḥwtyhm*. This is because we are dealing respectively with covert (20<sup>8b-10a</sup>) apostates who are contrasted with the overt

(20<sup>10b-13b</sup>) apostates who have already been banned from 'the House of the Law' (=the community) along with their families; only in the former case can the families of the individuals concerned not be in any way responsible for the covert actions of the individual.<sup>132</sup> The words *šbw 'm 'nšy ḥlšwn* in 20<sup>10-11</sup> appear to be a gloss since they intrude between the object and its verb, yet the author is probably merely likening apostates within the sect with a group known for its rejection of the sectarian law:

*These are the men of scoffing in Jerusalem who have rejected the Law of the Lord and scorned the word of the Holy One.*<sup>133</sup>

The identity of 'the men of scoffing' as the followers of 'the Man of Derison or Lie' seems obvious.<sup>134</sup>

*ḥqy ḥšdq* (20<sup>11</sup> and in 20<sup>33</sup>): these are those precepts which originate from the Teacher, possibly therefore 'the sectarian torah' (11QT) - 1<sup>11</sup>, 6<sup>7-8</sup>, 1QpHab.5<sup>10-12</sup>, 1Q14 10<sup>4</sup>. Davies points to the increased use of *šdq* in this final

---

<sup>132</sup>So Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 79, p548-559; cf. Davies, p184-185 believes that 20<sup>8b-10a</sup> refers to potential rather than actual apostates.

<sup>133</sup>4QpIs<sup>b</sup> 2<sup>6</sup>; 2<sup>10</sup> talks of 'the congregation of the men of scoffing'.

<sup>134</sup>The identity of 'the builders of the wall' or 'the seekers of smooth things' with this group, should not be made. Rabin (p39) points to Isaiah 28<sup>14</sup> as the origin of this phrase: 'Therefore hear the word of the Lord, you men of scoffing, who rule this people in Jerusalem.'

section 19<sup>33</sup>-20<sup>34</sup> as evidence that it originated at the time of the Teacher and his community.<sup>135</sup>

wm'sw bbryt w'mnh (20<sup>12</sup>). The form 'mnh occurs in Neh.10<sup>1</sup> to introduce the new covenant at the time of Nehemiah;<sup>136</sup>; our writer thus deliberately uses this term to indicate that a new covenant is also meant here, namely the Damascan covenant. Davies argues that this word, (along with the following whw' bryt hḥdšh,) is a gloss, and that the original text referred only to the covenant of the parent community.<sup>137</sup> However, the paradox of this passage is that as it stands it seems to refer to two 'covenants', and thus it seems probable that the text originally read bbryt n'mnh, 'the sure covenant', the nūn later being corrupted to a wāw.<sup>138</sup> This avoids the paradox, explains the need for the gloss whw' bryt hḥdšh, and does not conflict with the sectarian covenantal theology which concludes that the sect were merely renewing the covenant rather than creating a second additional 'covenant'.<sup>139</sup>

whw' bryt hḥdšh. Davies' whole hypothesis regarding the textual history of this section 19<sup>33</sup>-20<sup>34</sup> largely hinges on his interpretation of this secondary addition.<sup>140</sup> He maintains that the distinction between 'the covenant' and 'the new covenant' is more than a quibble. The new community as distinct from the parent community were distinguished by their adherence to the new

---

<sup>135</sup>Davies, p185-186.

<sup>136</sup>Neh.9<sup>38</sup> in the English text; 'mnh only occurs in Neh.10<sup>1</sup> and 11<sup>23</sup> in the MT.

<sup>137</sup>Davies, p186; T-S 16-311 does have an aleph after 'bryt' which might reflect an original 'l'.

<sup>138</sup>Cf. Murphy-O'Connor (RB, 79, p550) emends to 'bbryt h'mnh', cf.7<sup>5</sup>; cf. also 'the sure house' in 3<sup>19</sup>.

<sup>139</sup>See Chapter 3.1.4 on 'Covenant', p382-386.

<sup>140</sup>Davies, p176-9.

covenant and to the Teacher. These words are clearly a gloss, the phrase 'covenant ..of Damascus' being in some way inappropriate or misleading so as to require closer definition. Therefore 'it follows that the new covenant *is not associated with Damascus in the same way as the original "Damascus covenant"*'.<sup>141</sup> The old terminology used means that 'the new community continued to regard itself as the *true* community of the (original) Damascus covenant. Only at a secondary stage, and probably as a result of conflict within the parent community, did the new community define itself as the community of the *new* covenant...'<sup>142</sup> Thus this passage was originally directed at the parent community who refused to accept the Teacher, and only at a secondary stage, with the addition of these words, at the apostate members of the Teacher's community. Ingenious as this suggestion is Davies does not say how he would treat the other references to 'the new covenant'; presumably 6<sup>19</sup>, 8<sup>21</sup>=19<sup>34</sup> and 1QpH.2<sup>3</sup> are products of the 'new' community which means that nowhere is the covenant of the parent community directly associated with 'Damascus' where, according to Davies, the parental community originated.<sup>143</sup> In addition I have already argued against Davies' idea that the main body of this document is pre-Qumran in date.<sup>144</sup> Thus the restoration of n'mnh would seem to account better for this addition.

---

<sup>141</sup>Davies, p177.

<sup>142</sup>Davies, *ibid.*

<sup>143</sup>Damascus is also mentioned in 6<sup>5</sup> and 7<sup>15,19</sup> yet the word 'bryt' is not mentioned once in either of these passages.

<sup>144</sup>See notes on 1<sup>11</sup> (the Teacher of Righteousness) p33-34, and 6<sup>5</sup> (Damascus) p188-189, and Chapter 2.3 on the 'Sitz im Leben' of CD, p323-330.



The death of the Teacher: 20<sup>13-22</sup>.

Murphy-O'Connor points to the reference to the 'forty years' as evidence that a different eschatological perspective is being forwarded in 20<sup>13b-15b</sup>, with an emphasis on divine punishment not found elsewhere in the *Grundschrift*. Consequently 20<sup>13b-15b</sup> is secondary as it connects the 'Man of Lie' with the men of scoffing in 20<sup>10-11</sup>, while 20<sup>15c-17a</sup> is secondary because of its reference to *bqš hhw'* which can only refer back to the 'forty years' and because the introductory formula *k'šr 'mr* has already been found in secondary passages in 7<sup>8=19<sup>5</sup></sup>, 7<sup>14,16</sup> and 8<sup>20</sup>. However, 20<sup>17-22</sup> is part of the *Grundschrift* and deals with the faithful members of the community.<sup>145</sup> Davies on the other hand, argues that the unity of this whole passage 20<sup>13-22</sup> need not be doubted, for the quotation in 20<sup>16b-17a</sup> is developed in 20<sup>17b-18</sup>, and the theme is that of the death of the Teacher and the subsequent period of uncertainty.<sup>146</sup> The latter is the view I favour, not least because of the mosaic of biblical quotations which would seem quite out of place if the author were merely referring to apostates.

*'šr .bw* <sup>15</sup> *'m 'yš hkzb*. The second word is unclear in T-S 16-311, yet it seems to me that there is only one letter preceding the bet (or kaph) and that this has a Babylonian pointing sign over it; thus I read *šbw* rather than *hkw*. The 'Man of Lie' is clearly, 'a misleader of Israel', as he is in 1<sup>14</sup>.<sup>147</sup>

The words *'d tm kl 'nšy hmlḥmh* (20<sup>14</sup>) stem from Deuteronomy 2<sup>14b</sup>

---

<sup>145</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 79, p550.

<sup>146</sup>Davies, p186; I cannot hold with Davies' view that therefore the Teacher must still have been alive in 19<sup>35</sup>-20<sup>1</sup> - p187.

<sup>147</sup>See Chapter 3.2.2 on the identity of the 'Wicked Priest', p393-398.

which follows the reference in Deuteronomy 2<sup>14a</sup> to 'the 38 years (which) passed from the time (the Israelites) left Kadesh Barnea until (they) crossed the Zered valley.' In total, of course, the Israelites spent forty years in the wilderness before they entered the Promised Land, during which time the sinful generation died,<sup>148</sup> and likewise the sect believed that they had to spend 'forty years' (20<sup>15</sup>) in exile during which time 'the men of war' (=the current sinful generation) would die, before the community (as the true Israel) could enter the Promised Land. Some scholars have also tried to see in this and the chronological references of 1<sup>1</sup>-2<sup>1</sup> a chronomessianic timescale, for if we allow forty years for the ministry of the Teacher of Righteousness, then 390+20+x(=40)+40 totals 490 years, which corresponds to the 'seventy weeks of years' of Daniel 9<sup>24</sup>, or a period of ten jubilees. As mentioned elsewhere, the Teacher's death was thought to usher in the age of wrath.

There now follows a string of biblical quotations, some of which have been modified to suit the redactor's purpose. The first in 20<sup>16-17</sup> is taken from Hosea 3<sup>4</sup>,<sup>149</sup> yet our redactor restricts the subjects to people with authority in order to indicate that now the Teacher is dead Israel has no-one who is righteous. The second is from Isaiah 59<sup>20</sup>; the words šby pš' y'qb are deliberately used rather than the normal šby yśr'l because the author wished to allude to the first half of this biblical verse which reads: *'And he will come to Zion as a Redeemer.'*<sup>150</sup> This is then a further indirect allusion to the

---

<sup>148</sup>So Deut.8<sup>2</sup>; Caleb was the only one to enter Canaan of those that left Egypt - Num.14<sup>24,30</sup>, Deut.1<sup>36</sup>.

<sup>149</sup>Hosea 3<sup>4</sup> reads: 'yn mlk w'yn śr w'yn zbh w'yn mšbh w'yn 'pwd wtrpym', the underlined text appearing in 20<sup>16-17</sup>; the Targum translates 'teraphim' by 'teacher'.

<sup>150</sup>We can therefore reject Davies' suggestion that there is a distinction between 'šby yśr'l' = the parent community, and 'šby pš' y'qb' = the new community - Davies, p189.

Teacher who was the nation's redeemer; now that he has gone, the previous quotation applies, viz. *'(there is) none who arbitrates with righteousness'*. The identity of šby pš' is clarified by the words šmrw bryt 'l; šmrw should be emended to šmry.<sup>151</sup> The third quotation in 20<sup>17-20</sup> is from Malachi 3<sup>16</sup> and has been expanded in its earlier parts:<sup>152</sup>

*Then they<sup>153</sup> will speak with one another, <to make righteous each man his brother<sup>154</sup> that their step shall hold fast onto the way of El>; and El hearkened <to their words><sup>155</sup> and heard (them) .....*

The expansion to the quotation beseeches the sectarians to remain obedient to the (sectarian) covenant, whilst the quotation and the following clause<sup>156</sup> tell of the sure salvation which 'those who fear El' will receive. Thus the fourth quotation in 20<sup>20-21</sup> is from Malachi 3<sup>18</sup> and tells of the separation of the righteous from the wicked at the Day of Judgment - the latter being mentioned in Malachi 3<sup>17</sup> and 4<sup>(Hkb3<sup>19</sup>)</sup>.<sup>157</sup> Finally we have a composite citation of Exodus 20<sup>6</sup> and Deut.7<sup>9</sup>, both of which contain the phrase lšmry mšwty/w and

---

<sup>151</sup>So Rabin, p40-41 and Davies, p267; the phrase occurs in 1QS.5<sup>2,9</sup> - cf CD 19<sup>2</sup>, 1QSB.1<sup>1</sup> and 1QH.16<sup>13,17</sup>.

<sup>152</sup>Malachi 3<sup>16</sup> reads: 'z ndbrw yr'y yhw h 'yš 't r'hw wyqšb yhw h wyšm' wyktb spr zkrwn lpnw lyr'y yhw h wħšby smw'.

<sup>153</sup>The subject of the verb in Malachi is 'yr'y yhw h', yet this phrase (with 'l) is found in the clause following this quotation.

<sup>154</sup>Restored following Rabin, p41, thus 'ydbw' instead of the biblical 'ndbrw'; T-S 16-311 has: 'y[ ]dl ] 'ys 'l r'hw lh[ ]q 'y[ ] 't 'hyw'.

<sup>155</sup>In Malachi one needs to supply an object, namely 'them'.

<sup>156</sup>Read 'yglh' for Schechter's proposed 'y'lh' - p100; this clause may allude to Isaiah 56<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>157</sup>The MT of Malachi.3<sup>18</sup> is as 20<sup>20-21</sup> with the expected substitution of 'lhym' by 'l', plus CD has 'yrs' for 'lrs' in the MT. Note the use of the root 'šwb' with the meaning 'and did again' - cf.19<sup>34</sup>.

from the former of which we should restore l'lpym to the lacuna in 20<sup>21</sup>.<sup>158</sup>  
These quotations clearly show that the redactor was trying to stop any  
wavering among the sectarians now that the Teacher had died.

The House of Separation: 20<sup>22-25</sup>.

The subject of this section is .byt plg, yet the interpretation of this  
phrase is made more difficult by the lacuna that precedes it. There is space  
for two words yet there are no visible traces of any words with the exception  
of two dots before the bet indicating a possible single missing letter, namely a  
mem.<sup>159</sup> If the latter is the case, which is by no means clear, then it may  
suggest that only part of the House of Separation is meant. Who then are byt  
plg? Both Genesis 10<sup>25</sup> and Jubilees 8<sup>8</sup> attest that Peleg was given his name  
because he was born in the days when the sons of Noah were dividing up the  
earth among themselves. The phrase is also found in 4QpNah frags. 3-4, 3<sup>12</sup>-4<sup>1</sup>:

*[Put and the Lybians were your helpers.] (3<sup>9b</sup>)  
Interpreted, these are the wicked of [Judah] the House of  
Separation, who joined Manasseh.*

The uncertainty of the reading 'Judah' here is frustrating; as it stands  
4QpNah.4<sup>1</sup> suggests that members of 'the House of Separation' (=the  
Pharisees?) are joining the Sadducees (=Manasseh)!<sup>160</sup>

---

<sup>158</sup>Charles (p822) also supplies 'mšwtw' after 'wšmry' which he says was omitted by mistake; this avoids giving the root 'šmr' the meaning 'to wait', although this sense is found in 19<sup>9</sup>. Murphy-O'Connor (RB, 79, p551) believes that 'mšwtw' was deliberately omitted so as to associate the phrase 'for a thousand generations' with the fidelity of the members rather than with the mercy of God.

<sup>159</sup>Schechter, Charles, Rabin, Murphy-O'Connor (who suggests 'whnprdm' - RB, 79, p557 n45) and Davies all believe there are some words missing, whilst Ginzberg (p103) argues the text is simply 'mbyt plg'.

<sup>160</sup>This may however reflect the period immediately following the Civil war (94-88 B.C.); some Pharisees joined the Sadducees, others the Qumran sectarians, whilst the rest fled or went into hiding.

m'yr hqdš = Jerusalem; see: Neh.11<sup>18</sup>, Sirach 49<sup>6</sup>, Ps.Sol.8<sup>4</sup> and Mt.27<sup>53</sup>. In the light of CD 12<sup>1-2</sup> some scholars have suggested emending to m'yr hm̄qdš.

wyṭm'w<sup>161</sup> 't hm̄qdš (20<sup>23</sup>). If the text is tackled in a chronological order one has to ask how those concerned can have polluted the sanctuary after having left the Holy City. Rubinstein overcomes the problem by understanding this and the subsequent verb as part of a subsidiary clause to what precedes: *'though they defiled the sanctuary, yet they returned to God'*<sup>162</sup> this though seems clumsy. The most popular solution is to take 'Israel' as the subject of these two verbs: *'at the time when Israel sinned and defiled the sanctuary'*<sup>163</sup> yet in my mind this seems unlikely since we have a string of imperfect third person plural verbs and one would therefore expect their subjects to be the same unless there was clear evidence to the contrary. Thus we are left to translate: *'and they declared the sanctuary unclean'*.

wšbw 'd<sup>24</sup> 'l [...]k h'm bdbrym m't[...]. Schechter saw a section marker ":" after 'l, reads nsyk, stating that only the nun and the kap were certain, and does not restore the lacuna after m't; this gives: *The prince of the people with few words .....*<sup>164</sup> A more intelligible sense was forwarded by Vermes who restored '[w]d 'l [d]r]k and translated: *'but returned again to the way of the people in small matters'*<sup>165</sup> T-S 16-311 however does support

---

<sup>161</sup>Note, T-S 16-311 clearly reads the imperfect form of the verb; Schechter, p100 reads the perfect, 'wtm'w'.

<sup>162</sup>Rubinstein, VT, 7, p360.

<sup>163</sup>So: Charles, p822; Vermes, p91; Davies, p191-192 and p265.

<sup>164</sup>Schechter, p77.

<sup>165</sup>Vermes, p91, followed by Stegemann, Murphy-O'Connor and Davies. Charles (p822) reads: 'l nsk', viz. 'they polluted the sanctuary and returned again to molten images. The people with few words shall all be judged..'. Rabin (p40-41) reads: 'wysk' (after 1QS.10<sup>25</sup> which has 'swk') - 'And let him appease the people in a few words..'

Schechter's reading of n[sy]k and thus I propose that we read: *'and returned again to the prince of the people in a few respects'*; the 'prince of the people' must be the Hasmonean ruler. 'št hqdš - the phrase also occurs in 1QS.2<sup>25</sup>, 8<sup>21</sup>, 1QSa.2<sup>9</sup>, 1QH.7<sup>10</sup>, and 1QM.3<sup>4</sup>; according to our analysis of 1QS 1<sup>1-15</sup> 'the council of holiness' was the (inner) council of all full members (the rabbim).

I would concur with Davies that each member of 'the House of Separation' should be judged on their individual merits to decide whether they can enter the sect,<sup>166</sup> and it seems most likely that these were renegade Pharisees in the aftermath of the Civil War of 94-88 B.C..

Those whose sin remains undetected: 20<sup>25-27</sup>.

This section, 20<sup>25-27</sup>, does read as a separate unit referring to all those whose sin is only revealed 'when the glory of El becomes apparent', that is when the end of the age comes. They shall not escape punishment but will be cut off just like 'the wicked of Judah', who, as we have just seen from 4QpNah.4<sup>1</sup>, are 'the House of Separation' (=the Pharisees). This unrevealed sin is defined as 'breaching the bound of the law', namely transgressing the sectarian commandments.

---

<sup>166</sup>Davies, p193.

The Hebrew of 20<sup>27-34</sup>.

4	12	וכל המחזיקים במשפטים האלה
4	9	לצאת (28) ולבוא על פי התורה
2	7	וישמעו לקול מורה
2	7	ויתודו לפני אל
2	6	[ח]טאנו (29) רשענו
2	7	[גם] אנחנו גם אבותינו
3	9	בלכתם קרי בחקי הברית
3	9	צדק (30) ואמת משפטיך בנו:
4	10	ולא ירימו יד על חקי קדשו
4	9	ומשפטי (31) צדקו ועדות אמתו:
3	11	והתיסרו במשפטים הראשונים
4	9	אשר (32) נשפטו בני אנשי היחיד
4	7	והאזינו לקול מורה צדק:
6	13	ולא ישיבו (33) את חקי הצדק בשמעם אתם
4	10	ישישו וישמחו ויעז לבם
4	8	ויתגברו (34) על כל בני תבל
5	11	וכפר אל בעדם וראו בישועתו
3	6	כי חסו בשם קדשו:

The translation of 20<sup>27-34</sup>.

*But all who hold fast to these judgments,  
going out<sup>28</sup> and coming in according to the letter of the  
law;*

*And who obey the voice of the Teacher  
and confess before El:*

*'We have sinned,<sup>29</sup> we have acted wickedly,  
both we and our fathers,  
By walking contrary to the precepts of the covenant;  
Righteous<sup>30</sup> and true are Thy judgments upon us.'*

*And who do not lift up a hand against His holy precepts,<sup>31</sup>  
His righteous judgments or His true testimonies;  
But have instructed themselves in the former judgments,  
by which<sup>32</sup> the men of the community have been judged;  
And have listened to the voice of the Teacher of  
Righteousness,  
and who do not turn back<sup>33</sup> from the precepts of  
righteousness on hearing them -  
They shall rejoice and be glad, and their heart shall be strong.  
And they shall prevail<sup>34</sup> over all the children of the world;  
And El shall atone on their behalf and they shall see His  
salvation,  
for they have confided in His holy name.*

### 1.7.6. The Second Promise: 20<sup>27-34</sup>.

The outline of this poetic section is easy to discern: the opening two bicola are introductory; followed by the confession; then there are bicola on God's law, the Mosaic law and the Teacher's law; finally there is a quatrain on the saving benefits of obedience to these laws, the final short colon balancing the long colon in the final bicolon. This section was positioned here for three reasons: to mirror 8<sup>4-9</sup> in its original form, to provide a positive conclusion to the poetical Admonition in the manner of biblical poetical works,<sup>167</sup> and to provide an introduction of sorts to the following Laws of IX-XVI; yet this does not mean that this section cannot have originally been an independent unit.

The opening line *hmḥzyqym bmsṣṭym h'lh* has been paralleled by the redactional phrase *l' yḥzyqw b'lh {hḥqym}* in 8<sup>2</sup> = 19<sup>14</sup>; both refer to the same set of laws, the 'Twelve Duties', which were more fully expounded in the Laws of IX-XVI. In 20<sup>28</sup> we have the only occurrence of the unqualified form, *mwrh*, yet this is not a problem once one appreciates the underlying poetical form of this text; the form helps to create a bicolon which the full phrase *mwrh ṣḏq* would render top-heavy.

The confession found in 20<sup>28-30</sup> also appears in fragmentary form in 1QS 1<sup>24-26</sup>.<sup>168</sup> Rabin restores *ky* before *'nw*, *'Indeed, we have acted wickedly*

---

<sup>167</sup>See Isaiah 66, Ezekiel 40-48, Daniel 12, Hosea 14<sup>4-9</sup>, Joel 3<sup>16-21</sup>, Amos 9<sup>11-15</sup>, Zep.3<sup>14-20</sup>, Zech.12-14, and Malachi 4<sup>2-4</sup>.

<sup>168</sup>The text of 1QS.1<sup>24c-26</sup>: *'n 'wynw 25 [..... ..]nw hrs'nw 'nw [ ...]wtynw mlpnynw blktnw 26 [.....] 'mt wṣd[. ....] mṣṣṭw bnw . wb'bw[...]*.



...;<sup>169</sup> yet Büchler argues that it is possible to read [ḥ]ṭ'nw from T-S 16-311.<sup>170</sup> All scholars restore gm before 'nhnw, and most read blktnw in line with 1QS. Baumgarten maintains that this confession is from an ancient formula used in the singular by the High Priest on the Day of Atonement (Yoma 3<sup>8</sup>, cf.4<sup>2</sup>, 6<sup>2</sup>), but that in the period after the destruction of the temple in 70 A.D. the Jews adopted the plural form (b.Yoma 87b and Pesikta Rabbati 35,1), as we find here and in 1QS.<sup>171</sup> Murphy-O'Connor contends that this shift from singular to plural usage was as a result of the destruction of the temple, and this would explain the Qumranic usage of the plural since they too had 'lost' the temple in repudiating official temple worship.<sup>172</sup> A similar plural confession is also found in 1Kings 8<sup>47</sup> and Daniel 9<sup>5,15</sup>, both on the lips of exiles and thus by those deprived of the temple.<sup>173</sup>

Three enigmatic phrases occur in the following bicolon: ḥqy qdšw - a unique phrase in the Scrolls, wmsṣṭy ṣdqw - cf. 1QS.3<sup>1</sup>, 4<sup>4</sup>, 1QH.1<sup>23,30</sup>, and w'dwwt 'mtw - cf.3<sup>15</sup>. Are these three phrases referring to specific bodies of laws - the Mosaic torah, CD IX-XVI and 11QTorah respectively, as in 7<sup>7-8</sup> = 19<sup>4</sup> where the same three law codes are referred to in this order, or are these general injunctions for obedience to God's law? The form yrymw should be given a perfect sense along with yšybw in 20<sup>32</sup>, whilst the forms whtysrw and

---

<sup>169</sup>Rabin, p42 followed by Vermes, p91 and Davies, p264-5.

<sup>170</sup>Büchler, "Schechter's 'Jewish Sectaries'", JQR, 3 (1912-13), p455 n77.

<sup>171</sup>Baumgarten, 'Sacrifice and Worship among the Jewish Sectarians of the Dead Sea (Qumrân) Scrolls', HTR, 46 (1953), p154f.

<sup>172</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 79, p559-561.

<sup>173</sup>Davies (p196) points to 4QDibHam. as 'containing a very striking example of this prayer'. Yet this parallel is poor and furthermore is pro-temple in outlook, and it seems that the real reason that he alludes to this work is because of its supposed pre-Qumranic origin which in paralleling CD supports (to his mind) the pre-Qumranic origin of the latter.

wh'zynw, in 20<sup>31,32</sup> respectively, are to be taken as perfects with simple copulative wāw's. The phrase *bmšp̄tym hr'šwnym* in 20<sup>31</sup> cannot be considered independently from that of 20<sup>8</sup> and thus should be taken as a reference to the Mosaic torah,<sup>174</sup> and it is paralleled in the following bicolon by the phrase *ḥqy ṣdqw* (20<sup>33</sup>) which, as we argued in 20<sup>11</sup>, are the laws of the Teacher, namely the Temple Scroll. The latter bicolon also exhibits a chiastic structure, a:b c:b':a'; the particle 'l in the first colon has the sense 'from' as 'l' does in Ugaritic.<sup>175</sup> It seems that we need to read *bm*<sup>176</sup> rather than *bny*, 'sons', in 20<sup>32</sup>; initially 'the men of the community' were judged by their understanding of the Mosaic law and this is still the case for those addressed who would seem therefore to be initiates. The title *mwrh ṣdq* is without the article as in 1<sup>11</sup>, in contrast to its use outside of this document where the article appears all eight times; the absence is due to the poetic nature of both of these passages and this perhaps further suggests a common author.

---

<sup>174</sup>Cf. Davies, p197.

<sup>175</sup>Baal Cycle.I 4,24; II 1,27; et al - see Gibson, Canaanite Myths and Legends, esp. p149.

<sup>176</sup>So Rabin, p42-43 against Schechter, p100; T-S 16-311 is unclear.

Conclusion to 19<sup>13</sup>-20<sup>34</sup>.

The above analysis of the latter part of this document could be summarized as followed:

19<sup>17-28</sup> The crimes of 'the leaders of Judah', which stem from Hellenistic influence (19<sup>22-24</sup>) - (the original poetry of 8<sup>4-9</sup>=19<sup>16-21</sup> has been re-interpreted by the redactor).  
post 150 B.C.

19<sup>28-33</sup> Those who reject the Mosaic Law, viz. the Hellenizers, who will be punished like 'the builders of the wall'.

19<sup>33</sup>-20<sup>1</sup> Introduction: the apostates of the new covenant in the period following the Teacher's death.

20<sup>1-8</sup> 1. Those who are loath to fulfil the precepts of the upright.  
Cf.1QS c.130 B.C.

20<sup>8-13</sup> 2. Those covert apostates who reject the former and the latter commandments; their crime is comparable with those (the men of derision?) overt apostates who spoke against the precepts of righteousness (=the latter commandments).  
J.Hyrceanus' reign.

20<sup>13-22</sup> The life of the sect in the aftermath of the Teacher's death.  
c. 110 B.C.

20<sup>22-25</sup> 3. Every individual of the 'House of Separation' (=Pharisees) should be judged on his own merit.  
post 88 B.C.

20<sup>25-27</sup> 4. Those breaching the bound of the law whose crime is not revealed until the end of the age.  
c. 70 B.C.

20<sup>27-34</sup> Concluding promise / blessing for those that are obedient.

All these sections consider various general transgressions which an

individual can commit either outside or inside of the community. The author has acquired these general rules from more than one source, for 20<sup>22-25</sup>, 20<sup>25-27</sup> and in particular 20<sup>1-8</sup> betray strong similarities with 1QS, whilst 19<sup>16-21</sup>, 19<sup>28-33</sup> and 20<sup>27-34</sup> are written in a poetical or semi-poetical style. Consequently, I would tend to agree with Stegemann that we have here a series of independent sources which have been redacted. The final striking phenomenon to note is that these passages were arranged by the redactor in a chronological fashion, dealing with ever more recent events. The redaction of this whole section must have occurred prior to 'the end of the age' which (as I argue later) was considered to be c.70 B.C..<sup>177</sup>

---

---

<sup>177</sup>See Chapter 2.4, p333-335.

## CHAPTER 2

### THE LITERARY GENRES OF THE DAMASCUS DOCUMENT AND THEIR BEARING ON THE WIDER FIELD OF QUMRAN STUDIES.

#### 2.1. An examination of the literary genres found within CD.

In the first and main chapter of this study we were primarily concerned with deducing whether a passage was poetic or prosaic in structure. It is clear from our reconstruction of the text that large sections of the Admonition do consist of originally poetical literary units. These can be summarized as follows:

##### The Poetical Sections.

The Historical Introduction.	1 <sup>1</sup> -2 <sup>1</sup> .
The Theological Introduction.	2 <sup>2</sup> -13.
Lessons of History: 'the sins of the children'.	2 <sup>14</sup> -3 <sup>20</sup> .
Lessons of History: 'the torah'.	5 <sup>11</sup> -6 <sup>3</sup> .
The 'Twelve Duties', (with blessing and curse.)	6 <sup>11</sup> -7 <sup>10</sup> .
The second warning.	8 <sup>4-9</sup> = 19 <sup>16-21</sup> .
The second blessing.	20 <sup>27-34</sup> .

This was not however the only notable *genre* found within the Admonition, for there were a number of midrashic sections which can be listed as follows:

##### The Midrashic Sections.

The Ezekiel 44 <sup>15</sup> Midrash.	3 <sup>20</sup> -4 <sup>6</sup> .
The Nets of Belial.	4 <sup>12</sup> -5 <sup>11</sup> .
The Well Midrash.	6 <sup>3-11</sup> .
The Amos-Numbers Midrash.	7 <sup>14-21</sup> .
The Zechariah-Ezekiel Midrash.	19 <sup>7-13</sup> .
The Deuteronomy 32 <sup>33</sup> Midrash.	8 <sup>9-12</sup> = 19 <sup>21-24</sup> .

These two literary *genres* seem to have a significant relationship, namely that the midrashic sections always seem to be appended to the poetic sections: the Ezekiel 44<sup>15</sup> Midrash is appended to the third poem, the Well Midrash to the fourth poem, the Amos-Numbers Midrash in Ms.A or the Zechariah-Ezekiel Midrash in Ms.B to the 'Twelve Duties', and the Deuteronomy 32<sup>33</sup> Midrash to the section on the second warning. The exception on first sight would appear to be the Nets of Belial, yet this section is in fact appended to the secondary semi-poetic conclusion of the third poem, namely 4<sup>6-12</sup>. Furthermore, this section on the Nets of Belial does not exhibit the same linguistic structure as the other midrashic sections, which seems to be strong evidence that it was originally an independent literary unit and one which stems from a different hand from that of the other midrashim.

This leads neatly into the next point, namely that of authorship. Firstly, can all the poetical sections be regarded as stemming from the same hand? The standard formula which prefixes the first three poems would seem to be original, and if this is the case then these poetical sections were composed as a triad. It is possible that a similar formula is in fact missing from the fourth poem so that we could assign all four poems to a single hand. The 'Twelve Duties' may also be the work of the same person; however it seems more likely that it was drawn up, or at least modified, by the sect itself, either the founder members or some inner council of the community. The second warning in 8<sup>4-9</sup> deliberately uses much of the terminology found elsewhere in the poetry, and seems to parallel to a certain extent the final blessing in 20<sup>27-34</sup>; thus these two sections can also be attributed to the author of the four poems.

If we turn to the Midrashic Sections the same question can be posed: do

they all stem from the same author? We have already indicated the likely independent nature of the Nets of Belial passage, and the divergent midrashic texts of Ms. A and B must obviously come from different authors. There are though a number of strong reasons why three of the midrashic sections, namely the Ezekiel 44<sup>15</sup> Midrash, the Well Midrash, and the Amos-Numbers Midrash, can be seen to stem from one author. To begin with they all broadly share the same theme, viz. the foundation of the sect. The Ezekiel 44<sup>15</sup> Midrash and the Well Midrash both divide the sect into two groups; in the former *'The Priests are the returnees of Israel who went out from the land of Judah, and (the Levites) were joined with them (4<sup>2-3</sup>)*, while in the latter *'Those who dug it (=the Well) are the returnees of Israel who went out from the land of Judah and sojourned in the land of Damascus (6<sup>4-5</sup>)* - the Hebrew is identical. The second group are 'the sons of Zadok' in the Ezekiel 44<sup>15</sup> Midrash who are therefore to be equated with 'the nobles of the people' in the Well Midrash, both of whom are associated with 'the latter days' in 4<sup>4</sup> and 6<sup>11</sup>. Thus both midrashic expansions divide the sect into two groups: the founder members, and those who later joined them. As we have seen, the Amos-Numbers Midrash uses Amos 5<sup>26-27</sup> to justify the sectarian torah and the exile to 'Damascus', and thus shares with the Well Midrash the common theme of the 'torah' which is further substantiated by the reference to 'the Interpreter of the Law' in both. On stylistic grounds I feel that the Deuteronomy 32<sup>33</sup> Midrash probably also stems from the same hand, or at least the same school of thought, for the latter, like the three midrashic sections outlined above, also dogmatically re-interprets every phrase of the biblical quotation using the formula: biblical phrase + particle 'hm' + midrashic interpretation. This contrasts markedly with the style of the Nets of Belial passage, (which uses the word 'pesher' as in 1QpHab.), and also with that of

the Zechariah–Ezekiel Midrash, although we do find the particle 'hm' once in 19<sup>9</sup>.

But what is to say that one of the authors responsible for a midrashic section or sections is not also the author of some of the poetical sections?<sup>1</sup> There are, I believe, a number of elements which irreversibly separate the poetical texts from the midrashic and other material, and these can be summarized as follows:

1. All the midrashic sections contain biblical quotations which are formally introduced, often with direct reference to the prophet concerned: 'Isaiah' – 4<sup>13</sup>, 6<sup>8</sup>, and 7<sup>10</sup>; 'Jeremiah' – 8<sup>20</sup> ; 'Ezekiel' – 3<sup>21</sup>, and 19<sup>12</sup> ; 'Zechariah' – 19<sup>7</sup> . In contrast, in the poetic sections there are few biblical quotations, and those there are, are not introduced.
2. The midrashic sections contain numerous references to figures (David, the Messiah, 'the Interpreter of the Law'..), or countries (Damascus, Judah,..), or to the sect and their opponents in cryptic form ('the poor', 'the šby of Israel', 'the builders of the wall', Ephraim...). The poetic sections do not contain such references with the notable exception of the Teacher of Righteousness who in the first poem is also paralleled by his adversary 'the Man of Lie'. Furthermore 'the Interpreter of the Law' is a pseudonym for 'the Teacher of Righteousness', and this can best be explained by

---

<sup>1</sup>Obviously the redactor cannot be the author of the poetry because his redactional additions are just that – additions.



positing that a different author was responsible for this substitution.

3. The poetical sections contain not one original reference to the Jerusalem temple and its institutions. However the theme is found strongly elsewhere, in the midrashic sections: 4<sup>1,18</sup>, 5<sup>6</sup> cf. 12<sup>1-2</sup>, (7<sup>15</sup>) and in secondary (redactional) material: 1<sup>3</sup> and 20<sup>23,2</sup>
4. All references to females and marriage are restricted to the Nets of Belial Midrash (4<sup>19-5<sup>11</sup></sup>), the secondary addition in 7<sup>1</sup>, and 7<sup>6-9</sup> – nšym: 4<sup>21</sup>, 5<sup>2,10</sup>, 7<sup>7,8</sup>=19<sup>3,5</sup>; bt: 5<sup>8x2,10</sup>; root lqh: 4<sup>20</sup>, 5<sup>7</sup>, 7<sup>6</sup>=19<sup>3</sup>.
5. The particle hw' only occurs in poetry in 5<sup>16</sup> in a quotation, yet it is common elsewhere, in particular in the midrashic passages: 3<sup>20</sup>, 4<sup>16,19</sup>, 5<sup>10</sup>, 6<sup>7</sup>, 7<sup>17,18,20</sup>, 8<sup>2,10,11,20</sup>, and 20<sup>3,12,15</sup>. Cf.: 'zh' – 4<sup>18(x3),19</sup>, 8<sup>19</sup>=19<sup>32</sup>, and 20<sup>8</sup>; 'gm' – 5<sup>6,11,21</sup> and 20<sup>29</sup> in a formula; 'hm' – common in midrash, 1<sup>13</sup>, 4<sup>2(x2),3,20</sup>, 5<sup>6x2</sup>, 6<sup>4,8</sup>, 7<sup>15,17</sup>, 8<sup>10</sup> and 19<sup>9</sup>, but also present in poetry, 1<sup>9</sup>, 2<sup>4</sup>, 3<sup>1,17</sup>, 5<sup>13,17</sup> – the last in a quotation.

Thus we can summarize our conclusions to date on the authorship of the poetical and midrashic sections as follows:

Author 1 (=P1): the four poems, the credal section (with the help of others), and the final two poetical sections.

---

<sup>2</sup> 'Mqds' has a spiritual sense in 6<sup>12,16</sup> and refers to the community.

Author 2 (=M1): the Ezekiel 44<sup>15</sup> Midrash, the Well Midrash,  
the Amos-Numbers Midrash, and probably Deuteronomy  
32<sup>33</sup> Midrash.

Author 3 (=M2): the Nets of Belial.

Author 4 (=M3): the Zechariah-Ezekiel Midrash in Ms.B.

The third main *genre* within the Admonition is the section 19<sup>33</sup>-20<sup>27</sup>, 'the Redactor's Warnings' which was summarized as follows:

Introductory.	19 <sup>33</sup> -20 <sup>1</sup> .
Those who loathe the works of the upright.	20 <sup>1-8</sup> .
Those who reject the former and latter (commandments).	20 <sup>8-13</sup> .
Life after the death of the Teacher.	20 <sup>13-22</sup> .
The former members of 'the House of Separation'.	20 <sup>22-25</sup> .
Those who have sinned yet are not found out.	20 <sup>25-27</sup> .

I concluded that this section was meant to be regarded as a single literary unit but that not all this material originated from the 'author' of this section who borrowed at least one, 20<sup>1-8</sup>, if not three, 20<sup>22-25,25-27</sup>, units from a source closely related with 1QS. I also concurred with Davies that the 'author' produced this section to deal with two issues. Firstly, the death of the Teacher, 19<sup>35</sup>-20<sup>1</sup> and 20<sup>13-14</sup>, which led to the expectation of the imminent arrival of the End, 20<sup>1,15</sup>. Secondly, as a warning against apostates, a major new problem due to the sudden increase in the size of the sect; 'the liars', 20<sup>11</sup> and 'the men of war who followed the Man of Lie', 20<sup>14-15</sup> are given as examples of whom not to follow.

Davies argues that this section was composed by the redactor of the Admonition, who thus produced the Qumran recension of an originally pre-Qumranic document, 1<sup>1-7</sup><sup>9,3</sup>. To a certain extent I believe that he is correct

---

<sup>3</sup>Davies, p198-201.

in seeing the 'author' of the Warnings in 19<sup>33</sup>-20<sup>27</sup> as the redactor of the Admonition, for the same themes that are found in the former can be found in the latter: the death of the Teacher is alluded to in the secondary addition in 6<sup>16-17</sup> and in 19<sup>7-13</sup>, the Zechariah-Ezekiel Midrash; the chronological references in 1<sup>5-6.10</sup> can be tied in with 20<sup>15</sup>, and be seen as a direct reference to Daniel's 'seventy weeks of years', viz. 490 years; the concern for the end of the eschaton can also be found in 2<sup>9</sup> and more importantly in the semi-poetic sections of 4<sup>6-12</sup> and 7<sup>10</sup>-8<sup>3</sup> (excluding the Amos-Numbers Midrash). In addition, there are a number of glosses which call for obedience to the torah: 3<sup>15-16</sup>, 4<sup>8-9</sup>, 6<sup>10</sup>, and the whole of the Nets of Belial Midrash, 4<sup>12</sup>-5<sup>11</sup>, is a polemic against 'the builders of the wall' who misinterpret the law.<sup>4</sup> Thus, redactional activity is responsible for both the Nets of Belial ('Author 3') and the Zechariah-Ezekiel Midrash ('Author 4'). Yet since it is unlikely (though not impossible) that the same redactor was responsible for the original variant texts of 7<sup>10</sup>-8<sup>2</sup> (excluding the Amos-Numbers Midrash) and 19<sup>7-13</sup>, there were seemingly, at least two redactors responsible for Mss.A and B of which the latter was the more recent.

Turning our attention once again to the four Midrashic passages (viz.'Author 2'), I will now give a list of reasons why they should be regarded as later than the redactional activity:

1. These four midrashic sections are appended to their respective poetical sections.
2. They add nothing to the context which would make perfect

---

<sup>4</sup>4<sup>12-19</sup> was probably borrowed from another source in line with the redactor's practice elsewhere.

sense without them; e.g. 4<sup>6-12</sup>, added by the redactor, quite naturally follows on from 3<sup>20</sup>, whilst the Amos-Numbers Midrash has been inserted into the redactional discourse on the 'Day of Judgment' in 7<sup>10-13</sup> + 7<sup>21-8<sup>2</sup></sup>.

3. They were composed specifically for their present context, (e.g.: 3<sup>20</sup>-4<sup>6</sup> following up 'the sure house' in 3<sup>19</sup> and 7<sup>14-21</sup> expanding on 'the land of the north' in 7<sup>14</sup>), and if they were not composed by the poet (3<sup>19</sup>) or the redactor (7<sup>14</sup>), then they must be later than them.
4. The 'Teacher of Righteousness', the title used by both the poet and the redactor for the founder of the sect, is now referred to as 'the Interpreter of the Law', a later pseudonym; thus, he is no longer remembered as a person, but merely in his role as a Lawgiver.
5. These midrashic sections can be closely compared to 4QFI, whilst the material for which the redactor is the author have more in common with the pesharim – see below.
6. The Messianic outlook found in these texts is considerably later than that found in the rest of the Document – see the Chapter 3.1.1. on 'Messiah'.
7. The imminent 'Day of Judgment' has passed, and the midrashic sections now talk of 'the latter days' as a current reality; the sectarians are living in the era following the 'period of wrath'.

This only leaves us with a few secondary additions and glosses to consider which can be summarized as follows:

Anti-Temple material:	1 <sup>3,(7)</sup> , 6 <sup>12-14</sup> .
The New Covenant:	6 <sup>18-19</sup> , 20 <sup>12</sup> .
The 'Messianic' references:	2 <sup>12</sup> , 5 <sup>21</sup> -6 <sup>1</sup> .
Glosses:	1 <sup>16</sup> , 5 <sup>15</sup> , 6 <sup>15</sup> .

It is difficult to ascribe these additions to either the redactor(s) or the midrashic author with any certainty. However a few important points can be noted: it is clear that the concept of 'the new covenant' and 'the land of Damascus' do not belong to the earliest strands of the document; the so-called Messianic references of 2<sup>12</sup> and 5<sup>21</sup>-6<sup>1</sup> were originally references to 'the anointed ones' (=the prophets), and consequently they should be classified as mere glosses - later though the text was emended or corrupted to the singular.

It is now possible to summarize our studies as follows:

1. The poetry: the four poems, the 'twelve precepts' (with its blessing and curse,) and the two final poetical sections.<sup>5</sup>
2. The Secondary Redactional material

- Material borrowed by the Redactor:

\* Source 1: 4<sup>12-19</sup>.

\* Source 2: 20<sup>1-8</sup> and 20<sup>22-25,25-27</sup>.

---

<sup>5</sup>Namely: 1<sup>1-3</sup>20, 5<sup>11-6</sup>4, 6<sup>11-7</sup>10 excl.7<sup>6-9a</sup>, 8<sup>1-9</sup>=19<sup>13-21</sup>, 20<sup>27-34</sup>.

- Material deriving from redactional activity:  
 1<sup>5-6,10,12-14</sup>, 2<sup>9</sup>, 3<sup>15-16</sup>, 4<sup>6-12</sup>, 4<sup>19-5<sup>11</sup></sup>, 7<sup>10-8<sup>3</sup></sup>  
 (excl.the Amos-Numbers Midrash), 19<sup>7-13</sup>,  
 8<sup>12-21</sup>=19<sup>24-33</sup>, 19<sup>33-20<sup>27</sup></sup> (excl.20<sup>1-8</sup> and 20<sup>22-27</sup>.)<sup>6</sup>

3. The four Midrashic passages: 3<sup>20-4<sup>6</sup></sup>, 6<sup>3-11</sup>, 7<sup>14-21</sup> and 8<sup>9-12</sup>  
 = 19<sup>21-24</sup>.

The next obvious question is to consider whether the poetical sections originally existed by themselves, (or with the Laws of IX-XVI,) as an independent manuscript, a proto-CD? The alternative is to regard the redactor as the compiler of the original Damascus Document, who borrowed all the poetical sections from one or more earlier sources, whilst the 'Twelve Duties' and the Laws of IX-XVI were supplied by some inner council of the community. This would imply that the Document was commissioned with a particular purpose in mind, which in my view would be so that those who lived away from Qumran should have a document to keep them on the straight and narrow.

In outlining these various literary genres within the Damascus Document, I have tried to demonstrate that a number of authors / (redactors) are responsible for the composite nature of the document. In the following section I intend to further substantiate this position by considering briefly the evidence of the other Dead Sea Scrolls and of some of the pseudepigraphical

---

<sup>6</sup>The redactor may have used an originally poetical source in 4<sup>6-12</sup>, 8<sup>12-13,16-19</sup> = 19<sup>24-26,28-33</sup>.

writings. The composite nature of this document has led scholars to assign a variety of divergent dates to it; for they have fixed a date for one or more of the historical allusions present within the document and then, not considering its potential composite nature, have declared that all the document must date to this period. Yet in the light of the above analysis, we can avoid this pitfall in our discussion as to the possible date when each of these authors / (redactors) worked.

## **2.2. The Damascus Document in its wider environment.**

In the previous section three main levels of authorship were tentatively outlined:

- Author 1: The poetical sections.
- "Author" 2: The Redactor(s).
- Author 3: The Four Midrashim.

The linguistic style and the themes of these authors will now be compared with contemporary literary sources, both inside and outside of the Scrolls. In addition to simply providing parallels to the material of each of the above authors, it is hoped that these parallels will help date the material, in particular the relative dating of one 'author' to another.

### **2.2.1. The poetry of the Damascus Document in the wider context of the Scrolls and contemporary literature.**

The fact that poetry occurs here in the Damascus Document should not surprise us overmuch. There are a number of poetic pieces within the Scrolls, most notably the Hodayot and the so-called Master's Hymn in 1QS.10<sup>9</sup>-11<sup>22</sup>, but also including: 1QS.3<sup>13</sup>-4<sup>24</sup> (as we have seen); 1QM.10<sup>8-18</sup>, 12<sup>10-16</sup>, 14<sup>4-16</sup>,

and 19<sup>2-8</sup>; the Apocryphal Psalms - 11QPs<sup>a,7</sup>; two Lamentations - 4Q179 and 4Q501;<sup>8</sup> the Seductress - 4Q184, and the Exhortation to seek Wisdom - 4Q185;<sup>9</sup> 1Q ApGen.20<sup>2-8a,10</sup> plus a number of fragmentary poetical texts.<sup>11</sup> Yet the majority of this poetical material consists of personal psalms praising God's goodness or seeking his help and intercession; 4Q184 and 4Q185 are the only exceptions, being wisdom poems. So is there anything which corresponds to the historical poetical accounts that we have found in the Damascus Document? I believe that the closest parallel occurs in the Hodayot, for here in the poetry of column 8 we are presented with the following plantation imagery:<sup>12</sup>

*[For Thou didst set] a plantation ('mṭ'')  
of cyprus, pine and cedar for Thy glory,  
trees<sup>6</sup> of life beside a mysterious fountain  
hidden among the trees by the water,  
and they put out a shoot ('nṣr')<sup>7</sup>  
of the everlasting Plant ('mṭ't')<sup>13</sup>.  
But before they did so, they took root  
and sent out their roots ('šwršyh') to the watercourse  
that its stem might be open to the living waters<sup>8</sup>  
and be one with the everlasting spring.*

*And all [the beasts] of the forest  
fed on its leafy boughs;  
its stem was trodden by all who passed on<sup>9</sup> the way  
and its branches by all the birds.  
And all the [trees] by the water rose above it  
for they grew in their plantation ('mṭ't');<sup>10</sup>  
but they sent out no root ('šwrš') to the watercourse.*

---

<sup>7</sup>See Sanders, DJD IV. The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11.

<sup>8</sup>See Allegro, DJD V, p75-77; Baillet, DJD VII, p79-80.

<sup>9</sup>See Allegro, DJD V, p82-87.

<sup>10</sup>VanderKam, RQ, 10, p57-66.

<sup>11</sup>In DJD I: 1Q35-40; in DJD III: 3Q6, 6Q18, 8Q5; in DJD VII: 4Q498-499.

<sup>12</sup>Vermes' translation - p187-188, except where indicated in the footnotes.

<sup>13</sup>Cf. 1QH.6<sup>15</sup>, 1QS.8<sup>5</sup> and 11<sup>8</sup> for the same phrase.



*And He caused to sprout the shoot of holiness,<sup>14</sup>  
 for the Plant ('mṭ't') of truth  
 was hidden and was not<sup>11</sup> esteemed;  
 and being unperceived  
 its mystery was sealed .....<sup>12</sup>*

*No [man shall approach] the well-spring of life,  
 or drink<sup>13</sup> the waters of holiness  
 with the everlasting trees,  
 or bear fruit with [the Plant] of heaven,  
 who seeing has not discerned,<sup>14</sup>  
 and considering has not believed  
 in the fountain of life,  
 who has turned [his hand against] the everlasting [bud] .....*

The imagery of the poem should present few problems: 'the plantation' (mṭ' / mṭ't) is the sect as in CD.1<sup>7</sup>; 'the shoot', is the Teacher of Righteousness; 'the living waters' / 'everlasting spring' / 'well-spring', are common metaphors for the teachings of the sect like those in CD.3<sup>16</sup> and 19<sup>34</sup>. As in the first poem of the Damascus Document, the sect, as the plantation, was in existence for some time before 'the shoot', the Teacher, appeared among them raised by God, whilst as in the third poem there are a number of allusions to the hidden teachings of the sect to which all new members had to adhere. For a number of scholars, the hymns of 1QH.2<sup>1</sup>-10<sup>12</sup> are autobiographical and enshrine 'what were seen as the most authentic data about the life and experiences of the founder of the community'.<sup>15</sup> If this is the case, did the writer of the poetry found in the Damascus Document use the historical information contained in these autobiographical poems of 1QH, or, taking the argument a step further, is our poet to be equated with the poet

---

<sup>14</sup>Vermes translates: 'And the bud of the shoot of holiness' Yet the Hebrew reads: 'wmpryḥ nṣr qwds' - 'And He caused to sprout the shoot of holiness'; viz. 'wmpryḥ' is a participle, and a verb is certainly required here.

<sup>15</sup>So Davies, Behind the Essenes, p90.

responsible for these autobiographical poems in 1QH, namely the Teacher of Righteousness?

If we turn to contemporary writings outside of the Scrolls, we find a number of similar semi-cryptic historical accounts. In Daniel there are the celebrated historical accounts which we find recounted in the form of visions - Daniel 7-12. Similar historical texts exist in the pseudepigraphical literature such as 1 Enoch 93 ('the Apocalypse of Weeks'), Jubilees 1, the Testament of Levi, 17, and the Testament of Naphtali, 4. These however are all prosaic in style, although the Testament of Levi 17 is followed by a poetical account in chapter 18 of the eschatological priesthood. The only truly poetical historical account of a contemporary date outside of the scrolls is therefore that found in the Psalms of Solomon 17<sup>4-19</sup>.<sup>16</sup>

- 4 Lord, you chose David to be king over Israel,  
and swore to him about his descendants forever,  
that his kingdom should not fail before you.*
- 5 But (because of) our sins, sinners rose up against us,<sup>17</sup>  
they set upon us and drove us out.  
Those to whom you did not (make the) promise,  
they took away (from us) by force;  
and they did not glorify your honorable name.*
- 6 With pomp they set up a monarchy because of their  
arrogance;  
they despoiled the throne of David with arrogant shouting.*
- 7 But You, O God, overthrew them, and uprooted their  
descendants from the earth,<sup>18</sup>  
for there rose up against them a man alien to our race<sup>9</sup>*
- 8 You rewarded them, O God, according to their sins;  
it happened to them according to their actions.*
- 9 According to their actions, God showed no mercy to them;*

---

<sup>16</sup>Wright's translation in Charlesworth, Vol. 2, p665-666.

<sup>17</sup>For Wright, the 'sinners' are Judeans, not Gentiles; probably the Hasmoneans.

<sup>18</sup>A reference to Pompey taking Aristobolus II and his children to Rome - Josephus, Antiquities, 14.4.5, 5.4, 6.1; The Jewish Wars, 1.7.7, 8.6.

<sup>19</sup>Wright - Pompey.

*he hunted down their descendants,  
and did not let even one of them go<sup>20</sup> ....<sup>10</sup> ..*

- <sup>11</sup> *The lawless one laid waste our land, so that no one  
inhabited it,<sup>21</sup>  
they massacred young and old and children at the same  
time.*
- <sup>12</sup> *In his blameless wrath he expelled them to the west,  
and he did not spare even the officials of the country from  
ridicule.*
- <sup>13</sup> *As the enemy (was) a stranger  
and his heart alien to our God, he acted arrogantly.*
- <sup>14</sup> *So he did in Jerusalem all the things  
that gentiles do for their gods in their cities.*
- <sup>15</sup> *And the children of the covenant (living) among the gentile  
rabble adopted these (practices).  
No one among them in Jerusalem acted (with) mercy or  
truth.*
- <sup>16</sup> *Those who loved the assemblies of the devout fled from  
them  
as sparrows fled from their nest.*
- <sup>17</sup> *(They became) refugees in the wilderness  
to save their lives from evil.  
The life of even one who was saved from them was precious  
in the eyes of the exiles.*
- <sup>18</sup> *They were scattered over the whole earth by (these) lawless  
ones.*
- For the heavens withheld rain from falling on the earth.*
- <sup>19</sup> *Springs were stopped,  
from the perennial (springs) far underground  
to those in the high mountains.  
For there was no one among them<sup>22</sup>  
who practiced righteousness or justice<sup>23</sup> .....*

If the identification of Pompey (in v7c and v11a) and the Hasmoneans (in v6f) is correct then the Psalms of Solomon must date to after 63 B.C., and if verse 9 really refers to the destruction of the Hasmonean line, the Psalms

---

<sup>20</sup>Aristobolus III was the last of the Hasmoneans who was killed in 36B.C.

<sup>21</sup>Some mss. read 'the storm' for 'the lawless one'; cf.CD.19<sup>25</sup> which talks of the 'raiser of storms' (unlike the parallel description in 8<sup>12-13</sup>.)

<sup>22</sup> = the citizens of Jerusalem, cf.v15.

<sup>23</sup>Cf.CD 20<sup>16-17</sup> quoting Hosea 3<sup>4</sup>.

must date post-36 B.C.. As the Damascus Document dates to Period Ib (110-37 B.C.), the two documents are remarkably close in date. Who then are the refugees in the wilderness, the exiles, who were scattered over the whole earth/land? Seemingly, simply devout Jews, but could this be a reference to the Qumran sect?

### 2.2.2. The Redactor(s) of the Damascus Document and the Pesharim.

A number of scholars have in the past tried to point to the close connection between the Damascus Document, and the pesharim, in particular the Habakkuk Commentary. Carmignac,<sup>24</sup> back in 1957, attempted to assign some of the major Scrolls to one of two groups; the first consisted of 1QS, 1QM and 1QH, the second of CD and 1QpHab. These two groups he distinguished on the following grounds:<sup>25</sup>

1. Only in the second group is there any reference to the Teacher: 7 times in 1QpHab and 5 times in CD.
2. On examining the vocabulary, some words were common in the first group whilst being rare or absent from the second: brk/brkh, hll, ḥsd, ngd, tmyd, 'mt, 'wlm.
3. The second group was more precise in its style, whilst the first group showed a certain tendency to prolixity.
4. The first group considers certain themes which the second

---

<sup>24</sup>Carmignac, 'Conjectures sur les écrits de Qumran', RSR, 2 (1957), p140-168 especially p141-154.

<sup>25</sup>Carmignac, RSR, 2, p141-154; I have combined his points 'E' and 'F'.

group ignores completely; for instance: the love of God, and the dualism between light and dark, good and bad.

5. In contrast to the first group, the second group refers regularly and explicitly to biblical texts which are often midrashically expanded.

6. There is a greater spirituality exhibited in the first group than the second, and this is expressed in particular in the intimate attitude to God found in the variety of titles assigned to Him.

Stegemann, in his more recent book,<sup>26</sup> also wanted to draw attention to the similarities between the Damascus Document and 1QpHab. but on entirely different grounds. He analyzed the statements in the pesharim concerning the Jewish opponents of the sect, and concluded that there were two major groups: the community founded by the Man of Lie, and the group centred around the Wicked Priest.<sup>27</sup> However, only the first of these groups occurs in the Damascus Document, but more significantly, all the passages which refer to this group (1<sup>13-18</sup>, 4<sup>19f</sup>, 8<sup>12f</sup>=19<sup>25f</sup>, 20<sup>13-15</sup>) are secondary expansions of the original text. Davies, however, considers that it is difficult for Stegemann to assert that these passages are historically reliable on the grounds that they are consistent with the information within the pesharim, when, 'in what remains as the original text (of the Damascus Document), there is no direct

---

<sup>26</sup>Stegemann, chapter IV (p128-185) - cf. Davies, p21-26.

<sup>27</sup>A view Davies has recently concurred with - Davies, Behind the Essenes, p97.

allusion to the Man of the Lie, nor indeed to any of the other parties or titles recorded in the *pesher* traditions.<sup>28</sup> Yet if my reconstruction of the text of the Damascus Document is correct, then the redactor used the followers of the Man of Lie as a past example of apostasy. The redactor may well have gained his information on this group from another source, but there is no reason to suppose that this source was inaccurate or that the redactor used his material inaccurately, especially as he considers them to be a specific example of apostasy. Furthermore, from the reconstruction of the poetry of 1<sup>1</sup>-2<sup>1</sup> it is apparent that the reference to the 'Man of Lie' is original to the text, not least because it parallels the reference to the Teacher of Righteousness in the previous stanza.

Thus, to a certain extent we can agree with both Carmignac and Stegemann, and two reasons in particular indicate to me that the redactor of the Damascus Document is a contemporary of the author of 1QpHab. (and of some of the other pesharim):

1. Both speak of the Teacher, but most significantly they speak of him as a past figure, i.e. as though he were dead: CD.6<sup>15-16</sup>, 19<sup>7-11</sup>, 19<sup>35-20<sup>1</sup></sup>, and 20<sup>13-14</sup> whilst in 1QpHab. this is indicated by the change in tense from the past/present to the future as though the Teacher had predicted what followed.<sup>29</sup> In addition, both refer to his followers as 'the poor': CD.6<sup>16</sup>, 19<sup>9</sup> using 'nyy';

---

<sup>28</sup>Davies, p23 - brackets mine.

<sup>29</sup>Brownlee, 'The Historical Allusions of the Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash', BASOR, 126 (1952), p16; J.van der Ploeg, 'L'usage du parfait et de l'imparfait comme moyen de datation dans le Commentaire d'Habacuc', in Les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte, p25-35.

1QpH.12<sup>3,6,10</sup>, 4QpPss<sup>a</sup> 2<sup>9</sup>, 3<sup>10</sup> using 'bywn'.

2. Both refer to the 'Man of Lie' (often using the root ntp) - CD (1<sup>14-15</sup>), 4<sup>19-20</sup>, 8<sup>13=19<sup>25-26</sup></sup>, 20<sup>15</sup> and 1QpHab.2<sup>1-2</sup>, 5<sup>11</sup>, 10<sup>9</sup>, ?11<sup>1</sup>, (1Q14.10<sup>2</sup> and 4QTest.<sup>22-30</sup>); again I believe the implication of both documents is that the Man of Lie is dead.<sup>30</sup> Both refer to his 'followers' who are termed: 'the men of scoffing' - CD.20<sup>11</sup>; 'the builders of the wall' - CD.4<sup>19</sup>, 8<sup>12,18=19<sup>24-25,31</sup></sup> cf.1QpH.10<sup>10</sup> and 4QTest.<sup>26</sup>; 'the seekers of smooth things' - CD.1<sup>18</sup>, 4QpNah. frags 3-4,<sup>1,2,7</sup>, and 4Qpls<sup>c</sup> frag 23, 2<sup>10</sup>.

There are a number of other less important parallels: the reference to 'the defiling of the temple' in 1QpHab.12<sup>7-9</sup> cf. CD.5<sup>6-11</sup> and 20<sup>22-25</sup>; byt yhw dh / yhw dh and 'hryt hymym are themes common to both but also present in other types of Qumran writings;<sup>32</sup> a forty year period is also mentioned in 4QpPss<sup>a</sup> 2<sup>7</sup>. The reference in 1QpHab.2<sup>3</sup> to 'the new covenant' would suggest that 19<sup>33-34</sup> is the work of the redactor; later(?) the secondary glosses in 6<sup>19</sup> and 20<sup>12</sup> were also added.

Thus it is clear that the main reason why scholars have associated the

---

<sup>30</sup>CD gives this impression in 20<sup>14-15</sup> in awaiting for his followers ('the men of war'), rather than their leader, to die - cf. 1<sup>12-14f</sup>; in 1QpHab. 'the Man of Lie' appears prior to the change in tense to the future.

<sup>31</sup>It should be noted that they are 'followers' in the sense of supporting him, but not in the sense of being members of a religious party led by him; furthermore, these groups should not be equated - see: 1QH.2<sup>31-32</sup>.

<sup>32</sup>(The House of) Judah: CD 4<sup>11</sup>, (7<sup>12,13</sup>), 8<sup>3=19<sup>15</sup></sup>, 20<sup>27</sup>, 14<sup>1</sup> and 1QpH.8<sup>1</sup>, 12<sup>4,9</sup> - also: 4QPBI.1 and 4QTest.27. 'The latter days': CD 4<sup>4</sup>, 6<sup>11</sup>, 1QpH.2<sup>5</sup>, 9<sup>6</sup>; 1Q14 6<sup>2</sup>; 4Qpls<sup>a</sup> frags 5-6, 10; frags 8-10, 11; 4Qpls<sup>c</sup> frag 23, 2<sup>10</sup>; 2<sup>1</sup>; 4QpHos.<sup>a</sup> 1<sup>11</sup> - also: 1QSa.1<sup>1</sup> and 4QFI.1<sup>2,12,15,19</sup>. Brooke (*Exegesis at Qumran*, p206-7) uses both these phrases to connect CD with 4QFlorilegium - see below.

Damascus. Document and 1QpHab. together is because of their common reference to the same two figures, the Teacher of Righteousness, and the Man of Lie. Yet as we have shown, the real parallel is between the redactor(s) of CD and the author of 1QpHab. both of whom write after the death of these two antagonists.

### 2.2.3. The Author of the four Midrashim and 4QFlorilegium.

Brooke first drew attention to the possible connection between the Damascus Document and 4QFlorilegium in trying to identify the tradition to which the latter belongs. He considers that there is a clear break in the text of the former at 3<sup>12b</sup>, from where a new unit runs until 8<sup>20</sup>, where again there is a break in the sense. He then precedes to list the following parallels between CD.3<sup>12b</sup>-8<sup>20</sup> and 4QFlorilegium:<sup>33</sup>

1. The phrase *bny šdwq* is only found outside 1QS,Sa,Sb in 4QFl.1<sup>17</sup> and CD.4<sup>1,3</sup>, and only these two use it in an unqualified form.
2. The *bny šdwq* are in both cases identified with the *bhyry yšr 'l*: 4QFl.1<sup>19</sup> and CD.4<sup>3</sup>.
3. The phrase *'hryt hymym*, outside of the pesharim, is only found in CD.4<sup>4</sup>, 6<sup>11</sup>, 4QFl.1<sup>2,12,15,19</sup>, and in the title of 1QSa.
4. The figure *dwrš htwrh* is found only in 4QFl.1<sup>11</sup> and CD.6<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup>Brooke, Exegesis at Qumran, p205-9.



and 7<sup>18</sup>.<sup>34</sup>

5. There is the common use of biblical passages: Amos 9<sup>11</sup> in 4QFI.1<sup>12</sup> and CD 7<sup>16</sup>; Isaiah 8<sup>11</sup> in 4QFI.1<sup>15</sup> and CD.8<sup>16</sup>. Brooke also points to the use of Deut.33 in 4QFI.fragments 6-11 and Deut.32<sup>33</sup> in CD 8<sup>9-12</sup>=19<sup>21-24</sup>; to this I would add that mḥwqq seems to be mentioned in 4QFI.9<sup>4</sup> in the quotation of Deut.33<sup>21</sup> and it seems likely that it was expanded in accordance with CD.6<sup>7-10</sup>.
6. According to Fitzmyer's classification of the biblical texts found in the scrolls, both CD and 4QFI. have "modernized" and "eschatological" texts.<sup>35</sup>
7. The only use of pšr outside the pesharim is in CD.4<sup>14</sup> and 4QFI.1<sup>14,19</sup>.
8. The only use of the root yš' in CD is in relation to saving Israel (5<sup>19</sup>), as it is in 4QFI.1<sup>13</sup>.<sup>36</sup>
9. gr is only referred to in CD.6<sup>21</sup>, 14<sup>4,6</sup>, 4QFI.1<sup>4</sup> and 11QT.40<sup>6</sup>.
10. Apart from Isaiah.7<sup>17</sup> at CD.14<sup>1</sup>, the only other references to '(the House of) Judah' in the Damascus Document are at

---

<sup>34</sup>Not strictly true as it occurs in the fragmentary Catena (A) 10-11<sup>5</sup> - Allegro, DJD, V, (1968), p71.

<sup>35</sup>Fitzmyer, NTS, 7, p309-16 where under 'modernized texts' he lists CD 1<sup>13-14</sup>, 4<sup>12-18</sup>, 6<sup>11-14</sup>, 7<sup>15-16,18-21</sup>, 8<sup>9-12,14-16</sup>, 19<sup>1</sup>, 4QFI.1<sup>2-3,14-16,16-17</sup> - not found outside these two documents; p325-330 where under 'eschatological texts' he lists CD 7<sup>10-12</sup>, 19<sup>7-9,11-12,15-16</sup>, 20<sup>15-17</sup>, 4QFI.1<sup>11-13</sup> - this class also includes four passages from 1QM.; CD is present in all four categories, whilst 4QFI. is restricted to these two.

<sup>36</sup>The root does though occur seven times outside these two documents.

4<sup>11</sup> and 7<sup>12-13</sup>, and a similar concern can be found in 4QFI.2<sup>1</sup>, 4<sup>4</sup>.

11. The purity of the temple is the concern of the third 'net' of Belial, CD.5<sup>6-11</sup>, and the same concern is found in 4QFI.1<sup>1-7</sup>.

Thus eleven reasons are given for connecting CD 3<sup>12b-8<sup>20</sup></sup> with 4QFlorilegium. However, there are two major objections to this analysis. Firstly, 3<sup>12b-8<sup>20</sup></sup> cannot be considered as a literary unit, not least because 3<sup>12b</sup> occurs in the middle of the third poem and so cannot be the start of a major section; it is difficult to see what common theme unites the text of 3<sup>12b-8<sup>20</sup></sup>. Those who hold fast' to the 'sure house'? – if so surely 'the Warnings' should be incorporated as well. Secondly, Brooke, whilst noting that the pesharim are often closely associated with the Damascus Document, disregards the evidence of the pesharim in comparing CD.3<sup>12b-8<sup>20</sup></sup> with 4QFlor., thus presenting somewhat misleading information. Consequently I would conjecture that the real parallel is between the four midrashim and 4QFlorilegium. If this were the case, the first six reasons given above would still hold true, and these are in my opinion the strongest arguments adduced. The following three reasons (No.7-9) all rest on a single Hebrew word which in none of these cases is unique to the Damascus Document and 4QFlorilegium; *pšr*, in any case, occurs in a 'borrowed' source, 4<sup>12-19</sup>. The allusions to the sect as 'Judah' or 'the House of Judah' is not really a valid argument, since this allusion is found regularly elsewhere in the scrolls: 1QpH.8<sup>1</sup>, 12<sup>4</sup>, 4QpNah.3<sup>4</sup>, 4QP Bless.1, 4QTest.27, 4QDibHam.4<sup>6</sup>. Finally, the concern about the defilement of the Temple is one voiced by the redactor, who is responsible for 5<sup>6-11</sup>, 20<sup>22-25</sup>, and probably the secondary addition of 6<sup>12-14</sup>. However, the spiritual

interpretation of the sect as the 'temple' is a theme which underlies the Ezekiel 44<sup>15</sup> Midrash, the Amos-Numbers Midrash, and is also part of the message of 4QFI.1<sup>1-7</sup> where we read of 'the temple of men'.

In addition to the first six reasons given, plus the notion of the spiritual temple, a further reason can be forwarded for my restatement of Brooke's position. This is, that in quotations, the introductory phrase (k)'šr ktwb is found four times in 4QFI.1<sup>2,12,15,16</sup> and in CD 7<sup>10,19</sup>, 19<sup>7</sup>; but more significantly, often a quotation is qualified by the prophet's name: 'Isaiah' - CD 4<sup>13</sup>, 6<sup>8</sup>, 7<sup>10</sup>, 4QFI.1<sup>15</sup>; 'Ezekiel' - CD 3<sup>21</sup>, 19<sup>12</sup>, 4QFI.1<sup>16</sup>; ('Zechariah' - CD.19<sup>7</sup>); 'Daniel' - 4QFI.2<sup>3</sup>, and sometimes these prophets are defined as such: CD 3<sup>21</sup>, 4<sup>13</sup>, 7<sup>10</sup>, 19<sup>7</sup> and 4QFI.1<sup>15,16</sup>. This latter use of prophetic names, sometimes with nby', is only found in these two documents. Thus I believe that the real connection with 4QFlorilegium is with these (four) Midrashic passages and not with the whole of 3<sup>12b-8</sup><sup>20</sup>.

### Conclusion.

We have seen how the redactor(s) and the Midrashic writer are associated respectively with the pesharim, in particular 1QpHab., and with 4QFlorilegium. We should now consider the relative dates of these latter two documents. In view of the reference to 'the Kittim' as the Romans, scholars date 1QpHab. either just after Pompey's invasion in 63 B.C. or up to two decades before this date.<sup>37</sup> The redactor then must have worked around this time and since there

---

<sup>37</sup>See: Knibb, p221 - dates it to the second half of the first century B.C., though it was composed before this, probably during the last years of Alexander Jannaeus' reign; Carmignac, RSR, 2, p163 - 80 B.C.; Segal, JBL, 70, p140 - c.90 B.C.; Van der Woude, 'Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests? Reflections on the identity of the Wicked Priest in the Habakkuk Commentary', JJS, 33 (1982), p359 - between 79-76 B.C..

appears to be no allusion to the Romans in the Damascus Document, the likelihood is that he wrote before rather than after 63 B.C.. On the other hand, 4QFlorilegium is considered to be a first century A.D. work; Brooke dates it to the second or third quarter of the century whilst Brown gives it a date 1-50 A.D..<sup>38</sup> We can probably therefore safely say that 1QpHab. predates 4QFlorilegium by at least 50 years, and this therefore suggests that the Midrashic writer worked later than the redactor of the Damascus Document, a conclusion we have already strongly hinted at elsewhere. This though, is not to say that these Midrashim were not added until the first century A.D., simply that they were the latest parts to be incorporated in the already existing Damascus Document. What is also unclear from our study, is by how much the poetry of the Damascus Document predates the work of the redactor(s). The closest parallel within the scrolls is with 1QH.8 and if one were able to date the Hodayot to the lifetime of the Teacher, as many scholars would like to do, then there is no reason why one should not date the poetry of the Damascus Document almost as early, and perhaps even accredit it to the same hand.

### **2.3. The *Sitz im Leben* of the Damascus Document.**

Before we move on to the actual dating of this composite document, we ought to consider the equally important question of its *Sitz im Leben*. Three suggestions have been proposed:

---

<sup>38</sup>Brooke, Exegesis at Qumran, p217; Brown, 'The Teacher of Righteousness and the Messiah(s)', in The Scrolls and Christianity (ed. M.Black), p43; Knibb, p257 dates 4QFlor. to the turn of the millenium.

### 2.3.1. The Babylonian Theory.

Murphy-O'Connor first put forward this theory and has been followed by Davies.<sup>39</sup> The former proposed that the geographical references that abound in the Damascus Document should be taken seriously, so that 'Damascus' must refer to a place outside of Judah, namely 'Babylon'. We are dealing therefore with a group of Jews who had been living in exile since the Babylonian exile, yet with the Maccabean victories creating once again an independent Jewish nation and with the anti-Semitism of the surrounding countries making itself felt (1Mac.5<sup>1-2</sup>), these Jews decided to return to Judah. Yet on arriving they found life not as they expected, for among other things the Jews followed a different calendar. So they appealed to them to turn from their sins in the 'Missionary Document' of 2<sup>14</sup>-6<sup>11</sup>, whilst attacking the (Maccabean) princes of Judah in 8<sup>3-18</sup>. With Jonathan's usurpation of the High-Priesthood, the Teacher of Righteousness joined the sect, and this in turn led to a split within the community, with those backing the Teacher in opposition to the original leader, the 'Liar', and his supporters. Further traces of the sect's original Babylonian background can also be found in the correct vocalization of Assyro-Babylonian words in 1QIs<sup>a</sup>,<sup>40</sup> the Laws of the Damascus Document which indicate a gentile environment, and the Mesopotamia practices of divination and astrology, lustrations, prayer for sunrise and the interest in plants and stones. Davies seems to agree with most of these points, noting in addition that the ideology of the Damascus Document has powerful roots in

---

<sup>39</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, 'The Essenes and their History', RB, 81 (1974), p219-229, BA, 40, p103-109, RB, 92, p224-230; Davies, p122-123 and p198-204.

<sup>40</sup>Milik has mentioned that 4QDam<sup>a</sup> belongs to a special class of manuscripts, including both biblical and non-biblical texts, which have characteristically "non-Judaeen" orthography and writing - RB, 73, p103-104.

the Exilic priestly literature; consequently he dates the first layer (1<sup>1</sup>-7<sup>9</sup>) prior to Qumran (c.100B.C.) yet after Jubilees (pre-200B.C.). This theory was given further support by Weinert who suggested that 4Q159 is another document which pre-dates the Qumran sect and originates in a different milieu.<sup>41</sup>

The major problem with this view is why a group, originally committed to their leader, would not only accept an ex-High Priest into their group, but allow him to take over the leadership to such an extent that all who did not join him were now termed 'traitors'. Would sudden advocates of this High-Priest really call their former fellow sectarians, with whom they had travelled back from Babylon and lived with prior to that, traitors? I think not. Furthermore, do the Laws of the Damascus Document really reflect a gentile environment, or do they simply reflect an environment in which gentiles can be found? The Greeks first entered Palestine in 332 B.C. under Alexander the Great and since 198 B.C. the territory had been under Seleucid rule; in addition Judaea was still a relatively small state prior to 142 B.C. since it did not include Samaria, Idumea or the coastal strip. In addition, from around 87 B.C. there existed the Nabatean kingdom which stretched to the south and east of Judaea and included the eastern shore of the Dead Sea; consequently the Nabateans must also have come into contact with the sectarians at some point. Foreign, in particular Hellenistic, influence would therefore have been

---

<sup>41</sup>Weinert, 'A Note on 4Q159 and on a new theory of Essene Origins', RQ, 9 (1977), p223-230. 4Q159 deals in the following order with: ...prescriptions relating to agricultural life, the halfshekel temple offering, relations with pagans, disobedience towards a court, prohibition against tranvestism, the validity of a woman's virginity.... Bearing this in mind consider Milik's words: "...before page XV we can detect the loss of several pages in the Cairo manuscript A. Numerous fragments from the Cave IV manuscripts belong to this missing section. These contain ..... laws of marriage, prescriptions relating to agricultural life, the payment of tithes, relations with pagans, relations between the sexes, a prohibition of magic, etc." - Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, p152 n3. Assuming that he quoted these prescriptions in the order which they appear in 4QDam., Milik's list corresponds exactly to the laws outlined in 4Q159 to the extent that I suggest that 4Q159 may be part of the Laws of the Damascus Document, and thus one of Milik's 'numerous fragments'.

strong and we know that some Jews even favoured certain aspects of the gentile way of life.<sup>42</sup> Thus it seems more likely that foreign traits in the scrolls and in particular in the Damascus Document, can be attributed to the increasingly cosmopolitan population of Judaea and its neighbouring states. Failing this, it is easier to postulate a small band, or odd refugees, who on coming from Babylon and the *Diaspora* joined an already existing and thriving sect, rather than to suggest that they themselves founded and made up the nucleus of this sect. Thus, I am forced to reject Murphy-O'Connor's hypothesis which seems to be based on largely subjective evidence, originating from his interpretation of 'Damascus' as 'Babylon'. Davies' argument can be dispensed with on similar grounds, and because the poetical evidence means that the references to the Teacher in 1<sup>11</sup> and 20<sup>28,32</sup> must be original; consequently Davies' first layer (1<sup>1-7</sup> + traces of 20<sup>27-34</sup>) can in no way represent a pre-Qumran stage.

### 2.3.2. The Annual Covenant Festival Theory.

In Milik's description of 4QDam. he indicates that after page XVI there is some further material, namely a penal code and the liturgy for the feast of the Renewal of the Covenant.<sup>43</sup> From this Knibb conjectures that 'these facts suggest that in its final form this work was intended for use at this annual ceremony (cf. 1QS 1<sup>16-3</sup>). We are perhaps to envisage a solemn recitation of the laws that were peculiar to the Essene movement, preceded by an exhortation addressed to those about to join the movement as well as to

---

<sup>42</sup>See: Josephus, Antiquities, 12,5,1 13,1,1 cf The Jewish War, 2,8,11; 1Mac.9<sup>25</sup>, 2Mac.4<sup>11-17</sup>; Tcherikover, Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews.

<sup>43</sup>Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, p116-7 and p152.

existing members.<sup>44</sup> Elgvin has also explored this argument in his short article: 'The Qumran Covenant Festival and the Temple Scroll' – JJS, 36 (1985), p103–106. He notes, that since 4QDam<sup>b</sup> states that the feast was celebrated in the third month, then the Festival of Weeks (New Wheat) on the 15<sup>th</sup> of the third would seem to be the obvious candidate, especially since it is also the Festival for the Renewal of the Covenant in Jubilees 6<sup>17-22</sup>. Allusions to this festival may in fact be present in the extant section of the Damascus Document at 14<sup>3-6</sup>, for Vermes has suggested that the rules here for 'The Assembly of all the Camps' constitute the convention of the whole sect for this great annual covenantal ceremony.<sup>45</sup> In addition 1QS.1<sup>16-218</sup> provides the liturgy for such a yearly festival, whilst 1Q34<sup>bis</sup> would seem to be a liturgical prayer. However, one major question remains: 'How can it be that this most important festival of the sect is not mentioned at all in the Temple Scroll, which describes all the feasts celebrated at Qumran?'<sup>46</sup> Elgvin proposes two solutions to this enigma:

1. 11QT originated on the periphery of the Qumran sect; the sect knew of the scroll but did not think it authoritative.
2. Or, if 11QT is sectarian, there is a time-gap between 11QT and the compilation of 1QS and CD, during which the covenantal festival entered the calendar of the sect.

Elgvin sides with the second alternative and I would tend to agree with him.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup>Knibb, p14.

<sup>45</sup>Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective, p103.

<sup>46</sup>Elgvin, JJS, 36, p104.

<sup>47</sup>See Chapter 3.1.3 on 'Law', p370–382.



However it is not the case that this festival only appears in the later strands of the Damascus Document (in columns XVIIIf) and 1QS (in columns I-IV),<sup>48</sup> for if one considers the original *Sitz im Leben* of the poetry of the Damascus Document, then the main poems most naturally reflect the *Sitz im Leben* of the Annual Covenant Festival. Later when the redactor compiled the document he supplied the liturgy for the Annual Covenant Festival in column XVIIIf fully appreciating the liturgical setting of the poems he had already incorporated in the Admonition. This liturgy appears in the earliest attested copy of the Damascus Document, 4QDam<sup>b</sup>, palaeographically dated to 75-50 B.C., and consequently the redactor's purpose (to pre-empt the following section) was to provide those members who lived away from Qumran with the details of the Annual Covenantal Festival. Thus the Annual Covenantal Festival is not the main reason for the composition of the Damascus Document, since the former had been in existence prior to the latter as is reflected in part by the liturgical *Sitz im Leben* of much of the poetry of the Damascus Document. All this neatly squares with the evidence of the Temple Scroll, whose sources largely pre-date Qumran as we shall see,<sup>49</sup> and that of 1QS, columns I-IV of which Murphy-O'Connor dates to 100-75 B.C. and thus contemporary with the redaction of the Damascus Document.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup>1QS.I-IV belong to Murphy-O'Connor's fourth and final stage of development - RB, 76 (1969), p537-544.

<sup>49</sup>See Chapter 3.1.3 on 'Law', p370-382.

<sup>50</sup>The absence of the festival from the Cairo mss. is not the hurdle which Elgvin tries to make of it; these pages were either 'lost' (probably during their time in the Geniza), or the Karaites, finding no use for this sectarian festival, omitted it when they copied the text.

### 2.3.3. The non-Qumran Essene Theory.

For me, Schiffman puts his finger on the most striking difference between the perspective of the Damascus Document and that of the Manual of Discipline.<sup>51</sup> The former is for the Essene communities who live mainly in "camps" in the towns and villages of Judaea, given as 4000 in number by Josephus and Philo,<sup>52</sup> and which may have included groups in the *Diaspora* such as the Therapeutae or those at Leontopolis (which would explain how the Damascus Document ended up in Cairo.) The latter is for the members of the sect who were permanently based at Qumran, living a life of total asceticism and dedication to God, abstaining from marriage and declaring all their goods to be in common ownership; this group included the founder members and the current leadership, living as they were at Qumran, the centre for the sect. Consequently, the content of the Damascus Document supplies everything a sectarian living away from Qumran could need: historical and theological lessons in the form of liturgical poems taken from the sectarian Annual Covenantal Festival, sectarian interpretation of biblical passages justifying their foundation and cause, a summary of the laws in the form of a 'dodecalogue' with associated blessings and curses, rules for apostate members, a substantial set of laws (IX-XVI f) giving a detailed outline of how a sectarian should live in his hostile, largely gentile, environment, and finally a description of the Annual Covenant Festival Ceremony. This theory for the *Sitz im Leben* of the Damascus Document, best explains the contents of the document, not

---

<sup>51</sup>Schiffman, Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony and the Penal Code, p213.

<sup>52</sup>Josephus, Antiquities, 18,1,5 (21) and Philo, Quod omnis probus, 12 (75) - it has been argued that Josephus used Philo here; see Schürer, Vol.2, p562-574.

least because among those sectarians who lived away from Qumran there would have been a fundamental need for such a document which no other sectarian work comes close to fulfilling.

#### 2.4. The date of the Damascus Document.

The composite nature of our text is the fundamental point which must be realized before any attempt can be made to date CD, for the date of the whole document cannot be fixed on the basis of a historical allusion in a single passage, as so many scholars have in the past tried to do.<sup>53</sup> There are then three dates for us to find; the date of the poetical sections, the date of the redactor, and the date of the midrashic writer. We already know the relative dating of one section to another; the poetry predates the work of the redactor, and the redactor the work of the midrashic writer. However, before considering the date of each of these, we need to take account of the palaeographical evidence.

##### 2.4.1. Palaeography and the Qumran manuscripts of CD.

The major part of the Qumran evidence, some seven, largely complete, manuscripts of the Damascus Document, is yet to be published.<sup>54</sup> The oldest of these manuscripts is 4QDam<sup>b</sup> which is palaeographically dated by Milik to 75-50B.C..<sup>55</sup> Fragments of the Damascus Document have also been found in

---

<sup>53</sup>E.g.: Dupont-Sommer on the basis of 8<sup>9-12</sup>=19<sup>21-24</sup> being a reference to Pompey - p119-120 and p135 n3.

<sup>54</sup>See: Baillet et al, 'Le travail d'édition des fragments manuscrits de Qumrân', RB, 63 (1956), p61 and Fitzmyer, p15.

<sup>55</sup>Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, p58; cf. Cross, The Ancient Library of Qumran, p59 n46.

Caves 5 and 6, and these along with some of the Cave 4 fragments cannot be dated before the Herodian period.<sup>56</sup> According to Milik the manuscripts of Cave 4 'correspond to Manuscript A, though representing a different recension (or recensions), and contain sections missing from the Cairo Versions.'<sup>57</sup> Fitzmyer, in the prolegomenon of the second edition of Schechter's, Documents of Jewish Sectaries, reconstructs the outline of the Damascus Document based on the Qumran recensions, namely that there is additional material before column I, after column XX, and after column XIV (XV-XVI being placed before IX).<sup>58</sup> Two points emerge from the evidence we have so far on the Qumran manuscripts of the Damascus Document. Firstly that the document was extremely important for the sect, there being at least nine attested copies of it at Qumran, and this would support the theory that it was copied at Qumran for the wider Essene community. Secondly, the earliest of these copies only dates from around 75-50 B.C. whilst many date from much later; had the Damascus Document been in existence since the middle of the second century, (or even been pre-Qumran in date,) one would expect at least some fragments from this period, and that there are not, suggests to me that we are dealing with a first century B.C. document. Furthermore, if we are correct in identifying its *Sitz im Leben* as the wider Essene community, then there would be no need for the document until the sect had reached this stage in its development, viz. post 88 B.C.

---

<sup>56</sup>Baillet, DJD, III, p181 (5Q12) and p128-131 (6Q15); see too: Baillet, RB, 63, p513-523. 4QD<sup>e</sup> (4Q270) has an 'alphabet hérodien classique' whilst 4QD<sup>d</sup> (4Q266) 'date du premier tiers du 1<sup>er</sup> siècle avant J.C.' - so Milik, 'Milki-šedeq et Milki-resa' dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens', JJS, 23 (1972), p135.

<sup>57</sup>Milik, RB, 63, p61.

<sup>58</sup>Fitzmyer, p18-19 - his reconstruction uses 4QDam<sup>b,e</sup>; cf. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, p151-2.

## 2.4.2. The dating of the poetical sections of the Damascus Document.

The poetical sections contain three references to the Teacher of Righteousness in 1<sup>11</sup> and 20<sup>28,32</sup>. These references do not suggest that he has died, in total contrast to the work of the redactor(s) where this is explicitly stated, and this comparison suggests that the Teacher was alive when these poems were first composed. The current consensus of scholarly opinion is that the Teacher died either towards the end of John Hyrcanus' reign or at the beginning of Alexander Jannaeus' reign, i.e. between c.110-95 B.C..<sup>59</sup> Certainly there is no suggestion that the Teacher was alive by the time of Civil War in 94-88 B.C., for there is no reference to him in 4QpNah.; in addition the poetry does not reflect the wider Essene movement, further confirming a date prior to 88 B.C.. Thus, the poetry was written before the Teacher's death which definitely occurred prior to the civil war.

A couple of minor points help to fix the *terminus a qua*. Most importantly, the reference to 'the sure house' (=Qumran), which I believe was established in 140B.C. after Simon declared himself and his descendants 'High Priests' - 1Mac.14<sup>41,60</sup>; that the sect had boycotted the temple is further substantiated by the formula found in 20<sup>28-30</sup> with its use of the plural rather than singular, and by the concept of the spiritual temple found in 6<sup>12,16</sup>. Thus, the poetry dates

---

<sup>59</sup>Albright and Mann, 'Qumran and the Essenes. Geography, Chronology and Identification of the Sect' in The Scrolls and Christianity (ed.M.Black), p25 - date the Teacher's death to after 135 B.C.; Brown, 'The Teacher of Righteousness and the Messiah(s)', p39 in the same volume, also dates the Teacher's death to John Hyrcanus' reign; Cross, The Ancient Library of Qumran, p117, believes that it is unlikely he survived the reign of J.Hyrcanus; Charlesworth, 'The Origin and Subsequent History of the authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Four transitional phases among the Qumran Essenes', RQ, 10, p224 n49 - dates his death 'to the end of the second century'; Carmignac, 'Qui etait le Docteur de Justice?', RQ, 10, p245, equates the Teacher with 'Judah the Essene' whose death occurred around 103 B.C..

<sup>60</sup>See Chapter 3.2.1 on 'History', p387-393.

after 140 B.C. and thus between 140 B.C. and the death of the Teacher (c.110-95 B.C.); this would make it contemporary with 1QH, thus paralleling the historical account in 1QH.8.

#### 2.4.3. The dating of the Redactor of the Damascus Document.

We have already seen that the Redactor was contemporary with the pesharim, in particular 1QpHab. The latter seemingly wrote after the Roman invasion of Palestine in 63 B.C., yet there is no reference to the Romans anywhere in the Damascus Document which suggests the redactor worked before 63 B.C. However the redactor wrote because an influx of members during the Civil War of 94-88 B.C. had meant that it was no longer possible for all members of the community to live at Qumran. The redactor thus worked between 88-63 B.C., but what of his imposed chronology? A literal reading of the timespan proposed in 1<sup>5-9</sup>, beginning from the exile in 587 B.C.,<sup>61</sup> places the formation of the sect in 197 B.C. and the rise of the Teacher in 177 B.C., both of which are clearly too early. Beckwith, asserts that the Essenes reckoned the date of the exile to be 560 B.C., allowing 70 years for the exile.<sup>62</sup> This he deduces from Jubilees and the Ages of Creation (4Q180f) which divides history neatly up into ten jubilees (nine shown here), each lasting 490 years.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup>See 1<sup>5-7</sup>, p24-27, for the suggestion that 597 B.C. was seen as the first year of the exile.

<sup>62</sup>Beckwith, RQ, 10, p524. He also writes that 'the Essenes began Daniel's 70 weeks at the return from the Exile, which they dated in Anno Mundi 3430, and therefore they expected the period of 70 weeks or 490 years to expire in A.M.3920, which meant for them between 3 B.C. and 2 A.D.' - Beckwith, RQ, 10, p521-42 summarizing his previous article in RQ, 10, p167-202. This means that he does not equate the 490 years of CD with Daniel's seventy weeks.

<sup>63</sup>11QMelch. also seem to have this chronology, being concerned with the jubilee following the ninth jubilee.

Creat'n	Jared	Noah	Eber	Abram	Entry	Temple	Return	End EoW <sup>64</sup>
1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th
0	490	980	1470	1960	2450	2940	3430	3920

If we then use the chronology of the Damascus Document, the following time-scale emerges:<sup>65</sup>

560 B.C. - date of the exile.

170 B.C. - date of the foundation of the sect, 390 years later:  
CD.1<sup>5-7</sup>.

150 B.C. - date of the rise of the Teacher, 20 years later:  
CD.1<sup>10</sup>.

110 B.C. - date of the Teacher's death (40 years later).

70 B.C. - date of the end of the age, 40 years later: CD.20<sup>15</sup>.

Does this chronology make sense? Significantly, 170 B.C. is the date of the death of Onias III, the last legitimate Zadokite High Priest,<sup>66</sup> while in 167 B.C. we read of people fleeing to caves and hear of the Hasidim for the first time.<sup>67</sup> 150 B.C. is the year the Teacher would have had to abandon his position as the unofficial High Priest of the *Interregnum*, since it is the year Alexander Balas finally defeated Demetrius I and so could make good his promise of the

---

<sup>64</sup>EoW = Era of Wickedness.

<sup>65</sup>Beckwith has taken the 490 years from the start of the exile to date the foundation of the sect to 173-169 B.C. (as I do here) - RQ, 10, p181 and p195, but from the end of the exile to date the coming of the Messiah to 3 B.C.-2 A.D. - RQ, 10, p523.

<sup>66</sup>Josephus, *Antiquities*, 12.4.2 and 2Mac.4<sup>34</sup>.

<sup>67</sup>Josephus, *Antiquities*, 12.6.2 = 1Mac.2<sup>20-38</sup>, and 1Mac.2<sup>42</sup> respectively.

High Priesthood to Simon Maccabee. We have already suggested that the Teacher died between 110-95 B.C., and it seems from this that a date during the final years of John Hyrcanus' time is to be preferred; this in turn means that the poetry should be dated to 140-110 B.C.. Thus if the end of the age was considered to be 70 B.C., the redactor must have worked between 88-70 B.C..

#### 2.4.4. The dating of the four Midrashim of the Damascus Document.

The date of the midrashim is difficult to discern. As we have seen they are closely related to 4QFlorilegium, but it seems unlikely that they too date from the first century A.D., for this would suppose that some of the manuscripts from Cave 4 do not have these midrashic sections, a fact which if true Milik has not hinted at. Significantly perhaps, the reference in both CD.4<sup>4</sup>, 6<sup>11</sup> and 4QFlor.1<sup>2,12,15,19</sup> to the 'latter days' may imply that the sect considered that they were now living in the age which followed the period of wickedness, i.e. post 70 B.C.. Admittedly there are no references to the Romans, but then the author was not concerned with such matters.<sup>68</sup> In the following chapter under the headings of 'Messianism' and 'Temple' I will be able to demonstrate further that these midrashic passages are later than the rest of the Damascus Document, but how much later it is difficult to say.

---

<sup>68</sup>Theoretically I could therefore date the Midrashic sections to 70-63 B.C. but this seems unlikely.



### Summary of the dating of the Damascus Document.

The poetry: 140-110 B.C.  
The redaction: 88-70 B.C.  
The midrashim: post-70 B.C.

In the following appendix, I shall consider how the Laws of IX-XVI fit into this outline. Then in the third and final chapter I will consider two corollaries to the conclusions forwarded in this chapter: firstly, how the composite nature of the Damascus Document helps to explain the development of Qumran theology, and secondly, how all these conclusions tie into the overall history of the sect.

## I. Appendix: The Laws of CD IX-XVI.

### II. The Composite Nature of the Laws.

Recent studies of the Damascus Document have concentrated on the Admonition and have only in passing referred to the Laws of IX-XVI. Thus both Murphy-O'Connor and Davies consider that the Laws represent a pre-Qumranic stage and that their content implies they were composed in the Diaspora,<sup>69</sup> yet having made such claims they do little to justify their position.

In the light of Milik's now famous footnote, which states that columns XV-XVI should be placed before column IX,<sup>70</sup> the contents of columns IX-XVI can be summarized as follows:

15 <sup>1</sup> -16 <sup>19</sup>	Oaths and Vows.
9 <sup>1</sup> -10 <sup>10</sup>	Legal Administration.
10 <sup>10</sup> -12 <sup>18(20)</sup>	Rites to be observed (esp. Sabbath).
12 <sup>(20)22</sup> -14 <sup>19</sup>	The organization of the sect.
14 <sup>20-22</sup> , 17 <sup>1f</sup> .	The Penal Code.

From our analysis of the text of the Admonition and especially from the conclusions drawn in the preceding section, it is clear that the Admonition is composite in nature. Consequently, the obvious opening question is whether the Laws of IX-XVI are also composite? To try to answer this I shall begin by considering a proposal put forward in 1952 by Rubinstein<sup>71</sup> who begins by stating that the distinction between 'yr 'city' and mḥnh 'camp' is no arbitrary

---

<sup>69</sup>Murphy O'Connor, RB, 81, p219-229, RB, 92, p224-230 and BA, 40, p103-109; Davies, p122-3, p198-204.

<sup>70</sup>Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, p151-2.

<sup>71</sup>Rubinstein, 'Urban Halakhah and Camp Rules in the "Cairo Fragments of the Damascene Covenant"', Sefarad, 12 (1952), p283-296.

one.<sup>72</sup> He draws attention to 12<sup>19-22</sup>, an epitome which reads:

*(The rule for) the usage of the cities of Israel, according to these judgments to separate between the clean and unclean and to make known the difference between the holy and the profane<sup>73</sup>*

From this he concludes 'that all the rules following the epitome pertain to camp settlements while the rules preceding it refer for the most part to "town";<sup>74</sup> He goes on to state that 9<sup>1-10</sup><sup>10</sup> deals exclusively with camp matters.<sup>75</sup> Thus, having separated out 10<sup>10-12</sup><sup>18</sup>, he considers that it was the last addition to the text of the Damascus Document for three main reasons:<sup>76</sup>

1. The epitome at 12<sup>19-22</sup>.
2. The artificial joint at 10<sup>10</sup>.
3. The "camp rule"-splinter which strayed into 9<sup>10-12</sup>.

Finally, Rubinstein also considers 7<sup>6-9</sup> which he sees as an 'afterthought .. probably inserted in its present place when the "camp rules" were added to CD, for the purpose of signposting so to speak, the "camp rules";<sup>77</sup> by the time 19<sup>2-5</sup> was written, dwelling in camps was regarded more as a tradition than a current reality. Rubinstein is therefore outlining at least three stages of composition: the Admonition, the "Camp" Rules including 7<sup>6-9</sup>, and the "Town"

---

<sup>72</sup> 'yr' = 10<sup>21</sup>, 11<sup>5</sup>, 12<sup>1,2,19</sup> all in the section 10<sup>10-12</sup><sup>18(20)</sup>; 'mhnh' = 9<sup>11</sup>, 12<sup>23</sup>, 13<sup>4,5,7,13(x2),16,20</sup>, 14<sup>3,9</sup> - only occurs in 10<sup>10-12</sup><sup>18</sup> at 10<sup>23</sup>.

<sup>73</sup>Rubinstein's translation - Sefarad, 12, p285.

<sup>74</sup>Rubinstein, Sefarad, 12, p285.

<sup>75</sup>In fact Rubinstein finds 9<sup>1-10</sup> a problem, labelling it as 'a collection of confused rules from which it would be vain to try to extract good sense' (p287), and associating it with 16<sup>6-15</sup> on grounds of style and the fact that this passage also seems to be out of keeping with the rest of the legal part under discussion (p286). This is quite a remarkable connection in view of the fact Rubinstein was writing prior to Milik's revelation. There is therefore probably no difficulty in seeing 16<sup>6-9</sup><sup>10</sup> as an integrated part of the text.

<sup>76</sup>Rubinstein, Sefarad, 12, p293.

<sup>77</sup>Rubinstein, Sefarad, 12, p293 - see p290-293.

Rules, 10<sup>10</sup>-12<sup>22</sup>.

Initially it is the distinction of the "Camp" Rules from the "Town" Rules that I wish to consider. There are a number of additional reasons for seeing 10<sup>10</sup>-12<sup>18</sup>, the "Town" Rules, as a later addition:

1. Only here in the Laws are there rules dealing with members' property, and as such the following vocabulary is restricted to this section: byt, 'house', as a private dwelling - 11<sup>7(x2).8.10.22.23</sup>, 12<sup>18</sup>; 'bwdh, 'work' - 10<sup>19.20</sup>, 11<sup>23</sup>, (14<sup>16</sup> with a different sense); ml 'kh 'labour' - 10<sup>15.19</sup>; bhmh, 'beast' - 11<sup>5.13</sup>, 12<sup>8</sup>; šdh, 'field' - 10<sup>20.23</sup>, (9<sup>9</sup> not as property); hwn, 'property' - 10<sup>18</sup>, 11<sup>15</sup>, 12<sup>7(x2)</sup> cf.13<sup>11</sup>; kly, 'vessel' - 10<sup>12.13</sup>, 11<sup>2.9.17</sup>, 12<sup>17.18</sup>; 'bd, 'slave', and 'mh, 'maidservant' - 11<sup>12</sup>, 12<sup>10</sup>; gwrn 'threshing-floor' - 12<sup>9</sup>; gt 'wine-press' - 12<sup>10</sup>.
2. Only here is there reference to: the temple, mqđš - 12<sup>1.2</sup>; sacrificing 'wlh - 11<sup>18.19</sup> / mnhh - 11<sup>19.21</sup> at the altar, mzbh - 11<sup>17.19.20</sup>, (mzbh in 16<sup>13</sup> is in a different context); holiness, qwdš - 12<sup>1.20</sup> and uncleanness, t̄m' - 10<sup>13</sup>, 11<sup>19.22</sup>, 12<sup>20</sup>; the festivals mw'd - 12<sup>4</sup>, šbt - 19 times.
3. This section contains no references to any of the functionaries of the community: zqnym, 'Elders' - 9<sup>4</sup>, (14<sup>14</sup>); šwptym, 'Judges' - 9<sup>10</sup>, 10<sup>1.4.8</sup>, 14<sup>13</sup>, 15<sup>4.16</sup>, 16<sup>19</sup>; khnym, 'priests' - 9<sup>13.15</sup>, 13<sup>2.5</sup>, 14<sup>3.5.6</sup>, 16<sup>14</sup> and lwym, 'Levites' - 13<sup>3</sup>, 14<sup>4.5</sup>; mbqr, 'M<sup>e</sup>baqquer' - 9<sup>18.19.22</sup>, 13<sup>6.7.13.16</sup>, 14<sup>8.11.13.20</sup>, 15<sup>8.11.14</sup>; mšky1, 'Maskil' - 12<sup>21</sup>, 13<sup>22</sup>; rbym 'the Many' - 13<sup>7</sup>, 14<sup>7.12</sup>, 15<sup>8</sup>; the root pqđ (cf.pqyd in 1QS.6<sup>14</sup>) - 10<sup>2</sup>, 13<sup>11</sup>.

14<sup>3,6</sup>, 15<sup>6,8</sup>.

4. This section contains no references to: *twrh*, 'the Law' - 9<sup>17</sup>, 13<sup>5,6</sup>, 14<sup>8</sup>, 15<sup>2,9,12,13</sup>, 16<sup>2,5,8,9</sup>; *mšwt*, 'commandments' - 9<sup>7</sup>, 10<sup>3</sup>; *ḥwq*, 'precept' - 9<sup>1</sup>, 12<sup>20</sup>, 15<sup>5</sup>; *srk*, 'rule' - 10<sup>4</sup>, 12<sup>19,22</sup>, 13<sup>7</sup>, 14<sup>3,12</sup>; *bryt*, 'covenant' - 9<sup>3</sup>, 10<sup>6</sup>, 13<sup>14</sup>, 14<sup>2</sup>, 15<sup>2,3,5,6,8,9</sup>, 16<sup>1,12</sup> - in 12<sup>11</sup> it occurs in a unique phrase 'covenant of Abraham'.<sup>78</sup>

These four factors, plus Rubinstein's three should be enough to convince most scholars that 10<sup>10</sup>-12<sup>18</sup> forms a distinct section which is from a different source than the "Camp" Rules into which they were inserted. Admittedly, the "Town" Rules could have existed independently before their inclusion into our document, and so be as old as the "Camp" Rules. However this seems unlikely because they exhibit a more advanced stage of the sect with some "members", or branches within the sect, now allowed to hold property, marry, and mix with the Jewish population rather than living a segregated ascetic existence. It is possible that these rules were for those Essenes 'who agree with the rest as to their way of living, and customs, and laws, but differ with them in the point of marriage'.<sup>79</sup>

The next obvious problem is to consider how this two-stage development

---

<sup>78</sup>To this we could add that our section consists of largely apodictic laws - using the Jussive with 'l' forty-four times (occurring in 80% of the lines) compared with 'm' eleven times (occurring in 20% of the lines); whilst the Camp Section contains a larger percentage of casuistic law than apodictic - 'm' is found twenty-two times (occurring in 19% of the lines), Jussive with 'l' nineteen times (occurring in 15% of the lines).

<sup>79</sup>Josephus, The Jewish Wars, 2,8,13.

squares with the various authors / redactors outlined in the previous section.<sup>80</sup> Were the Laws, excluding the "Town" Rules, incorporated with the poetical sections into a 'proto-CD', and the "Town" Rules then added by the redactor? Or did the redactor as compiler add the "Camp" Rules with the author of the Midrash supplying the "Town" Rules, or alternatively did he borrow both the "Camp" and "Town" Rules from different sources before amalgamating the two? Four pieces of evidence need to be considered. Firstly the occurrence of the phrase 'the Messiah of Aaron and Israel' in 12<sup>23</sup> and 14<sup>19</sup> which in the Admonition was seen to be the work of the redactor. Secondly, the 'Twelve Duties' refer to sections in both the "Camp" and "Town" Rules, and so consequently either they did not originally refer to the Laws and the latter were partly composed to pick up the injunctions of the former, or the Laws are contemporary with the 'Twelve Duties', viz. they all originated from a common source which the redactor used when composing the document. Thirdly, the themes of marriage and uncleanness found in the Nets of Belial passage are more akin to the "Town Rules" and the two exhibit some common vocabulary,<sup>81</sup> yet conversely the Nets of Belial passage is more closely related to 7<sup>6-9</sup> which refers to the "camps". None of this evidence is conclusive but the most satisfactory solution would seem to be that the redactor as compiler used two sources, 10<sup>10-12</sup><sup>18</sup> being however the later, which he blended

---

<sup>80</sup>It is unlikely that these Laws predate the Qumran sect because the book of Jubilees is directly referred to in 16<sup>3-4</sup>; the latter has been dated by Charlesworth, (Vol.2, p43-44) between 161 B.C. and 140 B.C..

<sup>81</sup>The following words in the Nets of Belial Midrash (but not in any poetry) occur in the Camp Rules: root 'ns' - 9<sup>19</sup>; root 'nsl' - 14<sup>2</sup>; 'zqnym' - 9<sup>4</sup>, 14<sup>14</sup>; root 'yśb' - 10<sup>9</sup>, 13<sup>21</sup>, 14<sup>6</sup>; 'zh' - 10<sup>4</sup>, 12<sup>22(x2)</sup>, 13<sup>7,20</sup>, 14<sup>17,18</sup>; 'yswd' - 10<sup>6</sup>; 'spr' - 10<sup>6</sup>, 13<sup>2</sup>, 14<sup>7</sup>, 16<sup>3</sup>; 'twrh' - as above. Marital relations are implied in 12<sup>1-2</sup>, but they also occur in 16<sup>10-13</sup>.

together into the Laws.<sup>82</sup>

### I.II. The relative dating of the Laws (IX-XVI) to the other Scrolls.

Having dated the various layers of the Admonition in the previous section we need to make sure that the dating evidence of the Laws does not contradict those conclusions. Two scholars have written articles on the apparent development in the roles of the functionaries of the community between the Manual of Discipline and the Damascus Document, and both argue that the Damascus Document represents a later stage in the development of the life of the community.

Back in 1962 J.F.Priest wrote an article entitled 'Mebaqqer, Paqid and the Messiah' where he posed the question: 'Are *mebaqqer* and *paqid* separate titles denoting the same individual?'<sup>83</sup> In CD.13<sup>11</sup>, the *mebaqqer* is instructed to examine (=ypqdhw) all those who wish to enter the congregation 'with regards to their *actions, understanding* strength, courage and property', while in 1QS.6<sup>14</sup> it is the *paqid* who investigates the initiates as 'to their *action* and *understanding*. Priest argues that what we really have in the Damascus Document is 'a reflection of the taking over by the *mebaqqer* of a function once fulfilled by the *paqid*, and that the former situation is reflected in the retention of the verbal form ypqdhw.'<sup>84</sup> Priest also notes that 'the *mebaqqer* in

---

<sup>82</sup>Schiffman argues that 12<sup>1-9</sup> hints at a polemic against the Hasmoneans, especially in the prohibition against the gentiles in 12<sup>6,9</sup> - 'Legislation concerning relations with non-Jews in the Zadokite Fragments and in Tannaitic Literature', RQ, 11 (1982), p379-389.

<sup>83</sup>JBL, 81, p58.

<sup>84</sup>Priest, JBL, 81, p59.

CD fulfils many of the functions assigned to the priests in 1QS'.<sup>85</sup> However, CD 13<sup>5-7</sup> suggests that the *mebaqqer* is a layman, for here he has the task of instructing the officiating priest if the latter is uncertain about the exact meaning of the law. He therefore concludes that in 'the organization of the community the leadership was originally centered in two persons: the *paqid* who was the head of the priests, and the *mebaqqer* who was head of the laity'.<sup>86</sup> Finally Priest suggests that the *paqid*, as a priest, was a representative of Aaron and is the prototype of the Messiah of Aaron, whilst the *mebaqqer*, as a representative of Israel, was the prototype of the Messiah of Israel. The amalgamation of the authority of these two figures in 1QS into a single figure, the *mebaqqer*, in the Damascus Document, went hand in hand with the development from the expectation of two Messiahs in 1QS.9<sup>11</sup> to that of one in the Damascus Document.<sup>87</sup>

Yet is Priest correct in these deductions or is he forgetting one important factor, namely the *Sitz im Leben* of these two documents? Before answering this question we should consider what Kruse has to say regarding the *rabbim* in his article: 'Community Functionaries in the Rule of the Community and the Damascus Document: A test of Chronological Relationships'.<sup>88</sup>

Although the precise identity of the *rabbim* is not agreed upon, Kruse contends, correctly in my view, that the term, 'in its widest possible sense, refers to the number of those who had successfully completed their two year

---

<sup>85</sup>Priest, JBL, 81, p59: see CD 9<sup>18,22</sup>, 13<sup>7f</sup>, 14<sup>11,13</sup>, 15<sup>6f</sup>.

<sup>86</sup>Priest, JBL, 81, p60; this is evident from 1QS.5<sup>2f</sup>.

<sup>87</sup>So Priest, JBL, 81, p60.

<sup>88</sup>Kruse, RQ, 10 (1981), p543-551.



probationary period and were accepted as full members of the sect.<sup>89</sup> In the Manual of Discipline the *rabbim* have an important role in the decision to admit new members into the community, at the initial stage (6<sup>13-18</sup>), after their first probationary year and at the end of their second and final year's training (6<sup>21-23</sup>). There is no mention of the *mebaqqer* in the final two cases, and in the first case the *mebaqqer's* decision could be vetoed by the *rabbim* - 1QS.6<sup>16</sup>. The *rabbim* also have a number of other important functions in the Manual of Discipline, not least in their decision to grant an individual the right to speak in the Council of the Community - 6<sup>10-13</sup>.<sup>90</sup> However, in the Damascus Document the highest authority is in the hands of the *mebaqqer* whilst the *rabbim* have a subordinate position with no particular function to perform. Kruse concludes that 'assuming the normal process of organizational development it is easier to account for the gradual transfer of power from the many to the one than it is to explain how power once resting in the hands of one man would come to be relinquished to the many'.<sup>91</sup>

While many scholars have tried to define exactly what constituted the *rabbim*, few scholars have concentrated on the probably more important question of their function. For it seems to me that the *rabbim* are quite simply a democratic body consisting of all full members of the community.<sup>92</sup> This body, though, only had authority at Qumran where the 'Council of the Community' sat. It was headed by the *paqid*, a priest, perhaps to be regarded

---

<sup>89</sup>Kruse, RQ, 10, p549.

<sup>90</sup>See also 1QS.7<sup>16-17</sup>, 8<sup>16-19</sup>, 8<sup>24-92</sup>.

<sup>91</sup>Kruse, RQ, 10, p551. This assumption is debatable - many democracies have developed from dictatorships or monarchies.

<sup>92</sup>See Josephus, Antiquities, 2,8,9.

as a 'chairman' in his role. The *mēbaqqer*, though important as an individual, could only make recommendations to this democratic body as to the admission of an individual, and it was then up to the *rabbim* to vote on the matter. In practice this would work very much like an AGM of a contemporary political party, where various key ministers put forward their proposals on certain matters, which are duly passed with little or no opposition; although in theory, power lies with the voters, in practice it is the individual minister who is responsible for proposing what action is to be taken on a particular issue. Outside of Qumran in the 'camps' the *mēbaqqer* obviously held the highest authority, for the *rabbim* here are merely full members who live away from Qumran; they hold no power in themselves. Furthermore, the absence of any direct reference to the *paqid* is unsurprising, for his position was only in effect at Qumran when the *rabbim* sat. The absence of community functionaries from the rules for the "Town" 1Q10-12<sup>18</sup> suggests that all full members were required to live in "Camps" under the authority of the *mēbaqqer*, and that those who lived in "Towns" were novices or perhaps merely Essene sympathizers.<sup>93</sup>

It is significant that a brief examination of the roles of the priests and the Levites in these two documents shows no development. In both they occupy the first and second positions of responsibility - 1QS.1<sup>22</sup>, 2<sup>19-20</sup>, 6<sup>8-9</sup> and CD.14<sup>3-8</sup>; likewise both specify that each group of ten or more men had to have a priest - 1QS.6<sup>3-4</sup> and CD.13<sup>2-4</sup>. Kruse contends that '1QS tends to speak in more general terms, whereas the tendency in CD is towards detail,

---

<sup>93</sup>Josephus' talks of the four-fold division of the Essenes - The Jewish Wars, 2.8,10, cf. Schürer, Vol.2, p565. Here too we have four categories: the *rabbim* who lived permanently at Qumran; the *rabbim* who lived outside of Qumran in 'Camps'; those Essenes who lived in 'Towns' (refusing / choosing not to dwell in 'Camps'); novitates in their first two years of training.

and to make provision for certain unusual situations.<sup>94</sup> Yet I feel these differences can again be much better explained by the *Sitz im Leben* of the Manual of Discipline and the Damascus Document; the former contains rules connected with the admission of new members in the environs of Qumran - 1QS.1<sup>16-218</sup>, 6<sup>13-23</sup>, the latter with matters arising from living in the 'Camps' - CD 13<sup>5-7</sup>, 16<sup>13-14</sup>.

So the assertion of both Priest and Kruse that the Manual of Discipline represents an earlier stage in the development of community than the Damascus Document, seems, at least on the grounds discussed here, to be unfounded. The differences in the roles of the *mebaqqer*, *paqid* and *rabbim* are best explained in terms of the differing *Sitz im Leben* for which the two documents were written. Two further factors support this position. Firstly, the palaeographic evidence which dates many of the Qumran manuscripts of these two works to the same period.<sup>95</sup> And secondly, the composite character of these two documents which have evolved over a considerable length of time, allows for the possibility of the Manual of Discipline to have been revised should the need have arisen; the fact that this has not occurred but rather the original 'out-of-date' community structure was kept, strongly suggests that there was no need to revise it to conform with the Damascus Document.<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>94</sup>Kruse, RQ, 10, p545.

<sup>95</sup>See Cross, 'The Development of Jewish Scripts' in The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honour of W.F.Albright, p133-202; ten copies of the Community Rule have been found in Cave 4, 4QS<sup>a-j</sup> some of which contain older and better texts than that found in Cave 1. 1QS reached its present form around 100-75 B.C. (Stage IV of Murphy-O'Connor's theory) which compares favourably with the date I have suggested for the redactor's compilation of the Damascus Document of 88-70 B.C.; both though embody older traditions, 1QS.8<sup>1-9</sup><sup>16</sup> (=Stage I) stemming from pre-130 B.C. and like the poetry of the Damascus Document relating details concerning the formation of the sect - RB, 76, p528-549.

<sup>96</sup>There is therefore technically nothing in the respective roles of the community functionaries in 1QS and CD to count against the opposite view that CD is in fact earlier than 1QS, a view held by Murphy-O'Connor and Davies who regard the Laws as stemming from, or at least influenced by, a Babylonian milieu.

Thus the Damascus Document and the Manual of Discipline were contemporary documents of the sect; the latter being used solely at Qumran, the former in the wider Essene community outside Qumran.

## CHAPTER 3

### COROLLARIES.

#### 3.1. Corollaries regarding the Theology of Qumran.

In the above section we divided the Damascus Document into three literary *genres*: the earliest poetical level, the redactional work of the compiler, and the final midrashic level. Clearly the Damascus Document, like the Manual of Discipline, is composite in character, and thus may well exhibit a marked development in its theological outlook on certain key issues, such as: Messianism, the Temple, the Law and the Covenant. Such evolutionary tendencies arose in part through study of the scriptures, but they must also be the result of external influences upon the sect so that it may be possible to date a shift in theological outlook to a particular historical event.

##### 3.1.1. Messianism.

A number of scholars have argued that there is a definite development in the messianic outlook of the sect, most notably Starcky in his article 'Les quatre étapes du messianisme à Qumran'.<sup>1</sup> However, rather than analyzing this and other theories, I will attempt to outline the messianic views of the sect in a chronological fashion and refer to such theories where relevant.

**Stage 1:** At the earliest stage in the history of the sect the Teacher of Righteousness was alive and so there was little need to look for another

---

<sup>1</sup>RB, 70 (1963), p481-505.

redeemer to lead the sect in the way of the Lord. Instead it was the sect itself that was attributed with a variety of titles such as: 'a root / plantation' which God had caused to shoot from Israel - CD.1<sup>7</sup>, 'a plant of truth' - 1QH.8<sup>10</sup>, 'an everlasting plant' - 1QH.6<sup>15</sup>, 8<sup>6</sup>, 1QS.8<sup>5</sup>, 11<sup>8</sup>. Similiar plantation imagery can be found throughout the pseudepigrapha: Jubilees 1<sup>16</sup>, 21<sup>24</sup>, 1Enoch 62<sup>8</sup>, 93<sup>2.5.10</sup>, Ps.Sol.14<sup>3-4</sup>, T.Judah 24<sup>6.2</sup>. The sect also describe themselves as a 'byt': 'the House of Truth in Israel' - 1QS.5<sup>6</sup> cf.8<sup>9</sup>, 'the House of Holiness for Israel' - 1QS.8<sup>5</sup>, 'the House of Holiness for Aaron ..and a united House for Israel' - 1QS.9<sup>6</sup>, 'a faithful House in Israel' - CD.3<sup>19</sup>. Significantly all these references occur in the earliest scrolls or the earliest strands of composite works, including of course the poetry of the Damascus Document. This first stage of the 'messianic' beliefs of the sect agrees in content with that outlined by Starcky and Brown,<sup>3</sup> and should be assigned to the earliest period of settlement at Qumran (Period Ia), c150-110.<sup>4</sup>

Stages 2 and 3: We should now turn our attention to the vexing problem of the phrase 'the Messiah of Aaron and Israel'; the plural occurs in 1QS.9<sup>11</sup> - mšyḥy ḥrwn wyśr 'l, whilst the singular appears in two slightly different forms in the Damascus Document - mšyḥ ḥrn wyśr 'l in CD.12<sup>23</sup>-13<sup>1</sup>, 14<sup>19</sup>, 19<sup>10</sup>, and mšyḥ m'hrn wmyśr 'l in CD.20<sup>1</sup>. When the Scrolls were first published it was considered that the readings in the Damascus Document were the later corrections of a scribe unfamiliar with the concept of dual messiahship,<sup>5</sup> but in

---

<sup>2</sup>See Fujita, JSJ, 7, (1976), p30-45.

<sup>3</sup>Starcky, RB, 70, p482-487; Brown, 'The Teacher of Righteousness and the Messiah(s)', in The Scrolls and Christainity (ed.M.Black), p41; Brown, 'J.Starcky's Theory of Qumran Messianic Development', CBQ, 28 (1966), p51 where he formally states that he agrees with Starcky's first stage.

<sup>4</sup>See though Chapter 3.2.1. which deals with the Archaeological evidence, p387-393.

<sup>5</sup>So M.Burrows, More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls, p228.

a fragment of the Damascus Document found in Cave 4 the singular form of *mšyḥ* is also found at 14<sup>19</sup>.<sup>6</sup> So one arrives at the question: does this phrase in the Damascus Document refer to two Messiahs, viz. 'the Messiah of Aaron and (the Messiah) of Israel', or does the Manual of Discipline propound dual messiahship and our document that of a single Messiah? Both views have their advocates. On linguistic grounds the former translation is certainly possible, for Brown states that 'in Hebrew grammar the *nomen regens* need not be repeated before each *nomen rectum*... Examples of a *regens* in the singular governing two *recta* with the meaning "the X of Y and (the X) of Z" may be found in 2Sm.19,6 and Is 1,11.'<sup>7</sup> The problem here is how to explain why the redactor of the Damascus Document did not use the already existing plural form of the phrase if he had wanted to indicate dual messiahship, especially as the concept was one which differed from the norm of 'orthodox' Judaism? Conversely, Laurin asserts that if two Messiahs were meant by the phrase 'the Messiah of Aaron and Israel', then only the Messiah of Israel would have been referred to in CD.19<sup>10</sup>, for only he would have wielded a sword.<sup>8</sup> The general consensus favours the latter interpretation in seeing only one figure in the singular form of the phrase.<sup>9</sup>

The belief in two Messiahs or that of the dual role of a single Messiah,

---

<sup>6</sup>Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, p125.

<sup>7</sup>Brown, CBQ, 28, p54; dual messiahship is also understood in this phrase in CD by: Strickert, RQ, 12, p339 and Ginzberg, p248-9 - the latter again on linguistic grounds and without the evidence of 1QS.

<sup>8</sup>Laurin, 'The Problem of the two Messiahs in the Qumran Scrolls', RQ, 4 (1963), p50-51. He considers that there is never any reference to two Messiahs in the Scrolls; 1QS.9<sup>11</sup> should be regarded 'as a scribal error, or as a general designation for the eschatological priest and king' - p51.

<sup>9</sup>So: Priest, JBL, 81, p60-61 - see Appendix to Chapter 2; Brooke, ZAW, 92, p403; Teeple, The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet, p112; Vermes, DSSE2, p49.

who would rise from the priestly (Levi) and kingly (Judah) lines, is present in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs: T.Naph.5<sup>4-5</sup> looks to when 'Levi shall become like the sun' and 'Judah become luminous like the moon'; T.Gad.8<sup>1</sup> reads 'Tell these things to your children as well, so that they will honour Judah and Levi, because from them the Lord will raise up a Saviour for Israel'.<sup>10</sup> It seems significant that the priestly function of the Messiah is outlined both in the scrolls and the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs at broadly the same period of time.<sup>11</sup> What event could have led to this emphasis? It is often held that the original nucleus of the sect consisted of a group of (Zadokite) priests who were suddenly exiled from the Temple in 152/0 B.C. when Jonathen assumed the High Priesthood for himself. Any hope of quickly regaining the priesthood was dashed in 142 B.C. when the Hasmonians under Simon were declared 'High Priests' until a prophet should arise, and a later attempt by Eleazar (a Pharisee?) to persuade John Hyrcanus to relinquish the priestly aspect of his office led to disastrous results for the Pharisees.<sup>12</sup> In this political climate, the maxim stating that 'the less an aspiration can be realized, the greater its idealization',<sup>13</sup> quite naturally led to the foundation of the messianic belief in a future priestly Messiah, for likewise the seeds of the belief in a kingly Messiah were sown early in the post-exilic

---

<sup>10</sup>See also: T.Joseph 19<sup>11</sup> and T.Benj.11<sup>2</sup> though both may have been subjected to Christian influence - Charlesworth, Vol.1, esp. p777-9.

<sup>11</sup>Charles, (Vol.2, p289-290) on the basis of 18<sup>2</sup> dates the Testaments to John Hyrcanus' reign (134-107 B.C.); Charlesworth (Vol.1, p777-8) gives them a Maccabean date mainly because the concept of 'dual Messiahship parallels the (not always consistent) messianic outlook at Qumran'; Hollander & De.Jonge date the Aramaic Test.Levi to the second century B.C. - The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, p22.

<sup>12</sup>1.Mac.14<sup>41</sup> and Josephus, Antiquities, 13.10.5-6 respectively.

<sup>13</sup>So Ginzberg, p234.



period when the absence of the monarchy became a stark reality.<sup>14</sup> Thus, the evidence of history suggests that the expectation of the priestly Messiah would parallel the existence of the non-Zadokite Hasmoneans as High Priests, i.e. from 150/140 B.C. until 63 B.C., or perhaps until 36 B.C. when Aristobulus III, the last of the Hasmoneans, was murdered.

The evidence of the scrolls seems to support the view that the concept of dual messiahship developed into the belief of the dual role of a single Messiah, rather than that the two views existed side by side as they appear to do in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs. For the earliest texts speak of two Messiahs, namely 1QS.9<sup>11</sup>, 1QSa.2<sup>12-14</sup>, 4QAHA and 4QTestimonia, which are all second century B.C. in date or perhaps very early first century B.C.. However by the time the Damascus Document was redacted the sect had modified this concept into the more traditional view of a single Messiah, (who though had two roles,) and this modification may have resulted in part from the sudden increase in membership, the majority of whom would hold to the traditional concept of a single (Davidic) Messiah. I thus follow Starcky's theory of a development from two Messiahs to one and agree with his suggestion that this was due to Pharisaic influence.<sup>15</sup>

**Stage 4:** There are some fundamental criticisms to be made here of the theories of Starcky and Brown, for they fail to distinguish between uniform works (autographs) and composite documents which can be placed in more

---

<sup>14</sup>Psalms 2,72,110, originally enthronement psalms, were modified after the exile into Messianic ones - so De.Vaux, Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions, p110. Leviticus 8<sup>12</sup> and Ps.133<sup>2</sup> outline the anointing of the High Priest and this seems to be attested in Zech.4<sup>11-14</sup> where Zerubbabel (the governor) and Jeshua (the High Priest) are referred to as 'the two sons of oil' - see Snaith, The Jews from Cyrus to Herod, p107.

<sup>15</sup>Starcky, RB, 70, p487-492; cf. Brown, CBQ, 2, p54-55.

than one stage of Qumran messianic development. Thus Starcky is forced to date the Damascus Document late in order to place it in his third stage and thus show that there is continuity between this stage and the following in the use of the title 'Interpreter of the Law' found in both it and 4QFlorilegium.<sup>16</sup> Yet once it is recognized that the midrashic writer of the Damascus Document worked later than the rest of the document, then the major redaction of the Damascus Document can be dated prior to 63 B.C. whilst the concept of the 'Interpreter of the Law' and 'the Prince of the Congregation' can be associated with this final period. I do however concur with Starcky and Brown that this final period saw the return of the expectation of a Davidic Messiah, no doubt as the result of anti-Roman feeling and Zealot tendencies. These expectations are found in: 4QPB.<sup>3-4</sup> - 'the Messiah of Righteousness, a shoot of David', 4QFI.1<sup>11</sup> - 'the shoot of David who will arise with the Interpreter of the Law', 4Qpls<sup>a</sup> frags 8-10, 17 - '[..the shoot of] David who shall arise at the end [of days].' Coupled with this was the sect's own belief in 'the Prince of the Congregation' who will fight in the final war: 1QSb.5<sup>20</sup>, CD.7<sup>20</sup>, 4Qpls<sup>a</sup> frags 5-6.3, 1QM.5<sup>1</sup>. Thus I concur with Starcky and Brown concerning the final stage of Qumran Messianism, and date it with them to the Herodian period (period II).

There are two further interrelated points to consider, namely whether 'the Interpreter of the Law' is a messianic title, and whether 'the Teacher of Righteousness' had a messianic status. Since we have already equated 'the Interpreter of the Law' with 'the Teacher of Righteousness' these two points become for us one question, namely, what was the status of the Teacher in

---

<sup>16</sup>Starcky, RB, 70, p493-499. Brown also puts the references to the 'Interpreter of the Law' in CD and 4QFI. in different stages; the former in stage 2 c.100 B.C., the latter in stage 4 - CBQ, 28, p52-55.

the eyes of the sect? Those who favour giving him a messianic role point firstly to CD.6<sup>11</sup> - 'the one who teaches righteousness', and 4QPB<sup>3</sup> - 'the Messiah of righteousness', which would then be *prophecies ex eventu*. Yet such terminology can perhaps be accounted for by Brown's assertion that 'since the unknown is always imagined in terms of the known, it is most likely that the figure of their great anointed prophet and teacher coloured the sectarians' image of the prophet and anointed ones to come.'<sup>17</sup> The other possibility is that this terminology reflects the expectation of a 'Teacher of Righteousness *redivivus*', which would be understandable in the aftermath of his death. Teeple even considers that the description of the one Messiah in the Damascus Document corresponds to that of the Teacher, so that '19<sup>35</sup>-20<sup>1</sup> is not contrasting the two figures but rather employs two different titles of the same person.'<sup>18</sup> Secondly, it is argued that if 'the prince of the Congregation' is to be equated with 'the Davidic Messiah', then 'the Interpreter of the Law' (=the Teacher) is to be equated with 'the priestly Messiah'. Yet it is difficult to imagine how the usurpation of the Teacher's position as High-Priest, so ending the Zadokite line, could in anyway be equated with the role of the 'priest-Messiah'.<sup>19</sup> Furthermore, it is based on a false presupposition, for by the time 'the Prince of the Congregation' was expected the figure of the 'priestly-Messiah' was largely redundant.

Yet this does not solve our problem as to the earthly status of the Teacher. There seems much to be said for the observation that the sect did

---

<sup>17</sup>Brown, 'The Messianism of Qumran', CBQ, 19 (1957), p75.

<sup>18</sup>Teeple, The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet, p112.

<sup>19</sup>The only possibility is to take 'the Teacher of Righteousness *redivivus*' as the 'priest-Messiah', yet there is no evidence for this position.

not look for a prophet outside of 1QS.9<sup>11</sup> and 4QTestimonia because the Teacher had himself fulfilled this role. One of the roles of the prophet was to signal the coming of the end-time and the imminent arrival of the Messiah(s), and this would explain texts such as CD.19<sup>35</sup>-20<sup>1</sup> and 20<sup>13-15</sup>, and his role as 'prophet' is also found in his interpretation of scripture - 1QpH.2<sup>2-10</sup> and 7<sup>1-5</sup>.<sup>20</sup> More important however, is the role of the Teacher as a 'lawgiver'; he is called: 'star', 'vessel', 'craftsman', 'lawgiver', 'prophet' - all appellations applied to Moses around this time.<sup>21</sup> Like Moses, he led God's people into the wilderness, founded the 'true Israel', gave them the law, yet died before they could enter the Promised Land. Finally, the two figures of 'the Interpreter of the Law' and 'the King Messiah' in CD.6<sup>7-11</sup>, 7<sup>18-20</sup> and 4QFI.1<sup>11</sup> have a neat parallel in the Palestinian Targum on Ex.12<sup>42</sup>: 'Moses shall come out from the wilderness and the King-Messiah from Rome';<sup>22</sup> notably, there is only one Messiah. But why the change from 'prophet' to 'lawgiver'? Probably because when the end-time failed to materialize in 70 B.C. then the role of the Teacher as prophetic forerunner to the Messiah(s) looked less than complimentary, and so his role as 'lawgiver' was therefore highlighted instead. This all seems to lead to the following conclusions: the Teacher of Righteousness was regarded as a prophet during his lifetime and immediately thereafter, but as a Lawgiver, a second Moses, during the later period of the sect's existence; there is no evidence that he was considered to be a Messiah whilst alive, but after his

---

<sup>20</sup>Compare John the Baptist's role and see Chapter 3.2.2. on the Wicked Priest for the structure of 1QpHab., p393-401. The Essenes were known for their prophetic powers: Judah the Essene - Antiquities, 13,11,2; Menahem the Essene - Antiquities, 15,10,5; Simon the Essene - Antiquities, 17,13,3. In addition Freedman notes that in 'the subsequent centuries to Ezra and Nehemiah, the revival of prophecy brought a revival of poetry' - JBL, 96, p22-23.

<sup>21</sup>See Teeple, The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet, p50-56; 'nby' in 1QS.9<sup>11</sup> has no article as in Deut.18<sup>15,18</sup> where Moses is termed a prophet; cf. 4QTestimonia 5.

<sup>22</sup>Quoted by Vermes, DSSE2, p51.

death the sect naturally imagined the Messiah(s) to have some of the characteristics exhibited by the Teacher.

Summary of the Stages of Messianic development at Qumran.

1. The sect as the 'true Israel' described themselves as 'Everlasting Plantation', 'House of Truth', etc.  
Mss: CD poetry, 1QH.  
Date: Period Ia, c.150-110 B.C.
2. Teacher dead - seen as the prophetic forerunner.  
Belief in two Messiahs.  
Mss: 1QS.9<sup>11</sup>, 1QSa, 4QAhA, 4QTestimonia, (Test.12 Pat.).  
Date: Period Ib, c.110-88 B.C.
3. Teacher dead - seen as the prophetic forerunner / lawgiver.  
Belief in one Messiah with two roles.  
Mss: redaction of CD, (Test of 12 Pat).  
Date: Period Ib, c.88-(63)/36 B.C.
4. Teacher regarded as a lawgiver, the second Moses.  
Belief in one Davidic Messiah.  
Mss: CD midrashim, 1Qsb, 4QFl., 4Qpls<sup>a</sup>, 4QP Bless., 1QM.  
Date: Period II, Herodian, (63)/37 B.C.-68 A.D.

It should be appreciated that such divisions are probably slightly more fluid in reality than outlined here, for instance both 1Qsb and the midrashic writer of the Damascus Document probably pre-date the Herodian period. However, it gives a broad outline which cannot be made more precise until more manuscript evidence becomes available, in particular the various copies of the Damascus Document from Cave 4. Starcky's theory of Messianic development does largely square with our separation of the Damascus Document into three strands, whilst, on the other hand, our division does help to overcome some of the objections raised by scholars to his theory.

### 3.1.2. Temple

Most study in this area has centred on two inter-related questions: 'What was the sect's attitude towards the Jerusalem temple?' and 'Did the sect offer sacrifices?' Yet there are a number of other questions to consider and it is only after considering all the evidence that we can make a sound judgment on the general attitude of the sect to the temple and to consider whether this changed with time.

#### Was there a temple at Qumran?

The archaeological evidence lends some support to there being one, for an altar has been found at Qumran measuring 26.9 x 26.3 x 31(ht) cm., and twelve stones arranged in a circle in the manner found in the temple of Solomon - 1Kgs.6<sup>19,23</sup> In addition a sizeable number of pots containing boiled, or sometimes roasted, bones have been found at Qumran; for De Vaux these were not sacrifices but probably remnants of a meal of ritual significance.<sup>24</sup> Yet for those of the opposite persuasion, these pots are merely concrete evidence of what Josephus asserts, namely that:

*'when (the Essenes) send what they have dedicated to God into the temple, they do not offer sacrifices, because they have more pure lustrations of their own; on which account they are excluded from the common court of the temple, but offer their*

---

<sup>23</sup>So Steckoll, 'The Qumran Sect in relation to the Temple of Leontopolis', RQ, 6 (1967-69), p58 in considering 4Qpls<sup>d</sup>.4-5.

<sup>24</sup>De Vaux, p12-14 - there were 30 pots in loc.130. Instances like this bring to mind the archaeological maxim stating that if you do not know the significance of something label it 'cultic'!

*sacrifices themselves.*<sup>25</sup>

Another line of evidence has been advanced by Steckoll, for he draws on the parallels between Qumran and the Zadokite temple at Leontopolis, c154 B.C – 74 A.D.. Firstly, like Qumran, pots of bones have been found at Leontopolis. Secondly, the community chamber which functioned as the temple had no dividing walls at Leontopolis whereas it should have had three, and so the lack of such walls at Qumran cannot be used as evidence that the chamber there did not function as a temple.<sup>26</sup> Thirdly, the tower at both Leontopolis and Qumran was at the north-west corner, plus both sets of buildings were built using the Greek foot of 12.45".<sup>27</sup> In a more recent article Hayward draws some further parallels between the beliefs held by these two groups.<sup>28</sup> In particular he notes that Onias IV, instead of having the *menorah* put there, had a single lamp, and since the former was meant to represent the planets in relation to the sun,<sup>29</sup> Hayward conjectures that Onias meant the latter to symbolise solely the sun. Furthermore, Josephus asserts (Antiquities, 13,3,1) that Onias was said to have been encouraged to build a temple in Egypt by Isaiah, and it seems Onias was drawing on Is.19<sup>18</sup>. In the MT this text reads:

*On that day there shall be five cities in the land of Egypt...  
One shall be called the city of destruction ('yr hrs).*

---

<sup>25</sup>Antiquities, 18,1,5, cf. also Philo, Quod omnis probus, 12 (75).

<sup>26</sup>Josephus writes: 'they go.. after a pure manner, into a dining room, as though it were into a holy temple' - The Jewish Wars, 2,8,5.

<sup>27</sup>Steckoll, RQ, 6, p56-60; so Petrie for Leontopolis says Steckoll.

<sup>28</sup>Hayward, 'The Jewish Temple at Leontopolis: a Reconsideration', JJS, 33 (1982), p429-443.

<sup>29</sup>So Philo, Vita Mosis, II, p102-103.

However in 1QIs<sup>a</sup> the text has 'yr h̄rs, 'city of the sun', namely 'Heliopolis' in which nome Leontopolis lay. Turning to Qumran we are immediately reminded that the sect called themselves 'the sons of light' who walked after 'the Prince of Lights', followed a solar calendar, and showed a peculiar reverence towards the sun in praying to it in the morning and covering their ablutions so as not to offend its rays.<sup>30</sup> The two groups also share a number of common beliefs such as the theme of exile and restoration, and the concept of a 'New Jerusalem'; in addition both give prominence to 'judges' in their respective communities.<sup>31</sup> All this leads Hayward to conclude that the two groups were 'two branches of a common Zadokite movement which rejected the Jerusalem temple and its priests',<sup>32</sup> and certainly any connection between the two would considerably strengthen the evidence that there must have been a 'temple' at Qumran.

The textual evidence for there being a temple at Qumran is, as one might expect, ambiguous. Firstly, Steckoll points to CD.12<sup>1-2</sup>:

*Let no man lie with a woman in the city of the sanctuary so as to convey uncleanness to the city of the sanctuary with their impurity.*

He argues that since the surrounding notes deal exclusively with the members

---

<sup>30</sup>See Josephus, The Jewish Wars, 2,8,5 and 2,8,9 respectively. Smith went as far as to assert that the sect may have worshipped the sun, pointing to the gilded staircase in 11QT.30<sup>7</sup>-31<sup>9</sup> which he suggested functioned as a roof-top altar to the sun-god - Smith, 'The Case of the Gilded Staircase: Did the Dead Sea Sect worship the sun?', BAR, 10 (1984), p50-55. Milgrom strongly challenges this assertion, particularly the function of the gilded staircase, for sun-worship is expressly forbidden in 11QT.55<sup>17-18</sup> - Milgrom, 'Challenge to Sun-Worship Interpretation of Temple Scroll's Gilded Staircase', BAR, 11 (1985), p70-73.

<sup>31</sup>Hayward, JJS, 33, p442.

<sup>32</sup>Hayward, JJS, 33, p443; Steckoll also holds this view, but in addition believes that the 'Damascus' referred to in CD is Egypt, and that the sect went into exile there during the years 31-4 B.C. when Qumran was deserted - RQ, 6, p60 and p68.



of the sect then this reference must be to the temple at Qumran. Yet the same phrase has more recently been found in the Temple Scroll, (11QT.45<sup>11-12,16-17</sup>, *et al*), where it must refer to Jerusalem. Secondly, the word 'Lebanon' occurs some sixty times in the MT, yet in the Targum in about half of these cases it is not understood in its literal sense, and in these instances it is most commonly used as a symbol for the 'temple'.<sup>33</sup> Similarly in 1QpHab.12<sup>3-4</sup>, the pesher on Hab.2<sup>17</sup> states that '*Lebanon* is the council of the community', and according to Vermes this interpretation arose because the sect believed that they were the temple, and since traditionally 'Lebanon = temple', so now 'Lebanon' = the council of the community.<sup>34</sup> Thirdly, in view of the Old Testament terminology of the temple as a 'House of God', scholars point to a number of Qumran texts which view the sect as a 'byt': 1QS.5<sup>6</sup>, 8<sup>5,9</sup>, 9<sup>6(x2)</sup>; CD.3<sup>19</sup>, 4<sup>11</sup>, 20<sup>10,13</sup>; 1QpHab.8<sup>1</sup>. Finally, the widespread condemnation of the temple institution at Jerusalem is seen as evidence that the sect abandoned the temple: CD.4<sup>18</sup>, 5<sup>6-11</sup>, (6<sup>12-14</sup>), 7<sup>14-18</sup>, 20<sup>23</sup>; 1QpHab.9<sup>4</sup>, 12<sup>8-9</sup>; perhaps too the references to 'the illegitimate priest' (hkwhn hrš'). However Davies reminds us that 'it does not necessarily follow that because a group believed the Temple to have been defiled by others its members ceased to participate in the Temple cult in the normal way ... (for) to abandon it would relinquish it entirely to those of an opposite persuasion.'<sup>35</sup>

Thus the archaeological and textual evidence for there being a temple at Qumran is not conclusive and rests on a certain amount of subjective analysis.

---

<sup>33</sup>Vermes, Scripture and Tradition in Judaism, p26-38; 'Lebanon' as 'temple': Deut.1<sup>7</sup> and 11<sup>24</sup> in the Targum of Jonathan; Deut.3<sup>25</sup> in Targum Onkelos, etc.

<sup>34</sup>Vermes, Scripture and Tradition in Judaism, p33.

<sup>35</sup>Davies, JJS, 33, p290.

## Did the sect see themselves as a 'spiritual temple'?

Gärtner, in his book 'The Temple and the Community in Qumran and in the New Testament' (1965), was the first to clearly set out the evidence that the Qumran sect regarded themselves as some kind of 'spiritual temple'. Like many theologians he believed the Qumran texts provided a background to the New Testament evidence, as in the Pauline corpus - 1Cor.3<sup>16-17</sup>, 6<sup>14-20</sup> and Eph.2<sup>19-22</sup> - and also elsewhere - Mk.12<sup>10,14</sup><sup>58</sup>, Jn.4<sup>20-24</sup>, 1Peter.2<sup>3-6</sup>, Hebrews.12<sup>22-24</sup>. He noted that the whole sect were treated as 'priests' in that the priestly ideals, especially those of purity, were extended to all members of the sect. The hierarchy of the sect, as outlined in 1QSa for instance, resembled that of the Jerusalem temple, and the references to 'Aaron' (first) and 'Israel' would seem to be to the 'priests' and 'laity' within the community. The combination of temple as 'House' and 'plantation' in the Qumran texts is probably to be traced back to Jewish speculation concerning the rock of the temple and paradise, e.g. Jer.31<sup>27-28</sup> which reads:

*'The days are coming', declares the Lord, 'when I will plant the House of Israel and the House of Judah with the offspring of men and animals.<sup>28</sup> Just as I watched over them to uproot and tear down, and to overthrow, destroy and bring disaster, so I will watch over them to build and to plant.'*

Thus the references to the community as a 'House', or as 'Lebanon', can equally well be used as evidence that the sect believed they were a 'spiritual temple'.

A number of specific texts have been used to further this theory. The Damascus Document in particular seems to advance this interpretation, though this may not have always been appreciated in the past. In CD.6<sup>12</sup> I argued

strongly that the unusual reference to the 'temple' at the beginning of the section on the 'Twelve Duties' only really makes sense if one interprets it in a spiritual sense as a reference to the community. This section also contains a further spiritual reference to the temple in 6<sup>16</sup> to which a secondary gloss has been appended in the form of a deliberately reworked quotation. I also concurred with Murphy-O'Connor that the plural form of the confessional formula found in CD.20<sup>28-30</sup> and 1QS.1<sup>24-26</sup> indicates a community without a temple, as it did for the rabbis in the period after the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple in 70 A.D.. Finally both the Ezekiel 44<sup>15</sup> Midrash and the Amos-Numbers Midrash implicitly state that the 'temple' now lies with the sect in exile. Outside of the Damascus Document, Draper, in an unpublished article on the 'Origins of the Qumran Community', argues that an original group of twelve (1QS.8<sup>1-9<sup>11</sup></sup>) set up a rival temple offering spiritual sacrifices, and that 4Qpls<sup>d</sup> in interpreting Isaiah 54<sup>11-12</sup> 'shows the prophesied foundation of a new and glorified Jerusalem has taken place in the foundation of the sect':<sup>36</sup>

*'And I will lay your foundations with sapphires.'* (54<sup>11c</sup>)  
*Interpreted, this concerns the Priests and the people who laid the foundations of the Council of the Community .... the congregation of His elect (shall sparkle) like a sapphire among stones.*

*[And I will make] all your pinnacles [of agate]* (54<sup>12a</sup>)  
*Interpreted, this concerns the twelve [chief Priests] who shall enlighten by judgment of the Urim and Tummim ...*

However, the most notable passage in this context must be 4QFlorilegium 1<sup>2-7</sup>:

*This is the House which [He built for them in the] latter*

---

<sup>36</sup>Gärtner similarly draws attention to this passage: The Temple and the Community in Qumran and in the NT, p42-43.

*days .... And gentiles shall lay it waste no more, as they formerly laid waste the temple of Israel because of its sin. He has commanded that a Temple of Men be built for Himself, that they might send up, like the smoke of incense, the works of the Law.*

The only problem is that not all scholars are agreed as to the meaning of the text. Schwartz sees three temples in 4QFlorilegium; the references to 2 Samuel 7 in 4QFl.1<sup>7f</sup> referring to the desecrated second temple which is to be replaced by a third temple built by God in the future (4QFlor.1<sup>2-6</sup>), while *mqdš 'dm* (4QFlor.1<sup>6</sup>) refers to the first man-made temple.<sup>37</sup> Flusser, on the other hand, is one of a number of scholars who translate the phrase *mqdš 'dm*, 'sanctuary amongst men', which he then sees as referring to the future eschatological temple that God Himself will build.<sup>38</sup> Yet these interpretations both contradict the plain meaning of the phrase *mqdš 'dm*, 'temple of men', and so I concur with Gärtner and Brooke who see here a definite allusion to a 'spiritual temple' which deliberately stresses the position of the Qumran community in relation to the Jerusalem temple.<sup>39</sup>

This neatly leads into the related question of 'sacrifices', for scholars who accept the presence of the concept of a 'spiritual temple' tend to believe that all the references to sacrifices are symbolic. The prophets regularly stressed that the attitude of the individual was far more important than the actual sacrifice - Micah.6<sup>6-8</sup>, Ps.51<sup>19</sup> and Prov.15<sup>8</sup> - and this idea was further developed in the scrolls in 4QFl.1<sup>6-7</sup> (above), CD 11<sup>21</sup> - quoting Prv.15<sup>8</sup>, and

---

<sup>37</sup>Schwartz, 'The Three Temples of 4QFlorilegium', RQ, 10 (1979-81), p83-91 - cf. Dupont-Sommer, p312.

<sup>38</sup>Flusser, 'Two Notes on the Midrash on 2 Sam.vii', IEJ, 9 (1959), p101-102; see also Yadin's translation in his article: 'A Midrash on 2 Sam.vii and Ps.i-ii (4QFlorilegium)', IEJ, 9 (1959), p96.

<sup>39</sup>Gärtner, The Temple and the Community in Qumran and in the NT, p34; Brooke, Exegesis at Qumran, p185-186, p193.

1QS.9<sup>4-5</sup> which reads:

*They shall atone for guilty rebellion and for sins of unfaithfulness that they might obtain lovingkindness for the Land without the flesh of holocausts and the fat of sacrifice. And prayer rightly offered shall be as an acceptable fragrance of righteousness, and perfection of the way as a delectable free-will offering.'*

Yet there do seem to be laws which specifically outline sacrificial practices – CD.9<sup>14</sup>, 11<sup>17-20</sup>, 16<sup>13-14</sup> – and it is difficult to take these cases as symbolic.<sup>40</sup> Josephus relates that there were four grades within the Essenes, and it is possible therefore that some of the 'Essenes' who lived away from Qumran, perhaps those addressed in 10<sup>10-12</sup><sup>18</sup>, did still participate in the temple cult to a limited degree;<sup>41</sup> the different calendar of the sect would preclude any regular participation.

Thus the sect almost certainly did regard themselves as a 'spiritual temple' offering spiritual sacrifices, although there may in addition have been a limited contact with the Jerusalem temple for some of its members.

#### The evidence of the Temple Scroll and the New Testament.<sup>42</sup>

The first forty-eight columns of the Temple Scroll are devoted to the construction of the temple and its precincts, and subsequently to the festivals and sacrifices that should be observed there. What seems initially in doubt is

---

<sup>40</sup>The festival sacrifices outlined in 11QT 13<sup>8-29</sup><sup>2</sup> are for the future earthly temple.

<sup>41</sup>Neither CD.9<sup>14</sup> and 16<sup>13-14</sup> require sacrifice and could be seen as tithes offered to the priests.

<sup>42</sup>I am assuming here that the Temple Scroll is a sectarian work or at least one they held in high regard; evidence for this position will be forwarded in the following section (3.1.3) on 'Law', p370-382.

whether these prescriptions describe a future earthly temple that the sect would like to set up or a future heavenly (eschatological) temple. The solution seems to rest on the translation of the preposition 'd' in 11QT.29<sup>9</sup>:

*And I shall sanctify my [sanctuary with my glory for I shall cause<sup>9</sup> my glory to dwell upon it, 'd' the day of blessing on which I shall create my sanctuary]*<sup>43</sup>

If the preposition is translated 'during', as Thiering and Wacholder, then one has here a reference to an eschatological temple, but if it is translated 'until', as Yadin and Maier, then the reference is to an earthly temple.<sup>44</sup> In favour of the eschatological interpretation is the fact that the dimensions of the outer court are too large to fit the geographical topography available at Jerusalem; it is unrealistic and thus eschatological. Yet the whole structure and thrust of the Temple Scroll is not one of an apocalyptic writing telling of the glorious age to come but rather it is concerned with the present age. Furthermore, the brief allusion to the eschatological temple resembles the similar brief reference found in Jubilees 1<sup>17</sup>; in addition, the reference may belong to a secondary redactional insertion (29<sup>2</sup>-30<sup>2</sup>) and so did not form part of the original text on the temple found in the Temple Scroll.<sup>45</sup> So the sect looked to the day when they could build an earthly temple.

Thiering has suggested in a recent lecture that the Temple Scroll was written in Herodian times and that the Essenes, who were favoured by Herod,

---

<sup>43</sup>Following Maier's translation, p32.

<sup>44</sup>Thiering, 'Mebaqqer and 'Episcopos' in the light of the Temple Scroll', JBL, 100 (1981), p60f; Wacholder, The Dawn of Qumran, p21-30. Yadin, The Temple Scroll, Vol.1, p183 and Vol.2, p128-129; Maier, p32 and p86.

<sup>45</sup>Stegemann has suggested 29<sup>2</sup>-30<sup>2</sup> was a redactional addition to the festival calendar source of 13<sup>8</sup>-29<sup>2</sup> - 'The Literary Composition of the Temple Scroll and its status at Qumran', a lecture given at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll, Manchester University, December 1987; see the following section (3.1.3) on 'Law', p370-382.

drew up this blue-print for the temple hoping that he would implement it.<sup>46</sup> I would reject such a late date for the Temple Scroll, but the relationship between the Essenes and Herod the Great under whom the Jerusalem temple was rebuilt should certainly be explored. The arguments for equating the Essenes with the Herodians of the New Testament has been strongly advanced in two articles by Daniel.<sup>47</sup> The most important of these are as follows: Herod was known to be pro-Essene<sup>48</sup> and was seemingly influenced by Essene teaching;<sup>49</sup> the Essenes were known to have their own gate in the city wall built for access to their latrines<sup>50</sup> and not ornated with statues or images like the other gates;<sup>51</sup> the Essenes were exempt from the oath of fidelity to Herod<sup>52</sup> unlike the Pharisees and Sadducees whom they shared with Herod as common enemies; the site of Qumran was abandoned during the time of Herod, 37-4 B.C.;<sup>53</sup> in Mk.3<sup>6</sup> the Pharisees come out of the synagogue to meet with the Herodians.<sup>54</sup> What is even more interesting is that Herod's temple is said to have been built by priests (*Antiquities*, 15,11,1-2), and Daniel asserts that 'il est .. probable que ces mille prêtres qui ont travaillé à la reconstruction du

---

<sup>46</sup>Thiering, 'The Date of Composition of the Temple Scroll' given at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll, Manchester University, December 1987.

<sup>47</sup>Daniel, 'Les "Hérodiens" du Nouveau Testament sont-ils des Esséniens?', RQ, 6 (1967-69), p31-53; and 'Nouveaux Arguments en faveur de l'identification des Hérodiens et des Esséniens', RQ, 7, (1969-71), p397-402.

<sup>48</sup>Josephus, *Antiquities*, 15,10,5: Menahem's prophecy.

<sup>49</sup>Daniel, RQ, p35-37; Archelaus also called on an Essene to interpret a dream - Josephus, *Antiquities*, 17,13,3 (346).

<sup>50</sup>Josephus, *The Jewish Wars*, 5,4,2 (cf.2,8,9) and 11QT 46<sup>13-16</sup>; see Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, vol.1, p301-304 and *The Temple Scroll: the Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect*, p178-182.

<sup>51</sup>St.Hyppolite, *Contra Haereses*, 9,26.

<sup>52</sup>Josephus, *Antiquities*, 15,10,4.

<sup>53</sup>De Vaux, p21-24 and p36.

<sup>54</sup>Daniel, followed by Yadin, also draws attention to the '7 baskets' in Mk.8<sup>14-21</sup> as a reference to the Essenes - RQ, 6, p40-42 and *The Temple Scroll*, vol.1, p138-140.

Temple furent pour la majorité des prêtres esséniens, habitués au travail manuel, et non pas des prêtres sadducéens et pharisiens, qui n'avaient de leur vie effectué aucun travail de maçon ou de charpentier."<sup>55</sup> In the Talmud, Herod is seen to favour the 'Boethusians', (named after their founder 'Boethus'), who are therefore to be equated with the 'Herodians'; Grintz has attempted to show that there is an etymological connection between the 'Essenes' and the 'Boethusians' the latter being derived from byt, 'house' + (')sym, 'Essenes'.<sup>56</sup> Josephus claims that the Boethusians were a sacerdotal family, a fact which the names of the High Priests under Herod and his successor Archelaus certainly confirm: 'Simon son of Boethus' (c25-5 B.C.), 'Joazar son of Boethus' (4 B.C. and 6 A.D.) and 'Eleazar son of Boethus'(4-3 B.C.).<sup>57</sup> Were the Boethusians then the name of the priestly family that founded the Qumran sect and who were later High Priests under Herod? The main fact that seems to count against this is that there is no suggestion in any of the later scrolls that the sect in any way regained control of the High Priesthood.

So how much of the equation - Essenes = Herodians = Boethusians - are we in agreement with? If one agrees with the whole equation, then it seems likely that the Essene blue-print for the future earthly temple in the temple Scroll may have been partly utilized by Herod in his reconstruction of the Temple of Jerusalem. Furthermore, whilst the geographical topography of

---

<sup>55</sup>Daniel, RQ, 7, p399.

<sup>56</sup>Grintz, 'The Yahad Sectarians, Essenes, Beth(e)sin', Sinai, 32 (1954), p11-43 (in Hebrew); Talmon notes in his article in Scripta Hierosolymitana, 4, that the Boethusians shared a number of calendrical peculiarities with the Qumran sectarians - p186-7 and p196-7. Boethus was born around 240B.C. and was instructed by Antigonus of Soko who was prominent from 250 B.C. onwards.

<sup>57</sup>Josephus, Antiquities, 15,9,3 and 17,4,2. Eisenman asserts that Qumran was a training ground for the Jerusalem priesthood, but also believes that Herod was responsible for destroying Qumran in c.37 B.C. - Maccabees, Zadokites, Christians and Qumran, p23-24.



Mt.Zion may have prevented the construction of the outer court, those Essenes who lived within its proposed bounds in the Essene quarter of 'the city of the temple', conducted themselves in an appropriate manner - CD 12<sup>1-2</sup>.

### Conclusion

In our analysis of the attitude of the sect to the temple a number of important issues have been covered but no attempt has yet been made to weave them together into a coherent overall picture, and to achieve this we need to take into account the historical perspective. According to Josephus the High Priesthood had lain vacant from 159-152 B.C.,<sup>58</sup> yet the likelihood that this was actually the case seems very slim. Stegemann has therefore suggested that the Teacher of Righteousness officiated during the *Interregnum*, being the legitimate High Priest of the Zadokite priestly line,<sup>59</sup> and this in turn is supported by Murphy-O'Connor's claim that the letter from Demetrius I in 1Mac.10<sup>25-45</sup> must have been addressed to the High Priest of the *Interregnum*<sup>60</sup> However in 152/0 B.C. the High Priesthood was usurped by Jonathan, and under his successor, Simon, the Hasmoneans were decreed as

---

<sup>58</sup>Antiquities, 13.2,2-3 - cf. 12.11,2.

<sup>59</sup>Stegemann, p247-254.

<sup>60</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 83, p400-420. It is clear that Jonathan was not able to gain the High Priesthood promised to him by Alexander Balas until the latter had successfully defeated Demetrius I; thus Demetrius I must have backed an opponent of Jonathan, namely the current High Priest.

High Priests until a suitable prophet should arise - 1Mac.14<sup>41,61</sup>.<sup>61</sup> If Stegemann is correct, the Teacher and his early followers would still have adhered to the legitimacy of the Zadokite High Priesthood, and this, coupled with their presumed expulsion from, or at least avoidance of, the Jerusalem temple, naturally led to the rise in the belief of the early community as a 'spiritual temple'. Furthermore the community itself abstained from all regular sacrifice with the exception of that carried out on the Day of Atonement, believing instead that it was the attitude of the individual that was of fundamental importance in the worship of God. This situation continued throughout the time of the Hasmonean High Priesthood, yet with the end of the Hasmonean line the Essenes were able once again to participate at the Jerusalem Temple if they so wished, and this they did most actively during the reign of Herod the Great, who seems to have favoured them to the extent that they may even have influenced the design of 'Herod's' Temple and regained the High Priesthood temporarily.<sup>62</sup> Thus the attitude of the sect to the temple remained remarkably consistent throughout the time of their existence, with the notable exception of the period of Herod the Great's reign when the sectarians

---

<sup>61</sup>VanderKam has suggested that the 364-day solar calendar was probably the official calendar of the post-exilic period until the persecutions of 167 B.C. under Antiochus IV when a lunar calendar was introduced to allow for the birthday of the Seleucid governor to be celebrated - Dan.7<sup>25</sup>, 8<sup>11-14</sup>, 9<sup>27</sup>, 11<sup>31</sup>, 12<sup>11</sup>; 1Mac.1<sup>41-61</sup>, 2<sup>15-26</sup>, 2Mac.6<sup>1-11</sup>. Although the calendar may have reverted to a solar one during the years of 159-152 B.C. under the High Priesthood of the Teacher, with the Maccabeans gaining increasing power Jonathan abolished the solar (priestly) calendar sometime after 152 B.C. perhaps to keep some of his supporters happy; this in turn led to polemics such as we find in 1QS.1<sup>8-9,13-15</sup> and CD.3<sup>14-16</sup> - VanderKam, '2 Maccabees 6,7a and Calendrical Change in Jerusalem', JSJ, 12 (1981), p52-74. Yet as Davies counters, the Maccabeans would surely have returned to the traditional calendrical beliefs if the lunar calendar had been introduced by Antiochus IV; it cannot have been retained merely for pagan festivals! Furthermore, it is likely that the two calendars were reconciled by the time of Esther and only a few Jews continued to restrict themselves to the use of the solar calendar, namely the authors of 1Enoch, Jubilees, and the scrolls - Davies, 'Calendrical Change and Qumran Origins: An Assessment of VanderKam's Theory', CBQ, 45 (1983), p80-89.

<sup>62</sup>Davies' assertion that the gloss in CD.6<sup>12-14</sup> reflects 'a more hostile attitude towards the temple than its original source' (JJS, 33, p297) is clearly not the case once it is appreciated that the original text of 6<sup>11-14</sup> does not refer to the Jerusalem temple but rather to the sect as the 'spiritual temple'.

thought that they might at last have the opportunity to 'lay the foundations' of the future earthly temple which is so clearly envisaged in the Temple Scroll.

### 3.1.3. Law.

There are two questions to be answered in this section. Firstly, what was the status and date of the Temple Scroll (11QT)? Secondly, when the Damascus Document talks of the 'torah', 'commandments', 'judgments', 'precepts' and the like, to what is it referring, the Mosaic law, the laws of the Temple Scroll, or the Laws of IX-XVI?

#### The Temple Scroll.

Yadin in his three volume work seemed convinced from the outset that the Temple Scroll had to have been written by the sect and that all the evidence pointed to a Hasmonean date. Yet a number of scholars have for a variety of reasons attempted to demonstrate that the Temple Scroll is not Qumranic in origin, and their views shall be considered first.

Stegemann begins by separating out the various literary sources of the document:<sup>63</sup>

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. Columns 3-47.                                | The architecture of the Temple (excl.2.) |
| 2. Columns 13 <sup>8</sup> -30 <sup>2</sup> .   | The Festivals.                           |
| 3. Columns 48-51 <sup>10</sup> .                | The Purity Laws.                         |
| 4. Columns 51 <sup>11</sup> -66.                | A Law Code on Deut.12-26 (excl.5.)       |
| 5. Columns 56 <sup>12</sup> -59 <sup>21</sup> . | The Statutes for the King.               |

---

<sup>63</sup>Stegemann in a lecture given at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll entitled, 'The Literary Composition of the Temple Scroll and its status at Qumran' - Manchester University, December 1987.

To these sources we should add the literary introduction to the whole composition in columns 1-2, and the redactional addition of 29<sup>2</sup>-30<sup>2</sup>. Stegemann then goes on to date the Temple Scroll to the fourth century on the grounds that it most closely resembles Chronicles in style, and because this was the time when the tradition relating to the sixth book of the law was most prevalent.<sup>64</sup> The section on 'the Statutes for the King' is thus a polemic against the kings of Judah and Israel of the pre-exilic age. He then asserts that two copies of the scroll were later made by the Qumran sect for their own study, but that the book was never considered to be one of the documents of the sect to be kept in the Cave 4 library, for there is not one reference to it or quotation from it in any of the scrolls.

A number of scholars have argued that the Temple Scroll belongs to the period just prior to the Qumran sect and is in some way connected with the proto-sectarians of Qumran.<sup>65</sup> Thus Brooke believes the Temple Scroll belonged to the group responsible for Jubilees and the Aramaic Testament of Levi, and that at the time when the Qumran community was founded this group was 'responsible for the traditions of these writings passing into the Qumran library as some of their number became members.'<sup>66</sup> Yet he goes further, for he considers that Jubilees, the Temple Scroll and the Testament of Moses belong together in a Pentateuch; Jubilees covering Gen.1-Ex.15, the Temple Scroll Ex.34-Deut.23, and the Testament of Moses Deut.31-34. The former two works share a common levitical interest and use the solar

---

<sup>64</sup>Jer.3<sup>15</sup>; Ezra 2<sup>63</sup> = Neh.7<sup>65</sup>; 4Ezra 6<sup>28</sup>.

<sup>65</sup>In addition to Brooke, most notably Wacholder, The Dawn of Qumran, p211, whose position will be considered in the following pages when dealing with the status of the Temple Scroll.

<sup>66</sup>Brooke, 'The Temple Scroll: a law unto itself', p12 - as yet unpublished.

calendar. Furthermore, the Damascus Document, which as we have noted has been considered 'proto-Essene' in character by Davies and Murphy-O'Connor,<sup>67</sup> should be seen as the overall link between the three, sharing as it does a number of common elements; for example: 11QT.45<sup>11-12</sup> - CD.12<sup>1-2</sup>, 11QT.66<sup>14-17</sup> - CD.5<sup>7-11</sup>, etc.; Jubilees is explicitly referred to in CD.16<sup>2-4</sup>, Jub.1<sup>14</sup> - CD.3<sup>14</sup>, etc.; 'Taxo' in the T.Moses can be compared to the 'M<sup>e</sup>ḥōqēq' in CD,<sup>68</sup> T.Moses.5<sup>3-5</sup> - CD.4<sup>17-18</sup>, etc. Personally I do not believe that the connection between Jubilees and the Temple Scroll is as close as Brooke would have us believe, not least because, as VanderKam points out, the two exhibit a different pseudepigraphical outlook, for in Jubilees it is the angel who speaks to Moses whilst in the Temple Scroll God speaks directly to man.<sup>69</sup> In addition I would not accept a pre-Qumran date for the Damascus Document but that is not to say it does not share a common theological tradition with Jubilees and the Temple Scroll, being in fact dependent on them.

Both Stegemann and Brooke have suggested that the Temple Scroll originated in Levitical circles.<sup>70</sup> It is generally accepted that the Temple Scroll was found in Cave 11, yet Caves 1 and 4 were the main repositories for the sectarian works, the latter apparently functioning as a library, while Cave 7

---

<sup>67</sup>Davies, in his more recent book Behind the Essenes, compares the Damascus Document, 1 Enoch 92-105, and Jubilees 1, entitling the chapter 'A Comparison of Three Essenes Texts' - p107-134.

<sup>68</sup>See Delcor, 'Contribution à l'étude de la législation des sectaires de Damas et de Qumrân', RB, 62 (1955), p60-66.

<sup>69</sup>VanderKam in a lecture given to the International Conference on the Temple Scroll entitled, 'The Temple Scroll and the Book of Jubilees' - Manchester University, December 1987.

<sup>70</sup>Brooke, 'The Temple Scroll: a law unto itself', p4-7, (unpublished as yet) and more recently in a lecture given to the Society for Old Testament Study, entitled: 'Another "Pentateuch" from the Second Temple Period', London, January 1988; Stegemann in his lecture 'The Literary Composition of the Temple Scroll and its Status at Qumran'; in addition, Burgmann in his lecture '11QT: The Sadducean Torah', and Schiffman in his lecture, 'The Temple Scroll in relation to the Law and Halakhah of the Second Temple Period' - the latter three were all given at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll at Manchester University in December 1987.

held all the Greek papyri; Cave 11 on the other hand lay two kilometres north of the Qumran settlement, and contained manuscripts which show a marked Levitical bias: 11QLev., 11QpaleoLev., 11QEzek., 11QŠirŠab., 11QJub., 11QMelch., 11QPss<sup>3</sup>. The internal evidence may further support Levitical authorship, for the Levites are named before the priests in 11QT.22<sup>4-5</sup> and 60<sup>6-11</sup>, and receive the choicest part of the sacrifice in 11QT.22<sup>8-11</sup>. Did these Levites form part of the founding group that went into exile at 'Damascus' (CD.3<sup>20-44</sup>, 6<sup>3-11</sup>), or were they an independent group who also used the caves in the Qumran area?<sup>71</sup> Burgmann holds the latter view for he argues that they were Sadducean Levites, firstly because 11QT.64<sup>6-13</sup> defends the practice of crucifixion and so implicitly the crucifixion by Alexander Jannaeus of some 800 Pharisees,<sup>72</sup> (whereas most scholars see 4QpNah.1<sup>6-8</sup> as condemning this practice,)<sup>73</sup> secondly because the Temple Scroll carries a hidden polemic against the Essenes for it outlines a Feast of Oil and a Feast of Wine where all the people drink wine, whereas the Essenes did not use oil and only full members had access to wine.<sup>74</sup>

Thus three positions, all of which argue for a Levitical authorship and against a Qumran origin for the Temple Scroll, have now been considered, namely: it dates from the fourth century (Stegemann); it forms a 'Pentateuch' with Jubilees and the Testament of Moses (Brooke); it is a Sadducean document contemporary to the scrolls (Burgmann). In the light of these

---

<sup>71</sup>We know that a number of groups did use such caves in the Qumran area, namely the Zealots or Sicarii, and later the followers of Bar Kochba.

<sup>72</sup>Josephus, Antiquities, 13,14,2.

<sup>73</sup>So: Maier, p132-33. Yadin on the other hand considers that 11QT.64<sup>6-13</sup> and 4QpNah.1<sup>6-8</sup> do not represent contradicting views - The Temple Scroll, vol.1, p378f.

<sup>74</sup>Josephus, The Jewish Wars 2,8,3 and 5 respectively - cf. 1QS.6<sup>20</sup>, 7<sup>20</sup>.

arguments, let us now return to examine those in favour of a Qumran date for the Temple Scroll.

The earliest palaeographical evidence for the scroll is the Rockefeller Museum fragment No.43.366 which is palaeographically dated towards the end of the second century or perhaps the beginning of the first, thus providing us with a *terminus ad quem*<sup>75</sup> The presence of Mishnaic Hebrew means for Yadin that the Temple Scroll cannot pre-date the Hasmonean era. Consequently, for Yadin 'the Statutes for the King' have just over a fifty year period in which to be assigned, and he concludes that this section, together with the reference to the rings of the slaughterhouse in 11QT.34<sup>6</sup>, is a polemic against John Hyrcanus (134-104 B.C.).<sup>76</sup> On the other hand in a joint article by Hengel, Charlesworth and Mendels, the date of this polemical section is placed in the reign of Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 B.C.) for a number of reasons: he was the first of the Hasmoneans to use the title 'king', had an army composed of mercenaries, undertook offensive rather than defensive wars, had many concubines and a queen from his own family, and these are all matters which 'the Statutes for the King' legislate against.<sup>77</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup>Yadin, The Temple Scroll, vol.1, p17-20. Thiering has argued that there is no certainty that this fragment belongs to the Temple Scroll since it twice mentions 'Moses' who name is avoided in 11QT - in her lecture given at the International Conference of the Temple Scroll entitled, 'The Date of the Temple Scroll' - Manchester University, December 1987. Conversely, Strugnell has indicated in a letter to Wacholder that 'there are one group of 4Q fragments not yet published, which contain quotations from, or the text of, the Temple Scroll, or at least one of its sources', and these date to 150B.C. - The Dawn of Qumran, p206. Yet the impreciseness of this statement does not seem to help us much. Palaeographically, both scribes A and B of 11QT, plus Rockefeller Museum fragment No.43.975 are Herodian in date.

<sup>76</sup>Yadin, The Temple Scroll, vol.1, p344-349 and p390.

<sup>77</sup>Hengel, Charlesworth and Mendels, 'The Polemical Character of "On Kingship" in the Temple Scroll: an attempt at Dating 11QTemple', JJS, 37 (1986), p31-37 - Josephus, Antiquities, 13, 12,1 ; 13,8, 4, 13,5' - cf.11QT.57<sup>8</sup>, 13,12,2 - cf.11QT.58<sup>3-9</sup>; 13,12,1, 14,2 - cf.11QT.57<sup>15-17</sup>, respectively. Thiering argues that Herod the Great best fits this section which was composed when he refused to implement the sect's design for the Temple - in her lecture given at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll entitled 'The Date of the Temple Scroll' - Manchester University, December 1987.

Yadin has also pointed to a number of passages in the scrolls which he suggests allude to the Temple Scroll.<sup>78</sup> Firstly 'the book of Hagi'<sup>79</sup> in CD.10<sup>6</sup>, 13<sup>2</sup>, 14<sup>7-8</sup> and 1QSa.1<sup>7</sup>, yet this has been suggested as the title for a number of Qumran works (e.g. 1QS) and so can hardly be considered as hard evidence. Secondly, in the reference to 'the sealed book of the law' in CD.5<sup>2</sup>, but we have already argued that a literal rather than a cryptic meaning is meant here. Thirdly, the reference in 4QpPss<sup>a</sup> 4<sup>9-9</sup> to:

*..... the Wicked [Priest] who [rose up against the Teacher of Righteousness] that he might put him to death [because he served the truth] and the Law [which] he had sent to him.*

However this text rather pales as evidence in light of the forthcoming publication of the scroll entitled *mqst m'sy htwrh* (4QMMT), which Qimron purports to be a letter from the Teacher to the Wicked Priest detailing all the points of law on which the two disagree.<sup>80</sup> Thus we are left with the reference in 4QCatena<sup>a</sup> frags 4, 12-14 which speaks of two torahs:

<sup>12</sup> *Now, behold, everything is written on the tablets which [ ] and he taught him the number of [ ] and caused [him] to inherit...]* <sup>13</sup> *to [him] and to his seed [for] ever. And he arose from thence to go [ ] 'Blow the horn of Gibeah': 'the horn' is the book of [ ]* <sup>14</sup> *it is the book of the second law which [ m]en of his counsel, but they spoke rebelliously against him*<sup>81</sup>

Yet in my view Yadin has missed the main body of evidence which is to be

---

<sup>78</sup>Yadin, The Temple Scroll, vol.1, p393-397 and The Temple Scroll: the Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect, p224-228; he notes also in the latter the reference to the 'Book of the Alexandrian' which he suggests is Judah the Essene - p97-100.

<sup>79</sup>Following Qimron's pronunciation - p20.

<sup>80</sup>Qimron in a lecture delivered to the Dead Sea Scroll Conference entitled, 'A new scroll from Qumran and its contribution to the history of Jewish Sectarianism' - London, June 1987.

<sup>81</sup>Allegro (ed.), DJD V, p67-74.



found in the references to: 'the well' - 3<sup>16</sup>, 6<sup>3,4,9</sup>, 19<sup>34</sup>; 'the Interpreter of the Law' - CD 6<sup>7</sup>, 7<sup>18</sup>, 4QFI.1<sup>11</sup>, 4QCatena<sup>2</sup> frags.10-11<sup>5</sup>; 'the torah' - see the following subsection. Unsurprisingly, the majority of these occur in the Damascus Document, which as a document for the use of those sectarians living away from Qumran would naturally refer the reader to other important works of the sect.

Finally Yadin concluded his examination of the Temple Scroll by stating that the latter held canonical status at Qumran, because the tetragrammaton was written in the Hebrew square script, a practice found in all 'canonical' books at Qumran.<sup>82</sup> Wacholder takes this a step further and argues from the presence in the Temple Scroll of material not found in the Pentateuch that the author was 'presenting a new and superior torah that reveals what was still unrecorded in the Mosaic books'.<sup>83</sup> He points to Jubilees where two tablets were given to Moses: the first at Sinai on the 15<sup>th</sup> of the 3<sup>rd</sup> month (Jubilees 6<sup>17-22</sup>), the second at Sinai on the 16<sup>th</sup> of the 3<sup>rd</sup> month (Jubilees 1<sup>1</sup>); the first was revealed to Israel by Moses, whilst the second, which was kept hidden for when Israel fell into sin - CD.5<sup>1-6</sup>, was revealed to the sect as the true Israel by the Teacher of Righteousness = the Interpreter of the Law = Zadok = the second lawgiver; thus while the first torah was ephemeral, the second was eternal. Wacholder's hypothesis is provoking; however I am not convinced that the Temple Scroll as the second torah replaced the Mosaic Law, nor am I convinced by his interpretation of CD 5<sup>1-6</sup>.

---

<sup>82</sup>Yadin, The Temple Scroll, vol.1, p392; Yadin, The Temple Scroll: the Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect, p68.

<sup>83</sup>Wacholder, The Dawn of Qumran, p31.

So what can we conclude about the Temple Scroll? Although it may not be necessary to go back as far as the fourth century, it seems to me that many of the sources do predate the Qumran community and probably the second century B.C.,<sup>84</sup> and were known in certain circles such as that to which the author of Jubilees belonged. These sources were probably written by Levitical priests but were not welded together to form the Temple Scroll until the early years of the Qumran sect, when these Levites, finding themselves usurped by the Hasmoneans, accompanied the Zadokite priests into exile.<sup>85</sup> At this point, and through subsequent copying of the Scroll, the Qumran influence slowly became detectable within the text. The section on 'the Statutes for the King' was probably one of the last elements to have been added during John Hyrcanus' or Alexander Jannaeus' time, and may even have been revised during the reign of Herod the Great. Thus the Temple Scroll was an ever evolving document, whose origins predate the second century and Jubilees, but whose redaction was still continuing with every copy of the text. It does seem that this document was given certain canonical status, not least because it was compiled by the Interpreter of the Law, the Teacher of Righteousness, the founder of the sect. Finally, it would seem somewhat strange if the sect did not have its own sectarian torah, for if they truly followed a solar calendar the Mosaic torah would have been inaccurate for them on numerous important points.

---

<sup>84</sup>Even Yadin acknowledged that 'it is entirely possible that certain sections of the scroll were composed previously (to the J.Hyrcanus date) and that some of the traditions embedded in it originated in an earlier period.' - Yadin, The Temple Scroll, vol.I, p390.

<sup>85</sup>The association of documents with a levitical bias in Cave 11 does seem curious but perhaps it was no more than a 'library' of priestly texts which were restricted from general access. I find it hard to believe that there could have been a rival sectarian group living in such close proximity to Qumran.

## The Damascus Document and the Law.

We have already dismissed suggestions that the Temple Scroll is directly mentioned in such references as 'the Book of Hagi' or 'the sealed book of the Law', as unproven or simply not the case. Thus we must now restrict ourselves to a study of the occurrence of such terms as *twrh*, *mšwt*, *ḥwq*, and the like, to deduce whether these refer to the Mosaic Torah, the Temple Scroll, or to the Laws of IX-XVI.

The word 'torah' cannot refer to the Laws of IX-XVI, so that for each text we are left with a simple choice between the Mosaic torah and the Temple Scroll. However is *twrh* ever used as a reference to the Mosaic Law in the Damascus Document? The first impression is that it must be because the phrase *twrt mšh* occurs five times in the Damascus Document, plus twice in the Manual of Discipline. Yet consider the following texts:

*On joining the Community... he shall undertake by a binding oath to return with all his heart and soul to every commandment of the Law of Moses in accordance with all that has been revealed of it to the sons of Zadok (1QS.5<sup>8-9</sup>.)*

*And likewise is the ruling ... with regard to everyone who repents of his corrupt way: on the day that he speaks to the mebaqqer of the rabbim, they shall enrol him with the oath of the covenant which Moses made with Israel, the covenant to return to the Law of Moses with a whole heart and soul, in accordance to that which was found to be the practice for the whole period of wickedness (CD 15<sup>7-10</sup>.)<sup>86</sup>*

*Therefore a man shall impose upon himself an oath to return to the Law of Moses for in it everything can be learnt. (CD.16<sup>1-2</sup>.)*

---

<sup>86</sup>With regards to the form 'hnmš' in CD.15<sup>10</sup>, Schiffman states that 'the verb 'mš' serves as a technical term for the sectarian process of deriving law by the method of biblical exegesis' - The Halakhah at Qumran, p35.

Now if the Pentateuch is meant by the 'Law of Moses' then CD.16<sup>1-2</sup> implicitly excludes the Temple Scroll as a source of learning. Yet the imagery of the well as the torah - 3<sup>16</sup>, 6<sup>3,4,9</sup>, 19<sup>34</sup> - which the founders of the sect 'dug' under the leadership of the Interpreter of the Law - 6<sup>7</sup>, 7<sup>18</sup> - cannot be ignored, for here we must have an implicit reference to the Temple Scroll. This brings us back to 16<sup>1-2</sup> or more importantly the parallel passages of CD.15<sup>7-10</sup> and 1QS.5<sup>8-9</sup>, both of which tell how a new member of the sect has to take an oath to return to the Law of Moses as revealed to the sect, namely, the Temple Scroll. Thus when a scroll refers to 'the Law of Moses' - CD.15<sup>2,9,12</sup>, 16<sup>2,5</sup> and 1QS.5<sup>8</sup>, 8<sup>22</sup> - it would seem to be referring exclusively to the Temple Scroll.

Allusions to the Temple Scroll in the Damascus Document are in fact quite numerous: in the form ktwrh in CD.5<sup>7</sup> which must refer to 11QT.66<sup>14-17</sup>; in the phrase kprwš htwrh in 4<sup>8</sup>, 6<sup>14</sup>, and 13<sup>6</sup> (the latter perhaps referring to 11QT.52<sup>9-12</sup>); in the phrase mdrš htwrh in CD.20<sup>6</sup> and 1QS.8<sup>15</sup>:

*.<sup>13</sup> ... they shall separate from the habitation of ungodly men and shall go into the wilderness to prepare the way of Him; <sup>14</sup> as it is written, "Prepare in the wilderness the way of [.....] make straight in the desert a path for our God" (Is.50<sup>3</sup>) <sup>15</sup> This (path) is the midrash of the Law which he commanded by the hand of Moses, that they might do according to all that has been revealed from age to age, ...*

In 1QS.5<sup>1</sup> we have a heading which reads: *This is the rule for the men of the Community...*; yet in 4QS. we read instead: *'A midrash for the Maskil according to the men of the torah who freely pledge themselves...'*<sup>87</sup> The phrase 'men of

---

<sup>87</sup>Schiffman notes that 'midrash' here would seem to be a synonym for 'serek' - The Halakhah at Qumran, p59; thus my suggestion that the phrase 'ksrk htwrh' in CD.7<sup>8</sup> = 19<sup>4</sup> might refer to 11QT does not seem unjustified.

the torah' can be compared to 'the observers of the torah' - 1QpHab.7<sup>11</sup>, 8<sup>1</sup>, 12<sup>5</sup>, who are from 'the house of the torah' - CD.20<sup>10,13</sup>, and up against those that reject the torah - 1QpHab.1<sup>11</sup>, 5<sup>11</sup>; 4Qpls<sup>6</sup> 23,2<sup>10-14</sup>; CD.3<sup>17</sup>, cf.7<sup>9</sup>=19<sup>5</sup>, 8<sup>19</sup>=19<sup>32</sup>, 20<sup>8-9</sup>.<sup>88</sup> The use of the root glh 'to reveal', is regularly associated with 'torah', and often seems to refer to the Temple Scroll: 1QS.1<sup>9</sup>, 5<sup>9,12</sup>, 8<sup>1,15,16</sup>, 9<sup>19</sup>, CD 3<sup>13</sup>, 15<sup>13</sup>.

Thus there is hardly one instance in the Damascus Document where the word 'torah' refers to the Mosaic Pentateuch. A further important point emerges, namely that in the poetical sections any references to the 'torah' - 3<sup>16-17</sup> and 6<sup>14</sup> - are direct and straight forward, yet in the secondary and midrashic sections we counter dissent, opposition and disobedience to this 'torah': 3<sup>15-16</sup>, 4<sup>8</sup>, 5<sup>7</sup>, 6<sup>10,16-17,18-19</sup>, 20<sup>10,13</sup> - cf.1QpHab.1<sup>11</sup>, 5<sup>11-12</sup>, 8<sup>1-2</sup> and 4Qpls<sup>6</sup> 23,2<sup>10-14</sup>. Finally in the Laws of IX-XVI we have already noticed that the word 'torah' does not appear once in the section 10<sup>10-12</sup><sup>18</sup>, which seems to suggest that those whom lived in "Towns" were not subject to the sectarian law.

The word mšwt usually appears in the phrase mšwt '1 in the Damascus Document where it always refers to the Mosaic Pentateuch: 2<sup>18</sup>, 3<sup>2,6,12</sup>, 5<sup>21</sup>, 8<sup>19</sup>=19<sup>32</sup> and 9<sup>7</sup>.<sup>89</sup> The other occurrences of mšwt also refer to the pentateuchal laws: CD 2<sup>21</sup>, 3<sup>8</sup>, 7<sup>2</sup> (which refers to Lev.19<sup>17-18</sup> whilst the second half of the commandment alludes to CD 9<sup>3-9</sup>), 19<sup>5</sup>, 10<sup>3</sup> and 1QS.8<sup>17</sup> the latter

---

<sup>88</sup>Admittedly the sect could be arguing that they were the only ones who are correctly adhering to the Mosaic law, yet surely those outside the sect could not be said to be rejecting the law if this were the Mosaic law.

<sup>89</sup>The first three of these references appear in a historical setting prior to Moses; yet this would not have created a problem for the author(s), especially as the law was considered to be eternal.

two having *hmšwh*.<sup>90</sup> However, the exception to prove the rule is the quotation from Deut.7<sup>9</sup> in 19<sup>2</sup>, where the original Mosaic covenant and commandment are re-interpreted as applying to the sectarian covenant and law – cf. 1QSb.1<sup>1</sup>, 1QH.16<sup>13,17</sup>. Outside of the Damascus Document, the use of *mšwt* is relatively limited; this is only to be expected, because the sect used the Temple Scroll as its 'torah', and because in the Damascus Document, which was used outside of Qumran, the word occurs mainly in the poetical sections which are largely of historical content.

The word *hwq* clearly does not refer to the Pentateuch in any way and must therefore refer to the sectarian laws, but which ones? I believe that *hwq* is a general term to denote all sectarian law, viz. CD.IX-XVI, 1QS, (and 11QT?). Two texts suggest this. Firstly CD 4<sup>11-12</sup>, which states quite clearly that at the end of the current period of wickedness no more individuals will be able to join the sect; 'the precept (=the teachings of the sect) will be far removed'. Secondly CD 19<sup>5-6</sup> where the words *bmšwt wbhqym*, are an all-embracing pair covering the Mosaic Pentateuch (*mšwt*) and the sectarian law and rules (*hqym*). These *hqym* were also the 'laws' a new member took on entering the covenant, and thus *hqym* is often associated with the covenant of the sect: CD 1<sup>20</sup>, 5<sup>12</sup>, 19<sup>14</sup>, 20<sup>11,29</sup>; 1QS.1<sup>7</sup>, 5<sup>11,20,22</sup>; 1QSa.1<sup>5,7</sup>. A similar sectarian meaning is usually found with the word *mšpt*. In the singular *mšpt* usually refers to a specific sectarian law – CD.5<sup>9</sup>, 7<sup>2,3</sup>, 8<sup>1,16,18</sup>, etc., yet in the plural it refers to more general bodies of law whose identity can only be determined from the context – 7<sup>7</sup> and 20<sup>27,30,31</sup> – but which may not necessarily be sectarian – for instance the phrase *mšpt̄y šdqw* in 20<sup>30</sup> which is a general term for God's laws. Finally,

---

<sup>90</sup>The form has an almost participle sense, and that is how Vermes, p73, renders 1QS.8<sup>17</sup> – 'all that is commanded'.

the word srk usually refers to specific bodies of sectarian halakhah: CD 7<sup>8</sup> (which I suggested referred to the Temple Scroll), 10<sup>4</sup>, 12<sup>19</sup> (referring back to 10<sup>10</sup>-12<sup>18</sup>), 12<sup>22</sup>, 13<sup>7</sup>, 14<sup>3,12</sup>, cf. 1QS, 1QSa and 1QM. The exception is in 7<sup>6</sup> = 19<sup>2</sup> which seems to be a reference to the civil law of the land, yet perhaps the above counts against this?

The most significant conclusion from this study of 'law' in the Damascus Document, is quite simply that:

tôrâ	- nearly always refers to the Temple Scroll.
mišwôt	- nearly always refers to the Pentateuch.

However, ḥwq, srk and mšpt refer to sectarian halakhah with the occasional exception of the plural use of the latter.

#### 3.1.4. Covenant

Our study of 'covenant' will largely follow Collins' analysis in his article, *The Berith-Notion in the Damascus Document and its comparison in the New Testament*.<sup>91</sup> We should however bear in mind that his article was written before 1977 and so fails to take into account the possible influence of the Temple Scroll. In this respect, the conclusions from the previous section on 'law' shall be used.

In the Damascus Document we have to distinguish between three covenants: the Patriarchal covenant, the Mosaic covenant, and the Damascus covenant.

---

<sup>91</sup>In: ETL, 39 (1963), p555-594.

1. The Patriarchal covenant is referred to by the phrases *bryt r'snym* in 1<sup>4</sup> and 6<sup>2</sup>, *bryt (h) 'bwt* in 8<sup>18</sup>=19<sup>31</sup>, and *bryt 'brhm* in 12<sup>11</sup>; in addition it is also referred to in 3<sup>1,4</sup>. It is the euteronomic tradition that furnishes the greatest scriptural basis for the notion of the Patriarchal covenant found in the Damascus Document in the use of Deut.7<sup>8-9</sup> and 9<sup>5</sup> in CD.19<sup>1-2</sup> and 8<sup>14-15</sup>=19<sup>27-28</sup>; in both cases these texts are also seen as applying to the current members of the sectarian covenant. Collins also notes that 'the majority of non-pentateuchal themes in the CD's conception of the Patriarchal covenant can be found in the *Book of Jubilees*: e.g. Jub.12<sup>21</sup> in CD.3<sup>2,3</sup> and Jub.24<sup>11</sup> in CD.3<sup>2,92</sup>

2. The Mosaic covenant: here the conclusions from our study of the 'law' will lead us to markedly different conclusions from those of Collins. For we noted that when the Damascus Document referred to the 'torah' it usually meant the sectarian torah (11QT), and thus this was an indirect reference to the sectarian covenant rather than the Mosaic one. However, when the Damascus Document referred to the 'commandments' it usually meant the laws of the Pentateuch, and thus from our current point of view, the Mosaic covenant: 2<sup>18,21</sup>, 3<sup>2,6,8,12</sup>, 5<sup>21</sup>, 7<sup>2</sup>, 8<sup>19</sup>=19<sup>32</sup>, 9<sup>7</sup> and

---

<sup>92</sup>Collins, ETL, 39, p560; see M.Testuz, Les Idees religieuses du Livre des Jubiles, 1960, p62-74.



10<sup>3</sup>.<sup>93</sup> There is though an almost total lack of any direct reference to the Mosaic covenant, 3<sup>10-11</sup> and 15<sup>8</sup> being the only two,<sup>94</sup> but rather the covenant is seen as extending from the time of the patriarchs and is consequently referred to as such, 1<sup>4</sup>, 6<sup>2</sup> – both places where one might expect a reference to the Mosaic covenant.

3. The sectarian covenant was referred to in a number of ways: as the 'bryt '1' – 5<sup>12</sup>, 7<sup>5</sup>, 14<sup>2</sup>, 20<sup>17</sup>; or as 'brytw' – 1<sup>17</sup>, 3<sup>13</sup>, 8<sup>1</sup>=19<sup>14</sup>; or simply as '(h)bryt' – 1<sup>18.20</sup>, 2<sup>2</sup>, 4<sup>9</sup>, 6<sup>11</sup>, 9<sup>3</sup>, 10<sup>6</sup>, 15<sup>2.3.5.6.9</sup>, 16<sup>1.12</sup>, 19<sup>1.13</sup>, 20<sup>25.29</sup>. In addition it is once referred to in 19<sup>16</sup> as 'bryt tšwbh', once in 20<sup>12</sup> as bbryt {n}mnh, and, of course, three times in the well-known phrase 'b/hbryt hhdšh b'rš dmsq' – 6<sup>19</sup>, 8<sup>21</sup>=19<sup>33</sup>, 20<sup>12</sup> – which is how most scholars think of the sectarian covenant.

Thus, taking into account the location of the references, we find that the author of the poetry of the Damascus Document, plus the body responsible for the "Camp" rules, saw the covenant as originating with the patriarchs, to which the Israelites swore their allegiance through Moses at Sinai – 15<sup>8-9</sup>. Yet successive members of this covenant had sinned and turned from it – 3<sup>10-11</sup>

---

<sup>93</sup>The first three of these stem from the period before the Mosaic torah, yet to a certain degree (and particularly in the eyes of the writer) the Patriarchs were judged in the light of the later Mosaic laws. Alternatively these first three references can simply be seen as references to the Patriarchal covenant.

<sup>94</sup>The reference to 'the covenant for all Israel' in 3<sup>13</sup>, 15<sup>5</sup> and 16<sup>1</sup> must be to the sectarian covenant, since the sect regarded themselves as the true Israel and were ready to welcome anyone into this covenant.

and so God had re-established His covenant with the remnant who had remained faithful - 1<sup>4</sup>, 3<sup>13</sup>, 6<sup>2</sup>. Since the sect now regarded themselves as the sole representatives of this remnant, the covenant had in effect been re-established for them - 7<sup>5</sup>=19<sup>1</sup>, 19<sup>1-2</sup>, 20<sup>17</sup>. Thus all new members entered this 'renewed' covenant - 2<sup>2</sup>, 6<sup>11</sup>, 9<sup>3</sup> *et al* cf. 1QS.1<sup>16</sup>-2<sup>18</sup> - with those that subsequently transgressed it being cursed - 1<sup>17-18</sup>, 5<sup>11-15</sup>, 8<sup>1-2</sup>=19<sup>13-14</sup>, 20<sup>10.13.25</sup>. Therefore the poet and those behind the "Camp" rules spoke of the covenant exclusively in terms of 'the covenant of God' which had been re-affirmed with the sect; there was no suggestion that it was a 'new covenant' nor that it was connected with 'Damascus'.

So from where, and for what reason, did the later concept of 'the new covenant in the land of Damascus' originate? We have already noted that the secondary phrase '[hbryt] hḥdšh' also occurs in 1QpHab.2<sup>3</sup>, and in addition, the concept of 'renewing the covenant' can be found in: 1QSb.3<sup>26</sup>, 5<sup>21</sup> and 1Q34<sup>bis</sup>.3<sup>5-7</sup>. The definite form of the phrase 'hbryt hḥdšh' suggests a definite covenant was meant and the most obvious allusion would seem to be to Jeremiah 31<sup>31</sup>. Yet Collins does not believe this to be the case largely because there is no suggestion that Jeremiah 31<sup>31</sup> had been fulfilled. For him, 'the notion expressed by the root ḥdš is essentially eschatological, and .. the new covenant is always linked to the community which appears to be living in (realized) eschatological times.' Consequently 'its newness lies ... in its eschatological character' and the significance of the article lies in the fact that it is the 'new covenant which was awaited for at the end of days'.<sup>95</sup> I would tend to agree with this analysis and contend that the phrase 'the new

---

<sup>95</sup>Collins, ETL 39, p580.

covenant' was introduced in the period of the 'latter days', namely after 70 B.C.; it was therefore a new covenant for a new age. This would certainly concur with the secondary additions in 6<sup>19</sup> and 20<sup>12</sup>, and with the occurrence of the phrase in 1QpHab.2<sup>3</sup>, although it would mean that the presence of the phrase in 8<sup>21</sup>=19<sup>34</sup> would have to be taken as secondary which is not altogether easy to envisage. Yet I also believe that to a certain extent the occurrence of the concept of the 'new covenant' must have implicitly implied a reference to, and thus a fulfilment of, the Jeremian prophecy. For we know that the sectarians saw themselves as both 'the House of Israel' and 'the House of Judah' for whom the new covenant was to be according to Jeremiah 31<sup>31</sup>, whilst the words in Jeremiah 31<sup>33</sup> referring to God's action of 'putting the law within them, placing it on their hearts', would have been taken as further evidence that the sectarian torah (11QT) was to have been revealed to them.

#### Conclusion.

We can conclude from our study of the theology of Qumran that the composite nature of the Damascus Document reveals some development on certain theological points. Most notably my analysis of the concept of Messiah accords, and in fact clarifies, Starcky's theory of Messianic development, and in addition, the stress on obedience to the sectarian torah and the concept of 'the new covenant' both belong to the secondary levels of the Damascus Document. In contrast the attitude to the temple remained largely consistent throughout the history of the sect, so that from the historical point of view it is the reason for the initial adoption of the concept of 'the spiritual temple' that must be considered. Thus finally we shall take a brief overall look at the

history of the sect, incorporating in our scheme the results of our analysis of the composite nature of the text of the Damascus Document and the conclusions of our study of the theology of Qumran.

### **3.2. Corollaries regarding the History of Qumran.**

The task of the historian of the Scrolls and the sect which lay behind them has been made that much more difficult by the fact that almost all the historical references in the Dead Sea Scrolls to various figures and events are cryptic in nature. Yet when confronted with such a problem one should always work from the known to the unknown and thus we shall begin by comparing the archaeological evidence of Qumran with the known historical data.

#### **3.2.1. The External Evidence of the Scrolls: Archaeology and the Historical record.**

The archaeological evidence was, of course, presented by De Vaux in his book, Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Yet the evidence is not as clear cut as many would like to believe. The earliest occupation of the site of Khirbet Qumran dates back to the eight century from the pottery evidence, and can probably be equated with either Secacah or the City of Salt of Joshua 15<sup>61-62</sup>. Our sect began using the site sometime in the second century, but this earliest period of sectarian occupation (Period Ia) is difficult to date because of the lack of pottery sherds which are in any case very similar to Period Ib, and because of the absence of any numismatic evidence. Thus De Vaux states that 'for this reason the chronology can be established only

approximately by its relation to the better documented period which follows'.<sup>96</sup> In Period Ib the numismatic evidence is by contrast very good: Seleucid coins date to the reigns of Antiochus III, IV, and VII, whilst Palestinian currency, which first appeared towards the end of John Hyrcanus' reign, is present from every High Priest from then until Antigonus (40-37B.C.), though with by far the largest number of coins (143 of them) coming from Alexander Jannaeus' reign. Since the Seleucid coins could have survived from Period Ia, De Vaux believes that Period Ib cannot have begun until the reign of John Hyrcanus, and thus Period Ia begun under one of his predecessors.

However Rogerson seems to have interpreted the numismatic evidence differently, for he writes that 'Qumran was certainly occupied for a brief period sometime between 160 and 134 B.C.. It was then abandoned and resettled during the reign of John Hyrcanus (134-104 B.C.)'.<sup>97</sup> This suggestion has lead me to re-examine the evidence and it seems likely that the small amount of numismatic evidence from the reigns of Antiochus III (223-187 B.C.) and IV (175-163 B.C.) can be best explained by refugees who used the caves to escape the Seleucid menace, firstly in 198 B.C. when Jerusalem was initially forced to recognize Syria, and secondly during the Maccabean Wars 167-164 B.C..<sup>98</sup> The site was then first occupied by the sectarians during the reign of Antiochus VII (139-128), but not for long thereafter.<sup>99</sup> The fact that there are no coins from the reigns of Antiochus VIII (125-96 B.C.) or his rival Antiochus IX

---

<sup>96</sup>De Vaux, p5.

<sup>97</sup>Rogerson, The New Atlas of the Bible, 1985, p112.

<sup>98</sup>There are only six bronzes from the combined reigns of Antiochus III, IV, and VII - De Vaux, p19 including n1.

<sup>99</sup>There are 6 silver coins plus a few others from the reign of Antiochus VII, must possibly one coin from Demetrius II (147-139 and 128-125), plus those bronzes mentioned in the previous footnote - De Vaux, p18-19.

(116-95 B.C.) does seem to confirm Rogerson's assertion.<sup>100</sup>

The transition from Period Ia to Period Ib is marked by a substantial expansion of the site of Khirbet Qumran, due it seems to a large influx of members,<sup>101</sup> whilst the precise end of Period Ib remains uncertain. There was both a fire and an earthquake one of which led to the desertion of the site. The latter we know from Josephus, dates to 31 B.C. and De Vaux believes that the fire coincided with it since 'this solution is the simplest and there is no positive argument to contradict it.'<sup>102</sup> However other scholars such as Charlesworth believe Khirbet Qumran was abandoned due to the Nabatean invasion of 40 B.C. or shortly thereafter, because Ein Feshkhah, En-Gedi, Ein el-Ghuweir, all of which may have been sectarian sites, plus Qumran itself, were all destroyed between 40-37 B.C..<sup>103</sup> The site was then left deserted until 4-1 B.C. when the second major period of occupation began, viz. Period II.<sup>104</sup> There are a few coins from Herod the Great's reign belonging to the end of his reign, and after this the numismatic and pottery evidence is plentiful. The end of Period II occurred in the June of 68 A.D., for there are 83 coins from the second year of the revolt (67/68 A.D.), five from the third (68/69 A.D.), but

---

<sup>100</sup>This conclusion requires the numismatic evidence found in the Period Ib remains to be taken as Period Ia remains. Yet De Vaux himself writes (p19), 'the interpretation of the coin evidence is a delicate matter.... these (Seleucid) coins could have survived from Period Ia even though we have not been able to assign them definitely to that phase.'

<sup>101</sup>De Vaux, plates IV and VI which give the plans for Period Ia and Period Ib respectively.

<sup>102</sup>De Vaux, p23.

<sup>103</sup>Charlesworth, RQ, 10, p225-6; for evidence that Ein Feshkhah was a sectarian site see De Vaux, p60f esp.p84-88; for Ein el-Ghuweir see Bar-Adon, 'Another Settlement of the Judean Desert Sect at Ein el-Ghuweir on the shores of the Dead Sea', BASOR, 227 (1977), p18-20.

<sup>104</sup>On the re-occupation of the site Trench A was dug as a place for much of the debris which resulted from the fire and earthquake and includes only pottery and coins from period Ib with one exception, a coin from Herod Archelaus (4 B.C.-6 A.D.) lost during the clearances; there was also a hoard of 561 Tyrian silver coins dating from between 9/8 B.C. - 1/1 A.D. which were probably brought in at the start of Period II - De Vaux, p25 and p34-36.

none from the fourth although they are commonly found elsewhere; in addition, Vespasian is known to have destroyed Jericho and then gone on to the Dead Sea 'to see if men floated!'<sup>105</sup> The Romans left a small military attachment at Qumran from 68-73 A.D., i.e. until Masada fell in 74 A.D.. Finally the abandoned site was used as a base or refuge for the Jewish insurgents during the Second Jewish revolt of 132-135 A.D..

I shall now turn to consider the external historical evidence and begin by merely outlining in tabular form the major figures and events of the age.

Palestine under the Seleucids.

**HIGH PRIESTS**

**Onias III (198-174)**

- end of Zadokite line.
- murdered in Antioch: 170 B.C..

**Jason (174-171)**

**Menelaus (171-161)**

- the Maccabean Wars: 167-164 B.C..

**Alcimus (161-159)**

- Judas Maccabee killed in battle: 160 B.C..
- died of illness.

**'Interregnum' (159-152/0)**

**Jonathan Maccabee (152/0-143)**

- period of peace during power struggle.
- Josephus attests 3 sects: Ant.13,5,9.
- Jonathan killed by Trypho.

**Simon Maccabee (142-134)**

- 142 taxes removed; first year of independence.
- 140 Hasmoneans declared High Priests : 1Mac.14<sup>41</sup>.

- Simon and two of his sons murdered in Jericho.

**SELEUCID RULERS**

**Antiochus IV (175-163)**

**Antiochus V (163-162)**

**Demetrius I (162/1-150)**

**Alexander Balas (152-145)**

**Demetrius II (147-139)**

**Antiochus VI (145-142)**

**Antiochus VII (139-128)**

---

<sup>105</sup>Josephus, The Jewish Wars, 4.8.4.

**John Hyrcanus (134-104) - pro-Pharisee.**

- under Seleucid power 133-128.
- miniature golden age  
due to power struggle.

Demetrius II (128-125)  
Seleucus V (125)  
Antiochus VIII (125-96)  
Antiochus IX (116-95)

- Hyrcanus joins Sadducees: Ant. 13,10,5-6.

**Aristobolus I (104-103)**

- died of illness.

**Alexander Jannaeus (103-76) - pro-Sadducee.**

- civil war (94-88):  
at the end in 88 B.C. -  
800 Pharisees crucified  
8000 Pharisees fled.
- Aretas II (Nabt.) defeats Jannaeus.
- Jannaeus dies through drinking.

Demetrius III (95-88)  
Philip I (94-83)  
Antiochus X (94-83)

87: Nabt. take Damascus.

**Salome (76-67) - wife of Jannaeus.**

- backed the Pharisees.
- son, Hyrcanus II, high-priest.
- son, Aristobolus II, military leader.

**Aristobolus II (67-63) - pro-Sadducee.**

- Antipater + Hyrcanus II + Aretas III defeated Aristobolus II.
- Scaurus, sent by Rome, restored Aristobolus II.

Palestine under Romans.

**Hyrcanus II (63-40)**

- power with Antipater: 63-43 B.C.
- three rebellions in 57-55 B.C.

**Herod the Great (37-4 B.C.) made king by Anthony.**

- captured Jerusalem and beheaded Antigonus.
- Aristobolus III last of the Hasmoneans drowned: 36 B.C.

**Archelaus (4 B.C. - 6 A.D.)**

If we now combine this historical data with the archaeological evidence then the following conclusions can be drawn. Firstly, if the Teacher as High Priest had been usurped by Jonathan (which we agreed was possible), then we would expect the settlement of Qumran to show evidence of occupation from 150 B.C. That it does not is either because we have simply not been fortunate



enough to find any numismatic evidence for the years 150–140 B.C., or because the Teacher and his followers waited until Jonathan had been succeeded and only in 140 B.C., when the Hasmoneans were declared High Priests, did the Teacher's opposition force him to flee to Qumran; the latter is the view I would favour.<sup>106</sup> Then, if we follow Rogerson's suggestion, the Teacher and his followers returned from their brief exile at Qumran in the early part of John Hyrcanus' reign, (though probably not until 128 B.C. when the latter had regained Judah's independence,) again hoping to win back the High Priesthood. Yet when the suggestion to relinquish the High Priesthood was put to John Hyrcanus the result was disastrous; John Hyrcanus switched his allegiance to the Sadducees, while both the Pharisees and the Teacher and his followers were persecuted resulting in the latter retreating again to Qumran. From then on the opposition between the Hasmonean High Priesthood, and the Pharisees and the Qumran sectarians was intense. Under Alexander Jannaeus civil war broke out in 94 B.C. when he was pelted with citrous fruits at the Festival of Sukkoth. The uprising was probably engineered by the Pharisees and certainly Jannaeus considered that this was the case from the subsequent crucifixion of 800 of them in 88 B.C.. In addition some 8000 men, many of them Pharisees, were forced to flee Judaea, and many scholars consider this event to be the source of the sudden influx and corresponding expansion of the Qumran site at the beginning of Period 1b.<sup>107</sup> Finally we have already explored the possible connection between the sect and Herod, and it seems significant that the site of Khirbet Qumran lay abandoned during the whole of his reign. Although the

---

<sup>106</sup>It seems very apparent that different Seleucid families backed different groups within Palestine; thus the Hasmoneans were backed by Alexander Balas and his son Antiochus VI, whilst their opponents (such as the Teacher) were backed by Demetrius I and his son Demetrius II - his other son, Antiochus VII backed the Hasmoneans.

<sup>107</sup>So Murphy-O'Connor, RB, 81, p241; BA, 40, p123; Charlesworth, RQ, 10, p223-4.

sect were forced to leave their place of exile in 40-37 (or 31) B.C., their favourable relationship with Herod meant they only returned after his death in 4 B.C..

Thus we can summarize the sectarian occupation of Khirbet Qumran as follows:

Period Ia: 140-128 B.C. + c.115-94 B.C.  
Period Ib: 94/88 B.C. - 39 or 31 B.C.  
Period II: 1-4 B.C.- 68 A.D.

These conclusions both agree with our dating of the various literary strands within the Damascus Document, and square with our analysis of the theology of Qumran.

### 3.2.2. The Internal Evidence of the Scrolls: The Identity of the Wicked Priest.

Having considered the external evidence I shall now turn to consider the internal historical evidence of the scrolls themselves.<sup>108</sup> There are a number of historical allusions within the scrolls that would seem to support the conclusions that I have already arrived at, such as the conflict between 'the furious young lion' (=Alexander Jannaeus) and 'the seekers of smooth things' (=the Pharisees) that is outlined in 4QpNahum. However our study will be

---

<sup>108</sup>The impreciseness of the palaeographical data does not facilitate the accurate dating of individual scrolls, and the problem is further compounded when it is recognized 'that the major documents, especially 1QS and Dam.Doc., have obtained their present form through an evolutionary process that mirrors somewhat the historical stages of the Qumran Essenes' - Charlesworth, RQ, 10, p233. Thus, for the main sectarian works, all of which are probably composite, it is only possible to give a terminus ad quem for the final form of a document using the palaeographic evidence, although for the pesharim and other autograph works the palaeographic evidence is more valuable. However, it can be used to dismiss those scholars who either wish to give a Maccabean date to the Scrolls - Rowley, The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls, p62f and Rabinowitz, 'Sequence and Dates of the Extra-biblical Dead Sea Scroll Texts and "Damascus" Fragments', VT, 3 (1953), p175-185, or conversely a Herodian or even Christian one - Thiering, Redating the Teacher of Righteousness, plus the works of Allegro, Teicher and the like who see early christian influence at every turn.

restricted to identifying (and thus dating) the historical figures mentioned in the scrolls, namely the Teacher of Righteousness, the Man of Lies, and in particular the Wicked Priest.

In recent years the majority of scholars seem to have come to the conclusion that the Wicked Priest is Jonathan Maccabee.<sup>109</sup> The latter became High Priest in 152/0 B.C. when Alexander Balas granted him the office in return for his support, and consequently ousted the Teacher of Righteousness who was the legitimate Zadokite High Priest. Both 4QpPss<sup>a</sup> 4<sup>9-10</sup> and 1QpHab.9<sup>10-12</sup> suggest that the Wicked Priest died at the hands of a foreigner, and the only candidate that fits this role is Jonathan who was killed by Trypho, and this in turn constitutes the major obstacle in identifying the other main candidate, Simon Maccabee, as the Wicked Priest. Thus if the Wicked Priest is to be identified with a single person, Jonathan Maccabee seems to best fit the evidence.

Yet since Jonathan was only the first of the illegitimate High Priests of the Hasmonean line, then surely they were all in a sense 'Wicked Priests'? This argument, that the title 'Wicked Priest' refers to more than one individual, has been forwarded by both Brownlee and Van der Woude in recent years.<sup>110</sup> Two factors seem to support such an analysis. Firstly, there seems to be more than one account of his death; in 4QpPss<sup>a</sup> 4<sup>9-10</sup> and 1QpHab.9<sup>10-12</sup> the Wicked Priest dies at the hand of foreigners, yet the obvious reading of 1QpHab.9<sup>1-2</sup>

---

<sup>109</sup>Vermes, Milik, Jeremias, Stegemann, Murphy-O'Connor, Knibb, VanderKam, Hengel.

<sup>110</sup>Brownlee, 'The Wicked Priest, The Man of Lies, and The Righteous Teacher - The Problem of Identity', JQR, 73 (1982-83), p1-37; Van der Woude, JJS, 33, p349-359. Most recently Davies has also stated that the Wicked Priest 'is very possibly an amalgam of several figures, none of whom, moreover, may have dealt directly with the "Teacher" (nor maybe even his community), but who would have been the targets of the community's polemic' - Behind the Essenes, p28; cf. too Knibb, p238-246.

suggests that he died of some unpleasant disease, whilst in 1QpHab.11<sup>14-15</sup> some further kind of painful death is suggested. Secondly, in 1QpHab. the past tense is used throughout except towards the end of the document in 1QpHab.10<sup>3-5</sup>, 11<sup>14-15</sup> and 12<sup>2f</sup>, and scholars have posited that the author used the future tense of events which occurred after the death of the Teacher as though he had foretold them.<sup>111</sup>

So how are we to identify these 'Wicked Priests'? Van der Woude states that 'if the expression, "Wicked Priest", does not apply to one character but several, the author of the Commentary could only hope to make himself understood by introducing them in a comprehensible order'.<sup>112</sup> Furthermore, the Teacher of Righteousness appears only in conjunction with the third, fourth and fifth (Wicked) Priest, not with the first and second, and not with the last.<sup>113</sup> Thus we can begin by identifying the figure of 1QpHab.9<sup>9-10</sup> as Jonathan since he alone died in the hands of foreigners.<sup>114</sup> The Priest prior to him (1QpHab.8<sup>16-9</sup>) seems to have died of some unpleasant disease, a fate which befell both Alcimus and Aristobolus I, and as Alcimus was the High Priest prior to Jonathan this would seem to refer to him.<sup>115</sup> Between the two we have a reference to *'the last priests of Jerusalem, who shall amass money and wealth ..., but in the latter days .. shall be delivered into the hands of the army of the Kittim'* – 1QpHab.9<sup>4-7</sup>. The crimes are at this stage in the future, and thus the phrase must refer to the Hasmonean High Priesthood, which

---

<sup>111</sup>Brownlee, BASOR, 126, p16; Carmignac, RSR, 2, p160-163; J.van der Ploeg, 'L'usage..', in Les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte, 1957, p25-35.

<sup>112</sup>Van der Woude, JJS, 33, p353.

<sup>113</sup>Van der Woude, JJS, 33, p353.

<sup>114</sup>Van der Woude, JJS, 33, p356; I basically follow his identifications over against Brownlee's.

<sup>115</sup>So Van der Woude, JSS, 33, p355; Brownlee favours Aristobolus I – JQR, 73, p4.

began with Jonathan (1QpHab.9<sup>9</sup>) and ended effectively with the coming of the Romans (=the Kittim). The 'Wicked Priest' identified as Jonathan is followed by 'the Spouter of Lies' in 1QpHab.10<sup>9</sup>; the latter is said to have 'built his city of vanity with blood' which can be compared to 4QTestimonia 22-29;<sup>116</sup>

*Cursed is the man who rebuilds this city!<sup>23</sup> May he lay his foundation on his first-born and set its gate upon his youngest son. (Josh.6<sup>26</sup>)*

*Behold an accursed man, a man of Satan,<sup>24</sup> has risen to become a fowler's net to his people ... And [his brother]<sup>17</sup> arose<sup>25</sup> [and ruled], both being instruments of violence. They have rebuilt<sup>26</sup> [Jerusalem,<sup>118</sup> and have set up] a wall and towers to make of it a stronghold of ungodliness..<sup>27,28</sup>. They have committed an abomination in the land and a great blasphemy among the children<sup>29</sup> [of Israel... They have shed blood] like water upon the ramparts of the daughter of Zion...*

Cross has correctly identified the 'accursed man' as Simon Maccabee who lost his two sons and his own life when Ptolemy, the governor of Jericho and Simon's brother-in-law, laid on a banquet for them and then murdered them afterwards;<sup>119</sup> in both 1QpHab.9<sup>16-10</sup><sup>1</sup> and 4QTestimonia<sup>25f</sup>, Jonathan is also credited with this rebuilding programme.<sup>120</sup> The next Wicked Priest in 1QpH.11<sup>4-8</sup> must then refer to John Hyrcanus who pursued the Teacher of Righteousness into his house of exile, and this would be perfectly understandable if the sect (or what became the sect) were behind the

---

<sup>116</sup>Following Vermes' translation, p296. Compare the prophecy relating to John Hyrcanus and his two sons in Josephus - Antiquities, 13,10,7 and 13,12,1.

<sup>117</sup>The text may read sons here not brother, in line with the Joshua quotation - see Dupont-Sommer, p316.

<sup>118</sup>Perhaps this should be restored as 'yr šw', 'the city of vanity' (cf.1QpHab.10<sup>10</sup>), which would be of similar length to 'yrwšl(y)m'.

<sup>119</sup>Cross, The Ancient Library of Qumran, p112-114; Cross equates 'the Man of Lies' with 'the Wicked Priest' and thus is able to identify the latter as Simon Maccabee.

<sup>120</sup>Under Jonathan: 1Mac.10<sup>10-11,45</sup>, 12<sup>36-39</sup> = Antiquities, 13,2,1 and 3, 13,5,11; under Simon: 1Mac.13<sup>10,48,52</sup> = Antiquities, 13,6,4 and 7.

suggestion that John Hyrcanus should relinquish the High Priest aspect of his position. It seems there is no reference to Aristobolus I, whose reign was in any case short, because the next reference to the Wicked Priest must be to Alexander Jannaeus who died as a result of drink - 1QpHab.11<sup>13-15</sup> and Josephus, Antiquities, 13,15,5.<sup>121</sup> The change to the future tense here suggests that the Teacher had died before or during Alexander's reign, and we have already argued that the former position is probably the case.

There are though some problems with this theory. Firstly, we have left the first of the Wicked Priests unidentified (1QpH.8<sup>8-13</sup>); theoretically he should be Menelaus, but why would he be 'called by the name of truth'? Perhaps it is a further reference to Alcimus whom the 'Hasidim' initially seemed to support.<sup>122</sup> Van der Woude thinks it is a reference to Judas Maccabee who may have usurped the functions of the High Priest temporarily;<sup>123</sup> Josephus does credit him with the High Priesthood for four years<sup>124</sup> and Judas does seem to have a hand in the cleansing of the Temple.<sup>125</sup> Yet the Hasmonean line would then begin with Judas and so one would expect the reference to the 'last priests of Jerusalem' before this first reference to the 'Wicked Priest'. The second problem lies in the identity of the last, ?two, Wicked Priest(s) of 1QpH.12<sup>2,8</sup>; are they Hyrcanus II and Aristobolus II, or is this a further reference to Alexander

---

<sup>121</sup>Alexander Jannaeus is also referred to in 4QpHos<sup>b</sup>2<sup>3</sup> as 'the last priest' and in 4QpNahum.1<sup>6-7</sup> where he is 'the furious young lion'; in both he is opposed by 'the seekers of smooth things' = 'Ephraim', namely the Pharisees.

<sup>122</sup>1Mac.7<sup>12</sup>, cf. Josephus, Antiquities, 12,10,2.

<sup>123</sup>Van der Woude, JJS, 33, p354.

<sup>124</sup>Josephus, Antiquities, 12,11,2, cf.13,2,2.

<sup>125</sup>1Mac.4<sup>41f</sup>, cf.2Mac.12<sup>43</sup> and Josephus, Antiquities, 12,7,7.

Jannaeus who is now referred to in the future?<sup>126</sup> Finally, is there any reason why some of the 'Wicked Priests' are simply termed 'the Priest', - 1QpH.8<sup>16</sup>, 9<sup>16</sup>, 11<sup>12</sup>; were Alcimus, Jonathan, and John Hyrcanus favoured in some way? And why is Simon Maccabee referred to as 'the Spouter of Lies' and not 'the Wicked Priest'?

Thus to summarize the references to the Wicked Priests:

?Judas Maccabee:	1QpH.8 <sup>8</sup> .
Alcimus:	1QpH.8 <sup>16</sup> .
Jonathan Maccabee:	1QpH.9 <sup>9,16</sup> ; 4QpPss <sup>a</sup> 4 <sup>9-10</sup> .
Simon Maccabee:	1QpH.10 <sup>9</sup> as the 'Spouter of Lies'. 4QTestimonia <sup>23</sup> as the 'accursed man'.
John Hyrcanus:	1QpH.11 <sup>4</sup>
Alexander Jannaeus:	1QpH.11 <sup>12</sup> (?and 12 <sup>2,8</sup> .) 4QpNah.1 <sup>6-7</sup> as 'the furious young lion'. 4QpHos <sup>b</sup> .2 <sup>3</sup> as 'the last priest'.
?Hyrcanus II	1QpH.12 <sup>2*</sup> .
?Aristobolus II	1QpH.12 <sup>8*</sup> .

Yet there seems to me to be a further argument that can be adduced to favour the plurality of 'Wicked Priests' in 1QpHab. The Kittim have been firmly identified with the Romans because the military weapons and tactics used by the Kittim in the Scrolls correspond to the art of war practised by the Roman legions. In addition, the reference to the Kittim worshipping their standards (1QpH.6<sup>3-5</sup>) and to Jerusalem not falling to a foreigner from the time of Antiochus (IV or VII) to the time of the Kittim in 4QpNah.1<sup>3</sup>, must refer to the Romans, as it does in Daniel 11<sup>30</sup>. Yet 1QM.1<sup>2</sup> also talks of 'the Kittim of Assyria', (even if they are meant to symbolize the Romans,) whilst in 1Mac.1<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>126</sup>So Van der Woude who believes 1QpHab. was written during the last three years of his reign (79-76 B.C.) when he was already under the influence of drink - JJS, 33, p359.

and 8<sup>5</sup> they are the Greeks.<sup>127</sup> Thus Vermes states that 'from the second century B.C., Jewish writers .. used "Kittim" .. to denote the greatest world power of the day'.<sup>128</sup> As we have seen the Qumran sectarians often equated the Kittim with the Romans, quite understandably, but is this the only identification they made? Daniel 2 and 7 both tell of the four world empires, namely the Babylonian, Medes, Persian, and Greek empires. Is it also possible to find a similar concept in 1QpHab.2<sup>10</sup> - 6<sup>12</sup>?

The phrase pšr 'l hkty'ym.. occurs four times in 2<sup>12</sup>, 3<sup>4</sup>, 3<sup>9</sup> and 6<sup>1</sup> and refers, I would suggest, to the four successive empires of the Babylonians, Persians, Greeks and Romans. The first reference in 2<sup>12-16</sup> to the Kittim interprets Hab.1<sup>6a</sup>: *'For behold, I rouse the Chaldeans..'* and goes on to note that they *'take possession of dwellings which are not their own'* (Hab.1<sup>6b</sup>), restored in 1QpHab.2<sup>16f</sup>, namely Jerusalem and Judaea in 587B.C. That the Kittim in 3<sup>4-6</sup> refer to the Persians, can be seen from the following biblical passage of Hab.1<sup>8-9a</sup> used of the Greeks, for there we read: *Their horses are swifter than leopards..'* that is to say: the Greeks horses are quicker than leopards. Now in Daniel 7<sup>6</sup> the Persians are represented by a four-headed winged leopard, so that the implication is that the Greeks horses defeated the swiftness of the Persians. These 'Kittim' of 3<sup>4-6</sup> are also the only empire not to be accused of 'devouring nations' or the like, since they are the only ones of the four not to have conquered Israel as such. Of the 'Kittim' of 3<sup>9-4<sup>3</sup></sup> we read: *'They come from afar, from the islands of the sea..'* - 1QpHab3<sup>11</sup>, and the most obvious interpretation of this would be as a reference to Greece with its

---

<sup>127</sup>Originally, the word described the inhabitants of Kition, a Phoenician colony on Cyprus, but later it came to apply indiscriminately to those living in 'all islands and most maritime countries' (Antiquities, 1,128) - Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective, p148.

<sup>128</sup>Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective, p148.



many islands. There are then two peshers which deal with the 'commanders of the Kittim' (1QpHab.4<sup>5,10</sup>) and these seem to me to represent the Ptolemies and the Seleucids respectively;<sup>129</sup> the latter also mentions 'the House of Guilt' (1QpHab.4<sup>11</sup>) which would seem to refer to the pro-Seleucid Jerusalem hierarchy or the Tobiads. We then have two peshers in 1QpHab.4<sup>17</sup>- 5<sup>12</sup>, the first dealing with God's 'Elect', namely the sectarians, the second with the House of Absalom (?), the Man of Lies (=Simon), the Teacher of Righteousness and the Law (=11QT). These references to the Teacher and the sect, naturally occur before the final references to the Kittim in 6<sup>1,10</sup> who are there the Romans, who *'sacrifice to their standards and worship their weapons of war'* - (1QpHab.6<sup>3-5</sup>.)

Thus 1QpHab. can be seen to contain two chronological schemes. The first deals with the Kittim interpreted in terms of the four successive empires of the earth and how they in turn affected Israel, its people and its land. The second deals with the illegitimate Hasmonean High Priesthood, lasting seemingly from Judas Maccabee to Alexander Jannaeus (or Hyrcanus II). There is an introductory section which precedes both these accounts and credits this understanding of history to the Teacher of Righteousness - 1QpH.2<sup>1-10</sup> and 7<sup>1-5</sup>. This interpretation would further substantiate the fact that the sect were constantly opposed to the Hasmoneans, mainly because of their usurpation of the High Priesthood, but which in turn led to further conflict between the two on the 'law'. How much further does this linguistic principle extend? It is possible that the cryptic reference to 'the Man of Lie' also refers to more than one figure, for in 1QpH.2<sup>1-2</sup> and CD 1<sup>12-14</sup>, the 'Man of Lie' is associated with

---

<sup>129</sup>The phrase 'mwsly hkty( 'ym' is also found in 4QpNah.1<sup>3</sup> where it must refer to the Romans.

'a congregation of traitors', perhaps suggesting that he is responsible for creating a split within the sect. Does this phrase then, refer to both Simon Maccabee and the leader of an opposing group, perhaps the Pharisees, both of whom were responsible in their own way for advancing false teaching? Some scholars have even seen 'the Teacher of Righteousness' as an office<sup>130</sup> rather than as a reference to an individual,<sup>131</sup> though this is not a view I personally share.

So to conclude. My two corollary sections seem to me in general to substantiate the conclusions I put forward in the main body of this thesis regarding the composite nature of the Damascus Document. In both corollary sections, but in particular the latter, I have also, however, been led to conclude that the regnant views on many of the larger Qumran issues are not as strong as many scholars would like us to believe they are. I have therefore answered a few questions and raised many more. The field of Qumran studies is still wide open, and if I am thought to have stirred the pot helpfully and to have suggested some new avenues for discussion, I will be content. The avenue on which I have concentrated and which has made up the backbone of this study is the reconstruction of the poetry of the Damascus Document. But there are many others just waiting to be explored.

---

<sup>130</sup>Buchanan, 'The Priestly Teacher of Righteousness', RQ, 6 (1967-69), p553-8, and 'The Office of the Teacher of Righteousness', RQ, 9 (1977-78), p241-3; Siegel, 'Two Further References to the Teacher of Righteousness', RQ, 9 (1977-78), p437-40; Bregman, 'Another Reference to "A Teacher of Righteousness" in Midrashic Literature', RQ, 10 (1979-81), p97-100.

<sup>131</sup>Lehmann, 'Talmudic Material relating to the Dead Sea Scrolls', RQ, 1 (1959), p391-404 identifies Onias III (or 'Nehonyon') as the Teacher; Carmignac, RQ, 10, p235-246 identifies the Teacher as Judah the Essene - cf. Murphy-O'Connor's reply in 'Judah the Essene and the Teacher of Righteousness', RQ, 10 (1979-81), p379-385; Wacholder, The Dawn of Qumran, sees Zadok (c.240-170B.C.) the disciple of Antigonus of Soko as the Teacher, p141-169, p211-2.

## Bibliography of Books.

- Adam, A. Antike Berichte über die Essener, Berlin 1972.
- Allegro, J.M. The Dead Sea Scrolls, Harmondsworth 1956.
- Baumgarten, J.M. Studies in Qumran Law, (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, 24), Leiden 1977.
- Betz, O. Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte, Tübingen 1960.
- Birnbaum, S.A. The Qumran (Dead Sea) Scrolls and Palaeography, (Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, Sup.13/14,) New Haven, Conn. 1952.
- Black, M. The Scrolls and Christian Origins: Studies in the Jewish background of the New Testament, London 1961.
- Black, M.(ed.) The Scrolls and Christianity, London 1969.
- Brooke, G.J. Exegesis at Qumran; 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish context, (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplementary Series 29) Sheffield 1985.
- Brownlee, W.H. The Dead Sea Scroll of Habakkuk and the Targum of Jonathan, Durham, North Carolina 1953.
- Brownlee, W.H. The Text of Habakkuk in the ancient commentary from Qumran, (Journal of Biblical Literature, Monograph Series, Vol.XI), Philadelphia 1959.
- Bruce, F.F. Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts, London 1960.
- Bruce, F.F. Israel and the Nations from the Exodus to the Fall of the Second Temple, Exeter 1969, third impression 1978.
- Burke, D.G. The Poetry of Baruch: A reconstruction of the original Hebrew text of Baruch 3<sup>9</sup>-5<sup>9</sup>, (Society of Biblical Literature, Septuagint and Cognate Studies, 10), Chico, California 1982.
- Burrows, M. More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls, London 1958.
- Carmignac, J. et Guilbert, P. (ed.) Les textes de Qumrân, 1961, esp. p129-204 by Cothenet.
- Charles, R.H. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, 2 Volumes, Oxford 1913; esp. volume 2, p785-834 - 'Fragments of a Zadokite Work'.
- Charlesworth, J.H. The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, London: Volume 1 1983

- Apocalyptic literature and testaments, Volume 2  
1985 - Expansions of the "Old Testament" and legends.

- Cody, A. A History of the Old Testament Priesthood, (Analecta Biblica 35), Rome 1969.
- Cross, F.M. The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies, London 1958.
- Davidson, B. Concordance of the Hebrew and Chaldee Scriptures, London 1848; Zondervan edition, Grand Rapids, Michigan 1970, thirteenth printing 1980.
- Davies, P.R. The Damascus Covenant: An interpretation of the "Damascus Document", (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplementary Series 25), Sheffield 1983.
- Davies, P.R. Behind the Essenes. History and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls, (Brown Judaic Studies 94), Atlanta, Georgia 1987.
- Denis, A.-M. 'Evolution de structures dans la secte de Qumran' in Aux origines de l'Eglise, (Rech. Bibl. VII), Bruges 1964.
- Denis, A.-M. Les thèmes de connaissance dans le Document de Damas, Louvain 1967.
- Discoveries in the Judeaen Desert - Volume I 'Qumran Cave 1', (ed. Barthélemy, D. and Milik, J.T.); Volume III 'Les "Petites Grottes" de Qumrân (2Q,3Q,5Q,6Q,7Q à 10Q)', (ed. Baillet, M., Milik, J.T., and Vaux, R.de); Volume V 'Qumrân Cave 4 (4Q158-186)', (ed. Allegro, J.M.).
- Driver, G. The Judaean Scrolls: The problem and a solution, Oxford 1965.
- Dupont-Sommer, A. The Essene Writings from Qumran (translated by G.Vermes from the French: Les Écrits Esséniens découverts près de la Mer Morte, Paris 1959), Oxford 1961.
- Eisenman, R. Maccabees, Zadokites, Christians and Qumran: A new hypothesis of Christian Origins, (studies Post-Biblica, 34), Leiden 1983.
- Fitzmyer, J.A. The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1, Rome 1966, second revised edition 1971.
- Fitzmyer, J.A. Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament, London 1971. [p205-17]
- Fitzmyer, J.A. The Dead Sea Scrolls; Major Publication and Tools for Study, (Society of Biblical Literature, Sources 4, Biblical Study 8), Missoula, Mont., 1975 (with addendum

1977).

- Fohrer, G. History of Israelite Religion, (translated by D.E.Green from the German: Einleitung in das alte Testament.) London 1972.
- Fohrer, G. Hebrew and Aramaic dictionary of the Old Testament, (English version by W.Johnstone from the German: Hebräisches und aramäisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament.) London 1973.
- Gärtner, B. The Temple and the Community in Qumran and in the New Testament: A comparative study in the temple symbolism of the Qumran texts and the New Testament, (Society of New Testament Studies, Monograph Series 1), Cambridge 1965.
- Gesenius, W. and Kautzsch, E. (ed.), Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, Oxford 1910.
- Gibson, J.C.L. Canaanite Myths and Legends, Edinburgh 1978.
- Ginzberg, L. The Legends of the Jews, 7 Volumes, Philadelphia 1968.
- Ginzberg, L. An Unknown Jewish Sect, New York 1976; revised and updated translation of Eine unbekante jüdische Sekte, New York 1922.
- Goedicke, H.(ed.) Near Eastern Studies in Honor of W.F.Albright, Baltimore 1971.
- Hengel, M. Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their encounter in Palestine during the early Hellenistic period, (translated by J.Bowden from the German: Judentum und Hellenismus: Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2.Jh.v.Chr., Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 10, Tübingen, 1969,) in two volumes, London 1974.
- Hengel, M. Jews, Greeks, and Barbarians: Aspects of the Hellenization of Judaism in the pre-Christian period, (translated by J.Bowden from the German: Juden, Griechen und Barbaren: Aspecten der Hellenisierung des Judentums in vorchristlicher Zeit, Stuttgart 1976), London 1980.
- Hollander, H.W. and Jonge, M.de The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A commentary, (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha, volume 8), Leiden 1985.
- Horgan, M.P. Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books, Washington DC 1979.
- Jaubert, A. The Date of the Last Supper, Staten Island New York 1965.

- Jeremias, G. Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit, Göttingen 1963.
- Josephus, Antiquities - in Whiston's edition of The Works of Flavius Josephus, London.
- Josephus, The Jewish Wars - in Whiston's edition of The Works of Flavius Josephus, London.
- Kahle, P. The Cairo Geniza, (Schweich Lectures 1941), London 1947, second edition Oxford 1959.
- Kittel, B.P. The Hymns of Qumran: Translation and commentary, (Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 50), Chico California 1981.
- Knibb, M.A. The Qumran Community, (Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200B.C. to A.D.200, volume 2), Cambridge 1987.
- Kugel, J.L. The Idea of Biblical Poetry, New Haven and London 1981.
- Kuhn, K.G. Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten, Göttingen 1960 - (Supplement in RQ, 4 (1963/64), p163-234.)
- Kurylowicz, J. Studies in Semitic Grammar and Metrics, Warsaw 1972.
- Kutscher, E.Y. The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIs<sup>a</sup>), (Studies in the Texts of the Desert of Judah, Vol. VI), Leiden 1974, (with corrections by E.Qimron, Leiden 1979).
- Kutscher, E.Y. A History of the Hebrew Language, (ed. by R.Kutscher), Jerusalem 1982.
- Lambdin, T.O. Introduction to Biblical Hebrew, London 1973.
- Lasor, W.S. Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls 1948-1957, (Fuller Theological Seminary Bibliographical Series 2), Pasadena, Calif. 1958.
- Leaney, A.R.C. The Rule of the Community and its Meaning, (New Testament Library), London 1966.
- Lohse, E. Die Texte aus Qumran hebräisch und deutsch, München 1964, second edition 1971.
- McCullough, W.S. The History and Literature of the Palestinian Jews from Cyrus to Herod, 550B.C. to 4B.C., Toronto 1977 (1975).
- Maier, J. Die Texte vom Toten Meer, 2 volumes, München 1960.
- Maier, J. The Temple Scroll: An introduction, translation and commentary, (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplementary Series, 34), (translated by R.T.White

from the German: Die Tempelrolle vom Toten Meer, München 1978), Sheffield 1985.

Martin, M. The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls, in 2 Volumes, Louvain 1958.

Milik, J.T. Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, (Studies in Biblical Theology, 26), (translated by J.Strugnell from the French, Dix ans de Découvertes dans le Désert de Juda, Paris 1957,) London 1959, second impression London 1963.

Murphy-O'Connor, J. Hebrew Stanza Structure, Winona Lake Indiana 1980.

Musaph-Andriessse, From Torah to Kabbalah, London 1981.

Qimron, E. The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Atlanta Georgia 1986.

Rabin, Ch. The Zadokite Documents, Oxford 1954.

Rabin, Ch. Qumran Studies, (Scripta Judaica, II), London 1957.

Rabin, Ch. and Yadin, Y. (joint editors), Scripta Hierosolymitana. Volume 4, Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Jerusalem 1958.

Ringgren, H. The Faith of Qumran: Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls, (translated by E.T.Sander's from the German), Philadelphia 1963.

Rogerson, J. The New Atlas of the Bible, London and Sydney, 1985.

Rowley, H.H. The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls, Oxford 1952.

Rowley, H.H. The Growth of the Old Testament, (Hutchinson's University Library, 45), London 1958.

Russell, D.S. The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, London 1964.

Sanders, J.A. The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll, New York 1967.

Schechter, S. Documents of the Jewish Sectaries, Cambridge 1910; reprinted in New York 1970 with a prolegomenon by J.A.Fitzmyer.

Schiffman, L.H. The Halakhah at Qumran, Leiden 1975

Schiffman, L.H. Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, testimony and the penal code, Chico California 1983.

Schürer, E. The History of the Jewish People in the age of Jesus Christ, 3 Volumes; revised by Goodman, M., Millar, F., & Vermes, G. in 1980-87.

- Schwartz, O. Der erste Teil der Damaskusschrift und das Alte Testament, Diest 1965.
- Segal, M.H. A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew, Oxford 1927, (1986 reprint).
- Snaith, N. The Jews from Cyrus to Herod, London 1949, reprinted 1956.
- Stegemann, H. Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde, Bonn 1971.
- Stevenson, W.B. Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic, Oxford 1924, reprinted 1950 and 1956.
- Tcherikover, V. Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews, (translated by S.Applebaum from the German), New York 1959, reprinted 1970.
- Teeple, H.M. The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet, (Journal of Biblical Literature, Monograph Series, vol.10), Philadelphia 1957.
- Testuz, M. Les Ideés religieuses du Livre de Jubilés, Geneva-Paris, 1960.
- Thiering, B. Redating the Teacher of Righteousness, Sydney, 1979.
- VanderKam, J. Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees, (Harvard Semitic Monograph, No.14), Missoula Mont. 1977.
- Vaux, R.de, Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions, London, 1961, second edition 1965.
- Vaux, R.de, Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls, (translated by G.R.Driver from L'archéologie et les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte), London 1962, revised edition 1973.
- Vermes, G. Scripture and Tradition in Judaism, Leiden 1961.
- Vermes, G. The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, Harmondsworth 1962, second edition 1962, third edition 1987.
- Vermes, G. Jesus the Jew, London 1973.
- Vermes, G. The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective, London 1977, second edition 1982.
- Wacholder, B.Z. The Dawn of Qumran: The sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness, Cincinnati 1983.
- Watson, G.E.W. Classical Hebrew Poetry - A guide to its techniques, Sheffield 1984.
- Watters, W.M. Formula Criticism and the Poetry of the Old Testament, (Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 138), Berlin and New York 1976.
- Wernberg-Møller, P. The Manual of Discipline, Leiden 1957.



- Wevers, J.W. & Bedford, D.E. (editors) Essays on the Ancient Semitic World, (Toronto Semitic Texts and Studies), Toronto 1970.
- Wilson, E. The Scrolls from the Dead Sea, London 1955.
- Wolff, H.W. The Anthropology of the Old Testament, (translated by M.Kohl from the German: Anthropologie des Alten Testaments, München 1973,) London 1974.
- Yadin, Y. The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness, (translated from the Hebrew by Batya and Ch.Rabin,) London 1962.
- Yadin, Y. The Temple Scroll (English edition), 3 Volumes, Jerusalem 1983; Hebrew Edition published in Jerusalem 1977.
- Yadin, Y. The Temple Scroll: The Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect, London 1985.
- Zeitlin, S. The Zadokite Fragments: Facsimile of the Manuscripts in the Cairo Genizah Collection in the possession of the University Library Cambridge England, Philadelphia 1952.

## Bibliography of Articles.

- Aalen, S. "Reign' and 'House' in the Kingdom of God in the Gospels', New Testament Studies, 8 (1961-62), p215-240.
- Baillet, M. 'Fragments du Document de Damas Qumrân, grotte 6', Revue Biblique, 63 (1956), p513-523.
- Bar-Adon, P. 'Another Settlement of the Judaeen Desert Sect at 'En el-Ghuweir on the Dead Sea', Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 227 (1957), p1-25; appeared previously in Eretz Israel, 10 (1971), p72-89, (in Hebrew, with a summary in English).
- Barker, M. 'Some Reflections upon the Enoch Myth', Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, 15 (1980), p7-29.
- Baumgarten, J.M. 'Sacrifice and Worship among the Jewish sectarians of the Dead Sea (Qumrân) Scrolls', Harvard Theological Review, 46 (1953), p141-157.
- Baumgarten, J.M. 'The Calendar of Jubilees and the Bible', Tarbiz, 32 (1962-63), p317-318.
- Baumgarten, J.M. '4QHalakah<sup>a</sup> 5, the Law of Ḥadash, and the Pentacontad Calendar', Journal of Jewish Studies, 27 (1976), p36-46.
- Beckwith, R.T. 'The Modern Attempt to reconcile the Qumran calendar with the true solar year', Revue de Qumrân, 7 (1969-71), p379-396.
- Beckwith, R.T. 'The Significance of the calendar for Essene Chronology', Revue de Qumrân, 10 (1979-81), p167-202.
- Beckwith, R.T. 'Daniel 9 and the date of the Messiah's Coming in Essene, Hellenistic, Pharisaic, Zealot and Early Christian Computation', Revue de Qumrân, 10 (1979-81), p521-542.
- Ben-Ḥayyim, Z. 'Traditions in the Hebrew Language, with special reference to the Dead Sea Scrolls', in Scripta Hierosolymitana, 4 (1958), p200-214.
- Baillet, M. 'Le travail d'Édition des fragments manuscrits de Qumrân' Revue Biblique, 63 (1956), p49-67.
- Benoit, P. et al 'Editing the Manuscript Fragments from Qumran' Biblical Archaeologist, 19 (1956), p75-96.
- Bowman, S. 'The Meaning of the Name "Qumran"', Revue de Qumrân, 11 (1982),

p543-547.

- Bregman, M. 'Another Reference to "A Teacher of Righteousness" in Midrashic Literature', Revue de Qumrân, 10 (1979-81), p97-100.
- Brooke, G.J. 'The Amos-Numbers Midrash (CD 7<sup>13b</sup>-8<sup>1a</sup>) and Messianic Expectation', Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 92 (1980), p397-404.
- Brooke, G.J. 'Qumran Peshet: Towards the Redefinition of a Genre', Revue de Qumrân, 10 (1979-81), p483-503.
- Brooke, G.J. 'The Feast of New Wine and the Question of Fasting', The Expository Times, 95 (1983-84), p175-176.
- Brooke, G.J. 'The Temple Scroll: a law unto itself', (unpublished at present - provided by author.)
- Brown, R.E. 'The Messianism of Qumrân', Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 19 (1957), p53-82.
- Brown, R.E. 'J.Starcky's Theory of Qumran Messianic Development', Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 28 (1966), p51-57.
- Brownlee, W.H. 'A Comparison of the Covenanters of the Dead Sea Scrolls with pre-Christian Jewish Sects', Biblical Archaeologist, 13 (1950), p49-72.
- Brownlee, W.H. 'The Historical Allusions of the Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash', Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 126 (1952), p10-20.
- Brownlee, W.H. 'The Wicked Priest, The Man of Lies, and The Righteous Teacher - The Problem of Identity', Jewish Quarterly Review, 73 (1982-83), p1-37.
- Bruce, F.F. 'The Book of Daniel and the Qumran Community', in Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in honour of Matthew Black, (ed. E.E.Ellis and M.Wilcox), Edinburgh 1969, p221-235.
- Buchanan, G.W. 'The Priestly Teacher of Righteousness', Revue de Qumrân, 6 (1967-69), p553-558.
- Buchanan, G.W. 'The Office of Teacher of Righteousness', Revue de Qumrân, 9 (1977-78), p241-243.
- Büchler, A. 'Schechter's "Jewish Sectaries"', Jewish Quarterly Review, 3 (1912-13), p429-485.
- Callaway, P. 'Mî 'ad Tûmām: an abbreviated gloss?', Revue de Qumrân, 12 (1985-87), p263-268.

- Capper, B.J. 'An Interpretation of Acts 5.4', Journal for the Study of the New Testament, 19 (1983), p117-131.
- Carmignac, J. 'Conjectures sur les écrits de Qumran', Revue des Sciences Religieuses, 2 (1957), p140-168.
- Carmignac, J. 'Comparaison entre les manuscrits "A" et "B" du Document de Damas', Revue de Qumrân, 2 (1959-60), p53-67.
- Carmignac J. 'Le Genre Littéraire du 'Peshet' dans la Pistis-Sophia', Revue de Qumrân, 4 (1963-64), p497-522.
- Carmignac J. 'La notion d'Eschatologie dans la Bible et a Qumrân', Revue de Qumrân, 7 (1969-71), p17-31.
- Carmignac J. 'Qui était le Docteur de Justice?', Revue de Qumrân, 10 (1979-81), p235-246.
- Charles, R and Cowley, A. 'An early source of the Testament of the Patriarchs', Jewish Quarterly Review, 19 (1906-07), p566-583.
- Charlesworth, J.H. 'The Origin and Subsequent History of the authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Four transitional phases among the Qumran Essenes', Revue de Qumrân, 10 (1979-81), p213-233.
- Christensen, D.L. 'The March of Conquest in Isaiah X 27 -c.34', Vetus Testamentum, 26 (1976), p385-399.
- Chomsky, W. 'The Pronunciation of the Shewa', Jewish Quarterly Review, 62 (1972), p88-94.
- Collins, R.F. 'The Berith-Notion of the Cairo Damascus Covenant and its comparison with the New Testament', Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses, 39 (1963), p555-594.
- Cross, F.M. 'The Development of the Jewish Scripts', p133-202 in The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in honor of W.F.Albright.
- Culley, R.C. 'Metrical Analysis of Classical Hebrew Poetry', in Essays on the Ancient Semitic World, (ed. Wevers, J.W. & Bedford, D.E.), (Toronto Semitic Texts and Studies), Toronto 1970, p12-28.
- Daniel, C. 'Les "Hérodiens" du Nouveau Testament sont-ils des Esséniens?', Revue de Qumrân, 6 (1967-69), p31-53.
- Daniel, C. 'Nouveaux Arguments en faveur de l'identification des Hérodiens et des Esséniens', Revue de Qumrân, 7 (1969-71), p397-402.
- Davies, P.R. 'Hasidim in the Maccabean Period', Journal of Jewish Studies, 28 (1977), p127-140.

- Davies, P.R. 'The Ideology of the Temple in the Damascus Document', Journal of Jewish Studies, 33 (1982), p287-301.
- Davies, P.R. 'Calendrical Change and Qumran Origins: An Assessment of VanderKam's Theory', Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 45 (1983), p80-89.
- Delcor, M. 'Contribution a l'étude de la législation des sectaires de Damas et de Qumrân', Revue Biblique, 61 (1954), p533-553 and 62 (1955), p60-75.
- Dion, P.E. 'The Hebrew Particle 't in the paraenetic part of the "Damascus Document"', Revue de Qumrân, 9 (1977-78), p197-212.
- Draper, J.A. 'The Origins of the Qumran Community', (unpublished - provided by B.Capper, a friend of the author.)
- Elgvin, T. 'The Qumran Covenant Festival and the Temple Scroll', Journal of Jewish Studies, 36 (1985), p103-106.
- Fitzmyer, J.A. 'The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament' New Testament Studies, 7 (1960-61), p297-333.
- Fitzmyer, J.A. 'Prolegomenon', in the 1970 edition of S.Schechter's, Documents of Jewish Sectaries, p9-24.
- Fitzmyer, J.A. 'The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament after 30 years', Theology Digest, 29 (1981), p351-367.
- Flusser, D. 'Two Notes on the Midrash of 2 Sam.vii', Israel Exploration Journal, 9 (1959), p99-109.
- Freedman, D.N. 'Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy: An Essay on Biblical Poetry', Journal of Biblical Literature, 96 (1977), p5-26.
- Fujita, S. 'The Metaphor of Plant in Jewish Literature of the Intertestamental Period', Journal for the Study of Judaism, 7 (1976), p30-45.
- Gardner, A.E. 'The Purpose and Date of 1 Esdras', Journal of Jewish Studies, 37 (1986), p18-27.
- Gibson, J.C.L. 'Stress and Vocalic change in Hebrew: a diachronic study', Journal of Linguistics, 2 (1966), p35-56.
- Gibson, J.C.L. 'The Massoretes as Linguists', Oudtestamentische Studien, 19 (1974), p86-96.
- Glück, J.J. 'The verb prš in the Bible and in the Qumran Literature', Revue de Qumrân, 5 (1964-66), p123-127.
- Greenfield, J.C. & Stone, M.E. 'Remarks on the Aramaic Testament of Levi from

- the Geniza', Revue Biblique, 86 (1979), p214-230.
- Grintz, Y.M. 'The Yahad Sectarians, Essenes, Beth(e)sin' Sinai, 32 (1954), p11-43; (in Hebrew).
- Halle, M. & McCarthy, J.J. 'The Metrical Structure of Psalm 137', Journal of Biblical Literature, 100 (1981), p161-167.
- Hayward, R. 'The Jewish Temple at Leontopolis: A Reconsideration', Journal of Jewish Studies, 33 (1982), p429-443.
- Hengel, M., Charlesworth, J.H., & Mendels, D. 'The Polemical Character of 'On Kingship' in the Temple Scroll: An Attempt at Dating 11QTemple', Journal of Jewish Studies, 37 (1986), p28-38.
- Huntjens, J.A. 'Contrasting Notions of Covenant and Law in Texts from Qumran', Revue de Qumrân, 8 (1972-75), p361-380.
- Iwry, S. 'Was there a Migration to Damascus? The problem of šby yśr '1', Eretz Israel, 9 (1969), p80-88.
- Jaubert, A. "'Le pays de Damas'", Revue Biblique, 65 (1958), p214-248.
- Jeremias, J. 'Μωϋσῆς', in The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, (ed.G.Kittel), Volume 4, p848-873, (Michigan 1967 - translated from the German, Stuttgart 1942).
- Kimbrough, S.T. 'The Concept of Sabbath at Qumran', Revue de Qumrân, 5 (1964-66), p483-502.
- Knibb, M. 'The Exile in the Literature of the Intertestamental Period', The Heythrop Journal, 17 (1976), p253-272.
- Knibb, M. 'The Dead Sea Scrolls: Reflections on some Recent Publications', The Expository Times, 90 (1978-79), p294-300.
- Knibb, M. 'Exile in the Damascus Document', Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, 25 (1983), p99-117.
- Kosmala, H. "'At the End of Days'", Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute (in Jerusalem), 2 (1963), p27-37.
- Kosmala, H. 'Form and Structure in Ancient Hebrew Poetry (A New Approach)', Vetus Testamentum, 14 (1964), p423-445
- Kosmala, H. 'The Three Nets of Belial. A study in the terminology of Qumran and the New Testament', Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute (in Jerusalem), 4 (1965), p91-113.
- Kosmala, H. 'Form and Structure in Ancient Hebrew Poetry (Continued)', Vetus Testamentum, 16 (1966), p152-180.

- Kruse, C.G. 'Community Functionaries in the Rule of the Community and the Damascus Document: a test of chronological relationships', Revue de Qumrân, 10 (1981), p543-551.
- Kuhn, K.G. 'Nachträge zur "Konkordanz zu dem Qumrantexten"', Revue de Qumrân, 4 (1963-64), p163-234.
- Laperrousaz, E.-M. 'Les "Ordonnances Premières" et les "Ordonnances Dernières" dans les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte', in Hommages à Andre Dupont-Sommer, 1971, p405-419.
- Laurin, R.B. 'The Problem of the Two Messiahs in the Qumran Scrolls', Revue de Qumrân, 4 (1963-64), p39-52.
- Lehmann, M.R. 'Talmudic Material relating to the Dead Sea Scrolls', Revue de Qumrân, 1 (1959), p391-404.
- Lehmann, M.R. 'Ben Sira and the Qumran Literature', Revue de Qumrân, 3 (1961-62), p103-116.
- Levi, I. 'Un Écrit Sadducéen Antérieur à la Destruction du Temple', Revue des Études Juives, 61 (1911), p161-205 and 62 (1912), p1-19.
- Levi, I. 'Document Relatif à la "Communauté des fils de Sadoc"', Revue des Études Juives, 65 (1913), p24-31.
- Liver, J. 'The Doctrine of the Two Messiahs in Sectarian Literature in the time of the Second Commonwealth', Harvard Theological Review, 52 (1959), p149-185.
- Liver, J. 'The "Sons of Zadok the Priests" in the Dead Sea Sect', Revue de Qumrân, 6 (1967-69), p3-30.
- Longman, T. 'A Critique of two recent metrical systems', Biblica, 63 (1982), p230-254.
- McCready, W.O. 'The Sectarian Status of Qumran: The Temple Scroll', Revue de Qumrân, 11 (1982), p183-191.
- McCready, W.O. 'The Second Torah at Qumran?', Studies in Religion, 14 (1985), p5-15.
- Milgrom, J. 'The Temple Scroll', Biblical Archaeologist, 41 (1978), p105-120.
- Milgrom, J. 'Further Studies in the Temple Scroll', Jewish Quarterly Review, 71 (1980), p89-106.
- Milgrom, J. 'Challenge to Sun-Worship Interpretation of Temple Scroll's Gilded Staircase' Biblical Archaeology Review, 11 (1985), p70-73.

- Milik, J.T. 'Le Testament de Lévi en Araméen: Fragment de la grotte 4 de Qumrân', Revue Biblique, 62 (1955), p398-406.
- Milik, J.T. 'Fragment d'une Source du Psautier (4Q Ps 89) et fragments des Jubilés, du Document de Damas, d'un Phylactère dans la grotte 4 de Qumran', Revue Biblique, 73 (1966), p94-106, (esp. p105).
- Milik, J.T. 'Une Amulette Judéo-Araméene', Biblica, 48 (1967), p450-451.
- Milik, J.T. 'Milkî-ṣedeq et Milkî-reša' dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens, Journal of Jewish Studies, 23 (1972), p95-144, (esp.p135-6).<sup>1</sup>
- Milikoswky, Ch. 'Again: Damascus in the Damascus Document and in Rabbinic Literature', Revue de Qumrân, 11 (1982), p97-106.
- Moore, G.F. 'The Covenanters of Damascus; A Hitherto Unknown Jewish Sect', Harvard Theological Review, 4 (1911), p330-377.
- Morgenstern, J. 'The Calendar of the Book of Jubilees, its Origin and its Character', Vetus Testamentum, 5 (1955), p34-76.
- Morgenstern, J. 'The Ḥ<sup>A</sup>sîdîm - Who were they?', Hebrew Union College Annual, 38 (1967), p59-73.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. 'La Genèse Littéraire de la Règle de la Communauté', Revue Biblique, 76 (1969), p528-549.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. 'An Essene Missionary Document? CD II,14-VI,1', Revue Biblique, 77 (1970), p201-229.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. 'A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document VI,2-VIII,3', Revue Biblique, 78 (1971), p210-232.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. 'The translation of Damascus Document VI,11-14', Revue de Qumrân, 7 (1969-71), p553-556.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. 'The Original Text Of CD 7:9-8:2 = 19:5-14', Harvard Theological Review, 64 (1971), p379-386.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. 'The Critique of the Princes of Judah (CD VIII:3-19)', Revue Biblique, 79 (1972), p200-216.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. 'A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document XIX,33-XX,34', Revue Biblique, 79 (1972), p544-564.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. 'The Essenes and their History', Revue Biblique, 81 (1974), p215-244.

---

<sup>1</sup>In this text Milik refers to 4Q266 and 4Q270, whereas in RB, 73, p105-6 he calls 4Q266, 4Q226.



- Murphy-O'Connor, J. 'Demetrius I and the Teacher of Righteousness (I Macc.X,25-45)', Revue Biblique, 83 (1976), p400-420.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. 'The Essenes in Palestine', Biblical Archaeologist, 40 (1977), p100-124.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. 'Judah the Essene and the Teacher of Righteousness', Revue de Qumrân, 10 (1979-81), p579-585.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. 'The Damascus Document Revisited', Revue Biblique, 92 (1985), p223-246.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. A Review of P.R.Davies' book 'The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the "Damascus Document"', Revue Biblique, 92 (1985), p274-277.
- Nickelsburg, G.W.E. 'Simon - A Priest with a reputation for faithfulness', Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 223 (1976), p67-68.
- Nickelsburg, G.W.E. 'The Epistle of Enoch and the Qumran Literature', Journal of Jewish Studies, 33 (1982), p333-348.
- Noack, B. 'Qumran and the Book of Jubilees', Svensk Exegetisk Arsbok, 22-23 (1957-58), p191-207.
- Noack, B. 'The Day of Pentecost in Jubilees, Qumran and Acts', Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute (in Jerusalem), 1 (1962), p73-96.
- North, R. 'The Damascus of Qumran Geography', Palestine Exploration Quarterly, 87 (1955), p34-48.
- North, R. 'The Qumran "Sadducees"', Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 17 (1955), p44-68.
- Ploeg, J.van der 'L'usage du parfait et de l'imparfait comme moyen de datation dans le Commentaire d'Habacuc' in Les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte, 1957, p25-35.
- Priest, J.F. 'Mebaqqer, Paqid, and the Messiah', Journal of Biblical Literature, 81 (1962), p55-61.
- Rabin, Ch. 'Notes on the Habakkuk Scroll and the Damascus Document', Vetus Testamentum, 5 (1955), p148-162.
- Rabin, Ch. 'The Historical Background of Qumran Hebrew', in Scripta Hierosolymitana, 4 (1958), p144-161.
- Rabinowitz, I. 'The Second and Third Columns of the Habakkuk Interpretation-Scroll', Journal of Biblical Literature, 69 (1950), p31-49.

- Rabinowitz, I. 'Sequence and Dates of the Extra-Biblical Dead Sea Scroll Texts and "Damascus" Fragments', Vetus Testamentum, 3 (1953), p175-185.
- Rabinowitz, I. 'A Reconsideration of "Damascus" and "390 Years" in the "Damascus" ("Zadokite") Fragments', Journal of Biblical Literature, 73 (1954), p11-35.
- Rabinowitz, I. "Pēsher / Pittārōn". Its biblical meaning and its significance in the Qumran Literature', Revue de Qumrân, 8 (1972-75), p219-232.
- Revell, E.J. 'Studies in the Palestinian Vocalization of Hebrew', in Essays on the Ancient Semitic World, (ed. Wevers, J.W. & Bedford, D.E.) (Toronto Semitic Texts and Studies), Toronto 1970, p51-100.
- Revell, E.J. 'Clause Structure in the Prose Documents of Qumran Cave 1', Revue de Qumrân, 5, (1964-66), p3-22.
- Ringgren, H. 'The Branch and the Plantation in the Hodayot', Biblical Research, 6 (1961), p3-9.
- Robinson, Th.H. 'Some principles in Hebrew Metrics', Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 54 (1936), p28-43.
- Rowley, H.H. 'The 390 years of the Zadokite Work', in Mélanges Bibliques rédigés en l'Honneur de André Robert, Tournai 1957, p341-347.
- Rowley, H.H. 'The History of the Qumran Sect', Bulletin of John Rylands Library, 49 (1966/67), p203-231.
- Rubinstein, A. 'Urban Halakhah and Camp Rules in the "Cairo Fragments of a Damascene Covenant"', Sefarad, 12 (1952), p283-296.
- Rubinstein, A. 'Notes on some Syntactical Irregularities in Text B of the Zadokite Documents', Vetus Testamentum, 7 (1957), p356-361.
- Sanders, J.A. 'The Dead Sea Scrolls - A Quarter Century of Study', Biblical Archaeologist, 36 (1973), p109-148.
- Schechter, S. 'Reply to Dr. Buchler's Review of Schechter's "Jewish Sectaries"', Jewish Quarterly Review, 4 (1913-14), p449-474.
- Schiffman, L.H. 'Legislation concerning relations with non-Jews in the Zadokite Fragments and in Tannaitic Literature', Revue de Qumrân, 11 (1982), p379-389.
- Schwartz, D.R. 'The Three Temples of 4QFlorilegium', Revue de Qumrân, 10 (1979-81), p83-91.

- Schwartz, D.R. "To join oneself to the House of Judah" (Damascus Document IV,11)', Revue de Qumrân, 10 (1979-81), p435-446.
- Seebass, H. 'Moses', in The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, (ed.C.Brown), volume 2, p635-643, (Michigan 1976 - translated from the German, Wuppertal 1971).
- Segal, J.B. 'Intercalation and the Hebrew Calendar', Vetus Testamentum, 7 (1957), p250-307.
- Segal, M.H. 'Notes on "Fragments of a Zadokite Work"', Jewish Quarterly Review, 2 (1911-12), p133-141.
- Segal, M.H. 'Additional Notes on "Fragments of a Zadokite Work"', Jewish Quarterly Review, 3 (1912-13), p301-311.
- Segal, M.H. 'The Habakkuk "Commentary" and the Damascus Fragments (A Historical Study)', Journal of Biblical Literature, 70 (1951), p131-147.
- Siegel, J.P. 'Two further Medieval references to the Teacher of Righteousness', Revue de Qumrân, 9 (1977-78), p437-440.
- Smith, M. 'The Description of the Essenes in Josephus and the Philosophumena', Hebrew Union College Annual, 29 (1958), p273-313.
- Smith, M. 'The case of the Guilded Staircase: Did the Dead Sea Sect worship the sun?', Biblical Archaeology Review, 10 (1984), p50-55.
- Soloff, R.A. 'Towards Uncovering Original Texts in the Zadokite Documents', New Testament Studies, 5 (1958-59), p62-67.
- Starcky, J. 'Les Quatre Étapes du Messianisme à Qumran', Revue Biblique, 70 (1963), p481-505.
- Steckoll, S.H. 'The Qumran Sect in relation to the Temple of Leontopolis', Revue de Qumrân, 6 (1967-69), p55-69.
- Strickert, F.M. 'Damascus Document VII,10-20 and Qumran Messianic Expectation', Revue de Qumrân, 12 (1985-87), p327-349.
- Sutcliffe, E.F. 'The first fifteen members of the Qumran Community: A note on 1QS 8:1FF', Journal of Semitic Studies, 4 (1959), p134-138.
- Sutcliffe, E.F. 'The translation of CDC 5:5-6', Vetus Testamentum, 11 (1961), p91-94.
- Talmon, S. 'The Calendar reckoning of the Sect from the Judaeian Desert', in Scripta Hierosolymitana, 4 (1958), p162-199.

- Teicher, J.L. 'On a Puzzling Passage in the Damascus Fragments', Journal of Jewish Studies, 6 (1955), p53-55; Ch.Rabin's reply, p111.
- Teicher, J.L. 'Priests and Sacrifices in the Dead Sea Scrolls', Journal of Jewish Studies, 5 (1954), p93-99
- Teicher, J.L. 'Puzzling Passages in the Damascus Fragments', Journal of Jewish Studies, 5 (1954), p139-147.
- Thiering, B. 'The Poetic Forms of the Hodayot', Journal of Semitic Studies, 8 (1963), p189-209.
- Thiering, B. 'Mebaqqer and 'Episcopus' in the light of the Temple Scroll', Journal of Biblical Literature, 100 (1981), p59-74.
- Thorion-Vardi, T. 'The Use of the Tenses in the Zadokite Documents', Revue de Qumrân, 12 (1985-87), p65-88.
- VanderKam, J.C. 'The Poetry of 1QApGen,XX,2-8a', Revue de Qumrân, 10 (1979-81), p57-66.
- VanderKam, J.C. 'The Origin, Character, and Early History of the 364-Day Calendar: A Reassessment of Jaubert's Hypotheses', Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 41 (1979), p390-411.
- VanderKam, J.C. '2 Maccabees 6,7a and Calendrical Change in Jerusalem', Journal for the Study of Judaism, 12 (1981), p52-74.
- VanderKam, J.C. 'The 364-day Calendar in the Enochic Literature', Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers, 22 (1983), p157-165.
- VanderKam, J.C. 'Zadok and the Spr Htwrh Hhtwm in Dam.Doc.V,2-5', Revue de Qumrân, 11 (1982), p561-570.
- Vaux, R.de 'Fouilles au Khirbet Qumrân - Rapport préliminaire sur la deuxième campagne', Revue Biblique, 61 (1954), p206-236.
- Vermes, G. 'The Essenes and History', Journal of Jewish Studies, 32 (1981), p18-31.
- Wacholder, B.Z. 'The Date of the Eschaton in the Book of Jubilees: A Commentary on Jub.49:22 - 50:5, CD 1:1-10 and 16:2-3', Hebrew Union College Annual, 56 (1985), p87-101.
- Wacholder, B.Z. 'The "Sealed" Torah Versus The "Revealed" Torah: An Exegesis of Damascus Covenant V,1-6 and Jeremiah 32,10-14', Revue de Qumrân, 12 (1985-87), p351-368.

- Walker, N. 'Concerning the 390 years and the 20 years of the Damascus Document', Journal of Biblical Literature, 76 (1957), p57-58.
- Walker, N. 'An awkward reading in the Damascus Document', Journal of Biblical Literature, 79 (1960), p169-170.
- Watson, W.G.E. 'Chiastic patterns in Biblical Hebrew Poetry', in J.W.Welch (ed.), Chiasmus in Antiquity, Hildesheim 1981, p118-168.
- Watson, W.G.E. 'The Pivot Pattern in Hebrew, Ugaritic, and Akkadian Poetry', Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 88 (1976), p239-252.
- Watson, W.G.E. 'Gender-Matched Synonymous Parallelism in the OT', Journal of Biblical Literature, 99 (1980), p321-341.
- Weinert, F.D. '4Q159 : Legislation for an Essene Community outside of Qumran?', Journal for the Study of Judaism, 5 (1974), p179-207.
- Weinert, F.D. 'A Note on 4Q159 and on a new theory of Essene Origins', Revue de Qumrân, 9 (1977-78), p223-230.
- Weingreen, J. 'The Title Moreh Sedek', Journal of Semitic Studies, 6 (1961), p162-174.
- Weis, P.R. 'The Date of the Habakkuk Scroll', Jewish Quarterly Review, 41 (1950-51), p125-154, (esp. p137-142).
- Wernberg-Møller, P. 'A Reconsideration of the Two Spirits in the Rule of the Community (1Q Serek III,13 - IV,26)', Revue de Qumrân, 3, (1961-62), p413-441.
- Wernberg-Møller, P. 'šdq, šdyq, and šdwq in the Zadokite Fragments(CDC), the Manual of Discipline(DSD) and the Habakkuk Commentary(DSH)', Vetus Testamentum, 3 (1953), p310-315.
- Wernberg-Møller, P. 'Some Passages in the "Zadokite" Fragments and their parallels in the Manual of Discipline', Journal of Semitic Studies, 1 (1956), p110-128.
- Wernberg-Møller, P. 'The Noun of the Qṭwl Class in the Massoretic Text', Revue de Qumrân, 2 (1959-60), p448-450.
- Westhuizen, J.P.van der 'Hendiadys in Biblical Hymns of Praise', Semitics, 6 (1978), p50-57.
- White, S.A. 'A Comparison of the "A" and "B" Manuscripts of the Damascus Document', Revue de Qumrân, 12 (1985-87), p537-553.
- Wieder, N. 'The term qṣ in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in Hebrew Liturgical

Poetry', Journal of Jewish Studies, 5 (1954), p22-31.

Wiesenberg, E. 'Chronological Data in the Zadokite Fragments', Vetus Testamentum, 5 (1955), p284-308.

Winter, P. 'Two Non-Allegorical Expressions in the Dead Sea Scrolls', Palestine Exploration Quarterly, 91 (1959), p38-46.

Winter, P. 'Sadoqite Fragments IV 20,21 and the Exegesis of Genesis 1<sup>27</sup> in late Judaism', Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 68 (1956), p71-84 and p264.

Winter, P. 'The Holy Messiah', Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, 50 (1959), p275.

Woude, A.S.van der 'Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests? Reflections on the Identification of the Wicked Priest in the Habakkuk Commentary', Journal of Jewish Studies, 33 (1982), p349-359.

Yadin, Y. 'Three Notes on the Dead Sea Scrolls', Israel Exploration Journal, 6 (1956), p158-162.

Yadin, Y. 'A Midrash on 2 Sam vii and Ps. i-ii (4QFlorilegium)', Israel Exploration Journal, 9 (1959), p95-98.

Yadin, Y. 'Peshar Nahum (4QpNahum) Reconsidered', Israel Exploration Journal, 21 (1971), p1-12.

Zeitlin, S. 'The beginning of the day in the Calendar of Jubilees', Journal of Biblical Literature, 78 (1959), p153-156; p157 J.Baumgarten's reply.