



## Durham E-Theses

---

*History and prophecy in the Qumran Pesharim: an examination of the key figures and groups in the Dead Sea Scrolls by way of their prophetic designations.*

Wood, Marcus Edward Michael

### How to cite:

---

Wood, Marcus Edward Michael (2001) *History and prophecy in the Qumran Pesharim: an examination of the key figures and groups in the Dead Sea Scrolls by way of their prophetic designations.*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/3874/>

### Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

---

Academic Support Office, Durham University, University Office, Old Elvet, Durham DH1 3HP  
e-mail: [e-theses.admin@dur.ac.uk](mailto:e-theses.admin@dur.ac.uk) Tel: +44 0191 334 6107  
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk>

## **Abstract**

### **History and Prophecy in the Qumran Pesharim**

An examination of the key figures and groups in the Dead Sea Scrolls by way of their prophetic designations.

**Marcus Edward Michael Wood, B.A. (Hons) M.A. Dunelm**

Submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph. D.) to the University of Durham, United Kingdom

September 2001

The thesis examines the Qumran pesharim and seeks to test the claim that these texts are solely 'historically' based. Instead, it finds that the interpretations are driven by prophetic concerns, founded on and guided by the biblical concept of 'peshet' as dream-interpretation.

The study concentrates on the various sobriquets in the pesharim, and is loosely divided into two main parts. Part one examines those designations of groups, including the Kittim, Ephraim and Manasseh, and the Seekers of Smooth Things. Part two, meanwhile, focuses on the interrelationship between the Teacher of Righteousness, the Wicked Priest, and the Man of Falsehood. One of the dominating themes of the thesis is the stress laid on the relationship between the Teacher and the Man of Falsehood, while the thesis also proposes that 'Ephraim' and 'Seekers of Smooth Things' are an offshoot of the Man of Falsehood's original followers. This allows the opposition to this group in 4QpNahum to be properly understood, and suggests a link between the Qumran group and the proto-Pharisaic movement.

In concluding, the study condemns the suggestion that the 'masking' by sobriquets intentionally conceals these subjects' identity. Rather, such masking links the intended target with prophetic expectations. In short, the thesis finds that although the two are often distinguished in modern scholarship, the correct interpretation of any aspect of the 'historical' pesharim inevitably relies on the understanding of the prophetic term 'peshet' – and vice versa.

The thesis does not tackle the issue of the dating of these texts. Rather, it assumes the consensus view that the pesharim were composed during the first century BCE. Occasionally, it will be evident that a text requires a composition before or after a particular date or event, or even that it must postdate another Qumran text, but in general the question has not been an overriding concern.

# **History and Prophecy in the Qumran Pesharim**

An examination of the key figures and groups in the  
Dead Sea Scrolls by way of their prophetic  
designations.

**Marcus Edward Michael Wood, B.A. (Hons) M.A. Dunelm**

Department of Theology

University of Durham

Submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph. D.)

September 2001

Supervisor: Dr C.T.R. Hayward

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published in any form, including Electronic and the Internet, without the author's prior written consent. All information derived from this thesis must be acknowledged appropriately.



26 MAR 2002

ויזכר אל ברית ראשנים vacat ויקם מאהרן נבונים ומישראל  
 חכמים וישמיעם ויחפורו את הבאר באר הפרוה שרים כרוה  
 נדיבי העם במחוקק הבאר היא התורה וחופריה vacat הם  
 שבי ישראל היוצאים מארץ יהודה ויגורו בארץ דמשק 5  
 אשר קרא אל את כולם שרים כי דרשוהו ולא הושבה  
 פארתם בפי אחד vacat והמחוקק הוא דורש התורה אשר  
 אמר ישעיה מוציא כלי למעשיהו vacat ונדיבי העם הם  
 הבאים לכרות את הבאר במחוקקות אשר הקק המחוקק  
 להתהלך במה בכל קץ הרשיע וזולתם לא ישיגו עד עמד 10  
 יורה הצדק באחרית הימים

But God remembered the Covenant with the forefathers, and he raised from  
 Aaron men of discernment and from Israel men of wisdom, and He caused  
 them to hear. And they dug the Well: *the well which the princes dug, which the  
 nobles of the people delved with the stave* (Num. xxi, 18).

5 The *Well* is the Law, and those who dug it were the converts of Israel who went  
 out of the land of Judah to sojourn in the land of Damascus. God called them  
 all *princes* because they sought Him. And their renown was disputed by no  
 man. The *Stave* is the Interpreter of the Law of whom Isaiah said, *He makes a  
 tool for His work* (Isa. liv, 16); and the *nobles of the people* are those who  
 10 come to dig the *Well* with the staves with which the *Stave* ordained that they  
 should walk in all the age of wickedness – and without them they shall find  
 nothing – until he comes who shall teach righteousness at the end of days.

(CD VI:2-11; Trans. Vermes)

## ***Table of Contents***

The Well Midrash (CD VI:2-11)	Frontispiece
Table of Contents	i
Table of Figures	iv
Declaration and Statement of Copyright	v
Acknowledgements	vi
Abbreviations	vii
Reconstructions, Translations and Citations of Hebrew Prophecy	viii
Other Works	ix
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 The function of peshet	3
1.2 The 'peshet' word root in Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Usage	9
1.2.1 Genesis 40-41	11
1.2.2 Daniel	13
1.2.3 The Book of Giants	16
Conclusions	18
1.3 An appropriate question of genre?	18
1.4 Interpretative style in the Pesharim	22
1.5 The pesharim as historico-prophetic documents	23
<b>2.0 THE KITTIM</b>	<b>26</b>
2.1 Kittim: Biblical and post-biblical background	26
2.1.1 Bible and Versions	26
2.1.2 Pseudepigrapha	30
2.1.3 Josephus	32
2.1.4 The Dead Sea Scrolls	33
Conclusions	36
2.2 The 'Kittim' in the Qumran Pesharim	36
2.2.1 1QpHabakkuk	37
<u>Excursus: The Sacrifice to Standards</u>	55
Conclusions	68
2.2.2 1QpPsalms	69
Fragment 9	69
2.2.3 4QpIsaiah <sup>a</sup>	70
Fragments 8-10	70
2.2.4 4QpNahum	76
Fragments 1-2	76
Fragments 3-4	78
2.3 Conclusions	81
<b>3.0 EPHRAIM, MANASSEH AND THE SEEKERS OF SMOOTH THINGS</b>	<b>83</b>
3.1 The דורשי החלקות: Towards a preliminary identification	83
Conclusions	87
3.2 'Ephraim' and 'Manasseh' in Biblical and post-biblical tradition	88

3.2.1 Ephraim	88
3.2.2 Manasseh	90
Conclusions	91
3.3 Ephraim, Manasseh and the חלקות דורשי in the Pesharim	91
3.3.1 4QpNahum	91
Conclusions	108
3.3.2 4QpIsaiah <sup>c</sup>	110
Fragments 4, 5, 6+	110
Fragment 23	111
3.3.3 4QpHosea <sup>b</sup>	113
Fragment 2	113
Fragment 5-6	115
Fragments 10, 26	116
3.3.4 4QpPsalms <sup>a</sup>	116
Fragments 1-10	116
Fragment 13	119
3.3.5 4QTestimonia	120
3.3.6 4QCatena <sup>a</sup>	125
3.4 Conclusions	126
<b>4.0 THE TEACHER OF RIGHTEOUSNESS</b>	129
4.1 Meaning and translation of the title Moreh Şedeq	129
4.2 The Moreh Şedeq outside of the Pesharim	133
4.2.1 Biblical material	133
(a) Hosea 10:12	133
(b) Joel 2:23	134
Conclusions	134
<u>Excursus: The 'Teacher of Falsehood' (מורה שקר) of Isa. 9:15 and Hab. 2:18</u>	135
4.2.2 Qumran material	138
(a) Damascus Document	138
(b) 4QpUnid (4Q172)	141
<u>Excursus: The Moreh in 1QH?</u>	142
4.2.3 Rabbinic material	143
Conclusions	144
4.3 The Moreh Şedeq in the Pesharim	144
4.3.1 1QpHabakkuk	145
(a) The Teacher of Righteousness and the Man of Falsehood (איש הכזב)	145
<u>Excursus: The House of Absalom and John Hyrcanus</u>	152
(b) The Teacher of Righteousness and the Wicked Priest (בוהן הרשע)	156
<u>Excursus: The Teacher of Righteousness in 1QpHab I:13</u>	163
(c) The Teacher of Righteousness	164
Conclusions	169
4.3.2 1QpMicah	170
4.3.3 4QpIsaiah <sup>c</sup>	171
4.3.4 4QpIsaiah <sup>e</sup>	172
4.3.5 4QpPsalms <sup>a</sup>	173

Conclusions	179
4.3.6 4QpPsalms <sup>b</sup>	180
4.4 Conclusions	181
<b>5.0 THE MAN OF FALSEHOOD</b>	183
5.1 Meaning and translation	184
(a) The אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב	185
(b) The מְטִיף הַכֹּזֵב	186
(i) Micah 2:11	187
5.2 Background	189
5.2.1 Qumran material	189
(a) Damascus Document	189
5.3 The Man of Falsehood in the Pesharim	192
5.3.1 1QpHabakkuk	193
<u>Excursus: The אִישׁ הַלְצֹרֵךְ in 4QpIsa<sup>b</sup> II:6, 10</u>	195
Conclusions	207
5.3.2 1QpMicah	207
5.3.3 4QpPsalms <sup>a</sup>	210
Conclusions	215
5.4 Conclusions	216
<b>6.0 THE WICKED PRIEST</b>	219
6.1 Meaning and translation	220
6.2 The Wicked Priest in the Dead Sea Scrolls	222
6.3 The Wicked Priest in the Pesharim	222
6.3.1 1QpHabakkuk	222
(a) The Wicked Priest	223
(b) The Priest	232
Conclusion	241
(c) The Last Priests of Jerusalem	241
<u>Excursus: The Wicked Priests of the Groningen Hypothesis</u>	243
Conclusion: The Wicked Priest in the Habakkuk Pesharim	248
6.3.2 4QpIsaiah <sup>c</sup>	249
6.3.3 4QpPsalms <sup>a</sup>	249
6.4 Conclusions	250
6.5 The Multiple Identification of the Wicked Priest in the Pesharim	251
6.5.1 Jonathan and Simon Maccabee	252
6.5.2 Alexander Jannaeus	254
Conclusions	257
<b>7.0 CONCLUSIONS: HISTORY AND PROPHECY IN THE PESHARIM</b>	260
7.1 The Pesharim as historical	261
7.2 The Pesharim as prophetic	264
7.3 Conclusions	268
<b>APPENDICES</b>	270
Appendix A: Melchizedek	270
Old Testament Background	270
Melchizedek in the Early Jewish and New Testament Literature	273
Jubilees	273



Josephus	273
Philo	274
II Enoch	277
The Epistle to the Hebrews	278
Conclusions	279
Melchizedek in the Dead Sea Scrolls	280
The Genesis Apocryphon	280
4Q'Amram <sup>b</sup>	280
11QMelchizedek	281
11QMelchizedek as Thematic Peshet	286
 Appendix B: Index of Major Peshet References	 288
 <b>SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	 289
Texts and Editions	289
Grammars, Lexica, Concordances and other tools	290
Studies	290
 <b><i>Table of Figures</i></b>	
Figure 1: 'Kittim' in the Bible and Aramaic Targumim	29
Figure 2: A comparison of Ant. XIII with b. Kiddushin 66a	154
Figure 3: 1QpMic fr. 10 (PAM 40.437 [enhanced])	209

***Declaration and Statement of Copyright***

I declare that the material contained within this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree in this or any other university, and that it does not exceed the wordcount permitted.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without their prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

## **Acknowledgements**

A study of this length and nature invariably requires acknowledgement of the many individuals and groups to whom I have been indebted over the last three years, and in many cases during my entire university career.

I should first acknowledge my debt to the British Academy: Humanities Research Board, without whose financial support this study would not have been possible. In the same vein I would also like to thank the board of the Theology department for their regular financial contributions from the Watkins Hebrew fund.

For the duration of my university career I have been a member of St. Aidan's College, where I have made several friends, with the majority of whom I remain in contact. I would especially wish to mention the former Vice-Principal, Dr Alan Yarwood, continually a source of encouragement and inspiration. Others I would particularly wish to mention are Mark Tookey, my comrade in arms (especially against the French element) for so many years, and Tom Spannring, who finally became a member of the esteemed SCR last year, sadly ending the tradition of waiting for the inevitable knock at the door. Vangelis, formerly of Van Mildert College, formerly of St. Aidan's College, and now at Collingwood College, has been present throughout my time as a postgraduate and doubtless will be in Durham for some time to come yet. Other notables are Mlle Floriane Place-Verghnes whose name I still can't pronounce (even if I can now spell it), the college secretary, Mrs Cynthia Pattison, but there are many many more.

I would also like to thank the Theology Department as a whole, and some lecturers in particular. I should start by mentioning Dr Walter Moberly. He first taught me Hebrew without which the present study would not have been possible, and as the co-ordinator of the Departmental Old Testament seminar has encouraged me to produce papers based on my work. Dr Loren Stuckenbruck has, since his arrival in Durham, proved an inspiration for my study of the scrolls as a whole, while Dr Stuart Weeks has inspired me to broaden my knowledge into Ancient Near Eastern literature and Egypt in particular.

Finally, of those in the Theology department, I should of course acknowledge the great enthusiasm and commitment of my supervisor Dr Robert Hayward. He, more than anyone, has enabled me to remain focused on the study and frequently has found more in my work than I have! It is mainly thanks to him that I have edged into examining the Biblical and early Jewish connotations of several of the terms under discussion, and bringing much profit to the thesis as a whole.

In closing I should also reference the continued support of my family. To my sister, note the use of the 'Oxford comma'. And to my parents, whom it must be said I rarely see, stuck as I have been in the cold north-east, now I can go out and get a job!

Marcus Wood  
St. Aidan's College  
14 March 2001

## Abbreviations

Standard abbreviations for Biblical books and other Jewish material is not here covered. The citation of Qumran texts follows the standard formula 1Q = Cave 1, 2Q = Cave 2 etc. Wherever possible I retain the older form of identification over the numerical alternative to speed up identification of the texts in question. Thus I refer to the Nahum peshet as 4QpNah rather than 4Q169. In the Introduction the ‘pesharim’ are identified under both systems. Where a text has a title pre-existing even this I point this out when first referring to the text and use the standard identification thereafter. Thus the Habakkuk peshet was originally entitled DSH (Dead Sea Habakkuk) though I use the more normative 1QpHab when referring to this text. References to particular passages are given by text followed by fragment number or group (where relevant), followed by the column number (in Roman numerals) and finally by individual line numbers. Thus 4QpNah 3-4 I:2-3 refers to lines 2-3 of column one of the fragment group 3-4 of peshet Nahum.

In the following list of abbreviations several books are referred to, most notably those of Maurya Horgan and William Brownlee. For the full entry to these works please see the fuller Bibliography.

ABD	Anchor Bible Dictionary
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
<i>b.</i>	Babylonian Talmud
<i>BA</i>	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
<i>BAR</i>	<i>Biblical Archaeology Review</i>
<i>BASOR</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
<i>BDB</i>	F. Brown, S.R. Driver, and C.A. Briggs, <i>Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i>
BHS	Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia
<i>BO</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Orientalis</i>
Brownlee + p.	William Brownlee, <i>The Midrash Peshet</i>
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly—Monograph Series
<i>CHB</i>	<i>Cambridge History of the Bible</i> , 3 vols.
col(s). + I etc.	column number(s)
<i>CDSSE</i>	Geza Vermes, <i>The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English</i>
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Judah
<i>DSD</i>	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls
<i>DSS:SE</i>	F. García-Martínez, <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition</i> , 2 vols.
<i>ETL</i>	<i>Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses</i>
<i>FO</i>	<i>Folia Orientalia</i>
fr.	fragment number
Horgan + p.	Maurya Horgan, <i>Pesharim</i>
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
<i>IEJ</i>	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
<i>JAOS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>

<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal for Near Eastern Studies</i>
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
<i>JSOTSup</i>	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplements
<i>JSP</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
<i>JSPSup</i>	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha, Supplements
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>KJV</i>	King James Version
l(l).	line number(s)
<i>LXX</i>	Septuagint
<i>m.</i>	Mishnah
<i>MS(S)</i>	Manuscript(s)
<i>MT</i>	Masoretic Text
<i>NC</i>	<i>La Nouvelle Clio</i>
<i>NICOT</i>	The New International Commentary on the Old Testament
<i>NRSV</i>	New Revised Standard Version
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>NT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
<i>NT</i>	New Testament
<i>NovTestSup</i>	Novum Testamentum, Supplements
<i>OT</i>	Old Testament
<i>OTS</i>	<i>Oudtestamentische Studien</i>
<i>PAM</i>	Palestine Archaeological (now Rockefeller) Museum
<i>PEQ</i>	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>
<i>Pl(s).</i>	Plate(s)
<i>PRE</i>	Pauly's Real Enzyklopädie
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumrân</i>
<i>RHR</i>	<i>Revue de l'histoire des religions</i>
<i>RSV</i>	Revised Standard Version
<i>SBL</i>	<i>Society of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>SBFLA</i>	<i>Studii Biblici Franciscani. Liber Annuus</i>
<i>TDOT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i>
<i>Vg</i>	Vulgate
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
Wood + p.	Marcus Wood, "Peshar Habakkuk and the Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel".
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

### **Reconstructions, Translations, and Citations of Hebrew Prophecy**

This study requires that Qumran texts are often cited within the course of the chapter structure. Generally I have followed standard reconstruction formulae. Thus, square bracketing [...] is used to indicate where text has not survived and may have been reconstructed. In the accompanying translations, I try as much as possible to keep the translations of the Hebrew on the relevant lines (indicated by numbers in subscript form). Where this is not possible and the translation strays on to a following line this

is indicated by curly brackets {...}. These same curly brackets are also used at points in both Hebrew and English to indicate scribal errors such as the repetition of a word. Context should enable distinction of this to be obvious.

The degree of reconstruction used is, however, impossible to judge merely from a printed text. Thus in cases where a word is only partially extant the reader should always consult the published photographs of the text in question, preferably in the Oxford *DJD* series, or in the PAM photographs on the newly published CD-ROM. At one stage in the thesis I reproduce an image of part of one of the scrolls (Figure 3, below). This originated from the Oxford CD-ROM but has been 'surgically enhanced' in an attempt to make the Hebrew text in question easier to read.

The structure and style of the pesharim means that it is necessary to view the interpretation alongside the Biblical passage on which it is based. Thus I cite first the Biblical passage, as it appears in the Qumran text, including any points of divergence from the Hebrew Masoretic text. Where textual reconstruction is necessary, however, I cite the unpointed MT with any standard Qumran vowel letters inserted. In general, I do not indicate minor points of difference between the Qumran text and the MT, including the insertion of the vowel letters, since discussion of these minutiae has been adequately presented in Maurya's Horgan textual study. Nevertheless, where the Qumran text *substantially* differs from the MT, e.g. where a different word is found, or where perhaps one letter's difference results in a change in translation, especially where this is picked up in the interpretation, I use red to highlight the change.

Where I cite from other Bible passages, I give the BHS Masoretic pointed text, and accompany it with the NRSV translation. Occasionally, this results in a loose translation, but the reader should in these cases always refer back to the original Hebrew.

A final note on translation: Generally I commend the reader to use Maurya Horgan's translation of the pesharim. Many of the translations I adopt are based on Horgan's readings. Nevertheless, where I disagree with a particular reading she espouses, this is generally noted in the section corresponding to the passage.

### **Other Works**

At various points in the work it is necessary to cite supporting passages from other ancient sources, most frequently Josephus. For consistency, I have chosen William Whiston's *The Works of Josephus: Complete and Unabridged*, New Updated Edition (Hendrickson: Peabody, MA, 1987). Where it is necessary to cite the Greek the text is taken from the Loeb volumes. Again, for convenience, I give both numbering systems, though I abbreviate the titles of the relevant works: *War*, *Ant(iquities)* etc.

## 1.0 Introduction

Among the now vast number of texts uncovered from the 11 caves situated around the Qumran archaeological site, one group of documents stands out and commands attention: the Qumran pesharim, or ‘commentaries’ on biblical books. These texts take their name from the Hebrew term פֶּשֶׁר ‘pesher’, plural פֶּשְׁרִים ‘pesharim’, which is used in these texts to separate the prophecy from its commentary. For now, we may translate פֶּשֶׁר and its ancillaries by ‘interpretation’ though below we will see how confused this issue is. In her seminal work on this subject,<sup>1</sup> Maurya Horgan notes how eighteen texts have so far been designated ‘pescharim’, although she herself restricts the list to only fifteen that can be identified with certainty as such. These texts come from only two of the caves found near the Qumran site. From cave one she identifies four: 1QpHab (formerly DSH), 1QpMic (=1Q14), 1QpZeph (=1Q15), and 1QpPs (=1Q16). The remainder all come, perhaps unsurprisingly, from cave four: 4QpIsa<sup>a-c</sup> (=4Q161-165), 4QpHos<sup>a-b</sup> (=4Q166 & 167), 4QpNah (=4Q169), 4QpZeph (=4Q170), and 4QpPs<sup>a-b</sup> (=4Q171 & 173).<sup>2</sup>

Nevertheless, as Horgan admits, these texts are not the only ones to use the defining term ‘pesher’ and in fact accord to only one subsection of the genre to which these texts have been assigned. The texts above have been commonly termed ‘continuous pescharim’ from the fact that structurally they take one biblical book, Habakkuk, Nahum, Psalms etc., and interpret sections of these verse by verse. A second text-type, the so-called ‘thematic pescharim’<sup>3</sup> also exists, which typically brings together citations from a wide variety of biblical books, again using פֶּשֶׁר to distinguish between the biblical quotation and its interpretation. These texts are on Horgan’s numbering, less common, and only two are specifically identified: 11QMelch (=11Q13), which as its name implies brings together a number of biblical themes in order to expound the central theme of the figure Melchizedek (see Appendix A,

---

<sup>1</sup> M.P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*, CBQMS, 8 (Catholic Biblical Association of America: Washington, D.C., 1979). Henceforth ‘Horgan’.

<sup>2</sup> Of the remaining three texts, Horgan dismisses two – 3QpIsa (=3Q4) & 4QpMic (=4Q168) – for having no conclusive indications that they belong to the literary genre, while the third, 4QpUnid (=4Q172) is too fragmentary to be of use. Cf. Horgan, 1.



below); and 4QFlor(ilegium) (=4Q174), which takes as its theme the restoration of Israel.<sup>4</sup> Unfortunately, Carmignac's two-fold distinction does not include all instances of the term פֶּשֶׁר in the scrolls, an important (though not the only) reason as to why I ultimately reject his delineation. Several other texts use 'pesher' to introduce 'one-off' interpretations, including the Testimonia (above, n4), 4QCatena<sup>a</sup> (=4Q177), 4QAgnes of Creation (=4Q180-81), 4QEnGiants<sup>a-b</sup> (=4Q203 & 4Q530), 4QcommGen A (=4Q252), the fragmentary 4QExposition on the Patriarchs (=4Q464), and even the Damascus Document (=CD) itself. Finally in the Commentaries on Biblical Law (=4Q159) 'pesher' introduces an interpretation of Levitical law.<sup>5</sup>

The oft-cited distinction between the continuous and thematic pesharim receives a much more severe critique by Moshe Bernstein.<sup>6</sup> In particular he criticises the primacy that has been attributed to 1QpHab solely because it was uncovered first and has perhaps unfairly influenced scholarship as a result. He questions whether the dividing line between the continuous and thematic pesharim would have fallen in the same place had one of the other texts been uncovered first and proposes a more *nuanced* classification that demonstrates that there are further divisions which must be acknowledged.<sup>7</sup> Especially, he concentrates on the citation formulas used in both the 'continuous' and 'thematic' pesharim and concludes that the extant pesharim "occupy points along a continuum."<sup>8</sup> Thus, the 'thematic' pesharim occupy one end of the spectrum employing a wide range of citation formulas. Next come texts like 4QpIsa<sup>c</sup> and 4QpIsa<sup>e</sup> which primarily cite texts from Isaiah, but other texts as well. These are followed by 4QpIsa<sup>b</sup> which he terms a "non-continuous pesher, although not a 'thematic' one." 1QpHab and 4QpIsa<sup>a</sup> follow sharing citation formulas for recitation of their base texts, while last come the remaining 'continuous' pesharim where the

<sup>3</sup> The distinction between 'continuous' and 'thematic' pesharim was first proposed by Jean Carmignac ("Le document de Qumran sur Melkisédeq," *RevQ* 7 [1969-71], 360-61).

<sup>4</sup> A third text often listed as a 'thematic pesher' is 4QTestimonia (=4Q175). Again, this text draws citations from a wide range of material, but interestingly only the final passage, from Joshua 6, is accorded its own interpretation, albeit one introduced by 'pesher'. Consequently, it is dangerous to include this text in the 'thematic' text-type. See below, pp. 120-125.

<sup>5</sup> In the *editio princeps* John Allegro suggests Lev. 16:1 as a potential source text. Cf. J.M. Allegro, *Qumrân Cave 4, I (4Q 158 — 4Q 186)*, DJD, 5 (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1968), 9.

<sup>6</sup> M.J. Bernstein, "Introductory Formulas for Citation and Re-Citation of Biblical Verses in the Qumran Pesharim: Observations on a Pesher Technique," *DSD* 1 (1994), 30-70.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 67-70.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 69.



lemmata are not introduced but merely follow on, and the author's stance is completely within the biblical document being commented upon.<sup>9</sup> In short, Bernstein argues that "there is either one sort of pesher or many, but not exactly two."<sup>10</sup>

The suggestion that 1QpHab has unfairly dominated discussion is perhaps overstated. As Lim points out, had 4QFlor and 4QCatena<sup>a</sup> been published before 1QpHab (as in Bernstein's hypothetical reconstruction) the degree of fragmentation of these texts would not necessarily have led to their or the thematic variant's primacy over the continuous pesher represented by 1QpHab.<sup>11</sup> Nevertheless, it is possible that some of those texts which Horgan assigns to the continuous type, especially 1QpZeph where only one interpretation survives, might not have been so identified. Meanwhile, Bernstein's proposal allows for the proper weighting of the length of the interpretation. Thus 4QpIsa<sup>b</sup> and 4QpIsa<sup>c</sup> typically introduce long citations with only the briefest of interpretations, while in 4QpIsa<sup>d</sup> conversely the interpretation far outweighs the scriptural citation. The loosening of the genre is therefore welcomed and my study is not bound by whether a text has been assigned to the 'continuous' or 'thematic' type.

### 1.1 *The function of pesher*

Above, I use the terms 'commentary' and 'interpretation' to describe the pesharim, or at least our more loosely based understanding of 'pesher'. In fact, the precise understanding, or function, of pesher is problematic, and assessing what a pesher actually consists of is often difficult. The English term 'commentary' conveys very much the wrong sense of what pesher consists of, and yet as a neutral word the term accurately defines the material contained within the texts.

In his own words, the Habakkuk pesherist reveals how inspiration was given by God to interpret the words of the prophets:

... they are the viol[ators of the coven]ant who will not believe <sup>7</sup> when they hear all that is c[oming on] the last generation from the mouth of <sup>8</sup> *the priest in*

---

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 69-70.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 34.

<sup>11</sup> T.H. Lim, *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1997), 129-30.

[whose heart] God gave [wisd]om to interpret (לְפִשׁוֹר) all [the] 9 words of his servants, the prophets. (1QpHab II:6-9)<sup>12</sup>

And later:

<sup>1</sup> Then God told Habakkuk to write down the things to come upon <sup>2</sup> the last generation, but the fullness of that time he did not make known to him. <sup>3</sup> <Blank> And as for what he said, “that he may run while reading it,” (Hab. 2:2c), <sup>4</sup> its interpretation concerns the Teacher of Righteousness to whom God has made known <sup>5</sup> all the mysteries of his servants the prophets. (1QpHab VII:1-5)<sup>13</sup>

Although the issue is discussed in more detail below (pp165f.), it is here assumed that the Teacher and the priest are one and the same. At the very least, it may be suggested that the type of revelation is identical. In essence, however, we have the structure of the pesharim laid out in a nutshell. They are revelations by God to his representative (the Priest, Teacher of Righteousness) explaining the mysteries contained within the words of the Hebrew prophets. Further, these revelations are intimately connected with ‘the last generation’, i.e. the material is prophetic. The understanding that the prophets did not know the full content of their vision is already implicit in Hab. 2:3 which speaks of a ‘vision for the appointed time’ in order to allay the prophet’s fears outlined in chapter 1. In his article on the structure of the pesharim-interpretation, Herbert Basser links this with Daniel 10:14 (cp. Dan. 8:16-17) where the archangel Michael also speaks of ‘a further vision for those days’. This is further compared with Dan. 12 where the text is explicit that even to Daniel the entire story was not made clear (vv6ff.). Nevertheless, the text also contains a promise: “None of the wicked shall understand, but those who are wise will understand” (Dan. 12:10b).<sup>14</sup> Through the claim to know the full content of the divine message, the Teacher may then be linked with the ‘wise men’ referred to in Daniel. According to verse 12 the wise will not arise until after a period of one thousand three hundred thirty-five days,<sup>15</sup> but regardless of the precise length of time the passage is clearly eschatological, much like the content of the pesharim. Hence in some of the Isaiah pesharim, one of the introductory phrases reads: לְאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים ‘the interpretation of the

<sup>12</sup> For text and notes, see below, p147.

<sup>13</sup> For text and notes, see below, p165.

<sup>14</sup> H. W. Basser, “Peshar Hadavar: The Truth of the Matter,” *RevQ* 49-52 (1988), 403.

<sup>15</sup> The precise numbering in Daniel is confused. 12:6 speaks instead of 1,290 days, while earlier, Dan. 7:25-28 refers to a period of three and a half years (1,150 days).

word/passage with regard to the end of days'.<sup>16</sup> Since the community believed themselves to be living in the run-up to these last days, i.e. among the last generation, the full meaning of the biblical prophecy must therefore be capable of being explained by recourse to events unfolding within their own lifetime and, more often than not, within the community's own history. In other words, through analysis of the pesharim it is possible for the modern scholar perhaps to uncover the community's own life and history.<sup>17</sup>

This attempt is hamstrung, however, by the fact that the pesherist(s)<sup>18</sup> rarely divulge(s) specific historical references. Although there are instances within the pesharim where historical figures are referred to by name – e.g. the Seleucid rulers Antiochus and Demetrius in 4QpNah<sup>19</sup> – such instances are few and far between. Rather, the author generally refers to characters both inside and without the community by means of epithets or 'ciphers', the identification of whom often splits scholars by opinion. A good example of the sort of epithet used and of the difficulty in identifying the character is the "Teacher of Righteousness," cited in the passage

---

<sup>16</sup> Cf. 4QpIsa<sup>b</sup> II:1; 4QpIsa<sup>c</sup> 6-7 II:14; 3 II:10-11; 4QpIsa<sup>e</sup> V:2. Compare 4QpIsa<sup>a</sup> 2-6 II:26: פֶּשֶׁר הַפְּתוּחַ לְאַחֲרֵי הַיָּמִים 'the interpretation of the matter with regard to the end of days'. Cf. Horgan, 239ff.

<sup>17</sup> It is, however, important to note that this does not mean that the prophecies did not also have meaning for those at the time of their composition. They did. However, the fullness of the prophetic message was rather for the community's own time, as the pesherist also points out.

<sup>18</sup> It is difficult to know how many Qumran authors were responsible for creating this mini sub-section of the Scrolls corpus, or whether indeed one author composed all of the pesharim. Nevertheless, the fact that at least some of the texts are not autograph documents (but rather contain instances of scribal mistakes in transmission of these texts) it is well-nigh impossible to enumerate the precise number of authors. The same problem affects any attempt to date these documents, though a conservative estimate would place them somewhere in the mid-first century BC. Cf. Horgan, 3.

<sup>19</sup> Discussed below, pp92ff. Compare references to 'Shelamzion' in 4Q322 and 'King Jonathan' in 4Q448, presumably referring to Alexandra Salome and Alexander Jannaeus or Jonathan Maccabee respectively. 4Q322 also states that 'Hyrcanus rebelled', doubtless referring to the High Priest John Hyrcanus II and Salome's son, while 4Q324 twice states that 'Aemilius killed', almost certainly alluding to Aemilius Scaurus, the governor of Syria during Pompey's siege of Jerusalem in 63 BC. Finally, references to historical figures from this period have been restored in the pseudo-Danielic fragments from cave four (4Q243-245), specifically 'Balakros' (=Alexander Balas?) in 4Q243 and 'Honia' (=Onias), 'Simon', and 'Jonathan' in 4Q245. Cf. J. Collins and P. Flint, "Pseudo-Daniel," in J. VanderKam (ed.), *Qumran Cave 4 XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*, DJD 22 (Clarendon: Oxford, 1996), 95-164; H. Eshel and E. Eshel, "4Q448, Psalm 154 (Syriac), Sirach 48:20, and 4QpIsa<sup>a</sup>," *JBL* 119

above. Although we shall explore this figure more closely in chapter 4 below, we may state now that this figure is considered to represent a leader within the community, while his life both within and without the group is a matter of historical conjecture.

Nevertheless, the perception that these ciphers can be ‘decoded’ and the community’s own life and history thereby uncovered lies behind several reconstructions of the community’s history. Thus, for example, Frank Cross and Joseph Milik have both used the material contained within (in particular) 1QpHab combined with the historical material drawn from CD in their historical reconstructions.<sup>20</sup> Likewise, Hartmut Stegemann’s important contribution to the discourse – that the Teacher of Righteousness was originally a Zadokite priest during the *intersacerdotium* in Jerusalem in c. 159-152 also relies predominantly on the evidence drawn from the pesharim.<sup>21</sup> Again, Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, revising Stegemann’s thesis, has emphasised the place of the pesharim in his identification of the group among the return of Babylonian Jews during the early Maccabean successes.<sup>22</sup>

More recently, however, the use of the pesharim both to identify and support various theses surrounding the origin and history of the ‘Essene’ movement as based at Qumran has itself come under attack. Horgan’s work steers rather obviously away from the historical question, while she warns that “the history recounted in the pesharim, like the history recounted in the biblical books, is an interpreted history.”<sup>23</sup> Meanwhile, William Brownlee, in his significant commentary on 1QpHab, has

(2000), 645-659; and G. Vermes, “Qumran Forum Miscellanea II: The so-called King Jonathan Fragment (4Q448),” *JJS* 44 (1993), 294-300.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. F.M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, third edition (Sheffield Academic Press: Sheffield, 1995); J.T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea*. Trans. J. Strugnell. Studies in Biblical Theology (SCM: London, 1959).

<sup>21</sup> H. Stegemann, *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde* (Published privately: Bonn, 1971). Cf. reviews by J. Carmignac (*RevQ* 8 [1973], 277-81) and H. Bardtke (*Theologische Rundschau* 41 [1976], 100-119). Stegemann repeats his view more briefly in *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptists, and Jesus* (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1998), 147-48.

<sup>22</sup> J. Murphy-O’Connor, “An Essene Missionary Document? CD II,14-VI,1,” *RB* 77 (1970), 201-29; “A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document VI,2-VIII,3,” *RB* 78 (1971), 210-32; “The Original Text of CD 7:9-8:2 = 19:5-14,” *HTR* 64 (1971), 379-86; “The Translation of Damascus Document VI,11-14,” *RevQ* 7 (1971), 553-556; “The Critique of the Princes of Judah (CD VIII,3-19),” *RB* 79 (1972), 200-16; “A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document XIX,33-XX,34,” *RB* 79 (1972), 544-64; “The Essenes and Their History,” *RB* 81 (1974), 215-44.

reserved discussion of historical allusions contained within the texts to an entirely separate article.<sup>24</sup> Again, Philip Davies has in particular criticised Cross and Milik for lacking a critical methodology in their exegesis of the texts:

...basically they added archaeology and palaeography to the classical sources, then looked for an historical scenario consistent with statements in the *pescharim* and in CD 1. It was essentially a harmonising and synthesising method; the explicit *caveats* which Cross himself offered about the *pescharim* he never in fact heeded.<sup>25</sup>

Jeremias's attempts to distinguish between the Wicked Priest and the Man of Falsehood are similarly discredited, while Stegemann is "unduly influenced by Jeremias and by the prevailing consensus."<sup>26</sup> Davies does praise Stegemann for "striking out on his own" noting that where he does as much, in his treatment of CD, he has developed a good critical method. His historical conclusions, Davies continues, are, however, weakened by his study of the *pescharim*, causing him to "misconstrue" various passages in the Damascus Document. Meanwhile, although overall impressed by Murphy-O'Connor, Davies again maintains that too much emphasis has been placed on the *pescharim*'s importance. This is not to say that Davies denies these texts' historical importance; rather he notes that "the use made of the *pescharim* for historical purposes is nothing less than a shambles." Instead, he suggests that we should start looking critically at the *pescharim*:

...and until we have reason to believe anything they say we disregard all their allusions which are not corroborated elsewhere – and that is very few.<sup>27</sup>

Phillip Callaway, has similarly questioned the *pescharim*'s historical reliability, though his approach is rather more pragmatic.<sup>28</sup> In his study of the community's history, Callaway concentrates on the difficulty of identifying any of the characters referred to

<sup>23</sup> Horgan, 6.

<sup>24</sup> W.H. Brownlee, *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk*, SBL:MS 24 (Scholars Press: Missoula, Montana, 1979), esp. 22 (henceforth, 'Brownlee'). Cf. "The Wicked Priest, the Man of Lies, and the Righteous Teacher—The Problem of Identity," *JQR* 73 (1982), 1-37.

<sup>25</sup> P.R. Davies, *Behind the Essenes: History and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Brown Judaic Studies (Scholars Press: Atlanta, 1987), 26.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 26. Cf. G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen, 1963).

<sup>27</sup> Davies, *op.cit.*, 28.

<sup>28</sup> P.R. Callaway, *The History of the Qumran Community: An Investigation*, JSP:SS 3 (JSOT Press, Academic Press: Sheffield, 1988), 135-71.

within the scrolls, and thus the consequent problem of uncovering the historical events in question. His approach, indeed, stands as a sustained critique of Stegemann's reconstruction as he deals with the three pesharim to which Stegemann restricts his argument: 1QpHab, 4QpPs 37 (=4QpPs<sup>a</sup>) and 4QpNah. He finds, however, that with the exception of the identification of 'Demetrius' in 4QpNah and the events surrounding him, the sort of information provided by the pesharim is not of the kind that historians can use independently:

Assuming that the pesharim do in fact refer, by means of their cryptic language, to specific historical episodes, one would need to know more about the persons and events involved from other historical sources.<sup>29</sup>

In other words, aside from telling us about attitudes to these individuals and groups, the pesharim are of less help than, e.g. Josephus, since scholars inevitably fill out the 'historical' accounts in the peshar texts with information already covered by the Jewish historian.

Part of the problem, I suggest, lies with the intention residing behind scholarly approaches to the pesharim. If the intention has been to uncover the historical information contained therein, then the attempt is doomed to failure from the start. The pesharim are not historical documents. It is true that they may contain historical material, but this is a secondary concern. Rather, the pesharim are interpretations of prophetic texts which are made to speak to the community in its own setting. The use of epithets or ciphers is not intended to deceive the reader; and to speak of a requirement to "first crack the code in order to grasp what the pesharim are cryptically saying about Qumran history"<sup>30</sup> has not helped the study of these texts, although it is a 'crime' of which scholars are equally guilty. In fact, it is a product of modern scholarly debate. If it is so 'easy' for us today to 'decipher' the comments within the pesharim with only Josephus's works and a few other notable contributions to hand, then how much easier must it have been for readers within the lifetime of the events recorded or shortly thereafter? Seen in this light, is it proper or indeed helpful to speak of the pesharim as 'codes'? Rather, I suggest such talk arises from a misunderstanding of the nature of the pesharim and of the term 'peshar' itself, and in particular a refusal

---

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 169.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 135.

to recognise these texts' prophetic nature. Not only are they interpretations of prophecy themselves, but, as we have seen, references to (e.g.) the 'end times' within the body of the interpretation lend an eschatological element to the texts. What is needed, then, is a new study of the pesharim that both recognises this prophetic element and incorporates it into its method. This will lend understanding to the rationale behind many of the designations used by the pesharist(s) and may indeed help reflections on their historical integrity. Meanwhile, in response to the valid criticisms of Davies and Callaway, such a study must (a) not be restricted only to a few of the pesharim, whether that be the artificial distinction between 'continuous' or 'thematic' pesharim, or only to those pesharim that contain historically valuable information (so Stegemann); and (b) have a clear methodological basis, and aim not simply to uncover the *historical* references, which would represent an abuse of these texts. Thus my own approach will concentrate on the epithets used in the pesharim, Teacher of Righteousness, Man of Falsehood, Wicked Priest, Kittim etc., and will, most importantly, research the origin and background of these terms, examine the references in relation to the biblical passages on which the interpretation is based, and through analysis of the vocabulary used, perhaps help to forge links between these individuals and groups which may incidentally aid our understanding of the historical reality underpinning the material.

Before we may continue to this, however, some introductory words on a more detailed understanding of the term 'pesher' and its linguistic origins are required. These will, indeed, help to broaden our understanding of how the material in the interpretation is related to the biblical text on which it is based.

## **1.2 The 'pesher' word root in Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern usage**

The Hebrew term פֶּשֶׁר, of which 'pesher' is a transliteration, is, as we have suggested, used in the Qumran commentaries to distinguish between the scriptural citation and to introduce its interpretation. In her word study, which our current discussion addresses, Horgan distinguishes four consonant groups on which the word 'pesher' is alleged to

be based: *ptr*, *pšr*, *ptr*, and *ptr*, although she dismisses the first group which is well attested in both biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew, and in Aramaic.<sup>31</sup>

Horgan derives the *pšr* root from a Semitic root attested in Akkadian, Aramaic, Hebrew and Arabic, with a meaning ‘loosen’, ‘dissolve’. In Akkadian, she continues, the verb is used in several conjugations with meanings all derived from the base semantic range. Thus it can mean the release of prisoners, the settling of a dispute, the loosening of a curse or spell and, significantly, *the interpretation of dreams*. In this latter instance, the *pašāru* root can refer to: (1) the reporting of a dream by one person (the dreamer) to another; (2) the process of interpreting a dream with special recourse for future events revealed within the dream; and (3) the process of removing the negative consequence of a dream by magic means.<sup>32</sup> Within Hebrew, the *pšr* root recurs in Ecclesiastes 8:1 (‘Who is like the wise man? And who knows *the interpretation of a thing* [פֶּשֶׁר דְּבַר]?’), and it is found in the Aramaic portions of Daniel to be considered more fully below. Meanwhile, aside from the Qumran texts, the root recurs in Mishnaic Hebrew with the original meaning ‘loosen’, ‘dissolve’, and in later Aramaic again with the meaning ‘solve a riddle’ ‘interpret a dream’, especially within the Targumic accounts of the interpretative activities of Joseph while in prison.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>31</sup> Horgan, 230-37. Cf. A.L. Oppenheim, *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East: With a Translation of an Assyrian Dream Book*, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, 46:3 (American Philosophical Society: Philadelphia, 1956), 179-374.

<sup>32</sup> Horgan, 231; Oppenheim, *op. cit.*, 219. Oppenheim himself (219 & 301) refers to an example from the Assyrian Dream Book (KAR 252 III: 20-38) of the magical removal of a dream’s negative consequences. Here the individual will ‘report’ his dream to a lump of clay thereby transferring the dream and its effects to that lump. The clay will then be placed in water where it will dissolve and disappear, taking the dream’s evil effects with it.

<sup>33</sup> In LXX, Eccl. 8:1 is translated by καὶ τίς οἶδεν λύσιν ῥήματος, while the phrase τίς ἢ λύσις τοῦ λόγου τούτου for Heb. מִי יֵדוּעַ אֶת־פֶּשֶׁר דְּבַר is found in Dan. 12:8, and λύσεις αἰνιγμάτων ‘the solutions of riddles’ is used in Wis 8:8. The translation of פֶּשֶׁר by λύσεις suggests a possible parallel between the pesharim and the *Quaestiones* material. The questions and answers (ζητήματα καὶ λύσεων) formula is first evidenced in commentaries on Homer in an attempt to respond to questions raised by his critics. Aristotle devotes chapter 25 of his Poetics to the subject, which is itself entitled Περὶ προβλήματων καὶ λύσεων ‘Concerning problems and solutions’, while the style recurs in Latin texts, and among the Church Fathers to counter the problems raised by the heretics. Jerome’s *Hebrew Questions on Genesis*, meanwhile, reads like a *commentary* on the biblical text. This raises the possibility that the peshar technique originates outside Jewish literature. Cf. “Λύσεις,” PRE, 1 (1927), cols. 2511-29; O. Dreyer, “Luseis,” *Der Kleine Pauly*, 3:16-17 (1968-69), cols. 832-33; G.



The earliest attestation of the root *ptr* ‘interpret’, Horgan continues, is in the Genesis narratives relating to Joseph (Gen. 40-41). While in prison, Joseph interprets (Heb. פָּתַר) the dreams of both Pharaoh’s cupbearer and baker, and later Pharaoh’s own dreams. Here the root appears both in the verb form and in the cognate noun פְּתָרָן (40:5,8,12,18; 41:11). It is thus apparent that *pšr* and *ptr* overlap to an extent in meaning. Nevertheless, she continues, “there is no common proto-Semitic root that could at the same time yield Hebrew *ptr* and Aramaic *pšr*.”<sup>34</sup> The only root that could simultaneously account for both *pšr* and *ptr* would be *pṭr* (with the dental spirant), but this would result in Hebrew *pšr* and Aramaic *ptr*, and not the other way around. No such root is attested in Arabic or Ugaritic, but the wealth of evidence in Akkadian, Hebrew, and Aramaic does support the existence of such a proto-Semitic root, she suggests.<sup>35</sup> Meanwhile, the opposite usage of Hebrew *ptr* and Aramaic *pšr* might be explained by the magical and occultic nuances of the root in Akkadian, which the Genesis author might wish to have avoided. “If Akkadian *pšr*, Hebrew *pšr*, and Aramaic *ptr* point to a proto-Semitic root \**pṭr*, then the use of *pšr* in Aramaic may be a direct borrowing from Akkadian in the Babylonian period or from Hebrew at a later time.”<sup>36</sup>

### 1.2.1 Genesis 40-41

In Genesis 40-41, narrating Joseph’s sojourn in prison, the root פָּתַר is found both as a verb and in the noun formulation פְּתָרָן. In chapter 40 Joseph accurately interprets the troubling dreams of both Pharaoh’s chief cupbearer and baker and later, when Pharaoh himself is troubled by dreams, is, on the advice of the cupbearer, brought before Pharaoh himself, where he interprets (again correctly) Pharaoh’s dreams.

---

Bardy, “La Littérature Patristique des ‘Quaestiones et Responsiones’ sur l’Ecriture Sainte,” *RB* 41 (1932), 210-36, 341-69, 515-37; *RB* 42 (1933), 14-30, 211-29, 328-52; A. Kamesar, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship and the Hebrew Bible: A Study of the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesis* (Oxford, 1993), 82-92; and C.T.R. Hayward, *Jerome’s Hebrew Questions on Genesis* (Oxford, 1995), 2-7.

<sup>34</sup> Horgan, 235.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 235.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 236. Akkadian *pašāru* ‘to loosen’ ‘to solve’ and its background for dream interpretation is briefly discussed by Stephen A. Kaufman (*The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic*, *Assyriological Studies* 19 [University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1974], 81), though he concludes that little is certain.

The process of dream-interpretation is evidently a common feature of Ancient Near Eastern literature and professional dream interpreters abound,<sup>37</sup> explaining the baker and cupbearer's complaint to Joseph that "we have had dreams, *but there is no-one to interpret them* (וּפְתָר אֵינָן אִתָּנוּ)" (40:8). Such dream-interpreters evidently do not normally frequent prisons! Similarly, when himself beset by dreams, Pharaoh sends for "all the magicians of Egypt and all its wise men" (41:8). Clearly, the interpretation of dreams is a function of such court functionaries in the world of the Ancient Near East.<sup>38</sup> Nevertheless, Joseph implicitly rejects this understanding when in reply he queries, "Do not interpretations (פְּתָרִימִים) belong to God? Please tell [the dreams] to me." Later, in front of Pharaoh, Joseph again declaims his own ability to offer the interpretation of a dream: "It is not I; God will give Pharaoh a favourable answer" (בְּלִעְדֵי אֱלֹהִים יַעֲנֶה אֶת־שְׁלוֹם פְּרִיעָה) (41:16). Perhaps a more accurate translation of the latter phrase might be: "God will set Pharaoh's mind at peace." The important aspect to understand is that Joseph is not a trained dream-interpreter. God can convey a particular dream's interpretation through any intermediary, and thus the untrained Joseph can reveal what even the trained officials cannot. Another important aspect to discern is the fact that פְּתָר is here associated with the *accurate* interpretation of dreams. The court officials are unable to offer *any* explanation, let alone the dream's true explanation. Meanwhile, Joseph's explanation is borne out. The dreams of the baker and cupbearer come true in precisely the three days Joseph had predicted, and stand as testimony before Pharaoh for the *accuracy of the interpretation* of his dream which spans a longer period of some fourteen years: seven periods of 'fatness' followed by seven years of famine. Where a פְּתָר is offered, it will come true, even if the period of time involved is a long one.

---

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Oppenheim, *op. cit.*, 179-374, who deals with this subject in detail and provides numerous examples. A more recent examination has been conducted by Jean-Marie Husser (*Dreams and Dream Narratives in the Biblical World*, The Biblical Seminar, 63, Trans. Jill M. Munro [Sheffield Academic Press: Sheffield, 1999]), though this does not deal with the *pšr* root itself.

<sup>38</sup> Dream-interpretation is one of the functions of the *šā'il(t)u* ('[s]he who asks [the gods] questions) priest(ess) in Ancient Mesopotamia and the *oneiropolos* in Homeric epic. Such dream-interpretation is not solely restricted to priests, however. Interpretations can also be offered by a friend or a relative, such as Enkidu and Gilgamesh's mother in the Sumerian Epic of Gilgamesh. Meanwhile, in the dream report of Pharaoh Tanutamon, untrained courtiers are able to interpret the transparent symbolism of the dream's content. Cf. Oppenheim, *op. cit.*, 217-225.

In his discussion of the Genesis 40-41 episode, Rabinowitz devotes much attention to the meaning of 40:5 where the dreams of the baker and cupbearer are first described.<sup>39</sup>

The Hebrew and RSV translation (which Rabinowitz himself uses) follow:

וַיִּחְלְמוּ חֵלֹם שְׁנֵיהֶם אִישׁ חֵלְמוֹ בְּלַיְלָה אֶחָד אִישׁ כְּפִתְרוֹן חֵלְמוֹ הַמְּשָׁקָה  
וְהָאִפְסָה אֲשֶׁר לְמֶלֶךְ מִצְרַיִם אֲשֶׁר אֲסוּרִים בְּבַיִת הַסֵּהֶר:

And one night they both dreamed – the butler and the baker of the king of Egypt, who were confined in the prison – *each his own dream, and each dream with its own meaning.*

As Rabinowitz points out, the Hebrew does not say ‘...each dream with its own meaning’ as the RSV (among others) renders. Rather, the phrase refers not to the dream, but to the dreamer: ‘...each man according to the *pithrōn* of his dream’; and thus the KJV ‘...each man according to the interpretation of his dream’ is surprisingly a more accurate rendition. The *pittāron*, then, may denote “not merely the dreamed, though as yet unfulfilled or unrealized, presage of some event or circumstance, but *the presage thought of as fulfilled or realized, the reality presaged by the dream.*”<sup>40</sup> The idea that each dream comes with its own interpretation already ‘built-in’, then, further helps divorce the supposed ‘interpreter’ from the interpretation of the dream, and thus strengthens Joseph’s plaintive response: ‘do not interpretations belong to God?’

### 1.2.2 Daniel

Again in Daniel the *pšr* word-group is associated with the interpretation of dreams, and particularly in chapters 2, 4, and 5. Here the noun *p<sup>e</sup>shar* is frequently found.

The setting is broadly similar to that in Genesis 41. Again, the king (here Nebuchadnezzar, chs. 2,4; and Belteshazzar, ch. 5) is surrounded by court ‘lackeys’ – including magicians, enchanters, sorcerers and ‘Chaldeans’ – whose function is apparently to provide solutions to mystical problems such as dreams. In chapter two, like Pharaoh, Nebuchadnezzar has troubling dreams to which his counsellors are unable to provide an explanation. Part of the problem, they complain is that Nebuchadnezzar refuses to tell them the content of his dream first. Nevertheless, the

<sup>39</sup> I. Rabinowitz, “Pēsher/Pittārōn: Its Biblical Meaning and its Significance in the Qumran Literature,” *RevQ* 8 (1973), 219-32, esp. 220-223.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 221.

king reasons that a proper interpreter should be able to tell him first the content of his dream and then its interpretation. Requesting the dream's content is simply an attempt to gain time (2:8), although the Chaldeans claim that: 'There is no one on earth who can reveal what the king demands! In fact no king, however great and powerful, has ever asked such a thing of any magician or enchanter or Chaldean. The thing that the king is asking is too difficult, and no-one can reveal it to the king except the gods, whose dwelling is not with mortals' (Dan. 2:10b-11). Inadvertently, of course, the Chaldeans have hit on the right answer, that the interpretation of dreams lies with God himself; hence Daniel and his companions pray that God will reveal the mystery (2:18), while the pious Nebuchadnezzar glorifies God and not Daniel for the dream's accurate interpretation (2:47). Nebuchadnezzar's request that the magicians should first tell him the content of the dream and only then its interpretation also lends support to Rabinowitz's proposal that the *pšr* root encompasses both the dream and its interpretation. Both are divine mysteries, and if someone were to claim that he could reveal the one, he should also be able to reveal the other. The dream cannot be divorced from its interpretation.

Both of Nebuchadnezzar's dreams (chs. 2,4) relate to historical events which are interpreted symbolically. In chapter 2, a statue – made up of a gold head, chest and arms of silver, middle and thighs of bronze, legs of iron, and feet partly of iron and clay – refers to the four kingdoms of the Babylonians, Medes, Persians and Greeks, each metal referring to a particular kingdom.<sup>41</sup> The stone 'not of human hands' then refers to the coming kingdom of God. In chapter four, meanwhile, Nebuchadnezzar's dream of a great tree reaching even to heaven which will be cut down, is referred to the king's pride for his empire. As punishment, he will be made to live as an animal for seven years 'in order that all who live may know that the Most High is sovereign over the kingdom of mortals' (4:17b). As the story continues (vv28-36), this prognosis comes true twelve months later when the king boasts about his capital: 'Is not this magnificent Babylon, which I have built as a royal capital by my mighty power and for my glorious majesty?' Immediately a voice comes from heaven

---

<sup>41</sup> The mixture of clay with iron to make up the feet represents the break-up of the Greek Empire among the Seleucids and Ptolemies. Cf. 2:43.

pronouncing the punishment to be carried out; and straightaway the sentence is fulfilled and Nebuchadnezzar is driven from human society.

The account of Belshazzar's Feast in chapter five requires closer examination. Unlike in the previous instances, *pšr* is not here used in reference to the interpretation of a dream. Rather, the term is used in connection with the interpretation of the mysterious writing written on the wall during the feast by the fingers of a disembodied hand.<sup>42</sup> Although he could not read this writing, still the words so terrified the king that his face went pale and his knees knocked together. Like Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar calls for his wise men, but they could neither read the writing nor tell him its interpretation. Nevertheless, his mother the Queen reminds Belshazzar of Daniel:

“O king, live forever! Do not let your thoughts terrify you or your face grow pale. There is a man in your kingdom... Your father, King Nebuchadnezzar, made him chief of the magicians, enchanters, Chaldeans, and diviners, *because an excellent spirit, knowledge, and understanding to interpret dreams, explain riddles, and solve problems* were found in this Daniel, whom the king named Belteshazzar. Now let Daniel be called, and he will give the interpretation.” (Dan. 5:10b-12)

In passing we may note that the parallel of ‘interpret dreams’ (מַפְשֵׁר חִלְמֵיךָ) with ‘solve problems’ (וּמְשֵׁרָא קִטְרִין) recalls the root meaning of *pšr*, since a more accurate translation of the latter expression is ‘loosen knots’ (compare 5:16a). Daniel is thus brought into the king’s presence and asked to read the writing and give its interpretation. Accordingly, Daniel reminds Belshazzar of the warning given to Nebuchadnezzar regarding his pride and arrogance and the degrading he subsequently suffered, being made to wander among the animals. He is now guilty of the same pride and of not honouring the God “in whose power is your very breath” (5:23). This then was why the hand was sent and the writing inscribed:

וּדְנָה כְּחֵבָא דִּי רְשִׁים מְנָא מְנָא תְּקֵל וּפְרָסִין: דְּנָה פְּשֵׁר-מִלְּתָא מְנָא  
 מְנָה-אַלְהָא מְלִכּוּתְךָ וְהַשְׁלֵמָה: תְּקֵל תְּקִילְתָּהּ בְּמֵאוֹנֵיא וְהַשְׁתַּכַּחַת חֲסִיר:  
 פְּרָס פְּרִיסַת מְלִכּוּתְךָ וְיֵהִיבַת לְמָרִי וּפְרָס:

<sup>42</sup> There is a distinct parallel to this account in Ancient Near Eastern literature. Oppenheim refers to an example where a young man in Babylon dreams of an inscription on the pedestal of an image of the Moon-god, Sin. This inscription contained a prophecy regarding the outcome of the war between Assurbanipal and his brother Šamašsumukīn. The Daniel account is not itself a dream but the base elements are the same. Cf. Oppenheim, *op. cit.*, 201f.

And this is the writing that was inscribed: MENE, MENE, TEKEL, and PARSIN. *This is the interpretation of the matter*: MENE, God has numbered the days of your kingdom and brought it to an end; TEKEL, you have been weighed on the scales and found wanting; PERES, your kingdom is divided and given to the Medes and Persians. (Dan. 5:25-28)

In form, this passage comes closest to the usage of ‘pesher’ in the DSS. The expression *מלתא פשר דנה* ‘this is the interpretation of the matter’ accurately equates to the phrase *פשר הדבר* found in the scrolls, while, more importantly, the *method* of exegesis is very similar to that in the pesharim. Thus, the Aramaic author chooses three ‘cryptic’ nouns which are picked up in the interpretation as verbs: *מנא* becomes *מנה* ‘(God) has numbered’; *תקילתא* becomes *תקילתה* ‘you have been weighed’; while *פרסין* or *פרס* becomes both *פריסתה* ‘(your kingdom) is divided’ and of course *פרס* ‘Persia’.<sup>43</sup> This is the closest point of contact between the pesher structure found in the scrolls and other Jewish literature as a whole, and significantly comes in the Hebrew Bible itself, indicative that the pesher structure derives from the OT.

### 1.2.3 The Book of Giants

A discussion of ‘pesher’ and its meaning in Jewish literature should take into account the usage of the root in the Qumran Book of Giants (BG) material. BG’s main interest seems to have been to ‘flesh out’ the names of the fallen Watchers and giants and crucially *to establish Enoch as an interpreter of their dreams*.<sup>44</sup> Clearly, then, the material is at least comparable to the pictures of Joseph and Daniel we have already observed.

The *פשר* root occurs in both noun and verb formulations. In 4QEnGiants<sup>a</sup> 8 l. 13 we find the expression *פשר צבוחא* ‘And the interpretation of [this] matter’ (Stuckenbruck<sup>45</sup>), similar to both *פשר הדבר* and *פשר מלתא* found elsewhere

<sup>43</sup> See below, chapters two to six, for similar examples of where the pesherist chooses words from the particular prophecy to make wordplay and introduce his own dimension of interpretation.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Texts, Translation, and Commentary*, Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum, 63 (Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen, 1997), 32 (my italics).

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, 88ff. García-Martínez (*DSSE:SE 1*) prefers *פשר צבורא* which he translates ‘And tear loose [the] totality [of ...]’. While we have argued that *פשר* has a root meaning ‘loosen’,

(above). In the passage this phrase is closely associated with the announcement of the Noahic deluge which will even destroy those in deserts (ll. 12f.). The passage also introduces Enoch as ‘the scribe of interpretation’ (ספר פרשא; 1. 4, cf. 4Q206 2 l. 1), so-called because he is the one who writes down the announcement of destruction. Meanwhile, this title recurs in 4QEnGiants<sup>b</sup> where the relation of this phrase to the process of interpretation (here of the content of the giants’ dreams) is more pronounced:

] אדין אמר ההיה להון תלמא דן נתנן לחנוך לספר	14
פרשא ויפשור לנא	
חלמא	15

Then Hahyah said to them, “Let us give [th]is[ dream to Eno]ch, the scribe of interpretation, so that he may interpret for us <sup>15</sup> the dream. (4QEnGiants<sup>b</sup> II:14-15; Stuckenbruck, *Book of Giants*, 116)

It seems clear that the Qumran author here intentionally plays on the similar פשר (here in the verb) and פרש roots. Nevertheless, the fact that the meaning of פרש is ‘interpret’ (rather than its normal sense of ‘separate’) is hinted at by the use of פשר here specifically in the sense of ‘dream interpretation’; thus directly comparable to the picture that emerges from discussion of the Hebrew Bible passages. פרש in the sense of ‘interpretation’ is found famously in Nehemiah 8:8, where the Levites read from the Law ‘with interpretation’ (מפרש),<sup>46</sup> though Stuckenbruck is right to exercise a note of caution in comparing so closely the qal and pu‘al forms.<sup>47</sup>

To sum up, the BG material has close ties with the formulations common to both the pesharim and the Hebrew Bible (such as פשר (ה)רבר) while more significantly it ties the root to the underlying meaning of ‘peshar’ as ‘interpretation of dreams’ (and by extension also ‘visions’). The Qumran authors were clearly very much aware of this dimension of the root, and any understanding of the root’s usage in the pesharim should be aware of this.

this is generally not transferred into the translation. Meanwhile, this translation ignores the similarity to other ‘stock phrases’.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Ezra 4:18 (Aramaic). Here מפרש is used in the sense of ‘translation’.

<sup>47</sup> Stuckenbruck, *op. cit.*, 118f n. 125.

## Conclusions

From an initial meaning of ‘loose’ the *pšr* root quickly comes to mean ‘interpretation’ and is especially used of *the interpretation of dreams* occasionally by magic means. This may account for the initial resistance to using *pšr* in the Genesis narrative, and the root’s replacement with *ptr*. There is a temptation to suggest that by the time of the scrolls the use of ‘pesher’ in the commentaries is nothing more than as a *terminus technicus*, especially given the similarity of the stock phrase פֶּשֶׁר הַדְּבָרִים with comparable phrases in both Genesis and Daniel.<sup>48</sup> Nevertheless, this ignores the root’s usage in the BG material which retains the sense of ‘pesher’ as ‘dream interpretation’ and 1QpHab, which suggests that the Teacher of Righteousness has been accorded hidden knowledge or insight to interpret the mysteries of the prophetic visions. By suggesting that the Teacher has received such knowledge, the Qumran community are making a claim that not only does he represent the return of the prophets of old to Israel, but that crucially *only* the Teacher is able to reveal the full interpretation of that prophetic message; a message, moreover, that is certain, since in Hebrew bible usage nowhere does a ‘pesher’ turn out to be false or unfulfilled. By extension, this understanding is also used of his intellectual ‘success’ in the community. A claim to offer a ‘pesher’ is simultaneously a claim to its authenticity. This is the reason why, in the Hebrew Bible, other so-called ‘interpreters’ are unable to offer any explanation, let alone the right explanation, or, in the case of Dan. 2 and 5, give the content of the mysteries even before their proper interpretation.

### **1.3 An appropriate question of genre?**

Bound up with the overall debate surrounding the Qumran pesharim is the question: to which genre these texts should be assigned? The material, because it has so recently emerged, refuses to fit any of the traditional models, and debate centres on whether the texts should be regarded as commentary, midrash, or ‘pesher’ itself (i.e. as a new genre).

The structural presentation of the pesharim – citation followed by interpretation – broadly suggests that the material be treated as midrashic, since both treat biblical

---

<sup>48</sup> So Lim, *op. cit.*, 132.



texts atomically. Meanwhile, however complicated it may become, Rabbinic midrash like the pesharim, takes the form of a scriptural premise followed by a comment and/or additional explanation. The term ‘midrash’ is derived from the verb דרש ‘seek’ and even in the Hebrew Bible is used with primarily theological connotations with God or Torah as the object (Ezra 7:10; Isa. 34:16).<sup>49</sup> As the name implies, then, it is to do with a searching out or researching of scripture, *an exegesis*. It is found in 4QS<sup>b,d</sup>, and significantly in 4QFlorilegium where it appears alongside פשר (4QFlor I:14):

14 מדרש מאשרי [ה] איש אשר לוא הלך בעצת רשעים פשר הדבנך  
[המה] סרי מדרך [הרשעים]

<sup>14</sup> *Midrash of* “Blessed is [the] man who does not walk in the counsel of the wicked” (Psalm 1:1). *The interpretation of the wor[d: They are] the ones who turn aside from the path of [the wicked.]*

In this passage, there is apparently no distinction between the two terms; they seem to operate conjointly. The *drš* root is also found in 1QS proper, where the importance of studying the Law is expressed:

And where the ten are, there never shall lack a man among them who shall study (דורש) the Law continually, day and night, concerning the right conduct of a man with his companion. And the congregation shall watch in community for a third of every night of the year, to read the Book and to study the Law (ולדרוש) (משפט), and to bless together. (1QS VI:6-8; Vermes, *CDDSE*)

CD also refers to a figure termed the ‘Interpreter of the Law’ (דורש התורה; VI:7), which seems to be a title held within the community, perhaps emphasising the importance of study of the law for the group.

On this very general understanding of ‘midrash’ as interpretation it is possible to state that the pesharim are very similar. Nevertheless, when midrash is more closely defined and in particular models of rabbinic ‘midrash’ identified, the pesharim are more distinct. There are conventionally two types of Rabbinic ‘midrash’: *midrash halakhah*, which not only supplies details missing from the Bible, but also provides instructions for the application of a biblical rule, resolving contradictions, reconciling the biblical text with current practice, and finding biblical support for regulations not envisioned in scripture; and *midrash haggadah*, occasionally regarded as a

<sup>49</sup> G. Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, Second edition. Trans. M.

tautological term, which is by contrast freer and more characterised by a ‘playful element’, and yet at the same time strongly bound by tradition and open to contemporary influences such as apologetic and polemic needs.<sup>50</sup> In essence, as the names imply, halakhic midrashim are legal in orientation, concentrating on Exodus through Deuteronomy, while the haggadic midrashim are primarily narrative in outlook.

Nevertheless, in this light, the pesharim neither resemble the legal approaches of midrash halakhah nor the freer narrative aspects of midrash haggadah. In recognition of this, Brownlee proposes that the pesharim be related to a new, third strain of midrash, *midrash peshet*, similar and yet distinct from both midrash haggadah and midrash halakhah:

Rather than invent an entirely new genus called *Pēšer* which relates DSH [=1QpHab] to nothing previously known, it seems more logical to the present writer to recognize a new species of Midrash, calling DSH (and the fragments of other works found in the Scroll Cave of Qumran) an example of *Midrash Pēsher*, a classification which is at once related to the midrashim and at the same time distinguished from the previously known classes thereof, *Midrash Halakah* and *Midrash Haggadah*.<sup>51</sup>

Similarly, Stemmerger also describes peshet as a sub-genre of midrash, while the title has since been adopted by Krister Stendahl to characterise the formula quotations of biblical texts in Matthew, and by Earle Ellis to describe Paul’s use of the OT.<sup>52</sup> In the view of this writer it is both misguided and misleading to title a text ‘midrash’ while noting the differences between the two sets of material, midrash and peshet. The

Bockmuehl (T.&T. Clark: Edinburgh, 1996), 234.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 238-39. Cf. M. Taradach, *Le Midrash: Introduction à la littérature midrashique (Drš dans la Bible, les Targumim, les Midrašim)*, Le Monde de la Bible, 22 (Labor et Fides: Genève, 1991), 29-30.

<sup>51</sup> W.H. Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash and the Targum of Jonathan*, a mimeographed paper issued Feb. 2, 1953, 12.

<sup>52</sup> Stemmerger, *op. cit.*, 236, *The School of Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament* (C.W.K. Gleerup: Lund, 1954), 182-94, and *Paul’s Use of the Old Testament* (Oliver & Boyd: London, 1957), 139-47, respectively. Meanwhile, C.K. Barrett (“The Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New,” *CHB* 1 [1970], 392) argues that τοῦτ’ ἔστιν in Rom. 10:6-7 translates Heb. פֶּשֶׁר, while the *peshet hermeneutic* (my italics) of Matthew is again discussed by Marvin Pate (C.M. Pate, *Communities of the Last Days: The Dead Sea Scrolls, the New Testament & the Story of Israel* [Apollos: Leicester, 2000], 85-106). As we have seen, however, פֶּשֶׁר is normally translated by λύσις which does not appear in Paul except with a

peshar texts in our possession display such substantive differences from the more familiar midrashim as to render suspect any attempt to label the pesharim as ‘midrashim’. Not only do the rabbinic midrashim considerably post-date the pesharim, but the full extent of the peshar material is scarcely understood (especially given the difficulty in denoting texts ‘pesharim’). In short, titling the genre ‘midrash peshar’ seems not to advance the situation so much as confuse it. Thus Horgan:

When the pesharim and certain midrashic writings are compared, their respective historical contexts are often neglected. Seeking to illuminate the pesharim, all of which were written before A.D. 70, by pointing to allegedly similar elements in rabbinic midrashic writings dating from the second century A.D. on is taking the cart before the horse. This is not to deny that some of the presuppositions and techniques that are observed in rabbinic midrashic material may be found in works that are much earlier than the rabbinic writings — even in the biblical books themselves — but rather to warn that the results of isolated comparisons may be anachronistic and misleading. From this perspective, the term “midrash” is neither a useful nor an informative term by which to characterize the pesharim.<sup>53</sup>

Much the same problems dog Brownlee’s attempt to highlight similarities between (specifically) 1QpHab and the Habakkuk Targum. As he comments, “Targums too reveal free interpretations based upon midrashic methods and a concern for fulfilled prophecy,” while many of the same themes are developed in both instances: a concern for eschatology, and a belief that psalmody is prophecy.<sup>54</sup> I have dealt with the relationship between the peshar and the Targum elsewhere, and, without prejudicing my conclusions, would here point out that those instances where the peshar is seemingly dependent on the Targum (or vice versa) may be explained by recourse to common Jewish interpretation.<sup>55</sup> Meanwhile, attempts to compare the pesharim with material in the NT are by varying degrees much less successful, particularly Barbara Thiering’s disastrous attempt to explain the material in the gospels by recourse to the ‘peshar technique’.<sup>56</sup>

---

different meaning (I Cor. 7:27). Description of this as ‘midrash peshar’ is an attempt to jump on the scholarly ‘bandwagon’. Cf. Lim, *op. cit.*, 125.

<sup>53</sup> Horgan, 252. A.G. Wright (“The Literary Genre Midrash (Part Two),” *CBQ* 28 [1966], 422) calls for Brownlee’s tripartite division to be abandoned, while Lim (*op. cit.*, 111) suggests that ‘Midrash peshar’ is a vagary best avoided.

<sup>54</sup> Brownlee, 32.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. M. Wood, “Peshar Habakkuk and the Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel,” *JSP* 19 (1999), 129-46 (hereafter, ‘Wood’).

<sup>56</sup> B. Thiering, *Jesus The Man* (Corgi: London, 1992), esp. 28-35.

In short, one is left wondering about the value of any of the above approaches. As in the division of the pesharim into ‘continuous’ and ‘thematic’ text types, this question of genre smacks of contemporary scholarly concerns rather than anything which might have bothered the ancient writers. All that one can say is that the pesharim are representative of Jewish biblical interpretation more generally, and that by comparison with other forms of literature such as midrash and targum we gain some idea of what sort of interpretative comments we can expect to uncover in the pesharim themselves. Discussion of the pesharim in terms of ‘genre’ is not an end in itself, and hence my cautious titling of this subsection.

#### **1.4 Interpretative style in the Pesharim**

In his 1951 article on this subject, William Brownlee identified thirteen hermeneutical (or interpretative) principles used in 1QpHab.<sup>57</sup> These were:

1. Everything the ancient prophet wrote has a *veiled, eschatological meaning*.
2. Since the ancient prophet wrote cryptically, his meaning is often to be ascertained through a *forced, or abnormal construction of the Biblical text*.
3. The prophet’s meaning may be detected through the study of the *textual or orthographic peculiarities* in the transmitted text. Thus the interpretation frequently turns upon the special reading of the text cited.
4. A *textual variant*, i.e. a different reading from the one cited, may also assist interpretation.
5. The application of the features of a verse may be determined by *analogous circumstance*, or by
6. *Allegorical propriety*.
7. For the full meaning of the prophet, *more than one meaning* may be attached to his words.
8. In some cases the original prophet so completely veiled his meaning that he can be understood only by an *equation of synonyms*, attaching to the original word a secondary meaning of one of its synonyms.
9. Sometimes the prophet veiled his message by writing one word instead of another, the interpreter being able to recover the prophet’s meaning by a *rearrangement of the letters in a word*, or by
10. *The substitution of similar letters* for one or more of the letters in a Biblical text.
11. Sometimes the prophet’s meaning is to be derived by *the division of a word into two or more parts*, and by expounding the parts.

---

<sup>57</sup> “Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *BA* 14 (1951), 54-76.

12. At times the original prophet concealed his message beneath abbreviations, so that the cryptic meaning of a word is to be evolved through *interpretation of words, or parts of words, as abbreviations*.
13. *Other passages of scripture* may illumine the meaning of the original prophet.<sup>58</sup>

Certainly some of the principles could be disputed, especially no. 6, while Horgan is probably right to suggest that nos. 3-13 are merely extensions of no. 2.<sup>59</sup> The principles uncovered do not, however, support Brownlee's contention that they would show how 1QpHab was "essentially midrashic in character,"<sup>60</sup> since they are not *exclusively* midrashic. Rather, such principles are to be found in (e.g.) the Targumim, Philo, and even parts of Josephus, supporting the 'Jewish' (rather than 'midrashic') character of the pesharim as a whole. This explains my decision to divorce discussion of the principles from discussion of genre. Brooke reaches a similar conclusion:

Furthermore, it is also noteworthy that no one technique is the prerogative of any particular kind of literature, peshet, targum, sectarian halakah or whatever. Thus the use of exegetical techniques is not solely constitutive of the genre, if that it be, of peshet; neither for that matter is its eschatological outlook.<sup>61</sup>

The principles are cited here merely to inform the reader the sort of interpretation one might expect to encounter in analysis of the individual lemmata. They also support my choice within the body of the ensuing chapters to cite the Biblical text alongside its interpretation, since so many of these interpretative principles depend upon a relationship between the two.

### ***1.5 The Pesharim as historico-prophetic documents***

This discourse on the nature of peshet, both as a term and as an alleged 'genre' perhaps comparable to the midrashic material has certainly been helpful. It has

---

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, 60-62. His italics.

<sup>59</sup> Horgan, 250, n84. For further criticism see K. Elliger, *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer*, Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie, 15 (J.C.B. Mohr: Tübingen, 1953), 157-64. Henceforth 'Elliger'. Significantly, Elliger (127-49) describes the interpreter's order of priority in interpreting the biblical text: (1) where possible to use the text (of Habakkuk) word for word or slightly paraphrased; (2) to pick up on particular 'keywords' to convey the interpretation; and if all else fails (3) to resort to other interpretative techniques – allegory, wordplay, rearrangement etc. Cf. G.J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context*, JSOTSup, 29 (JSOT Press: Sheffield, 1985), 41, 283-88.

<sup>60</sup> Brownlee, *op. cit.*, 76.

<sup>61</sup> Brooke, *op. cit.*, 43.

enabled us to develop an understanding of the sorts of interpretation and attitude of the group that we might expect to uncover within the boundaries of the pesharim, which while it is not accurate to identify them as a genre are certainly more loosely distinct from other Qumran documents. As we have explained the term, use of the term ‘peshar’ within the Qumran ‘commentaries’ is not simply as a *terminus technicus* but represents a claim on behalf of the community acting in the stead of the Teacher of Righteousness to put forth accurate interpretation of Hebrew scripture utilising familiar *midrashic* principles to discern mysteries hitherto covered over. From analysis of the use of the *pšr* root within the Hebrew/Aramaic Bible we can see that both פִּשְׁר and פִּתְר are used of the interpretation of dreams by the divine representatives Daniel and Joseph respectively to offer authoritative prognoses of events scheduled to come to pass in human history. These may have already partially taken place as in the first half of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream in Daniel 4, may come to pass in the immediate future (Genesis 40-41) or may reflect a more long-term vision of history (Daniel 2), and it is in this sense that it is not improper to speak of a ‘historical’ dimension to the Qumran pesharim.

Nevertheless, while it is fine to discuss this in a more theoretical environment these suggestions need to undergo rigorous testing. The aim of the present thesis, then, is to resolve whether the sectarians were consistent in their applications of certain ‘keywords’ in Hebrew prophecy, and crucially whether their identifications of the so-called ‘ciphers’ or epithets, in relation to historical personages or groups, remain the same throughout the range of the peshar material, or even within the bounds of individual documents themselves. To this end, the study will focus on these epithets, which are readily identifiable and stand out from the remainder of the interpretation, and examine both their biblical usage and (prophetic) background, their usage in contemporaneous Jewish material where relevant — the scope of which will help to set study of the scrolls within the Judaism of the period as a whole — and to assess their usage and application within the scope of the peshar material in general, and not simply within individual texts.

Phillip Callaway has identified numerous designations within the pesharim,<sup>62</sup> but a full in-depth examination of all of these is beyond the scope of this study. Instead, I will concentrate on the more well-known designations, especially those which occur in more than one text. Throughout the course of the study, however, lesser used and/or known epithets will emerge from the interpretations in relation to other figures and will be explored in those contexts. Through this it is hoped that the majority of the epithets used in the pesharim will receive due examination. To this end the ensuing chapters are divided into two parts or sections. The first part will concentrate on those designations which are traditionally regarded as referring to groups, including the Kittim and Ephraim, Manasseh and the Seekers of Smooth Things (the close proximity of usage in the latter three demands that these are taken together), while in the second part I concentrate on individuals, most obviously the Teacher of Righteousness himself, the Wicked Priest and the Man of the Lie/Man of Falsehood.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> Callaway, *op. cit.*, 135.

<sup>63</sup> On my use of 'Man of Falsehood' over the normal translation 'Man of the Lie' see below, ch. 5.

## 2.0 Kittim

This first section examines the Kittim, a people who feature in several of the pesharim, although predominantly in 1QpHab itself. These people have been considered by many to be key to understanding the historical dimension of the Qumran pesharim, though my research will cast some doubt on that claim. In particular, through their identification with the Romans, the Kittim are often used to date other episodes in the pesharim, e.g. as a *terminus ad quem* for the events of 4QpNah I, and more generally for some of the figures referred to in 1QpHab. This will be discussed below. Again, though, the identification of the Kittim as Romans is premature, given, as we shall show, the strong association of the term with other Mediterranean regions.

### 2.1 Kittim: Biblical and post-biblical Background

In its simplest sense, ‘Kittim’ denotes the residents of Kition in Southern Cyprus (modern day Larnaca). More generally, though, the term refers to the wider region of Cyprus, and receives its fullest sense in the Hebrew Bible and beyond, where it comes to mean ‘sea peoples/naval powers’ more generally.

#### 2.1.1 Bible and Versions

In the Hebrew Bible, ‘Kittim’ (Heb. כִּיִּיִם, occasionally כְּחִיִּיִם) appears in eight instances.<sup>1</sup> Genesis 10:4 (also I Chron. 1:7) identifies ‘Kittim’ as one of the sons of Yavan (a son of Japheth). In Num. 24:21-24, Balaam prophesies to Balak of four military powers, Amalek, Kain, Asshur and Kittim, who will conquer and yet themselves be conquered. This imagery will recur in Daniel 7-8. For now, however, we note the linkage maintained between Kittim and Asshur and the fact that “ships shall come from Kittim” (24:24), thus implying the Kittim are a naval power. Meanwhile, in the prophecies of Isaiah and Ezekiel, (the coasts of) Cyprus/Kittim<sup>2</sup> is

---

<sup>1</sup> A ninth instance, Judges 1:26, while the Greek renders Χερτυμ/Χερτυν, is clearly a mistake for Heb. חִיִּיִם ‘Hittites’ – see also Vg. ‘Etthim’ and below, Figure 1.

<sup>2</sup> The interpolation of Kittim as Cyprus by the NRSV translator relies on their derivation from Kition in Southern Cyprus (above).



cited as a source of timber for shipbuilding (Isa. 23:1, 12; Ezek. 27:6), while in Jeremiah 2:10 the “coasts of Cyprus/Kittim” are used as a designation for the West, and contrasted to Kedar in north Arabia (the East). The eighth and final reference (Dan. 11:30), however, is substantially different since here the Kittim are seemingly identified for the first time as Rome. As such, this reference requires examination in more detail.

Daniel 11 is concerned unambiguously with Hellenistic history from Alexander the Great (‘a warrior king’; 11:3) to Antiochus (‘a contemptible person’; 11:21-45).<sup>3</sup> The prophet describes how Antiochus will sweep away armies from before him and depose the ‘prince of the covenant’ (Onias III, c. 175/174 BC; 11:22). He will stir up his power against the ‘king of the south’ (Ptolemy VI; 11:25) and capture him. Then the two will ‘exchange lies’ at the table (11:27; Porphyry describes how Antiochus deceived Ptolemy) following which the ‘contemptible person’ will return to his land with great wealth, his heart set against the holy covenant (11:28; in 169, on his return from Egypt, Antiochus plundered the Temple in Jerusalem; cf. I Macc. 1:20; II Macc. 5:11-21). In 168 Antiochus returned to Egypt, but as 11:29 points out, on this occasion it was not as before:

For ships of Kittim (כִּיִּים כְּתִים)<sup>4</sup> shall come against him, and he shall lose heart and withdraw. He shall be enraged and take action against the holy covenant. He shall turn back and pay heed to those who forsake the holy covenant. (Dan. 11:30)

Several classical sources describe how, while he was besieging Alexandria, Antiochus was approached by Popilius Laenas, an envoy from Rome, who summarily demanded that he withdraw from Egypt. So Livy:

When [Antiochus] had crossed the river at Eleusis, a place four miles away from Alexandria, the Roman envoys met him. As he approached, he greeted them and offered his hand to Popilius; whereat Popilius handed him the tablets containing the decree of the senate in writing, and bade him read this first of all. On reading the decree, he said that would call in his friends and consider what he should do; Popilius, in accordance with the usual harshness of his temper, drew a circle

<sup>3</sup> J.J. Collins, *Daniel* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1993), 377ff.

<sup>4</sup> Both LXX and Theodotion omit reference to ‘ships’ here. LXX reads ἐξώσους ‘issue forth’ and θ ἐκπορευόμενοι ‘go forth’ apparently reading יִצְאִים (Collins, *op. cit.*, 367, n. 103). This though overlooks the parallel between the current passage and Num. 24:24: וְצִיִּים מִיַּד כְּתִים.

around the king with a rod that he carried in his hand, and said, "Before you step out of this circle, give me an answer which I may take back to the senate." After the king had hesitated a moment, struck dumb by so violent an order, he replied, "I shall do what the senate decrees." Only then did Popilius extend his hand to the king as to an ally and friend. (Livy, XLV, xii, 3-6; Loeb)<sup>5</sup>

Livy's account is notable for the fact that Popilius did not here come directly from Rome with the *senatus-consultum*. Rather, his ships came from Delos where they had been protecting shipping bound for Macedonia.<sup>6</sup> In other words, if we accept Livy's evidence at face value the expression 'ships of Kittim' although it would appear to refer to Popilius's delegation, need not intend that Kittim *itself* be identified as Italy. Instead, the expression might mean 'ships from Greece' and thus Daniel might retain the normal biblical understanding of Kittim. It is not difficult to see how this could have been misunderstood!

In I Maccabees, the Kittim are referred to twice. In 1:1, Alexander the Great came 'from the land of Kittim', and is described as King of Ἑλλάς:

After Alexander son of Philip, the Macedonian, who came from the land of Kittim (ἐκ γῆς Χερτιμ), had defeated King Darius of the Persians and the Medes, he succeeded him as king. (He had previously become king of Greece.) (και ἐβασίλευσεν ἀντ' αὐτοῦ πρότερον ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα)

In this passage, we are interested in the geographical regions Macedonia, Kittim, and 'Greece'. 'Kittim' could be another term for Macedonia, but why differentiate between this and Μακεδών? The solution seems to be to regard Macedonia as part of Kittim, which then designates the entire Greek peninsula. Meanwhile, C.C. Torrey concludes that the Greek in the final clause is 'nonsense' and requires revision.<sup>7</sup> The difficulty, he suggests, is caused by Ἑλλάς and the adverb πρότερον, arising from a mistranslation of the original Hebrew, which read וַיִּמְלֹךְ תַּחְתָּיו רֵאשׁוֹן עַל יוֹן 'he reigned in his stead, as the first ruler of the Syrian Empire.'

As for the Greek rendering, it is not easy to decide whether the translator really misunderstood the passage, or only translated timidly. If the latter, we can

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Polybius 29:27; Diodorus Siculus 31:2; Collins, *op. cit.*, 384.

<sup>6</sup> Livy, XLV, x, 2-3.

<sup>7</sup> C.C. Torrey, "Yāwān and "Hellas" as Designations of the Seleucid Empire," *JAOS* 25 (1904), 302-311, esp. 307.

readily forgive him for refusing to paraphrase יון here; but he certainly should have written πρῶτος instead of πρότερον.<sup>8</sup>

In I Macc. 1:1, then, Μακεδών stands for Macedonia, Kittim for the Greek peninsula, and ‘Greece’ or ‘Yavan’ for the Seleucid Empire, the Greek presence in Asia established by Alexander. Meanwhile, in I Macc. 8:5, our second passage, the text refers to the defeat of the Macedonian Perseus, the ‘king of the Kittim’ (Κιτιέων βασιλέα) in 168 BC. Clearly ‘Kittim’ can designate a part as well as the whole of the Greek peninsula.

Both the LXX and Vulgate specifically identify the Kittim as Romans, while other passages refer to Italy. So Figure 1 below.

Ref.	MT	LXX	Vulgate	Targum <sup>9</sup>
Gen. 10:4	כתים	Κίτιοι	Cetthim	Onq: כתים
Num. 24:24	כתים	Κιτιαίων	de Italia	Onq: מרומא <sup>10</sup>
Judg. 1:26	החתים	Χεττιυ, Α Χεττιυμ	Etthim	חתאי
I Chron. 1:7	כתים	Κίτιοι	Cetthim	אטליון
Ezek. 27:6	כתיים/כתיים	Χεττιυ	de insulis Italiae	Jon: אפוליא <sup>11</sup>
Isa. 23:1	כתים	Κιτιαίων	Cetthim	Jon: כיתאי
Isa. 23:12	כתיים/כתיים	Κιτιείς	in Cetthim	Jon: לכתיים
Jer. 2:10	כתים	Χεττιυμ	Cetthim	Jon: כיתאד
Dan. 11:30	כתים	Ῥωμαῖοι, θ Κίτιοι	Romani	—
I Macc. 1:1	—	Χεττιυμ	Cetthim	—
I Macc. 8:5	—	Κιτιέων	Citiorum	—

Figure 1: ‘Kittim’ in the Bible and Aramaic Targumim

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 309. This meaning of ‘Yavan’ extends directly from the base meaning designating the Ionian Greeks of Asia Minor. A similar sense of Yavan designating the Seleucid Empire can be found in Dan. 8:21; 10:20; 11:2; Zech. 9:13. In each passage the LXX translates יון by Ἕλληνες. Cf. *BDB*, 402.

<sup>9</sup> Neofiti identifies the Kittim with Italy in Gen. 10:4 and Num. 24:24. In the former the four sons of Japheth are identified as the provinces Hellas, Tarsis, Italy and Dardania respectively. Cf. M. McNamara, *Targum and Testament – Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament* (Shannon: Irish University Press, 1972), 196, on ‘Italy’.

<sup>10</sup> Pseudo-Jonathan: Num. 24:24: “Now expeditions shall be summoned with implements of war and shall come out with great numbers from Lombarnia and from the land of Italy and be joined by legions who shall come out of Rome and Constantinople.” *The Aramaic Bible*, 4 – Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Numbers, Translated, with Notes by Ernest G. Clarke (T. & T. Clark: Edinburgh, 1995)

<sup>11</sup> Apulia was a province in South East Italy.

In the Biblical evidence, then it is certainly the case that the Kittim derive from an understanding of the Kitians in southern Cyprus. That region becomes renowned in shipbuilding and consequently the Kittim achieve fame as a naval power. The identification of Kittim as one of the sons of Yavan in Gen. 10 first suggests that the term is associated with the peoples of the Eastern Mediterranean more generally, and once קִיִּים (LXX Ἑλλάς) is used to refer to the Seleucid Empire established by Alexander, while 'Kittim' is used for the Greek peninsula. This is concordant with the loose meaning of Kittim in the Hebrew Bible, especially Num. 24. Nevertheless, although there is biblical evidence for the understanding of Kittim as 'Greeks', it is not possible to say for certain whether biblical writers also associated the Kittim with the Romans. Where this might have been the case (Dan. 11:30) is, on our reading, obscure. Although we agree with Collins that the incident here described refers to the prompt arrival and actions of Popilius Laenas during Antiochus's second campaign in Egypt, it is, nevertheless, not possible to identify the reference to Kittim here as necessarily referring to the Romans themselves. A careful rereading of Livy reveals that the Roman ships came from Delos and only indirectly from Rome herself. Thus given the biblical usage of Kittim as representing Greece/the Greek islands, this interpretation is preferable to that normally held, especially given the Numbers reading 'ships from Kittim' as opposed to the simple genitive construction 'ships of Kittim'. Nevertheless, while Daniel may still have intended the customary meaning of Kittim, it is clear that by the time of the compilation of the versions this is no longer the case. Where the translator of these documents makes an interpolation of Kittim in a particular context and does not simply transliterate, invariably this interpolation points toward Rome and Italy, and may have arisen out of confusion over the correct reading of the Kittim in Daniel 11.

### 2.1.2 Pseudepigrapha

Jubilees refers to the Kittim on two occasions. First, as part of Isaac's curse on the Philistines (Jub. 24:27-29):

And Isaac knew on that day that under pressure he swore an oath to them to make peace with them. And Isaac cursed the Philistines on that day, and he said, 'Cursed be the Philistines for the day of wrath and anger from among all the nations. May the LORD make them as scorn and a curse and (the object of) wrath and anger at the hands of sinners, the nations, and in the hands of the Kittim. And whoever escapes from the sword of the enemy and from the Kittim, may the

righteous people uproot them from beneath the sky with judgment, because they will be enemies and foes to my sons in their generations upon the earth. (*Jub.* 24:27-29; Trans. O.S. Wintermute in Charlesworth, II, 104)

Wintermute points out that the cursing of the Philistines here is not part of the biblical tradition (where it would follow Gen. 26:33). Instead, both he and Charles agree that the account reflects the writer's own attitude towards the contemporary inhabitants of 'Philistia', while Charles associates the Kittim's vengeance on 'the Philistines' with Alexander's capture of Gaza (*Ant.* XI, viii, 4 §325).<sup>12</sup> An important aspect to be inferred from the passage is the Kittim's function here as *God's chosen instrument of justice*. Although this might derive from the depiction of the Kittim in Numbers as the fourth nation, this understanding was certainly not as explicit there as here. Meanwhile, in *Jub.* 37:10, the Kittim are mentioned as part of Esau's sons' army for the war against Jacob (also not found in Genesis). Here they feature alongside the Ammonites, Moabites, Edomites, Philistines and the Hurrians/Horites, i.e. Israel's traditional enemies:

And they sent to Aram and to Aduram, to their father's friend, and they hired from them one thousand fighting men, chosen warriors. And they came to them: from Moab and from the Ammonites, those who were hired, one thousand chosen men, and from Philistia one thousand chosen fighting men, and from Edom and from the Hurrians one thousand chosen fighting men, and from the Kittim strong men, warriors. (*Jub.* 37:9-10)<sup>13</sup>

As Yadin states: "This description, as it has reached us in its latest form, is of special interest as it describes also the war of the Sons of Jacob (=Light) against Esau (=Darkness) and the enemies described in DSW."<sup>14</sup> If Yadin is right, then Jubilees introduces a new aspect; namely *the Kittim as Israel's enemies*. This interpretation

---

<sup>12</sup> Cf. O.S. Wintermute "Jubilees," in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, II (Doubleday: London, 1983), 104, f; Charles, *Jubilees*, 155.

<sup>13</sup> This passage presents problems. The Kittim are missing from the parallel list in 37:6, while, the mathematics in 37:14-15 (the 4,000 men) does not add up. Mention of the Kittim in 37:9-10 may then be a later insertion. Charles notes a further problem: "The [Ethiopic text] might also be rendered "Hittites" but the context is against this meaning in xxiv. 28" (*Jubilees*, 216).

<sup>14</sup> DSW = 1QM. Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* (Oxford: University Press, 1962), 24. Yadin relies on Genesis Rabba 2:3: "And God called the light Day – that is Jacob; and the darkness He called Night – that is Esau." Cf. 1QM I:1-2 where a similar list of enemies (omitting only the Hurrians) is found. See further below, p33.

would fit the general context of Jub. 37-38, which has often been referred to Judas Maccabaeus's campaigns against his neighbours in 163 BC.<sup>15</sup>

The Kittim in Jubilees, then, are best identified as Seleucids or their Greek mercenaries<sup>16</sup> (cf. II Macc. 13:2), and not the Romans as found in the LXX and Vulgate and perhaps Heb. Daniel 11. Where this transformation of the Kittim to Israel's enemies originates is, however, unclear.

Some commentators have found a reference to the Kittim in TestSimeon 6:3: "Then shall perish the seed of Canaan, and a remnant shall not be unto Amalek, and all the Cappadocians shall perish, and all the Kittim (οἱ Χερταίοι) shall be utterly destroyed" (Yadin).<sup>17</sup> This would, given the reference in the passage to 'Amalek', suggest a further link with Deut. 24:21-24. Nevertheless, the LXX term used is the normal reading for 'Hittite' in the Hebrew Bible (חִיטִּי; Cf. Gen. 10:15; 15:20; 23:10 etc.), thus there is no reason to translate the term by 'Kittim' here and I follow those translators who read 'Hittite' for this passage.<sup>18</sup>

### 2.1.3 Josephus

Finally, Josephus refers to the Kittim in his *Antiquities*:

Of the three sons of Javan also, the son of Japhet, Elisa gave name to the Eliscans...Tharsus to the Tharsians...Cethimos possessed the island Cethima (Χέθιμος δε Χέθιμα τὴν νῆσον ἔσχε); it is now called Cyprus: and from that it is that all islands, and the greatest part of the seacoasts, are named Cethim (Χεθίμ) by the Hebrew; and one city there is in Cyprus that has been able to preserve its domination; it is called Citius (Κίτιον) by those who use the language of the Greeks, and has not, by the use of that dialect, escaped the name of Cethim (Χεθίμου). (*Ant.* I, vi, 1 §126-128)

<sup>15</sup> See J.C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), 236-37; Russell Gmirkin, "Historical Allusions in the War Scroll," *DSD* 5:2 (1998), 172-214, 189f.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Charles, *op. cit.*, 216.

<sup>17</sup> And more recently Hanan Eshel ("The Kittim in the War Scroll and in the Pesharim," in *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 27-31 January 1999*, ed. A. Pinnick D. Goodblatt, & D.R. Schwartz [E.J. Brill: Leiden, forthcoming], 29-44).

<sup>18</sup> So Charles, *Pseudepigrapha*; H.C. Kee, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, I; A. Hultgård, *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douzes Patriarches, II: Composition de l'ouvrage textes et traductions*, Acta Universitatis Upsalensis, *Historia Religionum*, 7 (Uppsala, 1982), 242 & 273.

Josephus, then, supports the biblical evidence that Kittim is a descendant of Japheth and Yavan, and that the name is associated with Kition in Cyprus. More importantly, he also emphasises the connection of the Kittim with the coastlines, also inherent in the Hebrew Bible, but curiously does not tie down identification of the Kittim to any one nation. Clearly Josephus is aware of the understanding of ‘Kittim’ as representing Greeks and the Greek islands, but by not specifying this, he opens up the identification of the Kittim to other seafaring nations. Josephus might, then, reflect the identity of the Kittim in the LXX etc. and perhaps Daniel, as Romans; alternatively, he might be aware of a much wider usage of the term in traditions not passed down to us, which identifies the Kittim with a number of other seafaring nations, not just the Greeks and Romans.

#### 2.1.4 The Dead Sea Scrolls

Aside from the pesharim, the Kittim are referred to in several other texts: 4Q322 where two fragmentary references relate the ‘[Kit]tim killed’; 4Q247 which refers to the ‘kin[g] of the Kittim’; two fragmentary references in 4Q285 frs. 5 & 6<sup>19</sup>; and the War Scroll (1QM).<sup>20</sup> Here, the Kittim play a major role in the eschatological war as one of the principal enemies of the sect.<sup>21</sup> They are referred to on several occasions, although the majority of these references fall in cols. I-II and XVI-XVIII. Most interesting of all, however, is the apparent distinction between ‘Kittim of Asshur’ (כתיי אשור) and ‘the Kittim in Egypt’ (הכתיים במצרים) in I:1-2, 4 respectively.

The first engagement of the Sons of Light *shall be* to attack the lot of the Sons of Darkness, the army of Belial, the troop of Edom and Moab, and the sons of Ammon and the army [of the dwellers of] Philistia and the troops of the Kittim of Asshur, and in league with them the offenders against the covenant. The sons of Levi, the sons of Judah, and the sons of Benjamin, the exiles of the wilderness, they shall fight against them with [...], yea, against all their troops, when the exiles of the Sons of Light return from the Wilderness of the Nations to encamp in the Wilderness of Jerusalem. After the battle they shall go up thence against [all the troops of] the Kittim in Egypt. In His appointed time He shall go

<sup>19</sup> See further below, p71.

<sup>20</sup> The two fragmentary references to the ‘heroes of the Kit[t]im’ and ‘slain of [the Kittim]’ in 4Q492 1 I:9,12 equate to 1QM col. XIX:10,13.

<sup>21</sup> Although some recent scholars hold that the War Scroll is non-Qumranic (A. Lange, H. Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, Band XXVIII [de Gruyter: Berlin, 1997], 45-79, esp. 60-62) this has still to be proved. Meanwhile, the inclusion of ‘stock Qumran phrases’ such as ‘Sons of Light’ ‘the congregation’ etc. dictate that the material be treated as Qumranic.

forth with great wrath to fight against the kings of the north, and His anger *shall be such as* to destroy utterly and to cut off the horn of [Belial].

That shall be] a time of deliverance for the People of God,  
an appointed time of dominion for all men of His lot,  
and eternal annihilation for all the lot of Belial.

There shall be [great] panic [amongst] the sons of Japheth,  
Asshur shall fall, and none shall help him,  
and the dominion of the Kittim shall depart,  
so that wickedness be subdued without a remnant,  
and none shall escape of [all Sons of] Darkness.

(1QM I:1-7; Yadin)<sup>22</sup>

Interpretatively, this passage is of enormous interest. The section bears several similarities to both Jub. 37-38 and especially Dan. 11-12. Indeed, Beale notes that in 1QM “references from Daniel 11-12 compose over fifty percent of the O.T. allusions found” and that “[t]his should indicate that the author had in mind the context of Daniel 11:30-12:3 and that it is this context which provides the unifying basis for the whole of IQM 1.”<sup>23</sup> In particular, the passage equates to Dan. 11:40-45 and Jubilees 37:9-10 (above, p31), with its depiction of Edom, Moab and the Ammonites. Meanwhile, the reference to the ‘kings of the North’ picks up the war between the Kings of the South and North, the Ptolemies and the Seleucids, in Daniel 11:5-19, while the ‘horn of [Belial]’ may again allude to the Seleucid rulers.<sup>24</sup> In attempting to identify the Kittim of 1QM, then, a Seleucid reference better fits the overall context of this section of both this scroll and its supporting texts in Daniel (above) and Jubilees.

The juxtaposition of ‘Kittim of Asshur’ and ‘Kittim in Egypt’ is more complicated. Driver’s distinction of the ‘Kittim of Asshur’ as the Romans under Vespasian and the ‘Kittim in Egypt’ as the forces under Titus should be ruled out for the late dating of the scroll required,<sup>25</sup> and by extension for the lack of supporting evidence identifying

<sup>22</sup> H.H. Rowley, (*The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952, 66, n. 1) notes a possible parallel between this passage and Psalm 83:6-8 which has a similar list but includes Assyria (=Kittim of Asshur?).

<sup>23</sup> G.K. Beale, *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1984), 60f.

<sup>24</sup> Dan. 8 which again narrates the Hellenistic period beginning with Alexander depicts a great horn (Alexander) which, when broken, is broken into ‘four prominent horns’ (his four generals, Ptolemy, Seleucus, Lysimachus and Cassander; 8:8, 21-22). In Dan. 8:9-12, ‘another horn, a little one’ appears, who grew exceedingly great towards the south, will act arrogantly against the prince of the host, took the regular burnt offering away from him, and overthrew the sanctuary. For obvious reasons this ‘horn’ is identified with Antiochus Epiphanes.

<sup>25</sup> G.R. Driver, *The Judaean Scrolls: The Problem and a Solution* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1965), 203f.



the Kittim as Romans. Meanwhile, attempts to identify the two groups with the Seleucids and the Ptolemies respectively fail to take seriously the particle כּ in the expression הַכְּתִיִּים בְּמִצְרַיִם. Should this refer to the Egyptian Ptolemies (as opposed to the Seleucid Kittim of Asshur) as Dupont-Sommer proposes,<sup>26</sup> we might reasonably expect a construct relationship כְּתִיִּי מִצְרַיִם paralleling כְּתִיִּי אֲשׁוּר. In fact, Driver was partly correct. The כּ can reasonably imply only one meaning given the context: a separate force of Kittim from Asshur/Seleucid Assyria<sup>27</sup> in Egypt, *perhaps on campaign there*.

This understanding receives renewed impetus by the recent publication of two articles by Russell Gmirkin, which attempt to date the War Scroll to the second century BC.<sup>28</sup> The picture in 1QM, he suggests, “should be understood against the highly charged historical background of the Maccabean crisis.”<sup>29</sup> In particular, he dates the events described to the campaigns of Judas Maccabaeus against his neighbours in 163 BC, similarly linking the 1QM account with Jub. 37. The Kittim are identified as the Seleucid forces of Lysias and Antiochus V. Specifically, the Kittim of Asshur are the Seleucid garrison in the Acra in Jerusalem, whom Judas Maccabaeus besieged following his return from the Transjordan, while ‘the Kittim in Egypt’ anticipates a Seleucid invasion of Egypt – which following the *schema* of Daniel 11:40-45 would be followed by a campaign in Judaea.<sup>30</sup> Although such a campaign never took place, “in the eschatological battle pictured in Daniel and the War Scroll we are dealing with fears rather than historical realities.”<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey*, Trans. E. Margaret Rowley (Oxford: Blackwell, 1952), 79-80.

<sup>27</sup> Although I take the reference in 1QM to mean Seleucid Greeks, reference here to Asshur is out of place, and thus most scholars simply read ‘Syria’. This, though, overlooks the deliberate parallel drawn with Num. 24:24 (“ships shall come from Kittim and shall afflict Asshur and Eber”). A reference to Kittim of Asshur suggests that the conquest of that area described in Numbers 24 has already taken place and that Asshur/Syria has become a base of operations. This exactly fits the situation following Alexander’s campaigns and the division of his empire.

<sup>28</sup> Russell Gmirkin, “The War Scroll and Roman Weaponry Reconsidered,” *DSD* 3 (1996), 89-129; “Historical Allusions.”

<sup>29</sup> Gmirkin, “Historical Allusions,” 172.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 190f.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 198.

## Conclusions

Of the references to the Kittim in non-pesher literature a dominant feature is the application of the term to the Greeks, and by extension also to the Seleucid Greeks. This recalls the base meaning of the term to a Greek community on Cyprus, which is extended to encompass the entire Hellenistic Eastern Mediterranean. Initially, 'Kittim' is itself viewed as a geographical location, i.e. 'coasts of Kittim', rather than as the people themselves, the 'Kitions', but gradually this latter feature becomes more organised to the extent that the two are often indistinguishable. Where a reference to a historical people is explicit – Jubilees, 1QM – invariably these references are to the (Seleucid) Greeks. As we have seen, in I Maccabees, Kittim is used to distinguish the Greek peninsula from Yavan/Hellas, which denotes the Seleucid Empire more generally. Nevertheless, this distinction is not always maintained and may be accounted for by the connection between Kittim and Asshur prevalent in Numbers 24, essential to Daniel, Jubilees, and 1QM. This study has not uncovered any explicit evidence to link the Kittim with the Romans in either the Hebrew Bible, or any Hebrew literature more generally. Instead, this understanding is restricted to the LXX, Vulgate and the Aramaic Targumim. The association of the Kittim with the Romans derives from an assumption made of the Hebrew text of Daniel 11:30. The LXX omits the entire phrase 'ships of Kittim' and replaces it with 'Romans have issued forth' or equivalent, which approaches the more general reference in the Hebrew text, and it is from the LXX of this passage that the understanding of the Kittim = Romans derives, not the Hebrew Bible itself. Nevertheless, it is certainly true that the identification of the Kittim with the Romans and Italy dominates the LXX and Vulgate versions. Both identifications match the picture of the Kittim painted in these references; a naval power in their beginning, and later a military force, occasionally empowered to aid Judah, and occasionally her enemies. Whether the pesherist continues the heavy Greek identity or rather follows the LXX translator will now be our task to uncover.

### ***2.2 The 'Kittim' in the Qumran Pesherim***

References to the Kittim are found in the following texts: 1QpHab, 1QpPs, 4QpIsa<sup>a</sup> and 4QpNah, though predominantly in the Habakkuk pesher.

### 2.2.1 1QpHabakkuk

In the Habakkuk peshet, the Kittim play a dominant role. They are first mentioned in col. II, through their association with the Chaldeans (Hab. 1:6a, below), and continue in that mould until the end of col. IV. In column V they are referred to again, while they reappear in cols. VI and IX.

כִּי־אֶנֶּה מִקְיָם אֶת־הַכַּשְׂדָּיִם הַגּוֹי הַמֵּר [וְהַנְּמָה־הָרָה]

[“F]or behold I am raising the Chaldeans, that bit[ter and hast]y nation. (Hab. 1:6a; 1QpHab II:10-11)

פִּשְׁרוֹ עַל־הַכַּתִּימָיִם אֲשֶׁר־הֵמָּה קָלִים וְגִבּוֹרִים	12
בְּמַלְחָמָה לְאֹבֵד רַב־בָּנִים [בְּחָרֵב ] בְּמַמְשַׁלְתָּ	13
הַכַּתִּימָיִם יִרְשָׁנוּ אֲרָצוֹת רַבּוֹת וְלֹא יֵאֱמִינוּ	14
[ בְּחֻקֵּי אֱלֹהִים ] . [ ]	15
עַל־	16

<sup>12</sup> Its interpretation concerns the Kittim w[ho ar]e swift and mighty <sup>13</sup> in war to destroy m[an]y<sup>32</sup> [by the sword ...] Under the dominion of <sup>14</sup> the Kittim m[any lands] will be disposses[sed] and (men) will not be faithful to <sup>15</sup> the statutes of [Go]d [...] . [...] <sup>16</sup> concerning [...] (1QpHab II:12-16)

In this first passage the peshet identifies ‘the Kittim’ (הַכַּתִּימָיִם i.e. with an aleph) with the Chaldeans/Kasdaim of the original prophecy. At various times, these Chaldeans have been identified with Persians, Seleucid Greeks, a mythological demonic power sent as punishment by Yahweh, and as an unidentified conquering nation.<sup>33</sup> Nevertheless, Fohrer himself is almost certainly right in identifying the Chaldeans of Habakkuk with the founders of the Neo-Babylonian Empire (c. 626 BC).<sup>34</sup> This matches the rapid rise of the Babylonians from being scarcely known to exist to conquering Assyria (614), Nineveh (612), Harran (610) and the armies of Pharaoh Neco in 605.<sup>35</sup> The prophet could with some justification suggest that this

<sup>32</sup> This reading is disputed. Brownlee has [רַב־בָּנִים] [וענוגים] ‘s[of]t [and dainty]’; Habermann [וְהַטְּאִים] [רַב־בָּנִים] ‘e[vi]l [and sinners]’; Elliger [רַב־בָּנִים וְלִכְנִיעֵם] ‘(to destroy) r[uler]s [and subject them]’; my own reading follows Horgan though she adds [וְכַרְעָב] ‘[and famine]’ in the light of 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 1-10 II:1 (‘they will perish by the sword, *by famine*, and by plague’), since רַבִּים best fits the space available.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. G. Fohrer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Slough: SPCK, 1968), 454-455.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 454.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. O. Palmer Robertson, *The Books of Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah* (NICOTS: Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1990), 148f.

sudden rise to prominence was a part of God's plan to take vengeance on Israel's enemies. The Chaldeans/Babylonians form his chosen instrument of judgement.

This background matches what the pesherist says of the Kittim in this section of the interpretation. So they are "swift and mighty in war" (II:12-13; understanding [הגורי המ]ר והנמהר<sup>36</sup>) and in the time of their dominion "many lands will be (dis)possessed" (II:13-14) though this restoration is disputed.<sup>37</sup> The reference to men who "will not be faithful to the statutes of [Go]d" (ל[א]ל ולוא יאמינו בחוקי [א]ל) (ll. 14-15) seems to refer back to "the trai[tors to] the new [covenant] f[or] they were [no]t faithful to the covenant of God" in lines 3-4 (on Hab. 1:5). These may also be the same as the "viol[at]ors of the coven[ant] who will not believe" (l. 6).<sup>38</sup> Certainly the terminology involved indicates a relationship. According to the logic of the original prophecy, then, the Kittim will be brought by God to bring the downfall of these people. It may be stretching the extant Hebrew, though, to force a translation similar to "men *who* will not be faithful to the statutes of God [will be dispossessed/cut off]" – i.e. by the Kittim – lines 14-15.

[ההולך למרחבי ארץ] לרשת משכנות לוא לו

["who march through the wide places of the land to possess dwellings not their own."] (Hab. 1:6b; 1QpHab II:16-17)

[פשרו על הכתיאים אשר בעמק]	17
ובמישור ילכו לכות ולבוז את ערי הארץ	1
כיא הוא אשר אמר לרשת משכנות לוא לו	2

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Lou H. Silberman, "Unriddling the Riddle: A Study in the Structure and Language of the Habakkuk Pesher (1QpHab)," *RevQ* 3 (1961-62), 323-64, 336f. Silberman suggests that the commentator has derived מר not from מרר 'bitter' but מר 'lord, master' from מרא II 'be fat, strong' (Jastrow) hence וגבורים in the pesher. Accordingly, he suggests, the commentator understood Hab. 1:6a as: "For behold, I raise up the Chaldeans, the *mighty* and swift nation."

<sup>37</sup> Brownlee has: בממשלת הכתיאים ירש[יעו] מדברי הברי[ת] ולוא יאמינו בחוקי [א]ל: "Under the dominion of the Kittim, men will turn wick[edly] away from the provisions of the covenan[t] and not be faithful to the ordinances of God." Meanwhile, Horgan suggests: 'the wick[ed ones will betray the covenan]t' (ורש[עים יבגרו בברי[ת]), though my own translation follows Elliger, which, while perhaps a little short (so Horgan, 61), better fits the context of this section of the pesher, given that the Kittim are referred to in the next interpretation.

<sup>38</sup> Though contrast Dupont-Sommer's three types of traitors ("Le 'Commentaire d'Habacuc' découvert près de la Mer Morte," *RHR* 137 [1950], 153, §7). Cf. Brownlee, 54; Silberman, *op. cit.*, 336.

[Its interpretation concerns the Kittim who through vale] <sup>1</sup> and through plain will march, to smite and to plunder the cities of the land. <sup>2</sup> For that is what he said: “to possess dwellings not their own.” (1QpHab II:17-III:2)

Although the first part of the section is entirely reconstructed, this is almost certainly largely correct, at least in general terms. The Kittim, here, are themselves reconstructed (II:17), but inasmuch as the interpretation continues the sense of the previous section (and that the prophet is himself speaking of the Chaldeans), it is safe to assume that the pesherist is still speaking of them.

The ‘wide places of the land’ (למרחבי ארץ) in the prophecy are interpreted with reference to ‘[vale]’ (בַּעֲמָק) and ‘plain’ (ובמישור), while ‘the cities of the land’ (ערי הארץ) refer to the ‘dwellings’ (משכנות) of Hab. 1:6b. Brownlee’s reconstruction of בַּעֲמָק (II:17) relies on the parallelism between עֲמָק and מִישׁוֹר in Jer. 21:13; 48:8, but requires a meaning ‘plain’ for מִישׁוֹר rather than ‘uprightness’ as elsewhere (e.g. Ps. 45:7).<sup>39</sup> The application of the prophecy to ‘vales’ and ‘plains’, Brownlee suggests, envisions the march of a large army, for whom easier approaches are necessary. If any historical march is here being referred to, though, the generality of the interpretation does not allow us to identify it specifically. During this march the ‘cities of the earth’ will be smitten and plundered (understanding לְרֶשֶׁת of Hab. 1:6b), though again, the interpretation is too imprecise for our purposes.

איום ונורא הוא ממנו משפטו ושאתו יצא

“They are more dreadful and fearsome than they. Their judgement and their guile will go forth.” (Hab. 1:7; 1QpHab III:2-3)

פִּשְׁרוֹ עַל הַכְּתִיבִים אֲשֶׁר פָּחַדְם וְ[אֲמַנְתָּ] עַל כּוֹל	4
הַגּוֹאִים וּבַעֲצָה כּוֹל מַחֲשַׁבְתָּם לְהַרְעֵם וּבְנֹכַל וּמְרָמָה	5
יִלְכוּ עִם כּוֹל הָעַמִּים	6

<sup>4</sup> Its interpretation concerns the Kittim who (will be) objects of dread and [ter]r[or] for all <sup>5</sup> the nations. And in counsel all their thoughts will be to commit evil. And [with dec]eit and treachery <sup>6</sup> they will conduct (themselves) with all the peoples. (1QpHab III:4-6)

<sup>39</sup> Brownlee, 64.

In this next section the dreadful aspect of the Kittim is enlarged upon, פחדם and איום ונורא<sup>40</sup> translating the prophet's איום and ונורא respectively. There is though here a matter of translational importance in the original prophecy, which seems to have affected the way in which the pesherist understands this verse; namely the meaning of ממנו in context:

אִיּוֹם וְנוֹרָא הוּא מִמֶּנּוּ מִשְׁפָּטוֹ וְשִׂאתוֹ יֵצֵא:

Dread and fearsome are they; their justice and dignity proceed *from themselves*.  
(Hab. 1:7)

Here, the NRSV translator relates ממנו to the second part of the verse 'from themselves'. Most translators of the pesher adopt this reading at this point. So, for example:

Brownlee	Dreadful and fearsome are they; their judgement and their guile will go out <i>from them</i> .
García-Martínez	It is dreadful and terrible; his judgement and his exaltation arise <i>from himself</i> .
Horgan	Fearful and terrible are they. A claim to dignity goes out <i>from them</i> .

As reflecting the pesherist's interpretation, though, this translation seems not to be picked up on. We might for instance expect the pesherist, on this understanding, to emphasise how the Kittim ultimately govern themselves, for this is surely the meaning of 'their justice and dignity proceed from themselves.' However, this meaning does not reflect the context of Hab. 1, which depicts the Chaldeans as God's instrument of judgement. Far from being self-governing, they have the highest authority! Instead, if we examine the text in the light of its interpretation, it seems that the pesherist has interpreted ממנו with regard to 'for all the nations' (III:4-4a) thus suggesting that he has taken ממנו with the first part of the verse, i.e. איום ונורא הוא ממנו.

ממנו, then, can be understood in a variety of forms. The ending (on the preposition מן) can either be understood as a 3<sup>rd</sup> sing. masc. sf. 'from him'; or as a 1<sup>st</sup> pl. sf. 'from us'. It may even be possible to read the form in the pesher as ממני 'from me', i.e. the 1<sup>st</sup>

<sup>40</sup> Following IV:7 which omits the yod.

sing. sf. ending (in Qumran Hebrew ו and י are often indistinguishable). If we refer this back to Hab. 1:7 and link ממנו there with הוּא וְנֹרֵא הוּא then ממנו here seems to be a *Min of Comparison*; so, ‘he is more dreadful and fearsome than he/we/I’ respectively. In the latter two, the interpretation seems to indicate that the Kittim are chosen as God’s instrument precisely because they are more terrible ‘than we/I’ (presumably the community). If we bring in the reference to ‘the nations’ (III:4a) a meaning ‘the Kittim are more dreadful than *they/the nations*’ emerges. While this would normally require the 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. masc. suffix form מהם, given that the pesherist interprets the singular form הוּא with reference to the plural הכתִּיִּים it is also acceptable to translate the masc. sg. suffix form ממנו as a plural. This, then, is how we have translated the text above.<sup>41</sup>

The second half of Hab. 1:7 is interpreted with reference to the Kittim’s cunning and treachery in respect of their dealings with the peoples. First, however, the pesherist suggests that ‘in counsel all their thoughts will be to commit evil’ (ובעצה כול) (מחשבתם להרע; l. 5), seemingly as interpretation of משפטו – since as Brownlee points out in 1QS עצה and משפט are presented as synonyms (VI:22-23),<sup>42</sup> though the connection between the prophecy and interpretation here is unclear. The statement itself appears to derive from Prov. 24:8 where מחשב להרע is found:

מחשב להרע לו בעל-מזמות יקראו:

*Whoever plans to do evil will be called a mischief-maker.*

Again, though, it is unclear why an allusion to Proverbs 24 here is required. One suggestion may have to do with the reference to ‘the Scoffer’ (ליץ) in the verse immediately following (24:9): however, there is no indication in any of the other pesharim of a link between the Scoffer and the Kittim.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>41</sup> Contrast Silberman (*op. cit.*, 337f.) who introduces *Tanhuma Tazria* § 10 which refers איום הוּא וְנֹרֵא to Adam and משפטו to Eve “who proceeded *from* Adam יצא ... ממנו and was the instrument of his judgement” (338, his italics), thus clearly splitting up the verse. Silberman relates ממנו משפטו ושאתו יצא to the nations’ attack by the Kittim. Unfortunately, this overlooks the reference in the pesher to הוּא הוּא which appears to correspond to ממנו, thus placing ממנו with the first half of the verse.

<sup>42</sup> Brownlee, 67.

<sup>43</sup> On the ‘Scoffer’ in the Scrolls, see below, ch. 5.

The final part of this passage reads: ‘And [with dec]eit and treachery they will conduct (themselves) with all the peoples’ and interprets Hab. 1:7b ‘and their guile will go forth’ (ושאחו יצא). Although the MT is normally translated ‘dignity’ (from נשא), Brownlee correctly suggests that the pesherist understands נשא ‘beguile, deceive’.<sup>44</sup> Whether this is a valid translation of the MT or whether the pesherist has deliberately twisted the sense is unclear, however. נכל is not found elsewhere in the scrolls, while מרמה is discussed below in connection with ‘those who misdirect Ephraim’ (4QpNah 3-4 II:8; though a link between the two is unlikely).<sup>45</sup>

וקול מנמרים סוסו וחדו מזאבי ערב <vacat> פשו ופרשו  
פרשו מרחוק יעופו כנשר חש לאכול כולו לחמם יבוא  
מגמת פני הם קדים

“Their horses are swifter than leopards and keener than wolves in the evening. <Blank><sup>46</sup> Their steeds trample, their horsemen from afar like an eagle fly (acting) quickly to devour all of it. For violence do they come. The assembling of their faces is to the East.” (Hab. 1:8-9b; 1QpHab III:6-9)

פ[שר]ו על הכתיאים אשר	9
ידושו את הארץ בסוסניהם ובבהמתם ומרחק	10
יבואו מאיי הים לאכול [את] כול העמים כנשר	11
X ואין שבעה ובחמה יב[מרו וב]חרן אף וזעף	12
אפים ידברו עם כול [העמים כי]א הוא אשר	13
אמר מגמת פניהם קדים [...]	14

Its in[terpretation] concerns the Kittim who <sup>10</sup> will thresh the land with [their] horse[s] and with their beasts. And from afar <sup>11</sup> will they come, from the shores of the sea to devour all the peoples like an eagle. <sup>12</sup> Yet there is no sating. With wrath they will s[ubdue them and] (with) bursts of [an]ger and a vexing of <sup>13</sup> (their) faces shall they speak with all [the peoples fo]r that is what <sup>14</sup> he said, “(the) assem[bling of their faces is to the East.]” (1QpHab III:9-14)

The next stage of the prophecy (Hab 1:8-9) continues the developing picture of the Chaldeans and here further emphasises their military might through the reference to their cavalry. This recurs in the interpretation. So ‘the Kittim will thresh the land with their hor[ses] and with their beasts’ (II. 9-10). Several scholars have suggested that the

<sup>44</sup> Brownlee, 67.

<sup>45</sup> See below, p100ff.

<sup>46</sup> The space in the pesher (line 7) can almost certainly be explained by פשו immediately following which the copyist doubtless mistook for פשר and the beginning of the interpretation. This is one of the stronger pieces of evidence for 1QpHab being a copy.



reference to ‘beasts’ here (which appears to interpret both ‘leopards’ and ‘wolves’) applies to the Seleucid war-elephants referred to in 1 Maccabees (6:35, 43; 11:56 – θηρία = Hebrew בהמה?).<sup>47</sup> Since the Romans are known not to have used elephants in battle, the reference here is therefore applied to the Seleucids who did. Nevertheless, Brooke has termed this “a classic case of [the] historian’s abuse of the text.”<sup>48</sup> Were a reference to ‘elephants’ here suggested the term would be בהמות rather than the collective singular, he adds. Moreover, he continues, “when בהמות does occur in Hab. 2:17, it is interpreted in 1QpHab XII:4 as ‘the simple of Judah who keep the Law’, and as far as I know, nobody has tried to suggest that they were elephants!”<sup>49</sup> The relevance of this final point is unclear, since it is precisely the point that בהמות does occur in the original prophecy in Hab 2:17 rather than (as here) within the body of the interpretation. Nevertheless, it is certainly the case that a reference to ‘elephants’ in the present context is unlikely. Rather, Brownlee is doubtless correct in applying the reference to ‘beasts of burden’.<sup>50</sup> If we imagine the path of an invading army with all its supply carts etc., the land behind would indeed appear ‘threshed’!

More interesting is the reference in the interpretation to ‘from afar will they come, from the shores of the sea to devour all [the] peoples like an eagle’ which interprets Hab. 1:8b. The ‘shores of the sea’ is a tacit reminder of the nature of the Kittim as ‘sea-peoples’ (2.1, above, and esp. in Josephus, p32), though Brownlee attempts to identify more precisely:

Such “shores” can be either islands or coastlands. The insertion of this phrase by way of identifying the conquering Kittim suits the Romans much better than the Seleucids – even though it may be argued that the coast of Syria would seem remote to ancient Palestinians.<sup>51</sup>

This seems to rather miss the point. If either Romans or Seleucids are intended as the Kittim, then either can be said to come ‘from the shores of the sea’ precisely because

---

<sup>47</sup> So E. Stauffer, “Zur Frühdatierung des Habakkukmidrasch,” *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 76 (1951), 671. B. Nitzan (*Pesher Habakkuk: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea (1QpHab)*, 160) has attempted to refer the text to the Romans. The elephants are not real. Rather they reflect what the pesherist thought of the Roman army.

<sup>48</sup> Brooke, “The Kittim in the Qumran Pesharim,” *Images of Empire* (JSOT Press: Sheffield, 1991)146.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, 146.

<sup>50</sup> Brownlee, 70.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 70.

of the root meaning of the term as ‘sea-peoples’. Meanwhile, the Roman identification resurfaces due to the reference to the ‘eagle’ (נשר<sup>52</sup>) here, given the prominence of the eagle in the Roman army. Again, though, this overlooks the fact that נשר also appears in the original prophecy and thus its place in the interpretation may be unremarkable. Added to this, the commentator at this juncture seems to have been inspired by Deut. 28:49<sup>53</sup> which depicts an eagle from far away, becoming in the pesher ‘from the shores of the sea’:

יִשָּׂא יְהוָה עֲלֶיךָ גּוֹי מִרְחֹק מִקְצֵה הָאָרֶץ כַּאֲשֶׁר יֵרְאֶה הַנֹּשֵׂר גּוֹי אֲשֶׁר  
לֹא־תִשְׁמַע לְשׁוֹנוֹ:

The LORD will bring a nation *from far away, from the end of the earth, to swoop down on you like an eagle*, a nation whose language you do not understand,

Finally, Brownlee himself notes occasions in both the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple literature where the eagle is used to designate nations other than Rome. Thus: Ezek. 17 presents both Nebuchadrezzar of Babylon and Pharaoh Psammetichus II as eagles (verse 3 and 7 respectively); in Daniel 7 (the vision of the four beasts) the first beast has the wings of an eagle (though the body of a lion) and is also identified with the Babylonians; while in I Enoch 90 the eagle represents the Macedonians prior to the Maccabean revolt.<sup>54</sup> However, the reference to an eagle as representing the Romans does not have the force that it will require in later periods, as the eagle is only adopted by the army during the imperial period.<sup>55</sup> 1QpHab ought probably to be dated to the first half of the first century BC.

The final aspect of the interpretation is somewhat more problematic, since the meaning of the prophecy itself is obscure. Hab. 1:9a reads:

כֹּלֵה לְחֶמֶס יָבוֹא מִגִּמְת פְּנִיָּהִם קְרִימָה

Translations are made problematic by the enigmatic מגמת. The NRSV translates here ‘pressing’ which seems to be quite a loose translation. BDB offer as a possible

<sup>52</sup> נשר can be either ‘eagle’ or ‘vulture’ (specifically ‘griffon-vulture’) depending on context. While the eagle is a predator, the vulture feeds on carrion. Thus for a context which depicts the Kittim as a conquering nation ‘eagle’ is a better translation.

<sup>53</sup> We shall see other occasions in the pesher where this chapter is apparently referred to.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. IV Ezra 11 where the multi-headed many-winged eagle is identified as the fourth beast in Daniel’s vision (v12) and is reinterpreted to refer to the Roman Empire.

<sup>55</sup> On the ‘eagle’ in the Republic period, see below, pp56ff; Hengel, *The Zealots*, 103, n. 145.

derivation גמא 'swallow' as in Job 39:24. Otherwise, Palmer-Robertson suggests 'assembling' or 'collection' probably derived from גמם 'to become abundant' in a construct Piel participle form.<sup>56</sup> The entire phrase is thus translated: 'the assembling of their faces is forward'. In the peshet, the problem becomes greater still. So MT קרימה becomes קרים. Meanwhile, פניהם because of the space between י and ה, is variously read פני הם (Rabinowitz) or פנו הם (Brownlee<sup>57</sup>). קרים may then mean 'East wind' as in the Targum (פרוח קדומא) and the Vulgate ('ventum'). This leads Brownlee to translate מגמא as 'mutterings' from a Rabbinic Aramaic root גמם. Hence his translation: 'the mutterings of their face are the East wind',<sup>58</sup> though it is difficult to see how this reflects the separation of פנו הם for which he argues (above) and which he reads in his reconstruction. His earlier translation 'as for the mutterings of his face they are the East Wind' seems to have been forgotten.<sup>59</sup> Nevertheless, this does correspond to understanding of the East wind depicting angry speech (Job 8:2; 15:2), and neatly corresponds with the interpretation: 'bursts of [an]ger and a vexing of (their) faces' (III:12-13<sup>60</sup>). Meanwhile, in the Hebrew Bible, the 'East wind' (קרים) is itself associated with God's avenging power (Isa. 27:8; Jer. 18:17; Hos. 13:15), and is used in Ezek 19:12; 27:26 as figuratively of Nebuchadnezzar, a Chaldean. Thus while the prophet, through his mention of the East wind here, seems to reinforce the imagery of the Chaldeans, the peshetist adapts the force of the prophecy in accordance with other images of angry speech. The reason for this change is unclear, but may be indicated by the final part of the interpretation: 'will they speak with [all the peoples]'

The imagery of the Kittim speaking to the peoples with 'bursts of [an]ger and a vexing of (their) faces' conjures up a picture of an invading people shouting at the inhabitants in a foreign language which they do not understand. The interpretation seems, then, to reinforce the 'otherness' of the Kittim. They will come from another land, from far away, and will speak in another, different, tongue.

<sup>56</sup> Robertson, *op. cit.*, 153-54. LXX ἀνθεστηκότας 'resisting' is scarcely any clearer.

<sup>57</sup> In the repetition in line 14, Brownlee instead reconstructs פניו הם, but offers no explanation for so doing.

<sup>58</sup> Brownlee, 68ff.

<sup>59</sup> Brownlee, "Biblical Interpretation," 63.

<sup>60</sup> Note the repetition of פ/ף here.

## [ויאסוף כח]ול שבי

[“And they will gather] captives like s[and.”] (Hab. 1:9c; 1QpHab III:14)

[	פשוו [על הכתיאם אשוו	15
[	]	16
[	]	17

<sup>15</sup> Its interpretation [concerns the Kittim who ...] <sup>16</sup> [ ... ] <sup>17</sup> [ ... ] (III:15-17)

This section of the peshar is almost entirely lost, though we can guess as to the broad content of the interpretation. The prophet is still speaking of the Chaldeans and it is reasonable to see the Kittim here as well. It is also likely that the subject matter of the prophecy is carried directly into the interpretation, namely, the taking of captives in large numbers. Beyond this, however, speculation is futile, since the taking of captives is so common in warmongering.

## [והוא במלכים] יקלם ורזנים משחק לו

[“And they at kings] scoff, and rulers are to them a laughing stock.”] (Hab. 1:10a; 1QpHab III:17-IV:1)

פשוו אשוו		1
ילעיגו על רבים ובזו על נכבדים במלכים		2
ושרים יתעתעו וקלסו בעם רב		3

Its interpretation is that <sup>2</sup> they will mock the great and have contempt for those revered. At kings <sup>3</sup> and princes will they cast derision and they will scoff at a large army. (1QpHab IV:1-3)

This section is interesting stylistically for the fact that the text appears to be interpreted twice. So ‘kings’ (מלכים) are understood both as ‘the great’ (רבים) and ‘kings’ (מלכים), while ‘rulers’ (רזנים) is interpreted ‘those revered’ (נכבדים) and ‘princes’ (שרים). Meanwhile, the final aspect of the interpretation (‘they will scoff at large armies’) seems not to be derived from the prophecy at all except in the general terms of vocabulary. Much of the commentary here relies on synonym in fact. So ‘scoff’ (יקלם for MT יתקלם) is understood by both ‘mock’ (ילעיגו) and ‘cast derision’ (יתעתעו), while ‘laughing stock’ (משחק) is taken as ‘contempt’ (ובזו) and

‘scoff’ (וקלסו). Brooke points to a parallel between the vocabulary used here and II Chron. 36:16<sup>61</sup>:

וַיְהִיו מְלַעְבִּים בְּמַלְאֲכֵי הָאֱלֹהִים וּבִזְיוֹם דְּבַרְיוֹ וּמִתְעַתְעִים בְּנִבְאָיו

But they kept *mocking* the messengers of God, *despising* his words, and *scoffing* at his prophets

As Brooke points out, לעב is a virtual synonym for the pesherist’s לענ; hence in this short section we have three of the four verbs found in 1QpHab (לעב/לענ, בזה, and תעע).<sup>62</sup> This is especially striking given that two of these terms are rare in Biblical Hebrew; לעב occurs only in II Chron. 36:16, while תעע is only otherwise found in Gen. 27:12. As Brooke further points out, the context of the passage is itself relevant. The extract comes at the end of the description of the depredations under Zedekiah (II Chron. 36:11-14) described as “evil in the sight of the LORD his God” (36:12). As punishment, the Chronicler notes, God brought up against them the King of the Chaldeans who killed young and old, male and female, and took away the treasures of both the temple *and the king and his officials* (וּשְׂרִירֵי; 36:18). In other words, within both the pesher and II Chronicles, the Kittim/Chaldeans form God’s chosen instrument of justice, except that in this instance the vocabulary used of Zedekiah’s people is here reapplied to the Kittim themselves.

The similarities with Chronicles seem to account for the reference to ‘kings and princes’ (IV:2-3) in the prophecy, but the rationale for the other terms is less clear. Horgan<sup>63</sup> points out that הרבים (‘the Many’) is used frequently in the Scrolls to designate a particular group within the sect (so 1QS VI:1, 7, 8, 9 etc.), but our passage does not appear to refer to the sect. Meanwhile, Brooke notes how רבים is found earlier in 1QpHab II:13: “Its interpretation concerns the Kittim w[ho are] swift and mighty in war *to destroy m[an]y [by the sword ...]*” ([... לבחרב].). Nevertheless, as we have seen the reading there is disputed (above, n32).

<sup>61</sup> Brooke, “Kittim,” 147f.

<sup>62</sup> Only קלס is absent, but this word derives from Habakkuk itself in any case.

<sup>63</sup> Horgan, 30.

As regards נכבדים 'those revered', this title occurs in several other scrolls, including 4QpNah 3-4 II:9 discussed in the following chapter (below, p100f). Here, the נכבדים are part of the list to be led astray by the Seekers of Smooth Things. Elsewhere נכבדים is also found in 4Q400 and 4Q401 where the term is referred to an elite group of angels (ראשי ממשלות 'chiefs of realms'; 4Q401 14 I:6), and in particular reverence of them by human councils.<sup>64</sup> In 1QM, however, ולנכבדיהם is applied to members of the empire of Belial (1QM XIV:11), strangely in a context that also uses the בזה root.<sup>65</sup> The fact remains, however, that in the pesher the term is likely a more general reference to the Kittim's targets.

More interesting is the reference to עם רב which we have translated 'large armies' (i.e. a collective singular). Brooke suggests that רב here forms an *inclusio* with רבים and that the expression עם רב suggests a parallel with 11QT LVIII:6-7 in the 'Law of the King' which, he suggests, may have influenced other parts of the pesher.<sup>66</sup> Nevertheless, the context of these accounts is entirely different. In 11QT עם רב describes an invading nation. The pesher, by contrast, applies the term to those who defy the Kittim. 11QT does clarify, though, that עם should be translated 'army' rather than 'people' as with most commentators (Carmignac, Elliger, Horgan etc.). In this respect, I concur with Brownlee.<sup>67</sup> The identity of these armies is unfortunately unclear. Compare also the description of the army of the Kittim as עם רב in the next lemma.

והוא לכול מבצר ישחק ויצבור עפר וילכדהו

"And they will laugh at each fortress, and they will heap up dust, and take it."  
(Hab. 1:10b; 1QpHab IV:3-4)

פשרו על מושלי הכתיאים אשר יבזו על 5  
מבצרי העמים ובלעג ישחוקו עליהם 6

<sup>64</sup> Cf. Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *Angel Veneration and Christology: A Study in Early Judaism and in the Christology of the Apocalypse of John*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2 (Mohr-Siebeck: Tübingen, 1995), 157f.

<sup>65</sup> Brooke, "Kittim," 148.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, 148. Cf. G.J. Brooke, "History and Hermeneutics at Qumran," *Bulletin of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity*, 16:3 (1989), 9-11.

<sup>67</sup> Brownlee, 75.

7 ובעם רב יקיפום לתפושם ובאמה ופחד  
 8 ינתנו בידם וחרסום בעיין היושבים  
 9 בהם

<sup>5</sup> Its interpretation concerns the rulers of the Kittim who will hold in contempt <sup>6</sup> the fortresses of the peoples, and with mocking will they laugh at them. <sup>7</sup> And with a great army will they surround them to capture them. And with terror and dread <sup>8</sup> will they be given into their hands. And they will tear them down in ruins<sup>68</sup> (along with) those dwelling <sup>9</sup> in them. (1QpHab IV:5-9)

The next section of the prophecy continues this military aspect of the Chaldeans, who are again identified as the Kittim.

The interpretation neatly continues the sense of the previous interpretation. The biblical 'לשחק' 'laugh' (the same root as 'משחק' in 1:10a) is again interpreted by 'בזה' 'contempt', but also by 'לעג' 'mock', used to interpret 'קלם' in the previous section. Note also how the commentator reads 'ישחוקן' in the interpretation itself. The pesherist, indeed, sticks surprisingly close to the original prophecy. So 'מבצר' 'fortress' also appears in both the prophecy and its interpretation. Although the subject of the prophecy is again singular (הוא), in the interpretation this is referred to the 'מושלי הכתיאים' (IV:5). Although this phrase technically means 'rulers of the Kittim' several commentators have read the military context into their translations: hence Brownlee 'generals'; van der Ploeg 'les commandants'. Dupont-Sommer comments:

This expression...designates the Roman chiefs, the pro-magistrates *cum imperio* whom Rome sent into the provinces and who commanded the armies.<sup>69</sup>

Note the implication that these 'rulers' will be in charge at the same time, hence allowing the interpretation 'military rulers' to be brought into play. As with previous sections, though, there is no necessity to view a particular historical instance. Rather, the pesherist implies that this is a general trait of the Kittim, *and is characterised by*

---

<sup>68</sup> For line 8 I read 'בעיין' 'in ruins' following Brownlee ("The Jerusalem Habakkuk Scroll," *BASOR* 112 [1948], pp 11,17), Elliger and van der Ploeg among others. Brownlee has since read 'בעוון' 'because of the guilt' following Dupont-Sommer (Brownlee, 79). Horgan notes that the former is impossible in terms of context and syntax, but, while it is certainly the *lectio difficilior*, this reading better fits the context of the interpretation at this stage, particularly in the light of 'וחרסום' 'they will tear them down'.

<sup>69</sup> A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (Basil Blackwell: Oxford, 1961), 260 n. 2.

*whichever person is in charge at that time.* Nowhere in the Hebrew Bible is משלים used of anyone other than the ruler himself. Allowing an understanding ‘generals’ here quite unnecessarily reflects the (modern) commentator’s prejudices. ‘Rulers’ (i.e. ‘kings’) makes perfect sense when a more general reference is read.

There is no requirement in the peshet to go beyond the text of Habakkuk to explain the next phrase (‘with a great army will they surround them [i.e. the fortresses] to capture them’; l. 7), since this adequately understands ‘and they will heap up dust and take it’ (Hab. 1:10bβ). (נִקְרָא) translated ‘surround’ might mean ‘strike’ (so Delcor), but the former is more appropriate to a context indicating siege practices.

Finally, ‘terror and dread’ (ובאמה ופחד; IV:7) recalls ‘dread and terror’ (פחדים) in III:4 above, p39f. There the Kittim were described as ‘objects of dread and terror’. Here, that impact is felt by their enemies, and seems to derive from Exod. 15:16 which describes the effect of the Israelites’ passing for their enemies (Philistia, Edom, Moab and Canaan):

תפל עליהם אימתה ופחד בגדל זרועך ידמו כאבן ער־יעבר עמך יהוה  
 ער־יעבר עסזו קנית:

*Terror and dread* fell upon them; by the might of your arm, they became still as a stone until your people, O LORD, passed by, until the people whom you acquired passed by.

If we apply this same understanding to the Kittim in 1QpHab, then the divine nature of their calling is more apparent. Hence, like the Israelites, they might also be described as ‘acquired’ (קנה) by God. Brooke also links our passage with Ezek. 38:4 through its reference to ‘horses and horsemen’ (סוסים ופרשים) similar to 1QpHab III:6-10.<sup>70</sup> There, though, the reference to ‘horses’ (סוסיהם; III:10) derives from the prophecy (פרשו, סוסו; Hab. 1:8b) and is not reliant on any biblical parallel. Brooke’s parallel with the Ezekiel passage would appear, then, to be forced.

אז חלף רוח ויעבר וישם זה כוחו לאלוהו

<sup>70</sup> Brooke, “Kittim,” 145 n. 2, 149.



“Then they sweep by like the wind and pass over. *They place*<sup>71</sup> their strength for their god.” (Hab. 1:11a; 1QpHab IV:9-10)

	פִּשְׁרוֹ [ע]ל מוֹשְׁלֵי הַכְּתִיָּאִים	10
X	אֲשֶׁר בַּעֲצַת בַּיִת אֲשַׁמְתָּם [תָּם] יַעֲבֹרוּ אִישׁ	11
	מִלִּפְנֵי רַעִיָּהוּ מוֹשְׁלֵי[הֶם ז]ה אַחֲרֵי זֶה יִבְרֹאוּ	12
	לְשַׁחֵת אֶת הָאָרֶץ וַיִּשְׂם [זֶה כּוֹחַ לְאַלְוָהוּ	13
X	פִּשְׁרוֹ [אֲשֶׁר] לְהַעֲמִים	14
	לְ	15
	[ ]	16

Its interpretati[on conc]erns the rulers of the Kittim <sup>11</sup> who, through the counsel of the House of [their] Guilt will pass by, each one <sup>12</sup> from before his neighbour. [Their] rulers will come [on]e after another <sup>13</sup> to lay waste the l[and. “And] the[ly place] their strength for their god.” <sup>14</sup> Its interpretation [is that ... the go]ld of the peoples <sup>15</sup> l[ ... ] <sup>16</sup> [ ... ] (1QpHab IV:10-16)

This passage finishes off the initial section concerning the Kittim in 1QpHab. Again, reference is made to the ‘rulers of the Kittim’, though here the reference is linked to the ‘House of [their] Guilt’ (IV:11). Several scholars have suggested that this refers to the Roman Senate, and more specifically to the appointment of short-term provincial governors and consuls.<sup>72</sup> Nevertheless, this does not explain why the Senate is referred to specifically as a ‘guilty house’. In fact, as Brownlee has shown, אֲשַׁמְתָּם [תָּם] seems to derive from וַיִּשְׂם in the prophecy (1. 9). As he points out, this verb appears to have three different renderings, all of which recur in the interpretation.<sup>73</sup> First, the Qumran form differs from that of the MT וַאֲשַׁם (√אשם ‘to be guilty’). This may suggest an elided *aleph* for the imperfect form וַיִּאֲשַׁם found in Hos. 13:1. Hence ‘the guilty house’. Second, Gaster suggests that the verb be derived from שָׁמַם (as a Hiphil form) ‘to devastate’, hence ‘to lay waste the land’ (IV: 13).<sup>74</sup> Otherwise, in the body of the interpretation the verb is apparently taken with the latter half of the verse: שִׁים [וַיִּשְׂם ז]ה כּוֹחַ לְאַלְוָהוּ; IV:13. If correct, this suggests that וַיִּשְׂם is derived from שִׁים ‘put, place’. A literal translation would then read ‘[and he will place, this] one, his

<sup>71</sup> This is a clear change from MT וַאֲשַׁם ‘and become guilty’, though the pesherist was aware of this reading; hence אֲשַׁמְתָּם בַּיִת (IV:11). This is a clear example of the pesherist altering the biblical text for his own purposes. See further immediately below.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. K.M.T. Atkinson, “The Historical Setting of the Habakkuk Commentary,” *JSS* 4 (1959), 240-44; Brownlee, 81f.; T.H. Gaster, *The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect in English Translation* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1957), 250 n. 12. Contrast Driver, *op. cit.*, 200-202.

<sup>73</sup> Brownlee, 81.

<sup>74</sup> Gaster, *op. cit.*, 236 & 250 n. 11.

strength for his god'. The extent to which the commentator has combined these three different understandings is particularly noteworthy. Indeed to bring out the full range of meanings, Brownlee has to translate the verb three times:

Then, in accordance with the will, they transgressed,  
and passed on *and were guilty*,  
and each one *laid waste*  
And this one *appointed* his strength / to be their god.  
(1QpHab IV:9-10; *Midrash Pesher*, 80)

When this is properly understood, the meaning and/or application of 'the house of their guilt' is less important. It may refer to the Senate, but equally may refer to any political institution.<sup>75</sup>

Other aspects of the prophecy are similarly carried through into the interpretation. So both חָלַף 'exchange, change' and עָבַר 'pass on, pass by/over' reappear in the interpretation as: 'pass by (יַעְבֹּרֵוּ), each one from before his neighbour' (IV:11-12); and '[their] rulers will come (יִבְרֹאוּ) [on]e after another to lay waste the [and]'<sup>75</sup> (IV:12-13). Again, these interpretations might imply a rapid succession of governors (Atkinson), but the fact that they derive from the prophecy itself would suggest that if so, this is not the most important aspect of the interpretation.

Finally, the second part of Hab 1:11 is repeated in line 13, but unfortunately the interpretation itself has not survived. Brownlee reconstructs: פָּשְׁרוֹ [אֲשֶׁר יֵאָשִׁימוּ] 'Its prophetic meaning [is that they will appoint ... to be the go]d of the peoples / to [worship it and to prostrate themselves to it]' i.e. attempting to combine this third meaning of וִישַׁם 'put, place' with the prophet's reference to 'god' (אֱלֹהִים). "[I]t is impossible to know what object the Kittim appointed as their God," Brownlee declares. He himself suggests מַלְכָּם ('their king'), i.e. implying an element of 'emperor worship', or רִוְמָם ('their haughtiness'), a sarcastic reference to Rome, and specifically *Roma* (the city's patron goddess).<sup>76</sup> The latter understanding, however, relies on the link between the Kittim and Rome, which has yet to be shown. A better way to understand the interpretation here might be to refer the interpretation to the next passage to mention the Kittim, which depicts their

---

<sup>75</sup> So Horgan, 31.

‘weapons of war’ as ‘objects of veneration’ (below, VI:4-5). In other words, the Kittim are ultimately a secular people, for whom war has practically become a religious duty.

ותעש אדם כדגי הים כרמש למשל בו כולן בה]כה יעלה  
ויגדוהו בחרמו ויספדו במכ]מרתו על כן יחב]ה לחרמו על כן  
ישמח [ויגיל]ל [ויקטר למכמרתו כיא בהם] שמן חלקו ומאכלו  
ברי]

Thou hast made man as fish of the sea as gliding things, *to rule over them*.<sup>77</sup> They will bring [them] all up [with a hoo]k and drag out (fish) in their net and catch them up in their s[nare. Thus they will sacrifici]ce to their net.<sup>78</sup> Thus they will rejoice [and exult and offer incense to their snare, for by them] their portion will be [rob]ust [and their food in abundance.” (Hab.1:14-16; 1QpHab V:12-16)

[	[פשרו]	16
[	]	17
	הכתיאים ויוסיפו את הונם עם כול שללם	1
	כדגת הים ואשר אמר על כן יזבח לחרמו	2
	ויקטר למכמרתו פשרו אשר המה	3
X	זבחים לאותותם וכלי מלהמותם המה	4
	מוראם כיא בהם שמן חלקו ומאכלו ברי	5
	פשרו אשר המה מחלקים את עולם ואת	6
	מסם מאכלם על כול העמים שנה בשנה	7
	לחריב ארצות רבות	8

[Its interpretation ... ]<sup>17</sup> [ ... ]<sup>1</sup> the Kittim (who) will gather their wealth (with) all their plunder<sup>2</sup> like (the) fish of the sea. And as for what he says, “for this reason they will sacrifice to their net<sup>3</sup> and offer incense to their snare,” its interpretation is that they<sup>4</sup> sacrifice to their standards and {worship} their weapons of war.<sup>5</sup> “For by them his portion will be robust and his food in abundance.”<sup>6</sup> Its interpretation is that they will distribute their yoke and their tax<sup>7</sup> burdens, their food, upon all the peoples, year by year,<sup>8</sup> in order to lay waste many lands. (1QpHab V:16-VI:8)

Due to the importance of this lemma, it is necessary to divide the extract into three units. First, dealing with the gathering of wealth and plunder, second the sacrifice to the standards, and third, the distribution of the yoke and tax-burdens.

<sup>76</sup> Brownlee, 83.

<sup>77</sup> To bring out his meaning in the interpretation, the pesherist here adapts the Masoretic reading לוֹא־מִשַׁל בוֹ ‘like crawling things that have no ruler’. The change is paralleled in the interpretation, where the author refers to the lordship of the Kittim.

(a) The Kittim's/Chaldeans' exploitation of men is a direct consequence of their being raised by God to bring vengeance on the nations (Hab. 1:6), though the place in the interpretation where this might have been expressed has not survived. Instead, the interpretation picks up the reference to 'fish of the sea' – here understood to refer to the amount of wealth and spoil plundered by the Kittim during their period of lordship (VI:1-2). The terminology used here is הון ('wealth') and שלל ('plunder'), the same terms as used in IX:6 below: 'But in the last days, their wealth (הונם) along with all their spoil/plunder (שללם) will be given into the army of the Kittim' (IX:6-7). Elsewhere in the pesher הון is identified with the wealth amassed by the Wicked Priest (VIII:3, 11; XII:10<sup>79</sup>). Otherwise, both הון and שלל appear in CD VI:15-17:

...to abstain from wicked wealth (הון) which defiles, either by promise or by vow, and from the wealth (הון) of the temple and from stealing from the poor of the people, making widows their spoils (שלל) and murdering orphans... (García-Martínez)

Clearly, then, both these terms are viewed negatively. Brooke also notes how 'wealth' (הון) is the second of three nets of Belial in CD IV:17. Clearly this could be of great interest in the current context, since 'net' (חרם) occurs within the text of Habakkuk 1:16. Nevertheless, in CD the term used is מצודות (ציד√ 'hunt' thus 'hunting net'), while in 1QpHab חרם receives its own interpretation, to which we should now turn.

(b) The interpretation of the 'net' and 'snare' in the pesher is one of the most cited quotes from the text, and typifies the debate regarding the identity of the Kittim. The debate basically centers around the alleged existence of a 'cult of standards/signa' in either Seleucid or Roman practice which may explain the pesherist's "they sacrifice to their standards and worship their weapons of war".

---

<sup>78</sup> Here the order of the MT appears changed, though this may be explained by the repetition of ל כן: The correct order is found within the body of the interpretation, lines 2-3, and the curious order can be dismissed as an error in the process of transmission.

<sup>79</sup> See below, pp. 223ff, 232ff.

Excursus: The Sacrifice to Standards

*Dupont-Sommer (1950<sup>80</sup>)*

Dupont-Sommer builds on the picture of the Kittim in the scrolls as a whole, expressly identifying this group as Romans (based on [a flawed interpretation of] Daniel 11). For D-S, there are three principle reasons for this: first, because the Kittim will come from ‘the isles of the sea’; second, they have ‘rulers’ (מַשְׁלִימִים) rather than ‘kings’; and third, *because they sacrifice to their standards*, which he relates to the cult of *signa* in the Roman legions.<sup>81</sup> For the date of this account, D-S allows a *terminus a quo* of 63 BC (based on the dating of Pompey’s capture of Jerusalem which he believes is implied by the reference to the Day of Atonement later in the scroll), and a *terminus ad quem* of 29 BC, the nomination of Octavian as *imperator* (based on the succession of ‘rulers of the Kittim’ in 1QpHab IV:10-16 which D-S refers to the second triumvirate).<sup>82</sup> More specifically, D-S suggests a possible dating for the scroll in 41 BC “a little before the Peace of Brundisium, when the political situation kept the whole world in anxiety as the Parthian threat increased in the East.”<sup>83</sup> This places the Kittim (as Romans) squarely within the later Republic, and thus also the cult of *signa*.

*Delcor (1951<sup>84</sup>)*

Delcor principally reacts against D-S’s insistence that the Kittim were the Romans simply because of Daniel 11. Instead, he points to Maccabees and Jubilees where the Kittim are clearly Greeks (above, 2.1). He also claims that a cult of ensigns (*signa*) was ‘*monnaie courante*’ among Egyptians, Assyrians and Persians (and thus of little practical use),<sup>85</sup> though he does accept that the best attested evidence of such a cult (*War* etc.), is found among Romans and not Greeks. Nevertheless, he argues that the issue of ‘actual’ sacrifice to standards is irrelevant. The more important aspect is what

<sup>80</sup> A. Dupont-Sommer, “Le «*Commentaire d’Habacuc*» decouvert près de la Mer Morte,” *RHR* 137 (1950), 129-76; *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (1952).

<sup>81</sup> *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 31.

<sup>82</sup> Both of these views are now discredited.

<sup>83</sup> *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 31.

<sup>84</sup> M. Delcor, *Essai sur le Midrash d’Habacuc* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1951); “Le Midrash d’Habacuc,” *RB* 58, (1951) 521-48.

<sup>85</sup> “Le Midrash,” 527. Unfortunately he does not provide any specific examples of this.

the Jews/the author of the pesher thought to be the case. In support, Delcor points to coins minted under Antiochus I and Seleucus I which might have given this impression.

*Goossens (1952<sup>86</sup>)*

Goossens supports the Roman identity of the Kittim, criticising in passing those scholars, among them Delcor and Vermes<sup>87</sup>, who have cast doubt on the prevalence of a cult of *signa*. In particular, he attacks Delcor's suggestion that 'sacrifice to standards' "n'est pas mieux attesté" among the Romans as among the Greeks. "How," he queries, "can one write that a cult is 'not as well attested' among the Romans as it is among Greeks, when it is *not attested at all* (his italics) among the latter?"<sup>88</sup>

Goossens points to several instances which may witness to such a practice, among them Tacitus that the eagles and standards had the value of 'sanctuary' (*Annals* I, xxxix); Dio Cassius who, referring to events in 53 BC, describes the eagle of the legion carried around by the army in its own shrine (*Roman History* XL, xviii, 1); Josephus that the standards, the eagle included, were 'sacred objects' (τὰ ἱερά; *War* III, vi, 2, §123-4); in Suetonius, how, during the reign of Caligula, the King of Parthia was made to 'render homage to the standards of the legion' (*Vitellius*, II); and Tertullian that 'the religion of the Roman camp consists of venerating the ensigns, swearing by the ensigns, and of setting the ensigns before all the gods' (*Apologia*, XVI, viii). Above all, however, Goossens points to the *War* where the Romans, following the taking of Jerusalem, brought their standards into the Temple and sacrificed to them (VI, vi, 1 §316). "It must be added that only with difficulty could one imagine a more striking parallel," he comments. "The perfect coincidence between these two notes, both of Jewish origin, joined to the total absence of any information of such a cult outside of the Roman army, finally allows us to consider the question closed. *The Kittim are indeed the Romans.*"<sup>89</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup> R. Goossens, "Les Kittim du commentaire d'Habacuc," *NC* 4 (1952), 137-170.

<sup>87</sup> Cf. G. Vermes, "La communauté de la Nouvelle Alliance d'après ses écrits récemment," *ETL* (1951), 79.

<sup>88</sup> Goossens, *op. cit.*, 148-149 (Translated).

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, 150. His italics. (Translated).

Goossens does not attempt to identify this account with that described in the pesher. Josephus refers to a particular instance, while the pesherist refers to a more general practice. Nevertheless, he suggests that such a rite may accompany an event of military significance. Thus the account in *War* may refer to the Temple's capture in 63 BC. Goossens accepts that the evidence cited postdates this period, but he quotes passages by Cicero and Sallust, which refer to the conspiracy inaugurated by Catiline, and which depict him paying homage to a silver eagle.<sup>90</sup> This eagle is alleged to have been that of Marius's army in the Cimbrian campaign, suggesting that some importance is attributed to it. He links this to Josephus's claim that the standards were 'sacred objects' and concludes: "This cult existed in the time of Cicero, with all the characteristics that it would have under the Empire, and nothing allows me to say that it had been, at the time of *In Catilinam*, a recent innovation."<sup>91</sup>

Goossens thus pushes the evidence for a cult of *signa* into the republican period, and argues that 1QpHab alludes to this Roman cult of *signa*.

**Rowley (1952, 1956<sup>92</sup>)**

Put simply, Rowley presents the Kittim as the Seleucids under Antiochus. He rejects early interpretations of the Kittim as Romans, instead arguing that *signa* worship is not appropriate before the imperial period. Similarly, he rejects Goossens's claims to retroject this cult into the Republican period. Catiline's eagle, he argues, is evidence rather of a private cult than of actual worship of a standard by armies and thus is not relevant to the discussion. His attempts to distinguish between the different types of standard (*signa*, *vexilla* and *aquila*), however, are less convincing, given that we are ultimately dealing with these terms through a different language.

Instead, Rowley points to a parallel with Psalm 74:4 where אֹרֵת, 'sign, standard' the term found in the pesher, is also evidenced.<sup>93</sup>

---

<sup>90</sup> Cf. Cicero, *In Catilinam* II, 6, 13; Sallust, *Bellum Catilinae* 59, 3.

<sup>91</sup> *Op. cit.*, 154. (Translated)

<sup>92</sup> H.H. Rowley, *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Macmillan: New York, 1952); "The Kittim in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *PEQ* 88 (1956), 92-109; Cf. *The Dead Sea Scrolls from Qumran* (1958).

<sup>93</sup> "Kittim," 98. Cf. *Zadokite Fragments*, 73f.

שָׁאֲנוּ צִרְרֵיהֶם בְּקִרְבֵּי מוֹעֵדֶיךָ שְׂמוֹ אֹתוֹתֶיךָ אֵתוֹת:

Your foes have roared within your holy place<sup>94</sup>; they set up *their emblems* there.

This Psalm, he suggests, has long been thought to derive from the Maccabean period.<sup>95</sup> The verse may then allude to the placing of standards in the temple, thereby associating them with worship. Rowley links this with Antiochus Epiphanes' purge of Judaism. Elsewhere in Psalm 74, Rowley continues, there are references not merely to the desecration of the sanctuary, but to the burning of 'all the meeting places of God in the land' (74:8b), and the cry in verse 9 that 'there is no longer any prophet'. Aside from this final reference, the Psalm could refer to the Babylonian conquest in 587 BC, but prophetic activity during this period was high. Contrast this, however, with similar references in Maccabees to the lack of a prophet (cf. I Macc. 4:46; 9:27; 14:41), suggesting that the passage was, at the very least, redacted during that period. He concludes from this, then, "we are not therefore bound to come down to the Roman period or see the Roman cult of *signa* in [the pesher] passage."<sup>96</sup>

Rowley defends Delcor against D-S's assertion that evidence of *signa* worship among Egyptians etc. is irrelevant. Such worship prevailed in the east before Roman times, and he points to Dura-Europos where archaeological evidence suggests that standards were placed in temples. Rowley recognises that datewise Dura-Europos is of little help in itself, but compares this with, e.g., Persian coins of the second-century BC which depict a standard to the right of the sanctuary.<sup>97</sup> He comments: "The divine standards associated with the cult of the gods in the religions of the East are an institution of very great antiquity."<sup>98</sup> Thus he argues that this evidence is stronger than anything produced from pre-imperial Rome, and that it is "less justified to antedate by more than a century the sacrifice to standards by Roman soldiers, which is only attested by Josephus, and only for A.D. 70, than to accept the probability that an

<sup>94</sup> NRSV 'holy place' for Heb. מוֹעֵד is quite a loose translation. מוֹעֵד literally means 'appointed place/time/meeting' and refers to the temple via the intermediary 'tent of meeting' (Exod. 33:7). The term may have been suggested because of its use as 'appointed signal' (Judg. 20:38), thus as a potential parallel to אֹתוֹת.

<sup>95</sup> Though Rowley himself believes the Psalm to be considerably older.

<sup>96</sup> *Zadokite Fragments*, 74-5.

<sup>97</sup> "Kittim," 103.

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*, 104.



ancient oriental practice has been carried on in the East.”<sup>99</sup> He finds, then, that (a) the evidence of standard worship by armies in Republican times is ‘at best doubtful’, while (b) worship of standards in Syria prior to the coming of the Romans is ‘rather stronger’.

*Atkinson (1959)<sup>100</sup>*

Atkinson’s contribution derives from her analysis of the numismatic evidence. She details several coins from the late third-century BC to the time of Cicero which depict oath-taking scenes for Roman soldiers. Several of these depict a young man holding a pig, accompanied by a group of soldiers, standing before the standard; a representation of the oath and sacrifice of a new recruit. She refers to one particular coin which appears to depict a more senior figure, perhaps a general, offering prayers (and perhaps also a sacrifice) to an eagle on what is seemingly the legion’s standard.<sup>101</sup> This material, she asserts, stands alongside Josephus’s description of Titus’s entry into the Jerusalem Temple in AD 70, and supports the belief that this practice may be well established even within the Republic. At the very least, the coins suggest that non-Romans may have mistakenly believed that Romans “sacrificed to their standards and worshipped their weapons of war.”

By contrast, Atkinson finds no evidence for similar practices among the Seleucids. In particular, she points out that no distinction between sacrifice to *military* rather than *religious* standards is maintained; while it is only relevant among those powers that came in direct contact with Judaism during this period.<sup>102</sup> This refutes Delcor’s suggestion that the practice was common currency among the Egyptians and Assyrians, while she finds no evidence of a similar practice among the Persians. All scholars have found, she argues, is evidence for religious standards and banners as the subject of Syrian cults, very different from the attestation of a cult of *military* standards.<sup>103</sup>

---

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, 105.

<sup>100</sup> Atkinson, *op. cit.*, 238-63, esp. 246-55.

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*, 251f. and Pl. I Coin 4.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, 257f.

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*, 261f.

Atkinson, then, supports Goossens's proposal for a Republican date of the scroll, around the time of Pompey's conquest of Judaea, and thus also for the 'worship of standards' by the Kittim. This is attested by the numismatic evidence from this period, while there is no evidence for a 'worship of standards' in Seleucid times.

*Driver (1953, 1965<sup>104</sup>)*

Driver moves the debate into the Imperial period, dismissing the Seleucid theory arguing that the customs cited under these heads are not strictly parallel, variously interpreted and thus equivocal, or even misinterpreted.<sup>105</sup> His inquiry, then, is restricted to Roman practice. Within the Republican period, he finds no 'explicit' mention of sacrifice to standards. Rather, he notes a general understanding of the standards as 'sacred objects' – stemming from the Secessions of the Plebs in the fifth century. He supplements this with the numismatic evidence, and concludes: "That the actions described in the passages here cited from Greek and Latin literary sources were accompanied by sacrifice would seem then to be beyond doubt."<sup>106</sup>

Driver assumes that the peshar should be related to a particular (as opposed to a general) event. If, he queries, the Jews had known of a custom of offering sacrifice to standards, why should they have totally disregarded it before AD 70? They must only, he suggests, have thought of it when it was brought "forcibly and flagrantly to their notice."<sup>107</sup> Thus he notes how Pilate almost incited a riot when, in AD 26, he sent ensigns into Jerusalem (*War* II, ix, 2-3 §169-74; *Ant.* XVIII, iii, 1 §55-9); but, in particular refers to the description of Roman soldiers offering sacrifice to their standards at the fall of the Temple in 70. "There is no other event in recorded history to which the Commentator is likely to be or can be alluding," he comments.<sup>108</sup>

---

<sup>104</sup> G.R. Driver, "Once again the Dead Sea Scrolls," *JQR:NS* 44 (1953), 1-20; *The Judaean Scrolls* (1965).

<sup>105</sup> *The Judaean Scrolls*, 211.

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*, 213.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, 213.

<sup>108</sup> *Ibid.*, 214.

## Conclusions

There are, then, three basic approaches. First, that the pesher refers to Josephus's description of legionaries sacrificing to their standards in AD 70. However, this approach requires a late date for the pesher, which no longer seems applicable<sup>109</sup>; meanwhile, we might expect the pesherist to allude to the Temple incident itself while the pesher seemingly refers to a more general practice (hence a *cult* of standards) rather than a specific event. I thus reject Driver's suggestion that the Jews "only took notice when [the custom] was brought forcibly and flagrantly to their attention." There is nothing in the pesher that suggests either approval or disapproval of such a custom. Rather, it is another 'marker' by which the Kittim may be identified. The second approach also envisions the Kittim as the Romans, but projects this cult back into the republican period, to a period more consistent with the dating of the pesher. But, this approach too suffers its drawbacks. There is no evidence from this period, which may decisively prove whether Republican Romans ever had such a cult of *signa* worship. As we have seen, the literary evidence is highly suspect and, while the numismatic evidence is certainly suggestive of a reverent approach towards standards by the military, the evidence is hardly conclusive. The final approach argues for the Seleucid identity of the Kittim who sacrifice to their standards. Again, though, the evidence is scarcely overwhelming and the theory is hindered by the lack of direct evidence. Rowley's parallel in Psalm 74 may be helpful, but again refers (if at all) to a

---

<sup>109</sup> The same criticism applies to Robert Eisenmann's (more recent, 1983 onwards) thesis that references to the Kittim in the scrolls may be applied to the Romans of the late first century CE, and consequently that leading figures in the pesharim may be identified with figures from Early Christianity (Cf. Robert Eisenmann [ed.], *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the First Christians: Essays and Translations* [Element, 1996]). In dealing with the sacrifice to standards motif in the pesher, Eisenmann does not demand that the incident be referred to that described in *War* VI (though he suggests that it is possible). Rather, he also feels that the reference is *generic*, perhaps to other such incidents which "no doubt occurred after each successful siege as the Romans made their bloody way down from Galilee" (Eisenmann, "Maccabees, Zadokites, Christians and Qumran: A New Hypothesis of Qumran Origins," in *op. cit.*, 83 n. 152). Nevertheless, this view (like Driver's) is at odds with the majority of the palaeographic and archaeological evidence which place these documents within the first century BCE. It is not the case, *contra* Eisenmann, that "the Community as a whole had nothing new to say or no new reactions while 150 years of the most vital and controversial history in Palestine passed before its eyes" (p 85). Without prejudicing my overall conclusions here, suffice it to say that the reason no new pesher-type texts were composed during the first century CE is as a direct result of some of their predictions from other texts failing to be borne out in reality.

specific event, namely, to the purge under Antiochus, rather than to a more general cultic practice. The approach is thus subject to the same criticisms applied to Driver's hypothesis (above).

In short, the passage, long held to be the *coup-de-grace* for the identity of the Kittim in 1QpHab and the DSS as a whole, is of little practical benefit. The Kittim may still be the Romans, or the Seleucid Greeks, or any other ANE group displaying a reverent attitude to *signa*.

---

A more productive approach might be to consider the way in which the pesherist has moved from sacrifice/offerings to 'his net' (לחרמו) and 'his seine' (למכמתו) in Hab. 1:16 to 'their standards' (לאותותם) and 'their weapons of war' (וכלי מלחמתם) in 1QpHab. My own article<sup>110</sup> has dealt in some detail with the alleged parallel between the pesher and the targum (which seems to reverse the equation) and, while ultimately querying some of the conclusions drawn from the similarity, it has argued for a way by which the pesherist may have derived his interpretation from the Habakkuk passage itself. It is worth, then, reiterating some of those points here.

My approach essentially argued that the Qumran commentator has seen in the term חרם 'net' the religious concept of *herem* familiar from Deut. 7. This notion combines both a military and a religious dimension. Hence, the term is used of the destruction of Jericho in Josh. 6:21 (note how the NRSV brings out both nuances):

וַיִּחְרְמוּ אֶת-כָּל-אֲשֶׁר בְּעִיר מֵאִישׁ וְעַד-אִשָּׁה מִנְּעֵר וְעַד-זָקֵן וְעַד שׂוֹר  
וְשֵׂה וְחֻמֹּר לְפִי-חֶרֶב:

Then they devoted to destruction by the edge of the sword all in the city, both men and women, young and old, oxen, sheep, and donkeys.

We should also note that the 'net' in Habakkuk has been identified with the weapon of the god Marduk with which he overcomes his enemies, perhaps implying that this

---

<sup>110</sup> Wood, 130-40. Cf. N. Wieder, "The Habakkuk Scroll and the Targum," *JJS* 4 (1953), 14-18; W.H. Brownlee, "The Habakkuk Midrash and the Targum of Jonathan," *JJS* 7 (1956), 169-86; R.P. Gordon, *Studies in the Targum to the Twelve Prophets: From Nahum to Malachi* (VTSup, 51; E.J. Brill: Leiden, 1994), 83-95.

dual dimension is already implicit in the original prophecy.<sup>111</sup> By translating  $\text{סֶרֶט}$  as  $\text{סֶרֶטוֹת}$ , then, the pesherist may be attempting to retain this dual element in the interpretation – since standards have religious significance, as we have seen, and are primarily used as a rallying point in military conflicts. As evidence for this, we can see how the LXX of Micah 7:2b understands  $\text{סֶרֶט}$  ‘net’ in its second sense – ‘*they grievously afflict* ( $\epsilon\kappa\theta\lambda\iota\beta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu \epsilon\kappa\theta\lambda\iota\beta\eta$ ) everyone his neighbour.’<sup>112</sup> It is difficult to see how the Septuagint could have arrived at this translation unless they had assumed the Deuteronomistic sense of  $\text{סֶרֶט}$  to strengthen the impact of  $\text{יִצְוִיָּו}$ . The fact that at least one source has apparently transposed the meaning of the MT, whether or not this occurred accidentally, may have afforded a similar possibility for the pesherist himself, especially if he wished to retain the double meaning already implicit in Heb.  $\text{סֶרֶט}$ .

Nevertheless, this does not explain the transference in the pesher from  $\text{מִכְמַרְתָּ}$  to  $\text{כְּלֵי מִלְחָמָה}$ . In my article I suggested that this term has been mistranslated, either through the alleged parallel with the targum, or due to fixations with Josephus’s account. Although the phrase may be translated ‘weapons’, this seems to be suggested by the targum ( $\text{לְזִינְיָה}$ ). Instead, and as Atkinson points out, the phrase is ambiguous:

The translation of  $\text{כְּלֵי}$  as ‘weapons’ goes beyond its essentially vague connotation, and although the word obviously can have the meaning ‘weapons’ (cf. Judges xviii. 11 where the same phrase  $\text{כְּלֵי מִלְחָמָה}$  occurs), I have preferred the non-committal translation ‘gear of battle’ here. The possibility obviously arises that Roman *vexilla* (that is, flagged standards) and *signa* are respectively referred to, but on the whole a more general meaning (flags or standards) for the first term and ‘trophy’ for the second seems more likely.<sup>113</sup>

Within the pesher, then, it is entirely possible that the equations ‘net = standards’ and ‘seine = gear of battle’ (Atkinson) have no bearing on the *signa* worship debate. Certainly, the fact that we can arrive at this equation independently of the sacrifice to *signa* debate may suggest that this passage is undeserving of the attention it has

<sup>111</sup> Cf. Atkinson, *op. cit.*, 238-9, n. 2.

<sup>112</sup> *The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament* (London: Bagster). The Targum to Mic. 7:2 also has this reading: ‘All of them lie in wait to shed innocent blood, they deliver one another to destruction ( $\text{לְבַמִּירָא}$ )’ (R.P. Gordon, *The Targum to the Minor Prophets*, The Aramaic Bible, 14; Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1989, 126).

<sup>113</sup> Atkinson, *op. cit.*, 238, n. 2.

received. Of course, this is not to say that the fact that the Kittim may have not *incidentally* also sacrificed to standards, but, as with previous occasions, the reference arises predominantly out of the biblical text itself. In short, sacrifice to standards may be a common practice among the Kittim *or it may not*. To attempt to identify specifically the Kittim as either Romans or Greeks on this basis is ultimately futile. There is no reason, moreover, not to suggest that the author of the pesher is aware of some practice among the Greeks or Romans and that he alludes to this independently of any suggestion that these people are the Kittim. Indeed, increasingly one has to say that the Kittim seem to be a mixup of different cultures and/or ideas from this period.

(c) The final aspect of the interpretation refers to the distribution of ‘their yoke’ (עולם) and ‘their tax burdens’ (מסם) understanding חלקו ‘his portion’ and ומאכלו ‘his food’ in Hab. 1:16d respectively. עולם read as ‘*ōlām* could be translated ‘world’, but the reading ‘*ullām* is dictated by the second term מס ‘forced labour, tribute’. The normal parallel for עול in the Hebrew Bible is סבל (Isa. 9:4 (Heb. 9:3); 10:27; 14:25). The second of these passages, Isa. 10:27, Brooke notes,<sup>114</sup> may provide the rationale for part of the pesher, through the presence in either instance of שמן:

וְהָיָה בַיּוֹם הַהוּא יִסּוּר סִבְלוֹ מֵעַל שִׁכְמְךָ וְעָלוּ מֵעַל צְוֹאֲרֶיךָ וְחָבַל עַל  
מִפְּנֵי-שָׁמֶן:

In that day he will take away his burden from upon your shoulders, and his yoke from upon your neck. The yoke will be broken from *fat*. (Trans. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1-39*)

The doublet in the interpretation between ‘yoke’ and ‘forced labour’, Brooke explains by way of Sirach 40:1, which contains both ζυγός and ἀσχολία:

Hard *work* (ἀσχολία) was created for everyone, and a heavy *yoke* (ζυγός) is laid on the children of Adam, from the day they come forth from their mother's womb until the day they return to the mother of all the living.

The precise force which may be attached to this is unclear. The Hebrew of Sirach 40 has not survived and ἀσχολία only otherwise occurs in III Maccabees 5:34. The term otherwise used for מס (in the sense of ‘tribute’) in the LXX is φόρος (cf. I Ki. 5:27;

<sup>114</sup> Brooke, “Kittim,” 152.

Judg. 1:28; II Sam. 20:24 etc.<sup>115</sup>), suggesting that a parallel to the doublet in the pesher ought instead to use ζυγὸς and φόρος. Unfortunately, no parallel to these terms could be found in the LXX. Meanwhile, the commentator continues, the Kittim, because of the distribution of their yoke will ‘lay waste many lands’ (לַחֲרִיב אֲרָצוֹת; רַבּוֹת; VI:8). Brooke suggests that the verb חָרַב here “may be an attempt to explain ‘fatness’ (בָּרִי) of Hab. 1.16 through a play on words”. Nevertheless, his second suggestion that this phrase anticipates the ‘sword’ (חָרֶב) in the section immediately following is far better.<sup>116</sup> While this may be useful, the overall implication of the passage is that the taxes or ‘tributes’ levied by the Kittim on the Jews would ultimately ruin the country’s economy.<sup>117</sup>

Atkinson deals with this question of tribute in some detail.<sup>118</sup> The interesting aspect of the interpretation, she argues, concerns the levying of the tribute in the form of corn (translating מֵאֲכָלִים) rather than money. Atkinson discusses the models of taxation under the Seleucids and Ptolemies, as well as under the Roman administration and concludes that a reference to a taxation in the form of corn fits the time of the Roman conquest of Syria and Judaea by Pompey, since, as Josephus points out (*Ant.* XIV, v, 1 §80-81), Pompey’s legate Aemilius Scaurus was furnished by Antipater with corn out of Judaea prior to his campaign. Unfortunately, Atkinson does not take into account the fact that the operative term מֵאֲכָלִים derives from the original prophecy and the term we should instead concentrate on is מַס, which can mean any kind of tribute. To this we may add Brownlee’s suggestion that the equation between ‘food’ and ‘tax’ may also be made midrashically, since in both Rabbinic Hebrew and Aramaic לֶחֶם ‘bread, food’ has a second meaning ‘tribute, tax, a salary’.<sup>119</sup>

When the background is properly understood, then, the issue of the tribute is also uncommunicative of the identity of the Kittim, since ‘tax’ and/or ‘tribute’ (in whatever form) may apply to almost any conquering power of the Near East.

<sup>115</sup> In Isa. 10:27 סָבַל is translated by φόβος, but should probably now be emended to φόρος instead.

<sup>116</sup> Brooke, “Kittim,” 153.

<sup>117</sup> This was apparently quite a common complaint. Cf. Brownlee, 103.

<sup>118</sup> Atkinson, *op. cit.*, 244-46.

<sup>119</sup> Brownlee, 102.

Attempts to identify specifically the nature of the tribute also fail, since the wording in the interpretation ultimately derives from the biblical passage itself. In addition, there is no reason to hold that מאכל should necessarily refer to ‘corn’ as Atkinson assumes.

על כן יריק חרבו תמיד להרוג גוים ולוא יחמל

“For this reason he will draw *his sword*<sup>120</sup> continually to slay nations, but not show mercy.” (Hab. 1:17; 1QpHab VI:8-9)

פּשְׁרוּ עַל הַכְּתִיּוּמִים אֲשֶׁר יֵאָבְדוּ רַבִּים בַּחֶרֶב	10
נַעֲרִים אֲשֵׁישִׁים וְזַקְנִים נְשִׁים וְטַף וְעַל פְּרֵי	11
בְּטֶן לֹא יִרְחַמוּ	12

<sup>10</sup> Its interpretation concerns the Kittim who will destroy many by the sword: <sup>11</sup> youths, mature men, and old men, women and children; for upon “the fruit of <sup>12</sup> the womb they will have no compassion.” (Isa. 13:18) (1QpHab VI:10-12)

Much of the interpretation of Hab. 1:17 directly derives from scripture. As we can see, the latter part of the interpretation is a direct quote from Isa. 13:18 (albeit with the 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> reading<sup>121</sup>), while the reference to the killing of men, women and children appears to be inspired by II Chron. 36:17 (n.b. the Chaldeans here):

וַיַּעַל עֲלֵיהֶם אֶת־מֶלֶךְ (כַּשְׂדִּיִּים) [כַּשְׂדִּיִּים] וַיַּהַרֵג בַּחֲבוּרֵיהֶם בַּחֶרֶב בְּבַיִת  
מִקְדָּשָׁם וְלֹא חָמַל עַל־בָּחוּר וּבְתוּלָה זָקֵן וְנִשְׁשׁ הַכֹּל נָתַן בְּיָדוֹ:

Therefore he brought up against them the king of the Chaldeans, who killed their youths *with the sword* in the house of their sanctuary, and had no compassion on young man or young woman, the aged or the feeble; he gave them all into his hand.

This may indeed explain why the pesherist has changed the Masoretic reading from חרם ‘net’ to חרב ‘sword’. Additionally, Isa. 13:18 envisages ‘youths’ (נערים) being mangled by weapons, here ‘bows’.<sup>122</sup> Brownlee also draws a parallel with Deut. 28:50 (the context of which refers to a nation from afar who will swoop down on Israel ‘like an eagle’ – see above): ‘a grim-faced nation showing no respect to the old (זקן) or to

<sup>120</sup> over MT חרמו ‘his net’. See further below.

<sup>121</sup> Cf. Brownlee, 105.

<sup>122</sup> This passage should not then be used to back up the arguments of those who propose a Targumic parallel with the pesher both here and in the previous *lemma*. Although the Targum translates לחרמו ‘to his net’ by לזיניה ‘to their weapons’, when the reliance of the pesher on both II Chronicles and Isaiah 13 is properly understood, we can see why the passage should



the young (נער).<sup>123</sup> This passage, Brooke adds, may be responsible for the change in the interpretation from the ‘drawing’ (יריק) of the sword in Hab. 1:17 to the ‘destruction’ (יאבדו) by the sword in the interpretation, since in Deut. 28:51, that nation will cause Israel to perish (האבירו).<sup>124</sup> However, it is unnecessary to cite any particular passage in support of the change, since in Biblical Hebrew the ‘drawing of a sword’ is itself already associated with the destruction of a country. So, in Lev. 26:33 the LORD will ‘unsheathe (והריקתי) the sword against you; your land shall be a desolation, and your cities a waste’. The idiom is especially associated with Ezekiel (5:2,12; 12:14; 28:7; 30:11).

This section of the pesher, then, does not require any historical circumstance to explain it. The entire interpretation is either directly drawn from, or inspired by scripture, much of it already associated with the Chaldeans. Again, though, this is not to say the Kittim are *not* a historical group.

כי אתה שלותה גוים רבים וישלוכה כול יתר עמים

Because you have plundered many nations so will all the remainder of the peoples plunder you. (Hab. 2:8a; 1QpHab VIII:15)

ואשר	2
אמר כי אתה שלותה גוים רבים וישלוכה כול	3
יתר עמים פשרו על כוהני ירושלם	4
האחרונים אשר יקבוצו הון ובצע משלל העמים	5
ולאחרית הימים ינתן הונם עם שללם ביד	6
חיל הכתיאים כיא המה יתר העמים	7

And as for what <sub>3</sub> he said “Because you have plundered many nations, so will all <sub>4</sub> the remainder of the peoples {plunder you}.” (Hab. 2:8a) Its interpretation concerns the {last} priests of Jerusalem <sub>5</sub> who will gather wealth and profit

---

not be used to support the proposal of a link between the pesher and the targum. See further, my article.

<sup>123</sup> This passage (Deut. 28:47ff.) bears many similarities with the picture of the Kittim built up in the pesher. Not only will they come ‘from far away, from the end of the earth, to swoop down on you like an eagle’ (28:49, cp. III:10-11); but ‘He will put an iron yoke (על ברזל) on your neck until he has destroyed you’ (28:48) paralleling the ‘yoke’ in VI:6; and ‘they shall consume the fruit of your livestock and the fruit of your ground until you are destroyed, leaving you neither grain, wine, and oil, nor the increase of your cattle and the issue of your flock, until it has made you perish’ (28:51) perhaps explaining ‘to lay waste many lands’ in the pesher (cp. VI:8).

<sup>124</sup> Brooke, “Kittim,” 154.

gained by violence through plundering the peoples. <sup>6</sup> But in the last days, their wealth along with all their spoil/plunder will be given into the hands of <sup>7</sup> the army of the Kittim. <Blank> For they are “the remainder of the peoples.” (1QpHab IX:2-7)

The final reference to the Kittim in 1QpHab is more concerned with the ‘last priests of Jerusalem’ (ll. 4-5). The army of the Kittim is here identified with ‘the remainder of the peoples’ who will bring justice on these ‘priests’. This, though, directly contradicts the sense of Habakkuk, where it is the Chaldeans themselves who will be despoiled by ‘the remainder of the peoples.’<sup>125</sup> The ‘remnant’ (יִתְּרָה) in the Hebrew Bible is normally used of those exiled to Babylon (יִתְּרָה הָעַם cf. II Kings 25:11; Jer. 39:9; 52:15), so it is strange to find a similar phrase used of the Kittim themselves. Brownlee connects this with Daniel’s vision of the four successive kingdoms (Dan. 7), where the Kittim should be identified with the final world power, ‘for they are the ones *remaining to come*.’<sup>126</sup> This may be reading too much into what is itself a part of the original prophecy, however. Brooke queries those scholars who have suggested that the Kittim are viewed in a positive light, as the ones through whom God punishes his people, and then compare this picture with the Kittim of the War Scroll. This process, he suggests, “tends to minimize or omit reference to the role of the Kittim in devastating the land as described earlier in 1QpHab in the interpretations of the dialogue sections of Habakkuk.”<sup>127</sup> This overlooks, however, the very fact that the Kittim are clearly authorised by God in the pesher (cf. II:10ff., above, p37f.). It also assumes that the Kittim of the pesher and those of IQM are the same.

## Conclusions

In 1QpHab, then, the Kittim will come for war, in a mission invoked by God himself. The language reflects the imagery of the Chaldeans in the Hebrew Bible and models itself around their role. For many scholars, however, the significant aspect has been the Kittim’s *historical* relevance. My research, however, has attempted to show that this is a secondary concern. The Kittim in this text are *fulfilments of a prophetic*

---

<sup>125</sup> The Targum more specifically refers the ‘remnant of the people’ to the ‘tribes’ of Israel. Cf. *The Targum of the Minor Prophets*, The Aramaic Bible, 14, 151 and n. 28.

<sup>126</sup> Brownlee, 152. His italics. In Daniel, the fourth kingdom should as in similar passages be identified with the Seleucids and esp. Antiochus IV, ‘the little horn’. So Dan 7:8; 8:9. See also above, n24.

<sup>127</sup> Brooke, “Kittim,” 155.

*model* first, a historical people second. The Kittim may be the Romans. Equally, however, they may be Seleucids, or even an amalgam of these peoples. Passages considered key to identifying the Kittim have been shown to fit the prophetic model. Thus, the ‘sacrifice to standards’, long held to be the key to identifying the Kittim as Romans, does not require this interpretation. Instead, my research has highlighted problems with the suggestion that the Romans had such a practice, and has instead concentrated on the way in which this message has been derived from the original prophecy and from the OT as a whole. Other ‘keys’ to identifying the Kittim are also questionable. The Kittim may be Romans (which, datewise, is preferable to a Seleucid identification), but ultimately, this issue is of secondary importance to their prophetic role.

### 2.2.2 1QpPsalms

#### Fragment 9

ןמהיכלך על ירושלים לך יובילו מלכין שי פשרו על כול מ.]	1
לפניו בירושלים גצרת חייית [	2
קנה]	
עצרת אבירים בעגלי עמים מתרפס ברצין כסף פשרו חייית קנה	3
היא]	
[ הכתיאים ל..]	4
[ ה. .. לת]	5
[ ם ב]	6
[ ל]	7

<sup>1</sup> [“From your temple at Jerusalem, king[s] [bring] gifts [to you.” (Heb. Ps. 68:30)] Its interpretation concerns all the *m*. [ ]<sup>2</sup> [ ... ] before him in Jerusalem. “You rebuked [the beast of the reedbed,] <sup>3</sup> [the herd of bulls along with the calves of the peoples, who trample (?) bars of] silver.” (Heb. Ps. 68:31) Its interpretation: “the beast of the [reedbed] is] <sup>4</sup> [ ... the K]ittim *l*. [ ]<sup>5</sup> [ ... ]. *h* .. *lt* [ ]<sup>6</sup> [ ... ] . *m* *b* [ ]<sup>7</sup> [ ... ] [ ] (1QpPs 9 I:1-7)

This small fragment refers to the Kittim in respect of the interpretation of Ps. 68 (l. 4). Horgan reconstructs “the ru[lers of the Kittim, who ...]” ([משלי הכתיאים אשר]) in ll. 1-2, presumably on the reference to “kings” (מלכין) in Ps. 68:30 (l.1), though this is far from clear. As in other texts (notably 1QpHab and 4QpNah), the Kittim here seem to be associated with Jerusalem. This is especially true if Horgan’s reconstruction is correct. It is, though, unclear how the Kittim in the interpretation relate to the actual text of Ps. 68:31. The gap between [קנה היא] (l. 3) and [הכתיאים] (l. 4)

does not allow for a direct relationship between the text and the interpretation. However, if we compare the picture here with other pesharim, it is possible to add to our understanding of this passage.

In 1QpHab, the Kittim in the end times will plunder the wealth of the last priests of Jerusalem (IX 2-7). Here, the reference to “[bars of] silver” (l. 3) in the text of Ps. 68:31 surely invites comparison, though the meaning of 68:31b is scarcely straightforward. Again, the same verse refers to those “who trample” (מתרפס). In 4QpNah (below, p78) תרמס directly follows a reference to the Kittim (3-4 I:3), while the reference there as here to ‘Jerusalem’ might also indicate a relationship between the two texts. The passage is also comparable to the picture of the Kittim in 1QpHab III 6-14, where Hab. 1:8b has the Chaldeans’s steeds “trample and scatter” (פשו ופרשו; III:7).

1QpPs, on this reading then, may allude to the sack of Jerusalem by the Kittim. The text’s fragmented state, however, does not allow us to state whether the pesherist is referring to an actual event, or a future eschatology. The latter is more likely, however, from the picture we read of the Kittim in other passages.

### 2.2.3 4QpIsaiah<sup>a</sup>

#### Fragments 8-10

הנה הארון יהוה צבאות מסעף פארה במערצה ורמי הקומה  
גדועים והגבורים ישפלו וינקפו סובכי היער בברזל ולבנון  
באדיר יפול]

[“Behold! The Lord GOD of Hosts will lop the boughs with terrifying power, the tallest trunks will be hewn down, the mightiest will fall. The thickets of the forest will be cut down with an axe, and Lebanon by a mighty one will fall.] (Isa. 10:33-34; 4QpIsa<sup>a</sup> 8-10 III:1-3)

וינקפו סובכי היער] בברזל ולבנון באדיר	]	6
יפול פשרו על ה] כתיאים אשנר] יפלו] ביד ישראל וענוי		7
את] כול הגואים וגבורים יחתו ונמס לנבם]	]	8
ואשר אמר ורמי] הקומה גדועים המה גבורי כת] יאים]		9
אשר] ד וינקפו סובכי היער בברזל המה]		10
]. למלחמת כתיאים ולבנון באדיר]	]	11
יפול המה ה] כתיאים אשר ינתנו] ביד גדולו] ]		12
ים בברחו מלפני ישראל]. מ]	]	13

[ ] <vacat> [ ] 14

["The th]icket[s] of [the forest will be cut down] with an axe, and Lebanon by a mighty one <sub>7</sub> [will fall." (Isa. 10:33-34) Its interpretation concerns the] Kittim wh[o will fall] by the hand of Israel. And the poor ones of <sub>8</sub> [ ... ]<sup>128</sup> all [the] nations. And the warriors will be terrified, and [their] he[art] will weaken <sub>9</sub> [And as for what it says: "the tallest] trunks will be hewn down." They are the warriors of the Kitt[im] <sub>10</sub> [who ... ]*d*. "And the thickets of [the] forest will be cut down with an axe." They [are] <sub>11</sub> [ ...].*m* for the war of the Kittim. <Blank> "And Lebanon by a mi[ghty one] <sub>12</sub> [will fall." They are the] Kittim who will be plac[ed] in the hand of his great ones [ ... ] <sub>13</sub> [ ... ]*ym* in his fleeing from bef[ore Is]rael. .[ ]*m*[ ] <sub>14</sub> [ ... ] <Blank> [ ... ] (4QpIsa<sup>a</sup> 8-10 III:6-14)

This passage bears close resemblance with 4Q285, the so-called 'Pierced Messiah' fragment (fr. 5),<sup>129</sup> a text which has been linked to the War Scroll due to its eschatological references.<sup>130</sup> That text contains exegesis of Isa. 10:34-11:1, and refers to 'the Branch of David' (צמח דוד), 'the Prince of the Congregation' (נשיא העדה) and '[the High] Priest' (כהן [הרואש]). There may also be a reference to '[the s]lain of the] Kitt[im]' ([ח]לל[ני] כתיי[ם]) in line 6, though here the text is largely reconstructed. Within 4Q285 it is unclear who will die, whether (as Eisenmann claimed) the Branch of David will die, or (most likely) that the Branch of David will kill some other individual. If the latter interpretation is correct, the reference to the '[s]lain [of the] Kitt[im]' in line 6 suggests that this character to die, most likely the King of the Kittim from 1QM XV:

וכול ענתורין המלחמה ילכו וחנו נגד מלך הכתיים ונגד כול  
 חיל בליעל הנועדים עמו ליום נקם] בחרב אֵל  
*vacat*

All those who are r[eady for] the war shall go and camp opposite *the king of the Kittim* and opposite all the army of Belial, assembled with him for the day of ven[geance] by God's sword. <Blank> (1QM XV:2-3; García-Martínez)

<sup>128</sup> Horgan restores [את] ישרה ישפטו [את] '{And the poor ones of} [Judah will judge the]' following Carmignac, but admits the restoration of 'judge' here is tentative. Cf. Horgan, 84.

<sup>129</sup> Cf. G. Vermes, "The Oxford Forum for Qumran Research: Seminar on the Rule of War from Cave 4 (4Q285)," *JJS* 43 (1992), 85-90; "The 'Pierced Messiah' Text – An Interpretation Evaporates," *BAR* 18:4 (1992?), 80-82; James Tabor, "A Pierced or Piercing Messiah? – The Verdict is Still Out," *BAR* 18:6 (1992?), 58-59; M. Abegg, "Messianic Hope and 4Q285: A Reassessment," *JBL* 113:1 (1994). The fragment aroused massive worldwide interest when Robert Eisenmann (incorrectly) disclosed that the text contained references to a slain Messiah.

<sup>130</sup> Cf. Milik, "Milkî-šedeq et Milkî-reša' dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens," *JJS* 23 (1972), 143: "Les fragments conservés de ce rouleau appartenaient à la partie finale du Manuel, entièrement perdue dans le 1QM." So also Vermes, "Oxford Forum."

Our own text makes no mention of the King of the Kittim. Indeed the specific passage 'Lebanon by a mighty one will fall' (והלבנון באריר יפול; Isa. 10:34b), although fragmentary, seems to be interpreted more generally of the Kittim (III:12-13). Nevertheless, it is clear that 4Q161 retains the same eschatological framework as both 4Q285 and 1QM through its references to 'warriors' (וגבורים; III:8), 'warriors of the Kittim' (גבורי כת[יאים]; III:9) and most obviously 'war of the Kittim' (למלחמת) כתיאים; III:11). 4Q161, then, seems to stand in the tradition of these two texts.

What, then, can be said of any historical dimension to the text? George Brooke, in commenting upon this passage, says that "there is virtually nothing in these very brief interpretations which does not come directly from the text of Isaiah 10 itself. We cannot reconstruct historical events, only observe the use of scripture."<sup>131</sup> This may not be entirely true, however, and, when the pesher's wider context is explored, we find a reference to the 'plain of Akko' in col. II, immediately prior (interpreting Isa. 10:28-32; Senaccherib's march on Jerusalem in 701-700 BC):

[	פֶּשֶׁר הַפְּתוּחַ לְאַחֲרֵי הַיָּמִים לְבוֹא . ]	26
[	רָחָה בְּעֵלְוֹתוֹ מִבְּקִיעַת עֵכוֹ לְלַחֵם בְּפִלְ[שְׁתִּי]א	27
[	רָחָה וְאֵין כְּמֹדָה וּבְכוּל עָרֵי הַ. ]	28
[	וְעַד גְּבוּל יְרוּשָׁלַיִם ]	29

<sup>26</sup> [The interpretation of the] word concerns the last days, about the coming of . [ ... ] <sup>27</sup> [ ]*rh* in his climb from the plain of Akko to wage war against Phil[istia ...] <sup>28</sup> [ ]*dh* and there is none like her, and among all the cities of the . [ ... ] <sup>29</sup> and up to the boundary of Jerusalem. [ ... ] (4QpIsa<sup>a</sup> 2-6 II:26-29)

Initially, Allegro suggested that this section deals with the appearance of the Messiah in Akko and his 'triumphal march' to Jerusalem.<sup>132</sup> Nevertheless, this view has come under heavy criticism from a number of scholars, including Burrows, van der Woude, Yadin and Dupont-Sommer.<sup>133</sup> Burrows's argument is especially telling:

<sup>131</sup> Brooke, "Kittim," 140.

<sup>132</sup> J.M. Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," *JBL* 75 (1956), 177. In *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Pelican, 1956) 152-153, Allegro connects this passage with the apocalyptic war of 'the king of the whole world' which will take place at Armageddon (Heb. הַר-מְגִדּוֹן, 'hill country of Megiddo') because of the route from Akko to Megiddo and the plains of Jezreel to the South East.

<sup>133</sup> Millar Burrows, "The Ascent from Acco in 4Q p Isa<sup>a</sup>," *VT* 7 (1957), 104-5; A. van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân* (Assen, 1957), 180-81;

It might have struck many readers that Isaiah x 28-32, on which the *pesher* here is based, refers to a hostile advance against Jerusalem. It seems most natural, therefore, to suppose that the march from the Plain of Acco to the border of Jerusalem (line 11) is that of the eschatological foe or "Antichrist", Gog or Magog (cf. Fragment D, line 4), not the Messiah.<sup>134</sup>

Although Burrows does not connect the 'Plain of Akko' reference to mention of the Kittim in col. III immediately following, this may already be implicit in his reference to the 'eschatological foe'. In any case, this link had been made by van der Woude, who identified the subject as 'the King of the Kittim' from 1QM XV (above, p71).<sup>135</sup> The logical interpretation seems, then, to be that 4QpIsa<sup>a</sup> describes the advance of the Kittim from Akko on Jerusalem, where they will fall 'by the hand of Israel' (III:7). The historical nature of the account seems suggested from the fact that Akko nowhere appears in the original Isaiah passage.

All commentators accept that Akko, here, refers to the port-town Ptolemais, which has an interesting history in this period,<sup>136</sup> particularly through its association with Alexander Jannaeus and Ptolemy Lathyrus, the disgraced son of Cleopatra III, in exile in Cyprus (*Ant.* XIII, xii, 2-xiii, 2 §324-355). Josephus describes how Jannaeus, eager to expand his power to include the coastal towns, laid siege to Ptolemais. The citizens of that town sent to Ptolemy for assistance and he came to their aid with a sizeable army. Following an attempted double-cross and an appeal to Cleopatra for assistance, Jannaeus's forces were defeated at Asophon near the Jordan, and it was only through Cleopatra's intervention that the country itself was saved.

Joseph Amusin suggests, then, that it is this conflict between Jannaeus and Ptolemy over Ptolemais that is echoed in the *pesher*. So Amusin:

From all the known events connected with Acco-Ptolemais that were important for Judaea's fate only the march of Ptolemy from Acco to Judea, so dangerous at the beginning but which ended so auspiciously, could be considered by the

Y. Yadin, *Recent Developments in Dead Sea Scrolls Research* (1957), 52 (Heb.); A. Dupont-Sommer, *Les écrits esséniens* (Paris, 1964), 286 n. 3.

<sup>134</sup> Burrows, "The Ascent," 104-5. Cf. John Allegro, "Addendum to Professor Millar Burrow's (*sic.*) Note on the Ascent from Accho in 4QpIsa<sup>a</sup>," *VT* 7 (1957), 183, though Allegro's counter-arguments are ultimately unconvincing.

<sup>135</sup> Van der Woude, *Messianische Vortellungen*, 179-81.

<sup>136</sup> In the Hebrew Bible, 'Akko' is only found in Judges 1:31, where it is among the territory assigned to Asher.

Qumran Commentator as the “coded” message in the narrative of Isaiah about the miraculously happy ending of the march of Sennacherib.<sup>137</sup>

In Amusin’s interpretation, then, the Kittim should be identified with the forces of Ptolemy Lathyrus. This understanding has many advantages, not least of which are the origins of the Kittim in Southern Cyprus, the very area to where Ptolemy was exiled. Moreover, the ‘war against Phil[istia]’ (II:27) fits Ptolemy’s campaign against Zoilus, the tyrant of Strato’s Tower and Dora (*Ant.* XIII, xii, 4 §335).<sup>138</sup> However, this scenario does not fit *all* the known facts. In no way, for instance, can the Kittim/Ptolemy’s forces be said to have fallen ‘by the hand of Israel’ as the pesherist claims, and as any interpretation demands. Indeed, the opposite is true. According to Josephus, it was Jannaeus’s forces who were defeated and put to flight by Ptolemy, and Cleopatra’s forces who ultimately brought him to heel. Again, the passage seems to speak of the Kittim’s approach to Jerusalem, but Josephus does not speak of any approach by Ptolemy to Jerusalem, and indeed, as we can see above, Amusin, no doubt aware of this, has subtly transposed ‘Judaea’ for ‘Jerusalem.’<sup>139</sup>

Other attempts to identify the Kittim here must also be ruled out when the historical dimension is properly considered. So Driver, keen to identify the Kittim with the Romans, links the reference here with Titus’s reinforcement of Vespasian at Ptolemais, and the latter’s advance on Jerusalem in AD 67-68.<sup>140</sup> Hengel also points out that Ptolemais was on several other occasions used as a staging point for a

---

<sup>137</sup> J.D. Amusin, “The Reflection of Historical Events of the First Century B.C. in Qumran Commentaries (4Q 161; 4Q 169; 4Q 166),” *HUCA* 48 (1977), 132. Amusin’s thesis has received more recent support from H. and E. Eshel (“4Q448, Psalm 154 [Syriac], Sirach 48:20, and 4QpIsa<sup>a</sup>,” *JBL* 119 [2000], 645-659). These argue that 4Q448, which they posit refers to Alexander Jannaeus (‘King Jonathan’) in cols. B and C, in col. A relates a pseudepigraphic prayer attributed to Hezekiah during Sennacherib’s siege of Jerusalem. The addition of this section to the second and third columns is then intended as a ‘pesher-style’ exegesis explicating Sennacherib’s campaign with reference to Ptolemy’s invasion in 103-102 BC.

<sup>138</sup> Compare Jub. 24:27-29 (above, p30f) where the Kittim will make war against Philistia, a reference perhaps to Alexander’s capture of Gaza.

<sup>139</sup> Amusin’s thesis has received more recent support from H. and E. Eshel (“4Q448, Psalm 154 [Syriac], Sirach 48:20, and 4QpIsa<sup>a</sup>,” *JBL* 119 [2000], 645-659). These argue that 4Q448, which they posit refers to Alexander Jannaeus (‘King Jonathan’) in cols. B and C, in col. A relates a pseudepigraphic prayer attributed to Hezekiah during Sennacherib’s siege of Jerusalem. The addition of this section to the second and third columns is then intended as a ‘pesher-style’ exegesis explicating Sennacherib’s campaign with reference to Ptolemy’s invasion in 103-102 BC.

<sup>140</sup> Driver, *op. cit.*, 204. Cf. *War* III, vi, 2 §115.



campaign against Judaea.<sup>141</sup> However, the dates of the scrolls notwithstanding, neither approach accounts for the Pesherist's prediction of a victory for Israel over the invaders. While it is not possible to identify any historical campaign launched from the city, it is possible that the pesherist, speaking of events yet to take place, is emphasising the place of Akko *in any future campaign*, perhaps looking back on its importance in previous campaigns. History confirms the importance of Akko/Ptolemais for a drawn out land campaign. Not only do both Lathyrus and the Romans recognize Ptolemais's strategic value, especially for an assault on Judaea/Jerusalem but in the Middle Ages the Crusaders were also based at Akko/Acre. Clearly, the fact that the city is on the Mediterranean coast also helps emphasise the Kittim's naval strength.

Given this, the identity of the Kittim themselves is also difficult, particularly since, although referenced three times in the pesher, these references are all fragmentary. Nevertheless, the application of 'Lebanon' to the Kittim in the fragment is significant. Both within the scrolls and other ancient Jewish literature, 'Lebanon' has its own involved history of interpretation, being especially true of the Targumim. Here, 'Lebanon' is applied exegetically to 'the king', 'the Temple', 'Jerusalem', 'the rich', and 'the nations',<sup>142</sup> while the Scrolls themselves display the same range of exegetical interpretation.<sup>143</sup> By applying 'Lebanon' to the Kittim, then, the pesherist appears to adopt the tradition of 'Lebanon = the nations', and parallels the Targumist who relates the Isaiah prophecy to Gog and Magog. Driver's attempt to link this passage with Yohanan's prophecy of Vespasian's rise to power on the basis that "Lebanon by a majestic one will fall" fails, since 'Lebanon' in that instance refers to the Temple rather than the Romans.<sup>144</sup> The identity of the Kittim who will fall by the hand of

---

<sup>141</sup> Hengel, *The Zealots*, 276f and n. 50. Cf. *War II*, v, 1 §67 (Varus); x, 1 §187 (Petronius); and xviii, 9 §501 (Cestius Gallus)

<sup>142</sup> Cf. G. Vermes, "Lebanon: The Historical Development of an Exegetical Tradition." *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 26-39; "The Symbolical Interpretation of Lebanon in the Targums," *JTS:NS*, 9 (1958), 1-12. Compare H.F. Sparks, "The Symbolic Interpretation of *Lebanon* in the Fathers," *JTS:NS*, 10 (1959), 264-279.

<sup>143</sup> See my MA Dissertation: "The Symbolic Interpretation of Lebanon in the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Exegetical Tradition" (Durham: June, 1996); "Pesher Habakkuk," 140-145 and n. 41.

<sup>144</sup> *Lam. R.* 1:5, §31. Driver, *op. cit.*, 215-216. Cf. Vermes, *Scripture*, 35.

Israel in 4QpIsa<sup>a</sup> remains unclear, beyond a vague understanding that they will be a foreign power, itself already implicit in the use of the term ‘Kittim’.

### 2.2.4 4QpNahum

#### Fragments 1-2

	גוער] בים ויובנישהו פ]שרו הים הם כל הכנתיים אשר יגער	3
	אל בהם]	
	[ פשרו הנהרות הם הכתיים ]	4a
	לעשנות] בהם משפט ולכלותם מעל פני הארץ וכל הנהרות	4
	החריב]	
[	עם [כל מו]שליהם אשר תחם ממשלתם ]	5a
	[אמלל בשן] וכרמל ופרח לבנן אמלל פ]שרו בשן וכרמל	5
	הם ]	
[	[וה]חרני]בו רבים רום רשעה כי הבן	6
[	[כר]מל ולמושליו לבנן ופרח ל[ב]נן היא ]	7
[	[ואנשי עצ]תם ואבדו מלפני [עדת] בחירני אל	8
	[וכו]ל יושבי תבל	9

<sup>3</sup> “He re[bukes] the sea and dri[es it up.” (Nah. 1:4aα)] Its [in]terpretation: “the sea” is all the Ki[ttim, whom God will rebuke] <sup>4</sup> to carr[y out] judgement against them and to eliminate them from the face of [the land. “And dries up all the rivers.” (Nah. 1:4aβ) <sup>4a</sup> Its interpretation: “the rivers” are the Kittim] <sup>5a</sup> with [all] their [ru]lers, whose rule will end. [...] <sup>5</sup> [“Bashan] and Carmel [wither] and the bloom of Lebanon is withered.” (Nah. 1:4b) [Its] in[ter]pretation: “Bashan and Carmel” are ... ] <sup>6</sup> many [will per]ish because of it at the height of wickedness. For *hb*[...] <sup>145</sup> <sup>7</sup> [“Car]mel” and for its rulers: “Lebanon”. And “the bloom of Lebanon” is [...] <sup>8</sup> [and the men of] their [counsel.] And they will perish from before [the congregation of] the chosen ones [of God ... ] <sup>9</sup> [and al]l the inhabitants of the world. (4QpNah 1-2 II:3-9)

The Kittim are almost certainly referred to in the first column of 4QpNah, although as the above translation shows, they have to be reconstructed in either instance (ll. 3, 4a<sup>146</sup>). Certainly the reference to מו]שליהם in line 5a parallels הכתיים in 3-4 II:3 supporting the reconstruction of ‘Kittim’ here. Note, however, that “the rivers” (הנהרות), here interpreted with reference to the Kittim (l. 4a), are elsewhere in the

<sup>145</sup> Horgan suggests restoring [עדת דורשי החלקות] ‘the congregation of the Seekers-After-Smooth-Things ]’ at the end of line 7, though there is no evidence for this group to be reconstructed here. The ‘Seekers’ will receive detailed examination in the chapter following.

<sup>146</sup> Horgan reconstructs an additional line between lines 3 and 4 (termed 4a) which continues in line 5a (between lines 4 and 5). As a result, the first part of this interpretation is somewhat displaced.

pesher interpreted with regard to “the great ones of Manasseh” (3-4 III:9) though there the Hebrew term is **גדולי מנשה**.

The Kittim, then, are associated with “the sea” of Nah. 1:4a $\alpha$ , which will be rebuked and dried up. In the interpretation, the pesherist refers this to the elimination of the Kittim from the face of the earth (ll. 3-4). Similarly, Nah. 1:4a $\beta$ , here speaking of the drying up of ‘the rivers’, is again interpreted with reference to the demise of the Kittim – “whose rule/dominion (**ממשלתם**) will end” (l. 5a). **ממשלת** here recalls the application of the same term to the Kittim in 1QpHab above (II:13), while the term will also be used of the Seekers of Smooth Things (**דורשי חלקות**) later on in the scroll (4QpNah 3-4 II:4; below, pp99f.). The future aspect of this rule/dominion being ended suggests that the writer is living within the rule of the Kittim, which must now follow the dominion of the Seekers of Smooth Things (which we will trace to the Pharisees’ power and influence during the reign of Salome). If this is correct, the Kittim here, if such are to be reconstructed, must be identified as Romans, the only outside nation to hold power within Palestine in this period (from the time of Salome). The pesherist, then, looks for a time when the Kittim/Romans will face the avenging wrath of God.

Note, though, the close connection of the Kittim here with Lebanon (II:5,7; Nah. 1:4b). Compare the interpretation of the fall of Lebanon (Isa. 10:34) with regard to the Kittim in 4QpIsa<sup>a</sup> 8-10 III:1-10 (above). If, as I suspect, and as most scholars agree, the Kittim in 4QpNah are the Romans from the time of Pompey (see further below, Frags. 3-4), then it is possible that the Isaiah pesherist also has in mind the Romans when he refers to the Kittim. However, if this is true, then we have to say that the texts derive from different periods. In 4QpIsa<sup>a</sup>, Lebanon/Kittim will fall by the hand of Israel, continuing the train of thought in 1QM and 4Q285. Here, by contrast, Lebanon/Kittim is withered, implying a lingering demise in power. 4QpIsa<sup>a</sup>, I suppose, is written before the Romans have taken control, or before control has been properly established, when the group anticipated an uprising similar to that of the second-century BC, while 4QpNah by contrast, reflects a more settled occasion when the Romans *are* in complete control. Use of the different prophecies to Lebanon can accentuate this contrast, I suggest.

## Fragments 3-4

אשר הלך ארי לבוא שם גור ארינה ואין מחריד

Where the lion went to enter, the lion[’s] cub and no-one to disturb (Nah. 2:11b[Heb. 2:12b]; 4QpNah 3-4 I:1-2)

פשרו על דמי[טרום] מלך יון אשר בקש לבוא ירושלים 2  
 בעצת דורשי החלקות  
 ולוא נתן אל את ירושלים] ביד מלכי יון מאנתיכום עד עמוד 3  
 מושלי כתיים ואחר תרמם  
 [ ] 4

Its interpretation concerns Deme]trius<sup>147</sup>, King of Yavan, who sought to enter Jerusalem on the counsel of the Seekers of Smooth Things, <sub>3</sub> [but God did not give Jerusalem<sup>148</sup>] into the hands of the Kings of Yavan from Antiochus until the rise of the rulers of the Kittim. But later {[it]} will be trampled <sub>4</sub> [ ... ]<sup>149</sup> (4QpNah 3-4 I:2-4)

This passage will be dealt with in greater detail in our next chapter, which will deal with texts relating to the identity of Ephraim, Manasseh, and (in connection with the current passage) the ‘Seekers of Smooth Things’ (דורשי החלקות; I:2). Here we may point out that ‘kings of Yavan from Antiochus until the rise of the rulers of the Kittim’ (I:3) is intended as an historical inclusio in order to set in context Demetrius’s unsuccessful entry into Jerusalem (I:2). As we have seen (above, n8), ‘Yavan’ refers in Biblical Hebrew to the Hellenistic world, and thus its application to Alexander the Great (Dan. 8:21). It is almost certain, then, that Demetrius and Antiochus are Seleucid rulers of this period, especially given the relative frequency of these names among Seleucid ‘king-lists’. ‘Antiochus’, then, is most likely Antiochus IV Epiphanes, responsible for the purge on Judaism, and as we shall further express below, ‘Demetrius’ best identifies Demetrius III Eukerus (below, p92).

It is, nonetheless, unclear whether this should have any bearing on the meaning and application of ‘Kittim’ here. As we have seen (above, 2.1), ‘Kittim’ may be applied to

<sup>147</sup> “Demetrius” is partly reconstructed from the context. Only the letters טרום survive, but all scholars agree that “[Deme]trius” should be here understood, though the spellings differ: Allegro and Horgan read דמי[טרום]; Yadin has דמי[טריס]; while Dupont-Sommer has דמי[טריס].

<sup>148</sup> Restored with Horgan. García-Martínez adds בוא וולוא: “[but he did not enter, for God had not given Jerusalem] ...” The overall sense is clear in either instance.

the Seleucid Greeks, perhaps even in the DSS themselves. Nevertheless, the reference here, to the 'rise (עמור) of the rulers of the Kittim' suggests a change from Yavan (Seleucid Syria) to Kittim, which contextually must mean something else. It is, then, not unreasonable to conclude that the pesherist is here alluding to the capture of Jerusalem (and the Temple itself) by the Roman forces of Pompey (*Ant.* XIV, iv, 1-4 §54-76) in 63 BC.<sup>150</sup> The two captures of Jerusalem, by Antiochus in 168/167 and later by Pompey, thus form the historical framework.

Horgan finds this reference problematic insofar as:

...the commentary refers in some way to the independence of Judea and seems to be saying that Jerusalem (or Judea) as independent from the time of Antiochus until the coming of the Kittim (i.e., the Romans). It is unclear which Antiochus is meant, since it was not from Antiochus that Judea gained political independence. It was from Demetrius II that Simon, the son of Mattathias, was able to negotiate independence in 142 B.C. From that time until the Roman conquest (63 B.C.) Judea enjoyed relative freedom. The Qumran commentator could be referring to religious liberty, which was denied by Antiochus IV Epiphanes but was regained after his death. It is likely, therefore, that Antiochus IV Epiphanes is meant.<sup>151</sup>

Nevertheless, Horgan makes a conclusion unsupported by the pesher, namely that the pesher refers to Judea's political independence. The text says no such thing. Rather, it is the case that two climactic events in Judaea's history are used as 'chronological markers', nothing more.

One aspect of the passage that merits more detailed consideration is the expression *ואחר תרמס* (I:3) which we have translated 'but later it will be trampled'. As we have suggested (above, p70f), the language here invokes similarities with both 1QpPs 9 I:3 and 1QpHab III:7. Although the Hebrew terminology is different in each instance, all three phrases are found in close proximity to the Kittim, and, whereas in 1QpHab and 1QpPs the 'trample' references occur in quotations from the Hebrew Bible, in the current passage 'trample' enters the body of the interpretation itself. The biblical background of the *רמס* root is significant. It is used in an agricultural or industrial

<sup>149</sup> Horgan adds [העיר ונתנה ביד מושלי הכתרים] '[the city] {will be trampled} [and will be given into the hand of the rulers of the Kittim.]'

<sup>150</sup> Although others, including Ptolemy Lathyrus (above) attacked Judaea in this intervening period, Jerusalem herself did not fall, and thus these events cannot have been referred to by the pesherist here.

<sup>151</sup> Horgan, 173-174.

setting, for a wine-press (Isa. 63:3) or the treading of mortar (Nah. 3:14) respectively, but is most frequently encountered in a military context. In Isa. 28 (a passage that we shall have recourse to in our next chapter), the ‘proud garland of the drunkards of Ephraim’ will be trampled underfoot (28:3), relating to the fall of the Northern Kingdom. Meanwhile, in Ezek. 26:11, in connection with the siege of Tyre by the Babylonian Nebuchadrezzar, “with the hoofs of his horses he shall trample (ירמס) all your streets. He shall put your people to the sword, and your strong pillars shall fall to the ground.” In Isa. 41:25, the industrial imagery is used metaphorically for war, here in connection with the victories of Cyrus:

I stirred up one from the North, and he has come, and from the rising of the sun he was summoned by name. He shall trample (ויבא) on rulers as on mortar, as the potter treads (ירמס) clay.

Most significant of all, however, the terminology twice recurs in Daniel’s stylised depiction of Alexander the Great’s victory over the Persians (Dan. 8:7,10):

I saw it approaching the ram. It was enraged against it and struck the ram, breaking its two horns. The ram did not have the power to withstand it; it threw the ram down to the ground and trampled (וירמסו) upon it, and there was no one who could rescue the ram from its power. (Dan. 8:7)

It grew as high as the host of heaven. It threw down to earth some of the host and some of the stars, and trampled (ורמסם) on them. (Dan. 8:10)

Within the Hebrew Bible, then, the רמס root is especially associated with an invading army. One of its acts will be to ‘trample’ those living there. In the peshet, although neither the subject or object of הרמס has survived, the overwhelming biblical evidence certainly depicts Jerusalem as the object and the Kittim as the aggressors. The picture, then, especially given our comments above, is undoubtedly of the capture of Jerusalem by the Kittim, perhaps the forces of Pompey. What is clear from the biblical evidence however, is that contrary to Brooke’s proposal that הרמס is not chosen here “possibly because of its proximity to the sound of the name Rome itself”<sup>152</sup>, the term rather fits into the imagery surrounding the invading army and is paralleled by other terms in similar instances.

---

<sup>152</sup> So Brooke, “Kittim,” 138.

That said, however, it is clear that the Kittim in 4QpNah are the Romans, the only instance in the pesharim where this is demonstrably the case.

### **2.3 Conclusions**

There is a broad consensus among scholars that the Kittim be identified with the Romans of the later Republic; and this is especially clear when one examines studies devoted to 1QpHab. Although there was early debate as to whether the Kittim be identified with the Romans or Seleucid Greeks, scholarly consensus now almost exclusively identifies the Kittim of 1QpHab as Romans. Nevertheless, my research has shown that this argument rests on the flimsiest of bases. Those alleged ‘telling’ arguments have been rejected, leaving one with just the impression created, scarcely conclusive. Meanwhile, my study has also demonstrated that the blanket identification of ‘Kittim’ in the scrolls with any one people should also be resisted. 1QM, for instance, where it differentiates between the Kittim *of Asshur* and the Kittim *in Egypt*, is understood to refer to the Seleucid Greek forces of Lysias and Antiochus V. Within the pesharim themselves, it was argued that 4QpIsa<sup>a</sup> stood in the tradition of 1QM (and 4Q285) and, while it was not possible to support the identification of ‘Kittim’ here with the Greek forces of Ptolemy Lathyrus, a reference to the Greeks more generally is certainly warranted. By contrast, however, it is similarly clear that mention of the Kittim in 4QpNah specifically referred to the Roman forces of Pompey. A blanket identification of ‘Kittim’ in the pesharim, whether to Greeks or Romans, is thus impossible.

Instead, my research has demonstrated that, with the possible exception of 4QpNah, the primary focus of the Kittim in the DSS and the pesharim in particular is not historical, but prophetic, or *eschatological*. We have seen how the term ‘Kittim’ has a wide biblical and post-biblical reference and, in analysis of the relevant pericopae, we have frequently uncovered biblical sources for many of the words and phrases used of this group by the pesher author(s). Furthermore, in 1QpHab we have observed how the Kittim are identified as the Chaldeans of the base text while, through discussion of the various lemmata, we have demonstrated the way in which biblical passages originally referred to the Chaldeans are redirected to the Kittim. The reason for this change from ‘Chaldeans’ to ‘Kittim’ in 1QpHab at the same time reflects (1) the move in no longer understanding ‘Chaldeans’ as a warrior nation but as ‘court

magicians' in later biblical texts like Daniel (cf. Dan. 2:2); and (2) the emergence of the Kittim as an enemy of Israel in other early Jewish literature.

Certainly each pesherist had in mind a particular historical group when speaking of the Kittim (though not all may have been thinking of the *same* group). When properly understood, however, the historical identity of the Kittim is not itself the matter of concern. This is considered less important than the recognition that in prophecy the Kittim function as a signpost of the proximity of the eschaton. It is thus in this light, and in the hopes of the world to come, that the Qumran authors offer up their 'commentaries' on the prophecies of Isaiah, Habakkuk and others.

In our next chapter we will examine another well-established thesis within the pesharim, the meaning and application of the expression 'Seekers of Smooth Things' and the related terms 'Ephraim' and 'Manasseh'. As with the understanding of the 'Kittim' it may be that these applications are also premature.



### 3.0 Ephraim, Manasseh and the Seekers of Smooth Things

The designations ‘Ephraim’, ‘Manasseh’ and the ‘Seekers of Smooth Things’ (דורשי החלקות) are found in several of the pesharim, including 4QpIsa<sup>c</sup>, 4QpHos<sup>b</sup>, 4QpNah, 4QpPs<sup>a</sup>, 4QTest and 4QCat<sup>a</sup>. Although ‘Manasseh’ is not found outside of the pesharim<sup>1</sup>, both ‘Ephraim’ and the ‘Seekers of Smooth Things’ are found in CD,<sup>2</sup> and ‘Ephraim’ in 4Q379, the ‘Psalms of Joshua’ text, 22 II:13, which parallels the Testimonia account. The ‘Seekers of Smooth Things’ are also found in 1QH X:15, 32.

I take these designations together precisely because the pesherist himself relates them together, perhaps suggesting that the groups to whom the designations refer derive from a common point in history. For instance, ‘Manasseh’ only appears in texts that also refer to ‘Ephraim’ (especially the Nahum pesher), while (also in 4QpNah) ‘Ephraim’ is connected with the ‘Seekers of Smooth Things’ (3-4 II:2). As we shall show, these groups are of obvious importance to the history of the sect, and yet relatively few studies have dealt with these references at all, and none have been directly concerned with the designations themselves. Rather, these references have been used to support a prevalent understanding within the pesharim, an understanding that has yet to be rigorously tested.

#### 3.1 The דורשי החלקות: *Towards a preliminary identification*

The designation דורשי החלקות (ה) appears in several of the scrolls, and is not exclusive to the pesharim themselves, but can be found in 1QH and (albeit in a different construction) CD. There are three factors in understanding this phrase: first is to understand its constituent parts; second, to explore the accepted pun on חלקות with הלכות; and third, to note the parallel of this structure to the title דורש התורה (‘the expounder/seeker of the Law’) also found in the scrolls.

- (1) חלקות is found three times in the Hebrew Bible, at Isa. 30:10 and in Ps. 12:3, 4. In Psalm 12 the term is translated by ‘flattery’ and in Isaiah by ‘smooth things’.

<sup>1</sup> 11QT LIV:12 is purely tribal in significance.

<sup>2</sup> CD VII:12,13; XIV:1. Cf. I:18.

Neither context views the term in a positive light. In the Psalm it is associated with lies, two-facedness and boasting. In the Isaiah passage, the same element of lies comes forth:

כִּי עַם מָרִי הוּא בְּנֵיִם כְּחָשִׁים בְּנֵיִם לֹא־אָבוּ שְׁמוּעַ תּוֹרַת יְהוָה:  
אֲשֶׁר אָמְרוּ לְרֵאִים לֹא תִרְאוּ וּלְחֹזִים לֹא תַחֲזוּ־לָנוּ נִכְחֹת דְּבַרְו־לָנוּ  
חֲלָקוֹת חֲזוּ מִהַתְּלוֹחַ: סוּרוּ מִנִּי־דֶרֶךְ הַטֵּוּ מִנִּי־אֶרֶץ הַשְּׁבִיתוּ מִפְּנֵינוּ  
אֶת־קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל: ס

For they are a rebellious people, faithless children, children who will not hear the instruction of the LORD; who say to the seers, “Do not see”; and to the prophets, “Do not prophesy to us what is right; *speak to us smooth things*, prophesy illusions, leave the way, turn aside from the path, let us hear no more about the Holy One of Israel.” (Isa. 30:9-11)

From this passage we can see how חלקות ‘smooth things’ is paralleled by מהתלות ‘illusions’ (30:10c), a factor that is picked up in CD.

These are the ones who stray path from the path. This is the time about which it was written: “Like a stray heifer so has Israel strayed” (Hos. 4:16), when ‘the Scoffer’ arose, who poured out over Israel waters of lies and made them stray into a wilderness without path ... so that the curses of his covenant would not adhere to them, to deliver them up to the sword carrying out the vengeance of the covenant. *For they sought easy interpretations* (דַּרְשׁוּ בַחֲלָקוֹת),<sup>3</sup> chose illusions (במהתלות), scrutinised loopholes, chose the handsome neck, acquitted the guilty and sentenced the just, violated the covenant, broke the precept, banded together against the life of the just man, their soul abominated all those who walked in perfection, they hunted them down with the sword and provoked the dispute of the people. And kindled was the wrath of God against their congregation, laying waste all its great number, for their deeds were unclean in front of him. (CD I:13-21[=4Q266 2 I:16-II:2]; García-Martínez)

1QH makes much the same point:

I give you thanks, LORD, for your eye keeps [firm] over me. You have freed me from the zeal of the mediators of deceit, *from the congregation of the seekers of flattering things* (ומעדת דורשי חלקות). (1QH II:32; García-Martínez)

Clearly in both the Hebrew Bible, particularly Isa. 30:10, and the scrolls, 1QH and especially CD, *halaqot* are associated with lies, false prophecy and (following García-Martínez) *incorrect interpretation of the divine message*.

<sup>3</sup> The translation ‘interpretations’ here reflects the legal emphasis of CD; precepts, loopholes etc. It also assumes the reading in IQS VI:6 cited below.

By the Second Temple period, דרש has taken on an interpretative sense, particularly in the scrolls themselves. Werline, in a recent work, suggests that this derives from the sect's understanding of Deut. 4:29-30<sup>4</sup>: "From there you will seek (תדרשנו) the LORD your God, and you will find him if you search after him with all your heart and soul. In your distress, when all these things have happened to you in time to come, you will return to the LORD your God and heed him." The group appears to have taken this command to search to refer to searching in the Law, i.e. interpreting it. Hence 1QS VI:6f:

And in the place in which the Ten assemble there should not be missing a man *to interpret the law* (דרש בתורה) day and night, always one relieving another.  
(García-Martínez)

Again, as we have already suggested, there apparently existed within the sect a דרש התורה, but although this role probably reflects this aspect, the context of these references unfortunately does not further define the interpreter's role.

In later Rabbinic texts the noun מדרש refers to a form of scholarly interpretation of scripture. This form is evidenced within the scrolls themselves (above, p19), though it is unclear from the context whether the term has the range of meaning it will acquire later. In its more simple sense, then, 'seeking' refers to the scholarly practice of interpreting scripture, though whether this is viewed positively or negatively is dependent on context. It is clear, for instance, that such study of Torah is viewed as being of importance to the sect. The fact that *this* group is described as 'seekers of *halaqot*', however, suggests that the practice be understood negatively when the OT context is properly understood.

(2) Given that both חלקה and דרש suggest similarities with later Rabbinic terminology, it is quite proper to see in the phrase דרשי חלקה an allusion to the Pharisees, their indirect 'ancestors', who, from the evidence in Josephus, were clearly active in the early-mid first century BC. Josephus first mentions the Pharisees as a political party in the time of Alexandra Salome. During this period they became "the

---

<sup>4</sup> R.A. Werline, *Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism – The Development of a Religious Institution*, SBL Early Judaism and its Literature, 13 (Scholars Press: Atlanta, 1998), 110ff.

real administrators of public affairs” (*War* I, v, 2 §111). More importantly, Josephus notes that the Pharisees “appear more religious than others, *and seem to interpret the laws more accurately.*” Meanwhile, in *War* II, the Pharisees are the most accurate interpreters of the Law (*War* II, viii, 14 §162). In the *Antiquities*, Josephus describes the Pharisees’ fall from grace during the reign of John Hyrcanus I, principally through the machinations of one Jonathan, a friend of Hyrcanus, and a member of the Sadducees. This Jonathan so influenced Hyrcanus that he grew ‘irritated’ with the Pharisees and abolished “the decrees (νόμμοι ‘little laws’) they had imposed on the people” (*Ant.* XIII, x, 6 §296). These regulations, notes Josephus, had been handed down by former generations, and were not included in the Law of Moses, hence their rejection by the Sadducees, their opponents. The conclusion seems inescapable that these regulations (whether written *or* oral) are similar, if not identical, with the *halakhoth* recorded by the Rabbis, and that, in this period, the Pharisees were actively interpreting the law (as against e.g. Neusner<sup>5</sup>). If the Pharisees, then, were in this period already interpreting scripture and had their own הלכות/νόμμοι, the phrase דורשי חלקות might be understood to refer to their group, particularly if, as seems likely, there is a perceived pun on חלקות with הלכות.

This is to an extent supported by the Greek name of the group, φαρισαιοι. A loanword in Greek, the name no doubt derives from the Aramaic form פרישיא, Heb. פרושים. Semitic פרש means (in both Heb. and Aram.) ‘to separate’. The Pharisees could, then, be called ‘the separated ones’<sup>6</sup>. The similarity between this and a second meaning of חלק ‘divide’ should not be overlooked. דורשי חלקות could then be translated ‘seekers of divisions’ (so Amoussine – ‘Chercheurs des Dissensions’<sup>7</sup>). It is, though, interesting to note that Heb. פרושים may suggest a further parallel. Pointed *parōshim*, a second meaning ‘interpreters’ is possible. Indeed, as we have already seen, this understanding of the פרש root is found in the Book of Giants material – so Enoch is described as a ‘scribe of interpretation’ (ספר פרשא) who will ‘interpret’

---

<sup>5</sup> J. Neusner, *From Politics to Piety: The Emergence of Pharisaic Judaism* (New York: Ktav, 1979). A weakness of Neusner’s work as a whole is that he does not consider the Qumran evidence at all, perhaps the only evidence for the Pharisees at this early stage.

<sup>6</sup> Schürer, 2:396.

(פִּשְׁרֵ) dreams.<sup>8</sup> The very title ‘Pharisee’ may then reinforce Josephus’s evidence that the group were interpreters of the law.<sup>9</sup> To sum up: דורשי החלקות may mask a double or even triple pun – on הלכות ‘rulings’; חלקות ‘divisions’, and on the name ‘Pharisee’ itself, either as ‘the separated’ or as ‘the interpreters’.

(3) The structure of דורשי החלקות is itself reminiscent of the title דורש התורה ‘expounder of the Torah’ also found in the scrolls (CD VI:7; VII:18; 4QFlor. I:11), though it is as yet unclear how this figure relates to the 1QS reference noted above. In both contexts one person is responsible for interpreting passages of scripture, and it can presumably be inferred that this individual will be a senior member of the sect. This contrasts with the plural form of דורשי החלקות, which could be understood to imply that *any* member is entitled to give an authoritative interpretation of scripture, perhaps paralleling the form of legal argument presented in the Mishnah. For the Qumran author, this would breach the understanding of יחד ‘unity’, instead resulting in division (or חלקה). The very existence of a group like the דורשי החלקות, then, abrogates the Qumran principle, and threatens the sect itself. Although the designation most likely applies to the Pharisees as we have shown (and as analysis of the individual pericopae will further demonstrate), the terminology can be applied on a much broader level to all those who practice this sort of interpretative technique.

### Conclusions

The phrase דורשי החלקות is a matter of interest in its own right. In this brief study, we have demonstrated that the meaning of the clause is bound up with false interpretation(s) of scripture, whether accidental or deliberate. Inherent in the phrase is the perceived pun of חלקות on הלכות, a mode of scholarly interpretation particularly associated with the Rabbis and their intellectual predecessors the Pharisees. The very name of this group, as we have understood it, may cover a further dimension in the Heb. between (2) חלק ‘divide’ and פִּרֵשׁ ‘separate’, ‘interpret’.

<sup>7</sup> J.D. Amoussine, “Éphraïm et Manassé dans le Pésheh de Nahum (4 Q p Nahum),” *RevQ* 4 (1963-64), 389-96.

<sup>8</sup> Above, p16f.

Meanwhile, when explored on a more general level the phrase contrasts etymologically and symbolically with another figure, the *הורש הורה*.

### 3.2 'Ephraim' and 'Manasseh' in Biblical and post-biblical Tradition

The most obvious starting-point concerns the preferment of Ephraim over Manasseh, the sons of Joseph, by Jacob in Genesis 48. The account describes how, although Joseph places his father's right hand (for the firstborn) on Manasseh, and his left on Ephraim, Jacob crosses his hands so putting Ephraim ahead of his brother. In the biblical account Jacob explains how his act recognises the greater part the tribe of Ephraim will have to play, and their tribal superiority over Manasseh. The patriarchal trend of blessing the younger son over the firstborn is thus continued – compare Cain and Abel (Gen. 4), and Jacob himself over his brother Esau (Gen. 27). The story appears to have reflected historical reality, where Ephraim, during the period of the Judges and the early monarchy gained pre-eminence over the 'firstborn' tribe.<sup>10</sup>

#### 3.2.1 Ephraim

In the OT, Ephraim is otherwise associated with the Northern Kingdom (Israel), in much the same way that 'Judah' refers to the Southern Kingdom. This is largely because the tribal portion allotted to the half-tribe of Ephraim (Manasseh is usually forgotten) broadly coincides with the geographical region of the Northern Kingdom. Ephraim, then, is an epithet for the North, and in the Hebrew Bible is associated with wickedness and idolatry, particularly in the prophecies of Hosea, arising out of the fall of the Northern Kingdom in 722 BC. Whereas in the fall of Judah in the sixth century a large percentage of the population was carried off into exile to Babylon, in the North the land was settled by the invaders alongside the land's original inhabitants. The bloodline was, then, sullied and contaminated, and the hatred this engendered by the South for their Northern cousins largely, though not exclusively, accounts for the contempt held for the Samaritan group in later history.

---

<sup>9</sup> It is, though, unclear whether 'Pharisee' was a self-designation of the group. Although both Paul (Phil. 3:5) and Josephus himself (*Life*, 2) call themselves *φαραισαῖοι*, this may simply be seeking a common frame of reference. The *הורש הורה* link should not, then be overworked.

<sup>10</sup> So E.C. Kingsbury, "He set Ephraim before Manasseh," *HUCA* 38 (1967), 129-136.

In later Rabbinic tradition, a more positive view of Ephraim emerges – through the introduction of the Messiah of Ephraim, a warrior who will precede the Messiah of David. Two forms of this tradition exist: one, where this Messiah will be a victorious hero; the other where he will be slain in battle. Also incorporated is the Dry Bones vision of Ezekiel 37 which identifies these bones with the tradition of a premature exodus from Egypt by the tribe of Ephraim and their subsequent defeat at the hands of the Philistines. The tradition is also heavily associated with the revolt in the mid-second century AD, and Bar Kokhba himself is often identified as the Messiah of Ephraim.<sup>11</sup>

In the scrolls themselves, aside from the pesharim, ‘Ephraim’ does appear in an important passage in CD, which forms a ‘pesheresque’ interpretation of Isa. 7:17<sup>12</sup>:

But (for) all those who despise: when God visits the earth in order to empty over them the punishment of the wicked, <sup>10</sup> when there comes the word which is written in the words of Isaiah, son of Amoz, the prophet, <sup>11</sup> who said: “There shall come upon you, upon your people, and upon your father’s house, days such as <sup>12</sup> have <not> come since the day Ephraim departed from Judah” (Isa. 7:17). When the two houses of Israel separated, <sup>13</sup> Ephraim detached itself from Judah, and all the renegades were delivered up to the sword; but those who remained steadfast <sup>14</sup> escaped to the land of the north. (CD VII:9-14; García-Martínez)

The background of the Isaiah passage recalls the split of David’s kingdom towards the end of the reign of Solomon (c.f. I Kings 11). Since Jeroboam, the ruler of the northern kingdom, was an Ephraimite (I Ki. 11:26), while Solomon was of the tribe of Judah, the division is viewed in terms of Ephraim and Judah. The author of CD both acknowledges this division while also, it seems paralleling a contemporary situation in the life of the community. Within the passage we may identify the ‘renegades’ of line 13 with ‘Ephraim’ since the northern kingdom was effectively destroyed a mere twelve to thirteen years after Isaiah’s pronouncement, but the identity of the ‘steadfast’ who escaped to the north is more difficult since although Judah was taken off into captivity in Babylon this can by no means be classed ‘escape’. Instead, this may better reflect a more current situation. In the course of our discussions it is our

---

<sup>11</sup> So B.W.R. Pearson, “Dry Bones in the Judaean Desert: The Messiah of Ephraim, Ezekiel 37, and the Post-Revolutionary Followers of Bar Kokhba,” *JSJ* 29 (1998), 192-201, esp. 193 and (for the sources) notes 7-8. Cf. J. Heinemann, “The Messiah of Ephraim and the Premature Exodus of the Tribe of Ephraim,” *HTR* 68 (1975), 1-15.

<sup>12</sup> This verse also appears in MS A XIII:23-XIV:1 [=4Q267 9 V:2-4].

intention to identify a split in the community, referred to in both CD and the pesharim, and this appears to be reflected here. Once again 'Israel' (or 'the community') is divided into two groups, 'Ephraim' and 'Judah', and where Ephraim will suffer the same fate as that of the northern kingdom, the faithful Judah will escape to the north. This 'escape' seems to be clarified in the passage immediately following, which citing Amos 5:26-27, refers to a removal to Damascus – elsewhere in CD the site for the new covenant (VI:19). For CD, then, the historical division of Israel is reflected within the community's own split, one group of which is clearly identified by the epithet 'Ephraim'.

### 3.2.2 Manasseh

Fewer traditions surround Manasseh, the elder son in the Hebrew Bible, though there is one tradition concerning a 'Manasseh' that bears mention.

Manasseh was a King of Judah (697-642 BC), who, though son of the righteous Hezekiah, was accounted the wickedest King of either Judah or Israel. II Kings 21 relates how he undid the good deeds of his father, rebuilding the high places, erecting altars to Baal, making *Asheroth*, even engaging in child sacrifice. Indeed, for the Deuteronomist, Manasseh's reign was considered the worst period of apostasy in Judah, and he is ultimately blamed for Jerusalem's fall in 587 BC (II Kings 21:10-15). A more positive image is related in the parallel account in II Chronicles 33. Although the same elements as the II Kings passage are also found here (the altars to Baal etc.), in this account Manasseh apparently repents during a period of imprisonment in Babylon – an interlude not found in II Kings. This is normally put down to the length of Manasseh's reign over Judah (fifty-five years – by far the longest reign of any other King of Judah or Israel). Such a length of reign would have been inconsistent with the Chronicler's understanding of punishment for one's crimes. The Chronicler, then, rewrites the II Kings account incorporating this story of the king's captivity in Babylon, subsequent conversion and eventual restoration. The final years of his reign are then spent putting right his former faults.

The post-Biblical evidence is similarly ambiguous. These writers are obviously aware of the II Chronicles account. Indeed the *Prayer of Manasseh* supposedly locates the



King's prayer in Babylon. II Baruch, moreover, is clearly aware of Manasseh's entreaty, though here (II Bar. 64) it has no effect:

Therefore Manasseh was called the impious one in that time, and finally his habitation was in the fire. For although the Most High had heard his prayer, in the end when he fell into the brazen horse and the brazen horse was melted, it became to him a sign regarding the hour (which was to come). For he had not lived perfectly since he was not worthy, but (the sign was given to him) that he might know henceforth by whom he should be punished at the end. For he who is able to benefit is also able to punish. (II Bar. 64:7-10; Trans. A.F.J. Klijn in Charlesworth, I, 643)

The post-Biblical literature incorporates new features into the 'Manasseh tradition'. So Manasseh is blamed for the death of Isaiah whom he sawed in half (*Ascension of Isaiah* 5:1<sup>13</sup>). Parts of this document have been dated to the persecution instigated by Antiochus IV Epiphanes, and there have, moreover, been attempts to read this document as a Qumran text with its thinly veiled references to the Hellenistic crisis, though the identification of Manasseh as the Wicked Priest and the Teacher of Righteousness as Isaiah surely goes too far.<sup>14</sup>

### Conclusions

In sum, both Ephraim and Manasseh have a wide Biblical and post-Biblical reference, and both have damning and redeeming features. Overall, however, both are associated primarily with wickedness, Ephraim through her association with the Northern Kingdom, and Manasseh through the reign of the Biblical King.

### 3.3 Ephraim, Manasseh and the חלקי חרשי in the Pesharim

#### 3.3.1 4QpNahum

4QpNah is by far the most influential of the pesharim as far as preserved historical data is concerned. Not only does the pesher contain the most substantial information

---

<sup>13</sup> Also *The Lives of the Prophets* 1:1, and the Talmud, *b. Yebamoth*, 49b. Cf. Klijn in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, II, 151.

<sup>14</sup> See Flusser, *IEJ* 3 (1953), 34-47; H. Burgmann, "Gerichtsherr und Generalankläger: Jonathan und Simon," *RB* 9 (1977), 28-33, 70-72; J. van der Ploeg, "Les Manuscrits du Désert de Juda: Études et découvertes récentes," *BO* 11 (1954), 154f.; Philonenko, *Pseudepigraphes*, I, 1-10 (n. 41). Cf. R. Meyer, "Himmelfahrt und Martyrium des Jesaja," *RGG*<sup>3</sup>, 3, col. 336; L. Rost, *Judaism Outside the Hebrew Canon: An Introduction to the Documents*, Trans. D.E. Green (Nashville, 1976), 151.

about the groups termed ‘Ephraim’, ‘Manasseh’, and the ‘Seekers of Smooth Things’, but, as we have seen, the pesherist refers to two named individuals “[Deme]trius, King of Yavan” (3-4 I:2) and “Antiochus” (3-4 I:3) allowing us to accurately date the events recorded within the body of the interpretation. This, combined with the well-preserved nature of the text, has enabled scholars to correlate these accounts to events recorded in other ancient authorities (principally Josephus and the Books of the Maccabees) with a greater degree of accuracy than is normally possible with the pesharim. Nevertheless, despite the number of studies devoted to uncovering the historical realities recorded (and in many instances precisely because of the emphasis on the ‘historical’ references) other information on the groups is often neglected.

אשר הלך ארי לבוא שם גור ארינה ואין מחריד

Nah. 2:11b[Heb. 2:12b]; 4QpNah 3-4 I:1-2

פשוטו על דמיטרוס מלך יון אשר בקש לבוא ירושלים	2
בעצת דורשי החלקות	
[לוא נתן אל את ירושלים] ביד מלכי יון מאנתיכום עד עמוד	3
מושלי כתיים ואחר תרמם	
[ ]	4

4QpNah 3-4 I:2-3. For translation and textual notes see above, pp78f.

The section of the pesher with which we are interested (3-4 I-IV) begins by citing Nah. 2:11b, the lion’s den metaphor which the pesherist interprets as the coming of Demetrius, King of Yavan, to Jerusalem, on the advice of the Seekers of Smooth Things. The ‘lion’, then, is Demetrius, and the ‘lion’s cub’ the Seekers themselves with whom Demetrius is apparently in collusion. The interpretation seems to derive from לבוא in the original prophecy, since Demetrius is said to have “sought to enter (לבוא) Jerusalem” (l. 2). “Demetrius, King of Yavan” is undoubtedly one of the Seleucid Kings Demetrius and is almost unanimously thought to refer to Demetrius III Eukerus (95-87 BC). This event is set within a broader historical perspective (l. 3): “[but God did not give Jerusalem] into the hands of the Kings of Yavan from Antiochus until the rise of the rulers of the Kittim,” almost certainly a reference to the separate invasions of Judaea/Jerusalem by the Seleucid King Antiochus IV Epiphanes

in 169 BC<sup>15</sup> and by the Roman General Pompey the Great just over a century later (63 BC).<sup>16</sup> During this period three kings called Demetrius ruled Seleucid Syria: Demetrius I Soter (162-150 BC – broadly concurrent with the alleged intersacerdotium in Jerusalem); Demetrius II (145-138 BC (parallel to Jonathan Maccabee in Jerusalem) and 128-125 BC (John Hyrcanus); and Demetrius III Eukerus (Alexander Jannaeus). The latter is the most likely candidate, since Josephus records a failed attempt by him to gain entry to Jerusalem (*Ant.* XIII, xiv, 1 §377-378).<sup>17</sup> If this is correct, the כפיר החרון ‘Lion of Wrath’<sup>18</sup> in the following passage is almost certainly Alexander Jannaeus.

אָרִי טוֹרֵף בְּרֵי גּוֹרִיו וּמַחְנֵק לְלִבְיֹתָיו טוֹרֵף וַיִּמְלֵא טוֹרֵף  
חֹרֶה וּמַעֲוֹנָתוֹ טוֹרֵף]

The lion tears sufficient for his cubs, and strangles prey for his lionesses. [And he fills his cave with prey and his den with torn flesh.] (Nah. 2:12[Heb. 2:13]; 4QpNah 3-4 I:4-5)<sup>19</sup>

[פֶּשֶׁר הַדְּבָר] עַל כְּפִיר הַחֲרוֹן	5
אֲשֶׁר יִכֶּה בְּגִדּוּלָיו וְאֲנָשִׁי עֲצָתוֹ	
וְאֲשֶׁר אָמַר וַיִּמְלֵא טוֹרֵף] הֹרֶה וּמַעֲוֹנָתוֹ טוֹרֵף	6
vacat פֶּשֶׁרוֹ עַל כְּפִיר הַחֲרוֹן	
לְאִשֶׁת נֶקְמָוֹת בְּדוֹרֵשֵׁי הַחֲלָקוֹת	7
אֲשֶׁר יִתְלֶה אֲנָשִׁים חַיִּים	
[עַל הָעֵץ] בִּישְׂרָאֵל מִלְּפָנִים כִּי	8
לְתַלְוֵי חַי עַל הָעֵץ [וַיִּקְרָא הַנָּבִי אֵלָיו] כֹּה]	

<sup>15</sup> According to I Macc. 1:20-24, Antiochus came up against Israel and Jerusalem with his army and entered the temple, carrying off all its treasures to Syria as plunder (Also II Macc. 5). Later in I Macc. the author describes the purge on Jerusalem (1:41-64) apparently instigated by Antiochus, and it is possible that the Qumran author also has this in mind.

<sup>16</sup> On the identity of the Kittim see above, p77. For Pompey's entry into the temple see *Ant.* XIV, iv, 4 §72.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. *War* I, iv, 4 §92.

<sup>18</sup> For the translation 'Lion of Wrath' I follow the majority. García-Martínez has 'Angry Lion' and Vermes 'furious young lion'. The expression may derive from the lament in Ezek. 19:1-14, which speaks of a young lion who will devour humans (vv 3, 6). The verse originally referred to two kings of Judah, Jehoahaz and Zedekiah, thus extending the metaphor to include another ruler of Judah is entirely possible. Had the pesherist wished to comment on this passage, he might also have identified the lioness who raised up one of her cubs to be a 'young lion' as Alexandra Salome who appointed Jannaeus king.

<sup>19</sup> Horgan transcribes only 2:13a and restores [פֶּשֶׁרוֹ עַל דְּמִיטְרוֹס אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה מַלְחָמָה] עַל כְּפִיר הַחֲרוֹן [The interpretation of it concerns Demetrius, who made war] against the Lion of Wrath' at the beginning of l. 5. My own transcription better follows the understanding of the 'Lion of Wrath' as the lion of Nah 2:13a, also the subject of the verse in line 6.

[The interpretation of the matter] concerns the Lion of Wrath who smote with his great ones and the men of his counsel  $\epsilon$  [ ... and as for what He said, "And he fills] his cave [with prey] and his den with torn flesh" (Nah. 2:12b) <Blank> Its interpretation concerns the Lion of Wrath  $\zeta$  [ ... carrying out re]venge<sup>20</sup> against the Seekers of Smooth Things, who hanged men alive  $\eta$  [on the tree ...] in Israel, from ancient times. For regarding one hanged alive on the tree [it] reads<sup>21</sup>, "Behold I am against [you]  $\theta$  declar[es the LORD of Hosts." (Nah. 2:13a) (4QpNah 3-4 I:5-9)

For the majority of scholars this passage remains the key to understanding the pesher as a whole. The reference to men "hanged alive on a tree" is taken to refer to the Roman practice of crucifixion, and the overall passage to the account in Josephus immediately following Demetrius' failed attempt to secure Jerusalem, where 800 Pharisees are crucified by Jannaeus during a feast for his wives.

Now as Alexander fled to the mountains, six thousand of the Jews hereupon came together [from Demetrius] to him out of pity at the change of his fortune; upon which Demetrius was afraid, and retired out of the country; after which the Jews fought against Alexander, and being beaten, were slain in great numbers in the several battles which they had; and when he had shut up the most powerful of them in the city Bethome he besieged them therein; and when he had taken the city, and gotten the men into his power, he brought them to Jerusalem, and did one of the most barbarous actions in the world to them; for as he was feasting with his concubines, in the sight of all the city, he ordered about eight hundred of them to be crucified; and while they were living ( $\xi\tau\iota\ \zeta\acute{\omega}\nu\tau\omega\nu$ ), he ordered the throats of their children and wives to be cut before their eyes. This was indeed by way of revenge for the injuries they had done him ... However this barbarity seems to have been without any necessity, on which account he bore the name of a Thracian<sup>22</sup> among the Jews; whereupon the soldiers that had fought against

<sup>20</sup> Reading  $\text{לֹא־שׁוֹרָה}$  [נק]מֹת with Dupont-Sommer, Vermes. A similar phrase  $\text{נִמְקוֹת נָקָם}$  is found in CD I:17 (above, 84). In the editio princeps Allegro read מוֹת 'death' (with a question mark). Yadin reads  $\text{מִוֹת}$  [משפט] 'sentence of death'. Horgan does not restore.

<sup>21</sup>  $\text{כִּי לַחֲלוּי חַי עַל הָעֵץ}$  [י]קרא is difficult. Allegro's suggestion that the phrase alludes to Dt. 21:23 – understanding קללת 'cursed' which has been omitted for pietist reasons – is difficult to accept given the plethora of other 'curse' material from Qumran. More successful are the attempts to read the phrase as explanatory to לחלוי – thus Dupont-Sommer "since the hanged one is called alive on the tree" or Yadin "since the hanged one is called [hanged] on the tree". Like Horgan, however, I follow Bardtke in seeing יקרא as introductory to the next citation (Nah. 2:14), even though this violates the normal pesher (so Dupont-Sommer).

<sup>22</sup> Grk.  $\Theta\rho\alpha\kappa\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha\nu$ , i.e. barbarity like that of a Thracian. Allegro suggests that this term may lie behind the pesherist's  $\text{כַּפִּיר הַחֲרוּן}$  'lion of wrath' as a word play. He derives  $\Theta\rho\alpha\kappa\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha\nu$  from Greek  $\Theta\acute{\eta}\rho$  ( $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ )  $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\delta\omega\nu$  'lion of (the) barbs (thorns)' (Heb.  $\text{כַּפִּיר (ה) חַחִים}$ ). He also suggests a further wordplay on  $\text{סֶבֶה/סֶבֶה}$  often used to refer to the lair of a lion (so Jer. 25:38; Ps. 10:9) with the phonetically similar  $\text{שֶׁבֶה}$  'barb, spear', though this is less likely (Allegro, "Thracidan, The 'Lion of Wrath' and Alexander Jannaeus," *PEQ* 91 (1959), 47-51, esp. 47-48).

him, being about eight thousand in number, ran away by night, and continued fugitives all the time that Alexander lived; who being now freed from any further disturbance from them, reigned the rest of his time in the utmost tranquillity. (*Ant.* XIII, xiv, 2 §379-383)<sup>23</sup>

Although Josephus is not specific, the identity of those crucified here is most likely the Pharisees, since, later in the *Antiquities*, these are said to have desired to persuade Alexandra Salome to “kill those that had persuaded Alexander to kill the eight hundred men” (XIII, xvi, 2 §410; below, p99). If these 800 men were not themselves Pharisees, the passage certainly suggests a closeness between the two groups. They are ‘on the same wavelength’. In other words, this reference, it is alleged, may correlate to the episode described by Josephus, and the Seekers of Smooth Things themselves to the Pharisees.<sup>24</sup>

It is not clear, however, that the phrase “hanged alive on a tree” (Heb. לתלוי על) necessarily refers to crucifixion. The phrase itself derives from Deut. 21:22-23:

וְכִי־יִהְיֶה בְּאִישׁ חָטָא מִשְׁפָּט־מוֹת וְהוּמָת וְתָלִיתָ אֹתוֹ עַל־עֵץ: לֹא־תֵלִין נִבְלָתוֹ עַל־הָעֵץ כִּי־קְבוּרַתוֹ בְּיּוֹם הַהוּא כִּי־קָלַלְתָּ אֱלֹהִים תְּלִוֵי וְלֹא תִטְמָא אֶת־אֲדָמָתְךָ אֲשֶׁר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ נָתַן לְךָ נַחֲלָה: ס

When someone is convicted of a crime punishable by death and is executed, *and you hang him on a tree*, his corpse must not remain all night upon the tree; you shall bury him that same day, for anyone hung on a tree is under God's curse. You must not defile the land that the LORD your God is giving you for possession. (Deut. 21:22-23)

This passage is not concerned with the method of execution itself. Rather, it suggests the death penalty is carried out in some other (unspecified) manner, following which

<sup>23</sup> *War* I, iv, 6 §97 has a shorter account of the crucifixion of the 800.

<sup>24</sup> Lester Grabbe has also called for stock to be taken before identifying the Seekers of Smooth Things as Pharisees because of the current passage (“The Current State of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Are there more answers than questions?” in Stanley E. Porter & Craig A. Evans (eds.), *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After*, JSPSup 26 (Sheffield Academic Press: Sheffield, 1997), 54-67). He also points out that Josephus does not even mention the Pharisees in connection with the crucifixions of the 800. Rather, he argues, that while Pharisees may have featured among Jannaeus’s opponents, the context suggests that this opposition was far wider than any one group. From this, Grabbe argues that ‘Seekers-after-Smooth-Things’ did not have a consistent usage but was a useful epithet for any of the sect’s Jewish enemies (p60). Grabbe is on our reading correct to exercise a note of caution, which by his own admission is his main aim, but the fact remains that other passages in the *Antiquities* plausibly suggest that the Pharisees were Jannaeus’s chief opponents, and if the pesher refers to this event may have been reflected in the pesher’s description of Jannaeus’s opponents in terms of חלקות הררשי.

the body of the dead man is hung on a tree *as an example*. This interpretation is apparently ruled out by the pesherist through the insertion of חייים/חיי. For him, the guilty men are hanged on the tree *prior to death* and allowed to die, an understanding which is paralleled in the following Temple Scroll passage:

... If a man has informed against his people and has delivered his people up to a foreign nation and has done evil to his people, *you shall hang him on the tree* (ותליתמה אותו על העץ) and he shall die. On the evidence of two witnesses and on the evidence of three witnesses he shall be put to death, *and they shall hang him on the tree* (והמה יתלו אותו העץ). If a man has committed a crime punishable by death and has run away to the midst of the Gentiles and has cursed his people and the children of Israel, *you shall hang him also on the tree* (ותליתמה גם אותו על העץ) and he shall die; and you shall not leave their bodies upon the tree in the night but you shall bury them the same day, *for the hanged up on the tree* (תלוי על העץ) are cursed by God and men; and you shall not defile the land which I give you as an inheritance ... (11QT LXIV:6-13; Yadin)

Nevertheless, while it is clear from this that being ‘hanged alive’ on a tree is a euphemism for the death penalty, the nature of the penalty itself is unclear. While the reference could refer to crucifixion, it could equally well refer to hanging itself. Indeed, as Baumgarten points out, strangulation is one the four forms of capital punishment imposed by Rabbinic courts, who list hanging as a form of *heneq* ‘strangulation’.<sup>25</sup> Moreover, Targum Onqelos, in rendering Deut. 21:22, actually reads ותצליב יתיה על צליבה “and you shall hang him on a gibbet.” It seems unclear, then, why ‘being hanged alive on a tree’ in the pesher refers to crucifixion, where the evidence from Jewish literature (which must also include 11QT) suggests that a meaning ‘hanging’ is more appropriate.<sup>26</sup> Were it not, indeed, Josephus’s evidence,

<sup>25</sup> J.M. Baumgarten, “Does TLH in the Temple Scroll refer to Crucifixion?” *JBL* 91 (1972), 472-81, esp. 473f. See also: Y. Yadin, “Peshar Nahum (4Q pNahum) Reconsidered,” *IEJ* 21 (1971) 1-12; L. Díez Merino, “La crucifixión en la antigua literatura judía (Período intertestamental),” *Estudios Eclesiásticos* 51 (1976) 5-27; “El suplicio de la Cruz en la literatura judía intertestamental,” *SBFLA* 26 (1976) 31-120; M. Wilcox, “‘Upon the Tree’ – Deut 21:22-23 in the New Testament,” *JBL* 96 (1977), 85-99; M. Hengel, *Crucifixion* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977); J.A. Fitzmeyer, “Crucifixion in Ancient Palestine, Qumran Literature, and the New Testament,” *CBQ* 40 (1978), 493-513; and most recently O. Betz, “Jesus and the Temple Scroll,” in James H. Charlesworth (ed.), *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ABRL (Doubleday: New York, 1995), 75-103; J. Zias and J.H. Charlesworth, “CRUCIFIXION: Archaeology, Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in Charlesworth, *ibid.*, 273-289.

<sup>26</sup> The relation of the 11QT passage to Deut. 21:22-23 has in particular been discussed by Otto Betz. He points out that the punishment prescribed in Deuteronomy is reserved for crimes of high treason. Moreover, in connection with the passage in 4QpNah, Betz suggests that the

most scholars would avoid mentioning crucifixion in connection with this passage. It is then a circular argument, using Josephus to see in 4QpNah a reference to crucifixion, which would then point back to the passage in Josephus regarding the crucifixion of the Pharisees!

The *Antiquities* passage is certainly helpful. Josephus suggests that Jannaeus' action was "one of the most barbarous actions in the world." In other words he suggests that the action was effectively unprecedented. In this instance then, in referring to a practice otherwise unknown in Palestine, the Qumran author may have used a phrase already known to his readers. On this reading, it does not matter whether the actual phrase refers to crucifixion or hanging; indeed the latter is more likely. However, the circumstantial nature of the reference does not allow us to identify concretely the reference to the 'hanging alive' of the Seekers of Smooth Things to the crucifixion of the Pharisees and/or their supporters by Alexander Jannaeus, though this remains the most likely probability.

והבערתי בעשן רובכה וכפיריכה תאכל חרב והכרנתי  
מארץ טרפה ולא ישמע עוד קול מלאכיכה

I shall burn up] your [throng in smoke] and a sword shall devour your lions and [I] shall cut off its [p]rey [from the earth] and [the voice of your messengers] will no [longer be heard.] (Nah. 2:13b [Heb. 2:14b]; 4QpNah 3-4 I:9-10)

פשוטו רובכה הם גרודי חילו	10
אשר בירושלים וכפריו הם	
גדוליו ונאנשי עצתו אשר אכדו בחרב וטרפו הוא ההון אשר	11
קבצו כוהני ירושלים אשר	
אפרים	12
ינתן ישראל	
ומלאכיו הם צירו אשר לא ישמע קולם עוד בגוים	1

Its [interp]retation: "your throng" are the divisions of his army w[ho are in Jerusale]m. And "his lions" are <sup>11</sup> his great ones [and the men of his counsel who died by the sword.] And "his prey" is the wealth which [the pries]ts in Jerusalem gath[ered] which <sup>12</sup> they [will] give '[...E]phraim. Israel will be given [...] , and "his messengers" are his envoys whose voice will no longer be heard among the nations. (4QpNah 3-4 I:10-II:1)

---

Qumran author justifies Jannaeus's actions through reference to the Deuteronomic account. In other words, Jannaeus had correctly punished the crime of high treason by crucifixion ("Jesus and the Temple Scroll," 84-85). Nevertheless, again this presupposes a link between the Deuteronomic law and crucifixion, which on our reading is not straightforwardly apparent.

In this passage the military theme of the previous two passages is continued. ‘His army’ seems contextually to refer to Jannaeus the ‘lion of wrath’, while ‘his lions/great ones’ seems to refer to Jannaeus’s counsellors, military or otherwise. The pesherist seems to imply that the Nahum prophecy stands witness that, though initially victorious, Jannaeus’s celebrations will be short-lived because his throng will be burned in smoke and his soldiers die by the sword. Jannaeus is apparently considered as guilty as the priests in Jerusalem, since the pesherist explicitly links the wealth gathered by the latter with ‘his (i.e. Jannaeus’s) prey’. This will be a recurrent accusation against the wicked priest (below, ch. 6). Nevertheless, because of the poor state of the text at this stage, it is impossible to assess how Ephraim fit into this context. The length of the lacuna in l. 12 does not allow for them to be the subject of [י]תנוהו. Finally, the text refers to ‘his envoys’, though this amounts to little more than a restatement of Nah. 2:14b.

הוי עיר הדמים כולה [כחש פר]ק מלאה

Woe to the city of blood, utterly [treacherous, of plund]er, full. (Nah. 3:1a; 4QpNah 3-4 II:1)

פשרו היא עיר אפרים דורשי החלקות לאחרית הימים אשר 2  
בכחש ושקרנים [י]תהלכו

Its interpretation: It is the city Ephraim, the Seekers of Smooth Things, in the end times, who [will] walk in treachery and [li]es. (4QpNah 3-4 II:2)

Further evidence to link the Seekers of Smooth Things with the Pharisees emerges in the second column of the pesher. Here we find our first proper reference to ‘Ephraim’ (here identified with Nineveh) who are apparently linked with the Seekers of Smooth Things (l. 2). Several scholars have directly associated these two groups, but this seems to overplay the evidence available. The most that can be drawn from the reference here is that some connection is posited between the two groups. Again, it may be reading too much into the passage to see an implicit link between הלכה and חלקה (see above, 3.1) here through use of the verb הלך ‘walk’.

The majority of col. II is taken up with a description of the “dominion of the Seekers of Smooth Things” (l. 4), which the pesherist portrays in terms of violence:

לא ימוש טרף וקול שוט וקול רעש אופן וסוס דהר ומרכבה  
מרקדה פרש מעלה לחוב וברק חנית ורוב חלל וכבוד פגור



וְאֵינְךָ קֵץ לְגוֹיָה וּכְשֹׁלוֹ וּגְוִיָּתָם

Spoil will not be lacking, nor the noise of the whip, nor the noise of the rattling of wheels. Horses at the gallop and chariots bounding! Horsemen charging, <swords> aflame and spears alight – a multitude of slain and a weight of corpses. There is no end to the mass of bodies. They stumble over their carcasses! (Nah. 3:1b-3; 4QpNah 3-4 II:3-4)

	פִּשְׁרוֹ עַל מַמְשַׁלְתַּת דּוֹרְשֵׁי הַחֲלָקוֹת	4
וְאֵשׁ לֹא יִמּוֹשׁ מִקֶּרֶב עַדְתָּם חֶרֶב גּוִיִּם שְׁבִי וּבֹז וְחֲרָחֹר בֵּינֹתָם		5
	וּגְלוֹת מִפְּחָד אֵיִב וְרֹב	
פְּגָרֵי אֲשָׁמָה יִפּוּלוּ בִּימֵיהֶם וְאֵינְךָ קֵץ לְכָלֵל חֲלָלֵיהֶם וְאֵף בְּגוֹיָתָם		6
	בְּשָׂרָם יִכְשׁוּלוּ בְּעֵצַת אֲשָׁמָתָם	

Its interpretation concerns the dominion of the Seekers of Smooth Things <sup>5</sup> – how the sword of the nations will not depart from the midst of their counsel. Captivity, robbery and heated strife are among them, and exile for fear of the enemy. And a multitude of <sup>6</sup> guilty corpses will fall in their days, and there will be no end to all of their slaughter. And, moreover, over their decaying flesh they will stumble on account of their guilty counsel. (3-4 II:3-6)

Conventionally this passage further associates the Seekers of Smooth Things with the Pharisees as described in Josephus, since the references to bloodshed and slaughter in the interpretation closely resemble the reign of the Pharisees during the time of Alexandra Salome:

... and [Salome] permitted the Pharisees to do everything; to whom she also ordered the multitude to be obedient. She also restored those practices which the Pharisees had introduced, according to the traditions of their forefathers, and which her father-in-law, Hyrcanus, had abrogated. *So she had indeed the name of Regent; but the Pharisees had the authority* (τὸ μὲν οὖν ὄνομα τῆς βασιλείας εἶχεν αὐτή, τὴν δὲ δύναμιν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι); for it was they who restored such as had been banished, and set such as were prisoner at liberty, and to say all at once, they differed in nothing from lords ... and the country was entirely at peace, excepting the Pharisees; for they disturbed the queen, and desired that she would kill those that persuaded Alexander to slay the eight hundred men; after which they cut the throat of one of them, Diogenes: and after him they did the same to several, one after another. (*Ant.* XIII, xvi, 2 §408-410)

Several elements appear similar: (1) the reference to the ‘dominion’ (מַמְשַׁלְתָּה) of the Seekers of Smooth Things matches the depiction of Pharisaic rule in Josephus, who, although Salome had the name, had the authority; (2) the ‘multitude of guilty corpses’ fits the slaughter of Diogenes and his associates, especially given how Diogenes was

himself guilty of the crucifixion of the 800<sup>27</sup>; and (3) the gathering of the mercenary soldiers may be paralleled by the use of גר 'resident alien' in l. 9 of the pesher.

Schiffman rejects this reading and refers the events in col. II to the historical events immediately following the war with Demetrius.<sup>28</sup> He plays down the meaning of ממשלה (which we have translated 'dominion'), arguing that in Qumran usage the term can have the sense of 'domain', similar in scope to גורל 'lot'. Under this reading, it is the Pharisees themselves who were pursued by destruction and forced to flee as a result of their collusion with Demetrius. It is far from clear, however, that ממשלה should be understood as 'domain'. In 1QS, for instance, the term is used in contexts governing time where 'rule' is the most obvious translation (cf. 1QS II:19; X:1). Meanwhile, in 1QM the author refers to the 'dominion' of the Kittim. The reference to ממשלה in the pesher, then, very likely refers to a time when the Seekers of Smooth Things held positions of authority which must, if the Seekers of Smooth Things are synonymous with the Pharisees, be during Salome's reign.

In the latter stages of col. II (ll. 7-10) the focus shifts somewhat:

מרוב זנוני זונה טובת חן בעלת כשפים הממכרת גוים בזנותה  
ומשפחות ב[כש]פיה

On account of the multitude of debaucheries of the prostitute, gracefully alluring, the mistress of sorcery, the enslaver of peoples through her debauchery and families through her [sorc]ery. (Nah. 3:4; 4QpNah 3-4 II:7)

פשרנו [ע]ל מתעי אפרים אשר בתלמוד שקרם ולשון כזביהם 8  
ושפת מרמה יתעו רבים  
מלכיה[ם] שרים כוהנים ועם עם גר נלוה ערים ומשפחות 9  
יובדו בעצתם נ[כ]בדים ומוש[ג]לים  
יפולו [מז]עם לשונם 10

<sup>8</sup> [Its] interpretation [con]cerns those who misdirect Ephraim, who, through their false teaching, their lying tongue and deceitful lip, lead many astray <sup>9</sup> – king[s], princes, priests and people, joined with the stranger. Cities and families will perish through their counsel. N[ob]les and rule[rs] <sup>10</sup> will fall [through the fero]city of their tongues ... (4QpNah 3-4 II:8-10)

<sup>27</sup> Cf. *War* I, v, 3 §113.

<sup>28</sup> L.H. Schiffman, "Pharisees and Sadducees in Pesher Nahum," *Minhah le-Nahum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of his 70<sup>th</sup> Birthday*, Marc Brettler and Michael Fishbane, eds. (JSOTSS: 154: Sheffield, 1993), 272-90, esp. 281ff.

Here, the focus is more upon the relationship between the Seekers of Smooth Things and Ephraim, rather than upon any identifiable historical event. Hence many commentators have ignored these lines.<sup>29</sup> Although the pesherist does not identify the group that ‘misdirects Ephraim’ as the Seekers of Smooth Things, contextually this identification offers the best explanation of the passage. The references to ‘false teaching’ (בתלמוד שקרם), ‘lying tongue’ (לשון כזביהם), and ‘deceitful lip’ (שפת מרמה) in l. 8 all support this identification, since שפת and לשון appear in Ps. 12:2-3 alongside חלקות. In the same passage, moreover, חלקה is associated with שוא ‘lies’ which may tie in with ‘lying tongue’ in the pesher (though the terminology is admittedly different):

שוא ידברו איש את־רעהו שפת חלקות בלב ולב ידברו:  
יכרת יהוה כל־שפתי חלקות לשון מדברת גדלות:

They utter lies to each other; with *flattering lips* and a double heart they speak. May the LORD cut off all *flattering lips*, the *tongue* that makes great boasts. (Ps. 12:2-3 (Heb. 3-4))

Finally, in 1QH, ‘leading astray’ is directly related to the חלק root:

[רים החליקו למו ומליצי רמיה [ה]תעום וילבטו בלא בינה

]rym they have smoothed them, and mediators of deceit [le]ad them astray, so that they will perish without understanding. (1QH<sup>a</sup> XII:7; my translation)

This appears to be paralleled in another passage from the Hodayot:

שמתה בלבבו לפתוח מקור דעת לכול מבינים וימירום בערול  
שפה ולשון אחרת לעם לא בינות להלבט במשגתם

You placed in his heart to open the fountain of knowledge for all those who understand, but they altered it with an *uncircumcised lip* and a *foreign tongue*.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>29</sup> So Amusin does not deal with these lines in any detail in either of his studies. The only commentator to deal with these lines in any depth at all is Schiffman (“Pharisees and Sadducees,” 282-83).

<sup>30</sup> ‘Foreign tongue’ (לשון אחרת) here may suggest a possible link with Isaiah 28, the only OT passage where this phrase is found (ובלשון אחרת – 28:11). Isa. 28 is concerned with the alliance of Jerusalem’s leadership (‘the scoffers’ לצון אנשי – itself a Qumran phrase; see 4QpIsa<sup>b</sup> II:6-7, 10) with Egypt and compares their actions with the actions of Ephraim (Israel) prior to her fall in 722. Here, a ‘foreign tongue’ is associated with the inability of Jerusalem’s leadership to perceive the word of the LORD (28:10, 13) which either comes across as drunken babbling or as a foreign language – most likely the language of the Assyrian invaders – in a dramatic enacting of the word of the LORD. Cf. G.R. Driver, “‘Another Little Drink’ – Isaiah 28:1-22”. *Words and Meanings*. FS D.W. Thomas (University Press: Cambridge,



so that a people without understanding will stumble in their error. (1QH<sup>a</sup> X:18-19)

The subject of this passage also appears to be the Seekers of Smooth Things, since these are directly referred to earlier in X:15.<sup>31</sup> 1QH, then, almost certainly parallels 4QpNah col. II, since the Seekers of Smooth Things are the subject of both texts while Ephraim are paralleled by ‘a people with no understanding’ who, in 1QH XII:7 (above) are led astray.<sup>32</sup> The 1QH passage, indeed, derives from Hos. 4:14:

I will not punish your daughters when they play the whore,  
nor your daughters-in-law when they commit adultery;  
for the men themselves go aside with whores,  
and sacrifice with temple prostitutes;  
*thus a people without understanding comes to ruin* (ועם לא-יבין ילבט).

Although the terminology is again different, the pesherist’s addition of *במשגתם* ‘in their error’ to this phrase may echo a similar passage in Hos. 5:5 which directly identifies Ephraim:

Israel’s pride testifies against him;  
(Israel and) *Ephraim stumbles in his* (lit. ‘their’) *guilt* (ואפרים יכשלו בעונם)

Within this section of 4QpNah, then, the Seekers of Smooth Things are depicted leading Ephraim astray. The relationship between the two groups, then, is not as simple as an incautious reading of II:2 (פשרו היא עיר אפרים דורשי החלקות) might suggest. The Seekers of Smooth Things, as those who lead Ephraim astray, would seem, rather, to represent the group’s leadership, while the term ‘Ephraim’ itself is reserved for the group in its entirety, for whom the pesherist betrays a certain sympathy.

1968), 47-67, esp. 62; A. van Selms, “Isaiah 28:9-13: An Attempt to give a New Interpretation,” *ZAW* 85 (1973), 323-39. For an overview of the arguments see Stuart Weeks, *Ancient Israelite Wisdom* (University Press: Oxford, 1994), 132-35.

The Qumran author seems to imply something different. Here, the change in the meaning of “the fountain of knowledge” is deliberate (“they altered it”). The reference to the Isa. passage, though, may be an attempt to draw a further parallel with Ephraim (28:1-4) and perhaps with the *אנשי לצון* in Jerusalem (28:14).

<sup>31</sup> “I have turned into an ardent spirit against all the seekers of flat[tering things] (דורשי [חל]קרת).” (1QH X:15; García-Martínez)

<sup>32</sup> It may then be possible to reconstruct *אפרים* at the beginning of the line.

In 4QpNah III, the focus is again on the relationship between Ephraim and the Seekers of Smooth Things. Here, the pesherist seemingly anticipates a time when the wicked deeds of the Seekers will find them out:

והשלכתי עליך שקוצים [ונ]בלתיך ושמתיך באורה והיה כול  
רואיך ידודו ממך

I will throw filth at you [and tre]at you with contempt and make you repulsive(?). And so it shall be that all who see you will shrink from you. (Nah. 3:6-7a; 4QpNah 3-4 III:1-2)

פשרו על דורשי החלקות אשר באחרית הקץ יגלו מעשיהם 3  
הרעים לכול ישראל  
ורבים יבינו בעוונם ושנאום וכארום על זרון אשמתם ובה[ג]לות 4  
כבוד יהודה  
ידודו פתאי אפרים מתוך קהלם ועזבו את מתעיהם ונלוו על 5  
[י]שראל.

<sup>3</sup> Its interpretation concerns the Seekers of Smooth Things, whose wicked deeds will be revealed to all Israel in the end time. <sup>4</sup> And many will discern their sin, and they will hate them and will consider them repulsive for the arrogance of their guilt. But when the glory of Judah is re[v]ealed <sup>5</sup> the Simple of Ephraim will flee from the midst of their congregation. They will forsake those who led them astray and join [Is]rael. (4QpNah 3-4 III:3-5)

As in II:2, these events are placed in the ‘end times’, though here the events follow the dominion of the Seekers (II:4), already doubtless anticipated in II:6 (above, p99). The sense of the passage is clear. A time is coming when the true nature of the Seekers of Smooth Things will be made known to all Israel. At this time – linked to the revelation of Judah’s glory (Judah here being a reference to the community herself<sup>33</sup>) – the Simple of Ephraim (no doubt the same as those led astray in II:8) will recognise that they have been led astray by the Seekers of Smooth Things and will join with Israel (Israel again a reference to the community). Amusin, here, relates the Simple/common people of Ephraim with the note in Josephus of how, where the Sadducees were supported by the wealthy, the Pharisees enjoyed the support of the masses:

<sup>33</sup> So 1QpHab VIII:1-3: “Its interpretation concerns the *Doers of the Law in the House of Judah*, whom God will save from the House of Judgement on account of their sufferings, and because of their faith in the Teacher of Righteousness.”

The hope of the destruction of the Pharisees' communities and for the joining of the Qumran community by the common people who earlier "supported" those communities can be seen as an acceptance of the fact of broad support for the Pharisees and of their popularity among the masses. This fact is in full accordance with the vivid description of the alignment of forces of the Pharisees and the Sadducees which Josephus has given: "Only wealthy people were on the Sadducean side, but they could not attract the masses while the people were the allies of the Pharisees." [*Ant.* XIII, x, 6]<sup>34</sup>

Returning to the pesher (ll. 6-8), the interpreter also envisages the final destruction of the Seekers of Smooth Things (interpretation on Nah. 3:7):

וּאָמְרוּ שׁוֹדְדֵי נִינְוֵה מִי יִנּוּד לָהּ מֵאֵיךְ אֲבִקְשָׁה מִנְחָמִים לָךְ

And they will say, 'Nineveh is devastated. Who will mourn for her? Whence shall I seek comforters for you?' (Nah. 3:7b; 4QpNah 3-4 III:5-6)

פִּשְׁרוֹ [עַל] דּוֹרְשֵׁי	6
הַחֲלֻקוֹת אֲשֶׁר תּוֹבֵד עֲצָתָם וְנִפְרְדָּה כְּנִסְתָּם וְלֹא יוֹסִיפוּ עוֹד	7
לְתַעוֹת [אֵת הַקְּהָל וּפְתִי]אִים	
לֹא יִחְזְקוּ עוֹד אֵת עֲצָתָם	8

Its interpretation [concerns] the Seekers of 7 Smooth Things whose council<sup>35</sup> will perish and whose assembly will be divided. Never again will they lead astray [the] congregation. And the Simp[le ...] 8 will no longer support their counsel. (4QpNah 3-4 III:6-8)

Finally in col. III, the pesherist refers for the first time to Manasseh (here understood as Amon to Ephraim's Nineveh):

הַתִּיטִיבֵי מִנֵּי אַמְנוֹן הַיּוֹשְׁבֵי בְּיִזְרְעֵל	8
פִּשְׁרוֹ אַמּוֹן הֵם מִנְשָׂה וְהַיִּזְרְעֵלִים הֵם גְּדוֹן לִי מִנְשָׂה נִכְבְּדֵי הַנְּעִיר	9
הַמְחֻזְקִים אֵת מִנְשָׂה	
מִים סְבִיב לָהּ אֲשֶׁר חִילָה יָם וּמִים חוֹמוֹתֶיהָ	10
[פִּשְׁרוֹ] הֵם אֲנָשֵׁי [חִילָה גְּבוּרָתִי מִן] לְחַמְתָּה עַ כּוֹשׁ עוֹצְמָה	11
[וּמְצָרִים וְאֵין קִין]	
[פִּשְׁרוֹ]	12

<sup>34</sup> Amusin, *op. cit.*, 145. Cf. *Ant.* XVIII, i, 4 §17 where the Sadducees are depicted as 'magistrates'.

<sup>35</sup> עֲצָתָם can be translated either as 'their council' or 'their counsel' depending on the context. Here, the former is preferred due to the parallel in כְּנִסְתָּם 'their assembly' which unambiguously refers to the group. In line 8, however, the context suggests the latter meaning. Horgan reflects this ('council' and 'policy'), though García-Martínez and Vermes read 'council' in either instance. Allegro, however, is surely wrong in reading 'counsel' in both cases. Cf. John Worrell, "'sh: 'Counsel' or 'Council' at Qumran," *VT* 20 (1970), 65-74.

“Are you better than No-Am[on]<sup>36</sup> seated by] the streams of the Nile?” (Nah. 3:8a) <Blank> 9 Its interpretation: Amon is Manasseh and the streams are the gr[e]at ones of Manasseh, the honourable of the [people who surr]ound Ma[nasseh].<sup>37</sup> 10 “Water surrounds her whose rampart was the sea, and the water her walls.” (Nah. 3:8b) <Blank> 11 Its [in]terpretation: they are her men [at a]rms, her [m]ighty warrior[s].<sup>38</sup> “Ethiopia was her strength 12 [and Egypt, no limit.”] (Nah. 3:9a) [Its interpretation: ... ] (4QpNah 3-4 III:8-12)

In the original prophecy, Amon’s fate was used as a proof for the ultimate destruction of Nineveh. The two cities, representing Egypt and Assyria respectively, were deadly enemies, yet Assyria had ultimately prevailed against Egypt. Here, the same thing is apparently recurring. If Ephraim represent the Pharisees, then it is highly likely that Manasseh, here, are the Sadducees, since, from the evidence of Josephus, these two groups are often opposed in their beliefs.<sup>39</sup> This is supported by the pesher’s own evidence which refers to “the gr[e]at ones of Manasseh, the honourable of the [people who surr]ound Ma[nasseh]”, doubtless an indication of the sort of support enjoyed by the Sadducees in Josephus, and noted by Amusin above, n. 32<sup>40</sup>. If this understanding is correct (Manasseh = Sadducees) then the pesherist seems to be arguing (on the basis of the original prophecy) that the Pharisees’ (Ephraim’s) fate will be the same as that of the Sadducees whose order, from the evidence in Josephus, they had destroyed and/or driven into exile, and which we have seen echoed above in col. II (i.e. the anti-Sadduceean policy pursued during the reign of Salome, including the murder of Diogenes and his associates<sup>41</sup>). This understanding will be supported by the events of column IV.

Column IV, then, opens with a reference to a new group, the House of Peleg (carrying on the interpretation of Nah. 3:9b from the previous column):

פ[ר]וט ודה[ן]לובים היו בעזרתך]

<sup>36</sup> מנא אמון with Dupont-Sommer, Lohse, Weiss as an orthographic variant on MT מני אמון (preposition *min* with place-name No-Amon, i.e. Thebes). Others read מני אמון where מני is a poetic form of the preposition (Horgan, García-Martínez, Schiffman). Others still read מני as a variant of the place-name, i.e. Ni-Amon (Carmignac)

<sup>37</sup> Restored with García-Martínez as against Horgan, Schiffman: נכבדי ה[עיר המחזק]ים את מ[נשה] ‘the honoured ones of the [city who suppo]rt Ma[nasseh].’

<sup>38</sup> The interpretation is followed by an *ayin* in the manuscript. The significance of this is unclear, but may be a scriptural annotation of some sort.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. *Ant.* XIII, x, 6 §293.

<sup>40</sup> García-Martínez’s מנשה גרולי ‘nobles of Manasseh’ presumably has this in mind.

<sup>41</sup> See Amusin, *op. cit.*, 144.

Put and [Libya were her help.] (Nah. 3:9b; 4QpNah 3-4 III:12)

פֶּשְׁרוֹ הֵם רְשָׁעֵי יְהוּדָה בֵּית פֶּלֶג הַנְּלוּיִם עַל מַנְשֵׁה 1

Its interpretation is that it is the wicked ones [of Juda]h, the House of Peleg, who have joined with Manasseh. (4QpNah 3-4 IV:1)

The first thing that should be noted is that the text is corrupted precisely where the House of Peleg are identified. Here, I have reconstructed ה[יהוד]ה 'Judah' with García-Martínez and Murphy O'Connor<sup>42</sup> (following Stegemann). Schiffman, meanwhile, follows Horgan in reconstructing ה[מנש]ה here, though he does allow the alternate reconstruction. Horgan, however, suggests the lacuna is too long to reconstruct יהודיה here, supporting her reading with the parallel 'wicked ones of E[phraim]' in IV:5 (below). Nevertheless, Horgan's translation – "the wicked one[s of Manasse]h, the House of Peleg, who are joined to Manasseh" – makes no sense contextually.

The only other place where the phrase בֵּית פֶּלֶג 'House of Peleg/Division' emerges is in Damascus Document XX:22 (CD-B):

from the House of Peleg who left the holy city (Jerusalem) and were dependent on God, during the period of the transgression of Israel when they defiled the Temple; but they (i.e. the House of Peleg) returned to God.<sup>43</sup>

Here, the House of Peleg would seem to refer to the community itself, since, as Schiffman points out, these "are the ones who, when transgression set in, when the Temple was taken over by the Hasmoneans, left and formed a sect dedicated to returning to God."<sup>44</sup> On this understanding the reconstruction 'wicked ones [of Juda]h' in the peshet is to be preferred, thereby referring to evil members of the community who left to join the group termed Manasseh in the scrolls (since 'Judah' in the scrolls refers to the community).<sup>45</sup> Amusin suggests instead, that the House of Peleg in 4QpNah refers to Aristobulus II who, Josephus states, was allied with the Sadducees, and interceded on their behalf to his mother Salome in order to bring to an end the purge instigated by the Pharisees on their opponents (*Ant.* XIII, xvi, 2; cited

<sup>42</sup> J. Murphy O'Connor, "The Essenes and their History," *RB* 81 (1974), 215-44, esp. 239-44. Cf. J. Licht, "רמנים נוספים לפשר נחום," *Molad* 19 (1961), 455.

<sup>43</sup> Schiffman, "Pharisees and Sadducees," 286.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 286.



above, p99).<sup>46</sup> It is difficult, however, to reconcile this with CD, which seems to derive from an earlier period of history.

גם היא בגולה הןלכה בשבי גם] עילוליה ירוטשו בראש כל  
חוצות ועל נכבדיה יורו גורל וכול גדרןלניה רותקן בזקים

She too is in exile, go[ne into captivity, Even] her children are dashed to pieces at the head of every way. For her honoured ones they have cast lots, and all her g[rea]t [ones were bound] in chains. (Nah. 3:10; 4QpNah 3-4 IV:1-2)

פשרו על מנשה לקין האחרון אשר תשפל מלכותו 3  
[ בישראל  
נשיו עילוליו וטפו ילכו בשבי גבוריו ונכבריו בחרב יוברו 4

Its interpretation concerns Manasseh in the end time whose reign in Is[rael] will weaken [...] 4 His wives, his children and his infants will go into captivity; his warriors and his glorious ones [will perish] by the sword. (4QpNah 3-4 IV:3-4)

In the light of the earlier references to the historical events surrounding Salome's reign, this section almost certainly relates to the same general time frame; here, referring to the purge on the Sadducees previously referred to. 'End time' (לקין) here is doubtless a synonym for the more normative לאהרית הימים in the scrolls (see II:2). Note particularly the reference to Manasseh as a 'ruling' party (l. 3).

גם את תשכרין ותהי נעלמה

[You also will be drunk] and you will go into hiding. (Nah. 3:11a; 4QpNah IV:4-5)

פשרו על רשעי אפרים 5  
אשר תבוא כוסם אחר מנשה ]ל[ 6

Its interpretation concerns the wicked ones of E[phraim]<sup>47</sup> [...] 6 whose cup will come after Manasseh [...] (4QpNah 3-4 IV:5-6)

The fragmented state of this section of col. IV does not allow as full an understanding of these lines as we would prefer. The 'wicked ones of Ephraim' in line 5 (if the

<sup>45</sup> See R.I. White, "The House of Peleg in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *A Tribute to Geza Vermes* (Academic Press: Sheffield, 1990), 67-98.

<sup>46</sup> Amoussine, "Éphraïm et Manassé," 395.

<sup>47</sup> 'E[phraim]' is restored at the end of line 5 mainly on contextual grounds, since Manasseh is read in line 6. There is space for two to three more words after אפרים, but, while it is tempting to insert החלקות דורשי here (thus identifying more closely the two groups) and contextually offers the best suggestion, there is no external evidence for this.

reconstruction is correct) almost certainly refers to the Seekers of Smooth Things, since as we have seen, the pesherist's attitude to the general membership of this group, Ephraim, is rather one of sympathy, than of hatred. It is Ephraim's leadership, whom we have understood to be synonymous with the Seekers of Smooth Things, for whom the pesherist reserves particular vitriol. Nevertheless, this passage is important in that it confirms the relationship between the two groups Ephraim and Manasseh in the pesher (that we have largely assumed), by directly relating the two groups together. Moreover, when the pesherist says "their (i.e. Ephraim's) cup will come after Manasseh" this seems to reflect the transfer of power from the Sadducees to the Pharisees during the reign of Hyrcanus intimated throughout the pesher, itself based on the story in Genesis 48 of the preferment of Ephraim over Manasseh (above, p88). This, then, provides our final piece of evidence. The Pharisees are termed Ephraim not because of any pun between פרושים and אפרים<sup>48</sup> (though this may certainly have been a contributing factor) but because of the transferment feature of the Genesis story that the pesherist observes taking place during his own lifetime.

Unfortunately, however, just as the pesherist appears to be reaching the crux of his argument, having identified all the contenders, the commentary becomes corrupt and only a few words may be read. The legible aspects of the interpretation refer to "their enemies in the city" (אויביהם בעיר) IV:8 on Nah. 3:11b) and "[al]l the boundary of Israe[el]" (כל גבול ישראל) (4QpNah. 5 I:2), but without a context it does not seem sensible to attempt to offer any interpretation here.

### Conclusions

Within 4QpNah, 'Ephraim' and the 'Seekers of Smooth Things' are consistently referred to the Pharisees found in Josephus, though the precise nature of the relationship between both the Pharisees and Ephraim, and Ephraim and the Seekers is not always clear. Here, we have generally referred the Seekers of Smooth Things to the Pharisaic leadership and Ephraim to the general membership of the group. Whether this distinction may always be maintained, though, is a matter of debate. It is clear, for instance, that Ephraim may occasionally refer to those beyond the strict

---

<sup>48</sup> As Schiffman, "Pharisees and Sadducees," 279.

bounds of the group itself, to the general populace who, from the evidence supplied by Josephus were the traditional supporters of the group.

It is, of course, dangerous to place too much weight on Josephus's evidence as we have seen through the references to 'hanging alive on a tree' in col. I. While it is *probable* that this refers to the crucifixion of the Pharisees and their supporters by Jannaeus immediately following the invasion by Demetrius III, and fits the evidence of the scroll itself, there is a sense that interpretations have occasionally been 'pushed' in order to bring forth this application. Instead, I have shown that, through evaluation of the terminology used by the pesherist, certain OT passages can be seen to come to the fore which may back up the various accounts described in Josephus. These are especially apparent in cols. I and II where the preservation of the document is almost complete.

In the later stages of the pesher, where the text deteriorates, the evidence provided in the first two columns enables us to identify those events described in the latter instances. These latter columns introduce us to Manasseh (cols. III-IV) whom we have identified with the Sadducees of Josephus. It is certainly true that this relies to an extent on the identification of Ephraim as depicting the Pharisees in some sense, nevertheless, the evidence supplied by the latter stages of column III certainly support what we know of the Sadducees from Josephus, that is as representing the Jerusalem establishment.

In general, then, 4QpNah reflects the early-first century BC events described in Josephus; in particular the transposition of power and influence from the Sadducees under Alexander Jannaeus to the Pharisees in the time of Salome. This in itself reflects the prophecies of Nahum of the transfer of power from No-Amon (Thebes) to Nineveh, Egypt to Assyria. Nevertheless, in both instances, the real power lies with a third party, the LORD, who in the pesherist's time is manifested in the community itself (Judah). Meanwhile it is tempting to (as Amusin) see this threefold division (Ephraim, Manasseh and Judah) reflected in Josephus's three 'sects', Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes, though this requires a greater weight of evidence than is currently available.

3.3.2 4QpIsaiah<sup>c</sup>

In 4QpIsa<sup>c</sup>, ‘Ephraim’ and ‘Seekers of Smooth Things’ are found in one passage each. Manasseh is reconstructed in the citation of Isa. 9:20.

Fragments 4, 5, 6+

כִּי־אֵשׁ בְּעֵרָה כִּי־אֵשׁ רִשְׁעָה שְׁמִיר וְשִׁית תֹּאכֵל וְתִצִּית ]	16
בְּסִבְכֵי הַיַּעַר וַיִּתְאַבְּכוּ גִּזְוֹת עֵשֶׂן בְּעֵבְרַת יְהוָה צְבֻאוֹת [נְתָעִם ]	17
אֲרִיץ וַיְהִי הָעָם כְּמֵאֲכֹלֶת אֵשׁ אִישׁ אֵל אֲחִיָּו לֹא ]	18
יִהְיוּ וַיִּגְזֹר עַל יָמִין וְרַעַב וַיֹּאכֵל עַל שְׂמֹאל וְלֹא . . . ] בָּה	19
אִישׁ בָּשָׂר זָרְעוּ יוֹאכְלוּ מִנְּשָׁה אֵת אֲפְרַיִם וְאֲפְרַיִם ] אֵת	20
מִנְּשָׁה יַחֲדָיו [הֵמָּה עַל יְהוּדָה בְּכוֹל זֹאֵת לֹא] שָׁב אֲפָו ]	21

["For wickedne]ss [burns like a fire, con]suming briars [and thorns.] It kindled [the thickets of the forest, and they billowed upward in a col]umn of smoke. [Through the wrath of the LORD of H]osts [the land] is [black]ened (?) [and the people are like food for the fire. N]o man [spared] his brother. [They gorged on the right and were hungry. They ate on] the left but are not [.].<sup>49</sup> [The flesh of their neighbours they ate. Manasseh to] Ephraim, and Ephraim [Manass]eh. Together [they are against Judah. For all this] his anger [is not] turned away." (Isa. 9:17-20; 4QpIsa<sup>c</sup> 4, 5, 6+ I:16-21)

This section is the only passage in Isaiah where Ephraim and Manasseh are viewed together. The passage comes as the summation of the larger context of Isaiah 8-9, which depicts the Syro-Ephraimite alliance ranged against Judah (eighth century BC).

As it stands, no trace of a peshar survives on this passage (largely a result of the text being written on papyrus rather than, as with other pesharim, on skin – only the leftmost portion of the text survives). The question then becomes whether there was ever any peshar on this section? Fr. 7, which appears to mark the beginning of col. II preserves text of Isa. 10:12-13, thus the entire section 9:20b-10:11 is missing. In the editio princeps, Allegro placed fr. 7 directly above fig. 6 (which begins text of Isa. 10:19). On this reconstruction, however, the text of Isa. 10:13c-19a is also omitted. Strugnell moved fr. 7 to allow these verses to be inserted, but, if the entire biblical text is to be restored, a column length of at least forty-three lines is required, which, as

<sup>49</sup> The peshar appears to end בָּהּ. This does not fit either 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> שְׂבָעוּ וְלֹא or MT וְלֹא שְׂבָעוּ 'and they are not satisfied' (Isa. 9:19b). In the editio princeps, Allegro suggests that the final letter has been amended (possibly from a form close to the MT) with a heavily written *taw* over the last two letters, and thus restores יִשְׁבָּע 'will cease'. Strugnell reads יִשְׁבָּע instead, though the latter seems unlikely on a closer reading of the evidence. I follow Horgan and avoid restoration.

Horgan points out, would be too long. Horgan's solution is to omit the text of Isa. 10:1-11 which forms its own distinct unit, and to end col. I with Isa. 9:20 (the end of the chapter) perhaps followed by commentary, thereby reducing the length of the columns to "an acceptable thirty lines."<sup>50</sup> This seems to me right, given the importance of the terms 'Ephraim', 'Manasseh' and 'Judah' in the scrolls. It would be almost inconceivable for the one text in Isaiah which brings these names together (in a pesher) not to be commented upon.

It then falls to us to attempt to reconstruct what the pesherist *might* have said! If we follow the interpretation pursued in 4QpNah where Ephraim represents the Pharisees, Manasseh the Sadducees and Judah the community, the following situation would seem to emerge: These first two groups, the Pharisees and the Sadducees, fight amongst themselves, but are allied against the community. It is interesting to see from this how *both* Ephraim and Manasseh are enemies of the community, which, while implied, was never straightforwardly apparent in our study of pesher Nahum. From the brevity of the passage, though, and without any interpretative aspect whatsoever, it is difficult to assess whether this infighting is the same as that envisaged in 4QpNah, i.e. referring to the troubled political situation under Alexander Jannaeus and later Salome. In any case, this relies on the assumption that Ephraim = the Pharisees etc. as in 4QpNah, while one of the purposes of the study is to see precisely how far the interpretations of one pesher are valid elsewhere. It is senseless, then, to push this assumption beyond a conservative reading of the evidence available.

#### Fragment 23

[כי]א כ[ו]ה אמר יהוה קדוש ישראל בשובה ונח[ת]ת [תושעו]ן	3
[בה]שקט ובטח תהיה גבורתכמה ולוא אביתמה ות[ואמר]ו	4
לוא כיא על סוס ננוס על כן תנוסו ועל קל נרכב על כן	5
יקלו רודפיכמה אלף אחד מפני גערת אחד מפני גערת	6
חמשה תנוסו עד אם נותרתמה כתרן על רואש הר	7
וכנס על גבעה לבן יחבה אדוני לחנ[נכ]מה ולכן ירום	8
לרהמכמה כיא אלוהי משפט יהוה אשרי כול חובי לו	9

[For] t[hus says the [LO]RD, the Holy One of [I]srael: 'With return and r[est] you will be saved; in quiet[ness] and in trust shall be your strength.' But you would not have this and s[aid:] 'No! For we will flee upon horses.' For this reason you

<sup>50</sup> Horgan, 110.

will flee! And 'On swift horses we will ride.' For this reason your pursuers will be swift. One thousand [from be]fore the threat of one. From before the threat of five you will flee, until you are like a flagstaff on the top of a mountain and like a standard on a hill. Therefore the LORD waits to be gracious to you; therefore he rises up to be merciful to you. For the LORD is a God of justice. Blessed are all those who wait for him. (Isa. 30:15-18; 4QpIsa<sup>c</sup> 23 II:3-9)

	פֶּשֶׁר הַדָּבָר לְאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים עַל עֵדֶת דְּוֹרֵשֵׁי הַחֲלֻקֹּת	10
[	אֲשֶׁר בִּירוּשָׁלַיִם ... ה.	11
[	בְּתוֹרָה וְלֹא יֵה] .. [	12
[	לֵב כִּיֵּא לְדוֹשׁ].	13
[	כִּיחֲכָה אִישׁ גְּדוּדִים חֹבֵר כּוֹהֲנִים	14
[	הַתּוֹרָה מֵאִסּוֹ ]	14a

<sup>10</sup> The interpretation of the passage about the end of days concerns the congregation of the S[earchers of] Smooth Things <sup>11</sup> who are in Jerusalem ... *h* ... [...] <sup>12</sup> in the Law, but not *yh*[ ] . . . [...] <sup>13</sup> heart, for to trample .[...] <sup>14</sup> "As robb[er]s lie in wait for someone, [so a band of priests]" (Hosea 6:9) ... <sup>14a</sup> they have rejected {[the]} Law. (4QpIsa<sup>c</sup> 23 II:10-14a)

The second passage from 4QpIsa<sup>c</sup> is much better preserved than its counterpart above. Here, the first lines are almost complete, though in the final lines, where the majority of the interpretation is to be found, only the right hand portion of the scroll is extant. Although the text is principally a commentary on Isaiah, in line 14 there appears a quotation from Hosea 6:9. What is interesting about the passage is that it falls into the wider section Isa. 30:8-18, which as we have seen is one of the background passages for the title *דְּוֹרֵשֵׁי חֲלֻקֹּת* itself:

For they are a rebellious people, faithless children,  
 children who will not hear the instruction of the LORD;  
 who say to the seers, "Do not see";  
 and to the prophets, "Do not prophesy to us what is right;  
*speak to us smooth things, prophesy illusions ...*" מהחלוח חזו חלקות חזו מהחלוח  
 (Isa. 30:9-10)

It is perhaps not surprising, then, to find the Seekers of Smooth Things referred to in the peshet to this part of Isa. 30.

Given that Isa. 30:10 is a source-text for the title *דְּוֹרֵשֵׁי חֲלֻקֹּת*, and that this group reappear in the interpretation as a 'congregation', it seems likely that the Seekers of Smooth Things are the subject of this section of the peshet as a whole. Again, an eschatological reference is made, so 'the end of days' in line 10. This may hark back to Isa. 30:8 where the related *לְיוֹם אַחֲרוֹן* is found. Through the peshetist's continued use of this phrase, it may be that he is relating his present situation to that about which

Isaiah warned. In a sense, then, the Qumran community are living in Isaiah's last days. Here, the Seekers of Smooth Things are depicted in Jerusalem, line 11, which may refer back to Isa. 28:14 and the אנשי לצון 'the men of the Scoffer' and may suggest a link between these two groups. Li. 12 is too fragmentary to be of any real use, but line 14a, if it forms part of this section and refers to the Seekers of Smooth Things, has this group rejecting the Law. This would seem then to agree with Josephus's description of the Pharisees' legal interests, and further implies that the Seekers of Smooth Things may be so identified.

It is interesting to note that the Seekers of Smooth Things are referred to as a 'congregation' (עדה), since this term is also used of the Seekers in 4QCat<sup>a</sup> (below), and of the Scoffers in 4QpIsa<sup>b</sup> II:10, where, as in the present text, this congregation is also 'in Jerusalem' (below, p195f). The identical structure of the two phrases (עדה אשר בירושלים and עדה אנשי הלצון אשר בירושלים) again suggests that these two groups are linked, if not identical. עדה, however, is not uniquely used of the sect's enemies. Indeed, in many instances, including the pesharim themselves, the term is used of the community itself (so 4QpPs<sup>a</sup>, 4QpIsa<sup>b</sup>, 1QH and 11QT).

### 3.3.3 4QpHosea<sup>b</sup>

In Hosea, special contempt is reserved for Ephraim, here a reference to the Northern Kingdom (following their fall to the Assyrians in 722). It is not surprising, then, to find several references to Ephraim in a Hosea peshar.

#### Fragment 2

[	ולוא יגהה מכ[ם מזור פ]שר	]	1
	[. כפיר החרון כי אנכי כשח[ל לא]פ[ר]ים	]	2
	[ובכפיר]		
	[לבית יהודה פשרו ע]ל כוהן האחרון אשר ישלח ידו להכות	]	3
	באפרים		
	[ד]	]	4
	[אלך אשובה א]ל [מקומי ע]ד אשר [י]אשמו ובקשו פני	]	5
	בצר		
[	יסתיר אל את פניו מן הא[ר]ץ	]	6
	[הו ולוא שמעו]	]	7

[“Nor can he heal you]r wound.” (Hos. 5:13c) [Interpreted ...] <sub>2</sub> [ ... ]. the Lion of Wrath. “For I will be like a lion [n to E]ph[raim] and like a young lion <sub>3</sub> [to the House of Judah.” (Hos. 5:14a) Its interpretation concerns the last priest who will stretch out his hand to smite Ephraim <sub>4</sub> [...] *dw* <Blank> <sub>5</sub> [...] “I will go, I will return t]o [my place unt]il they [ac]knowledge their guilt and seek my face. In [their] trouble <sub>6</sub> [they will look in earnest for me.” (Hos. 5:15) Its interpretation: [...] God [will hid]e his face fr[om the land ] <sub>7</sub> [ ... ] *hw* but they did not listen [...] (4QpHos<sup>b</sup> 2 I:1-7)

This passage has much in common with 4QpNah col. I (above), not least of which is the reference to the Lion of Wrath (כפיר החרון; l. 2). Almost certainly, then, this fragment relates to the same historical context as there. A new character is referred to here, ‘the last priest’ (כוהן האחרון, l. 3), and, for the first time, ‘Ephraim’ appears in both the lemma and its interpretation.

In 4QpNah, the Lion of Wrath was referred to Alexander Jannaeus due to the references to ‘hanging alive on a tree’, which we took to refer to Jannaeus’s crucifixion of the 800 Pharisees following the unsuccessful invasion by Demetrius III. Here, almost certainly the reference is to the same individual, i.e. Jannaeus. Although the fragment does not preserve the whole of Hos. 5:13, but only the last stanza, if we can read back into the text the whole of 5:13 the context may become somewhat clearer:

וַיֵּרָא אֶפְרַיִם אֶת־חַלְיוֹ וַיהוּדָה אֶת־מִזְרוֹ וַיֵּלֶךְ אֶפְרַיִם אֶל־אֲשׁוּר וַיִּשְׁלַח  
אֶל־מֶלֶךְ יָרֵב וְהוּא לֹא יוּכַל לְרַפֵּא לָכֶם וְלֹא־יִגְהַה מִכֶּם מְזוֹר:

When Ephraim saw his sickness, and Judah his wound, then Ephraim went to Assyria, and sent to the *great*<sup>51</sup> king. But he is not able to cure you or heal your wound. (Hos. 5:13)

If this entire passage refers to the same event, then Ephraim sending to Assyria may parallel the Pharisees sending to Demetrius for support, and the inability “to cure you or heal your wound” may have been taken to emphasise Demetrius’s defeat by Jannaeus. In other words, the Pharisees’ attempt to seek outside aid ended in failure.

<sup>51</sup> NRSV suggests emendation to רב ‘great’. It has been suggested that ירב is a proper name, Jareb, perhaps underscored by its meaning ‘contender’ and used as an epithet of the King of Assyria (Cf. Jg 6:32). Meanwhile, LXX has πρὸς βασιλέα Ἰαριμ, and Vg. *et misit ad regem ultorem*. Unfortunately, no fragments of this section of Hosea survive among the DSS, thus it is difficult to suggest the possible implications for the pesher.



Horgan suggests that 'the last priest' is on the side of the community, because elsewhere Ephraim is an enemy of the sect, and here the priest is an enemy of Ephraim.<sup>52</sup> The enemy of my enemy is therefore my friend. This does not necessarily follow when the prophetic context is read. In Hosea, the lion is an enemy to both the houses of Ephraim *and* Judah. If Judah refers to the community, as seems to be the case elsewhere, then the last priest is also opposed to the community itself. Horgan also apparently overlooks that the lion of the Hosea passage is itself related to this 'last priest'. It is more likely that this refers to the Lion of Wrath himself, i.e. that the last priest and the Lion of Wrath are one and the same, Alexander Jannaeus. There is, though, a problem in relating the epithet 'the last priest' to Jannaeus, since he was not the last High Priest. He was, however, the last High Priest to be *the head of state*. After his death, the rulership of Judaea passed to Salome his wife who, being a woman, was excluded from being High Priest, which title passed to John Hyrcanus II her son.

Horgan does, however, relate the 'last priest' here to 'the priest' referred to in 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 1-10 II:18. Here, the wicked of Ephraim and Manasseh "will seek to lay their hands on the priest and on the men of his council in the time of trial that is coming upon them." Although we shall discuss this passage more fully in its own right below, at this stage there is no need to assume that the two figures are the same, as the passages are essentially contradictory.

#### Fragments 5-6

מה א[עשה לכה [אפרים] מה [אעשה לכה יהודה ]

["What] shall [I] do with you [O Ephraim?] What [shall I do with you O Judah?"] (Hos. 6:4; 4QpHos<sup>b</sup> 5-6 I:3)

The second passage is too fragmentary to be of any real use and as we can see, 'Ephraim' itself has to be restored. What little that can be reconstructed of the passage is actual citation from Hosea itself, though it should be noted that this fragment preserves a reference to 'their teacher' (מורייהם, l. 2), presumably as part of a peshar on the previous verse, Hos. 6:3. Whether any link was maintained between these two references cannot be confirmed, however.

<sup>52</sup> Horgan, 154.

## Fragments 10, 26

וַאֲשֶׁר זָמַח עֲשׂוּ בַּבַּיִת יִשְׂרָאֵל רָאִיתִי שְׁעָרֶיהָ שָׁם זָנוּת לְאִפְרַיִם	1
[נמטא]	
יִשְׂרָאֵל פִּשְׁנָרוּ	2
וְרָשָׁעֵי הַגּוֹאֲרִים	3
כּוֹל מַכְּ.	4
לְ]	5

1 and that ["they commit] a monstrosity. [In the House of Israel I have seen a horrible thing. Ephraim's harlotry is there.] 2 Israel {[is defiled."}] (Hos. 6:9b-10) [Its] interpreta[tion ... ] 3 the [w]icked of the nation[s ... ] 4 all *mk.*[...] 5 [ ]/[ ... ] (4QpHos<sup>b</sup> 10, 26 I:1-5)

The final reference to 'Ephraim' in 4QpHos<sup>b</sup> again rests on reconstruction of the biblical text (here of Hos. 6:9b-10). The degree of fragmentation, moreover, precludes a detailed analysis of the content of the interpretation, of which only a few words can be read. The identity of 'the wicked of the nations' in line 3 is unclear. Normally, in both the DSS and the Hebrew Bible, גוֹאֲרִים refers to 'Gentiles'. The 'wicked of the nations' here, then, should probably be distinguished from the 'wicked of Ephraim' in 4QpNah. If Ephraim, here, are the same as 4QpNah, then 'the wicked of the nations' may refer to the Seleucid forces of Demetrius III. Nevertheless, the available evidence should not allow us to push for such an identification.

3.3.4 4QpPsalms<sup>a</sup>

Here, 'Ephraim' is found on three occasions (once reconstructed). In two of these, Ephraim appears alongside Manasseh, again suggesting that a link is maintained between the two groups.

## Fragments 1-10

גוֹל עַל יְהוָה דְּרַכְכָּה וּבִטַח עֲלֵינוּ וְהוּא יַעֲשֶׂה וְהוּצִיאָא כְּאֹר  
צְדִקְכָה וּמִשְׁפָּטְכָה כְּצִהָרִים

["Commit your way to the LORD and trust in] him [and He will act. He will make your vindication shine like the light and your justice like the no]nday." (Ps. 37:5-6; 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 1-10 I:19-20)

פִּשְׁנָרוּ עַל עֲדַת בַּחִירוֹ לְעִשׂוֹת אַתְּ רִצּוֹן	] 21
תְּ הוֹלָלִים בַּחֲרוֹ	אַל 22
אַוְהָבֵי פִרְעַ וּמַתְעִים	] 23
[ רִשְׁעָה בִיד אַפְרַיִם	] 24

21 [ <Blank> Its interpretation concerns the congregation of his chosen ones who carry out ... th]e bidding of 22 [God<sup>53</sup> ... ]t foolish ones chose 23 [ ... ] those who [l]ove laxity and those who led astray 24 [ ... ] wickedness by the hand of Eph[raim]. <Blank> (4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 1-10 I:21-24)

This passage is interesting for the fact that it seems to contrast between the ‘congregation’, i.e. the community reconstructed in line 21, and the ‘foolish ones’ in the following line. If this is correct, then we can probably reconstruct something like *פרע* [להבי פרע] *הוללים בחרו [לעשות את רצון א]והבי פרע* ‘foolish ones chose [to do the bidding of] those who [l]ove looseness...’ for lines 22-23 (though again in its present form the reconstruction is too short).

The real question, though, concerns the relationship between ‘those who love laxity and led astray’ and ‘Ephraim’ in line 24. *פרע* ‘let go’ ‘let alone’ (BDB, 828a) may be a euphemism for *חלקות* ‘smooth things’. In the OT passages we examined (above; 3.1), *חלקות* was associated with lies and with a refusal to accept prophecy (see esp. Isa. 30:10). Meanwhile, *פרע* is associated with ignoring counsel and instruction (esp. Prov. 1:25; 8:33; 13:18; and 15:32) and behaving without restraint (so King Ahaz in II Chron. 28:19). Although the two terms are never used in direct parallel, both *פרע* and *חלקות* do appear in Prov. 29, an important passage for our purposes inasmuch as, in addition to *חלקות* (29:5), this passage also refers to the men of the Scoffer (*אנשי* *לצון*; 29:8), whom we referred to in respect of Isa. 28. Proverbs 29 has as its core theme the righteous and the wicked and is thus especially suited to Qumran exegesis.

‘Leading astray’ (*תעהו*) has already been used in conjunction with the Seekers of Smooth Things in 4QpNah (so 3-4 II:8; III:7; also 1QH XII:7) and thus provides concrete evidence for a link between the Seekers of Smooth Things and the group referred to here. Unfortunately, the first part of line 24 is missing, so only a partial understanding emerges with reference to Ephraim herself. As we have seen, the

---

<sup>53</sup> Restored in the light of II:5 *עדת עדה בחירו עושי רצונו* ‘They are the congregation of his chosen ones, the doers of his bidding’. The reconstruction in its present form is probably too short, but it is preferable to either Horgan (ת) *אשר בחרו לעשות א]ת* ‘[Its interpretation concerns the congregation of the poor who chose to do God]’s bidding’) or García-Martínez (ת) *אשר בחרו לעשות א]ת* ‘[Its interpretation concerns the congregation of the poor *who are ready to do*] the ...’) since there is no evidence for a reference to ‘the congregation of the poor’ at this stage in the pesher.

Nahum pesherist displays a certain sympathy for Ephraim, as contrasted to the leaders of this group, the Seekers of Smooth Things, whom he treats with contempt. Here, however, 'wickedness' (רשעה) is said to be 'by the hand of Ephraim' suggesting that Ephraim herself is now responsible. Either, then, Ephraim is here used to refer to the Seekers of Smooth Things on a more generic level, or, as seems more likely, Ephraim herself is now directly criticised and held responsible. If the latter, there seems a change in emphasis from earlier references which may suggest a later period in the community's history when attitudes had become more rigid.

חרב פתחו רשעים וידרוכו קשתם לפיל עני ואביון ולטבוה  
 ישרי דרך חרבם תבוא בלבם וקשתותיהם תשברנה

The wicked ones unsheathe the sword and bend their bows to bring down the poor and needy, and to slaughter those who walk uprightly; their sword shall enter their own heart, and their bows shall be broken. (Ps. 37:14-15; 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 1-10 II:16-17)

פשרו על רשעי אפרים ומנשה אשר יבקשו לשלוח יד	18
בכוהן ובאנשי עצתו בעת המצרף הבאה עליהם ואל יפדם	19
מידם ואחר כן ינתנו ביד עריצי גואים למשפט	20
<vacat>	21

<sup>18</sup> Its interpretation concerns the wicked ones of Ephraim and Manasseh who will seek to lay hands <sup>19</sup> on the priest and on the men of his council in the time of trial that is coming upon them. But God will deliver them <sup>20</sup> from their hands, and after, they will be given over to the hands of the ruthless ones of the nations for judgement. <sup>21</sup> <Blank> (4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 1-10 II:18-21)

We have already alluded to this pesher in connection with 4QpHos<sup>b</sup> (above, p115). As the Psalm is related to its interpretation, 'the wicked ones' are interpreted to refer to the wicked of Ephraim and Manasseh, and 'the poor and needy' and 'those who walk uprightly' correlate to 'the priest and the men of his council.' The pesherist is thus referring to the community and its enemies. 'The poor' is frequently used of the community, while 'uprightness' (ישר) – like righteousness (צדק) – is a natural epithet.

The pesherist is again apparently referring to a future event (the force of the imperfect יבקשו in l. 18). The wicked of Ephraim and Manasseh have not yet laid hands on the priest/men of his council. When this *has* happened, in a different period of history, the wicked of Ephraim and Manasseh will be delivered over to the nations, i.e. a gentile force. In 1QpHab this is left in the hands of the Kittim, God's chosen instrument of

justice. This episode, then, differs from earlier pictures of Ephraim in 4QpNah where it was the Lion of Wrath (Alexander Jannaeus, a Jew) who carried out vengeance against the Seekers of Smooth Things (part of Ephraim). No trace remains of the antipathy that exists elsewhere between Ephraim and Manasseh (most notably in the Isaiah pesher, but also in 4QpNah), but, since in 4QpIsa<sup>c</sup> 4, 5, 6+ I:21 (citing Isa. 9:20, above) Ephraim and Manasseh are both against each other and against Judah, it need not necessarily follow that the two groups are not also opposed here.

‘The priest’ almost certainly refers to a member of the community itself, and he is presumably a figure of some authority (hence ‘the men of *his* council’). Since the reference here is to the future it may be that ‘the priest’ is a title of some kind held by members of the community. Other references to ‘the priest’ occur in CD XIII:5, 1QpHab II:8, 1QM VII:12, 1QS<sup>a</sup> II:19 etc., and are discussed below (4.3.5; below).

### Fragment 13

[אלו]הים דבר [בקודשו אעלוזה אחלקה שכם ועמק סכ]ות  
אמדה לי [גלעד ולי מנשה ואפרים מעוז רואשי]

[G]od has promised [in his sanctuary: ‘I shall exult as I divide up Shechem and] apportion out [the Vale of Succ]oth. [Gilead] is mine [and Manasseh is mine and Ephraim is my helmet.’ (Ps. 60:8-9 = 108:7-8; 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 13 I:3-4)

[ פשרו גלעד וחצי שבט מנשה המה ] 5  
[ ונקבצו ] 6

<sup>5</sup> [Its interpretation: Gilea]d and the half-tribe of [Manasseh are ...] <sup>6</sup> [ ... ] and they gathered [...] (13 I:5-6)

Ephraim is again reconstructed here and forms only a part of the biblical text itself (Ps. 60:9). Meanwhile, Manasseh is reconstructed in both the lemma and the interpretation (since in the Hebrew Bible חצי שבט ‘half-tribe’ is consistently used of Manasseh, never of Ephraim; Num. 32:33; 34:13ff.; Dt. 3:13 etc.). If the interpretation here follows those of 4QpNah, then Ephraim will here refer to the Pharisees and Manasseh to the Sadducees, though this is by no means certain. Since the next part of the Psalms passage (which does not survive here) refers to Judah – “Judah is my sceptre” – it is possible that the pesherist retains the tripartite division observed elsewhere between Ephraim, Manasseh and Judah to refer to the Pharisees, Sadducees and the community respectively. Nevertheless, the Psalms passage also introduces a new group, Gilead, who reappear in the interpretation alongside Manasseh. Is it

possible that Gilead will here also refer to a Judaeen sect? If so, then there are two possibilities, the Hasidim or the Zealots whom Josephus calls a fourth philosophy (*Ant.* XVIII, i, 6 §23), though the reference here is probably too early for this group and caution should be exercised in applying this term. The Hasidim are referred to by name only in I and II Maccabees during the war against Antiochus.<sup>54</sup> Even so, several scholars have pushed for the common origins of both the Pharisees and the community within this group, so a reference to the Hasidim here might be relevant.<sup>55</sup> Due to the paucity of the evidence, though, any conclusions are futile.

### 3.3.5 4QTestimonia

בעת אשר כלה ישוע להלל ולהודות בתהלותיה	21
ויאמר ארור היש אשר יבנה את העיר הזות בבכורו	22
יוסדנה ובצעירו יציב דלתיה ואנה איש ארור אחד בליעל	23
עומד להיות פ[ח י]קוש לעמו ומחתה לכול שכניו ועמד	24
[ה]יות שניהמה כלי חמס ושבו ובנו את	25
[העיר הזות ויצ]יבו לה הומה ומגדלים לעשות לעוז רשע	26
[בארץ ורעה גדולה] בישראל ושערוריה באפרים וביהודה	27
[וע]שו חנופה בארץ ונצה גדולה בבני	28
[יעקוב ושפכו ד]ם כמים על חל בת ציון ובחוק	29
[ב]ירשלם	30

<sup>21</sup> <Blank> When Joshua finished praising and giving thanks <sup>22</sup> he said: "Cursed be the man who rebuilds this city. Upon his firstborn <sup>23</sup> will he found it, and upon his youngest son will he set its gates." (Josh. 6:26) And now, an accursed /man/ of Belial <sup>24</sup> will arise to be a [fo]wler's sn[are] for his people, and ruin for all of his neighbours. And it will arise <sup>25</sup> [ ... ].m.[ ...to b]e two instruments of violence. And they will rebuild <sup>26</sup> [this city and will er]ject for it a rampart and towers to make it a stronghold of wickedness <sup>27</sup> [in the land and a great evil] in Israel and a horrible thing in Ephraim and Judah <sup>28</sup> [ ... and they will com]mit a godless act in the land and a great blasphemy among the sons of <sup>29</sup> [Jacob. And they will spill b]lood like water upon the rampart of the daughter of Zion and in the precinct <sup>30</sup> <Blank> in Jerusalem. (4QTest I:21-30)

<sup>54</sup> See I Macc. 2:42; 7:13; II Macc. 14:6. Although Josephus does not refer to the group by name, he does refer to the incident described in I Macc. 7:13 (the betrayal of the group by Alcimus and Bacchides) in *Ant.* XII, x, 2 §396.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*, Trans. John Bowden (SCM Press: London, 1974), 175-180; E. Lohse, *The New Testament Environment* (London: 1976), 77f.; Schürer, 2, 400; Contrast P.R. Davies, "Hasidim in the Maccabean Period," *JJS* 28 (1977), 127-40.

The main theme of this text has to do with 'the accursed man of Belial' and the 'two instruments of violence' (ll. 23, 25).<sup>56</sup> These will rebuild 'the city', which scholars generally agree refers to either Jerusalem or Jericho, and make it a stronghold of wickedness. The majority of commentators agree that the interpreter is here referring to three persons, the accursed man and his two sons 'the instruments of violence', since the Joshua citation itself refers to three characters in the curse. Vermes, however, disagrees:

Most experts hold that the commentator, bearing in mind the biblical passage, is alluding to three characters: a father ('an accursed man') and his two sons. However, the verb 'arose' in the second sentence is in the singular, and it would seem correct to interpret this text as referring to two brothers only.<sup>57</sup>

He restores then, "And [his brother] arose [and ruled in li]es, both being instruments of violence" for line 25. Other scholars get around the singular verb וַעֲמַד (l. 24): Milik offers "And he stood forth and [made his sons] rulers (וְהַמְשִׁילַ בְּנָיו), and both of them became vessels of violence."<sup>58</sup> Finally, Cross suggests, "and he rose to power, and his sons rose to power with him (וַעֲמַדִּים בְּנָיו עִמּוֹ) becoming instruments of violence," i.e. repeating the root at the beginning of line 25.<sup>59</sup> Whichever reconstruction one opts for, it is clear that Vermes' concerns need not apply. Reference to three figures here better fits the Joshua context.

The identity of these figures, though, is hotly debated, and several suggestions should be outlined: (1) Cross applies the passage to Simon the Maccabee ('the accursed

---

<sup>56</sup> Interpretations have been offered by: Allegro, "Further Messianic References," 182-87; *Qumran Cave 4: I*. (4Q158-4Q186), *DJD*, 5 (Oxford, 1968); Milik, *Ten Years*, 61-64; P.W. Skehan, "Two Books on Qumran Studies," *CBQ* 21 (1959), 74-75; O. Betz, "Donnersöhne, Menschenfischer und der Davidische Messias," *RevQ* 3 (1961), 42, n. 4; Brownlee, *The Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls for the Bible* (New York: Oxford, 1964), 101-104; Dupont-Sommer, *Essene Writings*, 355-56; Cross, *Ancient Library*, 114-115, esp. n. 84; C. Newsom, "The 'Psalms of Joshua' from Qumran Cave 4," *JJS* 39 (1988), 56-73; and more recently by H. Eshel, "The Historical Background of the Peshet Interpreting Joshua's Curse on the Rebuilder of Jericho," *RevQ* 15 (1992), 409-20; "A Note on a Recently Published Text: The 'Joshua Apocryphon'," *The Centrality of Jerusalem: Historical Perspectives*, M. Poorthuis and Ch. Safrai, eds. (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996), 89-93; L.H. Schiffman, "Jerusalem in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *ibid.*, 73-88. See also J.J. Collins, *The Sceptre and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (London: Doubleday, 1995), 94f.; L.H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their True Meaning for Judaism and Christianity* (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 235-36.

<sup>57</sup> Vermes, *CDSSE*, 495f.

<sup>58</sup> Milik, *Ten Years*, 61-62 and n. 1.

man') and his older and younger sons Judas and Mattathias ('the two instruments'), all of whom died in the Dôk fortress at Jericho (135/34 BC) – during the attempted coup by Ptolemy son of Abubus (I Macc. 16:11-17). The reference to bloodshed which follows, he takes to refer to the attack by Antiochus VII Sidetes following Simon's death at Jericho; (2) Milik refers the episode to Jonathan and Simon Maccabaeus and their fortification of Jerusalem before Trypho's invasion in 146 BC). On this understanding, the 'accursed man' refers to Mattathias Maccabaeus; (3) Betz and Brownlee have both identified 'the accursed man' as John Hyrcanus I and 'the two instruments of violence' as his sons Aristobulus I and Alexander Jannaeus; (4) Allegro and Dupont-Sommer identify Alexander Jannaeus as 'the accursed man' and his sons John Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II as the 'two instruments of violence', whose feuding resulted in Judaea being appropriated by Pompey the Great.<sup>60</sup>

The 1987-88 excavations at Jericho by E. Netzer have shown that the man who rebuilt that city was John Hyrcanus himself,<sup>61</sup> and leads Hanan Eshel to identify 'the accursed man' with Hyrcanus, and the 'weapons of violence' (his translation) with his sons Aristobulus I and Antigonus.<sup>62</sup> Hyrcanus may have been 'accursed' because, while rebuilding Jericho, Antigonus murdered his brother Aristobulus I, then died shortly afterward (103 BC). Joshua's curse is normally understood to have been fulfilled by Hiel of Bethel when he rebuilt Jericho (I Kings 16:34). The Qumran interpreter, though, may have seen the curse as fulfilled in his own time through these events surrounding Hyrcanus. Hyrcanus or his son Alexander Jannaeus are the most likely to have been called 'ruin for all of his neighbours' (l. 24), since within this period of history it was these two who pursued the most aggressive foreign policies, almost succeeding in expanding Judaea to Davidic proportions. Both, moreover, had internal problems. We have already seen how Jannaeus faced rebellion by the Pharisees. Hyrcanus himself faced similar problems at the beginning of his reign. He was the only one of Simon's sons to escape the massacre at Jericho, while, following

---

<sup>59</sup> Cross, *Ancient Library*, 114, n. 7.

<sup>60</sup> Milik has rejected this argument on palaeographic evidence (*op. cit.*, 62, n. 1). For references to individual scholars see above, n. 56.

<sup>61</sup> E. Netzer, "The Hasmonean Building Project," in A. Kasher, G. Fuks and U. Rappaport (eds.), *Greece and Rome in Eretz-Israel* (Jerusalem, 1989), 229. (Hebrew)

<sup>62</sup> Eshel, "The Historical Background," 415ff.



his escape to Jerusalem and his confirmation in the priesthood, he had to put down Ptolemy's rebellion.

Eshel notes further evidence that John Hyrcanus is here being referred to. In the interpretation, the phrase פַּח יְקוֹשׁ 'fowler's snare' is applied to the 'accursed man'. This phrase derives from Hos. 9:8:

צִפָּה אֶפְרַיִם עִם-אֱלֹהֵי נְבִיא פַח יְקוֹשׁ עַל-כָּל-דַּרְכָּיו מִשְׁטָמָה בְּבֵית  
אֱלֹהֵיוֹ:

The prophet is a sentinel for my God over Ephraim, yet a *fowler's snare* is on all his ways, and hostility in the house of his God.

In both the *Antiquities* and the *War*, Josephus notes that Hyrcanus was accredited with the gift of prophecy.<sup>63</sup> It seems, then, that the Qumran commentator is here linking Hyrcanus with the prophet in Hosea and the reference here to 'a sentinel for my God over Ephraim' almost certainly refers to Hyrcanus's attack on Samaria and his destruction of the temple on Gerizim (*Ant.* XIII, ix, 1 §256). It is unclear, though, whether the allusion here is necessarily negative to the claims of Hyrcanus's prophecy as Eshel supposes,<sup>64</sup> since Hosea apparently views the prophet positively. Eshel is almost certainly right, though, in seeing the 'hostility in the house of his God' as referring to the death of Hyrcanus's sons following the rebuilding of Jericho.

The description of the two sons as 'instruments/weapons of violence' (כלי חמס) deserves examination. This phrase derives from the identical description of Simeon and Levi, the sons of Jacob, in Gen. 49:5:

שִׁמְעוֹן וְלֵוִי אֲחִים כְּלֵי חַמָּס מְכַרְחִיָּהֶם:

Simeon and Levi are brothers; weapons of violence are their swords.

The context of this description refers to the attack led by these two on Hamor and his son Shechem for the latter's treatment of their sister Dinah (Gen. 34). Eshel sees in this reference a parallel to the conquest of Samaria by Aristobulus and Antigonos (based on the geographical location) and the capture and subsequent destruction of

<sup>63</sup> *Ant.* XIII, x, 7 §299-300; *War* I, iii, 8 §68-69.

<sup>64</sup> Eshel, "The Historical Background," 419.

Samaria itself (the city).<sup>65</sup> In both cases, “two brothers co-operated on the capture of a city, while their father and other brothers were not involved.”<sup>66</sup>

How does Ephraim fit into the account? Eshel notes how in the pesharim and CD ‘Ephraim’ is used as a designation of the Pharisees, and ‘Judah’ for members of the sect (as we have seen). Line 27, then, “And they will do great damage in Israel and a horror in Ephraim and Judah” (his translation), he supposes:

... refers to a great injury inflicted on the Pharisees (Ephraim), and on the members of the sect (Judah) an injury described as great bloodshed in Jerusalem.<sup>67</sup>

This he derives from Hos. 6:10-11a:

In the house of Israel I have seen a horrible thing; Ephraim’s whoredom is there, Israel is defiled. For you also, O Judah, a harvest is appointed.

Eshel relates this to Hyrcanus’s renunciation of the Pharisees, his turn to the Sadducees, and the ensuing sedition this caused. (*Ant.* XIII, x, 6 §293-298)

Unfortunately, this assumption is a clear example of the careless intertextual interpretation I am trying to avoid. There is nothing in any of the rest of the interpretation which warrants the inclusion of the Pharisees here. Rather, reference here to the Pharisees serves only to confuse. Ephraim’s inclusion here is in fact relatively straightforward and, indeed, supports Eshel’s earlier proposal. We have already seen how the description of ‘two instruments of violence’ in line 25 relates to the account in Gen. 49. Moreover, we have ourselves seen (above, p88) how, frequently in the Hebrew Bible ‘Ephraim’ is used euphemistically to refer to the Northern Kingdom, the geographical region of Samaria and Shechem, while ‘Judah’ is used in the same way to refer to the South. That ‘Ephraim’ and ‘Judah’ here are used in precisely the same way is indicated by line 28 when the two lines are viewed in parallel: so ‘a great evil in Israel’ is paralleled by ‘a godless act in the land’ and ‘a horrible things in Ephraim and in Judah’ by ‘a great blasphemy among the sons of Jacob’. There may even be an internal chiasm in line 27 which makes the same point:

---

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, 415-16.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, 416.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, 416.

A

B

B

A

[in the land and a great evil] in Israel and a horrible thing in Ephraim and in Judah

Judah is thus related to 'the land' and Ephraim to 'Israel'.

I follow Eshel *et al.*, then, in referring the incidents described here to events surrounding John Hyrcanus and his sons: in particular to the attack on Samaria in c. 128 BC by Aristobulus I and his brother Antigonus. On this understanding, the reference to the shedding of blood in the precinct in Jerusalem in lines 29-30 (deriving from Ps. 79:2-3) may refer to the murder of Antigonus by Aristobulus's soldiers at Strato's Tower (*Ant.* XIII, xi, 2 §309). However, I find no evidence for the understanding 'Ephraim = the Pharisees'. Rather, 'Ephraim' is used euphemistically here to refer to Samaria and to the Hasmonean attacks against the area in the late-second century BC.

### 3.3.6 4QCatena<sup>a</sup>

These fragments of the Catena are in poor condition. Of this column of the text (which Steudel labels column 9<sup>68</sup>), no complete lines survive and the width of the lines has to be estimated.

- |  |   |    |
|--|---|----|
|  | ואשר א[מר פן יאמר אויב]                             | 11 |
|  | יב[ל]תו vacat [ המה עדת דורשי ה[חל]קות המ. ] ד אשר  | 12 |
|  | יבקשו לחבל  |    |
|  | [אנשי היחד] בקנאתמה ובמשטמ[תמה] ל פשן [כאשר] כתוב   | 13 |
|  | בספר יחזקאל הנ[ביא]                                 |    |
|  | [בית ישראל] ויחודה ככול העמ[נים] [פשר הדבר לאחריית] | 14 |
|  | הימים אשר יקבצו עליה[ם]                             |    |
|  | [ ועם צדיק ורשע אויל ופתני ] נני האנשים             | 15 |
|  | אשר עבדו אל   |    |
|  | [אשר הס]ירו ערלות לב[ב]שרם בדור הא[חרון] .. [וכו]ל  | 16 |
|  | אשר להמה טמא ול[וא]                                 |    |

[ ... and as for what He sa]id, "Lest an enemy say <sup>12</sup> ['I have prevailed'." (Ps. 13:4) <Blank> ] They are the congregation of the Seekers of [Smooth] Things, [

<sup>68</sup> Annette Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat<sup>a,b</sup>): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditions-geschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 („Florilegium“) und 4Q177 („Catena A“) repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden* (E.J. Brill: Leiden, 1994).

... ]d who seek to destroy <sup>13</sup> [the men of the community ...] in their vigour and enmit[...].<sup>69</sup> pš[... and as for wh]at is written in the Book of Ezekiel the pr[ophet:] <sup>14</sup> ["The House of Israel] and Judah is like all the peo[p]les." (Ezek. 25:8) [The interpretation of the matter about the last] days is that against [them] will rally <sup>15</sup> [ ... ] a just people, but the wicked, the fool and the simp[le ...].ny the men who served God <sup>16</sup> [who have circum]cised the foreskin of the hea[rt of] their flesh in the la[st] generation [...]. . [and al]l which belongs to them, unclean and n[o]. (4QCat<sup>a</sup> 7+ II:11-16)

Our final passage refers (like 4QpIsa<sup>c</sup>, above) to the 'Congregation of the Seekers of Smooth Things'. This follows the citation of Ps. 13:4, and appears to relate the congregation of the seekers to 'my enemy'. These 'seek to destroy' (l. 12), though the object of לחבל has to be restored. אנשי היחוד is the most likely suggestion based on what we have seen of the Seekers elsewhere. Line 14 appears to cite part of Ezekiel 25:8, relating this to the community (the most likely understanding of a 'just people' (עם צדיק) in the end times who will 'rally against them'. The identity of 'the wicked, the fool and the simple' in line 15 is complicated by the fragmentary nature of the text. Nevertheless, both רשע 'wicked' and פתי 'simple' are epithets applied to Ephraim (see 4QpNah. 3-4 III:5; IV:5) suggesting, given the earlier reference to the Seekers of Smooth Things, that this group is being referred to. Whether or not אירל 'the fool' refers to this same group, though, is unclear.

'The men who served God who have circumcised the foreskin of their heart' derives from the Deuteronomic command: "Circumcise, then, the foreskin of your heart, and do not be stubborn any longer" (Deut. 10:16). Although on the face of it the reference in the Catena seems to point straightforwardly to members of the community, a closer examination of the Deuteronomic background of the phrase suggests that these are converts to the community who are no longer stubborn. If so, the pesherist may be reflecting the belief held elsewhere that Ephraim would return to the community when the glory of God was revealed – so 4QpNah 3-4 III:4-5 (above, p103).

### 3.4 Conclusions

In certain of the pesharim, then, as we have seen, 'Ephraim' refers to the Pharisees and their supporters, 'Seekers of Smooth Things' to the leadership of that group, and

---

<sup>69</sup> Ezek. 25:8 has העמים rather than הגוים.

'Manasseh' to the Sadducees. This is true of both 4QpNah and 4QHos<sup>b</sup> since both refer to the 'Lion of Wrath' or Alexander Jannaeus, the crucifixion of whose opponents, the Pharisees, is related in the first part of 4QpNah.

Other of the pesharim rely on this identification to various degrees. So, 4QpIsa<sup>c</sup>, if an interpretation of Isa. 9:17-20 can be reconstructed, echoes the infighting between the Pharisees (Ephraim) and the Sadducees (Manasseh) implied in 4QpNah. Again, in 4QpPs<sup>a</sup>, the enmity between Ephraim and Manasseh on the one hand and Judah on the other would appear to reflect a possible interpretation of Isa. 9:20 (and thus back to 4QpNah). This admittedly slender evidence for a consistency in the terms' meaning is held together by the third term 'Seekers of Smooth Things'. In 4QpNah, this designation was strongly linked with the group 'Ephraim' (though in the exegesis of the passage the precise nature of the relationship was unclear). This understanding is, it seems, reflected in other texts. 'Ephraim', 'Manasseh' and the 'Seekers of Smooth Things' all appear in 4QpIsa<sup>c</sup>, though again this relies on reconstruction of interpretation of Isa. 9:20. Outside of the pesharim, 'Ephraim' appears in CD, which also includes the expression *דורשו בחלקות*, which we have earlier related to the title Seekers of Smooth Things (*דורשי החלקות*). Ultimately, however, our reasoning relies on the uniqueness of the expression *דורשי החלקות* itself. As we have shown (3.1, above), this term in itself points to the Pharisees as depicted in Josephus, through the interpretative aspects inherent in the expression (*דורשי, חלקה, חלקה*). It is unlikely that an expression with such a plethora of nuances would apply to more than one group.

The same cannot be said of 'Ephraim', however. In 4QTestimonia 'Ephraim' seems not to refer to the Pharisees, or indeed any group at all. Rather, the reference is to the geographical region of Samaria and relates to the military conquests of that area by Hyrcanus and his sons. This understanding, we have proposed, is entirely consistent with OT usage, which frequently refers to the region of the Northern Kingdom in terms of 'Ephraim'. It is possible, then, that this understanding pervades other pesharim, not merely the Testimonia, particularly those, such as 4QpHos<sup>b</sup> and 4QpPs<sup>a</sup>, since neither text refers to the 'Seekers of Smooth Things'. This possibility is generally ruled out, however, not least because of my comments on (particularly) 4QpHos<sup>b</sup> above, but also because the contexts in which 'Ephraim' is here referred to,

do not suggest a geographical dimension to the interpretation. Nevertheless, it is not possible to entirely rule out the possibility of a multiplicity of meanings for 'Ephraim' in the pesharim given that at least two meanings are presented in the extant portions.

The rationale for the application for these particular epithets seems to refer back to the Hebrew Bible. There is no reason to repeat the arguments for the (leadership of the) Pharisees as the 'Seekers of Smooth Things,' as this has been adequately covered in 3.1 above. The reasoning for the main body of the Pharisaic group as 'Ephraim' and the Sadducees as 'Manasseh' seems, though, to rely on the story of the two brothers in Genesis 48 (above, p88), which the pesherist appears to have related to his own timeframe. The Genesis story relates how Ephraim received Jacob's blessing over against Manasseh, his elder brother. Within the story this is explained as being because "[Ephraim] shall be greater than [Manasseh], and his offspring shall become a multitude of nations", an explanation which reflects the tribal prominence of Ephraim over Manasseh. For the pesherist this mirrors the situation whereby the Pharisees overtook the Sadducees in the people's support, perhaps aided through the similar sounding אפרים and פרושים. Moreover, as we have shown, even within the OT there is a trend for Ephraim not always to refer to the tribal group. As such, it joins other such terms as Lebanon and Kittim. Manasseh, although not interpreted in the Hebrew Bible, enters this tradition through the proximity with 'Ephraim'.

## 4.0 The Teacher of Righteousness

The Teacher of Righteousness (Heb. מורה (ה) צדק) in the scrolls is a key figure in the history of the community, thought to be responsible for the initial establishment of the community, and the events in whose life are thought to be represented in many of the texts – not simply the pesharim or CD, the only Qumran texts where the phrase מורה (ה) צדק is explicitly located. Perhaps somewhat surprisingly this figure is also known outside of the community, though this, as we shall see, may fall under the influence of CD, known to have a history outside of Qumran. At various times in the period since the discovery of the scrolls the Teacher of Righteousness (or more simply the Teacher) has been alleged to be responsible for authoring 1QS, 1QM, 11QT and 1QH (or portions thereof, that is to say, the key documents in any discussion of the sect's history. As such, the Teacher is of vital importance to a discussion of this nature.

### 4.1 Meaning and Translation of the Title *Moreh Şedeq*

The precise meaning of the phrase מורה הצדק (or מורה צדק in its shorter form) is a matter of debate, inviting several variations, including: 'Right Teacher', 'Legitimate Teacher', 'Teacher of Justice', 'Master of Justice', 'Righteous Teacher', and of course 'Teacher of Righteousness'. Nevertheless, few scholars have attempted to explore the meaning of the phrase מורה (ה) צדק itself.

In his 1961 article,<sup>1</sup> Jacob Weingreen analysed the precise rendering of the Hebrew phrase and rejected all the above possibilities, suggesting instead that the phrase should simply be transliterated (i.e. as *Moreh Şedeq*). In particular, however, he rejects the implications of the translation 'Teacher of Righteousness':

I wonder, however, whether the faulty translation "Teacher of Righteousness" or "Righteous Teacher" has not encouraged the general practice of ascribing to him extraordinary, if not unique, qualities. These English words, written in capital

---

<sup>1</sup> J. Weingreen, "The Title *Moreh Sedek*," *JSS* 6 (1961), 162-74.

letters, have ... a conditioning effect which makes the reader prone to see in him messianic qualities.<sup>2</sup>

מורה, the first part of the Hebrew phrase, is derived from the verb ירה, literally 'shoot' especially of arrows (cf. I Sam 20:36). Nevertheless, in a more developed sense the root comes to mean 'rain' in the sense of *rainfall*: thus Ps. 84:6 (Heb. 84:7).

עֲבְרֵי בְּעֵמֶק הַבָּכָא מֵעֵן יִשְׁתַּוְּהוּ  
גַם־בְּרִכּוֹת יַעֲטָה מוֹרָה:

As they go through the valley of Baca they make it a place of springs; / *the early rain* also covers it with pools.

The pre-eminent meaning for our purposes is the teaching dimension, however, ultimately leading of course to the noun תורה itself. This first emerges in Exodus 4:15 where the Lord is instructing Moses what he should say to Aaron:

וּדְבַרְתָּ אֵלָיו וְשַׁמַּתָּ אֶת־הַדְּבָרִים בְּפִיו וְאֵנֹכִי אֶהְיֶה עִם־פִּיךָ וְעִם־פִּיהוּ  
וְהוֹרִיתִי אֶתְכֶם אֵת אֲשֶׁר תַּעֲשׂוּן:

You shall speak to him and put the words in his mouth; and I will be with your mouth and with his mouth, *and will teach you what you shall do*

The same sense is also found in Lev. 10:11, where Aaron is instructed "to teach (ולתורה) the people of Israel all the statutes that the LORD has spoken to them through Moses." From these passages it appears as though the Moreh teaches what he himself has been instructed, in the sense that he passes this information on, and is supported by our understanding of peshar above. The Moreh is not the source of this knowledge, which ultimately derives from God himself. This is confirmed in II Chron. 15:3:

וַיְמִים רַבִּים לְיִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא אֱלֹהֵי אֱמֶת וְלֹא כֹהֵן מוֹרֶה וְלֹא תוֹרָה:

For a long time Israel was without the true God, and without a teaching priest, and without law.

In this passage 'God', 'the teaching priest' and 'the law' (also ירה) are intrinsically linked. It is ultimately the teacher who ensures the presence of law for Israel. I am also emboldened to suggest that the Law (תורה) be so named because it presents God's laws as *passed down* from him to his people.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 174.



צדק, the second part of the title, has a number of translations, among them 'righteousness', 'uprightness' etc., but there is a sense that the Greek term *δικαιοσύνη*, with its Pauline connotations, has overshadowed the Hebrew term.<sup>3</sup> Manifestly, the term can exhibit a number of shades of meaning, as demonstrated by the numerous parallelisms to צדק in the MT, which can be divided into two basic groups: those with a limited 'non-moral' sense of 'right' (as opposed to 'wrong'), and those with a more developed sense of 'order', whether of the individual in terms of his right conduct, or of the universe itself.

In its most basic sense צדק differentiates between 'right' and 'wrong' (in a 'non-moral' sense). Thus the term is found opposite רשע in Deut. 25:1 to indicate a legal decision:

כִּי־יִהְיֶה רִיב בֵּין אַנְשִׁים וְנִגְשׁוּ אֶל־הַמִּשְׁפָּט וּשְׁפָטוּם וְהִצְדִּיקוּ  
אֶת־הַצְּדִיק וְהִרְשִׁיעוּ אֶת־הַרְשָׁע:

Suppose two persons have a dispute and enter into litigation, and the judges decide between them, *declaring one to be in the right and the other to be in the wrong.*

Similarly, צדק is several times found alongside משפט indicating the correctness (or not) of a legal ruling. Thus Deut. 16:18: וּשְׁפָטוּ אֶת־הָעָם מִשְׁפַּט־צְדָק, which the RSV translates "and they shall judge the people with righteous judgement," is better translated "and they shall render correct (or 'true') judgement to the people." This is especially clear when Zech. 7:9 (מִשְׁפַּט אֱמֶת שֹׁפֵט) is taken into consideration.<sup>4</sup> Weingreen associates this with צדק זבחי in Ps. 4:6 (cf. Deut. 33:19) which has been translated 'sacrifices of righteousness' but where the translation 'true/proper sacrifices' is clearly more appropriate, thus removing the moral dimension of צדק.<sup>5</sup> In this sense of 'true' it is also appropriate at this point to note the application of the term to indicate the accuracy of weights and measures in Lev. 19:36. This sense of צדק is

<sup>3</sup> Cf. J.J. Scullion, "Righteousness (OT)," *ABD*, 724: "The words and phrases, "righteousness," "justification," "he ... whose sin is covered ... to whom the Lord imputes no iniquity" ... evoke theological associations which must be laid aside when dealing with the Heb terms *sedeq-sedaqa*."

<sup>4</sup> So Weingreen, *op. cit.*, 167-68.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 168-69.

also found in Deut. 25:15 and Ezek. 45:10 and is picked up in Job 31:6 (“let me be weighed in a just balance [במאזני צדק]”).

Nevertheless, צדק is also subject to a more developed sense of *order*. Thus, in the Psalms, to act in accordance with צדק is to act in accordance with God’s law. Hence, the priests should clothe themselves in righteousness (Ps. 132:9), and “comport themselves according to proper liturgical and moral order.”<sup>6</sup> In the same way, the Psalmist begs for Yahweh to empower the King with His justice and righteousness, in order that [the king] may enact this order through his judgements on earth (Ps. 72:1-2). But this concept of righteousness is also clearly two-sided. The LORD himself must also act in compliance with this sense of order. Thus he must uphold a sense of justice and make his judgements in accordance with this sense of righteousness.

When we bring the two constituent terms together, then, we can see how the title מורה הצדק can have a broad range of meanings. On the face of it, it seems unproblematic to read מורה as teacher since this is consistent with the depiction of מורה in the OT. We are, though, no closer to defining צדק. In form, the title may be either a subjective or an objective genitive, and whichever option one chooses will have an effect on which translation one adopts. A subjective genitive, for instance, might be translated ‘right/righteous teacher’, i.e. defining the teacher, while an objective genitive might be translated ‘teacher of righteousness/what is right’, i.e. defining what is taught. The latter is consistent with a normal Hebrew construct state, while we might expect ‘the righteous teacher’ to be written המורה הצדיק, a form that is nowhere found in any of the biblical, intertestamental or rabbinic literature (4.2, below). Nevertheless, if grammatically translating ‘teacher of righteousness’ is better, clearly this does not encompass the phrase’s range of meanings. Thus, there is no legal dimension to the phrase, even though Weingreen argued this to be the pre-eminent meaning of the phrase.<sup>7</sup> Nor is there a sense of order brought about by the Teacher – in the sense that he ‘teaches’ proper conduct for people on earth, and the proper order by which the universe itself is governed. Nevertheless Weingreen’s suggestion to transliterate Moreh Şedeq ultimately avoids the issue. Instead, I follow

---

<sup>6</sup> Scullion, *op. cit.*, 729.

the trend and translate the phrase throughout as ‘Teacher of Righteousness’. Nevertheless, since this offers only one dimension of the phrase, the range of meanings discussed should certainly be borne in mind when considering the various passages. Pardee sums it up best of all:

For our part, we would like to stress the richness of the expression: the very fact that scholars have debated its precise meaning in the Dead Sea Scrolls for a score of years without coming to a concensus would seem to indicate that perhaps the Qumran authors did not have precisely one of its meanings in mind when using it.<sup>8</sup>

## 4.2 *The Moreh Ṣedeq outside of the Pesharim*

### 4.2.1 Biblical Material

As several scholars have pointed out, the precise phrase מורה הצדק derives from two passages in the Hebrew Bible: Hosea 10:12 and Joel 2:23.<sup>9</sup>

(a) Hosea 10:12

זָרְעוּ לָכֶם לְצִדְקָה קְצְרוּ לְפִי־חֶסֶד נִירוּ לָכֶם נִיר וְעַת לְדָרוֹשׁ אֶת־יְהוָה  
עַד־יָבוֹא יְיָהּ צִדְקָ לָכֶם:

Sow for yourselves righteousness; reap steadfast love; break up your fallow ground; for it is time to seek the LORD, *that he may come and rain righteousness upon you.*

This passage, states Flusser, is “apparently the origin of the appellation מורה צדק.”<sup>10</sup> Here ויריה ‘that he may rain’ derives from ירה and thus by extension the noun מורה/יורה ‘early rain’. However, given the verb’s more developed sense ‘direct’ ‘teach’ ‘instruct’ (hence ‘teacher’), the passage could be translated ‘until he come and teach righteousness to you’, as indeed in Vg and LXX: ἕως τοῦ ἐλθεῖν γενήματα δικαιοσύνης ὑμῶν. Roth even suggests a variant reading מורה צדק from which the

<sup>7</sup> Weingreen, *op. cit.*

<sup>8</sup> D. Pardee, “A Restudy of the Commentary on Psalm 37 from Qumran Cave 4 (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan, vol. V n° 171,” *RevQ* 8 (1973), 163-194, esp. 186.

<sup>9</sup> O.R. Sellers, “A Possible Old Testament Reference to the Teacher of Righteousness,” *IEJ* 5 (1955), 93-95; Cecil Roth, “The Teacher of Righteousness and the Prophecy of Joel,” *VT* 13 (1963), 91-95. Cf. J. Weingreen, “Moreh Sedek,” 162-74.

<sup>10</sup> Note by D. Flusser in Sellers, *op. cit.*, 95 n. 6

Qumran sectarians derived ‘Teacher of Righteousness’<sup>11</sup> but this overlooks the parallel in CD VI:10-11: ‘until there arises one who teaches righteousness (יורה) (הצדק) at the end of days’.<sup>12</sup>

(b) Joel 2:23

וּבְנֵי צִיּוֹן גִּילוּ וְשִׂמְחוּ בַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם כִּי־נָתַן לָכֶם אֶת־הַמּוֹרָה לְצַדִּיקָה  
וַיּוֹרֵד לָכֶם גֶּשֶׁם מוֹרָה וּמִלְקוֹשׁ בְּרֵאשׁוֹן:

O children of Zion, be glad and rejoice in the LORD your God; for he has given *the early rain for your vindication*,<sup>13</sup> he has poured down for you abundant rain, *the early and the later rain*, as before.

The second passage preserves the phrase *את־הַמּוֹרָה לְצַדִּיקָה* again from יורה. Although it bears many similarities to the title *מורה הצדק*, however, actual translation of the passage should not reflect this. *מורה* appears later in the verse alongside *גשם* ‘rain’ ‘shower’ and *מלקוש* ‘latter-rain’ indicating that this is its primary meaning. *מורה* also appears in this sense in Ps. 84:6 (Heb. 84:7) alongside *עין* ‘spring’. Sellers calls for *לְצַדִּיקָה* to be regarded as a gloss inserted by a scribe from the same circle as those who produced CD (or at least familiar with their teachings).<sup>14</sup> It is certainly true that, while *הַמּוֹרָה* may be understood in terms of its meaning ‘early-rain’, *לְצַדִּיקָה* has presented problems for the translators. Nevertheless, there is no text-critical evidence to support treating the term as a gloss, especially by one close to the Qumran community. Meanwhile, his argument ignores the presence of equivalent terms in both LXX and Vg (εἰς δικαιοσύνην and *iustitiae* respectively). If *לְצַדִּיקָה* were a gloss, it would be more likely under the influence of the Hosea passage than by members of the community.

### Conclusions

Ultimately the context of each biblical passage indicates that a translation ‘Teacher of Righteousness’ (or equivalent) is unwarranted. Nevertheless, it is clear that one of the

<sup>11</sup> Roth, *op. cit.*, 93.

<sup>12</sup> Note that the corresponding passage in 4Q266 3 II (ll. 14-16) has not survived.

<sup>13</sup> LXX reads ἔδωκεν ὑμῖν τὰ βρώματα εἰς δικαιοσύνην which may indicate a variant reading *בְּרִיָּה* (?) ‘food’ (so II Sam 13:5,7,10) for MT *אֶת־הַמּוֹרָה*. Where *מורה* is repeated later in the verse, however, LXX has the parallel ὑετὸν πρόμιον.

<sup>14</sup> Sellers, *op. cit.*, 93-95.

passages could be translated ‘Teacher of Righteousness’ while the other bears strong resemblance to a passage from CD. It seems likely then that the title מורה הצדק is in some way derived from either of these passages, but whether this figure is already termed מורה and equivalent OT passages found to support this, or whether the title is entirely derived from these passages, is in the end unclear.

---

Excursus: The ‘Teacher of Falsehood’ (מורה שקר) of Isa. 9:15 and Hab. 2:18

It has been suggested that the title מורה הצדק is inspired by the similar construction מורה שקר which appears in Isa. 9:15 (Heb 9:14) and Hab. 2:18.<sup>15</sup> Given that the term is occasionally contrasted with צדק (so Psalm 52:3 [Heb. 52:5] and Prov. 12:17), this, and the similarity in construction, demands that we consider this phrase as well.

*i. Isaiah 9:15<sup>16</sup>*

זָקֵן וְנִשְׂוֵא־פָנִים הוּא הָרֹאשׁ וְנָבִיא מוֹרֵה־שִׁקֵּר הוּא הַזָּנָב:

Elders and dignitaries are the head, and *prophets who teach lies* are the tail

The passage occurs in the wider context of the rationale behind Isaiah’s condemnation of the Northern Kingdom, ‘Ephraim’. Here the blame is placed squarely on the leadership, both secular (‘elders and dignitaries’) and religious (‘prophets who teach lies’). One important aspect here is the link maintained between נביא ‘prophet’ and מורה־שקר ‘teacher of lies/falsehood’, since the Teacher of Righteousness himself is similarly imbued with prophetic capability. Nevertheless, here these are *false* prophets, since they have failed to perceive the danger surrounding Ephraim. As such, they are the targets of Isaiah’s scorn.

An examination of the wider Isaianic passage also reveals several matters of interest, since in the following verse the prophet states:

---

<sup>15</sup> Cf. H. Ringgren, *The Faith of Qumran: Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Expanded Edition (New York: Crossroad, 1995), 31-32.

<sup>16</sup> This passage also appears in 4QpIsa<sup>c</sup> 4-7 I:8-9, but the precise expression מורה שקר has to be restored, while the text where it does provide commentary on Isa. 9:11,13-16 (I:14-15) is almost entirely missing. Given the brevity of the commentary, however, it is unlikely (as also in 1QpHab, below) that the pesherist picked up on this expression *in particular* in the accompanying lemma.

וַיְהִיוּ מְאַשְׂרֵי הָעַם־הַזֶּה מִתְעִים וּמְאַשְׂרֵי מְבַלְעִים:

For those who led this people led them astray, and those who were led by them were left in confusion. (Isa. 9:16)

This is reminiscent of the terminology used of Ephraim and the Seekers of Smooth Things in 4QpNah above: בתלמוד שקרם 'misdirectors of Ephraim' II:8; 'through their *false* teaching' II:8; את מתעיהם 'lead many astray' II:8; רבים 'those who lead them astray' III:5; and לתעות [את ה]קהל 'lead astray the congregation' III:7). Moreover, as we observed there, that terminology recurs in 1QH XII:7-11<sup>17</sup>:

7	...[...]. רים החליקו למו ומליצי רמיה [ה]תעום וילבטו בלא בינה כיא [עשו]
8	בהולל מעשיהם כי נמאס(ת)י למו ולא יחשבוני בהגבירכה בי כי ידיחני מארצי
9	כצפור מקנה וכול רעי ומודעי נדחו ממני ויחשבוני לכלי אובד והמה מליצי
10	כזב וחוזי רמיה זממו עלי {בי} בליעל להמיר תורתכה אשר שננתה בלבבי בחלקות
11	לעמכה

Vermes translates this as:

Teachers of lies [have smoothed] Thy people [with words],  
and [false prophets] *have led them astray*;  
they perish without understanding  
for their works are in folly.  
For I am despised by them  
and they have no esteem for me  
that thou mayest manifest Thy might through me.  
They have banished me from my land like a bird from its nest;  
all my friends and brethren are driven far from me  
and hold me for a broken vessel.  
And they, *teachers of lies and seers of falsehood*,  
have schemed against me a devilish scheme,  
to exchange the Law engraved on my heart by Thee  
for the smooth things (which they speak) to Thy people.<sup>18</sup>

Note how the translation 'teachers of lies' for רמיה / מליצי כזב (ll. 7, 9-10) reflects the translations of שקר מורה as 'teacher of lies' in the biblical passages. Though Vermes does not admit it, I suspect his translation is motivated by a link

<sup>17</sup> Text: *DSS:SE* I, 166, 168.

<sup>18</sup> *CDSSE*, 263.

between the Hymns and the Isaiah passage, while taking into account the 4QpNah passages. The implications of this we shall explore below in the context of the pesharim themselves.

ii. *Habakkuk 2:18*

מַה־הוֹעִיל פֶּסֶל כִּי פִסְלוּ יִצְרוּ מִסִּכָּה וּמִזֹּרָה שֶׁקֶר כִּי בָטַח יִצַר יִצְרוּ  
עָלָיו לַעֲשׂוֹת אֱלִילִים אֱלִמִּים: ס

What use is an idol once its maker has shaped it – a cast image, a *teacher of lies*?  
For its maker trusts in what has been made, though the product is only an idol  
that cannot speak!

In the original prophecy, the reference applies to those who have placed their hopes in idols (of Baal etc.) rather than the LORD. As Habakkuk points out, however, the origin of these is ultimately secular – a workman makes them – so to put one's faith in them is ridiculous. The idol is here described as a 'teacher of lies' alongside *מִסִּכָּה* 'molten image'. So Robertson:

[a]lthough the image could not speak, it communicated a falsehood by giving the appearance that it had the power of a supernatural being. It thereby encouraged its viewers to put some trust in its striking form, to plead to this image for help in time of need, or to attribute unexpected prosperity to special intervention by this man-made shape.<sup>19</sup>

This passage should lead us directly to the 1QpHab itself, since the passage is taken from Habakkuk itself. In the pesher, however, the reading is clearly *מרי שקר* which Brownlee translates 'fatling of falsehood'.<sup>20</sup> The reading could, he continues, be explained as an orthographic variation of the MT, though this leads him to question why, in the pesher immediately following, no allusion is made to this figure.<sup>21</sup> Rather, as my translation demonstrates, the pesherist has taken the MT at face value!

פֶּשֶׁר הַדְּבַר עַל כּוֹל	12
פֶּסְלֵי הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר יִצְרוּם לַעֲבוֹדָם וּלְשִׁתְּחוֹת	13

<sup>19</sup> Robertson, *op. cit.*, 208.

<sup>20</sup> Brownlee, 209. Cf. 1QpHab XII:11.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 210. In favour of the orthographic variant it is worth noting that *הוא יורה* 'can it teach' is also found in Hab. 2:19, though 1QpHab XII:16, where the biblical text should be found, has to be reconstructed. Cf. Horgan, 54, who is also confused as to why no mention is made of the so-called 'teacher of falsehood' in the commentary. Ultimately she follows Rabin and Carmignac, reading *mar'eh*, 'appearance of falsehood'.

The interpretation of the passage concerns all <sup>13</sup> the idols of the nations, which they have made, to serve them, and to worship <sup>14</sup> to them. But they will not save them on the Day of Judgement. (1QpHab XII:12-14)

Regardless of the pronunciation of מרי, whether it favours an orthographic variant on the MT or whether some other, similar-sounding term is to be preferred, I find it unlikely that the same author as the one who composed the remainder of the pesher would have overlooked such an obvious allusion to the מורה שקר, which, if we are correct elsewhere, has influenced the title מורה הצדק. So, although the conclusion sits uneasy, I regard this section of the pesher (beginning at XII:10 and continuing through to the end of the text at XIII:4) as the product of another author, one perhaps not as familiar with the Hebrew Bible as our 'original' pesherist. There is no obvious change in scribal hand at this point, so I am also required to read the entire pesher as a later copy. Although this is a major conclusion to reach, I believe the final section of the pesher is so radically different from the remainder of the work that I ultimately have no choice but to consider it a secondary addition.

#### 4.2.2 Qumran Material

Outside of the pesharim, 'Teacher of Righteousness' is found in CD, and perhaps also in the fragmentary 4QUnid (4Q172).

##### (a) Damascus Document

Much is made of the appearance of the Teacher in CD, even though, as Davies points out, he also constitutes "something of a problem."<sup>22</sup> The Teacher first appears in col. I ('and [God] raised up for them a Teacher of Righteousness [מורה צדק], in order to direct them in the way of his heart'; I:11[=4Q266 2 I:14]), where he comes as the culmination of the passage concerning the 390 years between Nebuchadnezzar and the 'period of wrath', and in particular the twenty years of 'groping' immediately prior, and his arrival forms a turning point in the group's prospects. Many scholars have

<sup>22</sup> P.R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the Damascus Document*, JSOTSup 25 (JSOT Press: Sheffield, 1982), 17.



taken the chronology portrayed at face value and have crudely adopted the timeframe to suit the archaeological data from Qumran of the site's occupation.<sup>23</sup> The Teacher has, then, almost from the outset, been associated with the community's beginnings.

Nevertheless, this view is difficult to accommodate with the apparently future reference to 'the one who teaches righteousness in the end of days' (יורה הצדק) (באחרית הימים) in CD VI:11, the conclusion of the 'Well Midrash' passage (see Frontispiece), and is further complicated by mention in the same passage of the 'Interpreter of the Law' (דורש התורה; VI:7[=4Q267 2 I:15]), identified as the 'staff' of Num. 21:18.<sup>24</sup> There are, then, two clear questions: is (a) the Teacher of Righteousness the same figure as the Interpreter of the Law in the Well Midrash? And (b) how is the relationship (if any) between the Teacher of Righteousness and 'the one who teaches righteousness in the end of days' to be understood?

Most scholars conclude that the chronological discrepancy between the Teacher of Righteousness, a figure of the past, and the future 'one who teaches righteousness' cannot be overcome, and that either two separate individuals are described, or that the community believed in the Teacher's return (like Elijah) in the eschaton. This, then, allows the titles 'Teacher of Righteousness' and 'Interpreter of the Law' as references to the same individual. Unfortunately, however, this view immediately runs into problems, through the lack of parallel passages supporting it. Thus, Davies rightly considers the suggestion 'unsatisfactory'.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>23</sup> Thus 390 years from 587/6 (Nebuchadnezzar's capture of Jerusalem) +20 years of 'groping' establishes the Teacher's arrival c. 187/6 BCE. So L. Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect* (New York: 1970); I. Rabinowitz, "A reconsideration of 'Damascus' and '390 Years' in the 'Damascus' ('Zadokite') Fragments," *JBL* 73 (1954), 11-35; H.H. Rowley, "The 390 Years of the Zadokite Work," in *Mélanges Bibliques rédigés en l'honneur de André Robert* (Paris: 1957), 341-47; O. Schwartz, *Der erste Teil der Damaskusschrift und das AT* (Diest: 1965), 83ff.; and E. Wiesenberg, "Chronological Data in the Zadokite Fragments," *VT* 5 (1955), 284-308. However, the 390 years is probably better understood as deriving from Ezek. 4:5, which relates the number of days the prophet lay on his side to the number of years of Israel's punishment. Thus the passage is without any chronological value. C.f H. Ringgren, *op. cit.*, 36-7; Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 63, 67

<sup>24</sup> This figure also appears in VII:18-20 as the 'star' of Num. 24:17 who will come to Damascus, and in 4QFlor 1 I:11 as 'the 'Branch of David' (צמח דוד) who will arise with the Interpreter of the Law.'

<sup>25</sup> P.R. Davies, "The Teacher of Righteousness and the 'End of Days'," *RevQ* 13 (1988), 313.

Instead, Davies proposes that the Teacher and the Interpreter are not the same individual, but that the Teacher of Righteousness of the past is, paradoxically, the same individual referred to in the eschatological reference ‘the one who teaches righteousness in the end of days’. The ‘Well Midrash’ passage, he argues, “is not comparing or contrasting two *Teachers* but assigning to a future figure the actual title [Teacher of Righteousness], while denying it to the historical figure [Interpreter of the Law].”<sup>26</sup> By dealing with the text source-critically, Davies is enabled to deal with these two passages (cols. I and VI) independently. The ‘one who teaches righteousness’ in col. VI is, he argues, the same individual as the Teacher of Righteousness everywhere else referred to in the past. In other words, ‘the one who teaches righteousness’ is a messianic title adopted by the Teacher of Righteousness, whose arrival inaugurates the ‘end of days’.<sup>27</sup> Source-critically, then, col. VI should be dated prior to col. I, by which time this messianic title has been adopted. Chronologically, Davies places the Interpreter of the Law at the beginning of the community’s foundation (described in CD VI), and the Teacher as one who arrives later. This, now, better fits col. I where the Teacher comes across a pre-existing community, those who are ‘groping’ in the wilderness.

In MS B the Teacher is referred to on a further three occasions – though none of these passages are preserved in the 4Q fragments. The first (a) CD XIX:35-XX:1, refers to the ‘Unique Teacher’ (מורה היחיד) and seems to depict a time-frame of events ‘from the day of the in-gathering (האסף) of the Unique Teacher until there arises the Messiah of Aaron and from Israel.’ The term reappears in the second passage (b) XX:13-15: ‘And from the day of the in-gathering (האסף) of the Unique Teacher (here יורה היחיד), until the end of all the men of war who turned back with the Man of Lies (איש הכזב), there shall be about forty years.’<sup>28</sup> Provided we can identify the מורה הצדק with the מורה היחיד here (which is by no means certain), the key issue concerns the precise meaning of האסף. The majority of scholars, Davies included,

---

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 314.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 315.

<sup>28</sup> Continuing with the chronology derived from Ezek. 4 (the 390 years above, n23, & col. I), the forty years probably refers to the number of years punishment on the house of Judah (Ezek. 4:6). The Man of Falsehood, here, seems to be a leading member of the community, an aspect that will be picked up below.

suppose that some reference is here made to the Teacher's death. By contrast, Wacholder has argued that the biblical and Qumranic evidence argues against such a translation of אָסַף. Instead, he suggests that the reference is to the institution of the community by the Teacher.<sup>29</sup> Both these readings can without difficulty be made to fit the Teacher's role, earlier observed, of inaugurating the eschaton. Finally (c) the Teacher is referred to again in the latter lines of col. XX, at both ll. 28 and 32, as מוֹרֵה and מוֹרֵה הַצִּדִּיק respectively; where, in both instances, the 'men of the community' (אֲנָשֵׁי הַיְחִיד; l. 32) are enjoined to heed the Teacher's voice. Both Stegemann and Murphy-O'Connor read the reference to מוֹרֵה in the first instance as referring to God himself. Nevertheless, as Davies has pointed out, the reference to מוֹרֵה הַצִּדִּיק in l. 32 makes this suggestion improbable.<sup>30</sup> Moreover, we might add, none of the background evidence ever directly relates מוֹרֵה to God himself.

The Teacher of Righteousness in CD, then, is either (a) a figure of the past who is scheduled to reappear in the future, or (b) a figure previously anticipated, but now recognised as referring to the current leader of the community. In either instance, however, this figure will (depending on the meaning of הָאָסַף) inaugurate a new period of history, perhaps even the eschaton itself.

(b) 4QpUnid (4Q172)

A very fragmentary reference to the מוֹרֵה הַצִּדִּיק 'Teacher of [Righteousness]' may be preserved in 4QpUnid Fr. 7 I:1 (although the text could also read מוֹרֵה הַיְחִיד; cf. CD XX:1,14). As we have seen (above, p1), Horgan numbers this text among the pesharim. However, since there is no evidence beyond a general similarity between the two fragments, this fragment is excluded from discussion of references to the Teacher of Righteousness in the pesharim proper. In any case, the passage is too fragmentary to be of any real value.

---

<sup>29</sup> Ben Zion Wacholder, "Does Qumran record the death of the Moreh? The meaning of *he'aseph* in Damascus Covenant XIX, 35, XX, 14," *RevQ* 13 (1988), 323-330. Although I share the majority view that הָאָסַף refers to the Teacher's death I translate the term with Wacholder as 'in-gathering' (over e.g. Davies's *et al* 'gathering in') since this better preserves this ambiguity.

<sup>30</sup> Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 195.

---

Excursus: The Moreh in 1QH?

Although the precise title מורה הצדק is *not* found in 1QH, the semi-autobiographical nature of the text – through the volume of references to ‘I’ – has led many scholars to seek allusions to the Teacher therein.<sup>31</sup> One of the most compelling references comes in col. XVI[VIII]:4-end which Jeremias believes to have been composed by the Teacher himself,<sup>32</sup> and which depicts the author as a life-giving source of water in the desert, a green oasis. Water forms an important part of the imagery in ll. 4-15, but the parallel with the root meaning of ירה as ‘pour out [rain]’ (above, 4.1) is made explicit in ll. 16-17, which are worth quoting in full:

<p style="text-align: right;">ואתה אלי שמתה בפי כיוורה גשם לכול [...] ומבוע מים חיים ולא יכזב לפתוח</p> <p style="text-align: right;">השמים לא ימישו ויהיו לנחל שוטף ענל [...] מים ולימים לאין חןקר]</p>	<p>16</p> <p>17</p>
--	---------------------

<sup>16</sup> But you my God, you have placed in my mouth as it were an *early rain* for all [...] spring of living water; <sup>17</sup> the skies will not fail to open, they will not stop, but will become a torrent overflowing in[to ...] of water and into the seas, without e[nd.] (1QH<sup>a</sup> XVI:16-17; García-Martínez)

As the highlighting shows the key root ירה is here found in a context where the meaning unquestionably refers to water, but, if this section of the Hodayot is autobiographical of the Teacher as Jeremias claimed, then the link between ירה as ‘pour out’ and the title מורה הצדק pursued above is hard to avoid. Meanwhile, the overall imagery of a life-giving source of water in the desert exactly befits the Teacher’s role in the wilderness community at Qumran.

---

<sup>31</sup> See most recently Michael C. Douglas, “The Teacher Hymn hypothesis revisited: New data for an old crux,” *DSD* 6 (1999), 239-66. For a list of those scholars who have associated 1QH with the Teacher see Douglas, 240, n. 5.

<sup>32</sup> Jeremias, *Der Lehrer*, 171f.

### 4.2.3 Rabbinic Material

The Moreh Ṣedeq is not confined to the DSS and Hebrew Bible, however. Instead, as several scholars have pointed out, ‘Teacher of Righteousness (מורה צדק) and ‘one who teaches righteousness’ (ויורה צדק) are found in several medieval texts,<sup>33</sup> while even today the phrase can designate a practising Rabbi.<sup>34</sup>

Chief among the medieval references is the Midrash on Psalms 102:17 which refers to the lack of a ‘priestly teacher of righteousness’:

“Another interpretation of *He will turn to the prayer of the destitute* (Ps. 102:17) [is this]: Rabbi Isaac said, ‘With reference to *the generations*, they said that they had no prophet, *no priestly teacher of righteousness* (מורה צדק), and no temple which would atone for them. Only one prayer was left for them which they pray on New Year’s Day and on the Day of Atonement.”<sup>35</sup>

Evidently this picks up on II Chron. 15:13 (“Many days for Israel there will be no true God, *no priestly teacher* [מורה כהן], and no Torah”) but crucially maintains a link with 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> III:15 (below) where the phrase ‘the priest, the teacher of [righteousness]’ ([מורה הַצְדִּיק]) is found. Buchanan comments that the rabbinic passage “suggest[s] that the priestly teacher of righteousness was the approved high priest who could obtain atonement if the temple were standing and he were free to officiate.”<sup>36</sup> While this is possible, closer inspection shows that it is the Temple that atones, rather than the ‘priestly teacher of righteousness’, thus Buchanan’s larger conclusion that ‘Teacher of Righteousness’ was a title applied to a succession of priests is unsupported.

Rather, other medieval passages suggest precisely that the Teacher of Righteousness was a specific individual awaited; he is an eschatological figure, though apparently

---

<sup>33</sup> C.f G.W. Buchanan, “The Priestly Teacher of Righteousness,” *RevQ* 6 (1969), 553-558; “The Office of Teacher of Righteousness,” *RevQ* 9 (1978), 241-43; J.P. Siegel, “Two further Medieval References to the Teacher of Righteousness,” *RevQ* 9 (1977), 437-40; Marc Bregman, “Another Reference to ‘a Teacher of Righteousness’ in Midrashic Literature,” *RevQ* 10 (1979), 97-100. Others have proposed references to the Teacher in other texts, but without success. Cf. Chaim Rabin, “The ‘Teacher of Righteousness in the ‘Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs’,” *JJS* 13 (1952), 127-28; Ceslaus Spicq, “Une allusion au docteur de justice dans Matthieu 23:10?” *RB* 66 (1959), 387-96.

<sup>34</sup> Weingreen, *op. cit.*, 166.

<sup>35</sup> Text: Buchanan, “Priestly Teacher.”

<sup>36</sup> Buchanan, “Priestly Teacher,” 554.

distinguished from (and greater than) the Messiah himself. Thus in the account of the Messiah at Isfahan referred to in a twelfth century letter, the 'Messiah' refuses to answer three of the fifteen questions asked (so as to establish his identity) because the answers were not told to him:

...and I cannot interpret them, until he comes and teaches righteousness.<sup>37</sup>

This suggestion of the revelation of things hitherto unknown occurs in other texts, though in at least one text, the Midrash on the Torah, he is assigned the task of executing "justice and truth in the building up of Jerusalem."<sup>38</sup>

### Conclusions

The value of these Rabbinic accounts is unclear. In particular, the degree of influence of CD, known outside of Qumran, is impossible to calculate, and leaves open the possibility that the title derives merely from the Qumran sources rather than independent usage. Certainly a conclusion as important as that of Buchanan (that the title applies to the High Priest in Jerusalem) has to be questioned. If the texts do have an independent existence we can perhaps suggest that the title 'Teacher of Righteousness' is a Messianic epithet, since this reflects the medieval usage. Even this conclusion cannot be substantiated, however. The most we can say with any degree of certainty is that the title is evidenced in medieval Rabbinic literature, apparently in a Messianic light.

### 4.3 *The Moreh Şedeq in the Pesharim*

Within the pesharim, the title מורה הצדק appears in six texts, again predominantly in 1QpHab, but also in 1QpMic (once), 4QpIsa<sup>c</sup> (once), 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> (three times), and 4QpPs<sup>b</sup> (twice). The title is also commonly reconstructed in 4QpIsa<sup>c</sup>.

---

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Buchanan, "Office," 242.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Bregman, *op. cit.*, 97-100. Bregman attempts (unconvincingly) to argue that the absence of the definite article in the title 'Teacher of Righteousness' here implies that the phrase is "a more general messianic epithet derived from WYWRH ŞDQ (Hos. 10:12)" (p. 100), but this does not concur with the picture painted by the Isfahan account which depicts a specific individual.

### 4.3.1 1QpHabakkuk

Just under half of the references to the Teacher of Righteousness in the pesharim may be found in 1QpHab, which thus becomes – rightly or wrongly – one of our most important documents for researching this figure. These references can be broadly broken down into three groups: (a) those where the Teacher appears alongside the Man of Lies (the same figure as in CD); (b) those where he is connected with the Wicked Priest (כֹּהֵן הַרְשָׁע); and (c) those where the Teacher appears on his own.

#### (a) The Teacher of Righteousness and the Man of Falsehood (אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב)

These references probably constitute the first three references in 1QpHab: I:13, II:2 and V:10. I say “probably” because there is a recent debate as to whether to reconstruct אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב or כֹּהֵן הַרְשָׁע ‘Wicked Priest’ in col. I. We shall return to this below. Meanwhile, in cols. I-II, the reference is clear (interpreting Hab. 1:5):

]רְאוּ בֹגְדִים וְהִבִּיטוּ וְהִתְמַהוּ וְהִתְמַהוּ כִּי אֵל פִּעַל פִּוְעַל בִּימִיכָם  
לֹא תֵאֱמִינוּ כִּי א] יִסּוּפֵר

[Look, *O traitors*,<sup>39</sup> and see! Be astonished! Be astounded! For a work is being done in your days that you would not believe though] it was foretold. (Hab. 1:5; 1QpHab I:16-II:1)

פֶּשֶׁר הַדְּבַר עַל] הַבֹּגְדִים עִם אִישׁ	1
הַכֹּזֵב כִּי לֹא] הָאֱמִינוּ בַדְּבָרִין] מוֹרֵה הַצְּדָקָה מִפִּיא	2
אל	3

[ ... The interpretation of the passage concerns] the traitors with the Man of <sub>2</sub> Falsehood for [they did] not [maintain faith<sup>40</sup> in the words of] the Teacher of Righteousness<sup>41</sup> (which proceeded) from the mouth of <sub>3</sub> God. (1QpHab II:1-3)

The lengthy commentary (which extends to II:10) revolves around the threefold repetition of בֹּגְדִים ‘traitors’ and the אָמֵן ‘believe’ root in II:1, 3 & 5 (partially reconstructed) and II:2 (reconstructed), 4 and 6 respectively. Both terms pick up

<sup>39</sup> בֹּגְדִים is here restored over בְּגוּיִם ‘nations’ due to the repetition of the same term in the body of the commentary.

<sup>40</sup> I restore הָאֱמִינוּ with most translators since there is a threefold repetition of both this root and the expression בֹּגְדִים, both terms drawn directly from the prophecy itself. The precise wording may have been another form of the root אָמֵן, however.

<sup>41</sup> ‘Teacher of Righteousness’ here translates מוֹרֵה הַצְּדָקָה rather than מוֹרֵה הַצְּדִק. The variant spelling may be a scribal error, but is more likely deliberate given the interlinear ה. this was

words from Hab. 1:5 and are separately introduced by [פֶּשֶׁר הַדָּבָר עַל] 1. 1, 1. 3 and [עַל] וְכֵן פֶּשֶׁר הַדָּבָר [עַל] in l. 5. Dupont-Sommer thus identifies three groups of traitors: (1) the traitors with the Man of Falsehood who did not believe the words of the Teacher; (2) the traitors to the new covenant who were not faithful to the covenant of God (ll. 3-4); and (3) the traitors of the last days who will not believe the Priest when they hear what will happen to them (ll. 5-9).<sup>42</sup> This first group is contemporary with the Teacher; the second are enemies of the congregation following the death of the Teacher, perhaps in the time of the pesherist himself; while the third are a future group.<sup>43</sup>

The Teacher is, as we have seen, connected with the Man of Falsehood in CD XX:13-15. There, the text refers to ‘the Men of War who turned back (אֲנָשֵׁי הַמִּלְחָמָה אֲשֶׁר) (שָׁבוּ) with the Man of Falsehood’ – though here it is the ‘Unique Teacher’ (מֹרֵה) (הַיְחִיד) rather than the Teacher of Righteousness himself. These ‘Men of War’ seem to be the same group as the ‘Men of the Scoffer’ (אֲנָשֵׁי הַלְצוֹן) referred to earlier in the column. These also ‘turned back’ (שָׁבוּ) for:

דָּבָרוּ תוֹעָה עַל חֻקֵי הַצְדָּק וּמֵאֲסוּ	11
בְּבְרִית וְאִמְנָה אֲשֶׁר קִיְמוּ בְּאֶרֶץ דַּמְשֶׁק וְהָיָה בְרִית הַחֲדָשָׁה :	12

... they spoke heresy against the ordinances of righteousness and rejected <sup>12</sup> the covenant and bond which they affirmed in the land of Damascus <that is the new covenant>. (CD XX:11-12; Davies)

Much of this resonates with what is said of the traitors in 1QpHab. Like the Men of War, they are associated with the Man of Falsehood, but if the Men of War can also be identified with the Men of the Scoffer, then we have a powerful argument for questioning Dupont-Sommer’s proposal, since it is his second group of ‘traitors’ who are charged with not being faithful to the covenant but profaning his holy name (1QpHab II:3-4) – parallels to ‘rejecting the covenant’ and ‘speaking abomination’ respectively.

---

probably a later insertion to emphasise that the מֹרֵה צְדָקָה was the same person as the מֹרֵה הַצְדָּק. The reason for the initial spelling is unclear.

<sup>42</sup> Dupont-Sommer, “Le ‘Commentaire’,” 53, §7.

<sup>43</sup> Silberman, *op. cit.*, 336; Brownlee, 55; and Horgan, 24 among others.



Dupont-Sommer's argument is also called into question when the third group of traitors are referred to:

וכן	פֶּשֶׁר הַדְּבָר [עַל הַבּוֹנִים לְאַחֲרֵית אֵ	5
	הַיָּמִים הַמָּהָ עָרִיץ הַבְּרִית אֲשֶׁר לֹא יֵאֱמִינוּ	6
	בְּשׁוֹמְעֵם אֵת כּוֹל הַבְּרִית [עַל] הַדּוֹר הָאַחֲרוֹן מִפִּי	7
	הַכּוֹהֵן אֲשֶׁר נָתַן אֵל בְּלִבּוֹ חֵכְמָה לְפֶשֶׁר [אֵת] כּוֹל	8
	דְּבָרֵי עַבְדֵי הַנְּבִיאִים	9

<sup>5</sup> And so <Blank> the interpretation of the passage [concerns the tra]itors at the end of <sup>6</sup> days. They are the viol[ators of the coven]ant who will not believe <sup>7</sup> when they hear all that is c[oming on] the last generation from the mouth of <sup>8</sup> the priest in [whose heart] God gave [wisd]om<sup>44</sup> to interpret all [the] <sup>9</sup> words of his servants, the prophets. (1QpHab II:5-9)

Not only are both groups two and three accused of (in some sense) negating the covenant – suggesting that the two may in fact be synonymous – but the description of ‘the Priest’ here bears a strong resemblance to the picture of the Teacher of Righteousness later in the pesher:

פֶּשֶׁר עַל מוֹרָה הַצַּדִּיק אֲשֶׁר הוֹדִיעָנוּ אֵל אֵת	4
כּוֹל רִזֵי דְבָרֵי עַבְדֵי הַנְּבִיאִים	5

Its interpretation concerns the Teacher of Righteousness to whom God made known <sup>5</sup> all {the} mysteries of his servants, the prophets. (1QpHab VII:4-5)

Note in particular the link between לְפֶשֶׁר and רִזֵי in the passages concerned and our comments on the Danielic origins of פֶּשֶׁר (above, pp13f.). Moreover, ‘the Priest’ is more intrinsically linked with the Teacher in 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> III:15 (and Midrash on Psalms, above p143). The upshot of all this, then, seems to be that the same group of ‘traitors’ is referred to three times, no doubt to emphasise the major impact the break-up inaugurated by the Man of Falsehood had for those who stayed faithful to the Teacher. Both the ‘traitors’ and the ‘Man of Falsehood’ seem, then, to have been members of the community, but that at some stage in its history, there was a breakdown in relations between the groups resulting in a schism.

<sup>44</sup> Following Rabinowitz, who emphasises the link between רִזֵי and פֶּשֶׁר and Daniel, to whom was imparted ‘wisdom’. Other reconstructions are: בְּ[חֹךְ הַעֲדָה] ‘in the midst of the congregation’ (Elliger, García-Martínez, van der Woude); בְּ[בֵית יְהוּדָה] ‘in the House of Judah’ (Dupont-Sommer); Brownlee’s early reconstruction בְּ[בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לְמוֹרָה] ‘to the sons of Israel as Teacher’ (Brownlee, “The Jerusalem Habakkuk Scroll,” 9), later abandoned in favour of בְּ[לִבּוֹ בֵּינָה] ‘in his heart insight’ (Horgan).

The conflict between the Teacher and the Man of Falsehood is further referred to in col. V (here interpreting Hab. 1:13b):

למה תביטו בוגדים ותחריש בבלע רשע צדיק ממנו

Why, O Traitors, will you look on, and keep silent, while a wicked one swallows up one more righteous than himself? (Hab. 1:13b; 1QpHab V:8-9)

פִּשְׁרוֹ עַל בֵּית אַבְשָׁלוֹם	9
וְאֲנָשֵׁי עֲצָתָם אֲשֶׁר נִדְּמוּ בְּתוֹכָהּ מוֹרֵה הַצַּדִּיק	10
וְלוֹא עֲזָרוּהוּ עַל אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב אֲשֶׁר מֵאִס אֵת	11
הַתּוֹרָה בְּתוֹךְ כּוֹל עֲצָתָם	12

... Its interpretation concerns the House of Absalom <sup>10</sup> and the men of their counsel, who were silent at the rebuke of the Teacher of Righteousness <sup>11</sup> and did not aid him against the Man of Falsehood <Blank> who rejected the <sup>12</sup> Law in the midst of their whole co[n]gregati[on]. (1QpHab V:9-12)

If the same conflict is here alluded to – rather than merely being part of an ongoing struggle – then several elements are here added. First the dispute is now publicly located ‘in the midst of their whole congregation’, but second, and more importantly, has witnesses, the House of Absalom, while finally the nature of the dispute is clarified: the Man of Falsehood ‘rejected the Law’. Straightaway this ties in with the rejection of the covenant by the Men of the Scoffer in CD XX further suggestive of a link – even though ‘rejection of the Law’ and ‘rejection of the covenant’ are not precise parallels.

As in the first account, the pesherist picks up on the reference to ‘traitors’ (בוגדים) in the prophecy, but while we might expect the same interpretation to follow through (i.e. identification with the followers of the Man of Falsehood), an ambiguity in the Biblical passage makes such identification problematic. Hab. 1:13b (in the MT) reads:

לְמָה תִּבְיֹט בּוֹגְדִים תִּחְרִישׁ בְּבֹלַע רָשָׁע צְדִיק מִמֶּנּוּ:

Essentially this means: (1) “Why do you look on traitors, and are silent when the wicked one swallows up one more righteous than he?” reading בוגדים as the direct object of תביט. The pesherist, however, adopts the plural form תביטו which can lead to translation (2) “Why, O Traitors, will you look on, and are silent when the wicked one swallows up one more righteous than he?”, i.e. בוגדים as a vocative. Horgan regards the 1QpHab form as an error since ותחריש is singular (as in the MT).

Brownlee, meanwhile, sees the change in number as indicating “the expostulation from one addressed to God to one addressed to a human party.”<sup>45</sup> Hence he applies the ‘traitors’ to the House of Absalom.<sup>46</sup> I do not agree with Brownlee, however, that it is so clear that the ‘traitors’ are so straightforwardly the House of Absalom since this also requires the *a priori* assumption that the House of Absalom – as ‘traitors’ – are linked with the Man of Falsehood. Instead, I suggest that the pesherist plays on the ambiguity of Hab. 1:13b – including the ambiguity in number between the pesher and the MT, whether to a singular or plural number – that, on the one hand, the ‘traitors’ are the object of תבִּיטוּ which then refers to the ‘traitors with the Man of Falsehood’, while at the same time, as Brownlee and Silberman point out, the House of Absalom are themselves ‘traitors’ due to their inaction: “Why do you look on, O Traitors?” In other words, they may as well be grouped among the Teacher’s enemies.

But who are the House of Absalom? The debate here ultimately centres on whether ‘Absalom’ is a historical or metaphorical reference. The historical identification has been dealt with in two early articles.<sup>47</sup> In particular, Freedman has argued that the House of Absalom were an important family in the Maccabean period, alluded to in the books of Maccabees, and who appear to have held important positions during the Maccabean revolt.<sup>48</sup> Given the context, however, that is in a text where actual names are scant, but sobriquets paramount, it is more likely that בֵּית אַבְשָׁלוֹם is another ‘cipher’ for a group, similar (in structure at least) to the בֵּית פְּלֹג ‘House of Division’.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> Brownlee, 92.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Silberman, *op. cit.* 342: “This passage is a clear example of the commentator’s exegetical methods. The בִּגְדִים of the text are explained as specifically referring to בֵּית אַבְשָׁלוֹם.”

<sup>47</sup> D.N. Freedman, “The ‘House of Absalom’ in the Habakkuk Scroll” *BASOR* 114 (1949), 11-12; P. Winter, “Two Non-allegorical expressions in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *PEQ* 91 (1959), 38-39, 42.

<sup>48</sup> I Macc. 11:70; 13:11; II Macc. 11:17. The first two are paralleled in *Ant.* XIII, v, 7 §161 and vi, 4 §202. Freedman also notes a reference to Absalom the son of Hyrcanus, who was taken prisoner by Pompey during the capture of the Temple in 63 BCE, though this is less relevant here.

<sup>49</sup> CD XX:22; 4QpNah 3-4 IV:1. Cf. chapter two, above. The cryptic significance of this title is at least assured.

If the reference is indeed cryptic, a parallel is likely to be found in the stories of Absalom in (predominantly) II Sam. 13-18, and especially in the account of the Rape of Tamar in ch. 13 and Absalom's role therein. Indeed Teicher proposes a linguistic link between ותחריש (MT תחריש) in Hab. 1:13 and החרישי in II Sam. 13:20, both words deriving from חרש 'be silent'.<sup>50</sup> In the narrative, Absalom comes across Tamar, his sister, in the aftermath of the rape, but rather than taking immediate action, tells her to keep quiet and return to his house. So Callaway:

In this story, Absalom is characterized as one who remains silent, when he should have acted. This is precisely the transgression of Absalom in V,8-12. 2 Sam 13.20-18.18 depicts Absalom not only as the silent one, but clearly as a traitor to his father. Thus the House of Absalom in 1QpHab V,10 provides a concrete, symbolic example of the traitors mentioned in the quotation of Hab. 1.13b.<sup>51</sup>

The latter is a better suggestion. A potential problem with Teicher's proposal is that החרישי is not specifically used of Absalom himself, but rather of Tamar. Instead, Absalom's silence is assumed. Nevertheless his treason against his father David is broadly comparable to the House of Absalom, who might have been expected to speak out in defence (or support) of the Teacher, but instead maintained an element of neutrality. Again this also ties in with their designation as 'traitors'.

As we have suggested, the rationale for the conflict between the Teacher and the Man of Falsehood is here given as the latter's rejection of the Law (V:11-12). Rather than a total rejection of the Law, however, I suggest that this implies rejection of particular legal rulings, perhaps questions such as those raised in 4QMMT – ritual purification, calendar (cf. 1QpHab IX:2-8) etc. This conflict is located publicly, "in the midst of (their) whole '[..]m.'" (בתוך כולל-ע[.]) (m[.]). The middle two letters in the final word are difficult to read. Brownlee originally restored עמים 'peoples'<sup>52</sup>, but as Talmon has indicated, the final ם seems to indicate a possessive pronoun, hence the insertion of 'their' in any translation.<sup>53</sup> Moreover, it is possible to make out the 'kick' of a ן immediately to the bottom right of the ם. Accordingly, most scholars reconstruct

<sup>50</sup> J.L. Teicher, "The Habakkuk Scroll," *JJS* 5 (1954), 57. Teicher is wrong, though, to press a link between the pesher and the New Testament.

<sup>51</sup> Callaway, *op. cit.*, 151.

<sup>52</sup> Brownlee, "The Jerusalem Habakkuk Scroll," 11.

either עצתם ‘their council’ (so Elliger, Dupont-Sommer and Horgan) or עדתם ‘their congregation’ (Burrows, Brownlee [*Midrash Peshet*], Carmignac, Jeremias and Vermes *et al.*). Whether one restores עצתם or עדתם, the dispute appears to take place in public – before the House of Absalom and the ‘men of their council/counsel’ at the very least.

The ‘rebuke of the Teacher of Righteousness’ (בתוכחת מורה הצדק; l. 10) is ambiguous. תוכחה can have a number of meanings; including ‘rebuke’, ‘correction’, ‘reproof’, ‘punishment’, ‘chastisement’, ‘argument’, ‘impeachment’ and ‘chiding’. Nevertheless, the context does not help since מורה הצדק itself also has a number of meanings. It may refer to: (1) the rebuke by the Teacher of the Man of Falsehood; (2) the rebuke of the Teacher by the Man of Falsehood; or (3) the rebuke of the House of Absalom by the Teacher. A fourth possibility, the rebuke of the Teacher by the House of Absalom is ruled out by the reference to their ‘silence’.<sup>54</sup> Brownlee prefers (1), since תוכחה is normally used (in the MT) of the rebuke by the righteous of the wicked. Horgan, Vermes, Carmignac and Elliger, meanwhile, all believe that the reference is to (2) the rebuke of the Teacher by the Man of Falsehood. No scholar, to my knowledge interprets the passage with reference to (3) the rebuke of the House of Absalom. The debate, then, ultimately centres on whether the phrase is a subjective or objective genitive.

The תוכחה root also appears in Hab. 2:1, in relation to the prophet’s stand on the watchtower:

על-משמרתִי אֶעֱמְדָה וְאֶתִּיצְבָה עַל-מְצוֹר וְאֶצְפֶּה לְרֵאוֹת מִהַיִּדְבָּר־בִּי  
וּמֵה אֲשִׁיב עַל-תִּפְחָתִי:

I will stand at my watchpost, and station myself on the rampart; I will keep watch to see what he will say to me, and what he will answer<sup>55</sup> concerning my *complaint*.

<sup>53</sup> S. Talmon, “Notes on the Habakkuk Scroll,” *VT* 1 (1951), 35.

<sup>54</sup> Hence in my translation I retain the word ‘of’ to highlight the ambiguity. Cf. Brownlee, 93.

<sup>55</sup> The MT form אשיב ‘I will answer’ has here been amended by the NRSV translator for ישיב ‘he will answer’ in line with the Peshitta (though both the LXX and Vg. follow the first person reading). A lacuna in 1QpHab VI:14, where this verse is found, does not allow us to support either reading. Brownlee (107-108) prefers the emendation because of the “parallelism with both the preceding and following clauses,” a reference to the third person

Here the 'rebuke' or 'complaint' is that of Habakkuk himself, not God, and thus probably of the Teacher, who in the pesher following, is compared and contrasted with the prophet (VII:1-5, see below). It makes sense then that, in the current passage, the 'rebuke' is that of the Teacher of his opponent, the Man of Falsehood.

If correct, then an important link may be made between the Man of Falsehood and the Seekers of Smooth Things *who lead many astray* (see above, pp100f, 108<sup>56</sup>), since Prov. 10:17 links תוכחה with תעה:

אַרְחָ לְחַיִּים שׁוֹמֵר מִוֶּסֶר וְעוֹזֵב תּוֹכַחַת מִתְעֵהָ:

Whoever heeds instruction is on the path to life, but one who rejects a rebuke goes astray.

A fuller examination of the Man of Falsehood will be undertaken in the next chapter, in an attempt to firm up this provisional link.

When all this is taken into consideration, then, the pesher of Hab. 1:13b portrays a public dispute between the Teacher of Righteousness (צדיק) and the Man of Falsehood (רשע) concerning the correct interpretation of at least some aspects of the Law. The Teacher rebukes the Man of Falsehood for the position he takes, but is unsupported by the apparently influential House of Absalom and is, in the words of the prophet 'swallowed up' (בלע). Precisely how this swallowing up is understood, however, is as yet unrelated.

---

#### Excursus: The House of Absalom and John Hyrcanus

Both Brownlee<sup>57</sup> and Barthélemy<sup>58</sup> have posited that this incident reflects one already known from Josephus (*Ant.* XIII, x, 5 §288-296), which occurs during a feast

---

forms וידבר and ויאמר (Hab. 2:1, 2 respectively). The emendation also allows a better translation and sense for the verse and is to be preferred.

<sup>56</sup> We have already proposed a link between the 'Seekers of Smooth Things' (דורשי החלקות) and the 'men of the Scoffer' (אנשי לציון) on the basis of the recurrence of this phrase in Isa. 28. Given the link proposed between the 'men of the scoffer' and the Man of Falsehood in CD, a powerful link may also be made between the Man of Falsehood and his supporters, the men of the Scoffer and the Seekers of Smooth Things. The precise relationship between these

organised by Hyrcanus and at which both the Pharisees and Sadducees were present. Hyrcanus has boasted that he wishes to be a righteous man, and that if he is observed causing any offence, he should be corrected. With the exception of Eleazar, all at the meal attested to his being virtuous;

...but still there was one of his guests there, whose name was Eleazar, a man of an ill temper, and delighting in seditious practices. This man said, "Since thou desirest to know the truth, if thou wilt be righteous in earnest, lay down the high priesthood and content thyself with the civil government of the people." And when he desired to know for what cause he ought to lay down the high priesthood, the other replied, "We have heard it from old men, that thy mother had been a captive under the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes." This story was false, and Hyrcanus was provoked against him; and all the Pharisees had a very great indignation against him. (*Ant.* XIII, x, 5 §§290-292)

The conclusion of the story results in Hyrcanus's change of patronage from the Pharisees to the Sadducees, since the Pharisees' method of punishment was considered overly lenient. Brownlee thus identifies the Teacher with Eleazar, the Man of Falsehood with John Hyrcanus, and the House of Absalom as the Pharisees, since none of their membership supported the Teacher/Eleazar when he made this accusation against Hyrcanus. Evidently some of the Pharisees were outspoken in their criticism of Eleazar, since Josephus relates that they were 'indignant', but it need not follow that all were outspoken. Some may therefore have been 'silent'. Finally, the rejection of the Law in the *peshet* may be explained by Hyrcanus's illegal acquisition of the high priesthood since the issue of his mother's slavery would have automatically disqualified him from the priesthood.<sup>59</sup>

A similar incident is recorded in the Talmud, though here Alexander Jannaeus is the ruler, Judah son of Gedidiah his accuser, and Eleazar son of Po'irah the Sadduceean spokesman:

Now there was a man there, frivolous, evil-hearted and worthless, named Eleazar son of Po'irah, who said to King Jannai, 'O King Jannai, the hearts of the

---

groups is of course rather more complicated, but I suspect that a basic link between the groups may at this stage be entertained.

<sup>57</sup> W.H. Brownlee, "The Historical Allusions of the Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash," *BASOR* 126 (1952), 10-19; *Midrash Peshet*, 95-98.

<sup>58</sup> D. Barthélemy, "Notes en marge de publications récentes sur les manuscrits de Qumran," *RB* 59 (1952), 187-218, esp. 213ff.

<sup>59</sup> This argument is based on the rites prescribing the holiness of Priests in Lev. 21. Cf. *b. Kiddushin* 77 a/b.

Pharisees are against thee.' 'Then what shall I do?' 'test them by the plate between thine eyes.' So he tested them by the plate between his eyes. Now an elder, named Judah son of Gedidiah, was present there. Said he to King Jannai, 'O King Jannai! let the royal crown suffice thee, and leave the priestly crown to the seed of Aaron.' (For it was rumoured that his mother had been taken captive in Modi'im.) Accordingly, the charge was investigated, but not sustained, and the Sages of Israel departed in anger. Then said Eleazar b. Po'irah to King Jannai: 'O King Jannai! That is the law even for the most humble man in Israel, and thou, a King and a High Priest, shall that be thy law [too]!' ... Straightaway, the evil burst forth through Eleazar son of Po'irah, all the Sages of Israel were massacred, and the world was desolate until Simeon b. Shetah came and restored the Torah to its pristine [glory].<sup>60</sup>

The table below shows up this inconsistency over identity:

	<i>Ant. XIII</i>	<i>b. Kiddushin 66a</i>
<i>Ruler</i>	John Hyrcanus	Alexander Jannaeus
<i>Offender</i>	Eleazar	Judah b. Gedidiah
<i>Sadducee</i>	Jonathan <sup>61</sup>	Eleazar b. Po'irah

**Figure 2: A comparison of Ant. XIII with b. Kiddushin 66a**

Both Brownlee and Barthélemy<sup>62</sup> assume that Rabbinic tradition is correct as to the identity of the offender/rebuker, but that Josephus has confused the Sadduceean opponent ('Jonathan') with the offender (Eleazar). Meanwhile, Brownlee also assumes that Rabbinic tradition has confused John Hyrcanus with Alexander Jannaeus ('King Jannai').<sup>63</sup> He thus proposes a link between the Teacher/Judah b. Gedidiah and Judah the Essene referred to in both the *War* and the *Antiquities*,<sup>64</sup> as well as with the Simple/House of Judah in the pesharim themselves.<sup>65</sup> No evidence supports this, however, beyond a change in name, itself dubious.

<sup>60</sup> *b. Kiddushin 66a*. Transl. I. Epstein, *Seder Nashim, The Babylonian Talmud* (London: Soncino Press, 1936).

<sup>61</sup> *Ant. XIII*, x, 6 §§293, 295.

<sup>62</sup> Barthélemy, "Notes," 214.

<sup>63</sup> Brownlee, 97.

<sup>64</sup> *War I*, iii, 5 §§ 78-80; *Ant. XIII*, xi, 2 §§ 311-313. Josephus relates how this man foretold the death of Antigonos at Strato's Tower on a particular day. But when he sees Antigonos in Jerusalem on that day, many miles from Strato's Tower (near Caesarea Maritima), declares that it is better for him to die now, as he is in danger of being labelled a false prophet. As it turns out, however, the very same day Antigonos is murdered by his brother's soldiers in Jerusalem in a place also known as Strato's Tower. Thus Judah's prophecy comes true.

<sup>65</sup> So 1QpHab XII:3-5: "...for 'Lebanon' is the Council of the Community and the 'beasts' are the Simple of Judah, the Doers of the Law ..." Cf. Brownlee, 97, 204-205.



There are clear problems within Kiddushin itself, moreover. Most importantly, the text omits the nature of the punishment suggested by the Pharisees, though this is crucial to the group's downfall in both episodes. Hence the statement by Eleazar to Jannai in the Rabbinic account that the Pharisees have merely proposed the penalty for bringing a false claim against an ordinary citizen, not the King himself. Josephus's account, where the Sadducee exploits the Pharisees' tendency towards leniency for political ends, is thus used to bolster the Rabbinic account. Also, in Kiddushin Eleazar is a troublemaker, though as we have seen, in Josephus he is the Sadduceean opponent. The Talmud depicts the Pharisees being set up by Eleazar, while in the *Antiquities* the troublemaker requires no such motivation. Instead, Jonathan's (the Sadducee's) interference arises only after Eleazar has made his outburst! When all this is borne in mind, it is difficult to concur with Brownlee that the Rabbinic account is more reliable than that in Josephus, especially if, as he also argues, the Talmudic author has confused Jannaeus with Hyrcanus.<sup>66</sup>

These differences, then, make it difficult to identify the 'House of Absalom' incident in the peshet with the dispute between Eleazar/Judah and Hyrcanus/Jannaeus in Josephus/Rabbinic tradition. In addition, the peshet (supported by CD) suggests that the Man of Falsehood was himself a former member of the community. While one could say that the reference is to Hyrcanus's (or Jannaeus's) support of the Pharisees prior to this event rather than any internal political structure, this conclusion is premature. The evidence available, especially given the problems of the authenticity of the account, does not then allow us to correlate these two incidents.

---

In at least two passages in 1QpHab, then, the Teacher appears alongside the Man of Falsehood, and in both cases these figures are set in opposition, apparently as leaders of respective groups within the community. The passage thus supports CD XX that the Man of Falsehood was a member of the community. In the first instance, a general

---

<sup>66</sup> The confusion between Hyrcanus and Jannaeus may be explained by Jannaeus's documented hostility towards the Pharisees in Josephus (Cf. the 800 crucified: *Ant.* XIII, xiv, 2 §380; *War* I, v, 2-3 §110 ff.). The Rabbinic author may be attempting to correlate these accounts and make some rationale for the Pharisees' opposition to Jannaeus in the war with Demetrius.

opposition is described, while in the second a particular occasion is seemingly referred to, though it is difficult to tie this down to a particular historical circumstance such as the Eleazar/Hyrchanus incident. The Man of Falsehood appears to have been a member of the community who left during a schism – supposedly due to varying interpretations of Torah – but since these texts are composed in the Teacher's favour it is of course possible that it was he who was forced to leave. The latter is perhaps the meaning of his 'swallowing up' (בלע) by the Man of Falsehood.

(b) The Teacher of Righteousness and the Wicked Priest (כּוּהַן הַרְשָׁע)

At least two references to the Teacher of Righteousness in 1QpHab link him with the Wicked Priest (כּוּהַן הַרְשָׁע): V:9-10 and IX:4-5. These are not the only references to the Wicked Priest in 1QpHab, as chapter 6 will demonstrate, but they are among the most important. Elsewhere, the Teacher appears alongside the Wicked Priest only in 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 1+ IV:8 (below). As we shall see, in all three of these instances the Wicked Priest is set in opposition to the Teacher, and many scholars have suggested that their confrontation may have ended in the wounding, if not death, of the Teacher. As such, these passages are of vital importance.

מדמי אדם וחמס אריץ קריה וב[ו]ל יושבי בה

...because of human bloodshed, and violence to the earth, to cities and a[ll] /who live/ in them. (Hab. 2:8b; 1QpHab IX:8)

פּשְׁרוֹ עַל הַכּוּהַן הַרְשָׁע אֲשֶׁר בַּעֲוֹן מוֹרָה	9
הַצַּדִּיק וְאֲנָשֵׁי עֲצָתוֹ נָתַנוּ אֵל בִּינְדָא אֲוִיבִיר לַעֲנִיתוֹ	10
בִּנְגַע לְבַלָּה בַּמְרֹרֵי נַפְשׁ בַּעֲבוּר [א]שֶׁר הַרְשִׁיעַ	11
עַל בַּחִירוֹ	12

Its interpretation concerns the Wi[ck]ed Priest whom, for an offence against the Teacher of <sup>10</sup> Righteousness and the men of his council, God gave (him) into the ha[nds] of his enemies to afflict him <sup>11</sup> with wounds (and) to swallow him up<sup>67</sup> with a bitterness of soul, [f]or having acted wickedly <sup>12</sup> against His elect. (1QpHab IX:9-12)

<sup>67</sup> This reading follows Brownlee's לבלה (from בלע) as against לבלה 'for destruction' favoured by many scholars, including Elliger, Horgan and more recently García-Martínez. The 'kick' on the upper horizontal of the letter is consonant with other *beths* in the manuscript.

In fact, this passage has more to do with the Wicked Priest than the Teacher of Righteousness, especially in terms of his punishment, hence it will be more fully explored in a succeeding chapter. However, we can make some preliminary points.

The offence against the Teacher and the community ('the men of his council/counsel') itself is undefined, since עוון is a vague term for any kind of 'iniquity'.<sup>68</sup> Brownlee suggests that some kind of 'bloodletting' is referred to (i.e. that of the Teacher), though he distinguishes this account from that in 1QpHab XII (on Hab. 2:17, which repeats the prophecy) which is explicitly limited to Jerusalem (XII:7) and is, in any case, not specifically applied to the community. Even if bloodletting is referred to, this need not mean, as Brownlee points out, that the Teacher was himself killed, but "it naturally suggests that some of those associated with him were killed and that he himself may have suffered wounds, if not death, as a result of this bloodletting."<sup>69</sup> Again this is a difficult conclusion to reach, since the 'wounds' (בנגע; IX:11) allude to the Wicked Priest rather than the Teacher. Moreover, נגע need not necessarily refer to the stroke inflicted by one man on another, but may also apply to the mark of a disease, for instance leprosy.<sup>70</sup> Nevertheless, by relating this description to a passage in the Hymns, Brownlee's argument for 'bloodletting' becomes rather stronger:

פְּדִיתָ [ה] נֶפֶשׁ אֲבִירִין אֲשֶׁר חָשְׁבוּ לְהַתֵּם דָּמוֹ	32
לְשֹׁךְ עַל עֲבוֹדַתְכָה	33

Y[ou] have redeemed the soul of the poor man whom they planned to destroy <sup>33</sup>  
by *spilling* {his blood} because he served You. (1QH X:32-33)

The 'poor man' (אבירין) here refers no doubt to the Teacher himself.<sup>71</sup> Brownlee also links this passage to the 'gathering-in' (האסף) of the Teacher in CD and suggests that both passages may refer to the Teacher's 'martyrdom'.<sup>72</sup> Obviously if the Teacher was himself author of the Hodayot as many have suggested, then the reference there, should it allude to the Teacher, cannot refer to his death! Meanwhile, in CD there is no hint of any violence, nor is it certain that the references there are not to the

<sup>68</sup> Cf. BDB, 730b-731.

<sup>69</sup> Brownlee, 155.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. BDB, 619b. This will be more fully discussed in a following chapter.

<sup>71</sup> 'The poor' (אבירינים) is also a designation for the community. Cf. 1QpHab XII:6, 10.

<sup>72</sup> Brownlee, 155.

beginning of the Teacher's leadership over the community rather than to the end of his period of office (whether by natural or other means).

Although the nature of the Wicked Priest's offence against the Teacher is undefined, nevertheless, it makes sense to link the passage with 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 1-10 IV:7-10 (below) and more immediately to the Day of Atonement episode also referred to in 1QpHab. Interpreting Hab. 2:15:

הוי משקה רעיהו מספח חמתו אף שכר למען הבט אל  
מועדיהם

Woe to the one who makes his neighbour drink, pouring out to him his wrath, even strong drink, to make him gaze on *their festivals*.<sup>73</sup> (Hab. 2:15; 1QpHab XI:2-3)

פשרו על הכוהן הרשע אשר	4
רדף אחר מורה הצדק לבלעו בכעם	5
חמתו אבית גלותו ובקין מועד מנוחת	6
יום הכפורים הופיע אליהם לבלעם	7
ולכשילם ביום צום שבת מנוחתם	8

<sup>4</sup> <Blank> Its interpretation concerns the Wicked Priest who <sup>5</sup> pursued the Teacher of Righteousness in order to swallow him up through the vexation of <sup>6</sup> his wrath at the house of his exile.<sup>74</sup> (It was) at the time of the rest <sup>7</sup> on the Day of Atonement that he manifested himself to them, to swallow them up <sup>8</sup> and to make them stumble on the Day of Fasting, the Sabbath of their rest. (1QpHab XI:4-8)

If this is the 'offence' referred to in the previous passage, then it is interesting to note that it is now placed both chronologically ('on the Day of Atonement') and geographically ('at the house of his exile'). Dupont-Sommer's suggestion that the Day of Atonement reference here alluded to Pompey's capture of Jerusalem has rightly

<sup>73</sup> As against MT מעוריהם 'their nakedness'; cf. Vg *nuditatem*. MT makes better contextual sense – 'to gaze on their nakedness' – and the pesherist seems to pick up on both readings in the commentary. As a whole the pesher relates an incident on the Day of Atonement feast day, but the fact that the Wicked Priest is accused of 'manifesting himself' to them' (אליהם הופיע) seems to reflect the MT account.

<sup>74</sup> The precise translation of אבית was originally disputed. Nevertheless, a parallel passage in the Beth Mashko document from Wadi Murrabba'at indicates that אבית is a contracted form of אל בית. Cf. P. Benoit, J.T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, *Les grottes de Murabba'at*, DJD II (Clarendon: Oxford, 1961), 156, No. 42, l. 4. The expression probably refers to Qumran itself.

been discarded.<sup>75</sup> Instead, the reference is now applied to a change in *calendar*.<sup>76</sup> If the designation ‘Wicked Priest’ (כֹּהֵן הַרְשָׁע) refers to the High Priest as many believe (and which will be explored in chapter six), then his presence is *required* in Jerusalem on the feast day for the ritual aspects of the celebration. Thus, for the Wicked Priest to be present on the Day of Atonement ‘at the house of his (i.e. the Teacher’s) exile’, the calendar under which he operated must have been different to that of the community: probably the luni-solar as opposed to the solar calendar.<sup>77</sup> Talmon further understands this to be reinforced by the reference to ‘the Sabbath of *their* rest’ (שַׁבַּת מִנוֹחָהֶם; l. 8), thus emphasising the exclusive nature of the festival.<sup>78</sup> He also suggests that the Wicked Priest’s purpose in appearing at the sect’s place of refuge was to disrupt the Sectarrians’ Day of Atonement, perhaps because a rival celebration might have been conceived as a threat to his religious authority. Thus Talmon:

Their keeping of a separate Yom Kippurim, as a vindication of a separate calendar, was a direct negation of [the Wicked Priest’s] authority and a dangerous precedent which had to be stifled by any means.<sup>79</sup>

The precise nature of the conflict is difficult to assess. That the Wicked Priest is said to have ‘pursued after’ (רָדַף אַחֲרָי; l. 5) the Teacher of Righteousness would suggest

---

<sup>75</sup> Cf. Dupont-Sommer, “Le Commentaire,” 129-171, esp. 168-169. For criticism see especially M.B. Dagut, “The Habakkuk Scroll and Pompey’s capture of Jerusalem,” *Biblica* 32 (1951), 542-548; and S. Talmon, “Yom Hakkippurim in the Habakkuk Scroll,” *Biblica* 32 (1951), 549-563.

<sup>76</sup> Particularly Talmon, “Yom Hakkippurim”; “The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judaean Desert,” *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Scripta Hierosolymitana, IV (1965), 162-199

<sup>77</sup> The solar calendar, consisting of 364 days, is evidenced in Jubilees and in *Astronomical Enoch* (1 En. 72-82), which presents a process of ‘intercalation’ between the solar and lunar calendars to bring the two into line. Jubilees, by contrast, condemns the lunar calendar, which consists of 354 days divided into 12 lunar months, each month averaging 29.53 days. The difference between the two systems is very important since, whereas under the solar system a particular day for a festival remains the same (since 364 is exactly divisible by 7), this is not the case with the lunar calendar where the day is constantly changing. Thus for a community, such as that at Qumran, which placed great emphasis on the correct time for a particular festival, the lunar calendar presented dangerous implications. On a very general level, the solar calendar can probably be identified with the Zadokite priesthood and the lunar system with the Hasmonean dynasty and the later Rabbis. The change in calendar may have represented an attempt by the Maccabees to further distance themselves from the excesses of the Zadokites especially during the Hellenistic crisis. Cf. J.C. VanderKam, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time* (Routledge: London, 1998), 15-40.

<sup>78</sup> Talmon, “Yom Hakkippurim,” 552. This is also derived from מוֹעֲדֵיהֶם in Hab. 2:15.

that this pursuit began elsewhere, perhaps Jerusalem. Nevertheless, it is difficult to reconcile this with our comments on the Day of Atonement. If the Teacher is effectively functioning as High Priest then he is unlikely to have been anywhere other than in the community himself. Even if one argued that the Teacher arrived in Jerusalem to (controversially) celebrate the Day of Atonement, this does not fit with the second aspect of the interpretation where the Wicked Priest is said to have initiated the conflict by manifesting himself to the community. A better translation of  $\text{קָרַר}$  then is 'persecute' (as Deut. 30:7; Job 19:22; Ps. 69:27<sup>80</sup>) perhaps implying a more long term adversity between the Wicked Priest and the Teacher – which may have come to a head during the Day of Atonement incident. As concerns the statement that the Wicked Priest persecuted the Teacher 'in order to swallow him up through the vexation of his wrath' (ll. 5-6), some have suggested that the 'swallowing up' ( $\text{לבלעו}$ ) [also  $\text{לבלעם}$ ]; l. 7) here refers to the Teacher's death, though as we shall see, this appears to contradict the evidence of other pesharim.

$\text{לבלעו}$  here presumably renders  $\text{שכר}$  'be/become drunk' 'strong drink' (depending on pointing) of the prophecy: thus Brownlee's translation 'in order to make him reel'.<sup>81</sup> This ignores, however, use of the same root in Hab. 1:13b (V:8, above); hence 'swallow' is a better translation.<sup>82</sup> The pesher there indicated a conflict between the Teacher of Righteousness and the Man of Falsehood when the latter attempted to 'swallow up' the former. Here, usage of the same terminology might suggest that the same situation be envisaged. There is much to commend this position. Both texts retain the operative terms  $\text{צדק}$ ,  $\text{רשע}$  and  $\text{בלע}$ , and both incidents appear to take place on the community's 'home territory' ( $\text{גלותו}$  &  $\text{אבית גלותו}$  respectively). A direct correlation between the two events may thus be made, thereby identifying the Wicked Priest with the Man of Falsehood and both passages to the same event.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, 558.

<sup>80</sup> Cf. BDB 922b.

<sup>81</sup> Brownlee, 181. The reference to  $\text{בלע}$  in Hab. 1:13b (1QpHab V:8), however, suggests that the translation 'swallow' is to be preferred here.

<sup>82</sup> Brownlee does indicate this in his commentary but he attributes no value to the point. Cf. J. van der Ploeg, "Les Rouleaux de la Mer Morte," *BO* 8 (1951), 1-13, esp. 9: 'Pourquoi regardez-vous, méchants, et vous taisez-vous lorsque le méchant *engloutit* celui qui est plus juste que lui' (Hab. 1:13b. 1QpHab V:8) and 'pour *engloutir* dans l'exacerbation de sa fureur ... pour les *engloutir* et pour les faire trébucher' (1QpHab XI:5ff.).

Nevertheless, this overlooks the fact that the Man of Falsehood appears to have been a member of the community itself, albeit at an earlier stage in its development. While it is not unknown for the High Priest to interest himself in politics,<sup>83</sup> for him to take a leading position in one of these parties seems rather unlikely.

More recently Joseph Baumgarten<sup>84</sup> has concentrated on the precise implication of the phrase *למען (ן) הבט אל מועדיהם* (Hab. 2:15), which he translates 'in order to gaze at their feasts.' He links this with IQH XII:5-12 in the light of its references to 'smoothing' and 'smooth things' (*חלקות*; ll. 7, 10),<sup>85</sup> and draws particular attention to lines 11-12:

ויעצורו משקה דעת מצמאים ולצמאם ישקום חומין	11
<span style="color: red;">למען (ן) הבט אל</span>	
<span style="color: red;">תעותם להתהולל במועדיהם</span> להתפש במצודותם	12

They withhold the drink of knowledge from the thirsty, but cause the thirsty to drink vinegar *in order to gaze at* <sup>12</sup> *their error, to deport themselves foolishly on their festivals* and to be caught in their snares. (Transl. Baumgarten<sup>86</sup>)

The passage, he claims, is an almost verbatim paraphrase of the Hab. 2:15 passage, on which the Day of Atonement episode is based. Moreover, the references in the passage to 'smoothing' etc. suggest that the Teacher's opponents should be identified with the Seekers of Smooth Things:

The latter are apparently charged with misleading the people by encouraging them to desecrate the somber spirit of penitence of Yom Kippur with their folly (*הולל*).<sup>87</sup>

Baumgarten describes two separate notions of how to commemorate the Day of Atonement festival. On the one hand, the day is a day of celebration, when the liberation of the jubilee year was to be sounded by the shofar (Lev. 25:10; cf. 11QMelch); on the other, the day is a day of mourning, self-affliction and fasting (cf. Jub. 34:18-19 where Joseph's death is used as explanation). This dual aspect of the

<sup>83</sup> So Josephus (*Ant.* XIII) records how John Hyrcanus, Alexander Jannaeus and Alexandra Salome all aligned themselves with different political parties (mainly those of the Pharisees or Sadducees) at different stages in their respective terms of office.

<sup>84</sup> J.M. Baumgarten, "Yom Kippur in the Qumran Scrolls and Second Temple Sources," *DSD* 6 (1999), 184-191.

<sup>85</sup> Compare our discussion of this passage above in ch. 3, above.

<sup>86</sup> Baumgarten, *op. cit.*, 185.

festival is also found in Philo,<sup>88</sup> while the celebratory dimension of Yom Kippur is recorded in the Mishnah.<sup>89</sup> Finally, Baumgarten identifies this dimension of the feast-day with the Pharisees, a conclusion, he suggests, which can be inferred from both Josephus and tannaitic sources.<sup>90</sup> This also neatly ties in, of course, with our earlier identification of the Pharisees with the Seekers of Smooth Things. Thus, the conflict described in 1QpHab, he concludes, is not merely a matter of a change in calendar, but a difference in the way in which the Day of Atonement (and presumably other festivals) was celebrated. From here it is a short step to identifying the Wicked Priest as a 'sympathizer with the "preachers of smooth things," the Pharisaic teachers who allowed the somber spirit of Yom Kippur to be desecrated by popular rejoicing, להתהולל במועדיהם.'<sup>91</sup>

It is certainly tempting to align the Wicked Priest with the Seekers of Smooth Things, since this would allow us to make a powerful argument for Qumran origins. Nevertheless, since the Wicked Priest is never *directly* associated with this group, this is again a dangerous conclusion. In particular, in 4QpNah, neither the Teacher or the Wicked Priest are present nor can be reconstructed. We could, however, argue that this relates to a later period in the history of the community, perhaps following the Teacher's death (by whatever means), when the Seekers of Smooth Things had gained greater prominence. In 1QpHab, as we have seen, the Teacher's main point of conflict is with the Man of Falsehood, a figure with whom some link may also be maintained with the Seekers of Smooth Things (above, n56).

A conclusion thus presents itself: the Man of Falsehood was a one-time member of the community, but for some reason had a falling out with the Teacher and the two, along with their respective followers, parted. The Man of Falsehood's supporters were later termed 'Seekers of Smooth Things' and may have been, if not the Pharisees themselves, certainly linked with them. The Qumran group, on the other hand, termed themselves 'children of the light' etc. During their lifetimes, the conflict was seen in

---

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, 185.

<sup>88</sup> The Special Laws, I §186-87, *The Works of Philo: Complete and Unabridged*, transl. C. D. Yonge (Hendrickson, 1993), 551.

<sup>89</sup> So *m. Yoma* 7:4; *m. Ta'an* 4:8. Cf. Baumgarten, *op. cit.*, 189.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, 191.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, 191.



terms of the Teacher and the Man of Falsehood, but following their respective deaths, the dispute was viewed in terms of their followers – hence in 4QpNah the Seekers of Smooth Things are those who come in for direct criticism. How does the Wicked Priest fit into this scenario? Many have directly identified the Wicked Priest with the Man of Falsehood; but I have shown that this is simplistic and does not fit all the facts, particularly those which suggest that the Man of Falsehood was a member of the Qumran group, while the Wicked Priest seems to have been at the very least a priest in Jerusalem, and most likely a High Priest. Nevertheless, if the Wicked Priest and the Man of Falsehood were in some sense ‘allies’ then the Wicked Priest’s revenge on the Teacher of Righteousness is easier to comprehend. Under the influence of the Man of Falsehood, the Wicked Priest is made aware of a threat to his authority, whether it was an actual ‘threat’ or not, and took action to forestall it.

The present passage, then, describes a conflict between the Teacher and the Wicked Priest on Yom Kippur. It allows us to entertain various possibilities as to the makeup of the community (in terms of calendar) and propose a preliminary link between the Wicked Priest and the community led by the Man of Falsehood. These individuals, however, are probably not identical with one another, implying that, aside from the conflict with the Man of Falsehood, the Teacher also conflicted with the Wicked Priest. I suggest that these conflicts are probably related, perhaps due to the Man of Falsehood’s influence on the High Priest (i.e. the Wicked Priest)?

#### Excursus: The Teacher of Righteousness in 1QpHab I:13

This passage has, until now, been ignored because it rests on reconstruction of the first part of line 13. The legible aspects of I:12-13, including the restoration of Hab. 1:4b $\alpha$  on which the interpretation is based, are as follows:

כִּי אֶרְשַׁע מִכַּתִּיב אֶת הַצַּדִּיק	] 12
[ הוּא מוֹרֵה הַצַּדִּיק	] 13

[... “For the wicked surrou]d the righteous” (Hab. 1:4b $\alpha$ )<sup>13</sup> [...] he is the Teacher of Righteousness.

Clearly line 13 is part of the interpretation and generally the relationship between *הַצַּדִּיק* in Hab. 1:4 and *מוֹרֵה הַצַּדִּיק* has been assumed to imply a similar link between *רשע* and *הַכּוֹהֵן הַרְשָׁע*. Brownlee, Horgan and Elliger among others all restore l. 13 as follows:

13 [פֶּשֶׁרֵי הַרְשָׁע הוּא הַכּוֹהֵן הַרְשָׁע וְהַצַּדִּיק] הוּא מוֹרֵה הַצַּדִּיק

<sup>13</sup> [Its interpretation: 'the wicked' he is the Wicked Priest and 'the righteous'] he is the Teacher of Righteousness.

The restoration is certainly logical and is seemingly supported by the equation of 'wicked' and 'righteous' by 'Teacher of Righteousness' and 'Wicked Priest' in 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 1-10 IV:7-10. More recently, however, Timothy Lim has argued that רֶשַׁע could be interpreted by אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב, since while the Wicked Priest does not reappear until col. VIII, the Man of Falsehood is referred to as early as col. II.<sup>92</sup> In 1QpHab V:8-12, as we have seen, 'the righteous' and 'the wicked' of Hab. 1:13 are interpreted with reference to the Teacher and the Man of Falsehood, supporting Lim's suggested restoration for l. 13:

13 [פֶּשֶׁרֵי הַרְשָׁע הוּא אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב וְהַצַּדִּיק] הוּא מוֹרֵה הַצַּדִּיק

<sup>13</sup> [Its interpretation: *the wicked* is the man of the lie and *the righteous*] is the Teacher of Righteousness.

If this is accepted, he claims, it can be said that the Wicked Priest does not occur in the first seven columns of the peshar and "would support the view that the wicked priest and liar are two different individuals."<sup>93</sup>

Brownlee suggests that the absolute usage of מוֹרֵה הַצַּדִּיק (and כּוֹהֵן הַרְשָׁע) might imply that there is only one Teacher of Righteousness or Wicked Priest. He adds: "the intention of the present pericope is to present these men as exercising two contrastive offices, in a programmatic introduction to the *dramatis personae*."<sup>94</sup> If we are correct to follow Lim's suggestion, however, then mention of the Man of Falsehood here emphasises his importance over the Wicked Priest. This is a major revelation that will be further explored in our following chapter.

### (c) The Teacher of Righteousness

Other than in terms of conflict with either the Wicked Priest or the Man of Falsehood, the Teacher himself appears in only two passages: 1QpHab VII:4 and VIII:3. The

<sup>92</sup> Timothy H. Lim, "The Wicked Priest or the Liar?," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context*, ed. Timothy H. Lim (Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 2000), 45-51.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, 50.

<sup>94</sup> Brownlee, 49.

former interprets Hab. 2:1-2 and appears to focus more directly on the nature of the role of the Teacher of Righteousness himself.

על משמרתִי אעמודה ואתיצבה על מצורי ואצפה לראות מה  
ידבר בי ומ[ה אשיב ע]ל תוכחתי ויענני יהוה [ויאמר כתוב  
חזון ובאר] על הלוחות למען ירוץ [הקורא בו]

At my watchpost I will stand, and station myself on the rampart; I will keep watch to see what he will say to me, and what he will answer concerning my complaint. Then the LORD answered me [and said: Write the vision; make it plain] on tablets, so that he may run [while reading it]. (Hab. 2:1-2; 1QpHab VI:12-16)

פֶּשֶׁר הַדְּבָר אֲשֶׁר]	16
[	17
וידבר אל א <sup>ל</sup> חבקוק לכתוב את הבאות על	1
{על} הדור האחרון ואת גמר הקץ לוא הודעו	2
ואשר אמר למען ירוץ הקורא בו	3
פֶּשֶׁרוֹ עַל מוֹרֵה הַצַּדִּיק אֲשֶׁר הוֹדִיעוּ אֶל אֵת	4
כֹּל רִזֵי דְבָרֵי עַבְדֵי הַנְּבִיאִים	5

[The interpretation of the passage is that] <sup>17</sup> [ ... ]<sup>95</sup> <sub>1</sub> Then God told Habakkuk to write down the things to come upon <sub>2</sub> {upon} the last generation, but the fullness of (that) time he did not make known to him. <sub>3</sub> <Blank> And as for what he said, “that he may run while reading it,” (Hab. 2:2c) <sub>4</sub> its interpretation concerns the Teacher of Righteousness to whom God has made known <sub>5</sub> all {the} mysteries of the words of his servants the prophets. (1QpHab VI:16-VII:5)

The interpretation here ties in neatly with that of ‘the Priest’ (הכֹּהֵן) earlier in the peshar, as we have pointed out (above, p147f.), again suggesting that the Teacher and the Priest are identical. To repeat our comments on *pšr* in the Introduction, this passage establishes the Teacher’s importance over the prophets. Although the prophets had an understanding of the implications and meaning of their message, the full meaning of the message (גִּמְרָה; l. 2), its ‘prophetic meaning’ or ‘interpretation’, was not made known to them. Instead, the full meaning has only been made known to the Teacher of Righteousness himself, and, although the peshar does not actually relate the teaching of the Teacher himself, we may surmise that the interpretations encountered in the pesharim are based on this teaching, or that the community

<sup>95</sup> Line 17 is missing. Brownlee’s reconstruction – “The prophetic meaning of the passage is that Habakkuk prayed that he might know the things which would happen in the last days.” – is a reliable approximation, but is unsupported. Brownlee, 107.

considered themselves to have received the Teacher's prophetic inheritance. Nevertheless, the totality of the Teacher's understanding of the prophetic message ties in neatly with the picture found in Rabbinic material, and especially the Messiah at Isfahan account (above, p144). Here too, the Teacher is apparently imbued with special 'knowledge', perhaps implying that the concept of a 'Teacher of Righteousness' existed independently of Qumran, since this aspect of the Teacher is *not* found in CD.

The final passage to refer to the Teacher comes in col. VIII, interpreting Hab. 2:4:

[וְצַדִּיק בְּאִמְנַתּוֹ יִהְיֶה]

But the righteous by their faith, will live. (Hab. 2:4b; 1QpHab VII:17)

X פִּשְׁרוֹ עַל כּוֹל עוֹשֵׂי הַתּוֹרָה בְּבֵית יְהוּדָה אֲשֶׁר	1
יְצִילֵם אֱלֹהֵי מִבֵּית הַמִּשְׁפָּט בְּעִבּוֹר עֲמֵלֵם וְאִמְנַתֶּם	2
בְּמִוֶּרֶת הַצַּדִּיק	3

<sup>1</sup> Its interpretation concerns all the doers of the Law in the House of Judah, whom <sup>2</sup> God will deliver from the House of Judgement on account of their suffering and their faith in <sup>3</sup> the Teacher of Righteousness. (1QpHab VIII:1-3)

In the present passage, the Teacher appears obliquely, in connection with the faith and suffering of 'all the doers of the Law in the House of Judah' (כּוֹל עוֹשֵׂי הַתּוֹרָה בְּבֵית יְהוּדָה; VIII:1). This group seems synonymous with the community itself since, in the other passages where the 'doers of the Law' are found (1QpHab VII:11; XII:4-5 and 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> II:15, 23<sup>96</sup>), the expression is located alongside, for instance, 'men of truth' (אֲנָשֵׁי הָאֱמֶת) and 'Council of the Community' (עֲצַת הַיְחִיד). In two of these passages the 'doers of the Law' again appear alongside 'Judah'. So in 1QpHab XII:4-5 the

<sup>96</sup> In the second and fourth instances (the fourth is fragmentary), the singular עוֹשֵׂה הַתּוֹרָה is evidenced over the plural עוֹשֵׂי. It is unclear whether this change in form here is deliberate, or whether עוֹשֵׂה is an orthographic variant of עוֹשֵׂי. Brownlee, 203, suggests this change is deliberate and that "an original *Yôd* has been converted into a *Hê*", though it is unclear from the photograph whether this is in fact the case. Brownlee's evidence is somewhat coloured by his suggestion that the reference to Judah in these texts is an attempt to preserve the actual name of the Teacher of Righteousness (who is then further identified with the 'Judah the Essene' from *Ant.* XIII, xi, 2 §311 on account of the supposed derivation of 'Essene' from אֵסֵה). Nevertheless this requires a strange translation of יְהוּדָה עוֹשֵׂה הַתּוֹרָה: either "the simple ones of Judah the Law doer" or "the simple ones of Judah, the doer(s) of the Law" –

‘doer of the Law’ appears alongside פתאי יהודה ‘the simple ones of Judah’; while in 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> II:14-15 the עושי התורה אשר בעצת היחד ‘the doers of the Law who are in the Council of the Community’ seem to be paralleled by עריצי הברית אשר בבית יהודה ‘the ruthless ones of the covenant who are in the House of Judah’ as follows:

עריצי הברית	≠	עושי התורה
אשר	=	אשר
בבית יהודה	=	בעצת היחד

Both passages strongly suggest that the working equation ‘Judah’ = ‘the Community’ (as opposed to ‘Ephraim’ = ‘the Pharisees’ and ‘Manasseh’ = ‘the Sadducees’) expressed elsewhere is correct. A difficulty in this is the apparent equation in the parallelism of עריצי הברית with the עושי התורה, not merely because the titles sound mutually exclusive, but because the section immediately following (ll. 15-16) ‘God will not surrender them (i.e. the עושי התורה) into their hands’ specifically distinguishes the two groups. A possible solution is to assume that the ‘ruthless ones of the covenant’ represent former members of the community, most likely those ‘traitors’ who departed with the Man of Falsehood (so CD, 1QpHab *et al.*). This may also be expressed by the change from יהודה to the phonetically similar יחד. Both the עושי התורה and the עריצי הברית were originally members of the same community, but when the latter (along with the Man of Falsehood) departed, the name was changed to יחד ‘unity’ to reinforce the common purpose and resolve of those who remained. Although no trace of it is found in the scrolls it is also possible that an interim designation בית היחד ‘House of the Yahad’ may have been used. In the current passage, then, the ‘doers of the Law in the House of Judah’ represent those members of the original community (the House of Judah) who remained loyal to the Teacher of Righteousness during the schism engineered by the Man of Falsehood.

Our next concern relates to the ‘faith and suffering’ of the community and how this is related by the pesherist to the Teacher. Unlike Rom. 1:17 which interprets Hab. 2:4 as relating to the faith of the individual, the community’s understanding appears to have

---

where the underlining indicates which aspect of the phrase עושה התורה goes with. Compare אנשי האמת עושי התורה ‘the men of truth, the doers of the Law’ (1QpHab VII:10-11).

been very different. Here it is their continued faithfulness/loyalty to the Teacher that guarantees their salvation from the House of Judgement.<sup>97</sup> This may also be understood by the application of עושי התורה to אנשי האמת in VII:10-11, since the translations for אנשי האמת have included 'men of faithfulness' and 'faithful men'. Moreover, it also appears that the community underwent suffering (בַּעֲבוּר עַמְלָם; 1. 2), though it is unclear whether this is shared by the Teacher, or even whether he is still alive at this stage (which is not required by the passage). In fact, the peshar has already suggested that the Teacher is already dead, through its reference to the drawing out of the final age in column VII:

בִּיא עוֹרֵד חֲזוֹן	5
לְמוֹעֵד יִפְיַח לִקְיָן לֹא יִכּוֹב	6
פִּשְׁרוֹ אֲשֶׁר יֵאָרֹךְ הַקְּיָן הָאֲחֵרֹן וַיִּתֵּר עַל כּוֹל	7
אֲשֶׁר דִּבְרוּ הַנְּבִיאִים כִּיָּא רִזִּי אֵל לְהַפְלֵה	8
אִם יִתְמַהֵמָה חֲכָה לוֹ כִּיָּא בּוֹא יִבּוֹא וּלְאֵא	9
יֵאָחַר פִּשְׁרוֹ עַל אַנְשֵׁי הָאֲמֵת	10
עוֹשֵׂי הַתּוֹרָה אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִרְפוּ יְדֵיהֶם מִעֲבוֹדַת	11
הָאֲמֵת בְּהַמְשַׁךְ עֲלֵיהֶם הַקְּיָן הָאֲחֵרֹן כִּיָּא	12
כּוֹל קִיֻּצִי אֵל יִבּוֹאוּ לְתַכּוֹנֵם כְּאֲשֶׁר חִקַּק	13
לָהֶם בְּרִזִּי עֲרַמְתּוֹ	14

"For the vision has an appointed  $\delta$  time, it speaks of the end and does not lie" (Hab 2:3a). <Blank>  $\gamma$  Its interpretation is that the final time will be drawn out and will exceed all  $\delta$  that about which the prophets spoke, for the mysteries of God are wonderful.  $\epsilon$  "If it seems slow, wait, for it will indeed come and will not  $\iota_0$  be late" (Hab 2:3b). <Blank> Its interpretation concerns the Men of Truth,  $\iota_1$  the Doers of the Law, who will not relax their hands from the service of  $\iota_2$  truth, in the drawing out for them of the final time. For  $\iota_3$  all the ages of God will come to pass in their appointed time, just as he decreed  $\iota_4$  to [them in] the mysteries of his craftiness. (1QpHab VII:5-14)

As we have already suggested (above, p166), the Men of Truth here are synonymous with the Community and the clear implication is that the extension of the eschaton into the years following the Teacher's death has been a cause for concern within the group, hence this note of encouragement.

<sup>97</sup> The House of Judgement is clearly the place of the eschatological judgement rather than an actual historical place. The בית המשפט is also found in 1QpHab X:3 as the place where God will give his judgement, raising the Wicked Priest up for judgement before condemning him with the fire of brimstone; while the 'place of judgement' (Ethiop. *makâna dain*) is three times referred to in Jubilees (10:5, 9; 22:22).

Returning to our original passage, the Teacher may be referred to *in absentia*, in the sense that his life is used as *pro exemplar* for the community he left behind. That is, if the members of the community keep faith with him, their reward will be their rescue from the House of Judgement. The passage speaks of suffering, but it is unclear whether this refers to the Teacher or just his community. Nevertheless, since elsewhere 1QpHab suggests that the Teacher will suffer during his conflict with the Man of Falsehood, it is perhaps this that is being referred to here. This may be drawn out by the parallels drawn between the Teacher and the Community on the one hand and the Man of Falsehood and his followers, the Seekers of Smooth Things, on the other – as I have attempted to demonstrate.

### Conclusions

Of the seven references to the Teacher in 1QpHab, then, three refer to a conflict with his opponent the Man of Falsehood (I:13, II:2, and V:10), two to a second conflict with the Wicked Priest (V:9-10 and IX:4-5), one to the Teacher in terms of his community (VIII:3), and only one to the Teacher himself (VII:4). The Teacher is thus viewed predominantly in terms of others, rarely in his own right. Information about the historical Teacher of Righteousness is thus scarce, which, when it is compared to the delay motif in col. VII, strongly suggests that the Teacher is no longer alive. Several passages hint at this conclusion, though, due to the lack of any direct evidence, it is impossible to say how his death may have occurred. Instead, the most interesting revelation arises through the Teacher's comparison to the prophets, elevating him above them and suggesting that he is the possessor of hitherto secret knowledge. This ties in with the picture of the Teacher in the Rabbinic material, suggesting that this understanding of the Teacher was more widespread than is generally accepted.

## 4.3.2 1QpMicah

In 1QpMic the title is found once in fr. 10 I:4.<sup>98</sup> The fragment is relatively poorly preserved and the precise reconstruction of the surrounding lines is, as we shall see, a matter of debate.

מה פשע יעקוב הלא שומרון] פשרו על מ... [ ] ..	2
הפ]תאים ] ומה במות יהודה	3
הלא ירושלים פשרו על] מונרה הצדק אשר הואה	4
] ולכ[ן]ל המתנדרים לוסף על בחירי	5
]אל עושי התורה [ בעצת היחד אשר ינצל[ן] מיום	6
המשפט	7

<sup>2</sup> ["What is the transgression of Jacob? Is it not Samaria?" (Mic. 1:5b)] Its interpretation concerns *m* ... [...] <sup>99</sup> ... <sup>3</sup> [... the sim]ple ones. "And what are the high places of Judah? <sup>4</sup> [Is it not Jerusalem?" (Mic. 1:5c) Its interpretation concerns] (the) Tea[ch]er of Righteousness who is the one <sup>5</sup> [...]w and to a[[]] those volunteering to be added to the chosen ones of <sup>6</sup> [God ... ] in the council of the community, who will be saved from the day of <sup>7</sup> [judgement ...] (1QpMic 10 I:2-7)

The reading 'Teacher of Righteousness' here is almost certain. Only Carmignac transcribes anything else, and his suggestion מה הציץ "Qu'est-ce qu'est la fleur elle qui ..." does not seem to fit the context of the interpretation at all – although it is true that the final letter does resemble a final *sade*.<sup>100</sup> There is debate, however, as to whether the precise reading is מורה הצדק or מורי הצדק, since the latter (if the correct reading), though it is more likely an orthographic variant, may reflect a plural form. Thus Milik, in the Preliminary Publication read מורי הצדק but translated the phrase in the singular, while Gaster, who adopted Milik's reading, translated it as plural: 'those who expound the law correctly.'<sup>101</sup> As Brownlee has pointed out, however, any plural meaning seems ruled out by the singular הואה אשר which follows immediately after.<sup>102</sup> Indeed in favour of the orthographic variant, we may ourselves point to the reading מרי שקר 'teacher of falsehood' for MT ומורה שקר in

<sup>98</sup> García-Martínez reconstructs a reference to the Teacher of Righteousness in Fr. 11 (interpreting Mic. 1:8-9). However, since there is no evidence to support this reconstruction I pay no attention to it here.

<sup>99</sup> On this reconstruction see below, p208.

<sup>100</sup> Jean Carmignac, "Notes sur les Peshârîm," *RevQ* 3 (1961-62), 516-517. Cf. Horgan, 60.

<sup>101</sup> Gaster, *Scriptures*, 229, 247, n. 2.

<sup>102</sup> Brownlee, 204.



the citation of Hab 2:18 in 1QpHab XII:11. The placing of this alongside the singular מִסְכָּה 'cast image' supports the singular identification of מורי in 1QpMic.<sup>103</sup>

Brownlee equates the Teacher here to 'Judah' in the Micah prophecy and inquires whether this might have any bearing on the Teacher's real name, perhaps Judah son of Jedidiah or the Judas the Essene referred to in Josephus. He even entertains suggestions from Rabinowitz and Del Medico that the Teacher might be identified with Judas Maccabeus and Judas the Galilean respectively.<sup>104</sup> Nevertheless, the equation of the Teacher here with 'Judah' does not match other references to Judah in the scrolls. As we have seen, references to 'the House of Judah' and 'the simple ones of Judah' in 1QpHab (VIII:1 & XII:4-5 respectively) seem to relate 'Judah' as a more general term for the community. Instead, the Teacher in the current passage should, then, be equated with 'Jerusalem' in the prophecy, and the question 'what are the high places of Judah? Is it not Jerusalem' (Mic 1:5c) is a way of reaffirming the Teacher's position as leader of the group at Qumran.

#### 4.3.3 4QpIsaiah<sup>c</sup>

In this section of 4QpIsa<sup>c</sup> (which is very poorly preserved) mention is made of the מורה 'Teacher' (21 I:6). Whether this is a title in its own right (as with מטריף 'Spouter') or is part of the phrase מורה היחד or מורה הצדק (or some other unknown form) is impossible to ascertain from the surviving fragment.

[הל]וא עוד מעט מזער ושב]	1
[ לבגון לכרמל ליער ] יחשב הל[ב]נון ה[מה]	2
[ ל לכרמל ושב ה ]	3
[ בחרב כאשר ]אמר	4
[ .ם.]	5
[ מורה ]כאשר כתוב]	6
[ ותופר ביום ההוא וידעו כן ענוי הצואן ה[שומרים]	7
[ אותי כיא דבר יהוה ]הוא	8

<sup>103</sup> See further above, *Excursus*, p135. One problem with this view is that not all understand מורי here as a variant reading, instead opting for a different root derivation. As we have seen however, this arises more from confusion as to why the pesherist has not made any link with the title מורה שקר (as opposed to מורה הצדק) than from any real evidence.

<sup>104</sup> Brownlee, 204-205. Cf. I. Rabinowitz, "The Guides of Righteousness," *VT* 8 (1953), 402ff.; H.E. Del Medico, *The Riddle of the Scrolls* (Burke: London, 1958), 252, 258.

“Shall n[ot in a very little while] <sup>2</sup> [Lebanon {turn} into an orchard (and the orchard<sup>105</sup>)] be turned [into a wood?]” (Isa. 29:17) The Le[b]anon a[re ...] <sup>3</sup> [...] / to an orchard and they will turn into the [...] <sup>4</sup> [...]. by the sword. Just as [it says: ...] <sup>5</sup> [...] .m.[...] <sup>6</sup> [...]...[...] Teacher of [...] as it is written:] <sup>7</sup> [“So it was annulled on that day,] so the poor of the flock, the [ones watching {me} kne]w <sup>8</sup> [that] it was [the word of the LORD” (Zech. 11:11)] (21 I:1-8)

It is unclear precisely how the reference to the ‘Teacher’ relates to the interpretation, since there is no obvious textual or thematic link. The most interesting aspect of the passage is the reference to ‘Lebanon’ (לבנון) in both the prophecy and the interpretation. Elsewhere in the DSS this term appears with a variety of meanings most interestingly 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> IV:13, where a reconstructed ‘Lebanon’ may be referred to the Man of Falsehood,<sup>106</sup> and 1QpHab XII:3-4 which understands לבנון in Hab. 2:17 to refer to the Council of the Community (עצת היחד).<sup>107</sup> The latter interpretation may also be in operation here and it may be that some parallel is drawn between ‘Lebanon’ as the Community and ‘Carmel’ or ‘the orchard’ with the Teacher. Nevertheless it cannot be entirely ruled out that there is not an allusion to the Man of Falsehood particularly given the reference to a ‘sword’ (l. 4). In short this text has little to tell us of any value.

#### 4.3.4 4QpIsaiah<sup>c</sup>

In this text the ‘Teacher of Righteousness’ is wholly reconstructed.

[	ש י]	הנ] .[ או]	1
ד ואשר כתוב [ברועה עדרו		וירושלם ]	2
		[ירעה]	
מי פשר הדבר [על מורה הצדק אשר] גלה את תורת הצדק		מדד בשועלו מים]	3
		ושמים בנזרת תכן וכול בשלש עפר]	4
		וגבעות במואזנים]	

<sup>105</sup> Isaiah 29:17b reads: ושכ לבנון לכרמל והכרמל ליער יחשב. It may be that the scribe erred in writing out the biblical text, perhaps omitting either לכרמל or הכרמל of the MT (i.e. through haplography, since the lacuna does not seem sufficient for the entire verse to be restored). Horgan omits any reference to Isa. 29:17 in the translation, though in the notes she suggests that lines 2-3 may be related to this passage (Horgan, 118). My translation follows García-Martínez.

<sup>106</sup> See below, pp212f., n42.

<sup>107</sup> Cf. Wood, 144-45, n1 for a discussion of ‘Lebanon’ here.

, hn[ ]. 'w. [ ... ]š y[ ... ]<sup>2</sup> and Jerusalem [ ... ]d. And as for what is written, ["He will feed his flock like a shepherd," (Isa. 40:11a)]<sup>3</sup> the interpretation of the word [concerns the Teacher of Righteousness who] revealed the Torah of Righ[teousness. "Who has measured the waters in the hollow of his hand]<sup>4</sup> and [marked off] the heavens with [a span, or held the dust] of the land [in a measure], or weighed [the mountains in scales and the hills in a balance?]" (Isa. 40:12)] (4QpIsa<sup>e</sup> 1-2 I:1-4)

The reconstruction of 'Teacher of Righteousness' here is based on two things: (1) the reference to the 'shepherd' in Isa. 40:11 a thematic link very similar to the imagery of Jesus as the good shepherd in the NT; and (2) the reference to the revelation of the 'Torah of Righteousness' in the commentary. 'Teacher of Righteousness' and 'Torah of Righteousness' on this understanding are presumably set in parallel, since elsewhere the Teacher is connected with correct legal interpretation. This may also derive from a confusion of the Teacher with the Interpreter of the Law (דורש התורה; cf. CD, above). While the 'Teacher of Righteousness' remains the most likely subject of the commentary, the fragmentary state of the pesher does not allow us to press any conclusions.

#### 4.3.5 4QpPsalms<sup>a</sup>

In 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> the Teacher is referred to on three occasions: in the interpretations of Psalm 37:23-26 (twice), 37:32-33 and 45:2 [Heb. 45:1]. In the first and third instances, however, it is unclear from the extant material whether it is 'Teacher of Righteousness' (מורה הצדק) or 'Teacher of the Community'/'Unique Teacher' (מורה היחיד) that should be reconstructed. The reference to 'righteous[ness]' in the second account, however, if indeed it follows מורה, suggests that 'Teacher of Righteousness' be reconstructed throughout. At the very least, the same figure is being referred to, if by different designations. Firstly, interpreting Ps. 37:23-26:

כיא מיהונה מצעדי גבר [ כונגנו ודרכו יחפץ כיא יפול] לוא	14
יוטל כיא י[הנה סומך ידו] פשרו על הכוהן מורה ה[צדק אשר]	15
[ב]חר בו אל לעמוד [כיא] הכינו לבנות לו עדת [בחרו באמת]	16
[ו]דרכו ישר לאמת [נער היי]תי וגם זקנתי ולוא [ראיתי צדיק]	17
בעזב וזרעו מבקש לחנם כול היום [ חונן ומלוח וזרעו לברכה	18
[ פשר]	
[ הדבר על מורה הצדק	19
ואת ]	20

<sup>14</sup> For "by the LOR[D are the steps of a man.] They are made secur[e and] he delights in his [p]ath. For (although) he st[umb]les <sup>15</sup> he will not fall, for the

L[ORD supports his hand.” (Ps. 37:23-24)] Its interpretation concerns the Priest, the Teacher of [Righteousness as to which] <sup>16</sup> God [ch]ose him for a pillar, [for] he set him up to build for him a congregation [of his chosen ones in truth] <sup>17</sup> [and] his [wa]y is straight to the truth. “I have [been young] and now I am old. Yet [I have] not [seen the righteous] <sup>18</sup> forsaken, nor their offspring begging bre[ad. Forever] are they [all] giving and lending, [their] offspr[ing are a blessing.” (Ps. 37:25-26) The interpretation of] <sup>19</sup> the word concerns the Tea[cher of Righteousness who ... ] God *m*[...] <sup>20</sup> and the [ ... ](4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 1-10 III:14-20)

This text is crucial since it maintains a direct link between the Priest (הכֹּהֵן) and the Teacher of Righteousness (מורה הצדק), a link otherwise inferred (cf. 1QpHab I:16-II:10; VII:5). Note in particular that the phrase ‘the Priest, the Teacher of Righteousness’ (כֹּהֵן מורה הצדק) occurs outside of the scrolls in Midrash of Psalms 102:17 (‘Priestly teacher of Righteousness’; above p143f.). The parallel in structure suggests that this title may have been known outside of the community, or at least argues for wider dissemination of the pesharim than is often supposed.

This section has also been linked with the reference to ‘the Priest’ earlier in the commentary (4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 1-10 II:16-21, above, pp118f.), in connection with the ‘wicked of Ephraim and Manasseh’. In no other pesharim is a link between the Teacher of Righteousness and Ephraim/Manasseh maintained. Indeed, as we have seen, in 4QpNah the Teacher is not found at all! However, if ‘Priest’ is also a title for the Teacher of Righteousness, then as with the priesthood in Jerusalem itself, the title may be hereditary. The ‘Priest’ in II:16-21, then, while he may not himself be the Teacher of Righteousness, is most likely a later leader of the group, and may perhaps be related to the Teacher himself. If so, the conflict between the Priest and the Men of his Council (the community?) would derive from a later period when there may have been conflict with other Jewish groups such as the Pharisees and the Sadducees.

Note also the apparent references to the Teacher’s establishment of the community in lines 16-17. Provided the reconstruction is at least nearly correct, how do we reconcile this to Davies’ view that the Teacher was not himself the founder of the Community, but that instead he came on a pre-existing community? If we re-examine CD I, however, the Teacher there comes across a pre-existing community ‘groping’ in the wilderness and gives it direction. That same scenario may also be in evidence here. In fact we can also see this in operation here should we extend the metaphor of the pillar and contrast it with the ‘groping’. In short, though the Teacher did not himself ‘found’ the community, by giving it guidance and filling it with his own interpretations of

laws etc., he might be said to have ‘built a congregation’. The passage, then, does not, in and of itself, rule out Davies’s argument for the Teacher’s role in the community’s establishment, though it does cause us to re-evaluate our approach.

The commentary immediately follows (ll. 18-19). Unfortunately, the text here is barely extant and even the reference to the Teacher is partially reconstructed. Reading between the lines, however, if the ‘young and old’ reference of the prophecy (Ps. 37:25-26) is directly applied to the Teacher, then this may suggest that he survived to old age. The paucity of the extant material, however, does not allow us to press this conclusion. Nevertheless, if correct, it certainly adds to the implication that the Teacher survived his conflict with the Wicked Priest related in the following passage. Interpreting Ps. 37:32-33:

צופה רשע לצדיק ומבקש [להמיתו יהוה] לוא יעזבנו בידו  
ו[לוא י]רשיענו {{ו}} בהשפטו

The wicked lies in wait for the righteous and seeks [to kill him. But the LO]RD [will not abandon him in to his hand, and will] n[ot] condemn him when he is brought to judgement. (4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 1-10 IV:7)

פשרו על [הכו]הן הרשע אשר צנפה למורה הצדק ויבקש	8
להמיתו [ ] ק והתורה	
אשר שלח אליו ואל לוא יעזבנו בידו] ולוא ירשיענו ב[השפטו]	9
ולנו י[שלם] אל את] גמולו לתתו	
ביד עריצי גואים לעשות בו נקמות	10

<sup>8</sup> Its interpretation concerns the Wicked [Pri]est who wa[tched for the Teach]er of Righteous[ness and sought to] kill him [.....]q<sup>108</sup> and the Law <sup>9</sup> that he sent to him. But God will not a[bandon him into his hand] and [will] not [condemn him when] he is brought to judgement. But as for [him, God will] repay to him his due, giving him <sup>10</sup> into the hands of the ruthless ones of the Gentiles to wreak on him [vengeance.] (4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 1-10 IV:8-10)

<sup>108</sup> The reconstruction of the end of l. 8 is problematic. Pardee restores [החוק]ק והתורה [...] ‘[... the statu]te and the law’ suggesting that the eight or so spaces left be reconstructed something like אשר שלח אליו ואל לוא יעזבנו בידו] ולוא ירשיענו ב[השפטו] ‘... and to change the code and the law which he had sent to him’ (“Restudy,” 165, 188. The reconstruction is patterned on Dan. 7:25). Carmignac restores (ה)צדק ‘justice’ while Strugnell (“Notes,” 524) like Pardee reads החוק, though noting that the letter after the lacuna might be a ו. Horgan, 222, reads the letter after the lacuna as a ך but is unable to restore, while Allegro (DJD 5) originally restored ת. Pardee’s attempt is probably closer to the mark than most.

Here, as in 1QpHab, the Teacher is set in opposition to the Wicked Priest. But the passage is also interesting since it bears remarkable similarity to 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> II:16-20 (above, p118). Several elements are identical: (1) the overall theme of the Wicked against the Righteous – the ‘Wicked Priest’ and the ‘wicked ones of Ephraim/Manasseh’ and the ‘Teacher of Righteousness’ and the ‘Priest’/‘Men of his Council’ respectively; (2) the reference to judgement (משפט); and (3) the handing over of the wicked into the hands of the ‘ruthless ones of the Gentiles’ (עריצי גוים). The two events are not the same, however. As I have pointed out, the Teacher does not appear alongside Ephraim/Manasseh in any passage, and does not appear in 4QpNah at all. Nevertheless, the parallels between the passages are clearly deliberate, perhaps to reassure those going through a contemporary problem (the Priest and the men of his council) by reference to an earlier event in the community’s history. Thus, just as the Teacher of Righteousness was saved by God, so will those who follow in his footsteps. This may be what is implied by ‘through their suffering and their faith in the Teacher of Righteousness’ in 1QpHab VIII:2-3 (above).

For obvious reasons, this passage has been linked with those in 1QpHab also portraying conflict between the Teacher and the Wicked Priest (1QpHab IX:8-12, XI:2-8). Indeed the present passage is used as evidence that, contrary to popular belief, the conflict between the Teacher and the Wicked Priest did not result in the death of the former.<sup>109</sup> In 1QpHab, as we saw, the nature of the ‘offence’ (IX:9) is not explored, nor the reference to the ‘swallowing up’ of the Teacher in XI:5,7. The major headache, however, is caused by the use of the imperfect tense to govern this account. Generally in biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew, the imperfect is reserved for the present or especially the future tense.<sup>110</sup> Nevertheless, if applied to the current passage, this would suggest that the conflict between the Teacher and the Wicked Priest is still to come, a conclusion that sits uneasy with other accounts in the pesher – most notably the references to the wicked of Ephraim and Manasseh in column II which we have referred to a somewhat later period. Pardee’s solution is to find a reference to a

<sup>109</sup> Cf. Pardee, *op. cit.*, 180.

<sup>110</sup> A study of the tenses in 1QpHab has been conducted by 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: Colloque de Strasbourg 25-27 Mai 1955*, Travaux de centre

second 'Teacher' and to read the expression as a title held by the leader of the group. Thus 1QpHab picks up the "adventures of the first Teacher," while the use of the imperfect in the current passage "seems to indicate that the *pešer* was composed in the period when the deliverance of the Teacher was still future."<sup>111</sup> Whether this is intended to pick up the dichotomy between past and future aspects of the 'Teacher'/'one who teaches righteousness' in CD, though, is unclear. But this again is difficult, especially since the current passage is so similar to the Day of Atonement account in 1QpHab. To advance two such similar, but separate, events, is unacceptable. Stegemann, by contrast, argues that the force of the imperfect reflects the ongoing conflict between the Teacher and the Wicked Priest, since the Hebrew imperfect, through its incomplete nature, can express repeated or continual action.<sup>112</sup> This conclusion, though, is unsupported by any direct evidence. A better (and simpler) solution may be to recognise that the tense of the interpretation is in this instance governed by the (imperfect) tense of the original prophecy. This conclusion requires further work, however.

Since, then, the nature of the offence in 1QpHab is undefined, and there is no reason to conclude from CD that the community had a belief concerning a return of the Teacher, I see no problem in relating the current incident to that described in 1QpHab. To do otherwise, in fact, causes us to overemphasise this conflict between the two. As we have seen, both the *pesherist* and the author of CD are rather more interested in the conflict between the Teacher and the Man of Falsehood. Unfortunately, however, the importance of this is often overlooked. 1QpHab thus describes an occasion when the Wicked Priest came into conflict with the Teacher and, if we can conflate the incidents in cols. IX and XI, this is said to have taken place on the Day of Atonement (XI:7). If we add in the evidence from the current passage then we find that it was the Wicked Priest's intention to 'seek to kill' (IV:8) the Teacher, but that this attempt failed since 'God will not a[bandon him into his hand ...]'. The attempt also contains some legal bearing, but because of the lacuna in the text here the precise nature of this

---

d'études supérieures spécialisé d'histoire des religions de Strasbourg (Presses Universitaires de France: Paris, 1957), 25-35.

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*, 180.

<sup>112</sup> Cf. P. Paul Joüon, *Grammaire de l'Hebreu Biblique* (Institut Biblique Pontifical: Rome, 1923), 301f.

is not given. Overlapping with 1QpHab again, however, clearly demonstrates a difference of legal opinion, since the day of the Wicked Priest's arrival is given as Yom Kippur. If, as most scholars assume, the Wicked Priest was a High Priest then, as we have stated, the only place he can have been on the Day of Atonement was in the temple in Jerusalem; hence the conclusion that the Teacher's group operated under a different calendar. The Wicked Priest's incursion may then have been intended to force the community to adhere to the calendar practised in the Jerusalem temple, an attempt that seems to have been only partially successful, if at all.

In the third and final passage in 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> we are again forced to rely to an extent on restoration. (Note: The length of the column combined with the paucity of the extant material renders any reconstruction that attempts to retain the spacing difficult.)

ל[ב]י דבר טוב		24
[... קודש כיא	או[מר אני מעשי למלך פשרו	25
[ ולשוני עט	[... ] ספרי	26
לפני אל	[סופר מהיר פשרו] על מורה [הצדק אשר	27
	במעני לשון	

“My he[art] overflows with a good theme, <sup>25</sup> [I] add[ress my verses to the king.” (Ps. 45:1a, Heb 45:2a) Its interpretation ...] . . . holy, for <sup>26</sup> [...] books [.....] “And my tongue is the pen of <sup>27</sup> [a skilled scribe.” (Ps. 45:1b, Heb 45:2b) Its interpretation] concerns the Teacher[ of Righteousness who ... bef]ore God with an answering tongue. (4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 1-10 IV:24-27)

The translation of *לשון במעני* (l. 27) is odd. In the *Editio Princeps*, Allegro translated ‘eloquent tongue’ while others have translated ‘reply of the tongue’ (García-Martínez) and ‘purposeful speech’ (Horgan). My own translation reflects the NRSV of Prov. 16:1. If the placing of fr. 9 (על מורה) is correct,<sup>113</sup> the commentary appears to relate ‘my tongue’ (l. 26) to the Teacher of Righteousness, a reading supported by the various autobiographical (of the Teacher) elements of 1QH where *מענה לשון* is also found, cf. IV:17; VIII:14; X:7; and XIX:34:

I want to find a reply on (my) tongue (*מענה לשון*) to recount your acts of justice (1QH IV:17)

<sup>113</sup> In the *Editio Princeps* Allegro noted that fr. 9 was “uncertainly placed.” As Horgan points out, the only indication as to its placing is that the bottom margin of a column is visible. The width of this margin appears to correspond to that in fr. 10. Cf. Allegro, DJD 5, 49; Horgan, 225.



Since I know all this I want to find *a reply of the tongue* (מענה לשון) to prostrate myself and to ask [forgiveness (1QH VIII:14)

But you give *a reply of the tongue* (מענה לשון) to my uncir[cumcised] lips (1QH X:7)

You have put into the mouth of your servant thanksgiving and [...] <sup>34</sup> entreaties and *the reply of the tongue* (ומענה לשון). (1QH XIX:33-34; all translations, García-Martínez)

If the author of these apparently autobiographical sections of 1QH was the Teacher himself, these passages all demonstrate how מענה לשון is used of the relationship between the Teacher and God. As we have seen, in 1QpHab the Teacher was considered God's mouthpiece on earth. Here, too, we see how God places into his servant's mouth exactly what to say, i.e. *the reply of the tongue*. This allows us to support the placing of fr. 9 in this section. Other than this, however, the pesher has little to say.

### Conclusions

The picture of the Teacher in 4QpPs<sup>a</sup>, then, supports the depiction of the Teacher elsewhere, especially in 1QpHab. Here too the Teacher appears in conflict with the Wicked Priest, who even attempted to kill him, though this attempt was seemingly unsuccessful. Elsewhere, important links are made between the Teacher and the Priest, a suggestion that is implied in 1QpHab, though which also reappears outside of the Qumran corpus, in the Rabbinic material. The significance of this should not be ignored and suggests one of two things. Either the pesharim were more widely disseminated than is often realised, or the pesherist, in referring to the Teacher of Righteousness, makes use of a more widespread tradition. If the latter, the leader's claim to be the Teacher of Righteousness is eschatological, since the Rabbinic evidence argues for the appearance of this figure in the future. It may even be regarded as polemical. Meanwhile, the final passage, although it is the least well preserved, may reflect 1QpHab's suggestion that the Teacher is God's mouthpiece. As we have seen, this reflects various passages in Daniel, which portray him as receiving secret knowledge from God.

4.3.6 4QpPsalms<sup>b</sup>

The final two references to the Teacher occur in 4QpPs<sup>b</sup>, although unfortunately these are also the most fragmented. In neither text is there any real indication of what biblical passage is being commented upon (although Allegro has maintained that Ps. 127:2-3 could be restored in lines 2-3 of the first fragment<sup>114</sup>), and there is consequently very little text that can be reconstructed.

]. [	]	1
] א ל.כ. [	]	2
] א שר יבקשו [	]	3
] נס[חרות מורה הצדק [	]	4
] כו[הן לאחרית הק[ן [	]	5
] [	]	6
] י[ורשי הנחלה [	]	7

1 [.....].[.....] 2 [.....]' lk.[.....] 3 [... ..w]ho looked for [.....] 4 [...the  
hidd]en things of the Teacher of Righteousness [.....] 5 [...the pri]est in the end  
tim[e .....] 6 [.....] <Blank> [.....] 7 [... the ones who] take possession of the  
inheritance of [.....] (4QpPs<sup>b</sup> 1 I:1-7)

Although fragmentary, this passage is important for the link it apparently maintains between the 'Teacher of Righteousness' and 'the pri]est in the end tim[e' (כו[הן לאחרית הק[ן]), though the reconstruction of כו[הן here is uncertain. Unfortunately, even should the reconstruction be correct, since no complete lines of the pesher survive, it is difficult to assess how much material should be reconstructed and thus how closely the two figures should be identified. Is the Teacher of Righteousness himself the 'Priest' as in 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> above, for instance, or are we to take the eschatological reference seriously and thus identify separate figures, perhaps the Priest one to whom the 'hidden things' (נס[חרות) of the Teacher have been revealed? The fragmentary nature of the pesher does not allow us to answer this question.

In the final passage, the fragmentary state of the pesher also obscures a reference to the Teacher.

] פשר הפת[גם [	]	1
] מ[ורה הצד[ק [	]	2

1 [...] the interpretation of the mess[age .....] 2 [... the Tea]cher of  
Righteous[ness .....] (4QpPs<sup>b</sup> 2 I:1-2)

<sup>114</sup> Contrast Horgan, 27, who queries this suggestion.

So fragmentary is this passage indeed that it is not possible to read much more than a reference to the Teacher here. In the *Editio Princeps*, Allegro reconstructed Psalm 127:3b in l. 1 as follows:

[ שֹׁכֵר פְּרֵי הַבֶּטֶן ] פִּשְׁרוֹ הַפְּרִי 1

... 'a reward is the fruit of the womb'. Its interpretation: 'the fruit' [...]<sup>115</sup>

Nevertheless, the reading of הַפְּרִי here is uncertain, and I follow Horgan in reconstructing פִּשְׁרֵי הַפְּתִיגִים (in line with 4QpIsa<sup>a</sup> 2-6 II:26) instead.<sup>116</sup> Ultimately, however, the precise reconstruction of l. 1 is of little consequence given the paucity of the extant material. All that may be observed is a very fragmentary reference to the Teacher of Righteousness in this passage.

#### 4.4 Conclusions

Examining the references to the Teacher of Righteousness in any of the pesharim is ultimately frustrating. 1QpHab, which deals most extensively with the Teacher, only concentrates on him personally in one of the texts (VII:1-5); the remaining references are either to his conflict with the Wicked Priest, the Man of Falsehood, or to his followers, the community. The same picture emerges from other pesharim. Here, the Teacher is again found alongside the Wicked Priest (4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 1-10 IV:7-10) and possibly also the Spouter of the Lie (1QpMic 10 I:2). Meanwhile, those passages which might reveal personal information about him – that is to say those that begin “its interpretation concerns the Teacher of Righteousness” or something similar – are ultimately too fragmented to be of any use.

More positively, the picture of the Teacher in the pesharim does support the imagery elsewhere; predominantly the Teacher’s depiction as one to whom secret knowledge is made known (also found in the Rabbinic material), but also his conflict with the Man of Falsehood (alluded to in CD). When it comes to identifying the Teacher, however, our efforts are hampered by the lack of any direct evidence. It is, as we have suggested, largely through his association with the Man of Falsehood and the Wicked Priest that we uncover any information about the Teacher, and thus any suggestions as

<sup>115</sup> Allegro, DJD 5, 52.

<sup>116</sup> Horgan, 228.

to his identity naturally arise through discussion of these figures, to which we must now turn.

## 5.0 The Man of Falsehood

As we have seen, the Teacher of Righteousness is integrally connected with the opponent of the community referred to as the אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב and commonly translated ‘Man of the Lie’ ‘Man of Lies’. This is almost certainly the same figure as the ‘Spouter of the Lie’ (מְטִיף הַכֹּזֵב) because of the similarity in structure and vocabulary of the two expressions. Nevertheless, neither figure has been dealt with in any real detail in previous studies.

It is true that the Man of Lies features heavily in the reconstruction of Qumran origins proposed by Jerome Murphy-O’Connor (based on earlier works by Jeremias, *Der Lehrer*, 1963, and Stegemann, *Die Entstehung*, 1965). Indeed in the hypothesis he is depicted as the leader of the Essene group at the time of the Teacher’s arrival following his expulsion as High Priest by Jonathan Maccabee in 152 BC.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, the thesis makes no real attempt to properly understand the background of either title or to offer proper exegesis of the relevant passages themselves. Much is taken ‘on spec’. Meanwhile, the larger “Interregnum hypothesis” has come under more recent attack, scarcely offset by Stegemann’s restatement of the hypothesis in the recent publication of his 1993 work *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus* or its English translation of 1998.<sup>2</sup> A different approach is proposed by William Brownlee<sup>3</sup> but, although he does attempt basic exegesis of the passages, like Murphy-O’Connor, no attempt is made to properly understand the origins of the expressions; while his overall argument is flawed by an *a priori* assumption that the Man of Lies is the same figure as the Wicked Priest – and the community’s history reconstructed accordingly.

A new investigation is thus urgently needed, an investigation that will deal seriously with the same exegetical issues we have observed elsewhere – title, biblical background as well as parallels to other Qumran passages – but which is unburdened by the ‘chaff’ of larger historical reconstructions.

---

<sup>1</sup> Murphy-O’Connor, “The Essenes in Palestine,” 94-124, esp. 118ff.

<sup>2</sup> H. Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran*, esp. 147f.

<sup>3</sup> Brownlee, “The Wicked Priest, The Man of the Lies, and the Righteous Teacher – The Problem of Identity,” 1-37.

### 5.1 Meaning and Translation

As with the מורה הצדק of the previous chapter, אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב (and the related מְטַרְף הַכֹּזֵב) is subjected to a number of similar, but subtly different, translations. Any of the following may appear in an article or other work: ‘Man of Lies’ ‘Man of the Lie’ ‘the Liar’ ‘the False One’ ‘Man of Falsehood’ for אִישׁ כֹּזֵב; and ‘Spouter of Lies’ ‘Spouter of the Lie’ ‘Preacher of Lies’ ‘Preacher of the Lie’ ‘False Oracle’ ‘Babbler’ for מְטַרְף הַכֹּזֵב.

Common to both expressions is הַכֹּזֵב a derivative of the *kzb* I root normally translated ‘lie, to tell a lie.’<sup>4</sup> As Mosis points out in his article on כֹּזֵב, however, whereas in most modern European languages ‘lie’ has more of an ethical dimension, Hebrew usage shows that identifying *kzb* I with its modern equivalent is “misleading if not actually wrong.”<sup>5</sup> ‘Telling a lie’ means ‘telling someone something that the teller knows is untrue’, i.e. an intention to *deliberately* deceive another. As Mosis’ inquiries show, however, the primary meaning of *kzb* I is “(objectively) deceptive, false, untrustworthy, false, worthless” and is indicated by the various synonyms to which the root is exposed; including שׁוֹא ‘emptiness, vanity, falsehood’ (Prov. 30:8; Ezek. 13:16ff.), שִׁקָּר ‘deception, disappointment, falsehood’ (Prov. 6:19; 14:5; Isa. 28:15), תְּרֻמִית ‘treachery, fraud, deceit’ (Zeph. 3:13) and הַבֵּל ‘vapour, breath, vanity’ (Ps. 62:10). Substituting any of these terms with *kzb* I, he continues, results in no apparent change in meaning.

The difference between ‘telling a lie’ and ‘telling a falsehood’ ultimately rests on intention and/or knowledge. A speaker may ‘tell a lie’, in which case he is also ‘telling a falsehood’, in that what he is saying is false in the sense that it is not true, and he is at the same time *aware* that it is not true, hence it is also a lie. However, a speaker can tell a falsehood, without also telling a lie, if he is by contrast *unaware* that

<sup>4</sup> A separate root *kzb* II means ‘be abundant, magnificent’, but any link between the two roots can probably be excluded. Cf. Mosis, “כֹּזֵב *kzb* I; כֹּזֵב *kāzāb*; אִכְזָב *’akzāb*; כִּדְבָה *kidbā*; כֹּזְבִי *kozbi*; אִכְזִיב *’akzīb*; כִּזְיִב *kezīb*; כֹּזֵבָא *kōzēbā*,” *TDOT* 7, G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren & Heinz-Josef Fabry (eds.). Trans. David E. Green (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1995), 104-121, esp. 104f.

<sup>5</sup> Mosis, *op. cit.*, 108.

what he is saying is not true. Given the various synonyms, therefore, Mosis proposes ‘falsehood, untrustworthiness, worthlessness’ as the basic meaning of *kzb* I.<sup>6</sup>

We may further observe this basic difference through Hebrew usage. In Num. 23, for instance, Balaam in prophesying to Balak states “God is not a man that he should *lie* (כִּזְבוּ, piel) or a son of man that he should *change his mind* (וַיִּתְנַחֵם, hitpael).” The question is not whether God has intentionally misled Israel, as a translation ‘lie’ would warrant, but whether he would remain faithful to the divine promise. Similarly, Prov. 6:19 (“*a false witness* [עֵד שֶׁקֶר] breathes out *lies* [כִּזְבוֹת]”) might be taken in its modern sense, in that a false witness will intentionally deceive a jury. Again, however, this is not necessarily so. Instead, a false witness is simply a witness whose evidence is false, i.e. wrong, whether accidental or deliberate.

In almost every Hebrew passage, כִּזְבוּ may be better translated by other English terms than ‘lie’.

(a) The אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב

The expression אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב itself almost certainly derives from Prov. 19:22<sup>7</sup>:

תִּאֲמַת אֶדָּם חֶסֶדוֹ וְטוֹב־רֵשׁ מֵאִישׁ כֹּזֵב:

What is desirable in a person is loyalty, and it is better to be poor than a *liar*.

The expression אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב translated ‘liar’ strongly resembles the expression אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב found in the Scrolls; the main difference being the absence of the definite article. Following on from our discussion above, we can see how inaccurate a translation ‘liar’ here, is. Here, it is clear that the expression אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב is contrasted with חֶסֶד ‘steadfast love, faithfulness’ and yet ‘liar’ is not an appropriate antonym. A better translation, then, might be ‘man of untrustfulness’ or ‘faithless man’.

The presence of the definite article in the expression אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב seems to be deliberate, since the reading אִישׁ כֹּזֵב is not found in the DSS. Moreover, the article is also found in the related expression הַכֹּזֵב מְטִירִי (below). Mosis suggests that the presence of the

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 110.

<sup>7</sup> Pardee, *op. cit.*, 172.

definite article here pinpoints a specific historical individual.<sup>8</sup> But that its presence is merely meant to parallel, for example, מורה הצדק, or that contrariwise the article has some greater significance cannot be ruled out. In any case the deliberate inclusion of the article should lead us to reject such translations as ‘man of lies’, i.e. the plural form, since this ignores the definite article.

In translating the expression איש הכזב, then, we should rule out not only ‘man of lies’ but indeed any translation that translates כזב by ‘lie(s)’. Our own translation should echo the non-ethical translation of כזב, thus I follow Driver’s ‘man of falsehood’<sup>9</sup> though recognising that this does not encompass all dimensions of the Hebrew phrase; ‘man of untrustfulness’, ‘man of worthlessness’ etc.

(b) The מטרי הכזב

When we turn to the expression מטרי הכזב, our attention here focuses on the form מטרי. Translated ‘spouter’, מטרי is derived from the root נטף. This has a base meaning ‘drip’ ‘drop’ ‘melt’, and is probably derived from Egyptian *nṯp* ‘sprinkle’. In the Hebrew Bible the root appears on 18 occasions, in no less than five of which it is linked with clouds and rainfall (Judg. 5:4[twice]; Job 29:22; 36:27; and Ps. 68:8 [Heb. 68:9]), and is found alongside שמים ‘heavens’, מים ‘waters’, עב ‘clouds’, מטר ‘rain’, and אר ‘mist’. In other passages the root appears in the sense of mountains dripping sweet wine (Joel 3:18; Am. 9:13), lips dripping honey (Prov. 5:3; compare Song 4:11; 5:13) and hands dripping with myrrh (Song 5:5). The latter almost certainly leads to the development of נטף as ‘resin’ (Exod. 30:34).<sup>10</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Mosis, *op. cit.*, 116.

<sup>9</sup> Driver, *The Judaean Scrolls* (1965). Compare Gaster, *op. cit.*, though in the same work he also translates איש הכזב as ‘man of lies’. ‘Man of Falsehood’ is somewhat better than Cross’s ‘False One’ ‘False Oracle’ where the structure of the original Hebrew is lost. Cf. Cross, *Ancient Library*, 116f.

<sup>10</sup> This usage may also be found in 4QEn<sup>c</sup> Ar (4Q204) XII:28 (following García-Martínez, *DSS:SE*, 1), though the reconstruction is uncertain. Cf. Madl, “נטף *nāṯap*; נטפ *nāṯāp*; נטפ *netep*; נט(י)פוח *nēṯpōṯ*; נטפה *nēṯpā*; נטפתי *nēṯpāṯī*,” *TDOT*, IX, 395-402, esp. 395; J. A. Fitzmyer and D.J. Harrington, *A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts (Second Century B.C. – Second Century A.D.)*, *Biblica et Orientalia*, 34 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978), 64f. (as 4QEn<sup>c</sup> Fr. 1, I:6). (PAM 43.202)



At the same time, separate usage establishes a meaning of נָטַף which relates to prophetic speech. This usage, which is exclusive to the hiphil, is found in five passages (Ezek. 20:46 [Heb. 21:2]; 21:2 [21:7]; Amos 7:16; and Mic. 2:6, 11), in the first three of which it is paralleled by נָבֵא ‘prophesy’ (in the hiphil and niphil forms). The context of these passages does not enable us to specifically identify this dimension of נָטַף, but the NRSV translation ‘preach’ is probably closest to the mark. Koehler-Baumgartner attempt to link these aspects of the root with recourse to the slaving of ecstatic speech, i.e. foaming at the mouth. Nevertheless, Madl rules out any such link, pointing out that none of these texts suggest any sort of ecstatic speech, while in those passages where such prophetic ‘slaving’ is referred to, the verb does not appear. His own suggestion of a link through Job 29:22 (‘my word dripped on them like dew [ויעלימו הטף מלתי]), however, is scarcely much better.<sup>11</sup> A simpler suggestion may be that these roots were originally entirely separate, though certainly by the second century BC a link was perceived between the two different aspects. This, as we shall see, is especially emphasised by the expression מְטִיף הַכֹּזֵב itself.

(i) *Micah 2:11*

The form מְטִיף itself, a hiphil participle, reflects the second root meaning ‘preach’, since this form is found in one of the Micah passages (Mic. 2:11). Thus, NRSV ‘preacher’.

לוֹ-אִישׁ הַלֵּךְ רוּחַ וְשִׁקָּר כֹּזֵב אֵטָף לְךָ לַיּוֹן וְלַשֶּׂכֶר וְהָיָה מְטִיף הָעָם  
הַזֶּה:

If someone were to go about uttering empty falsehoods, saying, “I will preach to you of wine and strong drink,” such a one would be the *preacher* for this people!<sup>12</sup>

This verse appears within the wider context of Mic. 2:6-11, where the prophet criticises Israel’s leaders for failing to appreciate the realities of their situation. He cites their criticisms of him, when they tell him not to preach of calamitous events, for such disgrace will not overtake them (v6; where the נָטַף root is found three times). Like the false prophets of similar passages then (Isa. 30:10; Jer. 5:31; Amos 2:12), they tell the people what they *want* to hear, as opposed to what Israel *needs* to hear.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 399.

Thus the prophet mimics their vain attacks on wine and strong drink in the face of the greater danger (v11). Why harp on at such things when people's very lives are at stake? The passage also works on a deeper level, however. It is surely no coincidence that the terms the prophet uses to characterise their preaching, יין 'wine' and שכר 'strong drink', especially the latter, reflect the real content of their preaching; שקר 'falsehoods' and perhaps the implied אין 'nothing'.

For our purposes, the passage is also interesting since it brings מטיר together with שקר, but more significantly also with כזב; the only such passage in the OT. In other words, both elements of the phrase מטיר הכזב may be traced to this one verse in Micah.

---

מטיר הכזב, then, can mean two things: 'dripper of falsehood' if one follows the association with rainfall; or 'preacher of falsehood' if we follow the parallels of נטף with נבא in the latter stages of the Hebrew Bible. On a strictly literary level, the latter is more likely since, as we can see, the phrase appears to have originated from one of these passages (Mic. 2:11). Nevertheless, this overlooks the clear contrast between the מורה הצדק as 'the one who rains (or pours out) righteousness' (above, p133f.) and the translation of מטיר הכזב as 'dripper of falsehood'. Thus Brownlee:

This language of precipitation makes it antithetical to *môreh haš-sedeq*, "the one who showers righteousness [or, truth]."<sup>13</sup>

This is unlikely to be mere coincidence, especially since the links between ירה and נטף, though not direct, are nevertheless inherent in the parallels to which both are subjected. מטר 'rain' appears alongside both the נטף (Job 36:27) and ירה (Deut. 11:14) roots. This may also be added to our arguments in the previous chapter as to the precise meaning of צדק 'righteousness'. If כזב has a more general meaning 'falsehood' then צדק is more likely to refer to what is 'right' as opposed to what is

---

<sup>12</sup> N.B. the translation 'empty falsehoods' for שקר כזב.

<sup>13</sup> Brownlee, 168. Cf. "Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament," *NTS* 3 (1956-57), 13.

'wrong' or 'false', than to 'righteousness' in its normative sense. In other words, the ethical dimension of either term should be suppressed.

## 5.2 Background

Aside from the scrolls, no references to either an *איש הכוזב* or a *מטיף הכוזב* could be found outside the Hebrew Bible. While it is dangerous to draw conclusions from this, it may be that the expressions are exclusive to the DSS.

### 5.2.1 Qumran Material

Within the scrolls themselves, these expressions are again very rare. Aside from the pesharim, *איש הכוזב* appears in only one passage, in CD, while the *precise* expression *מטיף הכוזב* does not appear at all. Similar (or incomplete) expressions *are* found, although again these are limited to CD. Again, however, we should not impart too much significance to this given the incomplete status of the corpus.

#### (a) Damascus Document

Within CD the *איש הכוזב* appears in MS B XX:13-15 alongside the Teacher of Righteousness (above, pp140f.), while a *מטיף כוזב* (minus the definite article) is referred to in the parallel passages in MS A VIII:12-14 and MS B XIX:24-26. A similar expression *מטיף אדם לכוזב* (lit. 'a preacher of men to falsehood'; a more probable translation would be 'a preacher *to* men *of* falsehood') is found in the parallel passage in MS B XIX:25-26. Otherwise, the 'Preacher' (*מטיף*) is referred to in MS A IV:19-20 (quoting Mic. 2:6, and for which no parallel in the cave 4 fragments has surfaced) while the *נטף* root is evidenced in I:14(=4Q266 2 I:18) alongside the 'man of scoffing' (*איש הלצון*). From these references it is clear that although the full expression *מטיף הכוזב* is rare, the figure is nevertheless important.

Indeed, the 'Preacher' seems to have played an important role. For instance, as 'Zaw' the Preacher is associated with the 'builders of the wall': 'The builders of the wall who follow after Zaw – Zaw is a Preacher as it says "they shall indeed preach" (Mic. 2:6)' (IV:19-20). This passage is exceptionally difficult, and seems to be the base of a complicated process of exegesis within CD. On the one hand, the expression 'who follow after *zaw*' (*אשר הלכו אחרי צו*) derives from Hos. 5:11 where the term

appears alongside a reference to Ephraim<sup>14</sup>; meanwhile, the ‘builders of the wall’ (בִּנְיֵי הַחֵיִץ) which occurs elsewhere (VIII:12ff.) derives from Ezek. 13:10; while finally the author himself cites part of Mic. 2:6 (in relation to the נִטְרָף root). An obvious question concerns the identity of the ‘builders of the wall’. According to CD IV:19 these are caught in two of Belial’s three nets (itself a midrash on the ‘terror pit and snare’ of Isa. 24:17f.): fornication, by taking two wives in one’s lifetime (IV:20-21); and defiling the Temple, by not keeping apart in accordance with the law (V:6ff.). In VIII:12ff., meanwhile, ‘because one who weighs wind and a spouter of falsehood has spouted to them’,<sup>15</sup> God’s anger is aroused against all the congregation of the ‘builders of the wall’ and another group, the ‘smeared of whitewash’ (טַחַרְטַח הַחֵפֶל; again see Ezek. 13:10).<sup>16</sup> A strong link is thus maintained between the ‘Spouter’/‘Preacher’ and the ‘builders of the wall’, who then may be further identified as followers of the Preacher.<sup>17</sup> This receives support in Ezek. 13. Here, ‘prophets who

<sup>14</sup> The term also appears in Isa. 28:10,13, again in association with Ephraim (28:1), and is specifically used to ridicule Israel’s leadership. Cf. p101, n30 above. The meaning of צַר is unclear. The LXX translates τῶν ματαίωσιν ‘worthless’ ‘vanity’ for the term in Hos. 5:11. The parallels in meaning between this and כִּזְב should not be overlooked.

<sup>15</sup> The expression שׂוֹקֵל רוּחַ ‘one who weighs wind’ lends good support to our suggestion above that we refrain from translating אִישׁ הַכִּזְב as ‘man of the lie’. ‘Weighing wind’ has a clear metaphorical sense of ‘futility’ and ‘emptiness’. The precise nuance of אִישׁ הַכִּזְב in this instance is more likely ‘man of vanity’, but I have translated ‘man of falsehood for consistency.

<sup>16</sup> In VIII:18 God’s anger is aroused against those who hate the ‘builders of the wall’, although, due to the difficulties reconciling this with the previous reference, Davies may be right to suggest emendation. Cf. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 255-256.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 111. Although Davies finds (111-113) that the argument at first sight seems reasonable, nevertheless, he concludes that this interpretation conflicts with the overall argument of the *Admonition*. He finds it difficult, for instance, to reconcile the ‘builders of the wall’ with a sectarian group within the wider Jewish community since the point of the passage is to show that Belial is leading Israel astray by pointing to the activities of a representative group. A sectarian group, with which the Jewish community would themselves disagree, would lose this overall aim. Instead, he suggests that the ‘builders of the wall’ are the whole of Israel outside of the community, or, if the sub-group mentality is to be retained, at least depicts the Jewish religious leadership. He does accept, however, that an attempt has been made at a subsequent point to “direct the thrust of this passage against a specific group, an attempt which may be plausibly ascribed to the Qumran community”. Either way, the important aspect for our purposes seems to be that the prophetic expression ‘builders of the wall’ is applied (or re-applied) to a group which maintained some link with the Spouter of Falsehood. This reapplication would doubtless have taken place some time after the split alluded to within CD itself.

For a more literal interpretation of the ‘builders of the wall’ see Winter, “Two Non-Allegorical Expressions,” esp. 39-42. We shall return to this argument further below when we

see false (שוא) visions and utter lying (כזב) divinations' (v9) have 'misled (הטעו) my people, saying, "Peace," where there is no peace; and because, *when the people build a wall* (בנה חייך), these prophets smear whitewash on it' (13:10). The combination of false prophets and the people who build a wall surely recalls the link maintained between the preacher of falsehood and the 'builders of the wall' in CD.

Elsewhere, an important link between this figure and the 'man of scoffing' (איש הלצון) is found in col. I. This figure, the author alleges, 'spouted to Israel waters of falsehood' (הטף לישראל מימי כזב; CD I:14f.), thus retaining both aspects of מטף הכזב.<sup>18</sup> 'Man of scoffing' is not found in the Hebrew Bible, but a close parallel is found in two OT passages which refer to 'men of scoffing' (אנשי לצון; Prov. 29:8; Isa. 28:14). The first passage is especially important since, as we have seen, צו whom CD identifies as the 'preacher', also originates here. Meanwhile, the precise expression אנשי לצון is, as we shall see, twice referred to in one of the pesharim (4QpIsa<sup>b</sup> II:6-7,10), suggesting that the title איש הלצון is specifically created to maintain a link between the אנשי לצון and the איש/מטף הכזב.<sup>19</sup>

The 'men of scoffing' are themselves referred to in MS B XX:11 (again unparalleled in the 4Q fragments), where a strong connection is maintained between this group and the 'men of war' (אנשי המלחמה) who, in l. 14, 'turned back with the Man of Falsehood'; a passage that also affirms a link with the 'Unique Teacher' (above, p140). The 'men of scoffing' are accused of speaking heresy against the ordinances of righteousness and rejecting the covenant affirmed in the land of Damascus (XX:11-12), and as punishment neither they nor their families will be allowed to share in the House of the Law (בית התורה; XX:12). The change in name to 'men of war' reflects

---

consider the reference to the preacher of falsehood in 1QpHab X:9-13, since Winter proposes links between this, the CD passages, and the curse on the builders of Jericho in 4QTestimonia.

<sup>18</sup> Rowley suggests that this reference implies that 'the man of scorn' (i.e. the איש הלצון) is likely a foreign figure and suggests that the title refers to Antiochus Epiphanes (*Zadokite Fragments*, 70 n3). Although we shall discuss the possible historical identities of the איש הלצון and other significant figures in a separate chapter, there is no reason for now to suppose that the reference applies to a foreigner. Indeed, if the relationship between the 'man of scoffing' and the 'man/preacher of falsehood' can be upheld, this suggests that he was in fact a former member of the Qumran community itself.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Davies, *op. cit.*, 187.

the Deuteronomic curse in Deut. 1:26 on those who refused to enter the Promised Land at Kadesh-barnea. Because of their refusal, the LORD's wrath is raised against them and he promises that none of them, barring only Joshua and Caleb son of Jephunneh, will ever enter the land (1:35-36). The Israelites thus travel for a further thirty-eight years, 'until the entire generation of warriors (אנשי המלחמה) had perished from the camp, as the LORD had sworn concerning them' (Deut 2:14). The thirty-eight years parallels the 'forty years' between the 'in-gathering of the Teacher of Righteousness and the end of all the men of war' (CD XX:14).<sup>20</sup> The 'men of war' are thus the same as the 'men of scoffing' and thus the followers of the Man of Falsehood, those who left the community during the schism. The passage also of course confirms the link between the איש הלצון and the מטריף/איש הכזב.

---

CD, then, uses a number of different terms to refer to the same individual or group. The 'man of falsehood' can be identified exegetically with the 'preacher of falsehood' and with the 'man of scoffing'. Meanwhile, the followers of this figure are referred to as 'men of scoffing' (or 'men of the scoffer'), 'builders of the wall' and the 'men of war'. Any examination of the 'man of falsehood' in the pesharim should, then, account for this exegetical range. Clearly, the 'man of falsehood' is also shown in CD as an opponent to the Teacher of Righteousness even though the two only appear together at XX:13-15. The majority of instances where the 'man of falsehood' (or his *alter egos*) appears, suggest a schism within the community precipitated by this figure.

### 5.3 *The Man of Falsehood in the Pesharim*

Within the pesharim, the 'man of falsehood' appears twice, in 1QpHab and 4QpIsa<sup>a</sup>. Meanwhile, aside from a possible reference to the 'preacher of falsehood' in 1QpMic, this expression is confined to a single instance in 1QpHab.

---

<sup>20</sup> Cf. *Ibid.*, 188.

## 5.3.1 1QpHabakkuk

In 1QpHab both the man of falsehood and the preacher of falsehood are referred to, though the latter only once. Several of these passages have already been explored in our previous chapter since a strong link is clearly maintained between this figure and the teacher of righteousness, a figure normally associated with the wicked priest (בוהן הרשע).

In the first instance, we have entirely reconstructed a reference to the man of falsehood, which, as we have set out elsewhere, makes better contextual sense.

[כִּי־אֵל רִשָׁע מִכְתִּיר אֵת הַצַּדִּיק]

...for the wicked surrou]nd the righteous. (Hab. 1:4bα; 1QpHab I:12)

[פִּשְׁרוֹ הַרְשָׁע הוּא אִישׁ הַכּוֹזב וְהַצַּדִּיק] הוּא מוֹרֵה הַצַּדִּיק 13

[Its interpretation: 'the wicked' he is the man of falsehood and 'the righteous' he is the teacher of righteousness. (1QpHab I:13)

As we maintained above (pp163f.), it is preferable to restore 'man of falsehood' over 'wicked priest' since the former reappears as soon as col. II, while the 'wicked priest' does not otherwise appear until col. VIII. Moreover, since we envisage 1QpHab (among other texts) as predominantly relating a conflict between the teacher and the man of falsehood – rather than the wicked priest – it again makes more sense to restore a reference to the man of falsehood here. In itself, however, the passage is of little significance, seeking if anything, to offer a *dramatis personae*.

The next passage, however, is certain and straightaway sets forth an antithesis between the teacher and the man of falsehood.

[רְאוּ בּוֹגְדִים וְהַבִּיטוּ וְהִתְמַהוּ וְהִתְמַהוּ כִּי־אֵל פּוֹעֵל פּוֹעֵל בִּימִיכָם  
לֹא תֵאֱמִינוּ כִּי־אֵל יִסּוּפֵר]

Hab. 1:5; 1QpHab I:16-II:1

[פִּשְׁרֵהּ הַדְּבָר עַל]	הַבּוֹגְדִים עִם אִישׁ	1
הַכּוֹזב כִּי לֹא	[הֵאֱמִינוּ בַּדְּבָרִי] מוֹרֵה הַצַּדִּיקָה מִפִּי־אֵל	2
		3

1QpHab II:1-3. For translation and notes see above, pp145f.

The ‘traitors with the man of falsehood’ here are, as we maintained, one of three groups of ‘traitors’, a term that seems to be drawn directly from the original prophecy (Hab. 1:5). This implies that ‘traitors’ is not the precise term used by the community for their opponents, and that this group is likely referred to elsewhere under a different name. Again, in our earlier chapter we suggested this group might be synonymous with the ‘men of war’ (אנשי המלחמה) from CD XX:13-15 who ‘turned back (שבו) with the man of falsehood.’<sup>21</sup> The ‘traitors’ are clearly former members of the community since they can apparently be expected to maintain faith in the Teacher’s words. No mention of neglecting faith in the Teacher is mentioned of the ‘men of war’ in CD, but if Davies is right, and the expression is an allusion to the refusal of the Israelites at Kadesh-barnea (above, pp192f.), then this is perhaps an example of their not maintaining faith. In any case, within CD XX, as we have seen, a strong link is maintained between the ‘men of war’ and the ‘men of scoffing’/‘men of the scoffer’ (אנשי הלצון) who ‘turned back’ (שבו) because they rejected the new covenant (XX:11-12). ‘Rejecting the covenant’ is here analogous to not maintaining faith in the words of the teacher, albeit wrapped in Deuteronomic language. It is especially applicable to the ‘traitors to the New Covenant’ (הבוגדים בברית החדשה) and the ‘violators of the covenant’ (עריצי הברית), the supposed second and third groups of traitors in 1QpHab II:3,6 respectively.<sup>22</sup> Even if Dupont-Sommer is right and three groups of traitors are referred to in this interpretation of Hab.1:5 – crudely past, present and future groups – it is entirely probable that the *actual* group is the same, the followers of the man of falsehood and their descendants, viewed at different points in both their and the community’s history. Again this distinction may be maintained through the different titles: אנשי הלצון refers to those present with the man of falsehood at his rejection of the covenant; אנשי המלחמה applies to this same group some time after the split, perhaps after the death of the man of falsehood and contemporaneous with the Qumran author(s); while עריצי הברית is perhaps a more general term for the group in a future period. If this understanding is correct, then

<sup>21</sup> Above, p146f.

<sup>22</sup> Above, p146; Dupont-Sommer, “Le Commentaire,” 53, §7. As we can see in our excursus below, the אנשי הלצון are described (with reference to Isa. 5:24) as those “who rejected the Law of the LORD” (4QpIsa<sup>b</sup> II:7). This is again analogous to the actions of the ‘traitors’ in 1QpHab.



clearly the community maintained a much more long-term animosity towards the group inaugurated by the man of falsehood; an animosity, that just as the Qumran community apparently comes into its own (as against the Teacher's) self-government, is centred on the opposite group itself, rather than the 'man of falsehood' in particular. This doubtless explains why, in later texts such as 4QpNah, this opposition is group orientated (the Seekers of Smooth Things, Ephraim, Manasseh etc.), rather than person-orientated (e.g. to the Teacher, man of falsehood).

Excursus: The אנשי הלצון in 4QpIsa<sup>b</sup> II:6,10

It would be useful at this point to digress slightly and discuss the references to the אנשי הלצון – 'men of the scoffer' or 'men of scoffing' – in the pesharim. These are clearly related in some way to the איש הלצון 'man of scoffing' and thus also the איש/מטיף הכזב. The אנשי הלצון are referred to twice in the pesharim, both times in 4QpIsa<sup>b</sup>, within four lines of each other (ll. 6, 10). Because of the short pieces of commentary, and due to the consequent greater emphasis on the biblical text, this has been quoted in full alongside the pesher itself.

<u>הוי משכימי בבקר שכר ירדפו מאחרי בנשף יין</u>	2
<u>ידלקם והיה כנור ונבל ותוף וחליל יין משתיחם ואת פעל יהוה</u>	3
<u>לא הביטו ומעשי ידו לא ראו לבן גלה עמי מבלי דעת וכבדו מתי רעב</u>	4
<u>והמנו צחי צמא לבן הרחיבה שאול נפשה ופערה פיה לבלי חוק</u>	5
<u>וירד הדרה והמנה ושאנה עליז בא אלה הם אנשי הלצון</u>	6
<u>אשר בירושלים הם אשר מאסו את תורת יהוה ואת אמרת קדוש</u>	7
<u>ישראל נאצו על כן חרה אף יהוה בעמו ויט ידו עליו ויכהו וירגזו</u>	8
<u>החרים ותהי נבלתם כסחה בקרב החוצות בכל זאת לא שב</u>	9
<u>[אפו ועוד ידו נטויה] היא עדת אנשי הלצון אשר בירושלים</u>	10
<u>[ ]</u>	11

"Woe to those who when they arise early in the morning, in pursuit of strong drink, who stay late in the evening, by wine<sup>3</sup> inflamed. And there are lyre and harp, and tambourine and flute, the wine of their feasts. But the work of the LORD<sup>4</sup> they did not heed, and the deeds of his hands they did not see. Thus my people have gone into exile for lack of knowledge, and its nobles are dying of hunger,<sup>5</sup> and its multitude is parched with thirst. Thus Sheol has enlarged its appetite and has opened its mouth beyond measure.<sup>6</sup> And its splendour will go down, and its throngs, and its tumultuous crowd exulting in it." (Isa. 5:11-14) These are the men of the scoffer<sup>7</sup> who are in Jerusalem. They are the ones who "rejected the law of the LORD, and the utterance of the Holy One<sup>8</sup> of Israel have

despised. For this reason, the anger of the LORD was kindled against his own people and he stretched out his hand against them and struck them. {The mountains} trembled <sup>9</sup> and their corpses were like refuse in the street. In all this {[his anger]} has not turned away <sup>10</sup> [and his hand is stretched out still" (Isa. 5:24c-25).] This is the congregation of the men of the scoffer who are in Jerusalem <sup>11</sup> [... ...]/[...]/[... ...] (4QpIsa<sup>b</sup> II:2-11)

As we have suggested, אנשי הלצון is generally translated 'men of scoffing' or 'men of the scoffer' – those who propose the latter generally intend to reinforce the link with the איש הצון. The term לצון is derived from לויץ/ליץ, although suggesting a base meaning for the root is difficult.<sup>23</sup> While the modern translators offer 'scoff' 'mock' 'scorn' etc. all these translations seem to derive from the root's counterparts in the Targumim, later Greek versions and (occasionally) Syriac. Instead, the Hebrew parallels and LXX usage suggest that a meaning 'arrogance' 'proud' might be more appropriate. Even this is made difficult, however, by the range of different contexts to which the root is subjected – and especially so by the form מליץ (a Hiphil participle), which has a more *professional* meaning of 'interpreter' (cf. Gen. 43:23; II Chron. 32:31; and Job 33:23); also retained in the scrolls themselves (including seven times in 1QH<sup>24</sup>) in both positive<sup>25</sup> and negative<sup>26</sup> expressions. It is easy to dismiss מליץ as deriving from a separate root, but this does not explain the close proximity of the מליץ דעת, לצים and מליצי תעוה in 1QH X. When translating either אנשי הלצון or איש הצון in the scrolls it is probably better to retain the sense of 'scorn' 'scoff' as the meaning more inherent at the time of the scrolls' composition. Nevertheless, the sense of 'interpretation' should not be overlooked. It is entirely probable that the Qumran author(s) is drawing a deliberate contrast (through their close proximity in the Hodayot) between these two dimensions/usages of the Hebrew root ליץ.

אנשי הלצון itself almost certainly derives from one or more of three OT passages. In Prov. 1:22 the writer questions how long 'scoffers' (Heb. לצים) will delight in their 'scoffing' (לצון), an aspect that is related to how long the 'simple' (פתים) will love

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Barth, "ליץ \*lys; ליץ līs; לץ lēs; לצון lāsōn; מליץ mēlīs," TDOT 7, 547-552.

<sup>24</sup> 1QH X:13, 14, 31; XII:7, 9; XIV:13; XXIII:11.

<sup>25</sup> E.g. מליץ דעת 'interpreter of knowledge' (1QH X:13; 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 1+ I:27).

<sup>26</sup> E.g. מליצי תעוה 'interpreters of error' (1QH X:14); מליצי כוזב 'interpreters of falsehood' (1QH X:31; XII:9).

being simple. Meanwhile, again in Proverbs, 'scoffers' (אנשי לצון<sup>27</sup>) who set a city aflame are contrasted with the wise who turn away wrath (Prov. 29:8); while in Isa. 28:14 the prophet addresses his message to 'the scoffers (אנשי לצון) who rule this people in Jerusalem.' This is perhaps comparable to the reference to the 'men of the scoffer who are in Jerusalem' in 4QpIsa<sup>b</sup>, and suggests that the phrase is drawn directly from this passage in Isaiah. We should not overlook other passages, however, especially Prov. 1 which, through its reference to the 'simple' may be of relevance to the group termed 'the simple' (הפתיאים) in the scrolls.

איש הלצון itself is not itself found in the OT suggesting that this expression derives from the plural form. If we apply this to the scrolls, this might suggest that the אנשי הלצון originally applied to the followers of the 'man of falsehood', eventually personalised to the leader of the group himself.

איש הלצון and אנשי הלצון, then, might be translated 'men/man of pride' 'men/man of arrogance' respectively, while the DSS may perpetuate an underlying sense of 'interpretation', perhaps to rival the Teacher himself. We might also suggest that the expression מליץ דעת found in 1QH X:13 and 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 1-10 I:27 (below) was used in a titular sense at Qumran and, if we are correct in supposing that the איש הלצון = איש הכזב, the איש הלצון may well have been known by this title when at Qumran. Through the antithesis of titles in 1QH, this title comes to be viewed more negatively; ultimately developing into איש הלצון, an expression for which biblical basis could already be found. מליץ דעת seems also to have been retained, perhaps to draw a deliberate contrast between the authoritative interpretation of e.g. the teacher himself, as opposed to the man of falsehood. Thus, the antithesis of איש הלצון and מליץ דעת fits well the antithesis of the מורה הצדק and the מטף הכזב, further suggesting that the מליץ דעת in both 1QH and 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> refers to the 'teacher of righteousness'.

---

<sup>27</sup> As with similar expressions the definite article appears to have been incorporated in the Qumran expression.

In the third 1QpHab passage the man of falsehood is again placed in conflict with the teacher of righteousness, in the House of Absalom passage.

למה תביטו בוגדים ותחריש בבלע רשע צדיק ממנו

Hab. 1:13b; 1QpHab V:8-9

פִּשְׁרוֹ עַל בֵּית אַבְשָׁלוֹם	9
וְאִנְשֵׁי עֲצָתָם אֲשֶׁר נִדְּמוּ בַתּוֹכַחַת מוֹרָה הַצַּדִּיק	10
וְלוֹא עֲזָרוּהוּ עַל אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב אֲשֶׁר מֵאִם אֵת	11
הַתּוֹרָה בַּתּוֹךְ כּוֹל עַצְתָּם	12

1QpHab V:9-12. For translation and notes see above, pp148ff.

To our comments previously, I would add that the fact that the ‘man of falsehood’ is here accused of ‘rejecting the Law’ ties in, not only with the traitors’ rejection of the covenant, but also with a similar accusation levelled against the ‘men of scoffing’ in 4QpIsa<sup>b</sup> II:6ff. (above, Excursus, 14-17). These are said to have ‘rejected the Law of the LORD and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel’ (citing Isa. 5:24c). Similar accusations are levelled against ‘the earth’ in Jer. 6:19, and ‘Judah’ (Am. 2:4):

כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה עַל-שְׁלֹשָׁה פְּשָׁעֵי יְהוּדָה וְעַל-אַרְבָּעָה לֹא אֲשִׁיבֶנּוּ עַל-מִצְוֹתָי  
 אֶת-תּוֹרַת יְהוָה וְחֻקָּיו לֹא שָׁמְרוּ וַיִּתְעוּם כִּזְבִּיָּהֶם אֲשֶׁר-הִלְכוּ אֲבוֹתָם  
 אַחֲרֵיהֶם:

Thus says the LORD: For three transgressions of Judah, and for four, I will not revoke the punishment; *because they have rejected the law of the LORD, and have not kept his statutes, but they have been led astray by the same lies after which their ancestors walked.* (Amos 2:4)

This passage may well have appealed to the pesherist, not merely because of the general theme of rejection of the Law – which ties in more with the ‘men of scoffing’ than the ‘man of scoffing’ himself – but due to the specific accusation that ‘Judah’ were ‘led astray by lies’ (וייתעוים כזביהם). This would echo the events described in the pesharim, i.e. the leading astray of part of the community (‘Judah’) by the ‘man of falsehood’ (‘lies’). Although the accusation in 1QpHab is specifically aimed at the ‘man of falsehood’, the same criticism inevitably holds true for his followers as passages such as 4QpIsa<sup>b</sup> confirm.

Again, the specifics of this ‘rejection of the Law’ are unclear, but inasmuch as the community doubtless considered the teacher of righteousness to be their ‘lawgiver’ (1QpHab II:4-5; VII:4f.) any rejection of his position might fall within the category of

rejection of the law as a whole. Otherwise, more specific ‘rejections of the Law’ might include those described in CD – the fornication and defilement of the Temple levelled against the ‘builders of the wall’ (CD IV-V; above, 189f.) – though it is unclear whether these are intended to be understood metaphorically.

The fourth passage refers to this figure by the more detailed title, ‘preacher of falsehood’, the only definite use of this expression outside of CD.

הוי בונה עיר בדמים ויכונן קריה בעולה הלא הנה מעם  
יהוה צבאות יגעו עמים בדי אש ולאומים בדי ריק ויעפו

Woe to the one who builds a city by bloodshed and establishes a town by iniquity. Is it not, lo, *from*<sup>28</sup> the LORD of Hosts that peoples have toiled only for the sake of fire and nations weary themselves to no avail? (Hab 2:12-13; 1QpHab X:5-8)

פֶּשֶׁר הַדָּבָר עַל מִטִּיף הַכֹּזֵב אֲשֶׁר הִתְעָה רַבִּים	9
לְבָנוֹת עִיר שׁוֹן בְּדַמִּים וְלִקִּים עֵדָה בְּשִׁקֵּר	10
בְּעֵבֹר כְּבוֹדָה לֹוֹגֵיעַ רַבִּים בְּעִבּוֹדָת שׁוֹן וְלִהְרוֹתָם	11
בְּמִנְעֵי שִׁי שִׁקֵּר לְהִיּוֹת עֲמַלָּם לְרִיק בְּעֵבֹר יִבּוֹאוּ	12
לְמִשְׁפָּטֵי אֵשׁ אֲשֶׁר גִּדְּפוּ וַיַּחְרְפוּ אֶת בַּחֲרֵי אֱלֹהִים	13

The interpretation of the passage concerns the preacher of falsehood who led astray many <sup>10</sup> in vain to build a city through bloodshed and setting up a congregation in deceit; <sup>11</sup> on account of its glory making many toil in futile labour and saturating them <sup>12</sup> with works of falsehood so that their labours will come to nothing on account of the fact that they will come <sup>13</sup> to the judgments of fire because they reviled and reproached the chosen of God. (1QpHab X:9-13)

Aside from references to the ‘preacher of falsehood’ in CD, this is the only clear reference to the figure in any of the scrolls. Restoration of the title in 1QpMic is problematic while, as we shall see, it is difficult to restore [מִטִּיף] over [אִישׁ] הַכֹּזֵב in X:17-XI:1. The significance of the relative scarcity of the expression is probably minimal however, since, as we have seen, both expressions almost certainly allude to the same figure.

Here, the ‘preacher of falsehood’ is accused of ‘leading many astray’, an accusation that is very similar to those directed at the man of falsehood in 4QPs<sup>a</sup> 1-10 I:26 (below, p211; further evidence for the two figures to be closely identified together); and, of greater overall significance, to ‘those who lead Ephraim astray’ (מַחְעֵי אֶפְרַיִם);

4QpNah 3-4 II:8) which we earlier expressed to be a euphemism for the Seekers of Smooth Things. Earlier in 4QpPs<sup>a</sup>, ‘those who led astray’ (מתעים; 1-10 I:23) also appear, here alongside ‘those who love laxity’ (א[א]יהבי פרע) where ‘laxity’ is another probable euphemism for ‘smooth things’ (חלקות; above, pp117f.). This suggests that the Seekers of Smooth Things are the ‘leaders astray’ and may be identified with the followers of the man/preacher of falsehood. They are, then, if not the same group itself, doubtless closely associated with the אנשי לצון.

The reference to the building of a ‘city of vanity by bloodshed’ (עיר שוו ברמים; 1QpHab X:10) parallels the building of a ‘city’ by bloodshed in Hab. 2:12. The second half of the equation, the founding of a ‘town’ (קרייה) on iniquity, is itself reflected in the pesher by the setting up of a ‘congregation’ (עדה) by ‘deceit’ (שקר). The whole parallel may be more clearly seen below.

Hab. 2:12	עיר ‘city’	דם ‘blood’	קרייה ‘town’	עולה ‘iniquity’
1QpHab	עיר ‘city’	דם ‘blood’	עדה ‘congregation’	שקר ‘deceit’

The flow of this simple equation is, though, interrupted by the inclusion of שוו ‘vanity’, a variant of שוא,<sup>29</sup> which, as we saw, is one of the parallel terms to כזב itself (above, p184). The phrase עיר שוו is normally translated ‘city of vanity’ (so Brownlee, Cross, Horgan, Vermes etc.) though García-Martínez’s ‘useless city’ has much the same meaning. My own research into biblical usage, however, suggests that ‘in vain’ might be a more suitable translation for שוו. Thus Ps. 127:1, the only passage where the two terms appear together:

אִם־יְהוָה לֹא־יִבְנֶה בַּיִת שׁוֹא עֲמָלוֹ בּוֹנֵיו בּוֹ אִם־יִשְׁמְרֵהוּ עִיר שׁוֹא  
שָׁקֵר שׁוֹמֵר:

Unless the LORD builds the house, those who build it labor *in vain*. Unless the LORD guards the city, the guard keeps watch *in vain*.

<sup>28</sup> This replaces MT מאה though without any apparent change in meaning.

<sup>29</sup> This variant reading (with a second, consonantal, ו) is not found in the Hebrew Bible, although the form שו (with a Hōlem above the waw) is attested in some manuscripts of Job 15:31. Cf. Horgan, 46-47.

Here, the repetition of **שׁוּן** clearly demonstrates that it is those who build or keep watch whose *action* is in vain, not the end result itself. This amounts to a very subtle, but ultimately crucial difference. When applied to the pesher it is not that the people build a city of vanity, but that *in vain* they build a city. This also allows a better parallel between **שׁוּן** and **שִׁקְרָה** in the pesher, terms that are themselves set in parallel in the Hebrew Bible (cf. Ps. 144:8,11). Moreover, when **שׁוּן** is repeated in l. 11, it is the labour that is ‘in vain’ (**בְּעִבּוּרָהּ שׁוּן**), hence my translation ‘futile labour’.

The connection with Ps. 127 here is not accidental. The passage bears strong similarities, on the thematic, not simply linguistic, scale. Thus, the building of a house, if not by the LORD, is ultimately futile. This strongly resembles the building in vain of a city by the preacher of falsehood. Perhaps, as we suggested above, just as the expression ‘man/preacher of falsehood’ does not necessarily hold a pejorative sense (i.e. the differentiation between telling a ‘lie’ and telling a ‘falsehood’), so the suggestion that the building of a city by the community or ‘congregation’ of the preacher may also be non-judgmental. Biblical witness clearly suggests that this is a fruitless task, thus the community themselves do not need to condemn it. The inclusion of **שׁוּן** into the pesher at this juncture forms what we might term a ‘mini-midrash’ between this part of the pesher and Ps. 127:1.

Scholarship is divided over whether the building of this ‘city’ is actual or metaphorical. Thus Brownlee cites Paul Winter and concurs with him that the expression should be taken as ‘non-allegorical’, i.e. literally.<sup>30</sup> Winter has attempted to link the reference here not only to the ‘builders of the wall’ in CD, but also to the curse on the rebuilder of Jericho in 4QTestimonia. Even so, he is forced to recognise what he terms the ‘intrinsic weakness’ of the argument, namely the assumption that the **חִיָּין** and **חִרְמָה** of CD and 4Q175 respectively are synonymous to the **עִיר** of the present passage. This says nothing of the fact that, as we have seen, the understanding of the ‘builders of the wall’ is itself metaphorical in its reliance on a midrash of Ezek. 13. If the reference is literal, then, as with 4Q175, the reference almost certainly applies to either Jerusalem or Jericho; most likely Jerusalem, since this is more likely to be understood by ‘city’ when devoid of context.

More importantly, though, the 'city' derives from Hab. 2:12 combined with a possible midrash on Ps. 127:1. Our focus should instead lie on the reference to the setting up of a 'congregation in deceit' (l. 10b).<sup>31</sup> This represents a change from the biblical reading קרייה found in the prophecy in MT and in l. 6 and gives more of an indication of the real size of the community of the man of falsehood; something more akin to the size of the Yahad itself. We may then regard עיר in the former half of the line as merely intended to maintain a link with the prophecy rather than applying to the term any literal or overblown metaphorical importance.

Before moving on to discuss the second half of the interpretation, we should first reconsider the Hebrew term שקר which appears in both ll. 10 and 12 (במעשי שקר). This is of course the same term that appears in the expression מורה שקר, which Habakkuk uses to refer to false idols (Hab. 2:18; cf. Isa. 9:15). In the preceding chapter we expressed surprise that this expression did not recur in the scrolls, particularly given the obvious contrast with the מורה צדק (Above, pp. 135-138). The use of שקר in these passages, and moreover in relation to the מטריף הכזב, suggests that if the expression is ever found in any of the scrolls in a sectarian context, it should also be taken to refer to the man/preacher of falsehood.

In the latter half of the interpretation (ll. 11-13) more attention is paid to the futile sense of labour. Thus not only do we find (as we have seen) the expressions עבודת שו and מעשי שקר, in ll. 11 and 12 respectively, but also לריק ('in vain'), an adverbial phrase derived from ריק 'make empty' 'empty'.<sup>32</sup> This is drawn directly from Hab. 2:13c: בדי-ריק; '(nations weary themselves) for nothing'. Another aspect of the verse that recurs in the commentary is the suggestion that 'peoples labour only to feed the flames' (ויינעו אמים בדי-אש). In the commentary this is understood by: יבואו למשפטי אש 'they will come to the judgements of fire' (1QpHab X:12-13). The final part of the verse ('Is it not from the LORD of Hosts?' [יהוה]; Hab. 2:13a) seems to be reflected by the rationale for this judgement of fire;

<sup>30</sup> Brownlee, 170. Cf. Winter, *op. cit.*, 39-42.

<sup>31</sup> Note that there is a slightly larger than usual gap between עדה and בשקר in the photograph. If anything, this is most likely a copyist's error. Cf. Horgan, 47.

<sup>32</sup> BDB, 938a.



'because they reviled and reproached the chosen of God' (1QpHab X:13). It is interesting to see how the expression יהוה צבאות is reapplied as a reference to the community, but otherwise the commentary at this point sticks relatively close to the original prophecy, merely seeking to set the passage in this newer context of the conflict between the preacher of falsehood and his community and the community of the teacher.

The fifth and final passage, like the first, rests ultimately on restoration, as only הכזב is extant.

כִּי־אֵל תִּמְלֵא הָאָרֶץ לְדַעַת אֵת כְּבוֹד יְהוָה כַּמִּים יִכְסוּ עַל הַיָּם

For the land will be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the LORD, as the waters cover the sea. (Hab. 2:14; 1QpHab X:14-15)

פֶּשֶׁר הַדְּבַר [אֲשֶׁר]	15
[ ל ] כְּשׁוֹבֵם	16
[ {אִישׁ} ]	17
הַכּוֹזב וְאַחַר תִּגְלֶה לְהֵם הַדַּעַת כַּמִּי	1
הַיָּיִם	2

... The interpretation of the passage [is that] <sup>16</sup> when they return [... .. / ... ..] <sup>17</sup> [... .. {man}] <sub>1</sub> of falsehood. And later knowledge will be revealed to them like the waters cover <sub>2</sub> the sea. (1QpHab X:15-XI:2)

In this passage the main question revolves around whether one should reconstruct הכזב or איש הכזב or מטיף הכזב for X:17-XI:1 since the final three lines of column ten are either partially or entirely obscured. It is of course entirely possible that neither is correct and that either a third title is partially preserved or indeed no person is here referred to and the passage merely refers to a 'falsehood' (כזב). Thus Habermann<sup>33</sup> offers 'waters of falsehood' (מימי הכזב) alluding to the איש הלצון who 'spouted to Israel waters of falsehood' in CD I:14 (above, p191).<sup>34</sup> Most scholars, though, would accept that the pesherist is here referring to either the preacher or man of falsehood.

<sup>33</sup> A.M. Habermann, *Megilloth Midbar Yehuda: The Scrolls from the Judean Desert, Edited with Vocalisation, Introduction, Notes and Concordance* (Maḥbaroth le-Sifruth: Jerusalem, 1959). Cf. Brownlee, 176.

<sup>34</sup> As Brownlee notes, however, כזב is here presented without the article so an allusion to this passage may not be appropriate. Cf. Brownlee, 176.

In favour of the restoration **מְטִיף הַכֹּזֵב** ‘preacher of falsehood’, this title is, as we have observed, evidenced elsewhere in col. X; indeed it is found in the pesher immediately preceding. Contextually, then, **מְטִיף הַכֹּזֵב** offers the better alternative. As we have observed, however, ‘man of falsehood’ is the more common *titular* expression. Although the **נָטַף** root is found more frequently in CD, while ‘man of falsehood’ is evidenced only once, when the pesharim are included, ‘man of falsehood’ occurs in five clear instances, compared to only two clear references to the ‘preacher of falsehood’. This is hardly the most overwhelming evidence. Nevertheless, our argument for the exegesis of the title to incorporate links with the ‘man of scoffing’ in CD holds true here. ‘Man of falsehood’ allows the two titles **אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן** and **מְטִיף הַכֹּזֵב** to be drawn together, and suggests that this is the expression that came to be generally used of the teacher’s opponent. It is, then, ultimately for this reason that I restore **אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב** over **מְטִיף הַכֹּזֵב**.

Nevertheless, the alleged reference to the ‘man of falsehood’ forms only a small part of the pesher to Hab. 2:14. Unfortunately, only a small part of the interpretation survives, the partial reference to the ‘man of falsehood’ itself, and the commentary in lines 1-2 which bears a marked similarity to the original passage itself:

Hab. 2:14:           And the earth will be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the LORD, like the waters cover the sea.

1QpHab XI:1-2: And later knowledge will be revealed to them like the waters cover the sea.

While similar, the two passages are not identical. Thus two important elements are absent from the pesher: the ‘earth’ (**הָאָרֶץ**) and the ‘glory of the LORD’ (**אֵת־כְּבוֹד יְהוָה**). Both elements are found in the citation of Hab. 2:14 in X:14-15, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that these aspects of the verse may have been covered in the now missing lines 16 and 17 (see further below). Otherwise the wider implication of this is that the Qumran pesherist saw fit to separate out the Hebrew phrase **לְדַעַת** לְדַעַת **אֵת־כְּבוֹד יְהוָה** ‘knowledge of the glory of the LORD’ into two distinct parts; ‘knowledge’ and ‘glory’. Hence the reference to **אָחֵר** ‘later’ in XI:1.

Otherwise, the only part of the pesher that survives is the introductory expression **פֶּשֶׁר הַדְּבָר** (X:15) – which is almost certainly part of the larger expression **פֶּשֶׁר הַדְּבָר**

הדבר אשר – and בשׁוֹבֵם (l. 16) the initial part of the commentary. Brownlee links the latter expression with CD XX:10, 14ff. which refers to the ‘turning aside’ of the men with the man of falsehood:

They shall receive the same judgment as their companions *who turned back* <sup>11</sup> with the ‘men of scoffing’ ... From the day <sup>14</sup> when the Teacher of the community was gathered in until the ‘disappearance of all the men of war’ who turned back <sup>15</sup> with the Man of Falsehood is about forty years. And during that period the anger of God will be aroused <sup>16</sup> against Israel ... And all who have transgressed the limits of the law among those who have entered the covenant; when the glory of God appears <sup>26</sup> to Israel, they shall be cut off ‘from the mid[st] of the camp,’ and with them all the evildoers of <sup>27</sup> Judah in the days of its trials. (CD XX:10-11, 13-16, 25-27; Davies [my italics])

This leads him to offer the following reconstruction and translation of ll. 15-17 (he uses double bracketing to indicate the more tentative aspects):

פֶּשֶׁר הַדָּבָר [אֲשֶׁר]	15
בְּשׁוֹבֵם מִנְתִּיבוֹת צְדָק יַחֲרָה אֵף אֵל ל [בְּהֵם כִּי־אֵל]	16
[בְּהוֹפֵעַ כְּבוֹדוֹ לְיִשְׂרָאֵל יִכְרְתוּ הַשָּׂבִים עִם אִישׁ]	17

The prophetic meaning of the passage is [that] <sup>16</sup> when they turn aside [[from the paths of righteousness, the wrath of Go]]d [[will be kindled against them; for <sup>17</sup> when His glory shines out to Israel, they who turned aside with the Man of]] {Lies} [[will be cut off]]. (Brownlee, 174)

Brownlee’s reconstruction is certainly inviting. The reconstruction maintains links not only with the CD passage, but also with the original prophecy, through the revelation of God’s ‘glory’ (כְּבוֹד). As we noted above, this is omitted from the approximate citation of the verse in XI:1-2 and, Brownlee concludes, must have already been interpreted in the preceding part of the pesher. The other aspect of the biblical verse that is omitted is reference to ‘the land’ (הָאָרֶץ). CD intimates that God’s anger will be aroused against ‘Israel’ (i.e. those outside the community) and this is how Brownlee interprets ‘the land’ in the pesher as well.<sup>35</sup> Brownlee’s reconstruction also of course supports the restoration of אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב over מְטִיף הַכֹּזֵב since it is the former who appears in the parallel passage. My only concern relates to the reference here to the ‘paths of righteousness’ ([מִנְתִּיבוֹת צְדָק]).

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Brownlee, 176.

Concerning the reconstruction of the *mem* after בשובם, l. 16: Brownlee initially restored a *mem* here, though he later changed this in favour of an *ayin* (in [ע]ם איש) 'with the Man of the Lie'), before finally returning to a *mem* as suggested by the colour photographs.<sup>36</sup> These photographs show two faint traces of the upper part of a letter, which could correspond to the very tip of the two upper strokes of an *ayin* or *aleph* (as others have suggested), although both should be ruled out since the gap between the upper strokes of these letters is much wider than is available here. *Mem* remains the best suggestion since the upper part of the letter consists of a horizontal bar with a 'kick' upwards and to the left (compare תמלא in l. 14), the left and right extremities of which would be visible in the photograph. Nevertheless, the evidence is scarcely damning and in truth the traces could fit anything! As concerns the full reading [מ]נתיבות צדק, Brownlee derives this from a reference in CD I:16 (alongside the 'man of scoffing'):

... when the 'man of scoffing' arose who spouted waters of deceit to Israel <sup>15</sup> and led them astray in a wilderness without way, to bring low the everlasting heights and to turn aside <sup>16</sup> from the paths of righteousness (ולסור מנתיבות צדק) and to remove the boundary ... (CD I:14-16; Davies)

Unfortunately this reference follows סור rather than שוב although both terms seem to have the same overall meaning of 'turn aside'. In fact, the only instance of בשובם itself being followed by a *mem* arises in 4QpIsa<sup>a</sup> 2+ II:18 where the term is followed by ממדבר 'from the wilderness' though this is probably a reference to the community rather than to its opponents. If the *precise* wording of the lines in question is unclear, however, the general suggestion is not. As in previous passages, the pesher speaks of those who turned aside with the man of falsehood and suggests some element of final judgement upon them, following which the knowledge of God will be revealed to those who remain, the community.

---

<sup>36</sup> Cf. J.C. Trever, *Scrolls from Qumran Cave I: the Great Isaiah Scroll, the Order of the Community, the Pesher to Habakkuk from Photographs* by John C. Trever, F.M. Cross, D.N. Freedman, J.A. Sanders, eds. (The Albright Institute of Archaeological Research and the Shrine of the Book, Jerusalem, 1972).

## Conclusions

In 1QpHab, then, a clear picture is given of opposition between the man of falsehood and the teacher of righteousness. In three of the five passages we have examined, the man of falsehood is depicted alongside the teacher, in two of these in which an obvious conflict exists between the two figures. In this respect, then, the picture in 1QpHab supports that of CD and to a certain extent the Teacher Hymn in 1QH. The pesher also supports CD's depiction of the man of falsehood as the head of a rival group, the 'men of war', depicted in 1QpHab as 'traitors'. The size of this group is unclear, but because the pesherist uses the same term as that used of his community to refer to the man of falsehood's group (i.e. ערדה; X:10), we may speculate that the group is approximately similar in size to the Qumran community itself. As we understand it, the reference to the 'city' (עיר) in the same passage derives from the prophecy and is not intended literally. The text also suggests (and so supports CD) that the man of falsehood was a former member of the community. We reach this conclusion in two ways: first, for the man of falsehood's group to be 'traitors' they must first have betrayed someone or something, i.e. the teacher and his community since 'they did not maintain faith in the words of the teacher...' (II:2); and second, since the conflict observed by the House of Absalom (V:9-12) takes place 'in the midst of their whole congregation', one must either assume the man of falsehood was himself a member, or find a compelling reason why he should have been so bothered by such a small group.

In short, then, 1QpHab supports the picture in CD, although in line with our arguments concerning the evolution of the relevant expressions, sidelines 'preacher of falsehood' in favour of 'man of falsehood'.

### 5.3.2 1QpMicah

In 1QpMic הכזב מטיף 'preacher of falsehood' is often restored on one occasion alongside the 'teacher of righteousness'. The presence of the 'preacher' in 1QpMic is perhaps unsurprising, given the close association between both נטיף root – and the specific form מטיף itself – and the Micah prophecies (above pp186ff.), but the restoration may not be properly substantiated to any degree. To indicate the tentative

nature of the reconstruction, then, we have highlighted the relevant section in red. A photograph of the fragment may be seen below.

.. [ ] .. מ	2
הפ[תאים	3
הלוא ירושלים פשרו על [ מו[ר]ה הצדק אשר הוא	4
] ולכ[ו]ל המתנדבים לוסף על בחירי	5
[ א]ל עושי התורה [ בעצת היחד אשר ינצל[ו]ן מיום	6
המשפט	7

1QpMic 10 I:2-7. For translation and notes see above, p170.

As we have suggested, there is no explicit reference here to the ‘preacher of falsehood’, though several scholars reconstruct the title at the end of line 2. In the preliminary publication, Milik transcribed the words in question (l. 2 = Milik’s frg. i:3) as מיטיף כזב, i.e. with an additional י, while at the same time excluding the definite article ה; what he terms “*une modification intentionnelle*.”<sup>37</sup> Nevertheless, in the *Editio Princeps*, this reading is changed to the more normative spelling מטריף הכזב (8-10 I:4), though with a marker over the ט and ה to indicate the difficulty of the reading.<sup>38</sup> This restoration was followed by Brownlee (203), Gaster (*Scriptures*, 229), Sutcliffe (*The Monks of Qumran*, 179) among others; and more recently by García-Martínez (*DSS:SE*, 1, 8-9) and Vermes (*CDSSE*, 472). Only Horgan and Carmignac (*Notes*, 516) note the difficulty of this reading (which can be seen in the photograph below) and do not restore.

<sup>37</sup> J.T. Milik, “Fragments d’un midrash de Michée dans les manuscrits de Qumrân,” *RB* 59 (1952), 412-418, esp. 414f.

<sup>38</sup> “Commentaire de Michée” (J.T. Milik). J.D. Barthélemy and J.T. Milik (eds.), *Qumran Cave I* (DJD 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955), 77-80, esp. 78 (frs. 8-10), and Pl. XV.



Figure 3: 1QpMic fr. 10 (PAM 40.437 [enhanced])

As the photograph shows, although the first letter is quite clearly a *mem*, none of the other letters can be read with any certainty.<sup>39</sup> The letters at the top-left of the fragment may read *bet zayin kaph*, but this is unclear, especially in the DJD photograph. Moreover, if we accept that the letter immediately to the right of these letters is a final *pe*, this leaves a very large gap for *tet* and *yod*, especially since the first part of the *tet* can allegedly be made out immediately to the left of the *mem*. The large gap may incidentally partially account for Milik's original inclusion of an extra *yod*.

Given the uncertainty of the reading, then, we must also question Milik's fuller reconstruction: אשר הואה יתעה את ה [פתאים] 'the Prophet of Lies [who led astray the S]imple' (my translation). It is not difficult to see how Milik arrives at this restoration. The introductory phrase אשר הואה parallels the introduction of the teacher in l. 4, while the תעה root evokes both 'Jacob's transgression' (פשע יעקוב; Mic. 1:5b) and of course use of the same root in terms of the Seekers of Smooth Things and (the Simple of) Ephraim in 4QpNah.<sup>40</sup> Reference to 'the simple' (הפתאים) is itself difficult since the first two letters are not extant, though the same word – though never in full – may be restored in frs. 7 (7 I:3) and 20-21 (20-21 I:1).

<sup>39</sup> Thus for the letter immediately after מ, Carmignac rules out ט but offers ו, ז, ח, ץ or ת in its place (there appears to be a vertical line of a letter preserved). Cf. Carmignac, *Notes*, 516.

Nevertheless, the paucity of the reading immediately after על פשרו in l. 2 makes actual confirmation of the reconstruction problematic, as the passage ultimately depends on identification of the מטריף הכוזב.

The pesher clearly anticipates some antithesis, however. Although reference to ‘the simple’ could be neutral (as in the expression פתאזי יהודה; 1QpHab XII:4), it is more likely that the community’s opponents are here referred to, especially when the relationship between the prophecy and the pesher is explored. Brownlee argues, for example, that the ‘preacher of falsehood’ understands ‘Jacob’ in the prophecy, while ‘Samaria’ stands for ‘the simple’. In the next pesher this is extended so that the reference to ‘Judah’ in Mic. 1:5c (l. 3) is applied to the teacher himself. Brownlee is only half right. It is more likely that Jacob is instead a reference to the community, as ‘Israel’, and that the פשע יעקוב be understood as ‘rebellion *against* Jacob’, i.e. referring to those who left the community, the simple who were led astray. This retains much the same sense as Brownlee’s understanding, but does not necessitate a reference to the ‘preacher’, the evidence for which is not apparent.

The insistence on a link between the preacher of falsehood and the teacher in this passage has led to the passage as support for those suggestions which press a close relationship between the two figures. As we can see, however, the evidence for reconstructing a reference to the מטריף here is not self-evident and it is better not to restore. However, this need not have a detrimental effect on the overall meaning of the passage, which, when the biblical evidence is examined, does fit into this general milieu of conflict between the teacher and the man/preacher of falsehood, and their respective communities.

### 5.3.3 4QpPsalms<sup>a</sup>

Within 4QpPs<sup>a</sup>, the man of falsehood is referred to on two occasions, in cols. one and four. The preacher is nowhere found, however.

[דו]ם ל[יהוה ו]התחולל לו ואל תחר במצליח דרכו באיש  
[עושה] מזמות

<sup>40</sup> See pp103ff.



[Be silent] before [the LORD and] wait patiently for him. And do not be angry with the one who makes his way prosperous or the man who [carries out] evil plans. (Ps. 37:7; 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 1-10 I:25-26)

[פִּשְׁרוֹן עַל אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב אֲשֶׁר הִתְעָה רַבִּים בְּאִמְרֵי	26
שֶׁקֶר כִּיֹּא בַחֲרוֹ בַקְלוֹת וְלוֹא שִׁמְנָעוֹן לְמַלְיָן דַּעַת לְמַעַן	27
יִוָּבְדוּ בַחֲרָב וּבִרְעָב וּבִדְבַר	1

... Its [interpretation] concerns the man of falsehood who led astray many with words <sup>27</sup> of deceit; for they chose empty words and [did] not list[en] to the interpreter of knowledge so that , they will perish by the sword, and by famine, and by plague. (4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 1-10 I:26-II:1)

In this passage, rather than the usual antithesis of the man of falsehood with the teacher of righteousness, the אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב is here contrasted with the 'interpreter of knowledge' (מַלְיָן דַּעַת). As we suggested above (pp195ff.), מַלְיָן here derives from the same root as לְצוֹן – inherent in both expressions אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן and אֲנָשִׁי הַלְצוֹן. Meanwhile, the form מַלְיָן (also plural מַלְיָנִי) is found in 1QH X in both positive and negative references. Although, as we pointed out מַלְיָן is found on several occasions in the Hebrew Bible, the precise construction מַלְיָן דַּעַת is not found. This, and the lack of any equivalent expression in other Jewish literature, suggests that the construction is peculiar to Qumran.

The 'man of falsehood' is here accused of leading many astray, the same accusation as levelled against the 'preacher of falsehood' in 1QpHab (X:9-13; above, 199ff.; compare the Seekers of Smooth Things in 4QpNah). There the commentary focuses on the effects of this 'leading astray' (i.e. 'to build a city through bloodshed...'; 1QpHab X:10f.). Here, however, the focus is more on the method involved, i.e. 'with words of deceit' (בְּאִמְרֵי שֶׁקֶר; I:26-27). This is further explained by the 'empty (or 'worthless') words' (בַּקְלוֹת) which 'they (i.e. 'the many') chose', also contrasted with (not) listening to the interpreter of knowledge. The precise phrase בְּאִמְרֵי שֶׁקֶר is found in Isa. 32:7 where it refers to the ruination of 'the poor' (עֲנֻיִם) by the wicked devices created by villains. Thus the ruination of the poor is directly contrasted to the leading astray of the 'many' in the present passage. While this may be simply coincidence it would be wrong to overlook the reference. Meanwhile, of course, the expression also parallels the 'waters of falsehood' (מִיַּמי כֹּזֵב) which, according to CD I:14, the אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן spouted to Israel. Since 'spouting' here seems to refer to some aspect of teaching, the 'waters of falsehood' stand for what is taught and as a value

judgement. Exactly the same, then, as ‘words of deceit.’ Thus, ‘the many’ paid no heed to (the teachings of) the interpreter of knowledge, listening instead to the empty words of the man of falsehood and were thus led astray by him. The parallels between this and the split between the man of falsehood and the teacher of righteousness (almost certainly leading to a split in the community itself), then, suggest that the interpreter of knowledge is synonymous with the teacher himself.

The result is that ‘they will perish by the sword, and by famine, and by plague’ (II:1), which, as Horgan notes, is the only place in the pesharim where the three nouns occur together, but which as the biblical evidence clearly shows is a standard punishment to be meted out.<sup>41</sup> More significantly, with the exception of only one of these passages, this punishment is reserved for the House of Israel herself. Thus, since the House of Israel may also stand for the community itself, this passage further evidences that the group who were led astray by the man of falsehood were one-time members of the Qumran community.

The second passage is more fragmentary.

[ראי]תי רשע עריין ומתעלה כארזי הלבנון ו[אעבור על  
מקומו] והנה איננו וא[בקשהו] ולוא [נמצא]

I have [seen] the wicked one oppressing and tower[ing like the cedars of Lebanon].<sup>42</sup> Again I passed by his p[la]ce<sup>43</sup> but I[o] he was [not] there. Though I [sought for him] he could not [be found.](Ps. 37:35-36; 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 1-10 IV:13-14)

פשרו] על [אי]ש הכזב [אשר] [...] [...] על בח[יר]י אל 14  
ויב[קש] לשבית את

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Horgan, 204; Pardee, *op. cit.*, 172-173. Similar expressions include: החרב והרעב ‘sword and famine’ (4QpIsa<sup>b</sup> II:1); ברעב ובדבר ‘famine and plague’ (4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 1-10 III:4). Other passages merely use one of the terms in isolation. In the MT, the three terms are associated on fifteen occasions in Jeremiah (14:12; 21:7,9; 24:10; 27:8,13; 29:17,18; 32:24,36; 34:17; 38:2; 42:17,22; & 44:13), seven times in Ezekiel (5:12,17; 6:11,12; 7:15; 12:16; & 14:21), and once each in I and II Chronicles (I Chron. 21:12; II Chron. 20:9).

<sup>42</sup> Although MT reads ומתערה כאזרח רענן ‘? like a native tree of luxuriant growth’ (from ערה ‘be bare, be nude’ makes no sense contextually), commentators suggest emendation to ומתעלה כארזי הלבנון ‘towering like the cedars of Lebanon’ in line with LXX (ἐπαιρόμενον ὡς τὰς κέδρους τοῦ Λιβάνου) and Vg. Since the MT makes little or no sense, and especially given the parallel expression לבנון ארזי in 4QpIsa<sup>c</sup> 8-10 I:2-3 in both the citation and commentary of Isa. 14:8, I follow the emendation. Cf. Allegro, DJD 5, 19-20 and Pl. VII; Horgan, 113.

<sup>43</sup> על מקומו is not found in the MT.

לעשות [מ]מנו משפט [כריא] ... ] . מ . [ ... ] 15  
 הזיר ברד רמה  
 ... [ ... ] 16

... Its interpretation] concerns the [ma]n of falsehood [who ...]...[... ] concerning the cho[se]n of God [and he shall se]jek to put an end<sup>44</sup> to the <sup>15</sup> [ ... ] . m . [ ... ] to carry out judgment [ag]ainst him [for] he acted with high-handed arrogance <sup>16</sup> [ ... ] ... (4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 1-10 IV:14-16)

The reference here to the אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב is itself admittedly fragmentary and thus difficult. In his 1963 article,<sup>45</sup> Stegemann remarked that the remnants of three letters plus the definite article are preserved, and that the third of these letters best resembles a *shin*. This leads him in the notes to suggest the cautious restoration of אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב “Lügenmannes”, though he resists this in both the transcription and translations themselves.<sup>46</sup> This transcription has been adopted by the majority of scholars, including: Allegro (*DJD* 5), Horgan (*Pesharim*), Pardee (“Restudy”), Vermes (*CDSSE*) and García-Martínez (*DSS:SE*). A reference here to the ‘man of falsehood’ also fits in with the biblical passage here being interpreted (Ps. 37:35-36), which refers to the ‘wicked’ (רשע).<sup>47</sup> While it might be interesting to suppose that the pesherist was, through this passage referencing the ‘disappearance’ of the man of falsehood, as Stegemann rightly points out, there is no evidence of this.<sup>48</sup>

‘Lebanon’ (should it be restored) is as here (‘the chosen of God’) elsewhere referred to the community (1QpHab XII:3-4), although the interpretation of ‘Lebanon’ in the DSS is scarcely uniform.<sup>49</sup> The only other aspect of the OT which is repeated in the pesher is the root בִּקֵּשׁ ‘seek, search’ part of which survives in l. 14 in the expression

<sup>44</sup> Reading לשבית as an infinitive from שבת ‘to cease, end’ (Cf. וּלְשַׁבֵּית; Amos 8:4). Others restore לשבות (Stegemann) from שבה ‘take captive’; and לשבוע (Carmignac) from שבע ‘swear’. Stegemann dismisses the latter (“Der Pešer,” 255, n. 115) since the photographs suggest both an upright and upper horizontal bar on the letter, and best resembles a ה.

<sup>45</sup> H. Stegemann, “Der Pešer Psalm 37 aus Höhle 4 von Qumran (4 Q p Ps 37),” *RevQ* 4 (1963), 235-70. Cf. Stegemann, “Weitere Stücke von 4 Q p Psalm 37, von 4 Q Patriarchal Blessings und Hinweis auf eine unedierte Handschrift aus Höhle 4 Q mit Exzerpten aus dem Deuteronomium,” *RevQ* 6 (1967), 193-227, esp. 193-210; Horgan, 193f.

<sup>46</sup> Stegemann, “Der Pešer,” 254, 268.

<sup>47</sup> As we have seen, רשע is identified by the ‘man of falsehood’ in several other pesher passages; so 1QpHab V:11 (and perhaps also I:13).

<sup>48</sup> Stegemann, “Der Pešer,” 269, n. 200: “Aber von einem Dahinschwinden dieses «Lügenmannes», wie es im pešer zum gleichzeitig zitierten Vers Ps 37, 36 geschildert sein müsste, hören wir nirgends.

<sup>49</sup> Wood, 140-145.

את [ויב]קש לשבית although the text breaks off at this point. Again Stegemann is right that we cannot know either the subject or object of לשבית (in ll. 14 and 15 respectively).<sup>50</sup> In restoring the latter half of line 15 I have followed Pardee, who has himself adopted an earlier reading by Strugnell.<sup>51</sup> Restoring ממנו here contrasts sharply with Horgan's more cautious reconstruction (following Allegro, DJD 5): עי.[...]משפט<sup>52</sup> Both the DJD photograph (Pl. XVII) and PAM 43.417 of fr. 8 are somewhat unhelpful, but infra-red photography of the relevant section in another photograph (PAM 42.509) suggests that the restoration of ממנו is preferable.

The expression הזיר ביד רמה<sup>53</sup> which we have translated 'acted with high-handed arrogance' (l. 15) is not found in the Hebrew Bible. The root זרד/זיר 'seethe, act proudly' is itself rare in the MT, where it is mostly used of Israel's rebellion against God – particularly Deuteronomy (1:43; 17:13; & 18:20) and Nehemiah (9:10,16,29). None of the expressions seems directly drawn from Ps. 37:35-36, but may perhaps be explained by a variant reading in the Septuagint. Originally, Carmignac had suggested that in the citation of Ps. 37:35 in line 13 the text might have read עלין from עלין 'rejoice, exult' rather than עריין 'awe-inspiring, terror-striking' thereby paralleling both LXX (ὑπερψοῦμενον) and Vg. (*superexaltatum*).<sup>54</sup> Although Horgan has rightly rejected this (the *resh* is clear),<sup>55</sup> the presence of הזיר ביד רמה in the interpretation favours the LXX reading ('exultation' better fits 'arrogance' than 'terror-striking'). I thus propose a possible *Qere-Kethibh* reading on behalf of the Qumran author. That is to say, although the pesherist uses MT עריין (the 'Kethibh') in the biblical citation, he is clearly aware of an alternative reading עלין (the 'Qere'), and imparts this sense in the interpretation.

The passage has been compared to two passages in 1QpHab. Stegemann has compared it to XI:4-8, which mentions the 'conflict' between the Teacher of

<sup>50</sup> Stegemann, "Der Pešer," 269, n. 201

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Pardee, *op. cit.*, 166; Strugnell, "Notes," 216.

<sup>52</sup> The fragment would have been unavailable to Stegemann (and other early commentators) and thus he does not restore.

<sup>53</sup> This phrase is almost completely obscured in most photographs, including the DJD volume. See instead PAMs 41.793 and 42.627.

<sup>54</sup> Carmignac, *Les Textes*, 2, 126.

Righteousness and Wicked Priest ('Frevelpriester') on the Day of Atonement, specifically as to whether the missing aspects of the interpretation, esp. of Ps. 37:36 and 'he could not be found', might speak of the 'end' of the Wicked Priest. Ultimately, however, he questions the validity of comparing two texts that refer to two different figures, the 'Wicked Priest' and the 'man of falsehood'.<sup>56</sup> The issue of the separate identity of these two figures has also been raised by Callaway, who suggests that the current passage "clouds the issue" since an almost identical statement is said of the latter in 1QpHab XII:2-3; part of the same pesher as introduces the interpretation of 'Lebanon' (above).<sup>57</sup>

פֶּשֶׁר הַדְּבָר עַל הַכּוֹהֵן הַרְשָׁע לְשַׁלֵּם לוֹ אֶת      2  
גְּמוּלוֹ אֲשֶׁר גָּמַל עַל אֲבוֹיָנִים      3

<sup>2</sup> The interpretation of the passage concerns the wicked priest, to repay to him <sub>3</sub> his due which he heaped on the poor. (1QpHab XII:2-3)

He also links the passage with the reviling and reproaching of the 'chosen of God' at the hands of those led astray by the 'spouter of falsehood' in 1QpHab X:13. The link with the latter passage is certainly understandable, but the former is frankly inexplicable. That passage *may* be read as the community – understood as elsewhere by אֲבוֹיָנִים – describing some form of revenge against the wicked priest for his actions against them. No details of this revenge are given there, however, and the general nature of the reference provides no basis on which to base an understanding of either 1QpHab X:13 or the current passage, not least due to the textual difficulties of the latter, and especially given the prominence that we assign to the separate identifications of the two figures. In short, there is nothing to prevent the two being entirely separate.

### Conclusions

4QpPs<sup>a</sup> is at the same time enigmatic and revelatory – revelatory insofar as it supports the link between the 'man of falsehood' and the 'preacher of falsehood' in other documents. We can never definitely say that the two are the same, because the underlying question remains – why does the pesherist use two different expressions? –

<sup>55</sup> Horgan, 223.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Stegemann, "Der Pešer," 269, n. 201.

<sup>57</sup> Callaway, *op. cit.*, 153,

but inasmuch as one can ever be convinced in Qumran studies the parallels between the passages must argue in favour of the unified identity of the two figures. The pesher also, like 1QpHab, helps identify the man of falsehood as one of the chief opponents of the Teacher of Righteousness. Although, unlike 1QpHab, the two figures do not appear in the same interpretation, as we have suggested, the ‘interpreter of knowledge’ is almost certainly synonymous with the Teacher. One might add that the identification of the man of falsehood with the preacher of falsehood sets a precedent for the multiple identifications of characters within the community’s history. Otherwise the pesher is enigmatic, especially when one comes to interpret the second passage. Part of the problem here must lie with the original (slow) publication of the text in the early years, inevitably resulting in confusion. Nevertheless, the fragmentary nature of the text has not helped, especially by (in col. IV) breaking off at those points where one is anticipating important information will be divulged – such as the lack of either a subject or object of לְשִׁבִיחַ in IV:14.

#### 5.4 Conclusions

The ‘man of falsehood’ appears in two of the more important pesharim, 1QpHab and 4QpPs<sup>a</sup>, and may be considered synonymous with the ‘preacher of falsehood’, who – aside from a sole reference in 1QpHab – has been restored in 1QpMic, a restoration which we have been unable to support. As with other expressions employed by the pesherist the titles themselves are clearly significant. Although they are not known in Jewish literature or later texts both expressions are drawn directly from the MT. More could be learned from the Hebrew usage. ‘Preacher of falsehood’ (Heb. מְטִיף הַכֶּזֶב) is particularly important since the base meaning of the מְטִיף root ‘spout’ neatly parallels the root meaning of יָרָה ‘pour out’ in the expression מוֹרָה הַצֶּדֶק. These points are essential for any proper discussion of the Qumran texts.

In dealing with the texts themselves, aside from the pesharim, the titles are only found in CD, where surprisingly it is the ‘preacher of falsehood’ (or at least usage of the מְטִיף root) that dominates; the ‘man of falsehood’ himself appearing only once. Within CD, as we observed, this figure plays an important role, is specifically opposed to the Teacher of Righteousness, and may be identified with the אִישׁ הַלְצִוֵן and by extension to the אִישׁ הַלְצִוֵן in 4QpIsa<sup>b</sup> – almost certainly the same group as would

later be termed the Seekers of Smooth Things (his followers). Again the *אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן* may also be deliberately contrasted to the Teacher, since *לְצוֹן* can have an underlying sense of interpretation, especially apparent in the expression *מְלִיץ דְעַת* which, when discussing 4QpPs<sup>a</sup>, we applied to the Teacher himself.

Within the pesharim, the ‘preacher of falsehood’ is less common than ‘man of falsehood’. While this may simply indicate the fragmented state of the corpus, in this instance I believe it to be motivated by an intentional evolution of the title to parallel expressions such as *אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן*. In any case, the pesharim confirm many of the aspects uncovered in exegesis of CD. Thus the ‘man (and ‘preacher’) of falsehood’ is clearly contrasted to the Teacher of Righteousness – an aspect that is also supported by the derivation of the terms – and appears to have been a one-time member of the same community. Again, the precise rationale behind the split is unclear. We receive no indication from CD, while the pesherist merely accuses the man of falsehood of rejecting the Law (1QpHab V:11-12), which we argued may imply no more than disagreeing with the teacher, the community’s lawgiver.

On a more general level Stegemann suggests that the rationale lies with the Teacher’s claim to incarnate God’s covenant – a claim that involves boycotting participation in the Temple Cult – while Murphy-O’Connor holds that the reason lies with the Teacher’s decision to move from Jerusalem into the desert, an understanding which he supports through interpretation of the “Manifesto” in 1QS VIII:1-10a; 12b-16a; IX:3-X:6.<sup>58</sup> Murphy-O’Connor in particular stresses how only 50 people followed the Teacher at this time – a figure calculated from the size of the buildings in Period 1a of the occupation of the Qumran site<sup>59</sup> – and suggests that the majority were persuaded by the man of falsehood not to submit themselves to the “rigors of life in the wilderness.” This inevitably led to the allegation that ‘they sought smooth things and chose illusions’ (CD I:18-19), analogous to taking the easy path.

Murphy O’Connor’s argument is certainly compelling, but requires a certain number of suppositions that we are unable to support. First, it envisages that the community

<sup>58</sup> Murphy-O’Connor, “The Essenes,” 120; Stegemann, *Die Entstehung*.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. R. de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1959 (Oxford University Press: London, 1973).

were not already *in situ* at Qumran when this split took place, against the evidence of passages like 1QpHab V:9-12 (The House of Absalom); while, second, his argument flies in the face of the many being 'led astray' by the preacher of falsehood, key to the pesher's polemic. For Murphy-O'Connor, geographically it is the Teacher's community that moves away (to the desert). Moreover, it is the preacher whom the Habakkuk pesherist specifically accuses of founding a new community (X:9-13).

I would cautiously suggest that this implies the community was already in residence, if not at Qumran, certainly outside of Jerusalem, and that the man of falsehood physically as well as politically abandoned the teacher's group to its fate. Whether this is caused by an increasing isolationist tendency, from the Temple etc., or is indicative of a more personal vendetta is, for now, impossible to determine. We can, however, say that a split occurred within the movement, engineered by a dispute between the teacher of righteousness and the man/preacher of falsehood, resulting in the departure of the latter with a substantial part, perhaps even the majority, of the community in his wake. This figure apparently established a separate community elsewhere, perhaps within Jerusalem itself, and both he and the group are condemned for taking the easy route, 'smooth things'. This helps us tie the group in with the Seekers of Smooth Things mentioned elsewhere in the pesharim, whom, if we were correct earlier, may be identified with the fledgling group known as the Pharisees. On this basis, the man of falsehood may be identified with one of the leaders of this emerging group of Pharisees, 'Separatists'.



## 6.0 The Wicked Priest

The Wicked Priest, like the Teacher, has been the subject of numerous studies. In previous sections we have seen how this figure is often associated with the Teacher, while he is even straightforwardly identified with the Man of Falsehood. Meanwhile, along with both these figures – indeed more so due to his setting ‘outside’ the confines of the community itself – the Wicked Priest is used to establish an approximate date for the community; and thus also to set forth identifications for other figures in the community (such as the Teacher) and the events relayed through the course of such texts like the pesharim.

Leaving aside for now, those early scholars who proposed many and varying historical identifications of the Wicked Priest, more recent debate has centred on a proposed *multiple* identification of this figure. That is, there is no one ‘Wicked Priest’. Rather, either the Wicked Priest is an amalgam of characteristics associated with several historical figures, or, as in the case of the ‘Groningen’ hypothesis, each reference to a ‘Wicked Priest’ (in 1QpHab) refers to a different incumbent of the high priesthood in Jerusalem, six in all. Originally this thesis was published solely by Florentino García-Martínez,<sup>1</sup> though A. S. van der Woude was later credited as co-author.<sup>2</sup> Although we shall return to the hypothesis below, we may now suggest that one of its strengths appears to be not having to tie down all the references to the Wicked Priest in the scrolls to one specific individual. Meanwhile, the multiple identifications element is at the same time consistent with our own observations concerning the change in identity of such others as the Kittim.

In accordance with the approach adopted elsewhere in the thesis, this section begins with an attempt to understand the meaning of the term Wicked Priest’ (כֹּהֵן דֹּשֵׁעַ) itself and only later attempt to identify the ‘historical’ events under discussion – where most studies have started.

---

<sup>1</sup> F. García-Martínez, “Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis,” *FO* 25 (1988), 113-136.

### 6.1 Meaning and Translation

The expression כוהן הרשע 'wicked priest' is often thought to be a play on words for כוהן הר(ו)אש 'high priest' found in various OT passages. This was first suggested by Elliger,<sup>3</sup> and is now accepted almost unanimously by scholars, most recently by Lim.<sup>4</sup>

Within the MT the expression כוהן הראש (or one of its variant spellings) is found nine times, especially in II Chron. (four occasions). There we find the expression applied to Amariah, the high priest during the reign of Jehoshaphat (19:11), and Azariah, high priest in the reigns of Uzziah and Hezekiah (26:20; 31:10). Consonant with the meaning of ראש as 'head, first', the meaning of the phrase כוהן הראש should be 'first priest' – as is evidenced by II Kings 25:18 (=Jer. 52:24) with its reference to both a 'first' and a 'second' priest (כוהן המשנה)<sup>5</sup>:

וַיִּקַּח רֶב־טַבָּחִים אֶת־שָׂרְיָה כֹהֵן הָרִאשׁוֹן וְאֶת־צִפְנְיָהוּ כֹהֵן מְשֻׁנָּה  
וְאֶת־שְׁלֹשַׁת שְׁמַרְי הַסֹּפִי:

The captain of the guard took the chief priest Seraiah, the second priest Zephaniah, and the three guardians of the threshold.

As we can see, in the NRSV the meaning 'first priest' becomes equated to 'chief priest', and although this is how the NRSV generally translates the Hebrew phrase, it is not always the best offering.<sup>6</sup> For 'high priest' itself the NRSV reserves a second expression; כוהן הגדול, literally 'great priest', which may derive from Lev. 21:10 'a priest greater than his brothers' (הכֹהֵן הַגָּדוֹל מֵאֶחָיו). This expression is used of Jehoiada (II Kings 12:11), Hilkiyah (II Kings 22:4, 8; 23:4; II Chron. 34:9), Eliashib (Neh. 3:1, 20; 13:28) and Joshua ben Jehozadak (Haggai 1:1, 12, 14; 2:2, 4; Zech. 3:1, 8; 6:11), i.e. both before and after the exile,<sup>7</sup> but those pre-exilic references are likely to be later modifications; hence, where the parallel passages are found in Chronicles

<sup>2</sup> "A 'Groningen' Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History," *RevQ* 14 (1990), 521-542.

<sup>3</sup> Elliger, 266.

<sup>4</sup> Lim, "The Wicked Priest or the Liar," 45 & n3.

<sup>5</sup> N.B. II Kings 23:4, כוהני המשנה 'priests of the second order' (NRSV); here set alongside כוהן הגדול (below).

<sup>6</sup> Thus in Ezra 7:5, which outlines the priestly descent of Ezra, where כוהן הראש is applied to Aaron himself, it is best translated 'first priest'. Hence: "Ezra...son of Abishua, son of Phinehas, son of Eleazar, son of Aaron the *first* priest..."

<sup>7</sup> Cf. BDB, 464a-b.

and/or the LXX, the terminology used is either כהן הראש or more simply הכהן, the most common term used to refer to the head of the priesthood without qualification.<sup>8</sup> A fourth title הכהן המשיח 'anointed priest' is also found (cf. Lev. 6:13, 15), but this is of less importance.

In Second Temple texts, the expression כהן הגדול for the High Priest seems to be retained. Thus, in the Hebrew Mss of Ben Sira 50, Simon II is described as being גדול אחריו ותפארת עמו / שמעון בן יוחנן הכהן ('greater than his brothers and the pride of his people / was Simon the son of Yoḥanan, the priest' [MS B 50:1]),<sup>9</sup> a clear reference back to Lev. 21:10 (above). Meanwhile, in coins from the period, again one finds frequent references to the high priest in office as כהן הגדול, especially in the expression 'N the High Priest and the congregation of the Jews' (N הכהן הגדול) (והכבר היהודים); so John Hyrcanus I, Aristobulus I, Alexander Jannaeus, John Hyrcanus II, and Antigonus.<sup>10</sup> Occasionally a High Priest is known only as 'the Priest' (הכהן; so Mattathias [Antigonus]), but the title כהן הראש is *not* found in the numismatic material.

In its most simplistic form this difference can be explained by circumstances in Israel. While the country is a monarchy the high priest is referred to as כהן הראש or more simply הכהן. This reflects the fact that, while the high priest is the highest religious figure, ultimate authority rests with the king. After the exile, when the priest takes on the role of head of state, however, the title more likely to be applied is כהן גדול, which usage then continues into the Second Temple period. Thus, although Elliger's suggestion that כהן הרשע is a perverted form of the priestly designation of כהן הראש is likely to be correct, this assertion should be tempered by the knowledge that this is neither the most common title applied, nor that in current use.

<sup>8</sup> So Jehoiada, II Kings 11:9f.; Uriah, II Kings 16:11f.; Isa. 8:2; and Hilkiah, II Kings 22:12, 14. Cf. R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*, Trans. John McHugh (Darton, Longman & Todd: London, 1965), 378.

<sup>9</sup> See Pancratius C. Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A text edition of all extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a synopsis of all parallel Hebrew Ben Sira texts* (E.J. Brill: Leiden, 1997), 88.

<sup>10</sup> For the relevant inscriptions cf. Schürer 1, 602-606; Y. Meshorer, *Jewish Coins of the Second Temple Period* (1967).

## 6.2 *The Wicked Priest in the Dead Sea Scrolls*

Unlike previous expressions ('teacher of righteousness', 'man of falsehood' etc.), the designation 'wicked priest' (כהן הרשע) is not itself found outside of the pesharim.

Both כהן הגדול and כהן הראש are found, however, although curiously each is restricted to a particular text. Thus, the former is found exclusively in 1QM, while the latter is restricted to parts of the Temple Scroll (11QT). More significantly, the usage in either is subtly different. In 1QM, the 'chief priest' always appears as leader of a group, i.e. as first among priests – so II:1-2; XV:4; XVIII:5-6 etc. Moreover, as one would expect, this figure plays a role in the military confrontation being described as a 'motivator' (XVI:13-14). Meanwhile, in 11QT, the 'great priest' plays a more familiar role, offering sacrifices for himself and the people (XXIII:9-10; XXV:16), casting lots (XXVI:3-4), and consulting the Urim and Thummim (LVIII:18-19).

The DSS do then retain the title הכן הראש and one could argue that the existence of this title in the scrolls is evidence that the title was still applied to the 'high priest' and that, consequently, the expression כהן הרשע 'wicked priest' is a pun on 'high priest.' This conclusion certainly needs further work, however.

## 6.3 *The Wicked Priest in the Pesharim*

Within the extant pesharim, כהן הרשע 'wicked priest' survives in only three texts, predominantly in 1QpHab, but also in a solitary reference in both the fragmentary 4QpIsa<sup>c</sup> and 4QpPs<sup>a</sup>.

### 6.3.1 1QpHabakkuk

The Wicked Priest is referred to five times in 1QpHab, though this figure does not include the restoration of the expression in I:13, on which see my comments elsewhere (above, p163f.). The section will, however, consider the fragmentary reference to 'the priest who rebelled' (הכהן אשר מרד) in VIII:16ff., 'the priest who' in IX:16, and the reference to 'the priest whose shame exceeded his glory' (XI:12ff.). A separate section will also explore the identity of 'the last priests of Jerusalem' (כהני ירושלם האחרונים) in IX:4ff. since, contextually, all these references seem to best fit within a chapter on the wicked priest.

## (a) The Wicked Priest

The Wicked Priest is first introduced in col. VIII marking a new departure for the pesherist, in concentrating on events outside the community (hence Jerusalem is explicitly referred to in IX:4). The passage is also plainly introductory, referring to the beginning of the Wicked Priest's reign in office (IX:8-9) and seeming to identify him with the 'man of high standing' (גבר יהיר) of the original prophecy (Hab. 2:5). This is broadly similar to the attribution of 'righteous' and 'wicked' to the Teacher of Righteousness and Man of Falsehood, respectively, earlier in the pesher.

ואף כִּי־א הוֹן יבגוד גבר יהיר ולוא ינוה אשר הרחיב כשאול  
נפשו והוא כמות לוא ישבע ויאספו אלו כול הגוים ויקבצו  
אלו כול העמים הלוא כולם משל עליו ישאו ומליצו חידות  
לו ויומרו הוי המרבה ולוא לו עד מתי יכביד עלו עבטט

*Wealth*,<sup>11</sup> moreover, will make treacherous the man of good standing, and he will not endure; who will open his soul as wide as Sheol, and he like death will not be sated. All nations shall be gathered to him, and all the peoples collected to him. Shall not all of them bear a poem about him and, with mocking riddles, say, "Woe to him who heaps up what does not belong to him. How long will he load himself down with the weight of debts?" (Hab. 2:5-6; 1QpHab VIII:3-8)

פִּשְׁרוֹ עַל הַכוֹהֵן הַרְשָׁע אֲשֶׁר	8
נִקְרָא עַל שֵׁם הָאֵמֶת בַּתְּחִלָּת עוֹמְדוֹ וְכֹאֲשֶׁר מִשַׁל	9
בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל רֵם לָבוֹ וַיַּעֲזוֹב אֶת אֵל וַיִּבְגֹּד בַּחֻקִּים בַּעֲבוּר	10
הוֹן וַיִּגְזוֹל וַיִּקְבֹּץ הוֹן אֲנָשֵׁי חָמֵס אֲשֶׁר מִרְדּוּ בְּאֵל	11
וְהוֹן עַמִּים לִקַּח לוֹסִיף עָלָיו עוֹן אֲשֶׁמָּה וְדַרְכֵי	12
תְּנוּעָ[בּוֹת פִּעַל בְּכוֹל נִדַּת טִמְאַה	13

Its interpretation concerns the Wicked Priest, who <sup>9</sup> was called by the name 'Truth' at the beginning of his rise. However, when he ruled <sup>10</sup> over Israel his heart became proud, he deserted God, and betrayed the statutes on account of <sup>11</sup> wealth. And he robbed and hoarded the wealth of the men of violence who had rebelled against God. <sup>12</sup> And the wealth of the people he took, adding to himself

<sup>11</sup> The pesher reads הוֹן 'wealth' over MT היין 'wine'. LXX ὁ δε κατοινωμένος 'the one drunken with wine' supports the Masoretic reading, although both readings make good contextual sense. Modern translators prefer the Qumran variant although the weight placed on 'wealth' in the commentary makes it problematic to state whether (a) הוֹן is a true textual variant or (b) the pesherist has adopted a new(er) reading to support his comments in the interpretation.

For another view concerning the original reading of the verse in Habakkuk – from a root הוֹן/הִין meaning 'presumptuous' paralleled by the original Septuagint rendering κατοϊόμενος – see W.H. Brownlee, "The Placarded Revelation of Habakkuk," *JBL* 82 (1963), 319-325.

the sin of guilt. <sup>13</sup> And the ways of <sup>13</sup> ab[omi]nation he did by every type of unclean impurity. (1QpHab VIII:8-13)

This passage derives from one of the best surviving sections of the pesher, and consequently there are no problematic restorations to consider. As we have suggested, the Wicked Priest is clearly depicted as the man of high standing whom wealth has seduced.<sup>12</sup> He is thus described as ‘called by the name of truth at the beginning of his rise’ (נִקְרָא עַל שֵׁם הָאֱמֶת בְּתַחֲלַת עוֹמְדוֹ). ‘Beginning of his rise’ supports the notion that the wicked priest was a Jerusalem high priest, since the Hebrew term בְּתַחֲלַת is used in a similar sense with reference to the succession to kingship of Ahasuerus (Xerxes) in Ezra 4:6. Meanwhile, עָמַד is often used of the accession of both kings (Dan. 8:23; 11:3, 7) and priests (I Kings 12:32; II Chron. 8:14; Ezer. 3:8; Neh. 7:65). The wicked priest is clearly ruling priest since the pesherist explicitly states that he ‘ruled over Israel’ (ll. 9-10).<sup>13</sup>

Brownlee attempts without success to suggest that the application of ‘truth’, ‘true one’ (Heb. הָאֱמֶת) to this figure implies the Wicked Priest’s membership of the ‘Truth Party’ or the אֲנָשֵׁי הָאֱמֶת ‘men of truth’ of VII:10. In other words, he makes the Wicked Priest, like the man of falsehood, a former member of the group later resident at Qumran. This group is not, however, to be simply equated with the Essenes since (for Brownlee) the passage predates the rift between the Wicked Priest and the sect. Instead...

<sup>12</sup> E. Slomovic (“Towards an Understanding of the Exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *RevQ* 7 [1969-71], 14-15) suggests that the commentator derives a reference to the Wicked Priest from the introductory phrase כִּי הָרַן, utilizing the *al tikrei* rule to change the masoretic הָרַן to הָרַן and by extension to כִּוְהָרַן. Cf. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, 289. This, though, is far from proven, although it does support the view expressed elsewhere that this passage first introduces the Wicked Priest.

<sup>13</sup> The verb מָשַׁל ‘rule’, here, picks up the noun מִשְׁלָה ‘proverb, parable’ of Hab. 2:6a (1QpHab VIII:6). BDB (605a) also lists a third root מָשַׁל ‘represent, be like.’ Brownlee, 143, suggests that the ‘ancient midrashist’ probably did not consider this punning, but as the utilization of different meanings of the same root. Nevertheless, this is impossible to assert with any degree of confidence. The important aspect is the recognition that the pesherist sees the wicked priest’s rule prefigured in scripture and is another example of the prophet’s not recognising the full import of his message (Cf. 1QpHab VII:1ff.).

Most probably they [the “adherents of the truth”] are the Hasidim, whose reputation as defenders of the truth was later claimed by the Essenes, who thought of themselves as their true successors.<sup>14</sup>

A lack of evidence prevents us from accepting this conclusion, especially due to the minimal references to the Hasidim in the extant literature.<sup>15</sup> Nevertheless, Brownlee’s suggestion is far from the only attempt to explain the phrase ‘called by the name “truth”.’ By his own admission, he lists eight other proposals (pp. 134-137). Hence Elliger suggests that the phrase is a reference to the pun on כֹּהֵן הַרְאִישׁ: “der berufen wurde unter dem rechten Namen” – called by the proper name/title (as opposed to the perverted form). Nevertheless, Brownlee questions the appropriateness of the application of this “sarcastic surrogate” with this particular passage.<sup>16</sup>

Rather, the application of this expression should be understood in the light of the Wicked Priest’s later betrayal of the statutes through his own greed (ll. 10-13), and presumably the beginning of the application of ‘wicked priest’. This, we may suggest, is the root cause of the priest’s wickedness.<sup>17</sup> The course of events runs as follows: He ruled → became proud → deserted God → betrayed the statutes → robbed and hoarded the wealth of the men of violence → plundered the wealth of the people → and finally performed all manner of abomination. A gradual debasement is thus described, with wealth, as in the prophecy, the major catalyst. There is a possible parallel here with the debasement of the priesthood described in the Testament of Levi:

Because you have heard about the seventy weeks, listen also concerning the priesthood. In each jubilee there shall be a priesthood ... The fifth [priesthood] shall be overcome by darkness; likewise the sixth and the seventh. In the seventh there shall be pollution such as I am unable to declare in the presence of human beings, because only the ones who do these things understand such matters. Therefore they shall be in captivity and will be preyed upon; both their land and their possessions shall be stolen. And in the fifth week they shall return to the

<sup>14</sup> Brownlee, 136.

<sup>15</sup> Only I Macc. 2:42; 7:13; II Macc. 14:6.

<sup>16</sup> Brownlee, 137.

<sup>17</sup> The passage seems, indeed, to rule out the translation of רִשְׁעָא as ‘illegitimate’ which would otherwise support Stegemann’s hypothesis regarding the teacher’s forcible removal from the office of High Priest by Jonathan Maccabee, the illegitimate successor in the priesthood. Since the passage refers to the community’s apparent support for the wicked priest at the beginning of his office this directly coincides with the period of greatest conflict between the two groups of priests; i.e. directly after the change in priestly descent.

land of their desolation, and shall renew the house of the Lord. *In the seventh week there will come priests: idolators, adulterers, money lovers, arrogant, lawless, voluptuaries, pederasts, those who practice bestiality.* (TestLevi 17; Trans. H.C. Kee in Charlesworth, I, my italics)

The identity of the ‘men of violence (אנשי חמס) who rebelled against God’ in l. 11 is unclear. The closest biblical parallel to this expression is the reference to the איש חמס in Ps. 18:48 (Heb. 18:49), although here the phrase merely means ‘adversaries’ (and is thus set in parallel with איב ‘enemy’; cf. II Sam. 22:49). This is supported by the general reference to ‘oppressors’ in Heb. Sirach 13:13 where the exact phrase אנשי חמס is found:

השמר והיה זהיר ואל תהלך / עם אנשי חמס :

Be on your guard and take care  
never to accompany *men of violence*<sup>19</sup>

The contrast between the wealth of the ‘men of violence’ and the ‘peoples’ (corresponding to the biblical גוים and עמים; Hab. 2:5c) in the pesher (l. 12) suggests a more precise reference, however. Di Lella suggests, in commenting on the Ben Sira passage, that the author “may have had in mind undue familiarity of Jews with their pagan overlords who could and did oppress them.” “The ‘men of violence’,” he continues, “may also refer to the pagan nobility in the Holy Land”.<sup>20</sup> Nevertheless, the same problems did not concern the Habakkuk pesherist, and thus the reference more likely applies to those outside Israel – as הגוים ‘the nations’ would properly suppose. Brownlee thus suggests that a reference here to the Samaritans might be appropriate, especially since several times in Ben Sira חמס is used of Ephraim, i.e. Samaria.<sup>21</sup> Indeed, as he points out, this interpretation may be derived as far back as Judg. 9:24

<sup>18</sup> MS A. See Beentjes, *op. cit.*, 41.

<sup>19</sup> Trans. P.W. Skehan, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, The Anchor Bible (Doubleday: New York, 1987), 250. Introduction and Commentary by A.A. Di Lella. N.B. The Hebrew here scarcely corresponds to the LXX. In the commentary, however, Di Lella (253) links the expression to the ἄνδρα ἀμαρτωλόν / ἄνδρὸς ἀμαρτωλοῦ ‘man of sin’ of Sirach 10:23b; 15:12b. The latter is represented by Heb. באנשי חמס (MS A). Cf. Beentjes, *op. cit.*, 44.

<sup>20</sup> Skehan/Di Lella, *op. cit.*, 253.

<sup>21</sup> Brownlee, 140. Cf. Heb. Sirach 47:21 (MS B): חמס ומאפרים ממלכה ‘and a violent kingdom arose out of Ephraim’ (Beentjes, 85). Also, in Sirach 50:26b the Samaritans are contemptuously described as a ‘foolish nation’ (גוי נבל). Cf. C.T.R. Hayward, *The Jewish Temple: A non-biblical sourcebook* (Routledge: London, 1996), 62f.



where the violence against the sons of Gideon is blamed on the lords of Shechem. If a reference to the Samaritans is here deemed appropriate, then one would have *necessarily*, it seems, to identify the Wicked Priest of the commentary with John Hyrcanus, since Josephus records that he brought the contention between Jews and Samaritans to an abrupt halt in c. 128 BC when he captured Gerizim, site of the Samaritan temple, and presumably carried away its spoil at the same time (hence 'wealth').<sup>22</sup> Certainly the Samaritans, as apostate Jews worshipping at a separate sanctuary, would fit the accusation of rebellion launched in the peshet (cf. Josh. 22:18-19). Meanwhile, in Hosea, especially antagonistic towards Samaria, Samaria is herself accused of rebelling (מרהוץ/ מרהוץ) against her God (Hos 13:16 [Heb. 14:1]).

If the 'men of violence' may be so identified, the עמים 'people' may refer to the Jews themselves, and thus perhaps 'public wealth'. Brownlee rejects this interpretation as totally misconstruing the passage and suggests that, where the biblical גרים is interpreted as apostate Jews or Samaritans, the עמים are gentiles.<sup>23</sup> I suggest, however, that this makes no allowance for the aims of the peshet himself, which are to describe a progressive debasement of the wicked priest. Thus, the people cannot have been expected to have been overtly critical of the plunder of, for instance, the Samaritans. The same cannot be said, however, for the plundering of themselves. Hyrcanus is, indeed accused of plundering public moneys, since Josephus relates how he plundered the tomb of David and removed three thousand talents in order to maintain his army of foreign mercenaries (*Ant.* XIII, viii, 4 §249), although chronologically this antedates the conquest against Samaria. In the same passage, Josephus also records Hyrcanus's largesse to Antiochus VII (predating the Samaritan campaign), which included him marching on Antiochus's Parthian campaign; an episode that retains an element of compulsion by Antiochus on Hyrcanus.<sup>24</sup>

Following on from this, our next reference to the Wicked Priest comes in col. IX, where the wicked priest is depicted alongside the Teacher of Righteousness.

---

<sup>22</sup> Cf. *Ant.* XIII, ix, 1 §§255-256.

<sup>23</sup> Brownlee, 140.

<sup>24</sup> *Ant.* XIII, viii, 4 §§249-253. Cf. H. Jagersma, *A History of Israel to Bar Kochba*, Part II (SCM: London, 1985), 82f.

מדמי אדם וחמם ארץ קריה וכו' יושבי בה

Hab. 2:8b; 1QpHab IX:8

פשוו על הכוהן ה[ר]שע אשר בעוון מורה	9
הצדק ואנשי עצתו נתנו אל בידן אויביו לעניתו	10
בנגע לבלה במרורי נפש בעבור [א]שר הרשיע	11
על בחירו	12

1QpHab IX:9-12. For translation and notes see above, p156ff.

This passage clearly links the Wicked Priest's punishment with the 'offence' against the Teacher of Righteousness and the men of his council, contextually the 'elect' of line 12, though an offence which is almost impossible to delineate (further, below). Any suggestion of bloodshed is supplied by the prophecy (מדמי אדם) and may not be necessarily relevant.

The Wicked Priest's punishment is twofold: he will be given into the hands of his enemies to (a) be afflicted with wounds (בנגע); and (b) be swallowed up with a bitterness of soul (במרורי נפש); the two terms clearly being set in parallel. The former suggests a human element and is used earlier in the column with reference to 'the priest' (IX:1; below, 233), while the latter might imply disease or some progressive wasting away of the body. Due to the nature of this punishment many historical references have been proposed: Of the high priests in the early Hasmonean period, many suffered a violent death. Jonathan Maccabee was betrayed and murdered by the Seleucid Tryphon (*Ant.* XIII,vi, 2-6 §191-210), while his son Simon (along with two of his sons) was killed by the order of his son-in-law Ptolemy (XIII, vii, 4 §228). Aristobulus I, who reigned for less than a year, suffered a disease that caused him to cough up blood (XIII, xi, 3 §314-317), while Alexander Jannaeus suffered from a distemper brought on by hard drinking and after three years died (XIII, xvi, 5 §398, 404). If the current passage does record a historical reference, it could be to any of these High Priests, especially given the ambiguity whether the punishment is human-inflicted or otherwise.

The identity of the 'enemies' is also unclear. Brownlee suggests that "in view of the subjective genitives in Hab. 2:8b, the 'enemies' are identified with 'the land, the city and all who dwell in it'." They are thus internal enemies, the Priest's fellow

countrymen, perhaps even members of the Teacher's party.<sup>25</sup> Nevertheless, this is problematic, since מדמי ('bloodshed') in the prophecy has a causative sense, paralleling 'because you have plundered ... so will they plunder' in Hab. 2:8a. In other words, the pesher, like the prophecy, also has a causative sense with the Teacher and the community related to the אדם, ארץ, and קרייה of the prophecy. This is entirely separate from the identity of the enemies, whom, the pesherist has already identified – as 'all the remainder of the nations' – with the Kittim (IX:7; below, p242f.). Merely because it is the community who suffer does not require one to read that it is they who shall take revenge. Rather, it is the method employed that is identical. Just as the Wicked Priest plundered (the community?), his punishment will be replayed on him by being despoiled by others, the Kittim God's chosen instrument of justice and revenge.

The conflict between the wicked priest and the Teacher of Righteousness recurs in col. XI (the Day of Atonement incident).

הוי משקה רעיהו מספח חמתו אף שכר למען הבט אל  
מועדריהם

Hab. 2:15; 1QpHab XI:2-3

פשרו על הכוהן הרשע אשר	4
רדף אחר מורה הצדק לבלעו בכעס	5
חמתו אבית גלותו ובקץ מועד מנוחת	6
יום הכפורים הופיע אליהם לבלעם	7
ולכשילם ביום צום שבת מנוחתם	8

1QpHab XI:4-8. For translation and notes see above, p158.

Earlier (above, pp158ff.), we suggested that this event relates to the 'offence' described in the previous pesher (IX:9-10). Again it is difficult to precisely identify this offence, though it seems to revolve around a disputed calendrical system; an observation that relies on the wicked priest's identification as high priest in Jerusalem. Only on the evidence of 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> (below) can it be said that this conflict was violent. Nevertheless, because in that episode, the Teacher is saved, this 'offence' did not, contrary to most scholars' opinions, result in his death. The 'offence', then, is

<sup>25</sup> Brownlee, 156.

religious, to the extent that two separate, rival, Days of Atonement seem to have been celebrated, one by the Wicked Priest (in Jerusalem?) under a lunar system, one by the Teacher 'at the House of his exile' (=Qumran?) celebrated under the solar calendar. The Wicked Priest appears to have deliberately intruded on this latter festival for reasons unknown, perhaps because its very existence was conceived as a threat to his religious leadership.

Certainly, however, this is the extent to which the Wicked Priest and the Teacher of Righteousness appear alongside one another in 1QpHab. Otherwise, the two only appear in 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> (below). Meanwhile, the Wicked Priest is again referred to in col. XII, in the commentary on Hab. 2:17.

[כי חמס לבנון ישוד בהמות] יחתה מדמי אדם וחמס  
אריץ קריה וכול יושבי בה

[For (your) violence to Lebanon will overwhelm you, and the violence of the beasts] will terrify you, for human bloodshed and the violence to the land, the city and all who dwell in it. (Hab. 2:17; 1QpHab XI:17-XII:1)

X	פשר הדבר על הכוהן הרשע לשלם לו את	2
	גמולו אשר גמל על אביונים כיא הלבנון הוא	3
	עצת היחד והבהמות המה פתאי יהודה עושה	4
	התורה אשר ישופטנו אל לכלה	5
	כאשר זמם לכלות אביונים	6

The interpretation of the word concerns the Wicked Priest, to repay to him <sub>3</sub> his due for what he did to the poor – For 'Lebanon' is <sub>4</sub> the Council of the Community and the 'beasts' are the simple of Judah, the doers of <sub>5</sub> the Law – for God will sentence him to destruction, <Blank> <sub>6</sub> exactly as he intended to destroy the poor. (1QpHab XII:2-6)

Here, the Wicked Priest is twice accused of an action taken against 'the poor' (אביונים); in the second reference in particular he is accused of intending to 'destroy' (לכלות) them. It is unclear whether 'the poor' here is intended to refer to the community itself, and, if so, whether the Teacher himself should be included among their number. The interlude regarding the interpretation of 'Lebanon' and 'beasts' suggests that 'the poor' refer to a larger group, perhaps comprising both the 'Council of the Community' and the 'Simple of Judah, the doers of the Law'; possibly references to an inner council and the more general membership respectively. In my article I have rejected the suggestion that the reference applies to the Targumic

interpretation of Lebanon as Temple.<sup>26</sup> In a nutshell, I argue that ‘Lebanon’ is subject to a wide range of interpretations both in the Rabbinic literature and the scrolls themselves, and that consequently the use of ‘Lebanon’ here may be indicative of one more interpretative tradition. Referring ‘Lebanon’ to the elders, or inner council, of the community, would certainly coincide with biblical references to the tall ‘cedars of Lebanon’ (so II Kings 19:23; Isa. 2:13; 37:24 etc.). Consequently, the ‘Simple of Judah, the Doers of the Law’ are those outside the inner council – perhaps an indication of the length of one’s membership of the group – and are identified in the prophecy by the ‘beasts’. Certainly this more closely reflects other passages in the pesharim to refer to this group: thus ‘the doers of the Law in the House of Judah’ in VIII:1. Judah, like ‘the poor’ is a reference to the overall group.

Again, the pesharist refers to the demise of the wicked priest. Here God will sentence him to destruction and, as in IX:1-2, 9-10 (which latter passage also interprets ‘human bloodshed and violence to the land...’ since this passage is repeated in verses 8 and 17), there is a sense that the punishment fits (the intention of) the crime. The wicked priest will be destroyed because he intended to destroy the poor. Following on from our suggestion that ‘the poor’ is a reference to the entire community rather than just the Teacher of Righteousness, it follows that the wicked priest’s actions had ramifications for the entire community as well. Again, this is indicated by the fact that the ‘offence’ (IX:9) affects the Teacher and the men of his council. Nevertheless, just as the ‘offence’ is undefined, so it is unclear how the wicked priest intended to destroy the community, although one suggestion might relate to his actions on the Day of Atonement, in that he attempted to deliberately defile the community’s preparations.

Finally, the Wicked Priest occurs in a passage following immediately (again interpreting Hab. 2:17b):- the third occasion that this passage is commented upon.

וַאֲשֶׁר אָמַר מִדְּמִי	6
קָרִיָּה וְחַמֶּס אֶרֶץ פִּשְׁרוֹ הַקְּרִיָּה הִיא יְרוּשָׁלַם	7
אֲשֶׁר פָּעַל בָּהּ הַכּוֹהֵן הָרָשָׁע מַעֲשֵׂי תוֹעֵבוֹת וַיִּטְמֵא אֶת	8

---

<sup>26</sup> Wood, 140-145. Cf. G. Vermes, “Lebanon: The Historical Development of an Exegetical Tradition,” in *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* (E.J. Brill: Leiden, 1973), 26-39.

מקדש אל וחמס ארץ המה ערי יהודה אשר 9  
 גזל הון אביונים 10

And as for what he said, “the bloodshed of <sup>7</sup> the city and the violence to the land” (Hab. 2:17b), its interpretation: the ‘city’ is Jerusalem <sup>8</sup> where the /Wicked/ Priest performed abominations and defiled <sup>9</sup> the Sanctuary of God. ‘The violence (done to) the land’ (refers to) the cities of Judah where <sup>10</sup> he stole the wealth of the poor. (1QpHab XII:6-10)

Here, the wicked priest is referred to but, insofar as the author has omitted the identifier הרשע (which is a later, supralinear, insertion) this passage might as well refer to ‘the priest’ of similar passages. Moreover, since, contextually, the passage is referring to the same wicked priest as the previous vignette, it is reasonable to assume that the subjects are the same as well, i.e. the priest = the wicked priest.

Again, this passage relates a concern of the wicked priest with ‘wealth’ (הון). Here he is accused of stealing the wealth of the poor, although, bearing in mind our previous arguments, it would not make sense to relate the ‘poor’ here to either the ‘peoples’ or the ‘nations’ whom we have suggested refer to Gentiles and Jews respectively. Rather, the (wicked) priest is here accused of stealing the wealth of the poor, who may refer to the community itself. In this instance, the offence of which the wicked priest is accused may amount to nothing more than petty theft. This does of course require a rather strange interpretation of ‘cities of Judah’ but, since Judah is also an epithet for the community no real problem is encountered. Meanwhile, since ‘city’ (Heb. קרייה) is found in the prophecy, albeit interpreted as ‘Jerusalem’ (see below) usage of ‘cities of Judah’, although admittedly a different Hebrew word, may amount to nothing more than a rereading of the prophecy.

#### (b) The Priest

Aside from references to the ‘wicked priest’, the pesherist also records descriptions of ‘the priest’, i.e. without the רשע identifier. Not least because the final reference to the ‘wicked priest’ (1QpHab XII:7-10, above) reads רשע as supralinear, perhaps indicating the two figures are one and the same, this material belongs in the current chapter. It should also be recalled that הכוהן is the most common expression for the High Priest in the Hebrew Bible (above, p221 n8).

הלוא פת[א]ם ויקום ונ[שכ]יך ויקיצו מזעזעיכה והיתה

למשנין]סות למו כי אתה שלותה גוים רבים וישלובה כול יתר  
עמים

Shall not *suddenly*<sup>27</sup> your tormentors arise, and those who make you tremble awake, and you become as spoil to them? Because you plundered many nations, so shall all the remainder of the nations despoil you. (Hab. 2:7-8a; 1QpHab VIII:13-15)

פשר הדבר ע]ל הכוהן אשר מרד	16
[ללו בו ל]מען	17
X נגועו במשפטי רשעה ושערוריות מחלים	1
רעים עשו בו ונקמות בגויית בשרו	2

<sup>16</sup> [<Blank> The interpretation of the passage conc]erns the priest who rebelled <sup>17</sup> [and turned aw]ay<sup>28</sup> (from the) statutes of [God... ...]llw him in [order to] <sub>1</sub> plague him. For judgements of wickedness and horrible deeds <sub>2</sub> they inflicted evil {diseases} upon him and vengeful acts on the body of his flesh. (1QpHab VIII:16-IX:2)

The first reference (to the wicked priest) immediately follows the previous reference (above) where, although the wicked priest is not explicitly mentioned, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the identity of the ‘priest who rebelled’ is the same as the wicked priest of that passage. This is especially true since the ‘priest’ is accused of breaching the statutes of God; parallel to the Wicked Priest’s abandoning God and betraying his statutes (above; VIII:10). Nevertheless, because the majority of line 17 is obscured, where the commentary picks up in IX:1 (נגועו<sup>29</sup>), it is difficult to gain the overall context of the passage, and in particular the subject of the ‘evil diseases’ of ll. 1-2.

Early translators attempted to read the passage as relating to the conflict between the Wicked Priest and the Teacher, stretching their reconstructions to contain a reference to the Teacher. Thus Dupont-Sommer:

*‘Will not thy tormentors suddenly arise and torment thee and get inflamed, and wilt thou not become their prey? ... (Hab. ii. 7)*

<sup>27</sup> On this form cf. Brownlee, 146.

<sup>28</sup> following Brownlee against Horgan ר [ועב]ר ‘[and trans]gressed’. Horgan also reconstructs: ללו [יש]לול עמים רבים ויש]לול ‘[plundering many peoples, but they will pl]under him’.

<sup>29</sup> On the difficulties of the reading of נגועו, which is obscured by the closeness of the *ayin* and the *waw* – which might be read with במשפטי immediately following, cf. Horgan, 43.

‘[The explanation of these words refers to the Priest who has rebelled [*space of two lines; towards the end of this space supply something like:* ... and he persecuted the Master of Justice, who was] struck by him in the execution of iniquitous judgements; and odious profaners committed horrors on him and vengeance on his body of flesh ...’

From all the evidence this passage alludes to the Passion of the Master of Justice; he was judged, condemned, tortured. He suffered in ‘his body of flesh’: without doubt he was a divine being who ‘became flesh’ to live and die as a man.<sup>30</sup>

As we have seen, there is no evidence that the teacher was judged, condemned or tortured; only a vague reference to an unspecified ‘offence’, and certainly not the transparent messianic allusions to which Dupont-Sommer refers. Nevertheless, although line 17 *might* have originally contained a reference to the Teacher, and thus we might read the subject of נגורעו as a substantive with the masculine suffix, it is more likely that the משפטי רשעה ‘judgements of wickedness’ refer to the (wicked) priest since, as we have already seen, he is accused of ‘turning away from (סור) the statutes of God’ (VIII:17). To this end, Brownlee reconstructs ‘pain-inflicting angels’ (Heb. מלאכי חבל), who in 1QS IV:12 bring a ‘multitude of plagues’ (לרוב נגועים), involving the same root as the problematic נגורעו.<sup>31</sup> These ‘angels of pain’ are understood as the ‘tormentors’ (זועל) of Hab. 2:7 and the subject of עשו in IX:2. This leads me to reject Dupont-Sommer’s identification of שערוריות מחלים, ‘odious profaners’, as the subject of עשו.<sup>32</sup> Rather, I link שערוריות with ‘judgements of wickedness’<sup>33</sup> and give the entire phrase a causative sense. שערוריה/שערוריה is a rare term in the MT, though it is explicitly associated with adultery and whoredom (cf. Jer. 23:14; Hos. 6:10). It is possible that this be linked with the ‘ways of abomination’ referred to in the previous vignette. The pesherist seems to suggest, then, that what follows is directly attributed to the wicked priest’s evil actions.

<sup>30</sup> Dupont-Sommer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 34. Elliger also restores the passage in favour of the Priest’s violent treatment of the Teacher: פשר הדבר ע[ל הכוהן אשר מרד [באור] הוקני] “[Die Meinung des Wortes geht auf den Priester, der [gegen das Licht] der Satzungen Gottes. Und zwar widersetzen er und seine Ratsgenossen sich ihm, indem sie nicht]”.

<sup>31</sup> Brownlee, 148.

<sup>32</sup> Below, 21, I identify the subject of עשו as the Kittim, since in the vignette immediately following the Kittim appear as the remainder of the nations, and the plunder in Hab. 2:8a refers back to the ‘spoil’ (למשיסות) of 2:7 which is taken by the ‘tormentors’.

<sup>33</sup> As is indicated by the nature of the punishment. Two forms of wickedness entail two punishments (‘evil things’ and ‘vengeful acts’) to be meted out.



The priest's<sup>34</sup> punishment is to be inflicted with 'evil diseases' and have 'acts of vengeance' performed on the body of his flesh (IX:2). 'Evil diseases' here matches up to נגרעו in l. 1 since the נגע root can, in the Pu'al form, have a meaning 'stricken (by disease)'.<sup>35</sup> Again, it is possible that the pesherist is relaying historically accurate material here, since as we have suggested several high priests of the period suffered disease or torture during their pontificate.<sup>36</sup> Indeed, the only High Priest to have died of natural causes during this period was John Hyrcanus I himself. Identification of Alexander Jannaeus with the (wicked) priest is especially inviting, since Josephus records that he commanded Alexandra Salome to allow his enemies to violate his body after his death in order that she might regain their support for her rulership.

The second reference to 'the priest' is more fragmentary, but appears to maintain a link with 'the one who gets evil gain for his house' of Hab. 2:9.

הוי הבוצע בצע רע לביתו לשום במרום קנו לנצל מכף רע  
יעצתה בשת לביתכה קצוות עמים רבים וחטי [נפ]שכה כיא  
אבן מקיר תזעק [ו]כפיים מעץ יע[ננה]

Alas for the one who gets evil gain for his house, putting his nest on high to remain safe from harm! You have plotted shame for your house, cutting off many peoples, and have forfeited your very [so]ul. For a stone shall cry out from the wall [and] a beam from the woodwork shall ans[wer it.] (Hab. 2:9-11; 1QpHab IX:12-15)

ר	[פשר הרב]ר על הכ[וה]ן אשר ב	16
	[ ]	17
	להיות אבניה בעשק וכפיים ע'צה בגזל ואשר	1
	אמר קצוות עמים רבים וחטי נפשכה	2
X	פשרו הוא בית המשפט אשר יתן אל את	3

<sup>34</sup> It is, of course, possible that the subject of l. 2 is still the teacher of righteousness. Nevertheless, in order for this reading to be accepted, the burden of proof lies with those who have to restore VIII:17 with reference to the Teacher and explain why the reference is not more explicit.

<sup>35</sup> So Ps. 73:5: 'They are not in trouble as others are/ they are not plagued (ינגעו) like other people.' Cf. BDB, 619a.

<sup>36</sup> Above p228f. Dupont-Sommer also tries to tie the event down to the death of Aristobulus II captured and tortured by Pompey in 63 BCE, dragged before Rome in chains in 61, and poisoned by Pompey's supporters in prison in 49. The intricacies of this, he continues, are more fully outlined in the following vignette (1QpHab IX:9-12). Cf. Dupont-Sommer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 35.

משפטו בתוך עמים רבים ומשם יעלנו למשפט 4  
 ובתוכם ירשיענו ובאש גופרית ישפטנו 5

<sup>16</sup> [The interpretation of the passa]ge concerns the Pr[ies]t who b[... ...]r <sup>17</sup> [... ... ] <sup>1</sup> that its stones suffer pillage and its wooden beams robbery. And as for what <sup>2</sup> He said, “cutting off many peoples and have forfeited your very soul” (Hab. 2:10), <sup>3</sup> its interpretation: It is the House of Judgement where God shall give <sup>4</sup> his judgements in the midst of many peoples. And from there He will raise up for them judgement. <sup>5</sup> Then in their midst He will pronounce him guilty, and into the fires of brimstone he will condemn him. (1QpHab IX:16-X:5)

Although the commentary has not survived, there are good reasons to suggest links between this ‘priest’ and the ‘wicked priest’. Not least because, while רשע is not found in the interpretation, the reference to ‘the priest’ is derived from ‘evil’ (Heb. רע) in the prophecy (l. 12). Moreover, the ‘one who gains’ also implies ‘wealth’ (הון) a mainstay of the peshet and applied to the Wicked Priest as the main cause of his downfall. This is also made clear by references to ‘pillage’ and ‘robbery’ in X:1 in reference to the ‘wood’ and ‘stone’ of Hab. 2:11 – though the precise relation of this aspect of the prophecy is unclear. A simple reading of the prophecy would imply that the priest is accused of using his illegitimate gain to build himself a palace, perhaps even a hilltop fortress – hence ‘putting his nest on high to remain safe from harm’, verse 9b? – in which case Masada comes to mind, whose construction, by ‘Jonathan the High Priest’, Josephus relates:

Moreover, he built a palace therein at the western ascent: it was within and beneath the walls of the citadel, but inclined to its north side. Now the wall of this palace was very high and strong, and had at its four corners towers sixty cubits high. The furniture also of the edifices, and of the cloisters, and of the baths, was of great variety, and very costly; and these buildings were supported by pillars of stones on every side: the walls also and the floors of the edifices were paved with stones of several colors. He also had cut many and great pits, as reservoirs for water, out of the rocks, at every one of the places that were inhabited, both above and around about the palace, and before the wall; and by this contrivance he endeavored to have water for several uses, as if there had been fountains there. (*War VII, viii, 4* §289-291)

Although Masada is conventionally thought to have been built by Jonathan Maccabee, the surviving ruins can only be dated to the Herodian period, while Yadin, who excavated the archaeological site, dates its construction to the reign of Jannaeus.<sup>37</sup>

<sup>37</sup> So Yadin, *Masada: Herod's Fortress and the Zealot's Last Stand* (Steimatzky: revised ed., 1997), 205: “One of the purposes of our expedition was to find the buildings erected, according to Josephus, by ‘Jonathan the High Priest – to find them, determine their date and

This would fit with the general time-frame of the pesharim, and especially the wicked priest's identification with Alexander. Moreover, since Josephus relates that the construction of Masada was 'very costly', this might be expected to have been paid for through taxation of the Jewish people, and thus explains the pesharist's accusations of the ill-use of 'wealth'.

Nevertheless, there are other 'nests on high' to which the pesharist may be referring. We have made frequent reference to the activities surrounding Simon Maccabee's death at the Dôk fortress, while Jannaeus also built Alexandreion. In short, the reference could be to any Jewish fortress of the period, although Masada remains the obvious choice. This conclusion is rendered futile, however, by the fact that any such reading is entirely unsupported by the amount of commentary remaining, and the fact that the pesharist does not, as we have seen, always stick to the literal sense of the prophecy. Moreover, the building aspects of the prophecy seem to be picked up in the length of commentary that does survive, through its identification with the House of Judgement (בית המשפט) where the priest will forfeit his soul and be condemned into the fires of brimstone (l. 5).<sup>38</sup>

The manner of this punishment sharply resonates with that to be meted out to the man of falsehood, since as we have seen (and in the lemma immediately following; 1QpHab X:9-13; Hab. 2:12-13), the Spouter of Falsehood is similarly accused of building a city with bloodshed, for which he and his congregation shall enter the judgements of fire (above, pp199ff.). Although 'fire' originates in Hab. 2:13, this does not escape the fact that the Spouter is accused of a similar activity to that of the priest, namely 'building,' while the punishments predicted are also similar, involving elements of 'burning'. This does not, in and of itself, harm our argument that the

---

identify the 'Jonathan'. We were only partially successful in our search for the solution. We discovered no structure which could with certainty be attributed to any period before that of Herod. Moreover, none of our pottery finds could be said to match the pre-Herodian types. On the other hand, we discovered scores of coins struck by Alexander Jannaeus (among them the most ancient of all the coins found at Masada). We can therefore now say, perhaps, that any buildings and cisterns, which were constructed on this site in the period before King Herod, were the work of King Alexander Jannaeus, and he is probably the 'Jonathan the High Priest' mentioned by Josephus."

<sup>38</sup> Whether or not this is intended as an ironic twist on the priest's 'house' is unclear. But the interpretation certainly picks up on the theme of matching the punishment to the crime.

priest/wicked priest and the spouter/man of falsehood are distinct individuals, but it certainly has not helped. Hence Lim:

It could be added to this overlap between the roles ascribed to the wicked priest and the liar that the Habakkuk pesherist describes both as 'wicked'. If the wicked priest and the liar are separate individuals, then it has to be said that the Habakkuk pesherist does not always maintain this distinction.<sup>39</sup>

The 'priest' is finally referred to in col. XI, contextually immediately prior to the reference to the 'wicked priest' in XII:2, and the '/wicked/ priest' in XII:18. The passage also follows the Day of Atonement reference in XI:4-8.

שבעתה קלון מ[כ]בוד שתה גם אתה והרעל תסוב עליכה כוס  
ימין יהוה וקיקלון על כבודכה

You are more full of shame than [gl]ory. Drink! Yes you! and stagger! The cup of the LORD's right hand will come around to you, and shame will cover your glory (Hab. 2:16; 1QpHab XI:8-11)

פשרו על הכוהן אשר גבר קלונו מכבודו	12
כיא לוא מל את צור לת לבו וילך בדרכי	13
הרויה למען ספות הצמאה וכוס חמת	14
[א]ל תבלענו לוסינף [ע]ליו קי ק[ל]וננו ומכאוב	15
[הו]ליו [ל] [ל] [ ]	16
[ ] [ ] [ ]	17

<sup>12</sup> Its interpretation concerns the priest whose shame exceeded his glory <sup>13</sup> for he did not circumcise the *fore skin*<sup>40</sup> of his heart, but walked in the ways of <sup>14</sup> satiation in order to quench his thirst. But the cup of {[Go]d's} wrath <sup>15</sup> will swallow him up ad[ding t]o [him the vomit of] his [sh]a[me]<sup>41</sup> and the pain of <sup>16</sup> [his sick]ne[ss ...]!/[... ...]!/[...] <sup>17</sup> [... ...] (1QpHab XI:12-17)

Just as VIII:16 depicts 'the priest who rebelled', this passage refers to 'the priest whose shame exceeded his glory' (הכוהן אשר גבר קלונו מכבודו), thereby ruling out a reference here to the Teacher also occasionally alluded to as 'the priest' (הכוהן).

As with the first reference to the wicked priest in the pesher (VIII:8-13), the 'priest' is accredited with some positive remarks. Thus, he is credited with an element of

<sup>39</sup> Lim, "Wicked Priest or Liar," 51.

<sup>40</sup> In the manuscript the word עורלת 'foreskin' has a larger than normal space between the ר and ל. This is best understood as a scribal error, rather than an indication of any greater significance. The spelling עורלת is found in 1QS V:5 (below).

'glory'; interpreting Hab 2:16: 'disgrace/shame will cover your glory'. His fall from glory (i.e. 'shame'), however, is here linked to his not circumcising the foreskin of his heart (כִּי־אֵל לֹא־מִלְאָתָּה עֹרֶלֶת לִבּוֹ), an expression that derives from OT passages such as Deut. 10:16 and 30:6, and recurs in Romans 2:29 amid Paul's argument concerning the real Jew.<sup>42</sup> Circumcision itself is a sign of the covenant between God and his people (Gen. 17:10-11), but, as Paul points out, this is only an outward sign (Rom. 2:28); true circumcision is of the heart. It is clear that for Paul circumcision of the heart replaces the physical rite, while in the OT the two are complementary.<sup>43</sup> The expression recurs elsewhere in the scrolls. Thus, in 1QS the prospective member is commanded not to walk in the 'stubbornness of his heart' (בְּשִׁרְיוֹת לִבּוֹ), but that he should 'circumcise in the community the foreskin of his disposition and of his stiff neck' (לְמוֹל בִּיחָד עֹרֶלֶת יִצְרָר וְעֹרֶרְףָּ קִשְׁהָ; 1QS V:5). In other words, circumcision of the heart is a sign of commitment to God, much like the baptism rite which, as opposed to actual circumcision (and christening), involves a conscious decision on behalf of the supplicant.

In 1QpHab, then, the Priest is accused of not circumcising the foreskin of his heart, but instead walking in the ways of satiation. The reason for not reading Hab. 2:16 as הָעֶרֶל is thus clear since the pesherist envisions the priest staggering or 'reeling' under the influence of alcohol. 'Satiation' (הַרְוִיָּה) seems to reflect שִׂבְעָתָה 'you will be sated' in the prophecy (l. 8<sup>44</sup>). The reference to 'thirst' (l. 14), the quenching of which is the priest's motivation, is not spelled out, but may refer to his lusting after the wealth of others earlier in 1QpHab. The imagery is, of course, motivated by the next part of Hab. 2:16, the reference to 'the cup of the LORD's right hand' (כּוֹס יְמִיִן)

<sup>41</sup> Horgan restores the shorter כֹּל לְ[ו]ן[ו]נוּ {adding} [t]o [all] his [sha]m[e]l'.

<sup>42</sup> The pesherist refers to the issue of circumcision here as an obvious play on words on הָעֶרֶל 'reel' in the prophecy; Hab. 2:16, 1QpHab XI:9. Hence עֹרֶלֶת 'foreskin' is derived from the similar root עָרַל 'be counted as uncircumcised'. Nevertheless, this is confused by the fact that the Masoretic reading as it survives reads הָעֶרֶל, i.e. a niphal imperative of עָרַל. LXX διασαλεύθητι from διασαλεύω 'shake violently' better fits the meaning 'reel' of the pesher and thus attests to a textual variant. That the pesherist reads הָעֶרֶל may imply that this is the earlier reading, since otherwise he would have read MT הָעֶרֶל, a root which recurs in the interpretation in any case.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. J.D.G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, Word Biblical Commentary, 38A (Word: Dallas, Texas, 1988), 127.

<sup>44</sup> Note the final ה is not found in MT.

יהוה; XI:10), although properly this recurs in the next part of the commentary as the ‘cup of God’s wrath’ (ll. 14-15). This ‘will make *him* reel’ (תבלענו); where ‘him’ doubtless refers to the priest. The reference seems to echo Isa. 51:17, both through the expression ‘cup of wrath’ and use of the רעל ‘reel’ root:

הַתְּעוֹרְרִי הַתְּעוֹרְרִי קוּמִי יְרוּשָׁלַם אֲשֶׁר שָׁתִית מִיַּד יְהוָה אֲתִיכּוֹס הַמָּחַר  
אֲתִי־קִבַּעַת כּוֹס הַתְּרַעְלָה שָׁתִית מְצִית:

Rouse yourself, rouse yourself! Stand up, O Jerusalem, you who have drunk at the hand of the LORD *the cup of his wrath*, who have drunk to the dregs *the bowl of staggering*.

In the pesher too, the cup of God’s wrath will swallow up him who drinks it.

The central section of line 15 has not survived but, because a *waw* is clear at the end of the lacuna, while traces of a *lamed* are clearly visible above the line,<sup>45</sup> Brownlee restores ק[ל]ו[נ]ן ק[ר] ל[ר]י ע[ר] ל[ו]ס[ר]י ‘to heap upon him the vomit of his shame’. The latter aspect is derived from וקיקלון in the prophecy, though splitting up the word because of the length of the lacuna; while the overall meaning is in line with the fragmentary ו[ר]ו[ב] [ח]ו[ר] ל[ר]י ‘pain of / [his sick]ne[ss]’ immediately following (ll. 15-16).<sup>46</sup> Other reconstructions read א[ת] ק[ל]ו[נ]ן (Elliger) א[ת] ק[ל]ו[נ]ן (Horgan), while García-Martínez merely restores ק[ל]ו[נ]ן [...]. Brownlee’s offering is to be preferred since it is the only suggestion to account for the entire phrase וקיקלון in the prophecy.

An obvious historical parallel can be made here between the priest’s drunken state and the last years of Alexander Jannaeus. As we have earlier pointed out (above, pp228ff.), Josephus describes how, after his many campaigns, Jannaeus fell into a bout of heavy drinking, contracted a “quartan ague” which lasted for three years, and died.<sup>47</sup> Meanwhile, Frank Cross also links the passage with the treacherous slaughter of Simon Maccabee and two of his sons by his son-in-law Ptolemy. According to I Macc. 16:16 Ptolemy waited until Simon and his sons were drunk before ordering his

<sup>45</sup> A second *lamed* is clear towards the beginning of the lacuna under the *šade* of הַצִּמְאָה in the previous line.

<sup>46</sup> Brownlee, 193-194. The reading of חו[ר]ל[ר]י in line 16 is difficult. Although the top of a *lamed* is visible, this is all that can be made out of the word and most scholars do not restore. Brownlee’s offering relies on the fact that מַכְאֵב and חֲלִי are parallel terms (Cf. Isa. 53:3f.), but the reconstruction is still very questionable.

<sup>47</sup> *Ant.* XIII, xv, 5 §398.

men to attack.<sup>48</sup> Nevertheless, since the references to drunkenness derive from the original prophecy, it is unclear to what extent it is valid to see in the interpretation a reference to the drunkenness of a particular individual.

### Conclusion

As in previous passages, then, this vignette describes a figure ('the priest') who will be punished by God. It is unclear what form this punishment will take, since much of the terminology is drawn from the passage being interpreted. Similarly, 'shame' 'glory' and 'cup' all derive from the prophecy, while references to 'circumcision' rely on a pun in Hebrew on ערל/רעל.<sup>49</sup> This makes it difficult to suggest whether the individual described here is the same as the 'wicked priest' found elsewhere in the scrolls. Common sense would suggest he is.

### (c) The Last Priests of Jerusalem

Our final passage concerns the reference to the 'last priests of Jerusalem' in 1QpHab IX. This phrase does not occur elsewhere in the pesharim, but as Brownlee points out (further, below) may be linked to similar references to the last days and the 'last generation'.

וְאִשֶּׁר	2
אָמַר כִּי אַתָּה שְׁלוֹתָה גּוֹיִם רַבִּים וַיִּשְׁלֹכָה כּוֹל	3
יִתֵּר עַמִּים פָּשְׂרוּ עַל כּוֹהֲנֵי יְרוּשָׁלַם	4
הָאֲחֵרוֹנִים אֲשֶׁר יִקְבֹּצוּ הוֹן וּבִצְעַ מִשְׁלַל הָעַמִּים	5
וְלֵאחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים יִנְתֵּן הוֹנָם עִם שְׁלַלִם בְּיַד	6
חֵיל הַכְּתִיאִים כִּיֹּא הִמָּה יִתֵּר הָעַמִּים	7

And as for <sub>3</sub> what he said, "because you plundered many nations so will all the remainder <sub>4</sub> of the peoples {plunder you}," (Hab. 2:8a) <Blank> its interpretation concerns the {last} priests of Jerusalem <sub>5</sub> who will gather wealth and spoil by plundering the peoples. <sub>6</sub> But in the last days their wealth along with their spoil will be given into the hands of <sub>7</sub> the army of the Kittim <Blank> for they are "the remainder of the peoples." (1QpHab IX:2-7)

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Cross, *Ancient Library*, 115: "The drunken high priest not merely drinks in carousals, the cup of wrath swallows him. The comment admirably fits Simon's drunken demise."

<sup>49</sup> The Masoretic reading רעל 'reel' is incidentally supported by the LXX reading διασαλεύθητι καὶ σεισθητι 'shake and quake'.

Contextually, this passage immediately follows the reference to ‘the priest who rebelled’ in VIII:16-IX:2 and directly precedes the account relating the ‘offence’ of the Wicked Priest against the Teacher of Righteousness (IX:9-12). In other words, the passage falls right in the middle of two texts referring to the (wicked) priest. As in the previous passage the pesherist is still commenting on Hab. 2:8, and more specifically the phrase ‘because you plundered many nations, all the remainder of the peoples will plunder you’. The ‘remainder of the peoples’ (Heb. יִרְרַר עַמִּים) are explicitly identified with the Kittim (l. 7; above, p68) and these may also be the subject of the verb עָשָׂה in IX:2 who inflicted evil diseases on ‘the priest’ (above, p229). Nevertheless, the change in subject from the ‘priest who rebelled’ to the ‘last priests of Jerusalem’ is left unexplained. In the original prophecy, Habakkuk is still referring to the arrogant of 2:5, while the pesherist seems to change subject at will.

The identity of these ‘last priests’ is unclear, since the plural form seems to rule out straightforward identification with ‘the priest’ of the previous passage. Brownlee relates these to the ‘last generation’ (1QpHab II:7; VII:2; in the former the Teacher will announce their fate) and the ‘last days’ (II:5f.; the time of the traitors). He thus makes the reference eschatological in outlook (hence the use of the imperfect tense in these passages) and suggests that the pesherist is referring to the contemporary priesthood. He even suggests a reference to the rival priesthoods of Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II since the Kittim are frequently identified as the Romans (who benefited from this situation, ultimately seizing control).<sup>50</sup> This interpretation requires a later dating for the pesher than is often allowed, and would even date it after 4QpNah, which would seem to discard many of its elements (especially all mention of either the Teacher of Righteousness, Wicked Priest or the Man of Falsehood). Moreover, it is difficult to reconcile this view with the use of the imperfect tense. If the pesherist is writing from a position of knowledge of the events in question, why place these events in the future? Finally, there is no evidence in Josephus that the brothers themselves plundered the people’s wealth.

Another suggestion arises out of the Groningen Hypothesis. Although this will feature more fully below, in short, the hypothesis identifies six different Hasmonean high

---

<sup>50</sup> Brownlee, 152.



priests as the subject of vignettes referring to both ‘wicked priest’ and ‘priest’. The reference to the ‘last priests of Jerusalem’ in the hypothesis is, straightforwardly, identification of these ‘wicked priests’ *en masse*. In other words, ‘last priests of Jerusalem’ is a general reference to the faults of all six ‘wicked priests’. Although I concentrate on the difficulties of the hypothesis in more detail below (pp243-248), it is worth pointing out at this stage that the reference falls amid the references to the wicked priest etc. Were the reference to be summative, it should fall at the end of the ‘wicked priest’ section.

More likely, then, the reference to the last priests in the imperfect tense implies that this is still for the future. As elsewhere, the Kittim here form God’s chosen instrument of vengeance and judgement and given the pesherist’s obvious contempt for the High Priests of his time it is not unreasonable to suppose that in the future the bitter infighting in the Maccabean family (as evidenced by the deaths of Simon Maccabee and two of his sons in a family feud) might have resulted in rival priesthoods. As we have seen, this did in fact occur between the brothers Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, but the pesherist’s supposed ‘knowledge’ of these events may be considered an accurate foreseeing of how matters might develop in a dynasty such as that of the Maccabees. Moreover, a split in the priesthood would, for the pesherist, spell an end to the period and a dramatic act on God’s behalf.

---

#### Excursus: The Wicked Priests of the Groningen Hypothesis

In considering the designation ‘wicked priest’, it behoves us to consider a relatively recent hypothesis proposed by A. S. van der Woude, concerning the possible multiple identity of this figure.<sup>51</sup> This suggestion has since been incorporated in its entirety into the ‘Groningen Hypothesis’ originally put forward by Florentino García Martínez but of which van der Woude was later identified as co-author.<sup>52</sup>

In his original article, van der Woude proposes that within the confines of 1QpHab we should identify six ‘wicked priests’. These, he argues, may be identified with six

---

<sup>51</sup> Van der Woude, “Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests, 349-359.

successive High Priests: Judas Maccabeus (VIII:8-13); Alcimus (VIII:16-IX:2); Jonathan (IX:8-12); Simon (IX:16ff.); John Hyrcanus I (XI:2-8); and Alexander Jannaeus (XI:8-11). Van der Woude also considers the identities of the ‘last priests of Jerusalem’ in IX:4-7, which he refers to this succession of Hasmonean high priests, and the Spouter of the Lie (X:9-XI:2), whom he considers to be distinct from the wicked priests; a reasonable conclusion.

There are some surprising features in this list. Judas Maccabeus is not normally considered to have been a High Priest, though Josephus does record a tradition that Judas succeeded Alcimus to the priesthood (*Ant.* XII §§ 414, 419, 434). This is supported by a similar statement in *b. Meg.* 11A. Since other documents clearly show that Judas is survived by Alcimus by one year (I Macc. 9), while elsewhere Josephus states that Alcimus’s pontificate was succeeded by an *intersacerdotium* of seven years (*Ant.* XX x.1 §237), van der Woude depicts Judas preceding Alcimus’s pontificate – though at the same time acknowledging that he may have been a *de facto* rather than an officially appointed High Priest. Van der Woude also excludes Aristobulus I from his list of priests, by reason of his short pontificate, 104-103 BC.

An important aspect of the hypothesis is the conclusion that 1QpHab was composed during the pontificate of Alexander Jannaeus, the sixth ‘wicked priest’. Van der Woude arrives at this conclusion in two ways: first, unlike the other instances, the final ‘wicked priest’ is referred to in the present, rather than past, tense thereby implying he is still alive at the time of the pesher’s composition; second, the other wicked priests are ‘identified’ by a relative clause immediately following the introductory phrase (i.e. ‘the interpretation concerns the wicked priest *who...*’). Since the sixth wicked priest is instead referred to in an “absolute” sense<sup>53</sup>, it may be assumed that the audience would know to whom the pesherist was referring, i.e. the current incumbent. This ‘wicked priest’ is then identified with Alexander Jannaeus due to the references to ׀” ‘wine’ in col. XI and the evidence that in the last years of his life Jannaeus succumbed to overdrinking, ultimately leading to his death (*Ant.* XIII xv, 5 §398).

---

<sup>52</sup> García Martínez, “Qumran Origins and Early History; García Martínez, Van der Woude, “A ‘Groningen’ Hypothesis of Qumran Origins,” 521-541.

<sup>53</sup> Van der Woude, “Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests,” 351.

Aside from these issues, the remaining High Priests may be calculated historically to fit them in to the evidence given in the pesher. Thus Simon was the master-builder of the Hasmoneans and fits the reference to 'stone' and 'wood' in the interpretation of Hab. 2:9-11, while the sticky end of both the second and third wicked priests parallels the deaths of Alcimus and Jonathan Maccabee. Judas himself is identified as the first wicked priest since he was originally 'called by the name of truth' and only later betrayed God (1QpHab VIII:8ff.); allusions to his support of the Hasidim (even though he may not have been a member of the group himself) and his actions against the Hellenists, tempered by his usurpation of the priesthood from the Zadokite dynasty – whether *de facto* or in truth – and the atrocities he committed referred to in Maccabees.<sup>54</sup> Only the identification of John Hyrcanus I as the fifth 'wicked priest' is not based on external evidence. This is primarily because the Day of Atonement episode (1QpHab XI:4-8) refers to a conflict between the wicked priest and the teacher 'at the house of his exile', a reference to the Qumran settlement itself (above, p158). Since no high priest is accredited with a similar deed in the historical documents to hand, Van der Woude identifies John Hyrcanus on the basis of both the archaeological dating of the Qumran settlement and the fact that the other high priests have already been accounted for.

The hypothesis has been criticised by Timothy Lim<sup>55</sup> and, in spite of van der Woude's subsequent defence and reiteration of some of the main aspects of the thesis,<sup>56</sup> doubts remain as to the hypothesis's overall value. Lim divides his criticisms into three areas, relating to: the sixth wicked priest; Judas Maccabeus as *de facto* high priest; and the overall question of Simon as the fourth wicked priest. Concerning the sixth high priest, Lim questions whether he *is* in fact the subject of a relative clause ('whom God will judge for destruction', 1QpHab XII:5) albeit separated by intervening comments. He also points out that, in referring to the fourth wicked priest, the pesherist also uses the present rather than the past tense, thereby casting doubt on the supposition that the use of the present tense in referring to Jannaeus implies that he (Jannaeus) was *necessarily* alive (and therefore High Priest) at the time of writing.

---

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 354-355 & nn18-19.

<sup>55</sup> T.H. Lim, "The Wicked Priests of the Groningen Hypothesis," *JBL* 112 (1993), 415-425.

<sup>56</sup> Van der Woude, "Once Again: The Wicked Priests in the *Habakkuk Pesher* from cave 1 of Qumran," *RevQ* 17 (1996), 375-384.

Lim's second difficulty concerns Judas Maccabeus's assumption of the high priesthood, whether *de facto* or otherwise. He queries use of *b. Meg* 11A to support the suggestion, since this text also incorrectly states that Judas's father Mattathias was himself high priest, while the most important MS of the Babylonian Talmud omits the entire reference to Mattathias and his sons.<sup>57</sup> Lim recites the problems inherent in Josephus's description of events and suggests that van der Woude's reversal of the order of the Josephus account shows how methodologically contrived the suggestion is; on the one hand to accept (if only partially) *Ant.* XII which states that Judas was high priest (against the silence in *I Macc.* and outright contradiction in *Ant.* XX), while simultaneously rejecting the order of death and succession in the same passage so as to account for the sequence of events recorded in *I Macc.* 9. Finally, Lim points to Goldstein's commentary for support that, in his original statement in *Ant.* XII, Josephus made an error that was corrected in book twenty. "At that point," comments Goldstein, "Josephus should have asked himself why our ardent pro-Hasmonean author passed over in silence the first term of a Hasmonean as high priest."<sup>58</sup> Judas's tenure of three years followed by a four-year interregnum is thus corrected to a seven year interregnum in *Ant.* XX.

Lim's final concern relates to the identification of Simon as the fourth 'wicked priest'. He points out that the actual expression כוהן הרשע is not found in 1QpHab IX:16ff., the supposed reference. Instead the line is fragmentary. Following Brownlee's reconstruction 'the [Pries]t who...' (הכ[והן] אשר; Brownlee, 158), Lim examines the only really visible letter, the *he*, and suggests that it may better resemble a final *mem*, perhaps as the initial letter (defectively written in the final form, ם) of מטרף 'spouter', since the interpretation following (X:1-5) shares distinct parallels with what is said of the 'spouter of the lie' in X:9-13. Lim thus criticises van der Woude for dissecting 1QpHab IX and X into two distinct units, a dissection that does not stand up to close scrutiny. Harmonising the accounts, he adds, depicts a figure called the 'spouter of the lie', connected with the building of Jerusalem, who was initially judged and punished by God in the house of judgement. This figure caused many to err in building a city of

---

<sup>57</sup> Lim, "The Wicked Priests," 420.

<sup>58</sup> J.A. Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, The Anchor Bible, 41 (Doubleday: New York, 1976), Appendix vi, 569-570. Cf. Lim, "The Wicked Priests,"

vanity, setting up a congregation in falsehood, leading them too into the judgements of fire.<sup>59</sup> Although we may dismiss the claim that מַטְרִיף may be restored over הַכּוֹהֵן for IX:16,<sup>60</sup> enough doubt remains regarding the identification of this fourth wicked priest for us to agree with Lim's criticisms, which are supported by our own independent observations.

Van der Woude's proposal of six wicked priests in chronological order through the course of 1QpHab is ultimately questioned by the fact that some of his identifications of the relevant figures seems more inspired by the thesis than vice versa. In other words, having established, for instance, the first and sixth wicked priests as Judas Maccabeus and Alexander Jannaeus respectively, the identification of the remaining four seem to be a case of 'filling in the gaps'. The identification of Simon as the fourth 'wicked priest' is especially tenuous, relying on the Hasmonean's reputation as a 'master-builder' to explain an element of the interpretation already inherent in the biblical prophecy. Moreover, the fact that this fourth 'wicked priest' (and the second for that matter) is not referred to by the epithet כּוֹהֵן הַרְשָׁע, and Lim's criticisms concerning this figure and the identity of Judas as high priest, stand out. Nevertheless, both Lim and van der Woude agree to the extent that the material relating to this כּוֹהֵן הַרְשָׁע is too disparate to be applied to any one Hasmonean high priest. It then becomes a question of – if not six – to how many wicked priests does the Habakkuk pesherist refer? And: to which 'wicked priest' do the references in 4QpIsa<sup>c</sup> and 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> (not referred to by van der Woude) apply?

---

<sup>59</sup> Lim, "The Wicked Priests," 423-424.

<sup>60</sup> Thus van der Woude points out that reading מַטְרִיף brings with it its own problems. He points to the earliest photograph of col. IX, in the photographs produced by Burrows, where a final *nun* as opposed to a final *pe* is visible. Due to deterioration of the manuscript this is not visible in either the Trever publication or the Oxford CD-ROM. He also rules out Lim's reading on palaeographic evidence, while pointing out that any reading מַטְרִיף here would be preceded by the definite article. This is to say nothing of the fact that Lim's reading requires a defectively written *mem* in any case. Meanwhile, Lim's case is not helped by the fact that his examples show a defectively written *mem* in the middle – rather than at the beginning – of the word in question. Cf. van der Woude, "Once Again," 378 & nn10-11; M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*, 1 (New Haven, 1950), Pl. LIX.

### Conclusion: The Wicked Priest in the Habakkuk Peshet

In 1QpHab, references to the Wicked Priest (or כוהן הרשע) survive in either four or five passages (dependent on whether XII:2-10 is considered as one or two passages), from cols. VIII through XII, and may be compared with a figure referred to as 'the priest' followed by the identificatory 'who rebelled' 'whose shame surpassed his glory' in cols. VIII-IX and XI respectively. Each reference to these figures derives from interpretation of Hab. 2:5-17, the majority of which is concerned with the prophet's 'five woes' (vv6-20), originally applied to the Assyrians, Babylonians or Macedonians. For the peshetist, these woes are now applied to a new tyrant; a 'wicked priest'. Like the nations listed above, this figure is accused of plundering peoples, gaining wealth through violent acts, degrading his neighbours, and – should the original peshetist have intended to continue into vv18-20<sup>61</sup> – idolatry.

This makes it difficult, then, to state with any confidence how many different individuals are here being described as 'wicked priest'; whether the early scholars were correct to attempt to identify one particular Hasmonean high priest; or, as the Groningen hypothesis suggests, 1QpHab describes a multiplicity of 'wicked priests', be that the six that García-Martínez and Van der Woude initially suggested, or even four – to match the four 'woes' commented upon by the peshetist in this connection. It is, moreover, difficult to identify with clarity specific historical events being commented upon, since the vignettes are often closely related to the texts being interpreted. Nevertheless, it is clear that the peshetist has his own agenda, especially given the number of word-plays and textual changes from the MT.

The identity of the 'wicked priest' and 'the priest' may be sustained because they are both described in very similar words. The relationship between the Wicked Priest and the 'last priests of Jerusalem', however, remains unclear. As we have shown, various candidates have been proposed as the Wicked Priest at different stages, and have ranged from Simon Maccabee, to John Hyrcanus, to Alexander Jannaeus. This is by

---

<sup>61</sup> As outlined in a previous chapter, the final columns of the peshet are markedly different to what has come before, less direct and marked, and more closely aligned to the biblical text, to the extent that no new content is included. In the opinion of this writer, these columns mark the attempt by another writer in the group to finish off an earlier work, but lack the punch and drive of the previous author.

no means a complete list, but the very fact that there still so many possibilities to be accounted for indicates the need for further research, and especially analysis of the references to the Wicked Priest in other pesharim – a major weakness of the Groningen hypothesis, which deals exclusively with 1QpHab.

### 6.3.2 4QpIsaiah<sup>c</sup>

In 4QpIsa<sup>c</sup>, a fragmentary reference to the Wicked Priest survives. It is not, however, possible to identify the passage upon which the pesherist is commenting. As it survives, the pesher preserves interpretations on parts of Isa. chs. 8-10, 14, 19, and 29-31, any of which could form the basis for the current passage.

1	.[ את
2	ה[ בכא ל
3	הכ[והן הרשע
4	[ הואה
5	גב. מן[כי

] . 't  
 ]h bk' l  
 ]the Wicked [Pr]iest (?)  
 ]it  
 ]b. the ki[n]gs of  
 (4QpIsa<sup>c</sup> 30 I:1-5; Horgan)

Although the reference to the Wicked Priest is certain, as we can see, very little of the rest of the vignette survives, certainly not enough to help us interpret the passage.

### 6.3.3 4QpPsalms<sup>a</sup>

A much clearer reference to the Wicked Priest is found in 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> IV. Here, as in 1QpHab, the Wicked Priest is depicted alongside the Teacher of Righteousness.

צופה רשע לצדיק ומבקשן לחמיתו יה[והן] לוא יעזבנו בידו  
 ו[ל]וא י[רשיענו] {{ו}} בהשפטו

Psalm 37:32-33; 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 1-10 IV:7

8	פשרו על [הכו]הן הרשע אשר צ[פה] למור[ה] הצד[ק] ויבקש
	ל[המיתו] [ ] ק[ו] והתורה
9	אשר שלח אליו ואל לוא יעזבנו בידו] ולוא ירשיענו ב[השפטו]
	ולנו י[שלם] [אל את] גמולו לתת

4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 1-10 IV:8-10. For translation and notes see above, pp175ff.

Earlier I suggested that use of the imperfect tense in the vignette here should not necessarily imply that the incident described has yet to take place, since the same tenses are used in the prophecy. Rather, I identify the event depicted in the passage with the ‘offence’ referred to in 1QpHab.

As in similar passages, the Wicked Priest is here to undergo punishment for his crimes. In this instance, he is to be handed over to the ‘ruthless ones of the Gentiles’ (עריצי גואים) perhaps the Kittim of 1QpHab, although there these are not explicitly related to either the Teacher or Wicked Priest. Rather the Kittim are linked to the last priests of Jerusalem whose relation to the wicked priest is unclear.

#### **6.4 Conclusions**

The Wicked Priest is, as we have observed, unlike similar figures (notably the Teacher of Righteousness and the Man of Falsehood), unique to the Qumran pesharim. While the corpus’s fragmented state makes it difficult to draw broader conclusions from this, the absence of the priest from other texts – and most important of all CD and 1QS – may be of greater significance than is often realized, casting doubt on the Priest’s supremacy in reconstructions of the group’s internal history.

Within the pesharim, the Wicked Priest features in three texts, although 4QpIsa<sup>c</sup> is of little use. Meanwhile, in both of the remaining pesharim the Wicked Priest figures alongside the Teacher of Righteousness, although in 1QpHab he also appears in his own right. Due in large part to the 1QpHab passage that states the Wicked Priest ‘ruled over Israel’ and the alleged derivation of the name from the Hebrew for ‘high priest’, the Wicked Priest is generally considered to be a reigning high priest in Jerusalem of the period, and especially one of the Hasmonean priests. Nevertheless, the derivation of כהן הרשע from כהן ראש, while seemingly plausible, requires a Hebrew term for high priest unused in the Second Temple period and one which only refers to the chief priest (under a monarch) in the Hebrew Bible. Even where the expression occurs in 1QM it hardly supports the hypothesis. This does not, however, require us to reject the assumption that the Wicked Priest is a ruling Hasmonean high



priest, since the pesherist is explicit that he 'ruled' (משל) over Israel. Moreover, the Hebrew phrase referring to his 'taking office' is used in biblical passages with reference to state leaders, while as we have seen, many of the particular vignettes may be referred to particular events related to the priests in question. Rather, the expression 'wicked priest' seems to be straightforwardly derived from the identification of 'the wicked one' of Ps. 37:32 and to avoid confusion with the fact that the Teacher is himself described as a priest.<sup>62</sup> Similarly, where the pesherist refers to 'the priest' this again is covered by a following identificatory sub-clause so as to avoid confusion.

As we have stated both here and elsewhere, in 1QpHab the Wicked Priest is accused of 'an offence' committed against the Teacher of Righteousness, but the precise nature of this is unexplained. Nevertheless, given the Wicked Priest's infrequent appearances in the pesharim, it makes sense to identify the incident described in 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> with this 'offence'. Although it is still not possible to state precisely what this offence entailed, since the 'seeking to kill' aspect is drawn directly from the Psalter, it is evident, even so, that as in 1QpHab some personal attack is intended. Like both the Man of Falsehood and the Teacher himself the Wicked Priest does appear in his own right in 1QpHab; but the majority of these references are to his expected demise. According to the pesherist, he will be handed over to his enemies, will suffer a debilitating disease, be condemned by God and burned in the fires of hell. This more than anything gives scholars the impression that the multiple identity of this figure may be sustained.

### **6.5 The Multiple Identification of the Wicked Priest in the Pesharim**

When it comes to identifying the Wicked Priest(s) referred to in the pesharim there is scarcely any consensus. Various theories abound, which identify each Jerusalem High Priest from Jason and Menelaus in the early second century BC to the feuding brothers Aristobulus II and John Hyrcanus II in the mid-first century BC. Suggestions include Menelaus (Michel, Rowley), Jonathan (Vermes, Stegemann, Murphy-

---

<sup>62</sup> The identification of רשע with כהן הרשע, it should be noted, does not, of itself, rule out the identification of 'wicked' in 1QpHab 1:13 with the Man of Falsehood, since 'wicked' is already used in col. V with reference to the איש הכזב.

O'Connor), Simon (Vermees, Cross, Nickelsburg), Alexander Jannaeus (Allegro, Segal), and Hyrcanus II/Aristobulus II (Dupont-Sommer, Elliger). The Wicked Priest has even been identified with first century AD figures; including Jesus (Thiering), Paul (Teicher, Eisenmann) and the Jewish military leader Menahem (Driver). A summary of the major hypotheses may be found elsewhere,<sup>63</sup> but in the current section we choose to concentrate on the three prevalent theories: the identification of the Wicked Priest with one of the brothers Jonathan or Simon Maccabee, and Alexander Jannaeus, already referred to in 4QpNah under the sobriquet "Lion of Wrath."<sup>64</sup>

### 6.5.1 Jonathan and Simon Maccabee

Geza Vermes first suggested the identification of the Wicked Priest with Jonathan.<sup>65</sup> He suggested that 1QpHab VIII:8-13, including the 'called by the name of truth' reference, was the key and referred to Jonathan's struggle against Alcimus's pontificate, regarded favourably by the Zadokites at Qumran. His decision to accept the High Priesthood from Alexander Balas in 152 was, however, accounted Jonathan's "most grievous" sin. Meanwhile, Vermes identifies the theft of the wealth of the 'men of violence' with Jonathan's retention of spoil plundered from those apostate Jews allied to the Syrians. This spoil would have been considered the 'soiled goods of iniquity' and according to the law of *herem* should have been destroyed. Meanwhile, Vermes suggests that the Wicked Priest's sad end described in two passages of 1QpHab again fits Jonathan admirably, since he walked into Tryphon's trap at Ptolemais and was taken prisoner, probably tortured, and ultimately executed, especially fitting the Wicked Priest's 'wounds' and death at the hands of gentiles.

Nevertheless, Vermes does not identify all the references to the Wicked Priest with Jonathan. Rather, having identified the 'Liemonger' who misled many to build a city of vanity with the new priestly society founded by Jonathan's brother Simon, Vermes

---

<sup>63</sup> So M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Secker & Warburg: London, 1956), 160-183; *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (1958), 212-218; Driver, *The Judaean Scrolls*, 126-67; W.H. Brownlee, "The Wicked Priest," 1-37.

<sup>64</sup> Above, pp94f..

identifies Simon as the subject of other references to the Wicked Priest. Thus, the allusions to 'abominations' and the accusation of 'defiling the sanctuary' relate to the rumours that Simon's wife (John Hyrcanus's mother) had been a captive during the reign of Antiochus.<sup>66</sup> More importantly, however, Vermes identifies the accusations of drunkenness with Simon's death during a drunken feast at the Dôk fortress in Jericho.

Cross has developed this latter view, albeit identifying the Wicked Priest exclusively as Simon,<sup>67</sup> claiming that most of the rest of the data found in 1QpHab "can be fitted with equal ease to any of the warrior high priests from Jonathan to Alexander Jannaeus."<sup>68</sup> The reference to the Wicked Priest being given 'into the hands of his enemies' could, he suggests, refer to Jonathan's death at the hands of Tryphon as Vermes suggests, but may also be applied to Simon's death at the hand of Ptolemy and his men, an incident which, as we have seen, is alluded to elsewhere in 1QpHab. This position is strengthened through the references to walking in the ways of drunkenness in col. XI.<sup>69</sup> Meanwhile, Cross alleges that the Testimonia reference to the Accursed Man and his two instruments of violence may also refer to Simon (and his sons), even though the Wicked priest himself does not feature.<sup>70</sup> Finally, like Vermes, Cross applies the references to the *מטריף הכזב* and the *איש הכזב* to Simon as well. He refers the establishment of a congregation in falsehood and the building of a city of vanity in blood figuratively to the building of a high priestly house and thus its false congregation by the Wicked Priest – although here he is less sure of his ground.

<sup>65</sup> G. Vermes, "Où en est la question des manuscrits de la Mer Morte?" *Cahiers Sioniens* (1953), 63-76, esp. 71-74; *Discovery in the Judean Desert* (Desclee: New York, 1956), 89-97.

<sup>66</sup> Cited against Hyrcanus by Eleazar. So *Ant.* XIII, x, 5 §290-292. See *m. Kethuboth* 1:4; 2:5-6, 9.

<sup>67</sup> Cross, *Ancient Library*, 100-120. Cross's theory has received significant support from Charlesworth's analysis of Essene history, especially through the analysis of 4QTestimonia, although he ultimately concludes that the Wicked Priest could be Jonathan or Simon. Cf. Charlesworth, "The Origin and Subsequent History of the Authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Four Transitional Phases among the Qumran Essenes" *RevQ* 10 (1980), 213-233 esp. 217-222.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, 110-111.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, 115.

<sup>70</sup> As we have seen, however, the account in 4Q175 is best applied to the conquests of Samaria in c. 128 BC by Aristobulus and Antigonos, the offspring of Simon's remaining son, John Hyrcanus I. Cf. Eshel, "The Historical Background of the Peshet Interpreting Joshua's Curse on the Rebuilder of Jericho," 409-420; above, pp. 120-125.

Thus, he entertains the suggestion that these references may apply to the Wicked Priest's successor or predecessor, i.e. John Hyrcanus or Jonathan respectively.<sup>71</sup>

The identification of the Wicked Priest with Jonathan receives a major boost from Stegemann's 1971 thesis (*Die Entstehung*).<sup>72</sup> This contends that 'Teacher of Righteousness' is a traditional title of the High Priest in Jerusalem, designating him as "the highest doctrinal authority in Israel. Meanwhile, Stegemann claims, a number of passages in the scrolls show that the Teacher did not simply lay claim to the rank of high priest, but reveal that he had been the actual holder of that office before Jonathan ousted him in 152. The Teacher's fate was, then, the same as that of Onias III, expelled by Jason in 175, and Onias IV who briefly reigned as high priest in Jerusalem before he was himself deposed by Menelaus, escaping to Egypt where he founded a separate temple at Leontopoll. Again, Stegemann argues that he could not have established this temple simply on the basis of a claim to succession, but that Onias coupled this to his past exercise of the high priesthood in order to seek a continued investiture in the office. The Teacher, by comparison, seemingly used this same argument to establish the Qumran community, since Stegemann links his tenure as high priest with Josephus's report of the seven-year *intersacerdotium* between the pontificates of Alcimus and Jonathan (159-152). The theory aids the identification of the Wicked Priest with Jonathan since the conflict between the Wicked Priest and the Teacher of Righteousness can now be seen to originate with the Teacher's expulsion from office by Jonathan and the change in priestly dynasty from the orthodox Zadokite family to a Hasmonean put in place by a foreign ruler.

### 6.5.2 Alexander Jannaeus

The case for identifying the Wicked Priest with Alexander Jannaeus, the third son of John Hyrcanus, is mainly associated with John Allegro,<sup>73</sup> although M.H. Segal first argued the case in 1951.<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup> Cross's conclusions are implicitly supported by G.W.E. Nickelsburg ("Simon—A Priest With a Reputation For Faithfulness," *BASOR* 223 [1976], 67-8), who suggests that "to be called by a 'trustworthy name'" may allude to the decree in I Macc. 14:25-49 that Simon and his sons should be priests forever, and significantly the attestation to Simon's *faithfulness* (πίστιν; vv. 32-35).

<sup>72</sup> See also *The Library of Qumran*, 147-148.

<sup>73</sup> J.M. Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, esp. 94-100.

Allegro begins with 4QpNahum's clear identification of the Lion of Wrath with Alexander Jannaeus and suggests that this figure seems to be the same person who is referred to as the *Wicked Priest*, the 'arch-villain of the drama.' He identifies a possible watershed for the sect in *Ant.* XIII, xiii, 5 §372-374, where Josephus describes how during the Feast of Tabernacles the people turned seditious against Jannaeus and pelted him with citrons. Seemingly this relates to the same accusation raised against Hyrcanus, that he was the son of a slave woman and thus not of pure descent to hold the priesthood,<sup>75</sup> although Allegro also suggests that the imagery of Jannaeus "hands red with the blood of countless battles" presiding at the altar may have been a contributing factor. Jannaeus sent in soldiers to quell the uprising and in the course of events 'several thousand' people were killed. In any case, Allegro suggests that this may have led the Teacher and other 'faithful priests' to flee to the deserts of Qumran, there to await God's kingdom. There they built for themselves a new, temporary sanctuary, where the Teacher, as the true High Priest, could have offered up the daily sacrifices. Although not the community's intention, Allegro holds that this could have been interpreted as a deliberate attempt to subvert Jannaeus's authority, perhaps leading to political rebellion, and meriting a dreadful, gentile, punishment through crucifixion.<sup>76</sup> He even surmises that the Teacher was officiating at the Qumran altar 'at the house of his exile' when Jannaeus arrived:

In any case, the scene as these two priests faced one another must have been dramatic enough. The one, haughty and proud, scarred by the wounds of many battles, and the ravaging of a lifetime of greed and lechery, the other, white-robed and saintly, gazing scornfully on his enemy, secure in his simple trust in God and the hope of resurrection to eternal life. Would that those disciples, who perhaps watched the scene from the crags above the Monastery, had included a Mark or Luke. But connected narratives of this type have no place in Qumran literature.<sup>77</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> M.H. Segal, "The Habakkuk 'Commentary' and the Damascus Fragments: A Historical Study," *JBL* 70 (1951), 131-47; Cf. Brownlee, "The Wicked Priest," esp. 28-36.

<sup>75</sup> Above, n66. The riot is given a different cause in the Rabbinic literature. Here, an unnamed 'Sadducee' poured out the libation on his feet enraging the onlookers. That the 'Sadducee' be identified as Jannaeus himself is a not unreasonable conclusion to draw. So *b. Sukk.* 48b; *b. Yom.* 26b; Schürer, *History*, I, 223 n16.

<sup>76</sup> Ultimately, Allegro uses the evidence of 4QpNah and *Ant.* XIII to argue that the Teacher was crucified.

<sup>77</sup> Allegro, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 100.

Although ‘dramatic’, Allegro’s argument for identification lacks evidence, for which instead we turn to Segal.

Segal first identifies the Kittim in 1QpHab with the Roman forces of Pompey and decides that the differing picture of the Romans in this text – as opposed to their depiction in I Maccabees (which was composed in c. 100 BC) – leads to the conclusion that 1QpHab was composed after the composition of I Macc. and before Pompey’s conquest of Jerusalem in 63, and that the Wicked Priest in 1QpHab is none other than Alexander Jannaeus.<sup>78</sup> Thus, 1QpHab VIII:8-12 refers to the events surrounding his accession to the priesthood, while VIII:16-IX:2 and IX:9-12 both allude to Jannaeus’s ignominious defeat by Ubaid (i.e. Obadas) the Nabatean – when it may be assumed that he suffered severe wounds – and his return to Jerusalem where he was greeted by insults, which may have caused him a ‘bitterness of soul.’ The references to ‘drunkenness’ in XI:12-15 may be explained by Josephus’s evidence that Jannaeus’s heavy drinking was a contributory factor towards his death, while the abominable acts performed in Jerusalem related in XII:7-9 might refer to the unlawful way in which Jannaeus acted as High Priest, and more precisely to his introduction of foreign mercenaries to the Temple to quell the Tabernacles riots. Finally, Segal identifies the ‘last priests of Jerusalem’ in 1QpHab IX:4-7 as the Sadducee priests who joined Jannaeus and participated in his raids upon the neighbouring peoples.<sup>79</sup> He thus concludes “with a reasonable measure of certainty” that the Wicked Priest is Alexander Jannaeus and that 1QpHab was composed after his defeat by Obadas, during the early years of the six years civil war which followed:

Our Sect, though bitterly opposed to the doctrines of the Pharisees, joined hands with these religious opponents in fighting their common enemy — the priest-king renegade. The Sect must have formed a small section of the anti-Hasmonean party, and that may be the reason why they are not mentioned specially by Josephus or in Rabbinic tradition. Considering their extreme fanaticism it may be assured that they were among the most violent opponents of Jannaeus, in special revenge for his persecution of their Teacher of Righteousness.<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>78</sup> Segal, *op. cit.*, 137.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, 137-139.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, 139.

William Brownlee's identification of Jannaeus as the Wicked Priest in parts of 1QpHab is of special note. He argues that the case for identifying Alexander Jannaeus as the Wicked Priest is dependent on 1QpHab alone (*contra* Allegro) since regardless of the Lion of Wrath in 4QpNah the conflict between the Teacher and the Wicked Priest is not related in the extant material, while there is nothing to suggest that the Teacher was alive in 88 BC. Like Segal, Brownlee finds a probable reference to Jannaeus's death in 1QpHab XI:8-17, while he ties together IX:8-12 and XI:17-XII:10, since both passages deal with the same refrain (Hab. 2:8b = Hab. 2:17b).<sup>81</sup> The interpreter's assumption, he continues, would have been that the 'inspiring Spirit' would not have repeated this half verse if it meant exactly the same thing both times. Brownlee cites instead the Rabbinic Hermeneutical principle of *gēzērāh shāwāh* that portions of text similar in phrasing should be explained in relation to each other and concludes that both passages refer to the riots on the Feast of Tabernacles. In the first passage the 'shedding of men's blood' – the attack on the Teacher of Righteousness – takes place outside the city Jerusalem and provokes a revenge attack on Jannaeus during the festival. In the second, it is the city's blood that is shed by the Wicked Priest, thus profaning the Temple. In support, Brownlee cites *War* I, iv, 3 §89 which states that it was only through the intervention of his foreign mercenaries that Jannaeus survived. Clearly, he suggests, the people were armed with more than just lemons! The few weeks (allowing for the accompanying change in calendar) between the Day of Atonement incident in the peshar and the Feast of Tabernacles account in Josephus would have enabled the sect to regroup and organize a counterattack at the Feast. It may even have been the Essenes who began pelting Jannaeus, he suggests, while others joined in spontaneously. Attack and counter-attack probably took place in 95 BC, when Tabernacles would have been celebrated on 21<sup>st</sup> October and the (Qumran) Yom Kippur sometime in September.

### 6.5.3 Conclusions

There is an inherent danger in trying to 'telescope' the accounts among the pesharim to the limited historical accounts described in Josephus. This not only requires us to

---

<sup>81</sup> Brownlee, "The Wicked Priest," 29.

accept Josephus's biased accounts without question, but often the arguments do not allow for other unmentioned accounts to be described in the pesharim.

Of the hypotheses we have described, the identification of Jonathan as Wicked Priest requires an early date for the conflict between him and the Teacher, and weakens the link maintained between the concurrent Man of Falsehood and the later groups designated 'Ephraim' and 'Seekers of Smooth Things'. Nevertheless, Jonathan does emerge during a turbulent point in Jewish history – following a period of civil war – and marks a change in the priestly dynasty from the Zadokite family to the Hasmonean dynasty. However, the theory does not answer all its critics, and the lack of any incidents of drunkenness may be deemed significant. The identification of Simon as the Wicked Priest, meanwhile, identifies the 'drunkenness' reference with Simon's murder during the drunken debacle at Jericho. Nevertheless, this view too has its problems, since drunkenness is better applied to a way of life than a one-off incident, while the application of references to the man/preacher of falsehood to Simon is highly unlikely. The case for Jannaeus has in the past placed too much emphasis on the Feast of Tabernacles, a good example of how Josephus's evidence is often manipulated. Josephus's own explanation for the riots, as well as that found in the Rabbinic material, is entirely ignored, especially by Brownlee who prefers an Essene-instigated rebellion. Meanwhile, the group's alleged participation in the ensuing rebellion is entirely spurious, not based on any textual evidence in *either* the pesharim, Josephus, or the Rabbinic material, and ignores the community's superior attitude to the Pharisees's involvement in Demetrius's campaign in 4QpNah, a text which, given the vocabulary links between Ephraim and the Preacher of Falsehood, Brownlee is wrong to ignore. The case for Jannaeus, then, has not been best presented.

What does this leave? The Groningen hypothesis is overly simplistic, while no one High Priest *exactly* fits the references to the Wicked Priest. We might then identify, like Vermes, more than one Wicked Priest in the scrolls, but this is also unsatisfactory. Instead, I favour the identification of this figure with Alexander Jannaeus, given the evidence of 4QpNah, describing his drunken lifestyle and



reputation for brutality.<sup>82</sup> However, where the pesharim may not be easily related to historical events mentioned by Josephus, then we should recall (a) that Josephus and other do not tell us of *every* event; and (b) that the pesherist is inspired by the Biblical prophecy, and perhaps has always in mind previous examples of other 'wicked priests' who may have preceded Jannaeus, the epitome of the Wicked Priest. In other words, Jannaeus is the sum of the wicked Hasmonean priesthood in much the same way that the Testament of Levi describes a degeneration of the priesthood in the seventh age, itself often dated to the Hasmonean period:

In the seventh week there will come priests: idolators, adulterers, money lovers, arrogant, lawless, voluptuaries, pederasts, those who practice bestiality. (TestLevi 17:11; Trans. Kee)

---

<sup>82</sup> Admittedly this can cause a problem for the dating of 1QpHab, which (ostensibly due to the references to the 'delay' in col. VII) presupposes a significant lapse between the time of the Teacher of Righteousness and the community at the time of the authorship of the pesher, especially when the events related in 4QpNah, apparently not referred to in 1QpHab, are also taken into account. A possible solution to this is to place the Teacher in the first part of Jannaeus's reign, c. 100, and the authorship of 1QpHab immediately after Jannaeus's death in 76 BC – thus allowing for the 'delay' as well as the multiple references to the Wicked Priest's death to be taken into account, but before the depredations against the Pharisees' enemies undertaken by Salome which are more properly related in 4QpNah.

## 7.0 Conclusions: History and Prophecy in the Pesharim

We began this study with essentially two basic preconceptions: first, the consensus view that the pesharim contain historical information cryptically ‘concealed’ from the reader that could be ‘decoded’; and second, our own view, that the pesharim, although historically important, are ‘prophetic’, in the sense that we might expect to find an integral picture of the characters (regardless of any historical dimension) founded on, and supported by Hebrew/OT prophecy. This dual concern, history and prophecy, has dominated discussion of the pesharim. The two positions are not mutually exclusive, but it is our contention that the prophetic ‘mode’ far outweighs the text’s historical dimension, a balance that has yet to be perceived by scholars commenting on these documents, or at least has yet to enter the basic textbooks. Rather, these still suggest that the pesharim are essentially historical documents.

That the pesharim are prophetic should have been acknowledged from the outset. As we have seen, the *pšr* root is used across the Semitic language base for the interpretation of dreams – dreams/visions forming the basis of many of the OT prophetic texts including Habakkuk – while the pesher structure itself derives from the Hebrew Bible itself, in the interpretation of the mysterious handwriting at Belshazzar’s Feast in Dan. 5. In 1QpHab the Teacher of Righteousness is explicitly associated with the interpretative process, since to him has been given “wisdom to interpret all the mysteries of His servants, the prophets” (II:8-9), a passage which at the same time, also strengthens the link maintained between the pesharim and Daniel since פֶּשֶׁר, ‘mystery’, is so prevalent in Daniel’s visions. The Habakkuk pesherist, then, maintains that the Teacher is ‘a special kind of prophet’, since to him has been granted the fullness of the meaning of the prophetic visions, unknown even to the prophets themselves, ‘for the vision awaits for the appointed time’. One hesitates to apply the term ‘Messiah’ in reference to the Teacher’s person and function, although it is an appropriate parallel, since ‘messiah’ has its own particular meaning and application at Qumran – the messiah(s) of Aaron and Israel<sup>1</sup> – but insofar as the

---

<sup>1</sup> See especially M.G. Abegg, “The Messiah at Qumran: Are We Still Seeing Double?” *DSD* 2 (1995), 124-44; J.J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*, ABRL (Doubleday: New York, 1995). Collins suggests (114f.)

Teacher inaugurates the eschaton, the beginning of the fullness of the prophetic visions, he is certainly in a sense *messianic*. The pesharim are, then, also eschatological. Although the Teacher himself almost certainly did not compose them, they were undoubtedly written by his followers, or ‘congregation’, and may perhaps be based on his teachings themselves.

It is against this *eschatological* and *prophetic* background that the pesharim’s *historical* dimension should be considered. As we have seen, 4QpNah contains two clear references to two historical individuals – Demetrius III Eukerus and Antiochus IV Epiphanes – and these cannot simply be ignored. Indeed, it is not, I believe, coincidence that both individuals are *gentile* rulers. Both are for the pesharist unimportant and are not referred to in prophecy, which is largely concerned with the Jews. Nevertheless, they help him establish a historical background for the eschatological basis of the prophecy’s fulfilment. In essence, the historical identification of individuals or groups referred to by epithets or sobriquets derived from OT passages (where appropriate) stands as confirmation that the eschaton is nigh.

### ***7.1 The Pesharim as historical***

4QpNahum is, indeed, our most important source in establishing a broad historical background for the pesharim, since many of the ‘easier to decipher’ designations are found alongside one another. The ‘Kittim’, for instance, almost certainly refer to the Roman forces of Pompey in c. 63 BC, while ‘Ephraim’ and the ‘Seekers of Smooth Things’ may be more certainly identified as the fledgling group of Pharisees and their leadership respectively. The ancillary identification of ‘Manasseh’ with the Sadducees is largely (but not exclusively) dependent on the application of ‘Ephraim’ but even so the references to ‘nobles’ in the pesharim certainly aids this understanding. Finally, the ‘Lion of Wrath’ who ‘hangs men alive on a tree’ almost certainly refers to Alexander Jannaeus’s brutal execution of 800 influential members of the Pharisaic movement (although the identification of the 800 as Pharisees is based on a reasonable deduction from evidence recorded elsewhere, while the actual ‘crucifixion’ reference is also

---

that there is a case for identifying the Teacher with the Messiah of Aaron, but this goes

questionable as we have seen). References to Demetrius III, Alexander Jannaeus, and the internecine struggle between the Pharisees and the Sadducees squarely place 4QpNah within the timeframe of Alexander Jannaeus's and Alexandra Salome's respective reigns, i.e. from 103-67 BC), while the 'Kittim' as Pompey's Romans and Antiochus Epiphanes make for a broader time-frame from c. 170-63.

Even so, 4QpNah does not explicitly refer (in its extant form) to either the Teacher of Righteousness, the Wicked Priest, or the Man of Falsehood, arguably the more important figures in the community's history. It is thus difficult to extend the clear timeframe in 4QpNah to include the other pesharim, most notably 1QpHab. As we have suggested, it is, however, our premise that 4QpNah refers to the Man of Falsehood *indirectly*. As chapter 3 has shown, there seems a basic distinction between the broader group of 'Ephraim' and the 'Seekers of Smooth Things' who are their leadership. These latter 'misdirect Ephraim' and 'lead many astray' (4QpNah 3-4 II:8), terminology which is similarly applied to the Preacher/Man of Falsehood in 1QpHab and 4QpPs<sup>a</sup>. Thus, "the preacher of falsehood led astray many in vain to build a city through bloodshed" (1QpHab X:9-10) while the man of falsehood "led astray many with words of deceit" (4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 1-10 I:26-27). We suggest that the repetition of the פצע root in all three passages is not coincidence but rather implies that the fledgling Pharisaic movement be identified with the followers of the Man/Preacher of Falsehood who were led astray in 1QpHab and 4QpPs<sup>a</sup>; coincidentally the same group as the men of war/men of scoffing in CD. Logically, it would then follow that both the Man/Preacher of Falsehood and the Teacher of Righteousness (and thus also the Wicked Priest, the remaining member of the triumvirate) at least predate 'Ephraim' and 'Manasseh', although at this stage it is impossible to state by precisely what length of time. This matter of dating is largely dependent on the identification of the Wicked Priest.

Along with Allegro and Segal, and as discussed, I identify the Wicked Priest with Alexander Jannaeus. Jannaeus was among the first Hasmonean high priests to take the title 'king', which accords with the references to his reign over Israel, and, during his comparatively long reign (103-87 BC), he conquered new territory, while at the same

---

beyond the scope of our study.

time suppressing internal rebellion. This evidence, then, fits the accusations in the pesharim of the Wicked Priest's lust after wealth. As we have seen, Josephus describes how Jannaeus had 800 of his bitterest opponents executed for rebelling against him, while he also reports how during the Feast of Tabernacles the people again turned seditious against him, pelting him with lemons.<sup>2</sup> This is just one of several events that could have inspired the Habakkuk pesherist to accuse the Wicked Priest of violating the sanctuary, especially since this incident again ended in bloodshed. Finally, the accusation that the Wicked Priest would suffer a violent death, possibly at the hands of gentiles, may instead refer to Jannaeus's ambush by Obedas the Nabataean, when he barely escaped with his life. The most damning piece of evidence to identify Jannaeus as the Wicked Priest, however, surrounds the actual manner of his death, since during the last years of his life Jannaeus was beset by a severe distemper which Josephus states was brought on by heavy drinking throughout his life. This neatly fits the allegations of drunkenness in 1QpHab. This is to say nothing of the fact that Jannaeus has already been identified as the Lion of Wrath in 4QpNah. To all intents and purposes, then, the Lion of Wrath is identical with the Wicked Priest in those few pesharim where he appears. Again, it is one of our major conclusions that although he is significant in 1QpHab, the Wicked Priest is less important in the overall pesher-tradition, an observation supported by the fact that the designation of Jannaeus in the DSS is not uniform, but fluctuates between at least two Hebrew expressions.

It is another of our main conclusions that the two major characters in the history of the group are not – as appears in basic textbooks – the Teacher and the Wicked Priest, but rather the Teacher and the Man of Falsehood. I do not, however, attempt to identify either of these individuals, except to suggest that both are broadly contemporary with Alexander Jannaeus's tenure as High Priest in the early part of the first century BC. As we have seen, others have attempted to identify these characters; but these attempts fall short. Unlike the case of the 'wicked priest', the pesharim simply do not provide enough evidence for any identification to be upheld. Instead, identification of the Teacher (as e.g. Judah the Essene) remains suspect. Certainly there is not enough evidence to support the suggestion that the Teacher of Righteousness was ever a High

---

<sup>2</sup> *Ant.* XIII, xiii, 5 §372-374.

Priest in Jerusalem, whether Onias III or Stegemann's unnamed priest of the *intersacerdotium*. This view rests solely on circumstantial evidence. Nevertheless, as the existence of priestly communities at Leontopolis, in Egypt, and on Mount Gerizim, in Samaria, has demonstrated, it is not impossible that a high-ranking Jerusalem priest, perhaps an ousted High Priest, could have established a parallel priestly community at Qumran.<sup>3</sup> Meanwhile, the argument that the Teacher was a Jerusalem High Priest is implicitly ruled out by our identification of the Wicked Priest as Alexander Jannaeus. The interregnum proposal *requires* that the Wicked Priest be identified as Jonathan Maccabee.

This is not to suggest that the pesherists could not occasionally refer to people and events from the period prior to Jannaeus's rule. As we have seen, it is possible that Jannaeus represents an amalgam of 'wicked priests' including Jonathan and Simon Maccabee, while 4QTestimonia seems to refer to attacks mounted by John Hyrcanus and his sons against Samaria in the late second century BC, in the process setting the scene for Jannaeus's pontificate as wicked priest (Jannaeus was Hyrcanus's third son).

## 7.2 *The Pesharim as prophetic*

As we have shown, many of the designations used by the author(s) of the pesharim are either drawn directly, or altered from Hebrew Bible passages. Thus, מורה הצדק derives from passages in Hosea and Joel, while מטריף הכזב seems to derive from Micah. 'Ephraim' and 'Manasseh' derive more directly from the Joseph narratives in Genesis (although they may also reflect other traditions as well), while דורשי חלקות although not directly found in the OT, picks up a similar phrase in CD which itself picks up on חלקות 'smooth things' in passages from Isaiah and the Psalms. 'Kittim', of course, reflects the body of tradition surrounding the warrior nations of the Eastern Mediterranean, and especially the Greek forces of Alexander the Great. Lesser designations also follow this trend. Thus, 'House of Absalom', like Ephraim and Manasseh seems to pick up on the literature surrounding David's rebellious son in II Samuel, while אנשי הלצון 'men of the scoffer' reflects passages in Isaiah and

---

<sup>3</sup> Cf. C.T.R. Hayward, "The Jewish Temple at Leontopolis: A Reconsideration," *JJS* 33 (1982), 429-443; *The Jewish Temple: A non-biblical sourcebook* (Routledge: London, 1996).

Proverbs. It is surely no coincidence that the biblical origin of the majority of these references fall in the Prophecies or Psalms, precisely the same texts as receive Qumran pesharim.

Curiously, the Wicked Priest can not be seen to derive from any particular Hebrew passage. Significantly, our study has explicitly ruled out Elliger's oft-cited proposal that the epithet is a play on words with כֹּהֵן הַרְאֵשׁ 'high priest'. This expression is not found describing the Jerusalem High Priest at this stage in history in either the literary or numismatic evidence (which prefer the expression כֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל). Nevertheless, the title does reflect the historical reality that the wicked priest was a priest who ruled in Israel, while the descriptive רִשָׁע not only describes his tenure as high priest more generally, but reflects the gradual debasement of the priesthood described in Testament of Levi 17 which culminates with a quick succession of (wicked) priests in the "fifth week" (TestLevi 17:11). Meanwhile, of course, the correlation of the Wicked Priest with the Lion of Wrath in both 4QpNah and 4QpHos<sup>b</sup> – which incidentally seems to assimilate the Lion of Wrath with 'the last priest who will stretch out his hand to smite Ephraim' – brings to mind the references to the כַּפִּיר 'young lion' in Ezekiel especially, as demonstration that Jannaeus was himself depicted in prophecy (if not explicitly as the wicked priest).

In our opening chapter we pointed out that the pesharim were predominantly commentaries of Hebrew prophecy. We may now add that where designations were drawn from particular prophetic texts, invariably these texts also feature among the pesharim. Thus, several designations originate in the prophecies of Isaiah, while Isaiah accounts for at least five 'pesharim'. Moreover, we can also say that several designations derive from one key passage. Thus, in Isa. 28 the 'men of scoffing', צַו 'vanity', and Ephraim are found in close proximity, while in Hos. 5:11 'Ephraim' are accused of following after צַו. Many similar examples of such cross-textual exegesis could indeed be referenced. There is thus such a broad correlation between the particular designations and the materials chosen for peshar texts, that one might expect, should further texts be uncovered, to find pesharim on these passages as well. Prophecy and peshar form an integrated unit and may, when looked at in overview,

support one another. In essence, in tracing these base passages we may be engaging in the ‘pesher-technique’ ourselves to ‘fill in the gaps’.<sup>4</sup>

For the pesher authors, it seems it is not so important to identify any one historical event as much as uncovering a chain of events that may have been concealed within the ‘mystery writings’ of the prophets. As we suggested in the Introduction the community held a particular belief that they were living in the end-times and that the fullness of these times had been predicted in biblical prophecy. They also held that the Teacher (and by extension themselves) had received the relevant knowledge to uncover what was to come and thus make preparations.

For instance, the rivalry between the Pharisees and the Sadducees resulting in the domination of the former could be seen to arise from the conflict between Amon and Nineveh in the prophecies of Nahum, and the dominance of the tribe of Ephraim over Manasseh predicted by Jacob in Genesis 48. But how do we account for the initial identity of Ephraim with the fledgling Pharisaic movement? Essentially, this again is a result of cross-textual exegesis, albeit supported by the Genesis tradition. We have seen how the pesherist envisions the Pharisees emerging from among the followers of the Man/Preacher of Falsehood. 1QpHab depicts the Preacher as building a ‘city in vain’ (עיר שווא). Meanwhile, in CD the ‘Preacher’ (מטריף) is specifically identified as צור, which, as we have seen, reappears in Hos. 5:11 with a similar meaning ‘worthless’ ‘vanity’, specifically stating that “Ephraim is crushed, because he was determined to go after צור”. Thus if the Preacher is צור, and Ephraim goes after צור as Hosea suggests, and the fledgling Pharisees are the followers of the Man of Falsehood, then the followers of the Man of Falsehood may be identified with Ephraim! Another example: simply from their titles ‘Teacher of Righteousness’ and ‘Man/Preacher of Falsehood’

---

<sup>4</sup> Curiously, though, neither the Biblical books Habakkuk nor Nahum are seemingly the origin of any of these terms which may perhaps cause us to question the importance of these texts in the overall scale of things. Certainly 1QpHab is curious for the fact that it could easily have been the source of a possible designation. As we have seen, Hab. 2:18 refers to an idol as a ‘teacher of lies’ (ומורה שקר) which has obvious parallels to the expression מורה צדק. The author does not appear to pick up on this, however; and we suggested that this was cause in itself to identify a secondary author of 1QpHab. It is still possible, however, that Hab. 2:18 is implied as a source for מורה צדק, even though this is not alleged in the pesher. Meanwhile, the prophecies of Habakkuk are of more use to the pesherist for the more general theme of “the righteous and the wicked” that runs throughout the text.



these two should have been set in antithesis, since the two Hebrew expressions are diametrically opposed. 'Teacher of Righteousness' is derived from Heb. הרר 'pour out', while 'Preacher' derives from ררר 'drip, spout'.

Occasionally the pesherist uses designations that receive (similar) interpretations in other forms of Jewish literature. There are two obvious examples: As several studies (including our own) have shown, 'Lebanon' is subject to a wide range of interpretative exegesis in the DSS, Jewish and early Christian literature. Previously it had been suggested that the dominant understanding of Lebanon as the temple in Jewish literature could be used particularly to understand the 1QpHab account, but our study suggested that this was merely one more facet of the term's speculative exegesis. Indeed, as I attempted to show, the evidence of usage in the scrolls themselves was scarcely uniform, and there is evidence that both Lebanon and the second more significant term 'Kittim' are subject to reinterpretation in the scrolls. 'Lebanon' thus refers to both the community and its opponents, while 'Kittim' is applied to both Greeks and Romans in different texts at alternative times.

The necessity to reidentify a group as important as the Kittim, it has been more recently suggested, may help explain why the pesher style fell into disuse. As Eshel explains:

We may assume that one of the reasons, if not the major one, for no longer copying the pesharim (sometime after 63 BCE) was that the authors of this particular genre realized that they had mistakenly identified the Kittim. Because it is always easier to correct and update oral traditions than written compositions, they stopped putting the pesharim into writing.<sup>5</sup>

We can conclude that the community still considered the pesharim to be important, especially 1QpHab, since special care appears to have been taken to preserve this document. This perhaps lends credibility to the fact that the community considered the sort of interpretation found in the pesharim to be their inheritance from the Teacher himself; that the Teacher's own particular brand of inspiration was his gift to them. Nevertheless, the community clearly suffered from the same problems as will doubtless have recently afflicted many 'millenial' organizations. Having made particular claims regarding the end of the world, the community had to adapt when

that claim patently did not come true. This perhaps explains the lack of such 'historical' references in (e.g.) 11QMelchizedek, which while it is still undoubtedly eschatological, concentrates on angelic figures such as Melchizedek himself (see Appendix, below, pp270ff). The rise of, or at least placing of greater importance on angelic literature in the Qumran corpus perhaps arises out of this concern, albeit on a much more general level.

### **7.3 Conclusions**

The pesharim, then, may loosely be described as 'commentaries' on Hebrew Scripture, and biblical prophecy in particular. Nevertheless, the commentary given is itself prophetic and concerns the 'last days' in which the Qumran community who composed them believed they were living. While it is not claimed that they represent the teachings of the Teacher himself, a figure who appears in (some of) the pesharim as well as in CD, it is felt that the type of prophetic interpretation found in these texts is similar to that claimed by the Teacher in 1QpHab VII. The community are thus the inheritors of the Teacher's peculiar brand of interpretation.

Although the pesharim have been described as historical we have seen how incorrect this understanding is. While 4QpNahum refers to two historical individuals this is the only occurrence of such historical information clearly referenced in the pesharim. Moreover, the pesharim as a whole do not relay the type of chronological information one would expect from such alleged 'historical' documents. Where historical groups are referred to, these are referred to indirectly, by epithets or through 'ciphers'. Nevertheless, the intention of these alleged 'ciphers' is we argue not deliberately to confuse the original audience, who could be expected to decipher these references with far greater ease than the modern reader. Rather, it is to link up these groups and events with key passages drawn from Hebrew prophecy, and thus prove that prophecy was coming 'true' within the author's lifetime. These could be identified as 'signs' for the coming eschaton when the sons of light would wage war against the sons of darkness prior to the ending of the world, and involved particular claims about the

---

<sup>5</sup> Eshel, "The Kittim in the War Scroll," 44.

community's leader, the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom had been granted the full knowledge of the prophetic message.

This, however, was an ambitious aim and the community's initial optimism appears to have been premature. In at least one instance, they have cause to re-identify one such eschatological 'marker' – the coming of the Kittim – and the consequent failure to interpret fully the prophetic message stands at odds with the allegations regarding the origins of the Teacher's 'secret knowledge'. Ultimately, this impossible dichotomy appears to have spelled the end of this type of interpretative commentary. By so closely laying out the course of history (and when the eschaton would arrive) in their 'interpretative commentaries' the pesharim were the authors of their own demise. We see the beginnings of this in 1QpHab VII with the author's words of encouragement to his readers – 'though it be long, wait, for it will indeed come'. Clearly, the delay in the arrival of the eschaton in the years following the Teacher's death(?) was even at this relatively early stage cause for concern, while ultimately the delay caused a re-evaluation of the community's approach to scripture, and in particular their interpretation of prophecy.

## Appendices

### Appendix A: Melchizedek

Although 11QMelchizedek is often grouped among the pesharim (the term פֶּשָׁרִים itself is clearly found twice and may be reconstructed a further three times), we have relegated discussion of its eponymous hero to an appendix, since he is only of borderline relevance to the overall subject. 11QMelchizedek is frequently classed among the ‘thematic pesharim’ since unlike the ‘continuous pesharim’ the text uses biblical quotations from a variety of sources. Elsewhere we have discussed the inadequacies of this method of classification and the difficulties in assessing to which ‘group’ particular texts can be assigned. Nevertheless, there is no denying that 11QMelchizedek itself is substantially different from other Qumran pesharim, an aspect that is reflected in its content as well, which retains an eschatological, rather than overtly historical, interest. In other words, because there is no intention by either scholars or the Qumran author(s) to understand Melchizedek as an historical figure, but instead purely as an eschatological personage, discussion of this figure is best dealt with in an appendix.

Perhaps more so than any of the expressions we have looked at in the main body of the text, Melchizedek is the subject of his own history of interpretation, which has led one scholar to coin the phrase ‘the Melchizedek tradition’.<sup>1</sup> Obviously this includes the Qumran texts themselves, but from a brief survey of the literature we can see how the Qumran picture (specifically) is drawn from the various strands of tradition.

#### ***Old Testament Background***

The figure Melchizedek himself is drawn directly from two passages in the Hebrew Bible, the second of which is very much dependent on the first.

---

<sup>1</sup> F. Horton, *The Melchizedek Tradition: A Critical Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Century A.D. and in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (CUP: Cambridge, 1976).

In Genesis 14:18-20, within the larger 'Abraham cycle', a figure 'Melchizedek' (Heb. מֶלְכִּי־צֶדֶק) is referred to as both 'King of Salem' (מֶלֶךְ שָׁלֵם) and 'priest of God Most High' (כֹּהֵן לַאֵל עֲלִיּוֹן). According to the Genesis account, this figure is part of a delegation, comprising himself and the King of Sodom, who meet Abram following his defeat of the Eastern Kings and the release of his nephew Lot (14:1-17). Abram is met at the Valley of Shaveh by the two kings where Melchizedek brings out bread and wine and blesses Abram in the name of El-Elyon 'who has delivered your enemies into your hand' (verse 20b). In response Abram offers Melchizedek, one tenth of all his possessions, the standard biblical tithe.<sup>2</sup> Following this matter of the tithe, Melchizedek effectively disappears from the scene, which moves on to relate a dispute between Abram and the King of Sodom regarding the distribution of the spoil (verses 21-end).

The Genesis account raises a number of issues, not least of which is the name 'Melchizedek' itself. This seems on the face of it to be a Hebrew form meaning 'my king is righteous' analogous to Adoni-zedek 'my lord is righteous', the king of Jerusalem referred to in Joshua (Josh. 10:1, 3). It is also possible, however, that the name is a compound form with either Milku or Zedek as the name of a Canaanite deity. This is often combined with the notion that El-Elyon is also a member of the Canaanite pantheon, of whom El is the major deity. The notion is made more complicated, however, by conflation of El-Elyon with the Tetragrammaton later in verse 22. If Melchizedek is a priest of El-Elyon and El-Elyon is conflated with YHWH, then Melchizedek must have been himself a priest of YHWH. It is undoubtedly this aspect that led the Rabbis (and both the early Christian and Qumran communities<sup>3</sup>) to focus on the figure.

Psalm 110, the second biblical passage, is in appearance a coronation Psalm, and is often dated to the early monarchy. It opens with an invitation from the Lord to the new king to take the throne, while in verse 4 He promises 'You are a priest forever

---

<sup>2</sup> The matter of the tithe is complicated since the Hebrew phrase used (ויתן־לוֹ מַעֲשֵׂר מִכֹּל) might equally be taken to refer to a tithe by Melchizedek to Abram! Contextually, this is not the best way to read the account, hence most translators refer the tithe to Abram.

<sup>3</sup> Compare the picture of Melchizedek as ante-type of Christ in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Cf. Heb. 5:6, 10; 6:20 and ch. 7; below.

according to the order of Melchizedek' (אַתְּחַבְּהֶן לְעֹלָם עַל־דְּבַרְתִּי מֶלְכִי־צַדִּיק). It is clear that in some sense the Psalmist is alluding to the Genesis tradition of Melchizedek as priest, but it is equally clear that, as elsewhere, he understands Salem to refer to Jerusalem. Hence, in Ps. 76:2, Salem and Zion are set in parallel. The implication, then, is that a link is maintained between the pre-Israelite kingship and the Davidic monarchy, though historically this is a problem in that the Davidic kings were never themselves priests.<sup>4</sup> The alternate view, that verse 4 is the king's response (to Zadok the priest) affirming the continuation of the Jebusite priesthood in Jerusalem, has a lot to commend it, particularly the continuation of the linkage between the צַדִּיק root and Jerusalem, but relies on a particular reading of verse 4.<sup>5</sup>

The Biblical picture of Melchizedek, then is of a human figure, albeit one who is introduced in somewhat surprising circumstances, who is traditionally linked with both the priesthood and monarchy in early Israel.

---

<sup>4</sup> The closest point of comparison is II Sam. 8:18b, which states that the sons of David were priests. Nevertheless it is unclear how the term כַּהֲנִים here should be understood. In the parallel version in I Chronicles David's sons are described as 'chief officials' (הָרֵאשִׁימִים; I Chron. 18:17). Meanwhile, LXX uses ἀυλάρχαι (for כַּהֲנִים), which may be translated 'chiefs of court, palace officials'. Cf. R.P. Gordon, *I & II Samuel: A Commentary*, Library of Biblical Interpretation (Zondervan: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1986), 247.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. H.H. Rowley, "Melchizedek and Zadok," *Festschrift für A. Bertholet*, W. Baumgartner et al. (eds.) (J.C.B. Mohr: Tübingen, 1950), 470. We should also reference the suggestion that Ps. 110 may be dated to the Hasmonean period and specifically refers to Simon Maccabee. This revolves around an alleged acrostic שִׁמְעוֹן, 'Simeon', (perhaps שִׁמְעוֹן עַם, 'Simon is terrible') in the first part of the psalm and – referring to the military aspect of the psalm – the assertion that "the Hasmoneans are the only warrior-priests in Jewish history" (M. Treves, "Two Acrostic Psalms," *VT* 15 (1965), 81-90, esp. 86; Cf. R.H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* [Black: London, 1948], 630; M.C. Astour, "Melchizedek," *ABD*, 4, 685a). Treves's assertion has been heavily criticised by J.W. Bowker ("Psalm CX," *VT* 17 [1967], 31-41), while the more general notion of the acrostic is rendered problematic by the difficulties of the redaction of verse three. To these arguments we may add that, if this Psalm (and thus Melchizedek) is especially associated with Simon Maccabee, it is highly unlikely that, given the attitude of the Qumran group to the Maccabees, they would have gone anywhere near a figure like Melchizedek. The same argument might be said of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

## *Melchizedek in the Early Jewish and New Testament Literature*

### **Jubilees**

The Melchizedek episode must appear in Jubilees, although due to an unfortunate lacuna the entire episode has been lost. The text breaks off at the equivalent of Gen. 14:14 and picks up again in verse 20b, although, ostensibly due to the reference to the command to tithe later in the text (Jub. 13:25b-27), it is apparent that the author of Jubilees did not simply ignore the account, even though we do not know precisely what he intended.

### **Josephus**

Josephus refers to Melchizedek twice: at *War* VI, x, 1 §438 and *Ant.* I, x, 2 §179-182.

The first instance follows the description of the capture of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple by Titus. Josephus describes the city as being first founded by ‘a Canaanite chief, called in the native tongue “Righteous King” (βασιλεὺς δίκαιος)’ – i.e. an etymology of מלכ־יִצְחָק. From ancient Greco-Roman sources we know that the tradition of the founding of a city by a person is very important (compare Cadmus with Thebes and Romulus with Rome), thus Josephus, writing for a Greco-Roman audience makes a significant link between Melchizedek and the founding of Jerusalem. Nevertheless, an important distinction should be made. Melchizedek does not found the city Salem itself since, as he continues, as the first to build the temple, he renamed the city ‘Jerusalem’:

in virtue thereof he was the first to officiate as priest of God and, being the first to build the temple (τὸ ἱερὸν), gave the city, previously called Solyma (Σόλυμα), the name of Jerusalem (Ἱεροσόλυμα).

A Greek etymology of ‘Jerusalem’ is clearly incomprehensible. Nevertheless, it is intriguing that Josephus thus glorifies Melchizedek with the building of the sanctuary in Jerusalem, since this entirely omits Solomon’s role in the building of the Temple on Mount Moriah.<sup>6</sup> Through the identification of Melchizedek with the sanctuary, combined with an – albeit impossible – etymology of Jerusalem, Josephus makes a

---

<sup>6</sup> Cf. B. Mazar, “Josephus Flavius and the Archaeological Excavations in Jerusalem,” in L.H. Feldman and Gohei Hata, *Josephus, the Bible, and History* (E.J. Brill: Leiden, 1989), 326.

profound link between Jerusalem, the priesthood and the biblical priest-king; a linkage that is only made manifest on the introduction of Melchizedek and the subsequent founding of the temple.

In the second account Melchizedek is referred to by name (ὁ Μελχισεδεκ), and while again Josephus uses the derivation ‘righteous king’, this is now because ‘such was he by common consent, inasmuch that for this reason he was moreover made priest (τὸν ἱερέα) of God.’ Josephus thus drops the derivation ‘temple of Salem’ for the equally nonsensical ‘priest of Salem’. The strong link between Jerusalem, the priesthood and Melchizedek is still retained in this passage, although Josephus makes no mention of the founding of the temple.

It is difficult to offer any solid conclusions from analysis of the Melchizedek texts in Josephus, since the passages are difficult to combine. A coherent theme, however, is the strong relationship suggested between Jerusalem, Melchizedek and the priesthood, an aspect that while perhaps already inherent in the biblical picture is made more specific, and even more so in Philo.

### Philo

Philo is more interested in the biblical priest-king, referring to him in three places – *Legum Allegoriae* 3 §79-82, *De Congressu* §99, and *De Abrahamo* §235,<sup>7</sup> though the first of these does little more than refer to Melchizedek as ὁ μέγας ἱερεὺς τοῦ μεγίστου θεοῦ, a fairly literal rendering of Heb. כהן לאל עליון, except that Philo describes him as *high* priest.<sup>8</sup>

The *De Congressu* is rather more concerned with the matter of the tithe than it is the priest-king – though it does agree that Melchizedek is the ‘possessor (λαχὼν) of the

---

<sup>7</sup> A possible fourth passage (fragmentary), discovered by Rendel Harris, adds little to the picture painted in other passages. The complete text is found in J. Moffatt, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (1924), 91.

<sup>8</sup> Compare depictions in the Targumim. So Fragment Tg., P; Tg. Neof. of Gen. 14:18. Cf. C.T.R. Hayward, “Shem, Melchizedek, and Concern with Christianity in the Pentateuchal Targumim,” *Targumic and Cognate Studies*, 73.



priesthood' a term indicating overall responsibility.<sup>9</sup> The passage links the Melchizedek account with Jacob's promise to tithe after the dream at Bethel (Gen. 28:22), and suggests that, since this matter of the tithe had yet to be established, Melchizedek must have been 'self-learned and self-taught' (ὁ τὴν αὐτομάθῃ καὶ αὐτοδίδακτον). This is extremely important and reflects virtues elsewhere described of Isaac – for Philo the paragon of the philosophical virtues which allow contemplation of God. Philosophers, says Philo, say that three types of virtue exist among men, the virtue that is learned, the virtue that is practised, and the virtue that is natural, and may be epitomised by the three 'founders', Abraham, Jacob, and Isaac<sup>10</sup>:

For the eldest of them, Abraham, had instruction for his guide in the road which conducted him to virtue; as we shall show in another treatise to the best of our power. And Isaac, who is the middle one of the three, had a self-taught and self-instructed nature. And Jacob, the third, arrived at this point by industry and practice, in accordance with which were his labours in wrestling and contention. (*De Somniis*, I §168; Transl: C.D. Yonge, *The Works of Philo* [Hendrickson, 1993])

Earlier in the *De Somniis* Philo compares the gifts of Abraham and Isaac as symbolic of the difference between a native inhabitant of his country and the settler/foreigner. Isaac's is the greater gift (Cf. I §160). Meanwhile, Jacob, 'the practiser of virtue', also falls short of Isaac in his apprehension of the divine, since the latter "keeps to the intermediate divine word, which affords him the best suggestions and teaches him everything which is suitable to the times" (*De Somniis*, I §68; Transl: C. D. Yonge). By describing Melchizedek in similar terms, Philo is making an important point concerning the origins of the biblical priest-king's source of authority and information; directly God-given (this and the 'self taught' attribute are not mutually exclusive).

A much fuller description of Melchizedek is found in the *Legum Allegoriae*. Here, Philo begins with an interpretation of Melchizedek as 'king of Peace', an obvious play on מלך שלום/שלום, and stresses that his priesthood has been instituted by God. Philo also offers the derivation of מלכי צדק as 'righteous king' and contrasts him with 'the

---

<sup>9</sup> So Athene in Plato's *Timaeus* is described as the 'possessor' of Athens. (*Timaeus*, 23.D). Melchizedek might then be termed a protector of Jerusalem. If we include Jewish notions of the Temple's construction pre-creation, then his role becomes more universal.

<sup>10</sup> *De Somniis*, I §167f.

despot', the one the author of laws, the other of lawlessness. Where the king rules by 'right reason' (ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος), the despot rules through decree, imposing violent and mischievous commands on soul and body. Philo concludes:

Let the despot's title therefore be ruler of war, the king's prince of peace, of Salem, and let him offer to the soul food full of joy and gladness. (*Leg. All.* III §81; Loeb)

He returns to the issue of Melchizedek as Reason (λόγος) noting that...

... he is a priest, even Reason, having as his portion Him that is (τὸν ὄντα), and all his thoughts of God are high and vast and sublime. (*Leg. All.* III §82; Loeb)

The identification for Philo of the Genesis priest-king with the Logos of Stoic thought is our first indication that Melchizedek has become to take on a more universal importance. In Philo, the Logos is the architect of creation but, like the Logos in the Johannine Prologue, did not remain with God, coming instead into the world, in this instance as the immutable laws of nature. Elsewhere, Philo describes the Logos as an archangel to whom has been given by the Father

a pre-eminent gift, to stand on the confines of both, and separate[d] that which had been created from the Creator. And this same Word is continually a suppliant to the immortal God on behalf of the mortal race, which is exposed to affliction and misery; and is also the ambassador, sent by the Ruler of all, to the subject race. (*Quis Rerum* §205; C.D. Yonge, *The Works of Philo*)

Although Philo never specifically identifies Melchizedek as an angel, let alone archangel, by describing him as the Logos, who is here described as an archangel, it is not difficult to establish a coherent picture. For Philo, Melchizedek is clearly more than a human figure. He is 'possessor' of the priesthood, indicating an overall responsibility for it, and has knowledge unavailable to humanity in general; thus the matter of the tithe. By identifying Melchizedek as an archangel, at once Philo explains the source of this knowledge as well as why a figure who is introduced so suddenly into the biblical history is credited with such a place in Jewish history of interpretation.

With Philo's identification of Melchizedek as the Logos, we enter a new phase in our understanding of this figure, that is, identification of him as something 'more than human'. This will be an attribute picked up elsewhere in the early Jewish literature, especially our next text, and including the Qumran texts themselves.

## II Enoch

Melchizedek also appears in II Enoch 71, in both the A and J texts. He is the product of a miraculous (virgin) birth, the son of Noah's brother Nir, and the badge of the priesthood is upon his chest (71:19); a sign of God's continuation of the priesthood after the flood. Sure enough, God announces to Nir that the child will be taken away and placed in Eden:

...And this child will not perish along with those who are perishing in this generation, as I have revealed it, so that Melkisedek will be the priest to all holy priests, and establish him so that he will be the head of the priests of the future. (II Enoch 71:29 [J]; Trans. F.I. Andersen in Charlesworth, I)

The author then speaks of three 'Melkisedeks', the Melkisedek who will be the head of the thirteen priests who existed before – the subject of the present passage – a second, in the last generation, who will be the first of twelve priests, probably the subject of Genesis 14; and finally...

...a great archpriest, the Word and Power of God, who will perform miracles, greater and more glorious than all the previous ones. He, Melkisedek, will be priest and king in the place Akhuzan, that is to say in the center of the earth, where Adam was created, and there will be his final grave. (II Enoch 71:34b-35 [J]; Andersen)

Anderson suggests that, if ancient, this literary evidence should be added to the 'Qumran Melchizedek traditions' for the Christian treatment of this theme in Hebrews.<sup>11</sup> Interesting, however, is the author's concern with extending the priesthood into pre-creation. In Jubilees this is established through Noah himself, but perhaps due to the Genesis account of Noah's 'drunkenness' immediately after the Flood narrative (Gen. 9:20-29), the author of II Enoch places the priesthood in more 'reliable' hands. It may also explain Melchizedek's knowledge of the traditions of the priesthood and use of the divine name in Genesis. This is to say nothing, of course, to giving the anonymous biblical king a (respectable) genealogy of his own, an aspect that contrasts strongly with the Hebrews account of Melchizedek 'without father,

---

<sup>11</sup> H.I. Anderson, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) ENOCH: A New Translation and Introduction," in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, I, 95.

without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but resembling the Son of God he remains a priest forever' (Heb. 7:3; below).<sup>12</sup>

### The Epistle to the Hebrews

In Hebrews, especially ch. seven (the fullest account), many of the traditional elements of the Genesis account, including the references to bread and wine and the words of the blessing (although it is referred to) are missing. Melchizedek is still, however, described as king of Salem (understood as 'king of peace') and Priest of the Most High God (ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου; 7:1), while significantly the passage introduces Melchizedek's lack of parentage, normally derived from his abrupt appearance and disappearance in Genesis; the principle of *quod non in thora, non in mundo*.<sup>13</sup> By rejecting his parentage, the author *explicitly* rejects Melchizedek's claim to the priesthood through traditional grounds (cf. Exod. 28:1).

Hebrews pays particular attention to the matter of Abraham's tithe to Melchizedek, suggesting that tithe is always offered to a superior and that by tithing Abraham recognises the superiority of the Genesis priest-king; a tithe that he extends to Levi, still in Abraham's 'loins', and by extension to the Levitical priesthood. This is compared to Christ's resumption of the priesthood, Christ also not being of the tribe of Levi. Meanwhile, the author reapplies the promise in Psalm 110:4 to Christ, and takes the reference literally. Christ is a priest forever because he continues forever (7:24), and his High Priesthood is naturally superior to that of the Levitical priesthood because it was both conceived by an oath and will be eternally present in Christ,

---

<sup>12</sup> A similar situation recurs in the Targumim. These too are concerned by Melchizedek's lack of genealogy, an aspect that lays the tradition open to the claims of Hebrews. To avoid this, the Targumists specifically identify Melchizedek as Shem. "Melchizedek is thus given genealogy which makes him a Semite *par excellence* and ancestor of the Jews, a great Torah scholar, and head of an academy." (Hayward, *op. cit.*, 68.). This is arrived at mathematically. According to Genesis 11:10-11, Shem fathered Arpachsad two years after the flood, in his hundredth year, and then lived for a further five hundred years. He would, then, have been still alive thirty-five years after the death of Abraham and would have thus co-existed with Melchizedek. The association of both figures with wisdom and righteousness leads them to be identified as one.

<sup>13</sup> Strack-Billerbeck, 694ff. Cf. Horton, *op. cit.*, 153.

rather than a succession of priests. Melchizedek thus prefigures Christ's priesthood and functions as an 'antetype' of Christ.<sup>14</sup>

For Hebrews, then, Melchizedek functions in two ways. First, the Genesis account is used to disparage the Levitical priesthood. Second, Psalm 110:4 is referred to Christ who, like Melchizedek, will be a priest forever, though not of Levitical descent. It is unclear precisely how the relationship between Melchizedek and Christ is to be understood, since the picture that emerges is, as Hanson has suggested, either of a rival to Christ, or Christ himself.<sup>15</sup> It is perhaps unsurprising, then, that the ambiguity of Melchizedek in Hebrews would later inspire a heresy centred on that character.<sup>16</sup>

### Conclusions

The picture of Melchizedek in Second Temple and New Testament literature is clearly at odds with the Old Testament picture. Although some texts may appear to offer a straightforward retelling of the biblical legend, closer inspection reveals a deeper dimension. Josephus is a good example. Through his rewriting of the Genesis account, Josephus incorporates a particular relationship between Melchizedek, Jerusalem and the high priesthood, directly contradicting the biblical accounts of the temple's construction by Solomon. It is unclear whether Josephus is aware of the tradition of Melchizedek as angel which seems to underlie Philo's description of him as the Logos, but this is not an unreasonable assumption given Jewish traditions regarding the Temple in precreation. In any case, the depiction of Melchizedek as an angel in any piece of Jewish literature is integral for background to the Qumran picture of the biblical priest-king.

---

<sup>14</sup> For a more detailed description of the parallels between Hebrews, Philo and 11QMelchizedek see J.W. Thompson, "Conceptual background and purpose of the Midrash in Hebrews 7," *NT* 19 (1977), 209-223. In particular, Thompson stresses the close relationship between the epistle and Philo, while stating that the epistle "has little in contact with the Qumran document with its interest in Melchizedek as avenger and judge" (222-223). Nevertheless, this may ignore the more fundamental parallel of Melchizedek as angel.

<sup>15</sup> A.T. Hanson, *The Image of the Invisible God* (SCM: London, 1982), 69.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Horton, *op. cit.*, 164-165.

### *Melchizedek in the Dead Sea Scrolls*

Aside from 11QMelchizedek, the biblical priest king appears in the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20) and can almost certainly be restored in the Testament of Amram, 4Q‘Amram<sup>b</sup> (4Q544).

#### The Genesis Apocryphon

The Genesis Apocryphon deals with Abram’s encounter with Melchizedek in XXII:14ff. Ostensibly, the account does not significantly differ from the Genesis account, though it does strive to clarify several key areas. Both the origin and the recipient of the tithe are specifically laid out – one tenth of the possessions of the Eastern Kings from Abram to Melchizedek – while the author identifies the biblical location of the encounter, the Valley of Shaveh, as the valley of Beth-ha-Kerem.<sup>17</sup> The wording of the blessing is also subtly altered. In Genesis, El-Elyon is described as ‘the maker (Heb. קנה) of heaven and earth.’ In 1QApGen, meanwhile, קנה is exchanged for מר/א/מרה ‘lord’. This may have had to do with later Jewish concerns regarding the procreative dimension of the root – implicit in Eve’s naming of Cain in Gen. 4:1 – and thus a desire to emphatically rule out this dimension in the LORD’s creative act. 1QApGen, then, is similar to the Targumim; i.e. it does not revolutionise the story in any way, but is more interested in filling in the gaps in the original account, while removing any potential difficulties.

#### 4Q‘Amram<sup>b</sup>

In TestAmram, Melchizedek is almost certainly contrasted with the figure Melchiresha, a figure who also appears in 4QTeharot D (4Q280). The similarity in names is obvious. Where מלכי-צדק may be translated ‘my king is righteous’, מלכי-רשע means ‘my king is wicked’. Levi narrates how, in a vision, he sees the two spirits who rule over humanity contesting for his body after death. The second of these describes (I:13-14) and then names his evil opponent, only the third name of

---

<sup>17</sup> Wenham suggests this should probably be further identified with Ramat Rachel, two and a half miles south of Jerusalem. Cf. G.J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15* (Word: Waco, 1987), 315.

which, 'Melchiresha', survives (II:2-5). Kobelski restores the first and second names as 'Belial' and 'Prince of Darkness'.<sup>18</sup>

The second figure then identifies himself:

... And I asked him [and said to him: "What are your names?" ... / ... and he answered and said to me: ["My] three names [are Michael, Prince of Light, and Melchizedek."] (4Q' Amram<sup>b</sup> III:1-2; Kobelski)

Although all three names are reconstructed, clearly they balance the earlier three names, and thus the opposition of Melchizedek to Melchiresha. As we shall see, the ruler of darkness (as Belial) appears in 11QMelchizedek and may be paralleled by Prince of Light, elsewhere identified as the archangel Michael.<sup>19</sup> The identification of Melchizedek as an angel, then, removes the human dimension of the biblical figure entirely placing emphasis on the super-human aspect. This is how Melchizedek is also understood in 11Q13.

### 11QMelchizedek (11Q13)

In 11Q13, the eponymous Melchizedek is only actually referred to a certain five times<sup>20</sup> and is not the main subject of the text, though the text is dependent on restoration.<sup>21</sup>

.	[	... מ .. על	]	1
ל	]	ואשר אמר בשנת היובל [הזואת תשבו איש אל	]	2
		אחוזתו הזה ואשר אמר זה]		
דבר	]	השמטה שמוט כול בעל משה יד אשר ישה [ברעהו לוא יגוש	]	3
		את רעהו ואת אחיו כיא קרא שמטה		
לא	]	לאל פשרו לאהרית הימים על השכויים אשרן ] אמר לקרא	]	4

<sup>18</sup> Cf. P.J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša*, CBQMS, 10 (Catholic Biblical Association of America: Washington, 1981).

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Dan. 12:1.

<sup>20</sup> II:5 (twice), 8, 9, and 13. Kobelski restores a sixth reference at the end of l. 24.

<sup>21</sup> For reconstructions see: A.S. Van der Woude, "Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefunden eschatologische Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI," *OTS* 14 (1965), 357; J.T. Milik, "Milki-šedeq et Milki-reša' dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens," *JJS* 23 (1972), 95-144; P.J. Kobelski, *op. cit.*; É. Puech, *La Croyance des Esséniens en la Vie Future: Immortalité, Résurrection, Vie Éternelle? Histoire d'une Croyance dans les Judaïsme Ancien – II Les Données Qumraniennes et Classiques* (Gabalda: Paris, 1993), esp. 516-62; and most recently E.J.C. Tigchelaar, J.P.M. Van der Ploeg, F. García-Martínez, A.S. Van der Woude (eds.), *Qumran Cave 11 (11Q2-18, 11Q20-31)*, DJD, 23 (Clarendon: Oxford, 1998).

- לשבויים דרור פשרו אשר יאמר  
 5 להיותמה מן בני הנשמים ומנחלת מלכי צדק כינא  
 והמה ב. [ מלכי צדק אשר  
 6 ישיבמה אליהמה וקרא להמה דרור לעזוב להמהן משא כול  
 עוונותיהמה ] ויאשה דבר הזה  
 7 בשבועה היובל הראשון אהרן תשעת היובלים וינזב הכפונרים  
 הוואה סוף היובל העשירי  
 8 לכפר בו על כול בני נאל ונאנשי גורל מלכי צדקן [ים עלניהמה  
 התנדבר לן] ותמה כיא  
 9 הוואה הקץ לשנת הרצון למלכי צדקן ]... [ן קדושי  
 אל למפעלת משפט כאשר כתוב  
 10 עליו בשירי דויד אשר אמר אלוהים נצב בענדה אל בקרב  
 אלוהים ישפוט ועלוי אמר ונעליה  
 11 למרום שובה אל ידי עמים ואשר אמר עד מתי תשפוטו  
 עורל ופני רשענים תשאו סלה  
 12 פשרו על בליעל ועל רוןחי גורלו אשר  
 בסורמה [מהוקי אל לנאשות רשע  
 13 ומלכי צדק יקום נקמתן משפטוי אל  
 מיד בליעל ומיד כול רוחי גורלן  
 14 ובעזרו כול אלי הצדק והוואה אשר  
 אל בני אל והפן ]  
 15 הזואת הוואה יום הנשלוס אשר אמר אל עליו בדברי  
 ישעיה הנביא אשר אמר מה נאנו  
 16 על הרים רגלני מבשור משמיע שלום מבשר טוב משמיע  
 ישועה [אמר לציון מלך אלוהיך  
 17 פשרו ההרנים המה הנביאים המה א  
 ... [נבאו לכול ]  
 18 והמבשר הוואה משיח הרוחן כאשר אמר דניאל עליו עד  
 משיח נגיד שבועים שבעה ומבשר  
 19 טוב משמיע ישועה הוואה הכנתון עליו אשר אמר לנחם כל  
 אבלים לשום לאבלי ציון  
 20 לנחם] הנאבלים פשרו לנהשכילמה בכול קצי העולם  
 21 [באמת לן] ... ] ...  
 22 [יה סרה מבליעל ות. ] ...  
 [נ.]  
 23 [ במשפטני אל כאשר כתוב עליו אנבר  
 לציון מלך אלוהיך ציון הניאה  
 24 [מקימני הברית הסרים מלכתן  
 בדרך העם נאלוהיך הוואה ]  
 25 [לן מיד בליעל ואשר אמר והעברתמה



שׁוֹפַר תְּרוּעָה [בַּחֹדֶשׁ] הַשְּׁבִיעִי

<sup>1</sup> [ ... ] . . . *km* . . . concerning [ ... ] <sup>2</sup> [ ... ] And as for what he said: “In [this] year of Jubilee [each man shall return to his property.” (Lev. 25:13) This is the just as it says; “And this is the] <sup>3</sup> [manner of the re]mission – each owner of a loan of (his) hand shall let drop that which he lends [to his neighbour. He shall not exact (it) of his neighbour or his brother for] {God’s} remission [has been proclaimed.”] (Deut. 15:2) <sup>4</sup> [Its interpretation (?) (concerns) the fi]nal days concerning the captives about whom [it says: “to proclaim to captives liberty.” (Isa. 61:1c) Its interpretation is that (God) w]ill declare <sup>5</sup> [them to be from the son]s of heaven of the inheritance of Melchi-Zedek f[or ... ] and they in [ ... of Melchi-Ze]dek who <sup>6</sup> will return them to there and proclaim liberty to them, forgiving them [the burden of all] their [in]iquity.] Now this event [will happen] <sup>7</sup> [in the] first [week] of the Jubilee after the [nine] Jubilees. And “the D[ay of Atone]ment” is the e[nd of the] tenth [Jub]ilee <sup>8</sup> to atone on (that day) for all the children of [God a]nd the men of the lot of Mel[chi]-Zedek [ ... ] concerning them he will [speak] to [ ... ] them for <sup>9</sup> it is the time of the year of favour for Melchi-Ze[dek] ... [ ... ] the holy ones of God in doing (sentences of) judgement. Just as he wrote <sup>10</sup> concerning it in the songs of David who said: “God [has taken his pla]ce in the divine cou[n]cil.] In the midst of gods shall he judge,” (Ps. 82:1) and concerning which he [said:] “Over it <sup>11</sup> take (your seat) on high. God judges the peoples.” (Ps. 7:7b-8 {Heb. 8b-9}) And as for what he sa[id: “How long will you j]udge unjustly and lif[t up] the face of the wick[e]d? [Sel]ah.” (Ps. 82:2) <sup>12</sup> Its interpretation concerns Belial and the spir[it]s of his lot wh[o ... rebell]ed by their turning from the statutes of God t[<sup>o</sup> do evil.] <sup>13</sup> And Melchi-Zedek shall s[urely] establish the judg[eme]nts of G[od ... from the hand of Be]lial and from the hand of all [the spirits of] his [lot.] <sup>14</sup> And helping him all the gods of [justice. It is h]e w[ho ... all] the children of God. And the [ ... ] {this} [ ... ] <sup>15</sup> It is the day of [Peace?] as [God] said [concerning it in the words of Isaia]h the prophet who sai[d: “How] beautiful <sup>16</sup> upon the mountains are the feet [of] the herald proclaiming peace, brin[ging good tidings, who proclaims salvati]on [sa]ying to Zion [‘Your God reigns’.” (Isa. 52:7) <sup>17</sup> Its interpretation: “The mount[ains]” are the pr[ophets]. They [ ... They] prophesi[ed] to all [ ... ] <sup>18</sup> And “the herald” he [is the an]ointed one of the spir[it] just as Dan[iel] said [concerning him: “Until (the time of) an anointed prince (there shall be seven weeks.” (Dan. 9:25b) And “the one who brings {good} tidings] <sup>19</sup> the one who proclai[ms salvation]” It is about him that it was wr[it]ten, as it [says: “to comfort all those in mourning, to provide for the mourners of Zion.” (Isa 61:2c-3a) <sup>20</sup> “To comfo[rt] th[ose in mourning.” Its interpretation:] to in[st]ruct them in all the ages of the [world ... ] <sup>21</sup> [in] truth to [ ... ] ... [ ... ] <sup>22</sup> [ ... ] withdrawal from Belial and [ ... ] n[ ... ] <sup>23</sup> [ ... ] in the judgements [of] God just as he wrote concerning it: [“Those who say to Zi]on ‘your God reigns’.” (Isa. 52:7) [“Zi]on” i[s] <sup>24</sup> [ ... ] the ratifiers [of] the covenant, those who have turned from following [in the way of] the people. And “your G[od]” is [ ... ] <sup>25</sup> [ ... ]/[ from] the hand of Belial. And as for what it says: “Then you shall send abroad the [ceremonial] trump[et] in the [seventh mon]th {on the tenth day of the month}.” (Lev. 25:9) (11QMelch II:1-25)

11QMelch is in actuality an extended midrash on Leviticus 25 and the command to return captives in the Jubilee year. The text, which is eschatological in outlook, speaks of the tenth jubilee when God will declare these captives to be part of the ‘inheritance’ of Melchizedek (l. 17). Melchizedek himself is given a judgemental role, establishing

the judgements of El and, as in TestAmram, is pitted against Belial. Clearly, then, Melchizedek is a member of the heavenly court and seems to enjoy a status above that of the other 'elohim'. So Fitzmyer:

Depending on how strictly and literally these OT quotations are to be applied to him, Melchizedek seems to enjoy a status among or even above such heavenly beings as 'the holy ones of God' (*q<sup>e</sup>dōšē 'El*) ... When Ps 7:8-9 is applied to him, it emerges that Melchizedek is somehow exalted above the *adat 'El*; and when Ps 82:2 is referred to Belial and the spirits of his lot (line 12), we learn that Melchizedek will exact the vengeance of divine judgement from them, being aided in this by 'all the [eternal] *'ēlīm*', i.e. by the angelic spirits of heaven.<sup>22</sup>

Recently, James VanderKam has proposed that the Qumran picture arises out of the Genesis concerns regarding the return of Lot and the other captives (Gen. 14:11-16). This is, he suggests, the heart of what the sabbatical and jubilee legislation is all about, *and Melchizedek figures in the middle of this story.*<sup>23</sup>

A more fruitful search, however, concerns the time-frame of ten jubilees pursued by the pesherist. The jubilee period is equivalent to seven weeks of (or 49) years.<sup>24</sup> Thus, a period of ten jubilees equates to the seventy weeks of years in Dan. 9:24-27, itself already a modification of the seventy years in Jer. 25:11-12 (cf. II Chron. 36:20-21). Daniel 9 depicts an 'anointed priest' who will arise in the seventh week (9:25), while midway through the sixty-ninth week week 'an anointed one shall be cut off and shall have nothing and the troops of the prince who is to come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary' – a transparent reference to the death of Onias III and Antiochus IV's purge. Unfortunately, Daniel does not specify how the 'decreed end' will be poured out on the desolator (9:27), nor does he refer to any messianic figure in the seventieth week.

TestLevi 16, meanwhile, also speaks of a period of seventy weeks when 'you shall wander astray and profane the priesthood and defile the sacrificial altars' (16:1). More significantly, however, ch. 17 speaks of seven jubilees each one epitomised by a particular priest, while the chapter as a whole describes the debasement of the priestly

---

<sup>22</sup> J. Fitzmyer, "Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11," *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (Chapman: London, 1971), 252.

<sup>23</sup> J.C. VanderKam, "Sabbatical Chronologies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature," in Lim, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context*, 173.

<sup>24</sup> The fiftieth year, or jubilee year proper, is excluded from calendrical dating.

order.<sup>25</sup> Thus, the priest of the first jubilee spoke to God as father (17:2), while in the seventh week of the seventh jubilee there will come priests: ‘idolators, adulterers, money lovers, arrogant, lawless, voluptuaries, pederasts, those who practice bestiality’ (17:11). Chapter eighteen, however, describes the restoration of the priesthood:

When vengeance will have come upon them from the Lord, the priesthood will lapse.

And then the Lord will raise up a new priest

To whom all the words of the Lord will be revealed.

He shall effect the judgement of truth over the earth for many days.

And his star shall rise in heaven like a **king**;

kindling the light of knowledge as day is illumined by the sun.

And he shall be extolled by the whole inhabited world.

(TestLevi 18:1-3; Kee)

Guided by the reference to the lapse of the priesthood, several scholars have identified this ‘new priest’ with one or other of the Maccabean priest-kings (following the lapse of the priesthood during the hellenistic crisis).<sup>26</sup> Nevertheless, Collins identifies the priest as Levi himself,<sup>27</sup> while the introduction of this passage into the material surrounding the seventy weeks and the description of a priest whose star ‘shall rise in heaven like a king’ may suggest the Genesis priest-king is here referred to – though Fitzmyer is correct to advise caution since Melchizedek does not appear by name.

The judgement theme continues in a passage from the Apocalypse of Weeks in I Enoch (93:1-9; 91:12-19). Here, history is divided into ten weeks of years:

And after this in the tenth week, in the seventh part, there will be the eternal judgement which will be executed on the watchers, and the great eternal heaven which will spring from the midst of the angels. And the first heaven will vanish and pass away, and a new heaven will appear, and all the powers of heaven will shine for ever (with) sevenfold (light). (I En. 91:15-16; Trans. Knibb<sup>28</sup>)

Ten weeks of years here equates to the seventy years described in Jeremiah 25, the source-text for Dan. 9. Nevertheless, the important aspect concerns the judgement theme, and especially the revelation that this judgement will be executed by the angels

---

<sup>25</sup> The relation between the seventy weeks (or ten jubilees) of apostasy and the seven jubilees of the priesthood is not clear. Cf. VanderKam, *Calendars*, 107-108; above, p226.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, I, 794, n. 18a.

<sup>27</sup> Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 66.

<sup>28</sup> Michael A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A new edition in the light of the Aramaic Dead Sea fragments*, II: Introduction, Translation and Commentary (Clarendon: Oxford, 1978), 220.

in heaven, similar in this respect to Melchizedek's function in 11Q13. The text does not, however, speak of any particular angel (11QMelch) or priest (TestLevi).

Although the depiction of Melchizedek in the DSS is not drawn from any *one* source, it may be seen to derive from a number of sources, including the original Genesis account. It is certainly a very roundabout way of understanding the Qumran figure and is necessarily complicated and there may be more direct routes. In a paper delivered to the Durham University Department of Theology Old Testament seminar I suggested that one such route might encompass the literature surrounding the 'Angel of Peace' (TestAsher 6:4-5; TestBenjamin 6:1). In Heb. this would read מלאך שלום thus phonetically similar to the Genesis depiction of Melchizedek as King of Salem (מלך שלם). While I still believe this approach has much to commend it, I am reluctant to press this reading given the purely circumstantial evidence in its favour and the lack of an 'Angel of Peace' in the angel list in Jubilees.

### ***11QMelchizedek as Thematic Pesher***

11QMelch, then, is a thematic pesher to the extent that it includes the operative term 'pesher' and offers explanation of biblical passages; passages drawn from various sections of the Hebrew Bible. It is also similar to passages of the pesharim we have explored in the main section of our study, in its use of a character drawn directly from the Hebrew Bible combined with the connections made to otherwise, less obvious sections of the Hebrew Bible; so Daniel and Jeremiah in their usage of the Jubilee system or its antecedents. Nevertheless it is certainly clear that 11QMelch is also substantially different to what we have seen in the pesharim, predominantly because Melchizedek is not conceived as a historical figure in the community's past (as per the Teacher of Righteousness, Man of Falsehood, Wicked Priest etc.) but is instead eschatological in its outlook. Leaving aside questions of 'continuous' as against 'thematic' pesharim, 11QMelchizedek is substantially different from those pesharim we have already considered, including 4QTest and 4QFlor, both traditionally numbered among the 'thematic' text-type. To add to our comments in the Introduction it was one of our original intentions to breakdown this artificial division of the pesharim into continuous and thematic types, a division which, when looked at in greater detail can be seen to be built on flimsy grounds, not least of which was the few

texts that could be specifically identified to one or the other. Nevertheless even allowing for this, 11QMelchizedek is still different, a difference that should be catered for in studies such as this. If nothing else, it stands as a constant reminder that modern attempts to 'box' the documents into neat piles are ultimately impractical.

## Appendix B: Index of major Peshar references

1QpHab	I:12-13	163-64, 193	4QpIsa <sup>b</sup>	II:2-11	195-96
	I:16-II:3	145, 193	4QpIsa <sup>c</sup>	4,5,6 I:16-21	110
	II:5-9	147		21 I:1-8	172
	II:10-16	37		23 II:3-14	111-12
	II:16-III:2	38-39	4QpIsa <sup>e</sup>	30 I:1-5	249
	III:2-6	39	4QpHos <sup>b</sup>	1-2 I:1-4	172-73
	III:6-14	42		2 I:1-7	113-14
	III:14-17	46		5-6 I:3	115
	III:17-IV:3	46	4QpPs <sup>a</sup>	10,26 I:1-5	116
	IV:3-9	48-49		1-10 I:19-24	116-17
	IV:9-16	50-51		1-10 I:25-II:1	210-11
	V:8-12	148, 198		1-10 II:16-21	118
	V:12-VI:8	53		1-10 III:14-20	173-74
	VI:8-12	66		1-10 IV:7-10	175, 249-50
	VI:12-VII:5	165		1-10 IV:13-16	212-13
	VII:4-5	147		1-10 IV:24-27	178
	VII:5-14	168		13 I:3-6	119
	VII:17-VIII:3	166	4QpPs <sup>b</sup>	1 I:1-7	180
	VIII:3-13	223-24		2 I:1-2	180
	VIII:13-IX:2	232-33	4QpNah	1-2 II:3-9	76
	VIII:15-IX:7	67-68		3-4 I:1-4	78, 92
	IX:2-7	241		3-4 I:4-9	93-94
	IX:8-12	156, 228		3-4 I:9-II:1	97
	IX:12-X:5	235-36		3-4 II:1-2	98
	X:5-13	199		3-4 II:3-6	98-99
	X:14-XI:2	203		3-4 II:7-10	100
	XI:2-8	158, 229		3-4 III:1-5	103
	XI:8-17	238		3-4 III:5-8	104
	XI:17-XII:6	230		3-4 III:8-12	104-5
	XII:2-3	215		3-4 III:12-IV:1	105-6
	XII:6-10	231-32		3-4 IV:1-4	107
	XII:12-14	137-38		3-4 IV:4-6	107
1QpPs	9 I:1-7	69	4QFlor	I:14	19
1QpMic	10 I:2-7	170, 208	4QTest	I:21-30	120
4QpIsa <sup>a</sup>	2-6 II:26-29	72	4QCat <sup>a</sup>	7+ II:11-16	125-26
	8-10 III:1-14	70-71	11QMelch	II:1-25	281-83

## Select Bibliography

### *Texts and Editions*

#### Bible

*BibleWorks for Windows version 3.5*, programmed by Michael S. Bushell (1996)

*Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, ed. K. Elliger, W. Rudolph *et al.* (Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft: Stuttgart, 1967).

*LXX Septuaginta*, ed. Alfred Rahlfs (Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft: Stuttgart, 1935).

*Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*, ed. R. Weber, B. Fischer, J. Gribomont, H. F. D. Sparks *et al.* (Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft: Stuttgart, 1969).

NRSV, *The New Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrypha*, ed. Bruce M. Metzger & Roland E. Murphy (Oxford University Press: New York, 1994).

#### Qumran: The Official DJD Series

DJD i. *Qumran Cave I*, ed. D. Barthélemy & J. T. Milik *et al.* (Clarendon: Oxford, 1955).

DJD ii. *Les grottes de Murabba'at*, ed. P. Benoit, J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux (Clarendon: Oxford, 1961).

DJD v. *Qumrân Cave 4, I (4Q 158 — 4Q 186)*, ed. J. M. Allegro (Clarendon: Oxford, 1968).

DJD xxiii. *Qumran Cave 11 (11Q2-18, 11Q20-31)*, ed. E. J. C. Tigchelaar, J. P. M. Van der Ploeg, F. García-Martínez, A. S. van der Woude (Clarendon: Oxford, 1998).

#### Other

Beentjes, Pancratius C., *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A text edition of all extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a synopsis of all parallel Hebrew Ben Sira texts* (E. J. Brill: Leiden, 1997).

Burrows, Millar, Trever, John C., and Brownlee, William H., *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, i. The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary* (American Schools of Oriental Research: New Haven, 1950)

Charlesworth, James H., ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2 vols. (Doubleday: New York, 1985).

García-Martínez, F, Tigchelaar, E. J. C., eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2 vols. (E. J. Brill: Leiden, 1997, 1998).

Lohse, Eduard, *Die Texte aus Qumran: Hebräisch und Deutsch mit Masoretischer Punktation Übersetzung, Einführung und Anmerkungen* (Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft: Kösel, Kempten, 1971).

*The Works of Josephus: Complete and Unabridged*, ed. William Whiston (Hendrickson: Peabody, 1987).

*The Works of Philo: Complete and Unabridged*, ed. C. D. Yonge (Hendrickson: Peabody, 1993).

### **Grammars, Lexica, Concordances, and other tools**

Brown, Francis, with the co-operation of S. R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs, *The New Brown-Driver-Briggs-Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon* (Hendrickson: Peabody, Massachusetts, 1979).

Charlesworth, James H., *Graphic Concordance to the Dead Sea Scrolls* (J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck): Tübingen, 1991).

Liddell, H. G., Scott, R., and Jones, H. S., *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 2 vols. (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1968).

Lim, Timothy H., in consultation with Philip S. Alexander, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library*, vol. 1 (Oxford University Press/Brill Academic Publishers: Oxford/Leiden, 1997).

Qimron, Elisha, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Harvard Semitic Studies (Scholars Press: Atlanta, 1986).

Sokoloff, Michael, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period* (Bar-Ilan University Press: Ramat-Gan, 1990).

*The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche: a comprehensive facsimile edition of the texts from the Judean desert*, ed. E. Tov (E. J. Brill: Leiden, 1993).

Weingreen, J., *A Practical Grammar for Classical Hebrew*, second ed. (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1959).

Whitaker, Richard, *Whitaker's Revised BDB Hebrew-English Lexicon* (1995).

### **Studies**

Abegg, M. G. "The Messiah at Qumran: Are We Still Seeing Double?," *DSD* 2 (1995), 125-44.

Allegro, John M. "A Newly-Discovered Fragment of a Commentary on Psalm XXXVII from Qumran," *PEQ* 86 (1954), 69-75.



- \_\_\_\_\_, "Further Messianic references in Qumran Literature," *JBL* 75 (1956), 174-87.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Further Light on the History of the Qumran Sect," *JBL* 75 (1956), 89-95.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Penguin: Harmondsworth, 1956).
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Addendum to Professor Millar Burrow's [*sic.*] Note on the Ascent from Accho in 4QpIsa<sup>a</sup>" *VT* 7 (1957), 183.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "More Isaiah Commentaries from Qumran's Fourth Cave," *JBL* 77 (1958), 215-21.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrašim," *JBL* 77 (1958), 350-54.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "A Recently Discovered Fragment of a Commentary on Hosea from Qumran's Fourth Cave," *JBL* 78 (1959), 142-47.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Thrakidan, The 'Lion of Wrath' and Alexander Jannaeus," *PEQ* 91 (1959), 47-51.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "An Unpublished Fragment of Essene Halakhah (4Q Ordinances)," *JSS* 6 (1961), 71-73.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "More Unpublished Pieces of a Qumran Commentary on Nahum (4Q pNah)," *JSS* 7 (1962), 304-8.
- Amoussine, Joseph D., "Éphraïm et Manassé dans le Pêshèr de Nahum (4 Q p Nahum)," *RevQ* 4 (1963-64), 389-96.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "À propos de l'interprétation de 4 Q 161 (fragments 5-6 et 8)," *RevQ* 8 (1974), 381-392.
- Amusin, Joseph D., "The Reflection of Historical Events of the First Century B.C. in Qumran Commentaries (4Q 161; 4Q 169; 4Q 166)," *HUCA* 48 (1977), 123-52.
- Atkinson, K. M. T., "The Historical Setting of the Habakkuk Commentary," *JSS* 4 (1959), 238-63.
- Barthélemy, D., "Notes en Marge de Publications Récentes sur les Manuscrits de Qumrân," *RB* 59 (1952), 187-218.
- Basser, Herbert W., "Peshet Hadavar: The Truth of the Matter," *RevQ* 49-52 (1988), 389-405.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M., "Does TLH in the Temple Scroll Refer to Crucifixion?," *JBL* 91 (1972), 472-481.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Yom Kippur in the Qumran Scrolls and Second Temple Sources," *DSD* 6 (1999), 184-191.

- Bernstein, Moshe J., "Introductory Formulas for Citation and Re-Citation of Biblical Verses in the Qumran Pesharim: Observations on a Peshar Technique," *DSD* 1 (1994), 30-70.
- Berrin, Shani L., "Lemma/Peshar Correspondence in Peshar Nahum," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery 1947-1997. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997*, ed. Emmanuel Tov, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and James C. VanderKam (Israel Exploration Society in co-operation with the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum: Jerusalem, 2000), 341-350.
- Bloch, Renée, "Midrash," in *Dictionnaire de la Bible* (ed. F. G. Vigoroux); *Supplément 5*, ed. L. Pirot, A. Robert, and H. Cazelles (Letouzey et Ané: Paris, 1957), cols. 1263-81.
- Brooke, George J., "Qumran Peshar: Towards the Redefinition of a Genre," *RevQ* 40 (1981), 483-503.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context*, ed. Philip R. Davies, David J. A. Clines, JSOTSup, 29 (JSOT Press: Sheffield, 1985).
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Biblical Texts in the Qumran Commentaries: Scribal Errors or Exegetical Variants?," in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee*, ed. Craig A. Evans and William F. Stinespring (Scholars Press: Atlanta, Georgia, 1987), 85-100.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Kittim in the Qumran Pesharim," in *Images of Empire*, ed. Loveday Alexander, JSOTSup (JSOT Press: Sheffield, 1991).
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Genre of 4Q252: From Poetry to Peshar," *DSD* 1 (1994), 160-79.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Shared Intertextual Interpretations in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament," in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls – Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12-14 May, 1996*, ed. Michael E. Stone & Esther G. Chazon (E. J. Brill: Leiden, 1998), 35-57.
- Brownlee, William H., "The Jerusalem Habakkuk Scroll," *BASOR* 112 (1948), 8-18.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Biblical Interpretation Among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *BASOR* 14:3 (1951), 54-76.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Historical Allusions of the Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash," *BASOR* 126 (1952), 10-20.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Habakkuk Midrash and the Targum of Jonathan," *JJS*, no. 7 (1956), 169-86.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament," *NTS* 3 (1956-57), 12-30, 195-210.

- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary from Qumran*, JBL Monograph Series, 11 (Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis: Philadelphia, 1959).
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Placarded Revelation of Habakkuk," *JBL* 82 (1963), 319-325.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk*, ed. Leander E. Keck, SBL Monograph Series, 24 (Scholars Press: Missoula, Montana, 1979).
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Wicked Priest, The Man of Lies, and The Righteous Teacher – The Problem of Identity," *JQR* 73 (1982), 1-37.
- Burgmann, Hans, "Who Was the 'Wicked Priest'?", *FO* 25 (1988), 41-44.
- Burrows, Millar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Secker & Warburg: London, 1956).
- \_\_\_\_\_, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls: New Scrolls and New Interpretations* (Secker & Warburg: London, 1958).
- Callaway, Phillip R., "The History of the Qumran Community. An Investigation," *FO* 25 (1988), 143-150.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The History of the Qumran Community: An Investigation*, JSOTSup, 3 (JSOT Press: Sheffield, 1988).
- Carmignac, Jean, "À Propos d'une Restitution dans le Commentaire du Psaume 37," *RevQ* 1 (1959), 431.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Notes sur les Pesharim," *RevQ* 3 (1961-62), 505-38.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "La Notion d'Eschatologie dans la Bible et à Qumran," *RevQ* 7 (1969), 17-31.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Le Document de Qumrân sur Melkisedeq," *RevQ* 7 (1970), 343-78.
- Charles, R. H., *The book of Jubilees, or, The little Genesis translated from the editor's Ethiopic text and edited, with Introduction, notes and indices by R. H. Charles* (A. & C. Black: London, 1902).
- Charlesworth, J. H., Charlesworth, "The Origin and Subsequent History of the Authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Four Transitional Phases among the Qumran Essenes," *RevQ* 10 (1980), 213-233.
- Chilton, Bruce D., "Commenting on the Old Testament (with particular reference to the pesharim, Philo, and the Mekilta)," in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*, ed. D.A. Carson & H. G. M. Williamson (University Press: Cambridge, 1988), 122-40.
- Clements, R. E., "The Messianic Hope in the Old Testament," *JSOT* 43 (1989), 3-18.
- Collins, John J., *Daniel*, ed. Frank Moore Cross, *Hermeneia – A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible* (Fortress: Minneapolis, 1993).

- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*, ed. David Noel Freedman, ABRL (Doubleday: New York, 1995).
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Expectation of the End in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. C. A. Evans, & Flint, P. W., *Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature* (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 1997), 74-90.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls, The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Routledge: London, 1997).
- Cross, Frank M., "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran," *JBL* , 147-72.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert," *HTR* , 281-99.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 3rd edition (Sheffield Academic Press: Sheffield, 1995).
- Dagut, M. B., "The Habakkuk Scroll and Pompey's Capture of Jerusalem," *Biblica* 32 (1951), 542-548.
- Daumas, François, "Littérature prophétique et exegetique Egyptienne et Commentaires Esséniens," in *À la rencontre de Dieu: memorial Albert Gelin*, Bibliothèque de la faculté catholique de théologie de Lyon, 8 (Xavier Mappus: Le Puy, 1961), 203-21.
- Davies, Philip R., "Hasidim in the Maccabean Period," *JJS* 28 (1977), 127-140.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the "Damascus Document"*, ed. David J. A. Clines, Philip R. Davies, David M. Gunn, *JSOTSup*, 25 (JSOT Press: Sheffield, 1982).
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Was There Really a Qumran Community?," *Currents in Research: BS* 3 (1995), 9-35.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Sects and Scrolls: Essays on Qumran and Related Topics*, South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism, 134 (Scholars Press: Atlanta, 1996).
- \_\_\_\_\_, "James in the Qumran Scrolls," in *James The Just and Christian Origins*, ed. Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans, *NovTestSup*, 98 (E. J. Brill: Leiden, 1999), 17-31.
- Del Medico, H., *The Riddle of the Scrolls* (Burke: London, 1958).
- \_\_\_\_\_, "L'identification des Kittim avec des Romains," *VT* 10 (1960), 448-453.
- Delcor, M., "Le Midrash d'Habacuc," *RB* 58 (1951), 521-48.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Melchizedek from Genesis to the Qumran texts and the Epistle to the Hebrews," *JJS* 2 (1971), 115-35.

- Dimant, Devorah, "Pesharim, Qumran," in *ABD* v, 244-51.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The 'Pesharim on the Periods' (4Q180) and 4Q181," *Israel Oriental Studies* 9 (1979), 77-102.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Apocalyptic Interpretation of Ezekiel at Qumran," in *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity*, ed. Shaul Shaked and Gedaliahu G. Stroumsa, Ithamar Gruenwald (Mohr-Siebeck: Tübingen, 1992), 31-51.
- Dion, Paul-Eugene, "Les KTYM de Tel Arad: Grecs ou Phéniciens?," *RB* 99 (1992), 70-97.
- Doudna, Greg, "4Q Peshar Nahum: A Critical Edition" (Dr. Teol., University of Copenhagen, 1999).
- Douglas, Michael C., "The Teacher Hymn Hypothesis Revisited: New Data for an Old Crux," *DSD* 6 (1999), 239-66.
- Driver, G. R., *The Judaean Scrolls: The Problem and a Solution* (Basil Blackwell: Oxford, 1965).
- Dupont-Sommer, André, "Le 'Commentaire d'Habacuc' découvert près de la Mer Morte: Traduction et notes," *RHR* 137 (1950), 129-71.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey*, trans. E. Margaret Rowley (Basil Blackwell: Oxford, 1952).
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Essene Writings from Qumran*, trans. G. Vermes (Basil Blackwell: Oxford, 1961).
- Eisenmann, Robert, "The Historical Provenance of the 'Three Nets of Belial' Allusion in the Zadokite Document and BALLA'/BELA' in the Temple Scroll," *FO* 25 (1988), 51-66.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the First Christians: Essays and Translations* (Element: Shaftesbury, 1996).
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Wise, Michael, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* (Element Press: Longmead, 1992).
- Elliger, Karl, *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer*, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, 15 (J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck): Tübingen, 1953).
- Eshel, Hanan, "The Historical Background of the Pesharim Interpreting Joshua's Curse on the Rebuilder of Jericho," *RevQ* 15 (1992), 409-420.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Kittim in the War Scroll and in the Pesharim," in *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 27-31 January*

1999, ed. A. Pinnick, D. Goodblatt, & D. R. Schwartz (E. J. Brill: Leiden, forthcoming), 29-44.

\_\_\_\_\_, with Esther Eshel, "4Q448, Psalm 154 (Syriac), Sirach 48:20, and 4QpIsa<sup>a</sup>," *JBL* 119 (2000), 645-659.

Finkel, Asher, "The Peshet of Dreams and Scriptures," *RevQ* 4 (1963-64), 357-370.

Fishbane, Michael, "The Qumran Peshet and Traits of Ancient Hermeneutics," in *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, ed. Avigdor Shinon (1977).

\_\_\_\_\_, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1985).

Fitzmyer, Joseph A., "'4QTestimonia' and the New Testament," in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, ed. J. A. Fitzmyer (Chapman: London, 1971), 59-89.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Now this Melchizedek . . . (Heb 7:1)," in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, ed. J. A. Fitzmyer (Chapman: London, 1971), 221-243.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11," in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, ed. J. A. Fitzmyer (Chapman: London, 1971), 245-267.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Crucifixion in Ancient Palestine, Qumran Literature and the NT," *CBQ* 40 (1978), 493-513.

Flusser, D., "The Apocryphal Book of *Ascensio Isaiah* and the Dead Sea Sect," *IEJ* 3 (1953), 30-47.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Two Notes on the Midrash on 2 Sam. vii," *IEJ* 9 (1959), 99-109.

Fraade, Steven D., "Interpretative Authority in the Studying Community at Qumran," *JJS* 44, 46-69.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Looking for Legal Midrash at Qumran," in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls – Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12-14 May, 1996*, ed. Michael E. Stone & Esther G. Chazon (E. J. Brill: Leiden, 1998), 59-79.

Freedman, David Noel, "The 'House of Absalom' in the Habakkuk Scroll," *BASOR* 114 (1949), 11-12.

Frohlich, Ida, "Le Genre littéraire des Pesharim de Qumrân," *RevQ* 12 (1986), 383-398.

\_\_\_\_\_, "'Narrative Exegesis' in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls – Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the*

*Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12-14 May, 1996*, ed. Michael E. Stone & Esther G. Chazon (E. J. Brill: Leiden, 1998), 81-99.

García-Martínez, F., and van der Woude, A. S., "A 'Groningen' Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History," *RevQ* 14 (1990), 521-542.

García-Martínez, F., "Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis," *FO* 25 (1988), 113-136.

Gmirkin, Russell, "The War Scroll and Roman Weaponry Reconsidered," *DSD* 3 (1996), 89-129.

Goranson, Stephen, "The Exclusion of Ephraim in Rev. 7:4-8 and Essene Polemic against Pharisees," *DSD* 2 (1995), 80-85.

Gordon, Robert P., "The Targum to the Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Texts: Textual and Exegetical Notes," , 425-29.

\_\_\_\_\_, "The Interpretation of 'Lebanon' and 4Q285," *JJS* 43 (1992), 92-94.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Tg Habakkuk and the Habakkuk Peshet," in *Studies in the Targum to the Twelve Prophets: From Nahum to Malachi*, ed. Robert P. Gordon, VTSup, 51 (E. J. Brill: Leiden, 1994), 83-95.

Grabbe, Lester L., *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian*, one-volume ed. (SCM: London, 1994).

Grossfeld, Bernard, "Targum Onkelos and Rabbinic Interpretation to Genesis 2:1, 2," *JJS*, 176-78.

Haak, Robert D., *Habakkuk*, VTSup 44 (E. J. Brill: Leiden, 1992)

Halperin, D. L., "Crucifixion, the Nahum Peshet and the Rabbinic Penalty of Strangulation," *JJS* 32 (1981), 32-46.

Hamerton-Kelly, R. G., "The Temple and the Origins of Jewish Apocalyptic," *VT* 20, 1-15.

Hayward, C. T. R., "The Jewish Temple at Leontopolis: A Reconsideration," *JJS* 33 (1982), 429-443.

\_\_\_\_\_, *The Jewish Temple: A non-Biblical sourcebook* (Routledge: London, 1996).

Joseph Heinemann, "The Messiah of Ephraim and the Premature Exodus of the Tribe of Ephraim," *HTR* 8 (1975), 1-15.

Hendel, R. S., "4Q252 and the Flood Chronology of Genesis 7-8: A Text-Critical Solution," *DSD* 2 (1995), 72-9.

Hengel, Martin, *Crucifixion: In the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross* (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1977)

- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Zealots: Investigations into the Jewish Freedom Movement in the Period from Herod I until 70 A.D.*, trans. David Smith (T. & T. Clark: Edinburgh, 1989).
- Hoenig, Sidney B., "Dorshe Halakot in the Peshar Nahum Scrolls," *JBL* 83 (1964), 119-38.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Peshar Nahum 'Talmud'," *JBL* 86 (1967), 441-445.
- Horgan, Maurya P., *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*, CBQ:MS 8 (The Catholic Biblical Association of America: Washington, 1979).
- Horton, Fred L., *The Melchizedek Tradition: A critical examination of the sources to the fifth century A.D. and in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Cambridge University Press: London, 1976)
- Jacobs, Irving, *The Midrashic Process: Tradition and Interpretation in Rabbinic Judaism* (University Press: Cambridge, 1995).
- Jagersma, H., *A History of Israel to Bar Kochba*, one-volume ed. (SCM: London, 1994).
- Jeremias, Gert, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*, Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments, 2 (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen, 1963).
- Jull, A. J. Timothy, Donahue, Douglas J., Broshi, Magen, and Emmanuel Tov, "Radiocarbon Dating of Scrolls and Linen Fragments from the Judean Desert," *Radiocarbon* 37 (1995), 11-19.
- Kingsbury, Edwin C., "He Set Ephraim Before Manasseh," *HUCA* 38 (1967), 129-136.
- Kister, Menahem, "Biblical Phrases and Hidden Biblical Interpretations and Pesharim," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, ed. Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport (E. J. Brill: Leiden, 1992), 27-39.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "A Common Heritage: Biblical Interpretation at Qumran and Its Implications," in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls – Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12-14 May, 1996*, ed. Michael E. Stone & Esther G. Chazon (E. J. Brill: Leiden, 1998), 101-11.
- Kobelski, P. J., *Melchizedek and Melchiresa'*, CBQ:MS, 10 (The Catholic Biblical Association of America: Washington, 1981).
- Lane, William R., "Pešer Style as a Reconstruction Tool in 4 Q Pešer Isaiah B," *RevQ* 2 (1959-60), 281-283.
- Lehmann, O. H., "Materials Concerning the Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls: I: Habakkuk," *PEQ* (1951), 32-54.



- Lim, Timothy H., "Eschatological Orientation and the Alteration of Scripture in the Habakkuk Peshet," *JNES* 49 (1990), 185-194.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Attitudes to Holy Scripture in the Qumran Pesharim and Pauline Letters" (D. Phil., University of Oxford, 1991).
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Chronology of the Flood Story in a Qumran Text (4Q252)," *JJS* 43 (1992), 288-298.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Wicked Priests of the Groningen Hypothesis," *JBL* 112 (1993), 415-425.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters* (Clarendon: Oxford, 1997).
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Midrash Peshet in the Pauline Letters," in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After*, ed. Stanley E. Porter & Craig A. Evans, *JSPSup*, 26 (Academic Press: Sheffield, 1997).
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Wicked Priest or the Liar?," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context*, ed. Timothy H. Lim *et al.* (T.&T. Clark: Edinburgh, 2000), 45-51.
- \_\_\_\_\_, with Hurtado, Larry W., Auld, A. Graeme, and Jack, Alison, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (T. & T. Clark: Edinburgh, 2000).
- Maier, Johann, "Early Jewish Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran Literature," in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, ed. M. Saebo (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen, 1996), 108-129.
- Main, Emmanuelle, "For King Jonathan or Against? The Use of the Bible in 4Q448," in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls – Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12-14 May, 1996*, ed. Michael E. Stone & Esther G. Chazon (E. J. Brill: Leiden, 1998), 113-35.
- Mansoor, Menahem, *The Thanksgiving Hymns: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction*, Studies on the texts of the desert of Judah, III (E. J. Brill: Leiden, 1961).
- Milik, Josef T., "Fragments d'un Midrash de Michée dans les Manuscrits de Qumrân," *RB* 59 (1952), 412-418.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*, trans. J. Strugnell, Studies in Biblical Theology (SCM: London, 1959).
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Milkî-šedeq et Milkî-reša' dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens," *JJS* 23 (1972), 95-144.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome, "An Essene Missionary Document? CD II,14-VI,1," *RB* 77 (1970), 201-229.

- \_\_\_\_\_, "A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document VI,2-VIII,3," *RB* 78 (1971), 210-232.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Translation of Damascus Document VI,11-14," *RevQ* 7 (1971), 553-556.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Critique of the Princes of Judah (CD VIII,3-19)," *RB* 79 (1972), 200-216.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document XIX,33-XX,34," *RB* 79 (1972), 544-564.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Essenes and Their History," *RB* 81 (1974), 215-244.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Demetrius I and the Teacher of Righteousness (I Macc. x, 25-45)," *RB* (1976), 400-420.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Essenes in Palestine," *BA* (1977), 100-124.
- Neusner, Jacob, *From Politics to Piety: The Emergence of Pharisaic Judaism*, Second ed. (Ktav: New York, 1979).
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Introduction to Rabbinic Literature*, ABRL (Doubleday: New York, 1994).
- Nickelsburg, George W. E., "Simon – A Priest With A Reputation For Faithfulness," *BASOR* 223 (1976), 67-68.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (Fortress: Philadelphia, 1981).
- Niehoff, Maren, "A Dream which is not Interpreted is like a Letter which is not Read," *JJS* 43 (1992), 58-84.
- Oppenheim, A. Leo, *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East: With a Translation of an Assurian Dream Book*, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, 46:3 (American Philosophical Society: Philadelphia, 1956), 179-374.
- Oswalt, John N., *The Book of Isaiah – Chapters 1-39*, ed. R. K. Harrison, NICOT (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 1986).
- Pardee, Dennis, "A Restudy of the Commentary on Psalm 37 from Qumran Cave 4," *RevQ* 8 (1973), 163-194.
- Pate, C. Marvin, *Communities of the Last Days: The Dead Sea Scrolls, the New Testament & the Story of Israel* (Apollos: Leicester, 2000).
- Pearson, Brook W. R., "Dry Bones in the Judean Desert: The Messiah of Ephraim, Ezekiel 37, and the Post-Revolutionary Followers of Bar Kokhba," *JSJ* 29 (1998), 192-201.

- Pines, S., "Notes on the Twelve Tribes in Qumran, Early Christianity and Jewish Tradition," in *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity*, ed. Shaul Shaked and Gedaliahu G. Stroumsa, Ithamar Gruenwald (Mohr-Siebeck: Tübingen, 1992), 151-54.
- 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: Colloque de Strasbourg 25-27 Mai 1955*, Travaux de centre d'études supérieures spécialisé d'histoire des religions de Strasbourg (Presses Universitaires de France: Paris, 1957), 25-35.
- Puech, Émile, "Notes sur le manuscrit de XIMelchisedeq," *RevQ* 12 (1987), 483-513.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *La Croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d'une croyance dans le Judaïsme ancien – II Les données Qumraniennes et classiques* (Gabalda: Paris, 1993).
- Rabin, Chaim, "Alexander Jannaeus and the Pharisees," *JJS* 7 (1956), 3-11.
- Rabinowitz, Isaac, "The Second and Third Columns of the Habakkuk Interpretation Scroll," *JBL* 69 (1950), 31-49.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Peshar/Pittaron: Its Biblical Meaning and its Significance in the Qumran Literature," *RevQ* 8 (1973), 219-232.
- Rainbow, Paul A., "The Last Oniad and the Teacher of Righteousness," *JJS* 48 (1997), 30-52.
- Ringgren, Helmer, *The Faith of Qumran: Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, trans. Sander, Emilie T., New ed., Christian Origins Library (Crossroad: New York, 1995).
- Robertson, O. Palmer, *The Books of Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah*, ed. R. K. Harrison, NICOT (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 1990).
- Rosenbloom, Joseph R., "Notes on Historical Identifications in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *RevQ* 1 (1958), 265-272.
- Rowley, H. H., *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Basil Blackwell: Oxford, 1952).
- \_\_\_\_\_, "4QpNahum and the Teacher of Righteousness," *JBL* 75 (1956), 188-193.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Kittim and the Dead Sea Scrolls," *PEQ* 88 (1956), 92-109.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H., "Pharisees and Sadducees in Peshar Nahum," in *Minhah le-Nahum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of his 70th Birthday*, ed. Marc Brettler and Michael Fishbane (JSOTSS: Sheffield, 1993), 272-290.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Pharisaic and Sadducean Halakhah in light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Case of Tevul Yom," *DSD* 1 (1994), 285-299.

- \_\_\_\_\_, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their True Meaning for Judaism and Christianity*, ABRL (Doubleday: New York, 1995).
- Schürer, Emil, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135)*, Revised by Geza Vermes & Fergus Millar ed., 3 vols. (T. & T. Clark: Edinburgh, 1973).
- Shanks, Hershel, ed., *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls* (SPCK: London, 1993).
- Silberman, Lou H., "Unriddling the Riddle: A Study in the Structure and Language of the Habakkuk Peshar (1QpHab)," *RevQ* 3 (1961-62), 323-364.
- Slomovic, Elieser, "Towards an Understanding of the Exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *RevQ* 7 (1969-71), 3-15.
- Snyder, H. Gregory, "Naughts and Crosses: Peshar Manuscripts and their Significance for Reading Practices at Qumran," *DSD* 7 (2000), 26-48.
- Stegemann, Hartmut, "Der Peshar Psalm 37 aus Höhle 4 von Qumran (4Q p Ps 37)," *RevQ* 4 (1963), 235-270.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Weitere Stücke von 4 Q p Psalm 37, von 4 Q Patriarchal Blessings auf eine unedierte Handschrift aus Höhle 4 Q mit Exzerpten aus dem Deuteronomium," *RevQ* 6 (1967), 193-227.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde* (published privately: Bonn, 1971).
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 1998).
- Stemberger, Gunter, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, trans. Markus Bockmuehl, Second ed. (T. & T. Clark: Edinburgh, 1996).
- Stendahl, Krister, *The School of St. Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament*, Acta Seminarii NeoTestamentici Upsaliensis, 20 (C. W. K. Gleerup: Lund, 1954).
- Studel, A., "4QMidrEschat: «A Midrash on Eschatology» (4Q174 + 4Q177)" (paper presented at the *Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 1991*), 531-41.
- Strugnell, John, "Notes en Marge du Volume V des «Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan»," *RevQ* 7 (1969-71), 163-276.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T., *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Texts, Translation, and Commentary*, Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum, 63 (Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen, 1997).
- Talmon, Shemaryahu, "Notes on the Habakkuk Scroll," *VT* 1 (1951), 33-37.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Yom Hakippurim in the Habakkuk Scroll," *Biblica* 32 (1951), 549-563.

- Taradaach, Madeleine, *Le Midrash: Introduction à la littérature midrashique (Drš dans la Bible, les Targumim, les Midrašim)*, Le Monde de la Bible, 22 (Labor et Fides: Genève, 1991).
- Trever, John C., "The Qumran Teacher – Another Candidate?," in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in memory of William Hugh Brownlee*, ed. Craig A. Evans and William F. Stinespring (Scholars Press: Atlanta, Georgia, 1987), 101-121.
- VanderKam, James C., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (SPCK: London, 1994).
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time*, The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls (Routledge: London, 1998).
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Sabbatical Chronologies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (T. & T. Clark: Edinburgh, 2000), 159-178.
- Vaux, Roland P. de, "Exploration de la région de Qumrân: Rapport préliminaire," *RB* 60 (1953), 540-561.
- Vermes, Geza, *Discovery in the Judean Desert* (Desclée Company: New York, 1956).
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Lebanon: The Historical Development of an Exegetical Tradition," in *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*, 2nd ed., ed. G. Vermes (E. J. Brill: Leiden, 1973), 26-39.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective*, Revised 3rd ed. (SCM: London, 1994).
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (Penguin: London, 1997).
- Vogt, E., "Fragmentum Ps 37 ex Qumran," *Biblica* 36 (1955), 263-264.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "'Mysteria' in Textibus Qumran," *Biblica* 37 (1956), 247-257.
- Weinert, Francis D., "A Note on 4Q159 and a New Theory of Essene Origins," , 223-230.
- White, Richard T., "The House of Peleg in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *A tribute to Geza Vermes: essays on Jewish and Christian literature and history*, ed. P. R. Davies & R. T. White, JSOTSup 100 (JSOT Press: Sheffield, 1990), 67-98.
- Wieder, N., "The Habakkuk Scroll and the Targum," *JJS* 4 (1953), 14-18.
- Williamson, H. G. M., "The Translation of 1 Q p Hab. V, 10," *RevQ* 9 (1977), 263-265.
- Winter, Paul, "Two Non-Allegorical Expressions in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *PEQ* 91 (1959), 38-46.

- Wood, Marcus, "Peshet Habakkuk and the Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel," *JSP* 19 (1999), 129-146.
- Worrell, J., "'sh: 'Counsel' or 'Council' at Qumran?," *VT* 20 (1970), 65-74.
- Woude, A. S. van der, "Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefunden eschatologische Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI," *OTS* 14 (1965).
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests? Reflections on the Identification of the Wicked Priest in the Habakkuk Commentary," *JJS* 33 (1982), 349-359.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Once Again: The Wicked Priests in the Habakkuk Peshet from Cave 1 of Qumran," *RevQ* 17 (1996), 375-384.
- Wright, Addison G., "The Literary Genre Midrash (Part Two)," *CBQ* 28 (1966), 417-457.
- Yadin, Yigael, "Some Notes on The Newly Published Pesharim of Isaiah," *IEJ* 9 (1959), 39-42.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "A Midrash on 2 Sam. vii and Ps. i-ii (4Q Florilegium)," *IEJ* 9 (1959), 95-98.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*, trans. Batya & Chaim Rabin (University Press: Oxford, 1962)
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Peshet Nahum (4Q pNahum) Reconsidered," *IEJ* 21 (1971), 1-12.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Masada: Herod's Fortress and the Zealot's Last Stand*, paperback ed. (Steinmatzky: 1997).
- Zeitlin, Solomon, "The Hebrew Pogrom and the Hebrew Scrolls," *JQR* (1952), 140-152.